MEZAD ḤASHAVYAHU: ITS MATERIAL CULTURE
AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Alexander Fantalkin

The site of Mezad Ḥashavyahu\(^1\) (1207/1462) is located on the coastal kurkar ridge, approximately 1.7 km. south of Yavneh-Yam (Minet Rubin) (Figs. 1–2). Although the region was surveyed during the early 1950s by M. Dothan (1952), he did not discover the site. The first report concerning the site reached the Department of Antiquities from J. M. Weizenfreund, a resident of Tel Aviv, who heard about it from F. Burian and E. Friedmann.\(^2\) It appears that the latter two, who systematically surveyed the central coastal plain in search of prehistoric sites, were the actual discoverers of Mezad Ḥashavyahu (Burian and Friedmann 1965:1).

Three seasons of excavations were conducted at the site, two on behalf of the Department of Antiquities and the Israel Exploration Society (January and September 1960) under the direction of J. Naveh (co-directed by P. Beck in the second season) (Figs. 3–4). The third season was directed by R. Reich on behalf of the Department of Antiquities and Museums (April-May 1986).

The finds from these excavations, with the exception of the inscriptions, have not been published in final form. Only preliminary reports have appeared (Naveh 1962a; 1962b; Reich 1989); in Naveh’s words: “no attempt is made to list all the finds ...” (1962b:89). The excavators have allowed me to publish – for the first time and in its entirety – all of the material found in their excavations. The findings of Naveh and Reich will be described below in detail (including re-investigation of the material already published by the excavators), and their significance will be discussed, except for linguistic aspects related to the Hebrew inscriptions.

A. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

Two main factors promoted considerable interest among various scholars in the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu: first, the ostraca in biblical Hebrew, including the famous ‘Reaper’s Letter’; second, the discovery of relatively larger amounts of East Greek pottery than is generally found at sites in the Land of Israel, including imported cooking-pots.

---

\(^1\) Because the ancient name of the site is not known, the Government Names Committee decided to name the site “Mezad (fortress) Ḥashavyahu” because one of the ostraca found at the site included the name “Ḥashavyahu ben (son of) Ya...”

\(^2\) Although Naveh (1962b:89, n. 1) mentions that the site was known to Kibbutz Palmaḥim member S. Lifshitz.
Fig. 1. Aerial photograph taken in 1956, prior to the excavations at the site.

The ostraca found at the site have received extensive treatment (for the most recent summary with earlier literature, see Renz 1995:315–334), and there is no need to expand upon this here.

The pottery assemblage found at the site includes local wares dated to the end of the Iron Age as well as a variety of East Greek ware types. Based upon these finds and with the accompanying historical evidence for the use of Greek mercenaries by the Egyptian rulers of the 26th Dynasty, the excavators assumed the site was inhabited by such soldiers (Naveh 1962b; Reich 1989).
Fig. 2. Map of the area (inset) and topographical map showing the location of the fortress at Mezad Hashavyahu.
Naveh raised another possibility – that Greek merchants may have inhabited the site, but he rejected this in favor of the former interpretation, particularly in view of the evidence for metalworking at the site (Naveh 1962b:98–99; cf. Treister 1996:37). Nonetheless, to many scholars (Strange 1966:138; Galling 1968:70; Weinberg 1969:90, 94; Weippert 1988:620; Kelm and Mazar 1989:49; Waldbaum 1994:60–61) Mezad Ḥashavyahu was both a base for mercenaries and a settlement of Greek merchants (emporion).

Thus, according to Waldbaum, it could function as a Greek trading post, and as such had a central role in the diffusion of East Greek pottery from the coastal region to the interior “via Miqne and Batash …” (ibid.).

Whether the site was a settlement for mercenaries only or if others, such as merchants, were also active there, the question remains: who ruled it?

Naveh originally believed that the Greeks settled there as mercenaries of Psammetichus I and that a few years before 609 BCE the site was conquered by Josiah (Naveh 1962b:99). Later, however, he stated that the Greek mercenaries served Josiah rather than the Egyptian ruler (Naveh 1993:586). Naveh believes that the fortress was abandoned during the campaign of Pharaoh Necho II (609 BCE) who defeated Josiah at Megiddo. Independently, both Tadmor (1966:102, n. 59) and Strange (1966:138), first proposed attributing the Greek mercenaries to Josiah. Moreover, as early as 1962 Cross suggested that the fortress was built by Josiah (1962:42), without mentioning the matter of the mercenaries.
The attribution of the Greek mercenaries who settled at Mezad Hashavyahu to Josiah’s rule was widely accepted (Austin 1970:16, n. 1; Malamat 1973:272; Stern 1975:37; Aharoni 1979:403; Helm 1980:136; Kelm and Mazar 1985:118; Reich 1989; Barkay 1992:357; Naveh 1993; Katzenstein 1994:38, n. 26; Herr 1997:158; and others). Some scholars, following Naveh’s earlier view (Naveh 1962b), claimed that there were two phases in the history of the site: during the first phase, Greek mercenaries were in the service of Egypt or of the Philistine-Phoenician cities; in the second phase, the site was conquered by Josiah (Eshel 1986:236; Haider 1996:76). According to Wenning (1989), the mercenaries were in the service of Jehoiakim and the end of the site should be dated to 598/7 BCE.

In contrast to these historical reconstructions, one may note others, proposed by those who regard the finds uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu as evidence for Greek mercenaries working for the Egyptians. Boardman (1964:75) proposed that they were mercenaries of Necho II. Freedy and Redford (1970:478, n. 79) and Miller and Hayes (1986:389), on the other hand, insisted that the Greek mercenaries were in the service of Psammetichus I. According to Na’aman (1991a:46–47), the fortress was built by the Egyptians and was under their control, although it is not clear whether under Psammetichus I or Necho II.
The East Greek pottery exposed at the site together with the ostracon bearing the Phoenician name with the theophoric element of ‘Ba‘al’ (Naveh 1962a:30–31; Lemaire 1977:268–269), and the ostraca bearing Yahwistic names indicate, in Na‘aman’s view, that the inhabitants of Mezad Ḥashavyahu were of varied ethnic origins, such as Greek, Phoenician and Judean. This is similar to the situation in other contemporary Egyptian fortresses which were constructed following the rise of the 26th Dynasty (Na‘aman 1991a:46). According to him, the site was destroyed in 604 BCE in the course of Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign along the Philistine coast and the destruction of Ashkelon (ibid.:47). This historical reconstruction is likewise accepted by Stager, director of the renewed excavations at Ashkelon (Stager apud Waldbaum and Magness 1997:39, n. 118). In view of the above, additional scholars have interpreted the finds at Mezad Ḥashavyahu as attesting rather to an Egyptian fortress (Finkelstein 1995:148; Kletter 1999a:42; Faust 2001:134).

