

CHAPTER XX

NORTHERN PALESTINE IN THE MIDDLE BRONZE II B - III

Although the MB II B - III periods are fairly well-represented on the Phoenician coast, the sequence was not founded on materials from that region. The sequence was anticipated for the MB II B - III in that region because the earliest evidence of the MB II was found there, at Byblos.

The sequence of materials is based on the mass of groups found in Palestine. Of the regions of Palestine, the Northern was the most important. It contained the site of Megiddo, which yielded a complete sequence of materials for the periods from the MB II B - III. Other sites, such as Hazor, Tell Far'ah (N) and Ras el Ain, were of some value in this region, but none were as important as Megiddo.

Megiddo

Materials of Middle Bronze II B - III date were published from the so-called strata XV-X at Megiddo.¹ As Kathleen Kenyon has pointed out, these were neither strata nor valid architectural phases, but

¹Loud, Megiddo II, for Area AA, pp. 6-16 describe the pertinent materials; for Area BB, pp. 78-102 describe "Strata" XV-X; the loci are registered on pp. 145-188; pertinent plans are located on figs. 378-81 (area AA) and figs. 394-400 (area BB); pottery is illustrated on plates 7-47. Henceforth, plans will be cited by either the so-called "Stratum" number of Kenyon's architectural phase letter; pottery or tombs will be cited by the locus number and/or the illustration number in this dissertation.

collections of tombs, buildings and fragments of buildings. In many cases, these had approximately the same height above sea level, but not even this criterion was consistently used to establish a stratum. As is well known, the stratigraphic observation was poor; floors were rarely observed, while disturbances such as burial pits and robbers' trenches were not noticed.¹ As a result, the "Strata" cannot be considered real strata, since buildings have nothing to do with each other and the pottery published from the "Strata" came from tombs which were generally dug from above.

In two articles, Miss Kenyon has published a major attempt at salvaging substantial information from this confusion. Her method in the Middle Bronze Age was to establish two sequences, one for pottery and the other for architecture. The pottery sequence was based on her materials at Jericho in the MB III; she attempted no classification of MB II.² This was a standard qualitative sort.³ The architectural phases were based mainly on the evidence of stratigraphy. A building or feature found above another had to supersede it.⁴ In addition, a feature might cut across another, showing that it was later than the second feature.⁵ On the other hand, parts of buildings might be grouped

¹Kathleen Kenyon, "Some Notes on the Early and Middle Bronze Age Strata of Megiddo", Eretz-Israel, 5 (1958), pp. 51-60; Kathleen Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", Levant, 1 (1969), pp. 25-60; on pp. 25-26 she discusses the problems of MB "Strata".

²Ibid., pp. 26, 36.

³Ibid., pp. 25-26.

⁴Ibid., pp. 42-43; the discussion of 4040 demonstrates the method.

⁵Ibid., p. 43; the discussion of the town wall truncating adjacent buildings is illustrative.

together, generally based upon the fact that their plans were complementary and could be joined together, like two pieces of a broken pot.¹ In one case, a building was reconstructed from the plans of three successive "strata" which contained portions of the foundations, and the superstructure, respectively.²

Miss Kenyon then plotted tombs of the various pottery phases on tracing paper and placed it over the plans of earlier and later phases. Tombs found under walls of one phase might plausibly be considered earlier than that phase. Other tombs might be sealed above the same complex.³ By this means she created a sequence of tombs and building complexes that to some extent verified each other (see Table 31).

There were some problems with this reconstruction, which were quickly pointed out by Üve Müller and Thomas Thompson. They demonstrated that Miss Kenyon had not systematically plotted all of the tombs on all of the "strata".⁴ Thus they found where several tombs which they believed sealed above or below complexes that seriously affected her tomb classification, if they did not overturn it.⁵ In addition, they pointed out that she had failed to allow for isometricity in the drawings; in making the published drawings, the walls were extended upward to give the

¹Ibid., p. 47, see the discussion of phase O.

²Ibid., p. 49, see the discussion of temple 2048.

³Ibid.; p. 45 below.

⁴Thomas Thompson, "The Dating of the Megiddo Temples in Strata XV-XIV", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Palästina-Verein, 86 (1970), pp. 38-49;

⁵Üve Müller, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Straten XIII bis IX in Megiddo", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Palästina-Verein, 86 (1970), pp. 50-80, see p. 76.

TABLE 31

KENYON'S MIDDLE BRONZE AGE "STRATA" AND HER TYPOLOGICAL GROUPS

Arch. Phase	Megiddo II	M B Group	
J	Temple 4040 and tombs	M B II	
K	XIII A, S.E. and 4040	M B III group A?	
L	XIII A, S.E., 4040, XIII B N.W.	M B III Group B	Tomb 3080 above walls of L complex.
M	XIII A, N.W. "Masseboth" XII, S.E., Town Wall XIII A	M B III "group C" to "group D"	Tomb 5062, group B below floor, 5068 group D above wall.
N	XII, N.W. Town Wall XII? "Masseboth" S.E. same (XII-XI)	M B III "group C?"	Tomb 5050 of "Group D" above XII N.W.
O	XI, N.W. west part, S.E. same, "Masseboth"		
P	XI, N.W. East part, X N.W. XI, S.E. East part, X, S.E. Building in center, only wall 4008 remaining	M B III "group E" to "group C"	N.W. sector tombs 5242 and 5088, Groups E-G and S.E. sector 3075 and 3085, group E are earlier or belong to the plan. Tomb 3070 of Group H is later, cutting P walls

SOURCE: Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 36-49.

illusion of viewing the structure. As a result, some tombs might appear to be sealed when they were not. As a result of the more systematic approach, they found several tombs "sealed" out of place, which they felt overturned Miss Kenyon's pottery sequence.

There were, however, some problems with both Miss Kenyon's sequence and the Megiddo publication they either overlooked or could not have known without checking the field plans. First, they did not completely recheck Miss Kenyon's classification; it was taken rather literally. A number of groups were found improperly classified when the groups were reconstructed for use in this work; one of them was a key group in Thompson's argument (Table 32, 73117). In other cases, tomb groups were not especially diagnostic.

Both of the critics appeared to have taken the Megiddo published plans literally. In fact, isometricity appears to have been applied to Megiddo II plans as though the plan were a conic projection. To achieve the isometric effect, the drawings were extended downward below the center of the plan and upward above. Further, some of them were not the same in the field plans as in the publication. In at least one case, the publication shows a floor that is not present in the field plans (Table 33, T. 5062).

Finally, the critics abandoned the limited method of Kenyon in which a phase was dated by the latest tomb found beneath it or the earliest one above it. Instead, they considered any tombs sealed into a level from above by a wall to belong to that level.¹ Sensible in appearance, this leads to difficulties; a level is neither built nor destroyed

¹Ibid., p. 53, table.

at one time, nor is a house or other structure necessarily immediately replaced or destroyed when it is abandoned. Where the levels are clearly not unified, only traced surfaces could show the relationships between such tombs and the building levels that are above, below or beside them. At Megiddo, these are lost; attempts to use the material must be based on the limited methods of Miss Kenyon. To demand further precision will only lead to confusion, since it would require information we will never have.

In Tables 32-35 I have assembled the key points from Miss Kenyon's, and Thompson's and Müller's articles. The problem in Miss Kenyon's reconstruction was clearly seen by Thompson to be in her reconstructed cemetery of "Phase J" around temple 4040. While he found several tombs that were assigned to plans that she organized into later phases, such as 3127, 3117, 3097, 5084, 5075 and 5106, only one of these was clearly later than a construction of M. This is enough to prove the point; the MB II continued into phase M. It is hardly an accident that this tomb contained a juglet with upraised spoutlike one from Tell ed-Dab^ca level F. The other tombs cannot be used for any chronological purpose, since they are not sealed up by any architectural feature or are poorly classified (5084). Since there was extensive wall robbing and levelling in the Megiddo MB area as part of the construction of the complexes of P, mere levels above sea level or level assignments in the publication are not evidence for stratification.

Müller's related attack on Miss Kenyon's classification was based on the same stratigraphic principles. It made use of tombs 5062, classified in Kenyon's group B of the MB III, which the published plan shows sealed below a floor of M and 5106, which was sealed above a wall of the

TABLE 32
 M B II TOMBS AND THE MEGIDDO "STRATA" AFTER THOMPSON
 (ONLY OUT OF PLACE TOMBS)

Tomb	Found in Kenyon Phase	Found in "Stratum"	Remarks
3127	M	(Unstruct.) XII (XII)	This is verified--he has shown MB II to extend to phase M.
3117	M	(Unstruct.) XII (XII)	The classification of this tomb is now M B II-III transitional.
3097	M-N-Below	XI (X)	This tomb was not found in the XI locus above the floor, but below it.
3046	P?	XI (X)	This was a misplaced tomb; it in fact belonged to the M B III B.
5084	M	XIII A (XII)	This tomb was on a floor of XIII A, but it is classified only as belonging to the MB II C-III A. It had only one jug.
5075	M	XIII A (XII)	Found in XIII A, assigned by Thompson to XII.
5171	"J"	XIV (XII)	Credited by Thompson to XII, actually found in XIV.
5106	Actually M (called N)	XII (XII)	Field Plan 59 Stables shows this tomb to have been built against a wall of XIII A or under a XIII A and through a XIII B wall.

NOTE: Roman numerals in parentheses are Thompson's assignment of the tombs.

TABLE 33

KEY "SEALED" TOMBS AFTER MÜLLER, M B III: AREA BB

Tomb	"Stratum" Claimed Sealed Below	"Stratum" Sealed	Below Phase
3109	XII	--	
3130	XII	XII	M
3125	XII	XII	M
3104	XII	XII	L
2135	XI	--	
2138	XI	XI	P
3092	XI	XI	P
3095	XI	--	
3075	X	X	
3085	X		P
5062	XII	--	
5102	XII	XI	
5103	XII	XII	
5106	XI	--	
5134	XI	XI	P

SOURCE: Müller, "Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Straten XIII bis IX egiddo", tables on pp. 55-56, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65-66, 67, 67-68, 69, 70, 73-4, and 75.

TABLE 33 Continued.

Pottery Group	Remarks
"C"	The tomb was not only not clearly sealed according to the field plan, but belonged to group A when examined. Under wall or pavement, dubious.
"A"	Sealed and verified plan 36 E and 37 E.
"A"	Plan 36 E under L-shaped complex.
II C-III A	The tomb is under a floor of XII, in the NW area, which is architectural phase L 2.
"B"	Not sealed down by XII or XI, but by X.
"B"	Sealed XI.
II-III A	Kenyon's classification M B I-II C.
"D"	Kenyon's classification F; a built tomb, not sealed by XI, mixed group.
"C"	Kenyon E, sealed X.
"C"	Kenyon E under but not sealed by X.
"B"	Not sealed per field plan 59, a most important tomb.
M B II	Not a significant sealing.
M B II	
M B II	Claimed to be sealed up. It was in fact in a break in the wall. It was built against a XIII A wall.
--	Group sealed but declassified one Cypriote Pot pl 26:14 MB III B-C

TABLE 34

KEY "SEALED" TOMBS AFTER MÜLLER: AREA AA

Tomb	"Stratum" Claimed Sealed Below	"Stratum" Sealed	Pottery Group	Remarks
4088	XII	XII	"B"	Sealed XII.
4112	XII	XII	M B II	Sealed XII.
4056	X	X	"E"	Kenyon's group G, sealed X.

TABLE 35

THE DATE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL PHASES OF MEGIDDO AFTER KENYON, THOMPSON,
AND MÜLLER AFTER COMPARISON WITH THE FIELD PLANS

Architectural Phase	Kenyon Date	Thompson Result	Müller Result	Remarks
J	"MB 1"			The idea of a necropolis alone for this phase must be abandoned, since some tombs are associated with buildings
K	MB III A 1	MB II		Shown in M.
L	MB III A 2	MB II		Shown in M; Kenyon's evidence only showed that L was earlier than group B.
M	MB III A2-B	MB II		Tomb 5106 gives the clearest result, as associated with M. The field plan showed no floor above 5062, group B.
N	MB III B 1			
O				
P	MB III B-C			

same phase, and assigned to the MB II. A further tomb assigned to the MB II 3097, was noted by Thompson on a floor above phase N. Tomb 3109 of group C was said to be sealed below stage M complex as well. As the table shows, the main tombs were either declassified here (3109) or found not to be stratified where the publication indicates (5062, 5106 and 3097).

The result of these two critical discussions of the Megiddo phases has been to demonstrate that the MB II continued into phase M; phase J of the Megiddo town could not have been a cemetery. Miss Kenyon's sequence has not been overturned, since there were no tombs shown to be out of their proper order in the classification when plotted on the plans. Müller did, however, discover tombs that were improperly classified; 3109 and 5134 are the most important examples.

It should be clear that the essential order of the Megiddo sequence is maintained by the examination of both the findings of Kenyon and the two major critics. Since, however, the duration of MB II at Megiddo has been shown to be longer than Miss Kenyon thought, and there were some tombs that appeared on examination to be improperly classified (mostly due to misprints), a reclassification of the tombs and a re-examination of the phases should be undertaken. As an additional aid, we have the field plans, which appear to be much more accurate than the isometric drawings published in Megiddo II.

The Middle Bronze II

In her analysis of the Middle Bronze Age groups at Megiddo, Miss Kenyon avoided the separation of the MB II into groups. This was done partly because of the lack of parallels and partly, perhaps, because she

felt that the MB II was a very short period.¹ Though the MB II must be about a century and a half in length,² the period does not begin in Palestine until the MB II B. Depending on the date of the Seventeenth Dynasty, it could be as long as seventy-five years, or as short as thirty or fifty. Nevertheless, there is a considerable amount of variation in the pottery groups that may indicate some change in the material.

To assist in establishing a succession, we have a number of facts, some cited in the discussion of Egypt. At the end of the MB II in Tell ed-Dab^ea F, there were juglets with upraised spouts and others with ridge-rims and ovoid bodies.³ Further, none of the elaborately painted juglets and jars were found at sites in Palestine and Syria, though a few of these occurred elsewhere in Egypt.

Information from the stratigraphy of Megiddo agrees with these points. Tombs with jugs that had upraised spouts tend to be in the plans of XIII; one, 5106, was built against a wall of XIII A (Phase M). Tombs with painted pots tend to be in plans of XIV, XV and the southeast part of XIII (Phase L). The one tomb that was sealed under a XIV wall that cannot be later contained a single jar with horizontal stripes and vertical marks on the rim.⁴

These facts led to the following classification of MB II tomb groups at Megiddo.

¹Kenyon, *The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo*, p. 36.

²That is, from the time of the Byblos Royal Tombs to the time of the change from MB II - III in Tell ed-Dab^ea F.

³Above, pp. 74-75.

⁴Below, Group A, 5149.

The MB II B 1: MB II, group A

Tombs assigned to this group include 5149 (sealed down XIV), and 5175 from "Level XV". Tombs 3148, 3149, 3150, 3168, 5118, 5156, 5176, and 5181 came from "Level XIV", as well as locus T. E. and T. W. = 2152. Tomb 4010 came from the central part of "Level XIII". A single pot from locus E = T. 5147 belongs to this period, from "Level XIV" (Figs. 298-300).