Scholars’ attempts to establish under which ruler the site was founded and active have far-reaching historical consequences. Those who support Judean control over the site believe that this is proof that Josiah’s (or Jehoiakim’s) control extended to the coast. On the other hand, attributing the fortress to Egyptian rulers (or perhaps Babylonians?) leaves the Kingdom of Judah within its modest historical boundaries.

The following sections will first present the archaeological background for the finds uncovered at Mezad Ḥashavyahu. Then, the assumptions that may be made on the basis of the analysis of this data and the available historical sources will be discussed.

B. STRATIGRAPHY AND ARCHITECTURE

The site, which constitutes a single, enclosed architectural complex, extends over an area of approximately 6 dunams. It was built upon a kurkar hill; taking into consideration the topography, differences in elevation range between 25 m. in the southeastern corner to 12 m. near the gate in the west. As a result, the floor elevations in the eastern part of the structure range between 24.50–24.09 m., while the floor elevations in the vicinity of the gate in the western part of the structure range between 15.35–14.95 m. Thus, the average differences in elevation in the extremities of the structure are as much as 9.15 m.

The plan of the site (Fig. 5), which includes defensive elements such as a wall with offsets and a gate with tower, allows us to consider it a fortress. It is L-shaped and divided into two rectangles. Within the larger rectangle (4 dunams),

---

3 6 dunams = 0.6 hectares or 1.5 acres.
4 All elevations are above sea level.
a gate, a central square and several rooms abutting the wall were constructed. In the smaller rectangle (2 dunams), there are three rows of buildings abutting the wall with passageways between them. The walls of the inner buildings were constructed of sun-dried mudbricks resting upon a single foundation layer of kurkar stones. The thickness of their outer walls (in the eastern portion of the fortress, where this was investigated) is ca. 0.8 m. and the thickness of the inner walls is 0.53 m.
The thickness of the outer walls of the fortress, which served as the fortification walls, is ca. 3.2 m. They were constructed of mudbrick on a stone base and have projecting offsets ca. 0.7 m. from the line of the wall. Three offsets (the central offset is ca. 5 m. long and the western and eastern offsets are ca. 4 m. long) were constructed in the southern wall which is ca. 95 m. long – the longest wall in the fortress. Two additional offsets are located in the northeastern part of the fortress, one (ca. 5 m. long) in the northern wall of the small rectangle and the other (ca. 7 m. long) in the eastern wall of the large rectangle.

At the centre of the western wall is the gate of the fortress, including the guardroom and gate tower, all built of trimmed kurkar. Layers of mudbrick that must have lain above these foundations were not preserved.

During the first two seasons of Naveh’s excavation, eight areas were opened in different parts of the fortress. In Area A, the main excavation area, the southern wing of the gate and a number of adjacent rooms were uncovered. In Areas B and C, a row of rooms abutting the northern wall of the smaller rectangle was uncovered. Area D is a small probe in the northeastern corner of the larger rectangle, while Area E is a small probe abutting the inside of the eastern wall of the smaller rectangle (this area was later incorporated into Reich’s excavation, see below). Areas F and G abut the southern wall of the fortress; Area S – the only area excavated outside the fortress – is on a slope west of Area A.

It should be noted parenthetically that the supply of water to the site is unclear. On the one hand, the site lies at a relatively great distance from Nahal Sorek and on the other, no wells or cisterns were found in the immediate vicinity.5

**Primary Stratigraphic Issue**

The principal stratigraphic question concerning this site is whether it is possible to define two periods of settlement. Even though all agree that Mezad Hashavyahu existed for a relatively short period of time, some scholars identify two phases: the earlier, Greek, and the later, Judean (Eshel 1986:236; Haider 1996:76). Beyond any historical preconceptions of the scholars, this view was based mainly upon the exposure of two floors, one above the other, in Room 4 in the vicinity of the gate (Naveh 1962b:92–93). Beyond these, no hint of the existence of two phases was found in any other part of the fortress. Every area

---

5 Concerning the aquifer of the Israeli coastline and its use in ancient times by the digging of wells, see Nir 1993; regarding wells at Yavneh-Yam (near Mezad Hashavyahu) esp. during the Hellenistic period, see Nir and Eldad-Nir 1991; Fischer and Fantalkin (forthcoming).

6 Even those who do not relate to an ethnic definition of the second phase note that the Greek pottery is identified with the first phase (Waldbaum and Magness 1997:38).
excavated revealed a single floor, usually of beaten earth laid on bedrock. A thin layer of sand was often used to cover irregularities in the bedrock (ibid.:96). Naveh initially thought that after Josiah took control of the coastal area and Mezad HaShavyahu, the new owners cleared some of the floors in the gate area of any remains left by the Greek mercenaries of Psammetichus I and aside from raising the floor level of Room 4, did not change anything (ibid.:98–99, n. 14).

This reconstruction is supported by Y. Eshel, who gives the two-phase theory its ultimate expression: “the Judean finds published from a controlled source were related in various ways to the remains of the later period. The remains from the early period, on the other hand, contained Greek finds or finds lacking geo-cultural indicators ...” (Eshel 1986:234). For him, Mezad HaShavyahu constitutes one of the key sites for establishing the absolute chronology of Iron Age Judah. In order to substantiate his view, Eshel created a ‘Judean’ ceramic corpus consisting, he claims, of clean assemblages of the second phase (ibid.:329–335), which he dated to the years 625–609 BCE (ibid.:242). It should be noted that his claim is based exclusively upon Naveh’s preliminary publication (1962b), and that he did not examine the entire ceramic assemblage. Eshel’s clean assemblages of the second phase (‘loci’ by his definition, following the numbering of the rooms by Naveh) are: Area A: Loci 4 (finds upon the later floor), 5, 7 (only upon the floor), 10, 17, and a locus of the gate-entrance area (without a number); Area B: vessels and large fragments of the last phase in the fortress’s existence, which remained in situ (Eshel 1986:237).

A re-examination of the ceramic assemblage from Mezad HaShavyahu does not support the conclusion that two phases existed at the site. The assemblages, supposedly ‘clean Judean from the second phase’ are undifferentiated from the rest of the finds at the site. In order to prove this, the loci in which these assemblages were found are described below.

Area A

Locus 4 is the only room in which two floors were found, one above the other (Fig. 6). Upon the lower floor (elev. 14.95 m.), a ceramic assemblage was found that included both Greek and Judean types (Naveh 1962b:92–93). The upper portion of a local jar incorporated into this floor with its opening facing downwards served as an oven (ibid.). At some point, the floor was covered with mudbrick collapse and a pebble pavement was laid over it (elev. 15.35 m.).

---

7 According to Naveh, this is the reason for the high concentration of Greek sherds in two piles of refuse that he identified (Locus 15 and Area S). At the same time, he notes that most of the finds on the upper floor in Room 4 and Courtyard 17 were local (Naveh 1962b:99, n. 14).

8 Here and hereafter all of Eshel’s quotations have been translated from Hebrew.
The new floor cancelled the northern and eastern walls of the room, as a result of which, the entrance of the gate building was enlarged (Fig 7; Naveh 1962a: Fig. 1; 1962b:93). Upon this floor were found an iron arrowhead (ibid.: Pl. 12 D:3) and two ostraca: No. 1b⁹ – the lower portion of the ‘Reaper’s Letter’ (of which the upper five parts [No. 1a] were found in adjacent Room 10) and No. 3 which bears the Judean name (O)badyahu and, on the other side, four vertical strokes signifying the numeral ‘four’ (Naveh 1962a:29). According to Eshel (1986:237) “the importance of this room to our discussion (of pottery) is in clarifying stratigraphy: two clear floors from two periods of existence. Upon the early floor, Greek finds (pottery) and upon the upper floor, Judean finds (inscriptions).…” This claim is unreasonable. On the one hand, ‘Judean’ finds

⁹ Numbering of the ostraca follows Naveh 1962a.
Fig. 7. Plan of Area A with the findspots of inscriptions, mentioned by numbers (after Naveh 1962a: Fig. 1).

(i.e., local pottery) also came from the early floor\textsuperscript{10}, while on the other hand, all of the other ostraca (including No. 1a, the 'Reaper's Letter') were found in assemblages that contained an abundance of East Greek pottery (Area A: Loci 5 [Ostraca Nos. 6]; 10 [Ostraca No. 1a]; 15 [Ostraca Nos. 4, 5]; 17 [Ostraca No. 1c, part of the 'Reaper's Letter']; Area S [Ostraca No. 2 and a four-shekel stone weight, No. 7]) (Fig. 7). It thus appears that Eshel's basic assumption is flawed from the beginning. Moreover, why would the laying of a new floor in an entrance room, while elsewhere in the fortress only one floor was found, lead to such far-reaching conclusions (such as a second phase and new inhabitants)?

\textsuperscript{10} “On this floor were found a Greek cooking-pot (Fig. 6:8; Pl. 12 F:2) and nearby the base of a local lamp, the rim of a coarse bowl of the type shown in Fig. 4:16,17 and Pl. 12 E, a fragment of a Greek lamp (Fig. 8:4), two Ionian cups (Fig. 7:6, 11; Pl. 12 H), and a painted sherd (Pl. 10H) showing a human head(?)” (Naveh 1962b:92–93; italics are mine – A.F.). The base of the local lamp, mentioned by Naveh (\textit{ibid.}), came from the same basket as the Greek cooking-pot (Basket A65), and belongs to a clearly Judean type, characterized by a heavy disc-base. Moreover, a flat-shouldered storage jar, incorporated into the lower floor, is definitely not Greek but local.
Two possible reasons may be invoked for the laying of the later floor:

1. A purely functional attempt to enlarge the open place in front of the gate (Naveh 1962b:93).

2. The assemblage found upon the lower floor could be considered as a protective guardian deposition (Greek *apotropaia*). In contrast to the other parts of the fortress in which entire vessels were virtually absent, here a concentration of nearly complete East Greek vessels was found, including a unique fragment bearing a drawing of what appears to be a human head (Naveh 1962b: Pl. 10 H).

It is impossible to unequivocally establish why a new floor was laid only in Room 4. However, it may be said with certainty that this construction does not demonstrate any change in the population of the site.

**Locus 5** is the inner room in the gate tower, which protruded westward beyond the line of the wall (Fig. 6). According to Eshel (1986:238) “upon the floor of stone slabs remained a Hebrew ostracon (No. 5), a heavy mortar bowl, a small bottle-shaped decanter and several small fragments that could not be identified on the basis of the illustrated types....” Yet, that is not how Naveh described this locus. According to him, the excavators were unable to define the floor there, and the finds from Locus 5 were collected in the course of exposing the stones of the tower (Naveh 1962b:94). Moreover, the description of the finds presented by Naveh is slightly different from Eshel’s: “the objects found while clearing the stones of the tower include a coarse bowl (Fig. 4:17, Pl. 12 E:2) and juglet (Fig. 6:11), a pointed base of a jug, rims of local bowls, *part of an oinochoe*, a Hebrew ostracon11 and a *piece of hematite* ...” (ibid.; italics are mine – A.F.).

**Locus 7**, is the inner room of the gate tower, east of Locus 5 and south of Locus 4 (Fig. 6). According to Eshel (1986:238) “beneath the plaster floor was a levelling fill of sand, separating it from the bedrock surface. In the fill were several fragments from the early phase of the fortress. Upon the floor remained the following vessels from the later phase: fragments of several mortar bowls, a medium-sized decanter and fragments that could not be identified on the basis of the drawings....” However, this is not the way Naveh described it: “Here (*on the floor* – A.F.) pieces of coarse bowls were found (as Fig. 4:16, 17), fragments of a jar, a decanter (as Fig. 5:16), and an oinochoe. Pottery was also found in the sand filling below the plastered floor; it included fragments of *local bowls* (Fig. 4:3) and a *juglet*, as well as fragments of an Ionian cup....” (Naveh 1962b:94; italics are mine – A.F.).