The most outstanding characteristic of this phase, as it correlates with the MB II B 1 elsewhere, is the presence of juglets and jars with elaborate painted decoration which is sometimes bichrome. On jugs, some with the oversize dipper shape (Fig. 298 a), this takes the form of a band at the lip and one at the neck with pendant lines (often diagonal). On the shoulder or body are more horizontal lines, some broad, some narrow. Narrow bands often occur alone in this phase.¹ Horizontal stripes are painted on the handle. This feature can be seen on a painted juglet, with a combination of concentric circles or spirals painted on the body in bichrome (Fig. 298 q). There are vertical slashes on the bevelled rim. The pot from locus 5147 (Fig. 300 d) had this bichrome decoration in concentric circles (red and black). Rim slashes were in red; on the neck is a rather carelessly painted black zig-zag. This last feature may be compared with decoration on a crater from E = T. 2152 (Fig. 64 f). There, red and black lines alternate below the rim. They appear again below a band of rope decoration, but with a broad band of triangles outlined in black with red hatching. This style of decoration was seen at Byblos at the end of the MB II A on a juglet and on the

¹Above, pp. 891-93, and 885-86, Sidon and Byblos.

Montet jar (Fig. 257). We shall meet this style of decoration again repeatedly (Figs. 388, 389).

Shapes tend to be simple in Group A. There were hemispherical and subhemispherical cups with flat or at most a very low disc base. Open bowls were convex, with heavy sides and a somewhat inverted and triangular or flattened rim with a hint of a groove. The rims were sometimes pigmented; the entire inside of a bowl was painted in only one case as was an entire small bowl. The bases were mostly flat; there was rarely a low disc (Fig. 298 a-g).

Small bowls include the red-burnished carinated bowl. It appears once with a rounded body. Burnishing is always horizontal above the carination, vertical below (Fig. 300 k-m).

Dippers tend to be small-bodied and simple, with a red burnished surface, though one is unslipped (Fig. 298 r-u).

The juglets are rather globular; one was clearly an ancestor of the cylindrical juglet of later times. One of the juglets has a rather piriform shape with bevelled-in rim and bar handle. The base is flat; the decoration has already been discussed. A second juglet has a wide, baggy shape. Its rim appears to be partly pushed-out, partly bevelled-in, not quite belonging to either class; it has a double handle and stump base (Fig. 298 q). The cylindrical juglet has a folded-over rim that was not fully closed; we shall refer to the type as the ridge-neck juglet (Fig. 298 o-r).

Pitchers occur in both the shape of an oversized dipper, trefoil-mouth and round-mouth forms. They are decorated, undecorated, or red-burnished, and all are rather simple. One had a trefoil lip (Fig. 299 a-e).

One shoulder-handled jar is clearly from this group (a second, fig. 298 h may belong to a later burial). Although it has the characteristically globular shape of later MB II shoulder-handle jars, it is quite simple, with a flared neck and multiple handle made simply with an applied strap (Fig. 299 i). Handleless jars appear in this phase for the first time in MB II (except for the Montet jar). These have globular to ovoid bodies and concave necks. Rims are either pushed out, bevelled, or have a plastic ridge at the bottom (Fig. 299 g; fig. 300 a, d, e and g; fig. 300 f; fig. 300 b and c, respectively). Jars have either flattened or low disc bases. One of the jars (Fig. 300 c) is of a type that occurred at Mari and Baghuz.¹

Weapons include a rectangular notched battle axe from 3168; the type therefore appears before the end of MB II B 1.

The MB II B 2: Group B

Tombs assigned to this phase include 911 A, D; 912;² 5103; 5202; 5063; 3140; 5167; 5171; 5147; 5130; 5178; 2151; 3118; 4046; 5183; 3147; 3143; and 4016 (?) (Figs. 301-314).

Major changes in both shape and decoration occur in this group. The earlier elaborate decoration is simplified into a bichrome banded decoration. Narrow bands virtually never occur alone, and there were no more circles or spirals. Also new in this group is (incised and) punctate decoration which occurs on carinated bowls (Fig. 311 m). Most of the older shapes continue, especially the dippers and handleless jars. The dippers did occasionally have a small disc or button base.

¹Below, pp. 1120, 1122-23.

²Guy and Engberg, Megiddo Tombs, plates 28-31, 35.

The handleless jars do not generally have the pushed-out rim; the rim is either folded over or simply everted (Fig. 304 b-c, 307 e). Occasionally, the handleless jars have a very elegant ovoid shape (Fig. 304 b). There are two amphorae (Fig. 304 a)

One of the most important changes is in the platters or open bowls. The new types are even heavier than those of group A. The rims most often are triangular in section with a nearly vertical outer face which is often painted red (Fig. 301 a-u). This is sometimes given a ridge or molding at the bottom (Fig. 301 o-r), which often became a molded rim with a sinuous profile (Fig. 310 o-p). In other cases this is decorated with lugs or lug handles (Fig. 301 v, 305 i, 307 d, and 311 f).

The carinated bowl continues, with the same shape, as do the related convex bowls, though unburnished forms occur. One of the convex bowls has a groove in the rim and a ridge at the neck; a second has grooves on the shoulder and a pedestal base (Fig. 311 j and o).

Globular or squat jars with shoulder handles and related but taller jugs with rim-shoulder handles are also better shaped than in the previous period; they often have the pushed out rim. Handles are usually made of two strands of clay or have a strand applied to the top of a bar, giving the impression of a three-strand handle (Fig. 312 f, g, j, k, m, n, o). Some jars have three or even four strand handles (Fig. 67 j-m).

Juglets are red-burnished, with ridged or bevelled-in rim, ridged neck, and pointed or stump base. The shape in this period is sometimes more ovoid, but nearly globular types survive (Fig. 312 b, c, h, i, l; Fig. 302 h, i). The true cylindrical juglet may be in this group (Fig. 302 f), but the precursor of the cylindrical juglet with

sloping shoulder and simple rim definitely occurred (Fig. 312 d, e). One cylindrical juglet with narrow bands of punctate ornament on the body and triangles on the shoulder may belong to this group (Fig. 302 g). Odd juglets include a globular juglet with a convex tubular neck (Fig. 303 a) and a carinated juglet with an exaggerated biconical shape and grooves on the shoulder (Fig. 312 i).

Single examples of a tankard (Fig. 308 g), a small jar with a basket handle (Fig. 312 a), and a fruitstand (Fig. 305 c) appear.

Weapons from this group include the rectangular axe with notch, the veined dagger with widely spaced veins and short socket spearhead. There are also plain daggers (Fig. 309).

The Middle Bronze II C: MB Group C

Tombs assigned to this group are 3138, 3144, 3151, 3162, 4112, 5084 (?), 5088, 5090, 5102, 5106, 5114, 5121, 5130, 5152, 5177, 5186, and 5252 (Figs. 315-318).

Painted decoration is virtually abandoned by the time of C; it survives only as single bands on the shoulders of dippers (Fig. 317 i-1), on the rim of a pitcher (Fig. 317 h), and on one odd tankard (Fig. 315 o).

There are also only two elaborate bowl rims (Fig. 315 f). Many thickened bowl rims, (both vertical and angled) still occur, but these may have died out in the last few groups (Fig. 315).

The two handleless jars have the thickened and grooved or bent rims (Fig. 318 d and e).

There were no shoulder-handled jugs in this group, which is probably an accidental feature. The jugs that did occur were red burnished, with two-or three-strand handles. Three had pinched lips (Fig. 317 d-j, Fig. 318, a, b).

Dippers are generally taller in this group, sometimes with a small disc or stump base (Fig. 316-317).

The most interesting changes in the group are in juglets. These are generally ovoid in this group, only rarely globular (Fig. 316 a), or piriform (Fig. 316 b and d). The juglet with upraised or cutaway spout appeared in this group (Fig. 316 a-e) in some numbers. These appear only in this group and are red or brown polished. In addition, the ordinary everted rim appears on juglets of this phase (Fig. 315 p and s) with the type with a ridge at the rim (Fig. 315 r). One unusual variety occurs here, with a flared neck and small rib where the handle joined the neck; the type will be cited again (Fig. 315 t). Narrow-band Yehudiyya ware clearly appear in Megiddo groups for the first time here (Fig. 315 q). The pattern is not remarkable, only bands of leaning lines, but the narrow bands are a clear early type. This decoration in narrow bands appears at Tell ed-Dab^ca as did the juglet with upraised spout.¹

The transition to MB III

Tombs 3104, 3129 and possibly 5084 belong to this small group.

The groups that Miss Kenyon originally assigned to the transition do not compare well enough with each other to be classified together. However, three tombs may have a common feature in the carinated bowl with a vertical burnish in both the side above and below the carination. One juglet had Early Yehudiyya decoration, in standing and pendant triangles (Fig. 319).

¹Above, pp. 74-75.

TABLE 36

THE STRATIFICATION OF MEGIDDO MB II TOMBS

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
E+S=2152	A			XIV
3148	A		XIII	XIV field plan 37 E
3149	A	XV		XIV
3150	A	XV	XIII	XIV field plan 37 E
3168	A			XIV
5118	A		?	XIV below a niche in a room of XIII A, but attached to a short wall fragment below XIII A plans 61 and 59 (stables)
5149	A		XIV	XV below and between walls in XIV plan 61 (Stables)
5175	A			XV
5181	A	XV	XIII A ?	XIV above temple 5192, probably below XIII A, not verified.
4010	A			XIII A, central position in N 13 explains high position.
E=5147	A	XV		XIV, the pot from the locus but not the tomb is group A, above the XV temple 5192.

TABLE 36 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
2151	B		XI	XIII, stratification not verified from field plan
3118	B			XIII
4046	B			XIV
3143	B		XIII	XIV, Plan 37 E
3147	B		XII	XIV, stratification not verified from field plan
4016 (?)	B			XIV
3140	B		XII	XIII, Plan 37E
5103	B		XI	XIII A, stratification not verified
5183	B			XIV
5202	B		XIV	XV, stratification not verified from field plan
5063	B	XIV	XI	XIII A, stratification not verified from field plan
5167	B		XIII A	XV, stratification not verified from field plan
5171	B	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
5147	B	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
5130	B	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
5178	B	XV		XIV, above XV Temple

TABLE 36 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
3162	C		XII	XIV, below the enclosed pavement 3104, may have cut a wall base or pavement of "level XIII".
3151	C		XII	XV, not verified from field plan.
5177	C	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
5121	C	XIV	XIII A	XIV built against XIV wall, plan 61
5186	C	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
5130	C	XV		XIV, above XV Temple
3138	C		XII	XIV, Field plan 37 E shows the tomb under a wall but open.
3144	C			XIV
5114	C			XIII B, under the corner of a wall, XIII A
5090	C	XV		XIII A, not verified from field plans
4112	C			XIII

TABLE 36 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
5152	C	XIII A	XV	Above temple
5084	C	XIII A	XIII A	On floor, verified plan 61
5102	C	XIII A		
5088	C			
5252	C	XIII A	XIII B	Plan 65, in the niche of XIII B, which was probably built to take this tomb, see 5118 above--built from wall materials
5106	C	XII		From plan 59 (stables), built against a XIII A or under an A and through a B wall
3104	C	XII	XII	Below enclosed pavement
3129	C			

The MB III at Megiddo

Miss Kenyon discussed this group of materials in greater detail than she did the MB II groups. The tomb groups she used were reconstructed and reexamined for this work. In general, her classification has been accepted, with some changes and reservations. She divided the materials into groups A-H; her groups C and D did not really have an independent existence. The tombs of group C, based on the carinated bowl, contained pottery too varied for one group; they had many parallels in other groups. Only a few tombs remained, which contained parallels to Group E; they were attached to E at its beginning. Likewise, the Cypriote pots of D were of various dates in Cyprus. Tombs that contained Pendant-Line and Cross-Line Style jugs seemed consistent however. These will be called Group B 2 below. We shall see later that Cypriote pottery of this type was imported to Palestine in a restricted phase that marks the end of the MB III A and the start of B.¹ Finally, group H was based on very small or mixed groups. As such, it cannot be considered MB, but should be left to the Late Bronze Age (Table 37).

The MB III A 1; MB III Group A

Tombs assigned here to Group A are 2026, 2140, 2143, 3084, 3093, 3109, 3122, 3125, 3130, 3137, 4078, 4096, 4099, 4100, 4110. There are also small groups 4102, 5031, 5086, and 5094. Tombs 3076 and 3086 were taken away from Miss Kenyon's original group (Figs. 320-325).

In general, the pottery appears much lighter, with thinner walls and simpler shapes than that of the MB II (compare figs. 320-325 to 315-318). In addition, light-colored surfaces appear much more frequently.

¹Above, p. 76; below, p. 1203.

TABLE 37
 POTTERY GROUPS OF THE MB III AT MEGIDDO

Here	Kenyon	Overall Classification
A	A	MB III A 1
B	B	MB III A 2
B 2	D	MB III A 2 b
--	C	(Added to MB III B 1)
C	E	MB III B 1
D	F	MB III B 2
E	G	MB III C
"F"	H	Late Bronze I

the burnished cream slip already appears in this group (Fig. 321 c). In addition, the dark-face burnished juglets continue, with an occasional bowl (Fig. 321 b, 322 a, b, d, e, g, i, l, n and o). Although the dark-face burnished pottery becomes rarer and rarer in the MB III at Megiddo, it never entirely disappears (Fig. 336 c, d, p; Fig. 337, a, e, g, h, n; Fig. 340 f; Fig. 341 e, g, all from the MB III B; Fig. 347 c, MB III C). The orange burnished slip almost entirely replaced the red slip in MB III B, with rare exceptions (Fig. 341 g).¹

The platter in this phase is convex, with an inverted rim and a low disc base which was often concave (Fig. 320).

Though the carinated bowl continues, it is rare in the MB III of Megiddo (Fig. 321 a). The most important bowl is a variant of the convex bowl with an angled collar (Fig. 321 c-e). This change defines the MB III A 1; the bowl is the ancestor of the flared-neck jar that becomes so important in Syria later² and of the flared-carinated bowl that defines MB III A 2 (group B, see Fig. 328 m).

Dippers were plump and have large bodies for MB III dippers; they are clearly longer in proportion than their MB II forebears (Fig. 323 b, c, e, g-l). Some of these are quite pointed.

Pitchers are low and wide, with pinched lips (Fig. 322 u-w). Shoulder-handle jugs tend to be rather wider than tall, with everted rims (Fig. 324 a, c and f).

¹Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 28-36 give her classification. These groups are based upon a re-examination of Miss Kenyon's classification.

²Below, pp. 1010-12, 1007-16, 1132, 1158 for occurrences at Jericho, Ras Shamra, Hama and Alalakh.

Juglets in this group are generally piriform, though there are a few wide examples (Fig. 322 a-t). One is nearly biconical (Fig. 322 c). The rims are mostly simple, but the old ridged rim survives, as does the pushed-out or "trumpet mouthpiece" rim. The juglets have either stump or low ring bases. There is one type of Ychudiyya ware (in two tombs, Fig. 322 i) with narrow band decoration filled with alternating leaning zones of punctate ornament.

New in the MB III A are ovoid monophorae with handles on the shoulder (Fig. 324). The general shape is reminiscent of the MB II handleless jar; amphorae (Fig. 325) have the same shape, but with the handles at the waist.

The MB III A 2; MB III Group B

Tombs assigned to group B include 2130, 2135, 2138, 2141, 2147, 3064, 3080, 3107, 3123, 4051, 4054, 4088, 4091, 5062, 5067, 5142, 5259 and 5267. I have added 2027 and 2145; 4107 has been removed from the group (Figs. 327-333).