---

11 It should be noted that the ostracon discovered while exposing the stones in the western wall of the gate tower bears the Phoenician name and is marked by Naveh as No. 6 and not No. 5 as mentioned by Eshel (*ibid.*; cf. Naveh 1962a:30–31; 1962b:94, n. 7)
Locus 10, which is located west of Locus 4 and northeast of Locus 5, is a small room in the gate tower which Naveh calls a “guard-room” (*ibid.*:90) (Fig. 6). As elsewhere, both local and Greek vessels were found on the floor. Eshel (1986:238–239) discusses three bowls found on this floor, claiming that they represent the second (‘Judean’) phase at the site, finds from which included an Ionian cup. For some reason, the handle of an oinochoe, found together with several local vessels mentioned by Naveh (1962b:91–92, without drawings), was not mentioned by Eshel.

Locus 17 was defined as a courtyard by Naveh, primarily on the basis of its dimensions (6.25 x 4 m.) and the absence of a levelled floor (Fig. 6). The unlevelled floor, partly paved with shells, was laid upon the rock surface and sloped gradually towards the west from a level of 14.70 m. to 14.00 m. (*ibid.*:94). All of the ceramic finds from this locus, which is mentioned by Naveh (*ibid.*:95), are attributed by Eshel to the second phase of the fortress. As a result, the ‘Judean’ phase in Locus 17 includes, in Eshel’s opinion, both local and imported types (Eshel 1986:239). It is noteworthy that among the latter is an East Greek cooking-pot\(^\text{12}\) and a Samian amphora. An examination of the Locus 17 pottery (see details in Tables 7 and 16 below) reveals that most of the baskets included numerous fragments of East Greek pottery (*contra* Naveh 1962b:99, n. 14; footnote 7 above).

The Locus of the Gate-entrance is also attributed by Eshel to the second phase: “...from this locus three important artifacts were published ... a large fragment of a medium-sized decanter, an incised inscription on the shoulder of a jar (Naveh 1960:136) and a dome-shaped chalk weight with a 4 shekel mark engraved upon it” (Eshel 1986:240). It appears that in this case as well, there is a considerable difference between what Naveh describes and Eshel’s interpretation, as only the decanter (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:14) was found in the vicinity of the threshold. The incised inscription on the jar shoulder bears the name of “Hashavyahu ben Ya...” after whom the fortress was named. In his first article on the inscription, Naveh (1960:136) does not indicate the place of its discovery, except for the fact that it was found on the surface.

---

\(^{12}\) Eshel’s definition (*ibid.*) of these vessels as “broad-necked cooking jugs” without noting that they are clearly Greek vessels, is erroneous, despite his identification of the Samian amphora originating in this locus as Greek. Eshel is also mistaken in stating that two “cooking jugs” were found here, as Naveh clearly notes that only one Greek cooking-pot was found in this locus, similar to two prototypes illustrated “as Fig. 6:7, 8” (Naveh 1962b:95). Nonetheless, my examination of the finds revealed that only one cooking-pot was found in this locus (Baskets A166, A177), and it is published here for the first time (Fig. 32:1). This examination was important because as a consequence of Eshel’s error, this Greek cooking-pot appears as two different vessels in the corpus of types of Eshel’s last phase (Eshel 1986:330, Fig. 30:11–12).
His second article dealing with the epigraphic finds from Me'azad Ḥashavyahu (Naveh 1962a) presents the plan of Area A, upon which the findspots of all of the ostraca, except for this one, are indicated. A footnote states that “the incised inscription was found in another area of the fort, not shown on this plan” (ibid.:27, n. 1), contradicting Eshel, who attributes it to Area A. While from Naveh’s publications it is not clear where the inscription was found, this is not germane to this discussion. The findspot of the dome-shaped stone weight (No. 7) is indicated in the plan of Area A (Fig. 7; ibid.: Fig. 1) and it appears to have been found approximately 12 m.(!) west of the gate threshold, i.e., in Area S (Fig. 6; cf. Naveh 1962b: Fig. 2). Thus, of three objects ‘of importance’ noted by Eshel, only the rimless decanter attests to the so-called second phase. In order to support his views, Eshel had to prove that all of the decanters of this type at Me'azad Ḥashavyahu were found in contexts lacking Greek pottery, and as such, constitute the ‘Judean’ type of the second phase. However, finds of similar Judean decanters in Areas C and F side-by-side with East Greek pottery (Area C also had imported cooking-pots) (Naveh 1962b:95–96) contradicts this assumption.

**Area B**

According to Eshel, four of the six vessels from this area published by Naveh belong to the final phase of the existence of the fortress. His basis for establishing this is not explained, nor does he say how a Samian amphora (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:3) came to be included in the ‘typical Judean repertoire’ alongside local wares: a large bowl, a cooking-pot and a krater (ibid.: Figs. 4:15; 5:2; 6:9), while portions of two Greek cups (ibid.: Fig. 7:9, 10) were not included. Perhaps the reason is that, according to Eshel, the second phase in Area B is represented by vessels and large fragments, and the fragments of Greek cups were not encompassed by this definition, or perhaps he decided to relate to rims only. In the warehouses of the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA), there are 14 baskets of sherds originating in Area B. This pottery was gathered mostly from the floor of one room in a house situated in the northwestern corner of the smaller rectangle (ibid.:95). Here too, as in other parts of the fortress, only a single floor was found. A detailed description of the finds may be found below, however it should be noted that East Greek pottery constituted a considerable percentage (ca. 40%) of the Area B assemblage, more or less similar to the situation in other areas. One of the pieces of raw haematite found at the site also came from Area B. Another piece of haematite was found in Locus 5 in Area A, according to Eshel, one of the clean assemblages of the second phase (see above). How is it possible that on the one hand, pieces of haematite are regarded as indicators of metalworking at the site by Greek mercenaries of the early phase of the fortress (Naveh 1962b:99), while on the
other hand, certain parts of the assemblage in which the haematite was found are attributed to the later, supposedly Judean, phase (Eshel 1986:238)?

On the basis of his analysis of the stratigraphy, Eshel (ibid.:329, Fig. 30) created a ceramic corpus of 20 types which he attributes to the Judean period of control over the fortress, i.e., the second phase of its history. According to him, "the range of types simultaneously reflects the trade contacts(?) of the population of the fortress with other contemporary sites. Many of the vessels in the Judean corpus are stylistically related to the ceramic culture of western Judah.... other types are related to the non-Judean ceramic forms, and the latter appears to have reached the site as imports or through trade..." (ibid.:331). Six of the twenty types of the corpus (two heavy bowls, two East Greek cooking-pots and two Samian amphorae) are clearly imports. While the heavy bowls (mortaria) have a broad distribution in the Land of Israel, the East Greek cooking-pots and amphorae are certainly not represented at typical Judean sites at the end of the Iron Age (for their distribution in the Land of Israel, see the list of parallels in Section C).

In view of the above survey, it seems necessary to reject Eshel's assumption that there were two phases in the history of the fortress (an earlier Greek phase and a later Judean phase), which may be distinguished through the pottery assemblage. Examination of the 'clean Judean' loci which, according to Eshel, characterize the second phase, show that there is no difference between their pottery and that of the other loci. The re-examination indicates that the pottery assemblage of Mezad Ḥashavyahu is uniform and that it is impossible to divide it into two phases. This conclusion is further supported by the primary data published by Naveh, whereas the selective utilization of data by Eshel led him to erroneous conclusions. It should be noted that Naveh himself abandoned his original view concerning two phases at the site (Naveh 1962b) in favor of a single phase, in which Greek mercenaries served Josiah (Naveh 1993).

**Other Stratigraphic Issues**

It thus appears that the finds from the site reflect a single phase and may be treated as a single assemblage. Moreover, the absence of architectural change in the structures indicates a short period of existence, with no later settlement (Naveh 1962b:95). This situation makes it possible to verify to what extent the assemblage reflects the last period of the fortress's existence and whether there is a factual basis for dividing its various components into primary refuse, secondary refuse and defacto refuse, to use Schiffer's terminology (Schiffer 1976, 1985; contra Binford 1981; see also Shott 1998:311–312; and see below). In order to answer these questions, one must first understand the extent to which site formation processes affected the finds uncovered.
The final form of an archaeological site is influenced by several factors, both human and natural. When examining the stratigraphy of a given site, an attempt should be made to identify these factors although it is clearly not possible to reconstruct all the events that occurred at the site through its period of existence and afterward. The identifiable factors that influenced site formation at Mezad Hashavyahu following its abandonment are:

1) A heap of *kurkar* stones was found in the southeastern part of the smaller rectangle, between Areas E and F (Figs. 5, 16, 20). Its remains are still found at the site, although Naveh states that he excavated the southern part: “In Area F, the examination of a heap of stones on the top of the hill showed that it had been placed there at some time after the destruction of the fortress, because a layer of sand divided it from the brown earth containing mudbrick debris below which lay the remains of rooms” (Naveh 1962b:96). Naveh’s note that sand divided the bottom of the heap of stones from the top of the mudbrick collapse that sealed the original floors is of considerable importance. Reich noted a similar situation in his excavations: the western ends of mudbrick walls W3 and W4 were covered by the same pile of stones (Figs. 18–20). From Reich’s field notes it may be established that the top elevation of the heap is 25.66 m. and the bottom elevation is 24.85 m.; thus, the height in the measured portion is 0.81 m. The northeastern part of the stone heap was removed in the excavation of Area E by Reich, who refers to it as Locus 5 (5–86 in my division, see below).

From this evidence it is possible to establish that the heap of stones was created after the mudbrick walls of the fortress collapsed, and that the floors covered by the collapse were not disturbed by the human factor that placed these stones in a pile. On the other hand, it is probable that certain walls in the fortress (the lower courses of which were constructed with *kurkar*) were damaged as a result of this action. When remains of such walls are found in excavation, one may reasonably assume that the assemblages next to them will have been disturbed.

It is not clear why this pile of stones was created: the reason probably lies in its location at the top of the hill (an observation point?), or perhaps the stones were gathered with the intention of moving them elsewhere, but for some reason, this was never done. From Naveh’s preliminary reports, it is not clear if any finds were discovered that can date the creation of the pile, however, he attributes it to sporadic activity by Bedouins in modern times (Naveh, pers. comm.). This view is strengthened by findings from Reich’s excavation. When the surface was removed (Locus 1–86), a fragment of a so-called ‘black Gaza
ware' jar (Fig. 34:13) was found. Similar vessels\textsuperscript{13} are typical of all parts of the Land of Israel in recent generations (cf. *Tell el-Hesi II*: 106–108).

In Locus 5–86 (Basket E18) from Reich's excavation, which is the northeastern part of the stone pile, a bronze bell (Fig. 46:10) was found. This is not dated, however, it resembles the bells used by contemporary Bedouin shepherds. A David Roberts lithograph from 24 March 1839 (Fig. 8), depicts a Bedouin shepherds' encampment near Ashdod of the type that may also be reconstructed at Mezad Ḥashavyahu.

![Fig. 8. A Bedouin shepherd's encampment near Ashdod drawn by David Roberts on 24 March 1839.](image)

\textbf{2) A Hellenistic coin (IAA No. 21921) of Antiochus III (223–187 BCE) was found on the surface (Reich 1989:231–232, notes 16, 17), but not during the excavations, so it is unknown whether it came from inside the fortress or outside. It is not a surprising find given the near-by prosperous settlement at Yavneh-Yam during the Hellenistic period (Fischer and Fantalkin, forthcoming).}

\textsuperscript{13} Parallels: Tell el-Hesi, in the Muslim cemetery in Fields V and VI/IX (*Tell el-Hesi V*: 64, Pls. 16–19), dated to ca. 1550–1800 CE (*ibid.*:76). At Ta'anach a similar type was noted (Ziadeh 1995:233, Fig. 10:7) from Stratum VI (ca. 15th-16th centuries CE) to Stratum VIII (ca. second half of the 17th century CE) (*ibid.*:211, Table 1).
However, except for this coin and the poor modern finds (see above), no other objects have been found that can be dated to the period following the abandonment of the site.

3) Among the natural factors that affected the site formation, erosion toward the sea to the west is foremost, due to the considerable elevation differences between the high eastern part of the fortress and the lower western part. Reich, who excavated at the eastern end, notes that the state of preservation of the mudbrick walls steadily decreases as one moves westward (Reich 1989:228).