This phase is again virtually the same as Kenyon's. Though most of the pottery is the same as that of Group A, there are some important changes that define the group. The globular bowl with angled neck is no longer present. Flared-carinated bowls and platters with ring bases and sometimes straight rims appear for the first time (Fig. 327 i-n, Fig. 328 b-o).

The ridge-rim juglet continues in this phase, with the elaborate Ychudiyya decoration (Same as Fig. 322 i). Burnished juglets are the same; there is one cylindrical juglet, with a sloping shoulder (Fig. 329 h). One piriform juglet has a curl modeled from the end of a strand

of the handle (Fig. 329 s).

Other unusual features include tall jugs with trefoil mouth and a single twisted strand for a handle (Fig. 331 a and b). One shoulder-handle jug has three bands of combing on the shoulder (Fig. 330 f).

Kenyon's Groups C and D

As indicated above, neither of these small groups should be assigned equal chronological rank with the other large groups in the series, A, B, E, F and G. Further, tombs in these groups do not have many common characteristics. Group C contains some tombs that belonged to MB II. Further, it seemed rather odd that the simple carinated bowl would disappear at Megiddo at the end of the MB II only to reappear suddenly at the end of the MB III A. Two tombs of Kenyon's C compare well with each other. Since they also share characteristics with her group E, they are assigned to that group.

Miss Kenyon's group D is rather more coherent. Assigned to it are Cypriote jugs, Cross-line Style jugs, Red-on-Black painted ware, spouted bowls and trefoil-mouth juglets with painted White Painted IV-V decoration. We have noted the occurrences of Pendant-Line and Cross-Line Style jugs in Egypt, especially at Tell ed-Dab^ea E 1. We will see many of this type at Dhahrat el Humrayya on the Palestinian coast later.¹ Evidence from these two sites indicates that a separate chronological status is justified for Kenyon's group D, but not at the level of A or B. The evidence does not justify including the red-on-black painted pots, spouted bowls and the White Painted V juglets in this group. Since most of the local pottery resembles that of group B and a little, her group E,

¹Below, 1066-1067.

groups with Cypriote Pendant-Line and Cross-Line Style painting will be considered transitional, assigned to group B. We have, therefore, dropped her C and D groups; these letters designate other groups here.

The MB III A 2 b; MB III Group B 2

Tombs assigned here are 3068, 3076, 3111, 4107, 4109, 5068, and 5234.

Two tombs, 3068 and 3076 were added here; 5134 and 5050 have been removed (Fig. 334-335).

As said above, little distinguishes this group but the Pendant-Line and Cross-Line style jugs (Fig. 335). New was a very convex shallow bowl with a sharply triangular rim and concave-disc base (Fig. 334 b). The type occurs with some frequency in our groups C and D. Likewise common in C and D are platters with grooves across the base (Fig. 334 d).

The MB III B 1; MB III Group C

Early tombs in this group, with carinated bowls, are 4106 and 5046. Other tombs assigned to this group are 2144, 3075, 3085, 3087, 3110, and 4053, which is added to Kenyon's group. Tomb 3090, which is mixed, may end at this time (Figs. 336-339).

Miss Kenyon noted the appearance of platters with ring bases ranging from a high ring to low pedestal in this group (Fig. 336 c-f, h). Some of these had simple rims; they are not inverted (Fig. 336 d and h).

She noted that flaring carinated bowls have higher rims (Fig. 336 m). We may note that the first bowls of this type with pedestals occurred here (Fig. 336 o) with the first true carinated pedestal

chalice (Fig. 336 n). There is one example of a small necked jar with tall flared neck from this group (Fig. 336 p).

Juglets from C include a substantial number of cylindrical juglets, for the first time (Fig. 337 i-n).

Perhaps the most significant introduction, other than that of the chalice and necked jar, is that of simple Yehudiyya decoration. In one case, this takes the form of overall punctate decoration on a piriform juglet. In the other case there was a single band of punctate upended chevrons on the waist of a juglet (Fig. 337 b and c). No juglet has the ridged rim or neck. On the basis of simple Yehudiyya decoration, we may correlate this group with Tell ed-Dab^a E 1-D 3 and date it to the period between 1600 and 1550 B.C.

The MB III B 2; MB III Group D

Tombs assigned to this group are 3030, 3095 and 3175 (Figs. 340-342).

Although this group is small, there are some important changes in the pottery. First, platters with inverted rims are absent, while those with disc bases are in a minority (Fig. 340 a-f). Cylindrical juglets considerably outnumber piriform juglets; simple late Yehudiyya decoration is seen on one example (Fig. 341 f). The squat or globular jugs with narrow necks and shoulder handles have disappeared. Pedestal chalices have a shape in this group that is quite exaggerated (Fig. 340 k-m).

The MB III C; MB III Group E

Tombs assigned to group E are 2129, 3048, 4022, 4043, 4055 and 4056. Added here are 4004, 2165, 3205 and 3059 (Figs. 343-345).

The feature that distinguishes this from earlier groups is the total disappearance of piriform juglets. We may also note the appearance of one pedestal vase of southern type in this group (Fig. 343 k).¹

The key chronological point to be noted about this group is that there is no stage of the MB III in Egypt that corresponds to it, though it was not a small group here and will more extensively be documented elsewhere. We can only conclude that if the MB III B was later than 1600, then this phase of the MB III must be entirely later than the expulsion of the Hyksos.

"Group F"

Tombs assigned to group F were 3060, 3070 and 3074.

In this group the introduction of bichrome decoration is the major innovation. The shape of the jar which is given the painted decoration is also new.

Tomb 3070 is a large group with piriform juglets; it is clearly mixed. The other two groups contain nothing that is exclusively Middle Bronze Age. Indeed, the dipper juglets are both of the shorter, rather poorly proportioned Late Bronze type. This group should be dated to the Late Bronze Age.

We have here adopted five of Kenyon's eight groups of the Middle Bronze Age III. Two others were reclassified and a third redated to the Late Bronze Age. The groups we have accepted and modified can be organized into three major stages of the MB III; they may themselves represent minor stages of the larger phases. The first of these can be correlated

¹Below, pp. 1006-10, Jericho.

by the presence of Early Yehudiyya ware and ridge-rim juglets with Tell ed-Dab^ca F - E 2. The second stage was correlated to Tell ed-Dab^ca E 1 - D 2 by the presence of Late Yehudiyya ware. The last stage, Megiddo E, could not be correlated to Egypt, since there was no Asiatic materials of this date in Egypt. We have considered it later than Tell ed-Dab^ca D 1 or post-Hyksos expulsion.

Weapons

We noted above the battle axes from the MB II of Megiddo.¹ Earliest in the sequence of axes was the fenestrated axe from tomb 84; its nearly semicircular shape indicates a relatively early date.² The fenestrated axe from Temple 4040 was a more elongated, later type, like some of the later axes from the Deposits at Byblos (Figs. 271 and 272).

No duck-bill axes were found at Megiddo. The earliest axe of MB II B date is the rectangular axe with notch from tomb 3168 of MB II group A. Axes of this type are found in tombs 911 A 1, 911 D and 912 of group B (Fig. 309). The latest axe preserved at Megiddo was a narrow axe with oval section, ribs at the socket, and projection in front of and behind the socket. The axe was from tomb 4110 of MB III group A.³

One slotted and bent-tang spearhead came from a wall fragment called XIII A (5061). The wall fragment may belong to phase L, in which case the findspot of the weapon was MB II B - C. No elaborate button-tang and stopped spearheads came from Megiddo, or Palestine generally; the earliest socketed spearhead was from tomb 4052, assigned to level XVIII (Early Bronze Age). The tomb was not sealed by any level through

¹Above, p. 921.

²Above, pp. 864-54.

³Loud, Megiddo II, plate 182:2.

938
TABLE 38

THE STRATIFICATION OF MB III TOMBS

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
3084	A	XIII A		XII, In a wall of XII, small complex plan 37 E
3122	A		XI	XII, Not verified from field plans
3125	A		XII	XIII, Plan 36 E, under the L-shaped complex
3130	A		XII	XIII, Plans 36 E and 37 E, under the east wall of the L-shaped complex
4078	A			XI AA, Partly above gate K 7 Stratum XIII, not sealed by Stratum X, plans 47 N and 48 N
4099	A			XII, built into XIII
4110	A		X	XIV
3109	A		XII	XIII, Under a wall attached to the city wall, Plan 36 E somewhat doubtful whether under a wall or pavement
(3076	A	XI		XI)
5031	A		XI	XI, Not a tomb, at a wall of XI, not verified.
5086	A		XI	XI
5094	A	XIII B	XI	XIII A

TABLE 38 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
2138	B	XIII	XI	XII, possibly sealed up by a wall, but impossible to be certain because of the isometricity problem; Field Plan 37 A was not complete to that point
3064	B	XIII		XI, not verified
3080	B		X	XI, not verified
4051	B			X AA, cuts a wall of XI and XII according to plan 47 N
4054	B		X	X AA, under a wall of X, Plan 45 N and 59 Stables
4088	B		XII	XIII AA, not verified.
4091	B		X	XII, sealed by a floor of X, 45 N
5062	B			XIII A, according to plan 59, not sealed by any floor, a key tomb not stratified
5142	B		XI	XII, Plan 58 stables
5259	B	XIII A	XI	XII, Plan 67 stables verifies that it is above wall 5252 and below a wall of XI, plan 65.

TABLE 38 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
3076	B 2	XI	IX	XI, shown on the floor of complex XI; plan 36 shows no floors, but none are shown on this series of plans
4107	B 2		XI	XI, under stones of XI, plan 47 N
5234	B 2	XII	X	XI, below a pavement of X above a wall of XII, plan 65 stables
(5134)	B 2		XI	XII, below XI, in the Northwest sector, not verified)
4106	C	XII		X AA, plan 47 N
2144	C		X	XI AA, sealed X but not verifiable
3085	C		X	XI, under X but not sealed, Megiddo II and plans
3110	C		X	XI, not verified
4053	C	XIII		XI AA, sealed above XIII, plan 47 N
3095	D		X	XII, Plan 34 E, beside the wall
2129	E	XIII A	IX	XI, not verifiable

TABLE 38 Continued.

Tomb	Group	Plans: Whether Stratified		Remarks
		Above	Below	
4055	E	XIII		XI, the tomb fitted well in a room of X, but was not sealed until VIII, Plans 47 N and 45 N
4056	E	XIII		XI, in a corner of room of IX and X
3063	F	XI	IX	X, plans 36 and 34 E the sealing above XI is dubious
3070	F		IX	X + XI, mixed to group C, built into stratum XI room a Stratum X room was built around it

XI however; it fits nicely into a gap in a heavy wall of XV and may thus be later (having cut the wall). The only pot found with the weapon was a large, slightly convex bowl with heavy inverted rim. The type may resemble some pots of the EB IV, but similar types occur in the MB II group A.¹ The other socketed spearheads from the town are of somewhat uncertain date as well, but the findspots cannot be earlier than MB II A, nor later than MB III B. We have not, however, taken possible stratigraphic disturbance into account. Socketed spearheads of MB II B date were found in tombs 911 and 912 (Fig. 309).

The dagger blades of Tombs 911 and 912 best illustrate that weapon at Megiddo in the MB II. Most interesting are the daggers with widely-spaced veins; there is an excellent example of approximately similar date from the town as well.² Other daggers of the MB II and III have no veins or midrib; they usually have some sort of tang, in addition to the rivets.³ Curved knives occurred, from loci that could only be MB III or LB.⁴ We will see examples from better contexts below.

The Architectural Phases of the Middle Bronze Age at Megiddo

In her article, Miss Kenyon ascribed Temple 4040 to a Phase G of the architectural sequence. The twin temples of Stratum XV had already been ascribed to phase F.⁵ Temple 4040 must be earlier than the enclosure

¹Ibid., plate 178:5 for the slotted spearhead; other spearheads are on plate 173.

²Ibid., plate 178:3.

³Ibid., plates 178-79. MB loci include all those before "Stratum IX". This is not to assert that all of these are MB in date.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 37 and 40.

of altar 4017,¹ which was built against it. This altar was in turn overlaid by pavement and wall fragment 4009. This pavement was the only true E B IV locus found in the occupation of the mound.² The construction of temple 4040 must, therefore, be assigned a date earlier than the end of the EB IV. The wall and floor fragment that overlaid the altar did not align with any plan; they may belong to the southeast sector of XIV, where there was substantial building.

Phase H

Kenyon's F contained the twin temples. G contained the 4040 temple and associated altar structures. These were overlaid by locus 4009, which she grouped with elements of XIII B and elements of XIV into phase H. All of these were supposedly earlier than MB II.³ However, Tomb 5149 of the MB II group A was found below and between two elements of the N.W. of the XIV plan. These walls were too close together to permit any conclusion but that the tomb was earlier. H, if it is a legitimate phase, consisted only of 4009.⁴

Phase J

Miss Kenyon attempted to show that there was no real building in

¹Ibid., pp. 40-42. The enclosure was built against 4040.

²Thompson, "The Dating of the Megiddo Temples in Strata XV-XIV", p. 39.

³Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", p. 40, wanted to include part of plan XIV in G.

⁴The plans of Area BB, now under discussion, include three distinct areas with three distinct sequences of architecture. These are the Southeast area, the Central area, which included the 4040 area and the later temple 2048, and the Northwest area. From the sequential numbering of these areas, the Southeast and Northwest areas were dug at different times and joined only for the publication. The field plans preserve this separation.

the MB II period by grouping a cemetery around temple 4040. Thompson has shown, and a glance at the table of MB II tombs will demonstrate, that the northwest sector of Plan XIV was later than the start of MB II. The northwest sector of Plan XIII A was also earlier than the end of the MB II.¹ Miss Kenyon's phase J cannot have been a cemetery. Here, we will use the letter for a series of buildings.

J 1

The earliest stage of the MB II at Megiddo may be represented by a number of group A tombs that were outside phase F-G building plans.² These included 5149, which was stratified below part of XIV.

J 2-3

The first stage of J ended by the end of MB II group A, for a tomb of this date was stratified above temple 5192. It was most likely to be associated with the building of XIV, which was in two stages.³ The duration of these two building phases must be put within the period of MB II groups A and B (MB II B 1 and 2). Architecturally, these phases consist of XIV in the northwest sector and elements of the plan of XIII B that connect with these.

K

Kenyon's phase K consisted partly of a connected series of rooms in squares N-O 13-14; one of the walls from this complex curved to avoid

¹Tomb 5106 of the MB II C was built against a wall of XIII A. See Table 36.

²These include the MB II tombs from the plan of XV and some from XIV in the northwest area. See Table 36.

³Loud, Megiddo II, plan XIV BB. In the northwest area, there are two, sometimes three, building levels that supersede each other.

temple 4040, so she surmised that the temple was still in existence.

Most of XIII B in the Northwest sector may also belong to this stage.¹

These two complexes are K 1 and K 2.

L

L1

The next development was a group of walls in N-O 14-15 that conflicted somewhat with the plan of K 1 (Fig. 346 a). This group of walls is earlier than phase M, but later than tomb 3150 of MB II group A and probably also tomb 3143 of MB II group B.²

L2

The city wall from plan XIII A with its wide footing cut the rooms of L1, so the wall is later, called here L 2. It was most likely earlier than tomb 3162, of MB II group C, which was found below a narrow gap in the pavement, which is almost surely cut.³

M

The next phase, M, consisted of Stratum XII in the Southeast sector, together with the building of the town wall (Fig. 346 b). Sealed under the complex in N-O 13-14 were tombs 3125 and 3130 of MB III group A (Table 38). Tomb 3104, dated to the transition between MB II and III, was under an enclosed pavement attached to the city wall and above the

¹Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 44-45 discuss phases J and K.

²Ibid., p. 45; see above, Table 38.

³See Table 36; it must be presumed that a tomb that occurs directly below a gap of small size in a feature was in fact later than that feature and was cut through it.

gap in the pavement XIII A (Table 36).

In the northwest sector, Kenyon assigned the plan of XIII A to M, along with some walls to the north of the "Sacred Area" in M 13 of XIII B. A tomb of MB II - transitional date, 5084, was found on a floor of this complex, which should thus be dated to the end of MB II. Tomb 5106 belonged here also (Table 36).¹

M 1

This phase consists of the plan of XIII A in the northwest sector, with the attached walls of XIII B. It is dated above to the MB II C and transition to MB III.

M 2

M 2 consists of the city wall and attached structures in the plan of XII of the southeast sector. This is also dated to the transition between MB II and III, by tomb 3104.

M 3

Stage M 3 is the building of Stratum XII in the southeast sector, squares N-0 13-14, dated to the MB III A by tombs 3125 and 3130.

Temple 4040 and the later "Masseboth"

Kenyon pointed out that a wall of XIII A (phase M 1) overlaid temple 4040.² She assumed that the sacred area would not long be abandoned; she therefore considered several upright stones on fragments of pavement found in the central area of Plans IX-XI to be a single

¹Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 45-46. Note that the dates were changed due to revised stratigraphy in the field plans.

²Ibid., p. 45.

structure. This she dated to phase M on the grounds that temple 4040 had to be covered with some feature.¹

N

The next phase is represented only by the rebuilding in the northwest sector in Stratum XII and a thickening of the city wall, which should precede the next phase in the southeast sector. Presumably features of phase M continued in the southeast.²

O

This phase consisted only of the large building in square N 11 in the northwest sector, which was renewed in Stratum XI. The southeast sector remained the same.³

P

Phase P represents a complete building of the plan, here shown by the plan of X (Fig. 347). It is clear from Kenyon's reconstruction that minor changes in the plan indicate two stages in the main structures, here P 1 and 2 (Stratum X).⁴

In the central area, she considered the amorphous mass of 4008 (Stratum XII) as a structure that replaced the masseboth. Temple 2048 from strata IX-VII B conflicted with wall 2032 in X, but this wall was not part of any structure. It definitely conflicted with walls in XI of the O 13-14 complex. Mass 4008 could have been either a remnant of a temple or part of the foundations of 2048. Since there was such a large

¹Ibid. ²Ibid., pp. 46-47. ³Ibid., p. 47.

⁴Loud, Megiddo II, plans XI and X BB. There are some features of P structures that were rebuilt between XI and X, thus P 1 and P 2.

amount of destruction in the central area for the building of temple 2048,¹ both Kenyon and Epstein may be right. Kenyon was probably correct in considering the only floor of temple 2048 to be associated with Stratum VII B (LB),² and Epstein in asserting that there was a temple complex by the time of Stratum X, or P 2, which replaced Kenyon's masseboth.

Area AA

The architectural phases of Area AA are much less crucial than those of BB. There is less to date the various Strata than those of BB, but a general trend may be detected.³

AA

Miss Kenyon's phase AA is probably late EB IV or nearly MB II; it consists of the plan of XIII.⁴

AB

Kenyon's phase AB consists of the Stratum XII plan, together with the western portion of the XIII wall (Fig. 348 a). This phase of

¹Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", pp. 48-49; Claire Epstein, "An Interpretation of the Megiddo Sacred Area during Middle Bronze II", Israel Exploration Journal, 15 (1965), pp. 204-221. Kenyon pointed out that the walls of P in the southeast were cut by 2048. It was therefore later. This does not mean, however, that it was substantially later. If Epstein is correct about the earlier construction of some phase of 2048 it does not necessarily corroborate her entire plan, which appears to require substantial modifications in the plans of the complexes of P.

²Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", p. 54, fig. 25 gives the pottery from 2048 floor of VII B. On p. 52 she points out that the walls of VII B, VIII and IX as well as X are cut off in the area facing 2048. However, they are not really very close to that temple and may be cut off for other reasons. If the entire structure of 2048 was associated with VII B, then the locus immediately below would represent a temple in that period (4008).

³Ibid., pp. 55-59.

⁴Ibid., p. 55.

the architecture clearly overlaid the gate of XIII and was a bit more rational than the plans in Megiddo II.¹ The date appears to be later than MB III Group B.

AC

Phase AC is only a thickening of the AB wall.

AD

In phase AD, there was a considerable rebuilding of the wall area (Fig. 348 b). An internally buttressed wall with a tower was built on a high bank with some remains of a pavement. The angle of the bank, about 45 degrees, indicated to Kenyon that this was an example of the embanked fortification.² Stratum XII houses continued in existence.

AE

Phase AE consists of the rebuilding of house plans in Stratum XI: it may have been earlier than group D.

AF

Phase AF consists of the rebuilding of the wall in Stratum X and the houses inside the wall at nearly the same level (Fig. 348 c). It is dated to phase E by tomb 4043 which was built into a corner of L 6.³

AG

Phase AG consists only of minor changes in the houses and a massive

¹Ibid., pp. 55-56.

²Ibid., pp. 56-57. She states, however, that the wall with interior buttresses is not found elsewhere. The wall at Tell Far^ca North (below, p. 971) was buttressed in this manner.

³Kenyon, "The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo", p. 57.

TABLE 39

THE STRATIFICATION OF THE MEGIDDO MB II-III GROUPS AND ARCHITECTURAL PHASES

Area BB	Group	Whether Stratified		Area AA	Group	Whether Stratified		Date in M.B.
		Above	Below			Above	Below	
J 1	A	-	-					MB II B 1
J 2-3	A	-	yes					
K 1-2	B	yes	-					MB II B 2
L 1								
L 2	B or C	-	-					MB II B2orC
M 1	C or Trans.	yes	-					
M 2	Trans MB III	-	yes					
M 3	A	-	yes	AA				MB III A 1
N								
O				AB	B	-	yes?	
P 1	B	-	yes	AC				MB III A 2
	B 2	yes	-					MB III A2(b)
P 2	C	-	yes	AD				MB III B 1
	D	-	yes	AE				MB III B 2
P 3	E	-	yes	AF	E	-	yes or in.	MB III C
	"F"	-	yes					L B I A

950

set-back wall built against them. Again, no gate really belonged to this level.¹

AH

Phase AH is stratum VIII. Almost none of the old plans were continued. A new gate was added. Kenyon noted complete vessels of LB I type, with some sherds of 14th century date. The LB I pots may indicate the date of the structures,² and the LB II pots a gap in the sequence.

The important point in this sequence of architectural phases is the date of the embankment and wall of AD. It was later than AB which was in turn later than the MB III A 2 (group B). It was earlier than phase AF which was dated to group E or MB III C. The date of the embankment and wall at Megiddo is therefore in the MB III B, shortly after 1600 B.C. (Table 39).

Hazor

Hazor is the largest site in Northern Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age. Its vast lower city, dominated by a high mound and surrounded by an embanked fortification, has been considered a classic "Hyksos" city. It has long been known that the materials of this site belong to the MB III, certainly to be correlated, at least roughly, with the time of the Hyksos rulers of Egypt.³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 58.

³Y. Yadin, Y. Aharoni, R. Amiran, T. Dothan, I. Dunayevsky, and J. Perrot, Hazor I, the James A. De Rothschild Expedition (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, the Magnes Press, 1958); Y. Yadin, Y. Aharoni, R.

The high quality of the excavations has long been understood. There are, however, some doubtful areas of confused stratigraphy and typology that could be reinterpreted. When the earlier volumes were published, the Megiddo strata were still being used literally; I am not sure whether Yadin abandoned them in the latest volumes.¹ We must, therefore, make our own way, particularly in light of the reinterpretation of the typology and stratigraphy of Megiddo.

The MB II

The following areas on the high mound contained evidence of MB II occupation: Areas A, B, BA and G (Figs. 349-352).² In the lower city, the tomb area in D provided some evidence of materials of this date.³

Area A

In Area A, the EB IV level was succeeded by two MB levels, XVII and XVI. Carinated bowls and a globular bowl with out-turned rim were found in XVII that were characteristic of Megiddo MB II (Fig. 349 c-g). Only two potsherds are shown from XVI. One has a trefoil mouth and a neck; the body of the jug was gone. The second pot published is the upper part of what might have been a piriform juglet with double handle.

Amiran, T. Dothan, I. Dunayevsky and J. Perrot, Hazor II, the James A. De Rothschild Expedition (Jerusalem; Hebrew University, the Magnes Press, 1960); Y. Yadin, Y. Aharoni, R. Amiran, T. Dothan, M. Dothan, I. Dunayevsky and J. Perrot, Hazor III-IV Plates, the James A. De Rothschild Expedition (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, the Magnes Press, 1961); Yigael Yadin, Hazor; the Schweich Lectures 1970 (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 107-109.

¹The use of the "Strata" numbers has persisted despite the discovery that the Megiddo "strata" are not strata.

²Yadin, et. al., Hazor III-IV, plates CLVI, CXCVII-CXC, CCXXV-CCXXVI and CCXLVI.

³Yadin, et. al., Hazor I, plate XCI, 2-3, Area D 4.

The date of these two pots is MB II C-III B (Fig. 349 k-1).

Area BB

Area BB locus 3277 contained bowls similar to those in XVII of Area A. The same comparisons at Megiddo in the MB II apply here.

Stratum 14 of area BA contained materials similar to XVII in A and 3277 in B, including the carinated bowls (Fig. 350 a-d). There were a number of jar rims of the types found on the MB II handleless jars at Megiddo (Figs. 350 g-i; 300; 314). There was one heavy bowl with grooved rim of MB II type as well (Fig. 350 e). The bottom portion of a small baggy juglet with disc base has no direct parallel in the Megiddo Groups. However, baggy juglets of this general type are common at Sidon in the MB II.¹ Experiments in the shape of juglets are more common in the MB II as well (Figs. 350 i, 77 b-e, h and i).

Pottery from locus 4022, level 13 is not distinctive, but the pots from tomb 4021, a burial assigned to level 12, are (Fig. 351 a-e from level 13; f-m from level 12). This tomb contained two globular bowls with everted rims of late MB II type at Megiddo (Fig. 301 gg; 308 b). There were two dippers, one with a round mouth and thickened rim; this last feature appears in MB II Sidon.² Two ovoid to piriform brown juglets have ridge-rims. One had a ring base, the other a wide disc. An open bowl or platter has a concave disc base and a heavy, carinated, almost bevelled rim. These heavy rims with a sharp profile, are especially common on Megiddo MB II bowls. The brown burnished surface and ovoid shape of the juglets, especially with the wide ring or disc

¹Above, pp. 890-892.

²Above, pp. 891-892.

base, has already been cited at Tell ed-Dab^ca and Megiddo as a sign of early date (MB II C).¹ These features all indicate that the date of tomb 4021 is to be dated at the end of MB II C. The strata below, 13 and 14, must be MB II, possibly MB II B 1-2.

Area G

Area G contained materials similar to those of A and B. One handle from a juglet has three strands. Here, however, carinated bowls are often red-slipped (Fig. 352 f-h). The red-slipped carinated bowls, especially burnished, are exclusively MB II at Megiddo, while they continued to MB III group ii at Jericho and into MB III at Ajjul. The carinated bowl ended earlier in North Palestine than in the south, however.²

Area D

Finally, there was evidence for MB II from area D 3 from Hazor I, stratum 4, loci 9010 and 9011. The latter was a tomb cut in the rock below a prepared floor, cut in the edge of the lower city. From this tomb came a juglet with ridge-rim, MB II D - III A, most likely the latter. From the floor outside came pottery that may have been thrown out of the tomb when the MB III A burial was put in place, among other, later sherds.³ Two red-burnished carinated bowls have disc bases; one has horizontal burnishing above the keel and vertical burnish below. This is diagnostic of MB II date (Figs. 298, 311 and 319).⁴

¹Above, pp. 74-79, 923-24.

²Below, p. 1006, Jericho.

³Yadin, et. al., Hazor I, plate C, pp. 109-112; for locus 9011 see number 8, for locus 9010 see bowls 2 and 19. Sherds of other types, 13 and 14 called Cypricote, are later than the MB II.

⁴Kenyon dated some red-burnished carinated bowls to the MB III, but these have been reclassified to the transition period. These have a vertical burnish all over however.

except for the single burial, it was abandoned during the MB III B and C. Breaks occurred not only between the EB IV and the MB II but between the early MB III A and LB.

Hazor in the MB III: The Lower City

MB III remains were found in all areas of the lower city. These began in a few areas in the MB III A, but became general in the MB III B - C.

Area F

MB III remains from Area F include parts of piriform and cylindrical juglets with no elaboration of the rim. Pedestal chalices indicate that this area was occupied in the MB III B - C. One handle has coiled strands of clay applied to it (Fig. 352 n-u).

Area H

Pottery from area H is not too distinctive. Flared cups with wide mouths rather resembled the pedestal chalices from level 3. There were also some simple carinated bowls.¹ These were most probably MB III C if not LB in date.

Area K

A few remains from area K level 3 date to the MB. Two Cypriote sherds include one of the Pendant Line Style, MB III A 2 (b) in date. A black on red painted sherd is less clearly dated. A sherd from a piriform juglet confirms the impression that MB III B materials as well

¹Yadin, et. al., Hazor III-IV, plate CCLIV, chalices include 9, 10, 12 and carinated bowls 13-15. Incised decoration was found on sherds 22-24.

as MB III C materials are present.¹

Area 210/A1

Remains are also few from this area. Part of a high pedestal came from level 4 that indicates that some material of MB III B or C date is present. Burial 2011 from level 3 contained only one juglet and that is cylindrical; it is MB III C or earliest LB.²

Area D

This area was a group of rock-cut tombs and cisterns in the MB; stratification tended to be rather questionable.³ The area was divided into five sub-areas: 1, the area east of cave 9038; 2, the area between D 1 and D 3; 3, the area east of the rock escarpment; 4, the area to the west and above the rock escarpment; and 5, the rocky area in the south of the excavation.⁴

D 1

The lowest level of D 1, level 5, was exposed only in a small area in front of and in cave 9038. The pottery is not particularly distinctive, though there is one deep carinated bowl with flared neck. This is MB III B (Fig. 353 1) in date. Level 4 was also confused, but one pedestal is also MB III B.⁵ Level 3 contained flared-neck jars (Fig.

¹Ibid., plate CCLXXXVII, numbers 23 and 24 are Cypriote; 19 is a piriform juglet as is 18; number 6 is possibly from a chalice. There was also rope decoration, 11 and 12.

²Ibid., plate CCXCVI, number 4 is a pedestal; number 10 is a cylindrical juglet. The baggy juglet number 9 is a Late Bronze type.

³Yadin, et. al., Hazor I, p. 99.

⁴Ibid.; see also plans on plates CLXXXII-IV.