Based upon the above, one might expect to find several undisturbed assemblages since human activity at the site after its abandonment did not greatly change it. It seems that the main reason for this is that the fortress was covered by sand dunes in antiquity. However, since natural factors considerably affected the site’s formation, an attempt to define the undisturbed assemblages that will primarily be found beneath the mudbrick collapse that covered the floors must be made.

Naveh’s Excavations

Since Naveh’s preliminary report included stratigraphic attribution of selected pottery prototypes only, it was necessary to separate the assemblages found at the various loci. Despite prolonged searching, Naveh’s original field diaries were not located, but registration numbers on the pottery sherds made it possible to determine their source. The methodology adopted during the excavation involved registering the area and basket number on each sherd that was retained; the first basket from Area A, for example, was marked A1, etc. In addition, each major artefact (such as stone and metal artefacts) received a separate, sequential basket number. Since the pottery finds from Mezad Hashavyahu were moved several times after the excavations, this resulted in disarray. First, all of the sherds found in the IAA warehouses were sorted by excavation area and basket, and the finds from each basket were separated. Then, the baskets were attributed to the loci. In the gate area, Naveh defined each of the rooms with a locus number. The numbers mentioned in the publication (Naveh 1962b) relate to the rooms and the rubbish dump uncovered in Area A only, namely: 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18. Rooms 16 and 18 were

---

14 A similar situation – a single-period fortress that was apparently covered by sand dunes following its abandonment in antiquity, occurs at the Persian period site located ca. 2 km. north of Ashdod (Porath 1974). It appears that both sites provide reliable archaeological evidence for coastal dune activity that resulted in the preservation of ancient remains from later disturbance.

15 In Naveh’s publication (1962b), selected basket numbers appear alongside pottery plates under the heading “Reg. No.”
not excavated, but were defined at the end of the excavation based on the outline of their walls (*ibid.*:95). As the number given relates to entire rooms, it does not allow precise division of the finds by findspot, as for example: fill above mudbrick collapse that sealed a floor; mudbrick collapse; on a sealed floor; or in and below a floor. In relation to fragments of the Hebrew ostraca found in the guard-room and near its entrance under collapsed mudbrick walls, Naveh notes that only clean sand without any ancient remains was found above the mudbrick debris (*ibid.*:98). It is unclear if this situation holds true for the other portions of the fortress, or if it was possible to distinguish fills that accumulated above the mudbrick collapse following abandonment of the fortress.

The assemblages from Area A received new locus numbers that combine the room number given by Naveh with the addition of a Latin letter, where the letter ‘a’ represents the uppermost assemblage. Various loci from Room 4, for example, were marked from top to bottom in the following manner: 4a>4b>4c, etc. This same re-numbering was carried out, insofar as possible, on the assemblages uncovered in other areas. In order to create a clear division between the areas, each area received a different prefix: Area B - 21; Area C - 31; Area D - 41; Area E - 51; Area F - 61; Area G - 71. Because the starting point in reconstructing the provenience of all baskets from Area A is the baskets whose numbers were presented in Naveh’s article (1962b) together with the room numbers in which they were found, all baskets that can definitely be attributed to a specific room will be marked with an asterisk (*). This marking will also appear next to published basket numbers from other excavation areas.\(^{16}\) Information concerning the elevation above sea level of each assemblage is included only if it was indicated by Naveh, in the article or in accompanying plans.

**Area A**

Forty-eight basket numbers from Area A were incorporated into the pottery plates in Naveh’s publication (Naveh 1962b). Among the baskets stored in the IAA warehouses, the last was numbered as A246, so at least 246 baskets were registered from this area. Of these, only 177 were located in the warehouses, i.e., finds from 69 baskets were not preserved and part of them were apparently discarded in the course of sorting during the excavation.\(^{17}\) On the other hand,

---

\(^{16}\) Numbers of all pottery prototypes taken from Naveh’s and Reich’s publications, which appear in illustrations in Section C (below), have also been marked with an asterisk, in order to distinguish them from those first drawn in the framework of the present work.

\(^{17}\) The poor preservation of the pottery at Mezad Hashavyahu, apparently due to humidity and the salinity of the sand, was noted by Reich (1989:232, n. 7), and was probably also the case during Naveh’s excavation.
some of the artefacts exposed in the course of excavation, partly mentioned by Naveh (1962b), are stored without numbering. In what follows, the remaining baskets will be attributed to their original assemblages insofar as possible.

**Room 4**

"Room 4 is a vestibule to the guard-room. Near its north wall, of which only about 20 cm. remain standing, we found the upper part of a jar placed upside down and used as an oven. The traces of ashes around this jar showed the floor level distinctly at 14.95 m.... the deposit on the floor reaches a level of 15.1 m. and is sealed off by the debris of a collapsed brick wall. This collapse must have occurred when the fortress was still occupied, because at a level of 15.3–15.35 m. we found the pebble-pavement leading to the entrance of the guardroom. This pavement also overlies the north wall of Room 4 which by that time had gone out of use." (Naveh 1962b:92–93).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Locus</strong></th>
<th><strong>Elevation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>2 ?? 15.30/15.35</td>
<td>Finds on the upper floor</td>
<td>Ostraca Nos. 1b, 3; iron arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>15.30/15.35</td>
<td>Upper floor of river pebbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>2 ?? 15.10</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>15.10 14.95</td>
<td>Finds on the lower floor</td>
<td>A65*, A66, A68*, A81*, A82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>14.95 14.00</td>
<td>Lower floor on bedrock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon Naveh's description, it is possible to distinguish seven separate assemblages (Loci 4a–4g according to my division). Four baskets of pottery were clearly found on the lower floor, as selected types from four of these were included in Naveh's publication. The fifth basket, A66, is the upper part of a jar that was used as an oven in the lower floor (*ibid.*: Pl. 12 A) and could also be attributed with certainty to the lower floor. Naveh also noted finds from the upper floor which included an iron arrowhead and two ostraca. Locus 4b, which represents the upper mudbrick collapse (mudbrick material which turned into hard mud over time) sealing the finds on the upper floor, should, in my
opinion, include the fill that accumulated following the abandonment of the site. As such, it will probably include sherd that do not belong to the original assemblage. The reasons for the scattering of the finds are probably varied, however in the case of Area A, it appears that the main reason was erosion toward the sea. So, a number of sherds were definitely washed down as a result of the great difference in elevation at the extremities of the structure. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 1.