⁵Ibid., plate XCIII, 2 and 16, respectively. There was also a flared-neck jar 15 and pendant line style sherd 21, so some MB III A 2 (b)

353 p, s, t), parts of a piriform juglet (Fig. 353 w), and a cylindrical juglet (Fig. 353 v). It is MB III B, or possibly C.¹ Level 2 was Late Bronze.

D 2

D 2 was a badly disturbed area. Pottery from various loci includes the pedestals (Fig. 353 a, b), flared-neck jars and piriform juglets characteristic of MB III B (Fig. 353 c-e, 336-7).

D 3

We have already discussed the nature of D 3 levels 4 and 3 under the MB II.² A piriform juglet was an MB III A type, somewhat later than those of the B A tomb. A globular bowl had an angled neck, a feature that defined MB III A 1 at Megiddo.³

Level 3 was also rather mixed. There are flared-carinated bowls and sherds of painted juglets. Since the contents of D 5 are much clearer, we will discuss the date of this new painted ware there. The flared-carinated bowls are MB III A 2 and B, probably the latter (Fig. 356 n and o). Both stratum 2 and 1 contained some MB III B material, both piriform and cylindrical juglets were found in both levels (Fig. 354-355).

(Area D 4 contained the sherd with the painted spiral discussed above.)

materials were found in the area as well.

¹Ibid., plate XCIV. Note the collared jars 4 and 5, piriform juglets 16 and 17, cylindrical juglet 15, and rope decoration on sherds 19 and 20.

²Above, p. 954.

³Yadin, et al., Hazor I, plate C, 1 and 8.

D 5

Area D 5 was especially important because it contained evidence that will help determine the date when the painted juglets appeared in the MB III. The main sequence was contained by cistern 9024. The excavation of this cistern was carried out under conditions of great hardship and some danger. In addition, the materials were somewhat mixed by the excavation of graves in the mud of the cistern and by a partial cave in. The publication noted that smaller objects and finer pottery, such as scarabs, pins and delicate bowls assigned to the lowest or pre-burial stratum really belonged to the burial stratum.¹

Five levels were found in the cistern. Five was the period of the cistern's use as a cistern. Finds from it include domestic and industrial vessels. Level four was a level of burials, covering a short period, according to the excavator. Level three was Late Bronze I.

Of key importance to the date of level 5 is the group of carinated bowls (Fig. 361). Because of the excavator's warning, we must assign at least two or three (Fig. 361 b, d, and g) to the burial stratum. It would not appear reasonable to reassign all of the other flared-carinated bowls to level 4 from 5, though some others may belong there (Fig. 361 h). The flared-carinated bowls that remain thus date level 5 to the MB III A 2.

Stratum 4, the burial stratum, contained flared-carinated bowls, jars with flared necks, and pedestal bowls (Fig. 359-note especially l, m, and n). The stratum thus contained clear evidence of MB III B 1, especially with the additions from stratum 5, which include a pedestal bowl. Eight of the twenty-six juglets illustrated from these burials

¹Yadin, et al., Hazor I, pp. 127-129.

are painted; one juglet has a simple band of punctate ornament. Three undecorated and two painted juglets have a ridge rim; one larger jug has a pushed-out rim of unusual type. These features may indicate that the burial stratum began in the MB III A 2, though there were none of the true "trumpet-mouthpiece" rims of MB III A. Level 5 was already of MB III A 2 date, so 4 could not have begun much before the end of that period.¹ The decoration on the juglets is in brown paint and consisted of groups of lines, often with wavy or zig-zag lines between. Vertical lines or groups of lines are painted on some of the shoulders, radiating from a line at the base of the neck to a line on the shoulder.

Though the context is marred slightly, it is sufficiently clear to date the beginning of the Yehudiyya painted style in Palestine, as well as the Syrian prototypes for these early painted juglets. The stratum began in the MB III A 2 and ended in the MB III B 1; none of the high pedestals that characterized the later MB III B were found in it. As the next level was Late Bronze, there must have been a gap in the sequence.

Area E

Loci 7001 and 7012 in Area E at the base of the high mound yielded materials of MB III A date, including ridge-rim juglets and an elaborate pitcher (Fig. 357 a-f).

Area C

This area contained materials that illustrate the end of the MB III B and the MB III C. The materials of MB III B date were found in loci 6210, 6205 and 6206. A loose juglet with a ridge rim was found

¹The flared-carinated bowl is the defining characteristic of MB III A 2 (See Fig. 94).

below floor level, called 3-4 undefined (t 29, 6210), or MB III A in date. T. 7, locus 6205 consisted of two parallel walls with fragments of a pithos burial at one end. Inside were fragments of two piriform juglets and an infant's bones.¹ This burial was MB III A, or more likely, MB III B in date. T 13, in 6206 was a burial in a complete jar with a piriform juglet. The position of the burial indicates that it was earlier than a level 3 wall; the locus itself was called level 3-4² (Figs. 363-369, Fig. 370 a-d).

All of the other juglets from this area are cylindrical, as are all of the juglets dated to level 3; one of these is painted (Fig. 365 j-r, Fig. 366). If the MB III A and B immediately preceded level 3, MB III C was the main period of occupation in the level and can thus be stratigraphically isolated.³

A glance at Table 65, the Hazor areas will give the reader a fair idea of the complexity of dealing with many unconnected areas in the same mound with different types of materials. Unlike Megiddo, where we dealt almost exclusively with the well-defined tombs of the tell, at Hazor we were forced to use the more confused evidence of stratified deposits of debris. The results were fairly simple however.

Four areas of sounding in the high mound yielded materials of MB II date; in three of these, A, B and BA, the occurrence was nearly certain. Because the sample of materials was small, there was nothing that could clearly be assigned an MB II B date, though some of the sherds probably belonged to that phase. The occupation continued into the MB III

¹Yadin, et al., Hazor II, p. 83, plate CXI, 25.

²Ibid., fig. 4, chart p. 120.

³Ibid., pp. 76-91, 119-126, plate CXI.

with the tomb group of the transitional period from BA and possibly level XVI in area A. Except for isolated materials, MB III B-C did not occur on the high mound.

It was at this time that settlement was first made on a large scale in the so-called Lower City. A few groups of the MB II and III A periods were found in Areas D 3, D 5, C and E. In the MB III B period, however, evidence of occupation or tombs came from Areas D 1, 2, 3, 5; C; F; K and 210/ A 1. We should, therefore, date the large-scale occupation of the Lower City and the building of the embanked fortification that surrounded it to the MB III B. This occupation continued through the MB III C when the city was destroyed, then rebuilt in the Late Bronze I A. Shortly thereafter, the city was abandoned.¹

The groups from Hazor contributed two points to our general discussion of Palestinian archaeological chronology. First, pottery from cistern 9024 dated to the MB III A 2 (level 5 and 4) and MB III B 1 (level 4), showed the date of the earlier Yehudiyya Painted ware. Second, the MB III C was given some stratigraphic confirmation in the level 3 of area C.

Tell Far^ha North

This major site and excavation yielded materials of the MB II B - C and the MB III in groups, tombs, and occupation levels. These occupation levels included houses, fortifications and a possible cult structure.²

¹Yadin, Hazor; the Schweich Lectures 1970, p. 32.

²Roland de Vaux, O. P., "La première campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^hah près Naplouse", Revue Biblique, 54 (1947), pp. 394-433; de Vaux, "La seconde campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^hah près Naplouse", Revue Biblique, 55 (1948), pp. 544-580; de Vaux, "La deuxième campagne

Tombs of the MB II

Remains of MB II date are few and those published were all from tombs. They include parts of the assemblage from tomb 16, tomb B from the town, and tombs AN and AD from the southwest area of the city.

Tomb 16

Despite the fact that this tomb was used in the Chalcolithic, Early Bronze, Middle Bronze II, III and Late Bronze ages, the remains of MB II C date are fairly clear. The dippers of that date had the rather plump profile of the mid MB II and possibly flattened bases as well; one of the mouths is trefoil, while the others are simply pinched. One handleless jar has simple red bands at the neck and shoulder. This feature is MB II B 2 in date.¹

Tomb B

This was the interment of an adult; with it were two handleless jars and a convex bowl with everted rim. Although the bowl could be either MB II B or C in date, the jars seem more developed than other MB III B 1 examples. The tomb is therefore dated here to the MB II B 2 (Fig. 375 a-c).²

de fouilles à Tell el-Farāh près Naplouse, Rapport Préliminaire (suite)", Revue Biblique, 56 (1949), pp. 102-138; de Vaux, "La troisième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Farāh près Naplouse", Revue Biblique, 58 (1951), pp. 393-430; de Vaux, "Les fouilles de Tell el-Farāh près Naplouse; cinquième campagne; rapport préliminaire", Revue Biblique, 62 (1955), pp. 541-589; de Vaux, "Les fouilles de Tell el-Farāh près Naplouse; sixième campagne; rapport préliminaire", Revue Biblique, 64 (1957), pp. 552-580; de Vaux, "Les fouilles de Tell el-Farāh; rapport préliminaire sur les 7^{me}, 8^{me}, 9^{me} campagnes 1958-1960 (suite)", Revue Biblique, 69 (1962), pp. 212-253; Joel Mallet, Tell el-Farāh; L'installation du Moyen Bronze antérieure au rempart, Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 14 (Paris: J. Gabalda and Co., 1973).

¹De Vaux, "Tell el-Farāh près Naplouse; cinquième campagne", fig. 2, number 7, 10, 11 of MB II. Pottery of the MB III included juglets 1, 3, and dipper number 2.

²Above, fig. 68 d, 72 e.

Tomb AN

This tomb contained an ovoid amphora, large jug with grooved rim, a convex bowl with everted rim and two ovoid juglets with ridged necks and flared rims (Fig. 378). This group is MB II; the juglets, with the flared rims and ridges at the neck, compare with type found at Megiddo in the MB II C (See Fig. 315 t).

Tomb AD

This tomb was probably mixed, as it included pots of both MB II C and MB III A types. Likely MB II C elements include a juglet of the type that occurred in tomb AN, but with a pointed base (Fig. 379 d). There were two rather bulged dippers and a pitcher with pinched mouth and three-strand handle as in MB II B-C and an ovoid amphora (Fig. 379 a, b, g). Other elements may be MB III (Fig. 379 c, e, f. See also Fig. 319 e, 322 c, and 325 b and c).

The MB III A 1

A number of tombs may belong to the MB III A 1, the phase of the convex bowl with angled neck. The necks on these are often higher than those of Megiddo, and we shall see these as ancestral forms of the MB III B pedestal vase in the MB III A 2. Tomb H was the best example of an MB III A 1 context here, though E was also clear.

Tomb H

Tomb H contained the bowl of Megiddo group A and Jericho group i with short, flared neck (Fig. 374 h). A variant had a wider, shorter shape (Fig. 374 i). A crater with flared neck and deep bowl have tripod loop bases. Two long, pointed dippers contrast with the plump, more rounded dippers of MB II. Two monophorae have the very ovoid shape of

early forms of this type. Juglets are piriform, nearly ovoid, and very plump with ring or stump bases. The crater and a juglet were cream burnished, the other juglets were red (Fig. 374).¹

Tomb 1

De Vaux compared this tomb to H. The collared bowls, especially bowl 3, appear slightly more developed, as does the tripod loop base on a vessel. Dippers are the same as in H. One piriform juglet has a pointed base.²

The MB III A 2

Tombs belonging to this phase or having some connection with it included tomb A (Figs. 371-372), part of 3 (Figs. 375-377), and X (Fig. 381). Tombs F and G may belong to this period, while J, K, and L were MB III A generally.³

Tomb A

Among the early monophorae, amphora, dippers and piriform juglets are a flared-carinated bowl and a globular jug with concave neck and rim-shoulder handle (Fig. 371). This last may be an imitation of a Cypriote shape which appears only at the end of the MB III A.⁴ The

¹De Vaux, "La seconde campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^cah près Naplouse", pp. 37-39.

²De Vaux, "La troisième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^cah près Naplouse", pp. 399-401.

³De Vaux, "La seconde campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^cah près Naplouse", pp. 575-577; de Vaux, "La troisième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^cah près Naplouse", pp. 401-404.

⁴Compare the shape of Fig. 371, bottom center, with those of Fig. 335.

weapons from this tomb will be discussed below.

Tomb 3

Along with the Early Bronze Age and MB III B materials, some jars may indicate that the tomb was used in the MB III A as well. The flared-neck jars here are more developed than the bowl with angled neck of the MB III A 1, but much less developed than the flared-neck jars of the MB III B, though jars of this type may occur in that phase also (Fig. 376, c-d).¹

Tomb X

The MB III A date of this tomb was indicated by the red-polished carinated bowl, stump-based juglet and ovoid amphora. There is a variant of the flared-carinated bowl (Fig. 381a). A larger jar has a tripod-loop base. It is decorated with bands, zig-zags and dots in red and yellow paint on a white surface.²

Tomb AM

This tomb contained a ring-based juglet with brown slip, which indicates an early date.³ The bowl with angled neck and flared-carinated bowl showed that the date is the MB III A or B. The carinated bowls of this MB III A 2 tomb illustrate a type of bowl with flared neck which is intermediate between the MB III A 1 type and the pedestal vases of the MB III B (Fig. 382 b; see also Fig. 336 p).

¹Below, pp. 1007-1008.

²De Vaux, "Tell Far'ah; les 7^{me}, 8^{me}, 9^{me} campagnes", p. 245.

³Above, pp. 923-924.

Tombs F, G, J, K and L

These tombs were all probably MB III A in date, but the groups were too small to be clearly distinguished.

The MB III B

The excavator noted that one of the major changes between the earlier MB II (i.e. the MB II B-C and MB III A) and the later MB II (MB III B) was that large numbers of individuals were buried in one cave or tomb in the MB III B. De Vaux also noted this change in both the Megiddo and Jericho groups. Child burials, however, continued to be made under house floors.¹ Tombs 3, 5, 16 and possibly 7 contained materials of this era.

Tomb 3

The most significant change from the MB III A to B documented in this group was the frequent occurrence of the carinated pedestal goblet. This is a primary characteristic of MB III B at Megiddo. One early pedestal vase came from this group (Fig. 376 e). Several platters were found, one without the inverted rim (Fig. 375 d). Some juglets have ring bases and some have true button bases (Fig. 376 n-q, s). The long, well-proportioned dipper is being replaced by the shorter, more tapered or plump dipper types. One is nearly baggy. An important special feature is the occurrence of a round or lentoid faience flask (Fig. 377 a).

Tomb 5

This group contained no carinated chalices. The faience flask,

¹De Vaux, "La deuxième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far'ah près Naplouse", p. 570.

piriform and cylindrical juglets are the same as those in tomb 3, however. Two jugs with shoulder handles are nearly carinated. One especially resembled jugs from Ajjul in the MB III C (Fig. 498 c, n and Fig. 360 a and b).

Tomb 7

There was still one piriform juglet in tomb 7. The other pots are not distinctive.¹

Tomb 16

A long dipper and piriform juglet indicate that the tomb include materials of the MB III; the convex bowl with a groove below the rim documents the presence of MB III B.²

The MB III C

The last phase of the MB III was not easy to document from the material of Tell Farca North.

Tomb C

This tomb contained an amphora, cylindrical juglet and a Cypriote spouted cup. Its date is thus MB III B-C; it was found at the base of a LB house.³

¹De Vaux, "La deuxième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Farcah près Naplouse", p. 136.

²De Vaux, "Tell Farcah près Naplouse; cinquième campagne", fig. 2, p. 545.

³De Vaux, "La seconde campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Farcah près Naplouse", pp. 572-573.

Tomb 5

The carinated jug from tomb 5 has already been discussed above.¹

These two tombs are certainly insufficient to prove that the MB III C was present at Tell Farca North. Until further information becomes available, we cannot assume that the MB III C was present here.

Weapons

The weapon documented from the MB II C at Tell Farca N. was the dagger with widely-separated veins. It was found in tomb H with a rounded knob-like pommel. Another example from tomb 3 could not be dated so clearly, because the context was mixed (Fig. 380 g, Fig. 377 h).

The next type of dagger illustrated was the convex pointed dagger with flat midrib. This occurred in tomb A with pottery of the MB III A 2 (b). It has an almost globular pommel (Fig. 372).

The axe from the same tomb was narrow, with the ribs at the socket and wide bracing in front of and behind the socket (Fig. 372).

Tell Farca; The Town

The excavation of Tell Farcah was carried out in nine campaigns beginning in the late forties. The excavation was of the architectural type. The stratigraphic controls of the baulk-debris method of excavation were not then in use. Further, the Middle Bronze Age strata were often disturbed by wall robbing and tombs.²

¹De Vaux, "La troisième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Farcah près Naplouse", pp. 123-32.

²Mallet, Tell el-Farcah, L'installation du Moyen Bronze antérieure au rempart, p. 21. Note the incomplete plans on figs. 6 and 7.

The MB II - III A

The earliest remains of the MB II - III A town consisted of houses built on the Early Bronze Age rampart.¹ There may have been a rudimentary fortification traced in several sectors, south of the later gate, the only defense was the remaining Early Bronze Age rampart.² In addition, a few tombs and loci were earlier than the Middle Bronze Age rampart.

The Middle Bronze Age structure above the fortified gate of the Early Bronze Age could be dated to the end of the MB II by the occurrence of a convex bowl with grooved rim but ring base. Pottery from a nearby locus, 771, includes a bowl with flared or angled neck of the MB III A 1 type, a juglet with a line below the rim, and a jar with a tripod loop base. An ovoid amphora may indicate a rather early date.³ Pottery from loci in the structure includes a piriform juglet with a stump base (MB III A), a platter with heavy but inturned rim and concave disc base (MB II C - III A 1), and a lamp made of a sherd from a bowl with angled neck of MB III A 1.⁴ The structure(s) above the Early Bronze gate can thus be dated to the end of the MB II C and the MB III A 1.

In the southwest sector of the excavations, no real buildings were found between the buildings of the Early Bronze Age and the rampart of the Middle Bronze. However, a number of tombs excavated in the Early

¹Ibid., fig. 5, pp. 32-33.

²Ibid., p. 33. Dating any fortifications to this period is most uncertain.

³Ibid., fig. 11. For the location, see figs. 5 and 6.

⁴Ibid., fig. 12.

Bronze Age levels were of MB III A date, including AM, AD, AN and AJ.¹

The MB III B - C

Level 5 and the fortification seem to offer evidence for the MB III B period.² The house plans of level 5 inside the city gate are not particularly enlightening. The wall with internal buttresses, gate and southern bastion seem to date to this period, with a bank or glacis stretching some ten to fifteen meters in front.³ The gate was constructed with a bent-axis approach like the gate in Megiddo. Behind the main entry was a pair of doorways, which we will see repeatedly elsewhere.⁴

The southern bastion was a rather shallow projection with internal rooms.⁵

The glacis had an external retaining wall for part of its extent. There was also an internal retaining wall with loose stones inside it.⁵

Pottery from trench 7 dated the rampart; it includes a carinated pedestal vase of the MB III B.⁶

The Subterranean chamber

This chamber was a rectangular room over two meters deep, originally even deeper. The walls inclined slightly, indicating that

¹Ibid., fig. 9, pp. 51-92. The tombs are discussed, but for some reason, the author still used Megiddo "Strata" for comparison, damaging the results.

²De Vaux, "La troisième campagne de fouilles à Tell el-Far^Cah près Naplouse", pp. 396-404, 421-30.

³Ibid., plate VI.

⁴Below, p. 979 for the Shechem Northeast gate.

⁵De Vaux, "Tell el-Far^Cah; cinquième campagne", p. 573, fig. 15

⁶Ibid., fig. 3, 2.

the roof was corbelled. A low bench in the south corner had pottery on it. The pottery recovered from this structure includes two pointed dippers, a bowl with tripod-loop base, a lamp and open carinated bowls. A flared-neck jar with high collar indicated that the date is MB III B.¹

De Vaux compared this structure to the "Mithraeum" at Alalakh (Level V, LB I). It should be compared also to built tombs at Jericho and those of Tell ed-Dab'a. The structure was found near the heavy wall of what could have been a temple.²

The pottery of Tell Farca North contains few surprises. Perhaps the most interesting vessels include an imitation of a Cypriote pot from tomb A (Fig. 371, MB III A 2 b), the jar painted in red and yellow on white (Fig. 381 e, MB III A 2), and the remarkable amphora with the crude paintings of men and palm trees added to the normal lines and zig-zags of MB painted decoration. The date of this last vessel is most likely MB II C - III A.

Perhaps the most important feature of the sequence at Tell Farca North is the stratigraphic separation of MB III A from III B. This was determined by Mallet in his study of the Middle Bronze Age before the construction of the rampart.³

The sequence of Middle Bronze Age remains at Tell Farca began in the MB II B with tomb B. There was much more present from the MB II C and especially the MB III A. Even though there were more important structures from the MB III B than the MB III A, there was much less

¹De Vaux, "Tell el-Farcah; sixième campagne", p. 564, fig. 6.

²Ibid., pp. 559-567.

³Mallet, Tell el-Farcah; L'installation du Moyen Bronze antérieure au rempart.

pottery published from that period. This was probably because most of the pottery published came from tombs, most of which were in the tell; the change to using chamber tombs in the MB III B may account for the relative paucity of whole MB III B pots in these publications. No certain MB III C occurrence was documented at Tell Far ah.

Although de Vaux did not mention any violence in or at the end of the Middle Bronze Age sequence, there was no published evidence of the earliest LB. The black globular juglets and Ajjul ware characteristic of the LB I was absent. There was thus a gap in the sequence from some time in the late Middle Bronze Age to well into the Late Bronze.

Shechem

Like so many other sites in Palestine, Shechem was first excavated by Sellin. He was followed much later by an American excavation which redated much of the material and architecture found by Sellin and his immediate successors. This excavation remains largely unpublished, except for a number of preliminary reports on the excavations, articles on the scarabs and a general book.¹

Two dissertations have been written on Middle Bronze Age pottery

¹G. Ernest Wright, "The First Campaign at Tell Balatah (Shechem)", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 144 (1956), pp. 9-20; Wright, "The Second Campaign at Tell Balatah (Shechem)", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 148 (1957), pp. 11-28; Wright and Lawrence R. Toombs, "The Third Campaign at Tell Balatah (Shechem)", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 161 (1961), pp. 11-54; Wright and Toombs, "The Fourth Campaign at Tell Balatah (Shechem)", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 169 (1963), pp. 1-60.

These are the main preliminary reports; summaries of these may be found in Revue Biblique and elsewhere. For a more complete bibliography see the following entry: G. Ernest Wright, Shechem; the Biography of a Biblical City (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1965), p. 247, note 1 to chapter 4 contained the bibliography. This volume consolidated the findings of the excavations, and is the main source cited here.

from Shechem, or have contained much information on this pottery.¹

It would appear that this excavation dealt primarily with occupation debris. As such, it yielded much information on the architecture. Since, however, the occupation debris was mainly fill, the pottery sequence obtained from it contained many problems and distortions not found in well-defined groups (i.e. tombs).² A third problem with the material from Shechem is that the "MB II A" pottery (i.e. MB II - III A) has not been discussed in any significant way. We shall, therefore, only discuss the date of the major architectural features and one or two groups.

The "Temenos"

The chronology of Shechem in the Middle Bronze Age has been expressed in terms of seven phases of an area that certainly included temples at the end of the Middle Bronze Age.³ Earlier structures in that area have been identified as temples because of their position and their resemblance to temples elsewhere.⁴

Temenos I (968)

This phase of the "Sacred Area" consisted only of massive filling

¹Joe D. Seger, "The Pottery of Palestine at the Close of the Middle Bronze Age", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1966; Dan Poling Cole, "Middle Bronze II B Pottery at Shechem; Incorporating Proposals for the Analysis and Reporting of Near Eastern Stratified Sherd Materials", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1965.

²Wright, Shechem, fig. 67. This is the only pottery group mentioned from the excavations at Shechem in the MB in this book. The basis of the Cole dissertation is sherd material.

³Ibid., fig. 41 shows the plan of the penultimate MB temple, with the classic "fortress-temple" shape. Other examples from Palestine included the Early Bronze Age temples at Megiddo (Loud, Megiddo II, "Stratum XV").

⁴Wright, Shechem, pp. 106-107.

and a platform surrounded by a retaining wall. Other architectural features were found associated with this period, but there was no consistent attempt at excavating the phases below Temenos 2, so these cannot be closely correlated with each other. No evidence for the date of this phase has been published other than the statement of Wright that it was "MB II A" (i.e. MB II - III A).¹

Temenos 2

The next phase of the temenos was built between a massive wall (900) and city wall D, the earliest traced fortification of the Middle Bronze Age at Shechem. The pottery indicates that temenos 2 and wall D were contemporary.²

The plan of Temenos 2 could not be traced in any detail, but it appeared to be roughly rectangular--an enclosure with some rooms near the outer wall. To the north there was a group of parallel rooms.³

Wright dated this phase to the "MB II B". Since pedestal goblets of earlier type were associated with this phase of the Temenos, it must be dated to the MB III B, at or shortly after 1600.⁴

Temenos 3

The third phase of the Temenos was a fully developed courtyard building, with casement-rooms around the outside. An inner court, which Wright felt was the main place of cultic activity, was directly below a later altar and masseboth.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 110-112.

²Ibid., pp. 112-114.

³Ibid., fig. 63.

⁴Cole, "Middle Bronze II B Pottery at Shechem", plates XXII-XXIII.

⁵Wright, Shechem, p. 108, item 2, and pp. 114-118.

The date was indicated clearly by the occurrence of a sherd of Late Yehudiyya ware below the complex; pedestal chalices of MB III B were associated with this phase as well.¹

The area outside the temenos had been fortified in this period with a great earth embankment; nevertheless, the use of this temple was cut short by a destruction that Wright called violent.²

Temenos 4

In the fourth phase, the casement was abandoned, though the courtyard was kept as part of the complex, with rooms to the north of the rectangular structure,³ some rooms were added to the west after the construction.

Temenos 5

This phase was built over the embanked fortification associated with Temenos 3; it was built on an entirely different plan, larger than before.

Temenos 6

In this period, the old form of the temple was abandoned and the structure filled in.⁴ The new temple, designated 1 a, was of the "Fortress Temple" type; the general shape compares best with the Late Bronze Age temple at Megiddo, though others resemble it as well. It

¹Cole, "Middle Bronze II B Pottery at Shechem", plate LXXXV, from T 3 s or below Temenos 3.

²Wright, Shechem, p. 117.

³Ibid., pp. 118-120; there may have been some standing stones here also.

⁴Ibid., p. 87-91 (Fortress-temple 1 a).

was a compact rectangular structure with extremely heavy walls, two projecting piers or towers, an axial doorway with a column in the center and columns in the main cella.¹ This temple was associated with another reconstruction of the defenses and was "MB II C" (i.e. MB III B 2 - III C) in date.²

Temenos 7

This consisted of the rebuilt temple 1 b, built on approximately the same plan as 1a. Outside the doorway there were two masseboth flanking the door.³ There may have been a brick altar in the courtyard.

The construction of wall B and the East Gate has been connected chronologically with the reconstruction of this temple without the direct evidence of stratigraphy. Sherds under the temple indicate that it was constructed in the MB III B - C (probably III C). It was violently destroyed.⁴

The chronology of the Temenos area

It might appear puzzling that there were some six phases of the temenos constructed between 1600 and 1500 B.C., but the explanation is fairly simple. Before the first destruction of Temenos 3, there was only Temenos 2. The existence of Temenos 3 was cut short by destruction. It was immediately replaced by Temenos 4 on a very similar plan; when the glacis fortification was replaced, Temenos 5 replaced 4, with a more spacious plan. Thus the existence of two phases, 3 and 4 may have been

¹Ibid., fig. 41.

²Wall A. Ibid., chapter 5, pp. 57-79 for this rather tangled set of relationships, tabulated on p. 122.

³Ibid., pp. 91-95.

⁴Ibid., p. 95.

cut short for reasons not directly connected with the use of the temple. All of these phases, 2-5 should be dated to the MB III B.

The earlier temenoi were built on an open courtyard plan; this was replaced by the solid, compact building of Temenos 6, or Fortress temple 1a. This change in practice may be contemporary with the establishment of 2048 at Megiddo, if that temple or a similar building was associated with phase P there. The possibility must be raised that a change in (religious) practice caused this change in architecture and that Temenos 6 may have replaced 5 after only a short time. Since Temenos 7 was rebuilt on the same plan, Temple 1 a may have had a normal existence. Of the six "phases" of the MB III B - C temenos, there were only two which may have been used for any great length of time, temenoi 2 and 6. Two of the phases (3 and 7) were cut short by destruction; two more (4 and 5) may have been cut short for technical reasons or to accommodate changes in practice.

The fortifications

The earliest known fortification of Shechem in the Middle Bronze Age was wall D. This was a brick wall on a stone foundation, some two and a half meters wide. The stone foundation was made with carefully constructed faces and a rubble core. Sherds found in the core included sharply carinated vessel fragments, which Wright dated to "MB II B".¹ Vessels of this type occur in the MB III A 2 and III B (Fig. 328 b-o, 336 m-p). Elsewhere, Wright dated the wall approximately to the time of Temenos 2, which is MB III B.

¹Ibid., p. 63.

This wall was later used as the inner retaining wall for an embanked fortification. This fortification was held in place by a massive wall built against its outer face (wall C). The bank was itself made of white, packed clay. Though no wall was found preserved on the embankment, as the embankment was not preserved to its full height, the fortification would not be complete without one.¹ The date of this embankment must be MB III B as it was later than wall D.

Wall A was a large, "Cyclopean" wall built after and superseding the embankment; in the temenos area, it was built beyond it. Earth was piled against its inner face so that the mount was level with the top of the stone wall.² In some areas, at least, there was an inside wall, with cross-walls making a casement. In the northwest, there was a gate with three sets of piers, a feature we will note frequently later.³ Pottery associated with the wall was dated to the "MB II C", so it belongs to the later Sixteenth Century B.C.⁴

After Wall A was in use for some time, an additional wall, B, was constructed inside it.⁵ This wall was of the offset type already noted at Megiddo (Fig. 348). It apparently protected only the northern and eastern parts of the mound as only sectors there contained clear evidence of this wall; it did not appear to be of the casement type. There was one gate, on the east, with two sets of piers. Rooms between Wall A and B were probably filled in in this period, and the area between the wall at least partly transformed into a glacis.⁶ The gate to wall B was at

¹Ibid., pp. 62-66.

²Ibid., pp. 66-71 and 58.