**Room 5**

"The tower (Locus 5) projects about 3 m. from the line of the wall and its front measures 5.25 m. in length. The threshold leading to Room 7 shows that the space within the tower had been utilized. Although we could not find a clearly marked floor in the tower, there must have been one on the same level as the threshold, which is 35 cm. higher than the floor of Room 7. The architectural remains are sufficient to show that the length of the north-south axis of the tower-room was 3.5 m.; the length of the east-west axis, however, cannot be determined, since the west side of the tower has been eroded and the courses do not reach the postulated height of the floor (see Pl. 9C). The room may have been divided into two by a partition, but in view of the obvious necessity of making the west wall of the tower as thick and strong as possible, it is more likely that there was space only for one chamber about 3 m. wide. The scant remains also do not show whether there had been an opening from the guard-room (10) to the tower (5). Since there is no opening between Rooms 4 and 7, we assume that originally there had been such an opening between 10 and 5" (Naveh 1962b).

Since the excavators did not succeed in locating the floor of the gate tower, there was probably no floor at all on the ground floor, and a wooden ladder placed on bedrock was utilized to ascend directly to the upper floor. The finds revealed there while exposing the stones beneath the supposed mudbrick collapse\(^\text{18}\) must be interpreted as the living surface and not as alluvial fill. However, this is merely an assumption and it is probable that in this case the fill was not sealed by the mudbrick collapse. Only one basket may be attributed with certainty to this source, since Naveh published selected types from it. Also a piece of raw haematite marked A38 from Room 5 was located in the warehouses. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 2.

---
\(^{18}\) The existence of a mudbrick collapse in Room 5 was not clearly noted by Naveh. Nonetheless, as such a collapse was found in the adjacent rooms (10 and 7), the inner space of Tower 5 was probably likewise sealed by it.
TABLE 2. ROOM 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a  ↓</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b  ↓</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>Occupational fill</td>
<td>A70*; Ostracon No. 6; piece of raw haematite (A38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room 7

“a light-coloured plaster covers walls and floor. The floor (height 14.75 m.) is laid on the sand used to fill out and level the uneven and sloping bedrock (see Fig. 3, Section 2-2; and here Fig. 6). Bricks from collapsed walls covered this floor to a depth of one metre. Here pieces of coarse bowls were found (as Fig. 4:16, 17), fragments of a jar, a decanter (as Fig. 5:16), and an oinochoe. Pottery was also found in the sand filling below the plastered floor; it included fragments of local bowls (Fig. 4:3) and a juglet, as well as fragments of an Ionian cup....” (Naveh 1962b:94).

According to Naveh's description, it is possible to distinguish four different loci (7b–7e according to my division) plus another presumed locus (7a) noted by this author. Only one basket (A73), whose number was indicated in the pottery plate (ibid.: Fig. 4:3), definitely comes from the sand fill beneath the floor. The rest of the finds referred to by Naveh constitute a problem since he compared them to prototypes from other assemblages (as Figs. 4:16–17; 5:16), and therefore they cannot be attributed to a specific basket. Still, through references to the vessels found on the floor and beneath it, it was possible to locate the missing baskets, since each basket kept in the warehouses was sorted separately. The basket whose contents are most suited to the description of the finds from the floor, and whose number is lower than 73 (since Basket A73 was clearly taken from beneath the floor), is Basket 51. This basket contains: two adjoining fragments (complete profile) of a heavy, coarse bowl of the type noted by Naveh; two adjoining fragments of the upper part of a local jar; and two body fragments of an oinochoe. It appears that, with the exception of the decanter, the finds in the basket match those noted by Naveh (above). The content of no other basket among those sorted fits this description. It is probable that the decanter was lost during the numerous moves of the excavated finds. If the basket from the floor is indeed Basket 51, then the number of baskets with finds from beneath the floor must be greater than 51, since they were excavated after the floor was removed. The baskets that seem to best fit the description of the finds originating in the fill beneath the floor...
are: A53 which contains a base of an Ionian cup; A72 in which the upper part of a local juglet was found; and A74 which contains two fragments of a bowl of the type present in basket A73 and was published by Naveh. Except for these three, no other basket of those sorted fits Naveh’s description. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 3.\(^{19}\)

**TABLE 3. ROOM 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>? ? ?</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer (+ alluvial fill above mudbrick collapse?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.80?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>14.80?</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td>A51?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>Plastered floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.70?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e</td>
<td>14.70?</td>
<td>Sand fill beneath the floor, on bedrock</td>
<td>A53?; A72?; A73*; A74?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Room 8**

“Room 8 is a narrow chamber adjoining the east wall of Room 7. In its northeast corner we found a clay furnace which had been plastered over, and which stood on a few stones. The bottom of the furnace and the floor of the room were full of ashes. Here a large piece of iron ore was found and an iron arrowhead and spatula” (*ibid.*:93).

In describing Room 8 (internal measurements: approx. 2 x 1.5 m.) Naveh explicitly notes the assemblage found on its floor, including a clay installation and a number of metal objects. Regarding the pottery there is uncertainty, as full details of the stratification are missing: was it, too, found on the floor and covered by the mudbrick collapse, or did it originate in this collapse or in the alluvial fill above it? Or, was the mudbrick collapse not noted here at all?

\(^{19}\) The information concerning absolute elevations of the various assemblages from Room 7 is based on Section 2-2 in Naveh’s publication (Fig. 6), on the floor elevation noted (14.75 m.), and on the thickness of the mudbrick collapse noted (1 m.). The missing data are the lower elevation of plastered floor and the upper elevation of the artefacts found upon it. In both cases, in order to create a correlation between the absolute elevations and the upper assemblage, which came from the fill above the mudbrick collapse, and the fill beneath the plastered floor the thickness of that floor was estimated as ca. 5 cm., and allowed an additional 5 cm. for the finds above the floor. The estimated elevations have been recorded with question marks, although in Section 2–2 it is clear that the thickness of the floor is not greater than 5 cm.
In the photographs taken in the course of excavating Room 8 (Figs. 9–12), one can see the mudbrick collapse that covered the floor and the clay installation, and no finds are apparent in the section cut into the collapse. These details make it difficult to attribute the rich ceramic assemblage to the floor of the room. Likewise, it appears that in Naveh’s description, a certain distinction was made between the metal objects found in an ash layer that covered the floor and the selected pottery types that originated in Room 8 (five baskets of sherds may be unequivocally attributed to Room 8 on the basis of their notation in the published report). Considering the fact that this room is the easternmost of the gate chambers and in view of the differences in elevation at the site, it may be safely assumed that these pottery vessels were carried here by erosion and originated in a fill layer that covered the mudbrick collapse and perhaps became mixed with its upper part following abandonment of the site. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 4.