³Below, pp. 1185-1193.

⁴Wright, Shechem, p. 69 below.

⁵Ibid., pp. 67-68, fig. 20. ⁶Ibid., p. 67.

least once renewed, with orthostats added; this second phase was destroyed twice in rapid succession, violently in the LB. After this destruction, which was only possibly still in the Middle Bronze Age, there was a gap which appears to have covered the Fifteenth Century.¹

Table 40 shows the one major problem in the archaeology of the Shechem defenses. These defenses were obviously needed in the period from the time when wall D was constructed, for they were renewed and enlarged with the embankment. Yet Wright shows no defenses for the period of temenos 4 and 5. Either there was a fortification that the Drew-McCormick expedition did not find, which appears unlikely considering the scale of the excavation, or Wall A was at least partly contemporary with those two phases. This is the more likely solution to the problem, as Wall A was dated rather inconclusively, as merely between the MB III C wall B and the MB III B glacis.²

Tell Ta'annek

This site, a short distance southeast of Megiddo, was excavated twice in this century, first by Sellin,³ then by Lapp over a half-century later.⁴ The site appears to have been settled only in the MB III B-C

¹Ibid., p. 76.

²Ibid., p. 69, fig. 74.

³Ernst Sellin, Tell Ta'annek, Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophische-Historische Klasse, Band 50, 4 (Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1904). Paul Lapp, "The 1963 Excavation at Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 173 (1964), pp. 4-44; Paul Lapp, "The 1966 Excavations at Tell Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 185 (1967), pp. 2-38; Paul Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 195 (1969), pp. 2-49.

⁴Paul Lapp, "The 1963 Excavations at Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 173 (1964), pp. 4-44; Paul Lapp, "The 1966 Excavations at Tell Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 185 (1967), pp. 2-38; Paul Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta'annek", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 195 (1969), pp. 2-49.

TABLE 40

THE CORRELATION OF TEMENOS AND FORTIFICATION PHASES AT SHECHEM WITH
THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE

Temenos	Fortification	Date
1		MB II - III A
2	Wall D	MB III B 1
3 destroyed	Wall C and Bank	
4	Wall C and Bank superseded	MB III B 2
— 5 (built over bank)	↑ ?	
6	Wall A —┘	MB III C
7 — destroyed	Wall B destroyed	
gap	gap	LB I

in the Middle Bronze Age.¹

Almost no pottery has been published from the recent excavations, only the repeated statement that the settlement was MB "II C"² (i.e., MB III B - C). Only one group, the burial of a child, was published from the earlier excavations. It included a monophora, a polished orange piriform juglet and a well-shaped dipper. A pedestal chalice of very light ware had an exaggerated profile; this chalice and the piriform juglet combine to date the group to the MB III B 2.³ No other groups were published.⁴ None of the other pottery published in this volume indicated an earlier date for the settlement.

The Defenses

The defenses of the Middle Bronze Age town (in area SW 7 at the western crest) were erected in two major phases, each with sub-phases. The first of these phases was dated by Lapp to some time within the "MB II C" (MB III B 2 - C) after the foundation of the MB city. It consisted largely of a wall with a glacis built against it in alternate layers. This rather flimsy wall was jogged forward by the addition of other walls built against it and bonded to it. Inside the wall, smaller walls were built against the city wall; the resulting chambers were equipped with water channels or drains. At least part of this complex

¹Lapp, "The 1963 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", p. 13; Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", p. 16.

²Ibid.; Lapp, "The 1966 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", p. 13; Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", p. 16.

³Sellin, Tell Ta^cannek, p. 51, fig. 55.

⁴Ibid., p. 51, fig. 56; p. 52, fig. 57.

was repaved twice, then refilled and paved again with stones.¹ There may have been a second glacis built of rubble and topped by a layer of huwwar.

This second glacis may only have been intended as a base for the second major phase of the defenses, as the new wall rested on it.² This wall was considerably more substantial than the earlier wall; it had a cross-wall and inner wall attached, making a casement in at least this area of the excavation.³ The large outer wall was made of the large stones noted from other fortifications of this period in Palestine and usually called Cyclopean.⁴ The wall was constructed in the Middle Bronze Age; an additional floor was put over the casement, eliminating the inner wall before a destruction in the Late Bronze I.

In other areas of the south and west side of the mound, the defenses were represented by three phases of the glacis. The last of these glacis surfaces was associated with the last major phase of the defenses, while the first two were associated with the first phase.⁵

The West Building and the Town

This structure was originally excavated by Sellin and dated by Lapp to the third phase of the glacis or the second major phase of the Middle Bronze Age defenses. This was a large building with thick walls built on a rectilinear plan.⁶ It was associated chronologically with a

¹Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", pp. 16-19.

²Ibid., pp. 19-20.

³Ibid., pp. 20-22.

⁴Wall A at Shechem was given this designation.

⁵Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Ta^cannek", p. 22.

⁶Lapp, "The 1963 Excavation at Ta^cannek", pp. 16-17.

number of buildings along a street, covered with a layer of mudbrick debris. These contained a number of burials made below the floors, most of them infants. It would appear that there was only one phase of the town dated entirely to the Middle Bronze Age. At the end of that time, there was a violent destruction and selective reconstruction; the new houses were used largely in the LB.¹

TABLE 41

TELL TAPANNEK

Date	Sellin Excavation	Lapp Excavation	
		Defenses	Town
MB III A-B 1	Few Sherds		
MB III B 2	"Kindergrab" and pottery	First Defense	First Town
MB III C	(West Building)	Second Defense	Partial Destruction
LB I			Second Town Destruction

Tell Poleg

Tell Poleg is located on the coast, some distance north of Tel Aviv, about 6 kilometers south of Nathanya.² Excavations there have

¹Lapp, "The 1968 Excavations at Tell Tapannek", pp. 24-26.

²R. Gophna, "The Middle Bronze Age II Fortifications at Tel Poleg", Eretz-Israel, 11 (1973), pp. 111-118 and 26*.

uncovered a very substantial rectilinear brick building. This was described as a fortified building by Kenyon.¹ Pottery found with this building included MB II shapes such as a large platter with heavy rim of MB II B 2 type.²

A large mud-brick wall was found associated with a glacis or embankment of crushed stone. The excavators also wished to date this fortification to the MB II, though they published no convincing evidence. If this date is correct, the glacis of Tell Poleg is a century or more earlier than the other fortifications of this type in Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age.³

Ras el Ain

Materials from Ras el Ain illustrated not only the type series of MB II B 1 and 2, but something of a stratigraphic relationship as well. Two layers, perhaps in three period were discerned in the second season of excavation.⁴ The uppermost level contained brickwork, some of it Byzantine and some fill with sherds of Middle Bronze date. The second stratum contained deposits of pottery, some of which were from burials. The third phase was a series of built tombs below the second

¹Kathleen Kenyon, "Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age", The Cambridge Ancient History, Third Edition, Vol. II, part I, chapter III, ed. by I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), p. 114.

²Gophna, "The Middle Bronze Age II Fortifications at Tel Poleg", fig. 5, p. 111.

³Ibid., fig. 4, p. 115.

⁴J. H. Iliffe, "Pottery from Ras el Ain", Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, 5 (1935-36), pp. 113-126. Pottery was too mixed in this first report to clearly discern periods; J. Ory, "Excavations at Ras el Ain II", Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, 6 (1937), pp. 99-120.

stratum.¹ We shall see that the difference between the built tombs and stratum II corresponds to that between MB II B 1 and 2. This is not to say that stratum II was free from disturbance; its remains seem to begin with MB II B 2, while the tombs are II B 1.

The pottery published from Stratum I contained MB III A - B elements as well as those of MB II.² The only pot with a clearly MB III date from Stratum II is a pointed dipper.³ A number of Early Bronze sherds came from the fill of that stratum.⁴ One fragmentary juglet has narrow red bands with painted strokes on the rim and handle, characteristic of MB II B 1.⁵

MB II B 2 pottery from Stratum II contains the following types: open bowls have bevelled-in rims, and sometimes a red slip and burnish.⁶ An open bowl has four lugs on the rim,⁷ and an open bowl has a grooved rim.⁸ A number of convex cups, have well-developed disc bases (Fig. 386-387). Red burnished carinated bowls normally have grooved rims as well (Fig. 386 b-c). There were convex bowls with everted rims (Fig. 386 d),

¹Ibid., pp. 100-101, fig. 2 gives a section that shows the relationship. Plate XXVI has a photo of the section.

²Ibid., pp. 107-110; p. 109 number 12 is a piriform juglet with well-developed button base of MB III A-B, numbers 15 and 19 are pointed base dippers of MB III; number 21 on p. 110 is a cylindrical juglet of MB III B - C shape.

³Ibid., p. 113 number 49, a dipper with pointed base of MB III A.

⁴Ibid., p. 112, numbers 39, 41 and 42.

⁵Ibid., p. 113, number 45 A.

⁶Ibid., p. 110, number 24, p. 111, 29.

⁷Ibid., p. 110, 26 A.

⁸Ibid., p. 110, 25; the type was MB II B - C at Megiddo.

and two types of dippers, both with flattened bases; one was nearly globular while the other was more ovoid.¹ A red-brown burnished ovoid juglet has a ridged neck and a shoulder-handle jug has a triple handle (Fig. 386 g and k). One very graceful rim was probably from such a shoulder-handle jar (Fig. 386 m). Two ovoid handleless jars were characteristic of the MB II; one of them had simple broad painted bands which indicates that it is to be dated to the MB II B 2 (Fig. 386 j).

The Tombs

Grave 2(MB II B 1)

The tombs of Ras el Ain below stratum II illustrated the MB II B 1 especially well. Grave 2 was the largest of these groups and contained the following major types: convex open bowls have round, flat or disc bases (Fig. 387 a-c, g). One of these had a narrow band in raised relief below the rim. A second bowl has the rim bevelled inward, while the rim of a third is grooved. There were carinated bowls and an early form of the convex bowl, as well as the convex cup (Fig. 387 d, e, h). The dippers were very plump; one had a round lip (Fig. 388 c, e). Two juglets were also found. One was the normal globular type with what appeared to be a folded rim; it was red burnished.² A second juglet had the generally cylindrical shape, but was modified by thumb impressions that gave it a wavy profile (Fig. 388 d). There were two pitchers, one with trefoil mouth; the type has been cited at Amrith in this period

¹Ibid. The early type included p. 113, 47, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 58. The later type included numbers 48 and 57. All had pinched lips.

²Ibid., p. 117, number 86.

(Fig. 388 c and f). Decoration on the pottery described was mainly groups of narrow bands between slightly wider bands on the waist of a dipper and a pitcher; there were painted strokes on the rim of the dipper. The decoration was characteristic of MB II B 1.

In addition to the other pottery of MB II B 1, there was the round-mouthed jug with complex painted decoration. The painting was in monochrome, which gave a bichrome appearance varying with the thickness of the paint. The neck was decorated with horizontal bands, with pendant lines from the lowest band at the base of the neck. On the shoulder below the handle was a band of hatched triangles followed by a band of rectilinear cross-hatching just above the waist (Fig. 388 a).

Grave 4 (MC II B 1)

Though fewer pots were found in grave 4, the context was also clearly MB II B 1. The tomb contained a convex cup with the side handle of the type we have seen at Byblos and Sidon in the MB II A - B 1 (Fig. 389 c), and two very plump dippers of MB II B type. Two other decorated jugs were found. These have the same general shape, with globular bodies, almost disc bases, pinched bilobate lips. The handles extend from ridges around the neck to flaps on the shoulders of the pots. The first jug (Fig. 389 a) has bands on the lip and neck, in the same paint as the jug from tomb 2. A horizontal band of rectilinear cross-hatching is on the shoulder. It extends from the base of the neck to the bottom of the handle. A band of cross-hatched triangles is painted on the shoulder. Below the waist of the pot are two groups of narrow bands flanked by broad bands of paint, characteristic of MB II B 1. The last jug has only a variant of this decoration, but with pendant triangles on the shoulder (Fig. 389 b) in addition to the standing triangles.

Graves 5 and 6 (MC II B 1)

The pottery from the last two tombs parallel the non-luxury potter from tombs 2 and 4 (Fig. 390).

Thus the pottery of Ras el Ain clearly demonstrates the relationship between the MB II B 1 and 2. The site shows a sort of stratigraphic relationship between the two periods and a substantial repertoire of types that we can use to identify these materials elsewhere, especially to the north. Other objects from this site include a short-socket spear-head from tomb 2 and a number of pots from more doubtful contexts. Of particular interest are two handleless jugs (Fig. 383 1 and n). One of these is similar to a type found at Sidon.¹

Affula

The site of Affula is situated in the Esdraelon plain across the Kishon from Megiddo. Excavations there were carried out by Sukenik which yielded some pottery groups; stratigraphic control was poor in that excavation,² however, and the groups must be used only with the Megiddo series. More recent excavations yielded material from some kilns of the MB II.³

One very large group from the Sukenik excavations dates from the end of the Middle Bronze II and the beginning of the Middle Bronze III (Figs. 392-393). Tomb F 19 contained bowls that included both the type

¹Above, p. 892.

²E. L. Sukenik, Archaeological Investigations at Affula Conducted on Behalf of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 1948).

³Amiran, Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land, photos 115-118, plate 36, number 3.

with horizontal rim and a type with a ridge below the rim (MB II B - C).¹ There are also convex platters, one with a ring base characteristic of the MB III A.² Several hemispherical cups and two carinated bowls were found.³ One convex bowl has an everted rim that is nearly an angled neck.⁴ Dippers include types with flattened or stump base and those with nearly pointed bases.⁵ Juglets are piriform to ovoid, some highly burnished. The bases include low stumps and pointed bases. One juglet has elaborate Yehudiyya decoration, triangles in four zones; it has a ring base and folded over rim.⁶

More recently, pottery was found in a kiln excavated by Ben Dor.⁷ This includes unbaked specimens of Yehudiyya ware, fragments with punctate decoration.⁸ Other pottery included by Amiran from Affula probably also came from the kiln (Fig. 391). This included ovoid juglets with a low stump or pointed base. Rims include the "trumpet-mouthpiece", bevelled-in rim and the ridge at the neck. The handles have multiple strands of clay.⁹

Decoration is generally in horizontal zones, though one juglet has many vertical zones, the ancestor of a common type of the MB III B.¹⁰

¹Sukenik, Archaeological Investigations at Affula, pp. 12-13, fig. XV, 8, and XV, 6, respectively.

²Ibid., fig. XV, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, and 14.

³Ibid., 15-17.

⁴Ibid., 11.

⁵Ibid., fig. XIV.

⁶Ibid., fig. XIV, 8.

⁷Amiran, Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land, p. 20.

⁸Ibid., photo 124. Parts of triangles can be recognized on the sherds.

⁹Ibid., photos 115-118, plate 36 number 3.

¹⁰Ibid. Compare photo 116 with plate 36, 24 and 30.

The decoration includes upended chevrons, triangles and checks; sometimes grooves are the bases of the necks. Although no other types of pottery have been published from this group it may be dated to the MB II B. The ovoid shape of the juglets is generally almost globular; this type of shape may be intermediate between the globular shapes of the MB II B 1 and the well-developed ovoid shapes of the MB II C (Fig. 315 p-t).

Nahariyya

The site of Nahariyya is located some eight kilometers north of Acre on the seacoast of Palestine. A small mound there was made up of a single building and surrounding debris. From the quality of "incense burners", pottery models of vessels, figurines of birds in clay and female figurines in metal, Ben Dor inferred that the structure was a shrine of some sort, standing isolated on the seacoast.¹

Although such MB III pots were found in the area as a sherd of a pedestal chalice,² most of the pottery that can be dated is MB II. This includes rather clumsy juglets with a globular or nearly biconical shape, flattened or pointed base and heavy bar handles that extend from the shoulder of the pot to a bevelled-in rim.³ At least one of these is decorated with the MB II B 1 elaborate painted decoration.⁴ Dippers are

¹I. Ben-Dor, "A Middle Bronze Age Temple at Nahariya", Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, 14 (1950), pp. 1-40. See pp. 1-2, fig. 2, pp. 17-18 and 26 for the "incense burners" and figurines.

²Ibid., p. 36, fig. 36.

³Ibid., p. 31, fig. 24 c; p. 24, fig. 16.

⁴Ibid., p. 24, fig. 16.

short and rather plump; at least one has a flat base.¹ There were a number of carinated bowls, often with a burnished red slip, and some small convex saucers. Due to their size, perhaps, few remains of platters and handlesless jars were published that could clearly be identified. One miniature handlesless jar has bichrome painted decoration of MB II B type.² Most of the bowl rims curve outward or are thickened on the outside; the inverted rim of the MB III is rare.

The "shrine" at Nahariyya is thus to be dated to the MB II B 1, the earliest stage of the occupation of Palestine proper by the Middle Bronze Age culture. Since there are very few objects in or near the building of later date, it may be dated to the MB II B almost entirely, with almost all of the contents.³

Kurdana

The site of Kurdana is located between Acre and Haifa, about three miles inland; it was a swamp before the Second World War.⁴

Archaeological investigations carried out there by Julius Jotham-Rothschild during the draining of the swamp yielded a group of the MB II. This was apparently found in a dump near the Crusader mill. It included a large jug with pulled-out bar handle, biconical body and a large stump base with a ring around it in relief. The rim was broken, but it appears to have been splayed, possibly into a bilobate lip.

¹Ibid., p. 31, fig. 24 a.

²Ibid., p. 39, fig. 47.

³Ibid., p. 32, fig. 26. Note the biconical juglets and early Yehudiyya ware juglet with shape seen at Affula (d). These objects include metal figurines that are thus the immediate descendants of those in the Byblos Deposits (ibid., plate XII).

⁴Julius Jotham-Rothschild, "Kurdaneh", Palestine Exploration Quarterly (1949), pp. 58-66; see pp. 58-59.

There was also a smaller jug with a heavy bar handle. A large platter had the elaborate rim treatment of the MB II B as well. With this pottery was found a "hand-shaped battle axe of Hittite origin."¹ The only axe that fits this description is the duck-bill axe.

Yauron

There is an unpublished duck-bill axe said to be from Yauron "in Northern Palestine" in the Toledo Museum of Art. This would appear to be the Yauron which the Gazeteer indicates is the extreme south of Lebanon, almost at the Israeli border, south of Biqaa.

We have, therefore a series of duck-bill axes from northern Palestine, which may indicate that the MB II B 1 expansion began early in that phase, before the rectangular axe was introduced. Elongated fenestrated axes were found in the tomb at Beth Shan and temple 4040 at Megiddo. These had replaced the earlier semicircular type found at Ma^cabaro^th, Megiddo tomb 84, and Jericho.² At Ma^cabaro^th and Jericho, these were found with EB IV pottery. The elongated fenestrated axes, of the same type as that found in Kültepe II, were not found with pottery. The duck-bill axe was found with the MB II B pottery at Kurdana, possibly at Tell Dan as well. The context at Yauron is unknown.

Barqai

A many-chambered tomb was excavated at Kibbutz Barqai in the plain of Sharon, south of the entrance to the Nahal ^cIron (Wady ^cAra).

¹Ibid., p. 61, plate VII, fig. 1.

²Since the duck-bill axes were extremely rare in the MB II A 2, and were common in the MB II B 1, we infer that they are MB II B 1 where there is no other evidence for the context. However, any other variant of the fenestrated axe must be MB II A or earlier in date, as the duck-bill began to be used by the end of the phase.

Burials were found in three phases, the second of which was primarily MB II B, the third, mostly of MB III B of the northern region.¹

Materials from the second phase include convex bowls, carinated bowls, a convex cup and a handleless jar. The three dippers are rather plump; one has a trefoil mouth with flattened base. Decoration is painted in multiple narrow bands of red or red and black paint. In one case slashes are on the rim and handle. There were two juglets, one ovoid with the rim bevelled inward. The second was globular and had a ridged neck. Two convex spearheads have short sockets.²

The third burial phase contained most of the objects.³ In addition to the carinated chalices with pedestals characteristic of the Northern MB III B, a simple collared bowl or jar of Megiddo MB III A 1 was found. Some small carinated and convex bowls might also indicate an earlier date for some of these materials. Most common is a convex platter with ring base. Juglets include both cylindrical and piriform types; the latter have button bases.⁴

Barqai thus demonstrates that the MB III of Northern type occurs on the coast of Northern Palestine in the plain of Sharon.

Beth Shan

Materials so far published from excavations at Dan include MB II B 2 and MB III C remains.

¹R. Gophna and Varda Sussman, "A Middle Bronze Age Tomb at Barqai", *Atiqot*, 5 (1969), pp. 1-13, *1 and plates I-III. See fig. 10 number 1, scarab with Sheshi or ppi.

²Ibid., fig. 4

³Ibid., figs. 5-7.

⁴Ibid., fig. 7.

Tomb 92

This tomb from the Northern Cemetery contained only weapons (and a scarab). These include a crude dagger with two midribs, a short-socket spear, possibly an arrowhead and an elongated fenestrated axe, which is nearly a duck-bill. A scarab has a garbled inscription.¹

The dagger and the fenestrated axe are MB II A weapons. Since other MB II A weapons, primarily earlier fenestrated axes occurred several times in EB IV contexts in Palestine, the occurrence is not surprising here, though it may be linked to other occurrences of tombs with only weapons as grave goods.²

The MB III C; tombs 59 and 303

Oren assigned all of the later materials in the Northern Cemetery to the Late Bronze Age, including two groups with rather tall dipper juglets, cylindrical juglets and pedestal chalices. He cited a few other groups where pedestal chalices occurred with Late Bronze Age materials;³ cylindrical juglets occur common in LB I.⁴ However the tall dipper juglet does not occur in Late Bronze Age contexts that have no admixture of Middle Bronze materials.⁵ The same appears true of the pedestal chalice,

¹Eliezer D. Oren, The Northern Cemetery of Beth Shan (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), pp. 60-67, p. 182, fig. 24.

²Below, pp. 1102-1103.

³Oren, The Northern Cemetery of Beth Shan, pp. 184-87, figs. 25-26. The comparisons are either from large, mixed groups or fill, or do not resemble the tall pedestal goblets of Beth Shan.

⁴Ibid., pp. 75-76.

⁵Ibid., p. 76; Oren recognized the sequence and the fact that the tall dipper (B 1) occurred in MB.

which was confined to the Middle Bronze Age in the well-defined groups of Megiddo. Tombs 303 and 59 should therefore be dated partly to the MB III C. Other pots from these tombs could be dated either to the MB or LB. Only a few pieces could be considered distinctively LB.

Kefar Szold

The large tomb group of MB II C - III A date from Kefar Szold is most valuable because it illustrates the continuation of painted pottery in the period, including bichrome.

The Tomb

MB II C

Pottery of the MB II type includes the platter with lug-rim,¹ red-polished carinated bowls,² handleless jars, jugs and short dippers.³

Juglets of MB II type include the type with an ovoid body and a definite ridge below the rim.⁴

MB III A 1

Pottery of this date includes platters with inverted rims, globular bowls with short straight or flared necks, amphorae with grooves at the handles and juglets with piriform shape and thickened ridges below the rim (candlestick or trumpet-mouthpiece rims).⁵ There is one

¹Claire Epstein, "Middle Bronze Age Tombs at Kefar Szold and Ginosar", Eretz-Israel, 12 (1974), pp. 13-42; fig. 4, 1.

²Ibid., fig. 3, 17-18.

³Ibid., fig. 1, 16-17; fig. 2, 7-8; fig. 1, 13-14.

⁴Ibid., fig. 1, 1 and 3.

⁵Ibid., fig. 4, 2-6; fig. 3, 5-7; fig. 2, 3 and 6; fig. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7.

shoulder-handle juglet.¹ Evidence of periods later than the MB III A 1, such as the flared-carinated bowl, was absent. Indeed the bowls with short necks were very early variants of this characteristic type of MB III A 1 (Fig. 321 e).

Painted juglets

One juglet could be identified as MB III A by the shape; it has the slight ridge below the rim. It has spirals on the body with two horizontal bands painted across them.² Two juglets with bichrome painting could belong to either the MB II C or III A 1. The first of these has wavy and straight lines on the shoulder and body with slashes on the rim and handle and a band of pendant lines at the base of the neck.³ The second juglet has two groups of black bands flanking narrow red bands on the shoulder. Between them is a zone of standing triangles filled with painted dots and cross-hatching. This juglet links the painted styles of MB II with early Yehudiyya ware.⁴

Ginosar

The Tombs

Tomb 1 (MC II C - III A 1)

Pottery from Ginosar Tomb 1 parallels that of Kefar Szold in date. Platters with heavy molded rims, carinated bowls and globular bowls with everted rims indicate an MB II C date.⁵ A red-burnished jug

¹Epstein, "Middle Bronze Age Tombs at Kefar Szold and Ginosar", fig. 1, 9.

²Ibid., fig. 1, 6.

³Ibid., fig. 1, 5.

⁴Ibid., fig. 1, 8.

⁵Ibid., fig. 7, 2, 3, 4-10.

has a rim-shoulder handle of Megiddo MB II type and an ovoid juglet has a ridge-neck.¹

Other pottery, including platters with inverted rims and piri-form juglets with trumpet-mouthpiece rims, is MB III A.² One of these is painted with a band of slanted lines and a band with union-jack panels on the shoulder.³ One jar has a series of painted horizontal bands on the body.⁴

Weapons include a short-socket spear and rectangular axe with notch.⁵

Tomb 4 (MB II C - III B 1)

Only one juglet is likely to have been made in the MB II C, with a ridge on the neck.⁶ Other pottery began in the MB III A 1. The globular bowls with short straight neck is characteristic of that period. One has horizontal painted bands.⁷ The presence of MB II A 2 is indicated by a jug with Cypriote White Painted Pendant Line Style decoration.⁸

Pottery of MB III B date includes platters with ring or flat base and simple (rather than inverted) rims, flared-carinated bowls with tall sides and a wide pedestal chalice.⁹ There are three cylindrical juglets, one with a disc base.¹⁰

¹Ibid., fig. 5, 3, 9.

²Ibid., fig. 5, 13-15; 6-8, 10.

³Ibid., fig. 5, 10.

⁴Ibid., fig. 7, 13.

⁵Ibid., fig. 7, 14-15.

⁶Ibid., fig. 14, 8; see fig. 159 a, b.

⁷Epstein, "Middle Bronze Age Tombs at Kefar Szold and Ginosar", fig. 16, 7-8.

⁸Ibid., fig. 15, 9

⁹Ibid., fig. 16, 12-14, 16.

¹⁰Ibid., fig. 16, 1-3.

Six of the nine piriform juglets are painted. Of these, one has bichrome painted bands and a group of pendant lines at the base of the neck.¹

All of the others have some variant of the spirals or concentric circles in a band on the waist, framed by groups of horizontal lines above and below.² One of these has dotted circles.³ On the shoulder of another is a vertical panel of dots.⁴ On a third is a pair of triangles made with crossed lines rather like stitching. Between the three spirals are two simple quadrupeds and a bird, all with hatched bodies.⁵

Four of the juglets have variants of the trumpet-mouthpiece rim. The elaborately decorated juglet has the vestigial ridge rim. The date is latest MB III A or earliest MB III B.

Weapons from this tomb include the simple riveted daggers, with one globular pommel, and spearheads.⁶

Tomb 2/3 (MB III A - B 2)

Pottery from this tomb is much more mixed than that of the last tomb. MB III A types include platters with inverted rims, juglets with trumpet-mouthpiece rims⁷ and Early Yehudiyya ware.⁸

¹Ibid., fig. 14, 1-5, 9; 4. ²Ibid., fig. 14, 1-3, 5, 9.

³Ibid., fig. 14, 9. ⁴Ibid., fig. 14, 2.

⁵Ibid., fig. 14, 5.

⁶Ibid., fig. 18; there were possibly curved knives also, fig. 18, 6-7.

⁷Ibid., fig. 9, 9-14; fig. 8, 9, 11 and 12.

⁸Ibid., fig. 8, 16-19.

Pottery of MB III B date includes both wide goblets and pedestal goblets of mature type (MB III B 2).¹ There is simple punctate and painted Yehudiyya ware and many cylindrical juglets.² Flared-neck jars were also present.³

Painted pottery in this tomb includes bichrome straight and wavy bands⁴ as well as simpler monochrome painted pottery of MB III B.⁵

Weapons include spearheads, simple riveted daggers, a curved knife and two rectangular axes with notches.⁶

Kefar Szold and Ginosar clearly demonstrate that bichrome painted pottery was made in the MB III A. In addition, the juglets with spirals and circles show that the use of this decoration was also continuous. Painted decoration of this type was confined to juglets at this time, however. Other types of painting are found on jars with flared necks.

Tell Dan

Tell Dan (Tell el Qadi) is still very much in the process of being excavated. The excavations are known only from preliminary reports that are not very detailed. At the present time, materials from the MB II B, late MB III and early LB have been discussed in reports.

¹Ibid., fig. 10, 23-24.

²Ibid., fig. 8, 20-21 (bichrome III A, 22); fig. 9, 1-8.

³Ibid., fig. 10, 8-10. ⁴Ibid., fig. 8, 22.

⁵Ibid., fig. 8, 21; fig. 9, 8.

⁶Ibid., fig. 11, 23-24; fig. 12. The rectangular axes must belong to the MB III A use of the tomb, if it was not used in MB II C. (Note fig. 11, 13. This faience vase is of later type.)

The MB II

The most recent preliminary report mentioned that the excavation had found MB II levels. One clearly dated find was a duck-bill axe, known only from the end of MB II A 2 and the MB II B 1.

The Fortification

Tell Dan was protected for a fortification which consisted of a main fortification wall with an embankment heaped against it. This embankment consisted of layers of earth topped by crushed Kurkar limestone with a slope of about 45 degrees.¹ Sometime after the construction of this fortification, the embankment was used for occupation. This occupation left debris, walls and child burials in jars with painted and punctate decorated Yehudiyya juglets.² The city was then destroyed in a conflagration before the end of the Middle Bronze Age. Subsequent occupation was not found until much later.³ The date of the destruction was probably MB III C.

¹P. Riran, "Laish-Dan; Secrets of a Canaanite City and an Israelite City", Qadmoniot, (Quarterly of the Antiquities of Eretz-Israel and Bible Lands) Vol. IV (1971), pt. 1, pp. 2-11. Pages 3-5 give the pottery.

²Ibid., pp. 3-5, level VIII; the embankment was level IX.

³Ibid. The author says about the end of the XVIIth century or the beginning of the XVIth. Conventionally, that is MB III B-C.