### TABLE 4. ROOM 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer (+ alluvial fill above mudbrick collapse?)</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td>↑ A22*; A28*; A32*; A62*; A75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td>Clay furnace; piece of haematite; iron arrowhead; iron spatula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room 10

“The floor of the guard-room lies directly on the rubble filling of the wall; the threshold and the entrance were paved with pebbles.... The level of the floor is 15.35 m. above sea level; the depth of the deposit is so shallow that only in the corners does it reach 15.4 m.... and 15.46 m....” (Naveh 1962b:92).

“The ostraca were found in the guard-room and near its entrance under collapsed mudbrick walls. Since only clean sand without any ancient remains was found above the mudbrick debris, we assume that the fortress was abandoned ... and never reoccupied” (ibid.:98).

Based on this description, it is possible to distinguish four different loci (10a-10d according to my division). Three baskets of sherds clearly originate above the floor, as their numbers appear in Naveh’s pottery tables. The
resultant correlation is summarized in Table 5.20

TABLE 5. ROOM 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>? ? ?</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td>A18*; A19*; A26*; Ostracon No. 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>Floor, lies directly on the rubble filling of the wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Area 15

Locus 15 is located south of Room 16, outside the group of rooms of the gate area. This open expanse was defined by Naveh as a rubbish dump due to the large concentration of sherds found in it (Naveh 1962b:95). This assumption appears to be correct, as the finds from this locus are distinct from those of other assemblages, except Area S where another rubbish dump was encountered (see below). Twenty-four baskets of sherds definitely originate from this dump, as their numbers appear in Naveh’s pottery tables. Excavation of the locus was not completed. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 6.21

TABLE 6. OPEN AREA 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer?</td>
<td>A98; A99*; A106*; A112*; A133*; A142*; A171*; A174*; A178*; A179; A181*; A183*; A185*; A198*; A202; A203*; A204*; A205*; A206; A208; A209; A210; A216*; A217*; A223*; A224*; A226; A228*; A230*; A231*; A233; A242*; A243*; Ostraca Nos. 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>Rubbish dump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Like the floor of Room 7 (Locus 7d above), the thickness of the floor in Room 10 has been estimated as ca. 5 cm.
21 Eight baskets – A98, A179, A206, A208, A209, A210, A226, A233 – appear here without asterisks because they were not mentioned in the published report, however, they were attributed to Locus 15 on the basis of joins made in restoring vessels with sherds from these baskets and ones mentioned by Naveh.
Fig. 9. Area A, Room 8 at the beginning of the excavations.

Fig. 10. Area A, Room 8 during the excavations, looking southwest.

Fig. 10. Area A, Room 8 during the excavations, looking southwest.
Fig. 11. Area A, the northern profile of Room 8.

Fig. 12. Area A, the clay furnace excavated in Room 8.
Courtyard 17

The description of Locus 17 is presented above and was defined as a courtyard by Naveh based on the absence of a levelled floor. The available stratigraphic data concerning Courtyard 17 do not allow the secure identification of the numbers of each basket of pottery found on the shell flooring. In a photograph taken during the excavation (Fig. 13), the mudbrick collapse covering at least part of the shell paving is visible, and a section cut into the collapse appears to be without finds. Nonetheless, the photograph shows a relatively small portion of the floor, and there is no way of knowing whether the other parts of the floor were sealed by the mudbrick collapse. Nine baskets of sherds clearly originate from this space as their numbers appear in Naveh’s pottery plates. The finds from Courtyard 17 were probably partly collected above the floor (the bottom-most baskets), but mostly in the alluvial fill that covered the mudbrick collapse and became mixed with it. Thus, the
assemblages of finds from this space cannot be definitively separated. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 7.22

TABLE 7. COURTYARD 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>14.70/14.00</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>14.70/14.00</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill</td>
<td>A118*; A123*; A124*; A156*;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A159*; A166*; A177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c</td>
<td>14.70/14.00</td>
<td>Finds on the floor?</td>
<td>A193*; A194*; A195*; A196?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17d</td>
<td>14.70/14.00</td>
<td>Floor with partial shell pavement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gate-entrance

The existence of this locus is based on Naveh’s mention of two artefacts that were found in the gate-entrance: an iron arrowhead (Figs. 39:6; 47:1; Naveh 1962b:93, n. 6, Pl. 12 D:2), and a rimless decanter (Fig. 27:6*; ibid.: Fig. 5:14). The arrowhead was located at the IAA storehouses, with its basket number, A15. The decanter’s basket number, as it follows from Naveh (ibid.) is A128. Since there is no data concerning this locus in Naveh’s publication, it is not possible to create any correlation, aside from the fact that the decanter was uncovered later than the iron arrowhead, at a lower elevation.

Attribution of the Remaining Baskets

The above survey shows that stratigraphic attribution was found for 66 of the 177 baskets preserved from Area A. Based upon the distribution of their numbers, it is possible to attempt to reconstruct the source of 111 of the remaining baskets. The basket numbers that have been securely attributed to Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 range between 1 and at least 82, while the basket numbers securely attributed to Room 17 and to Rubbish Dump 15 range between 98 and 243.23

22 Basket A177 without an asterisk has been included along with those mentioned by Naveh (marked with asterisks) because sherds from it were joined with those from Basket A166*. Basket A196 was attributed to Room 17 in view of the fact that a small sherd of an Ionian cup bearing the number A196 was found in the IAA warehouses in its original box, upon which was written “Room 17”. This attribution is uncertain and has therefore been presented with a question mark.

23 The only exception is the two baskets from the gate-entrance: A15 and A128 (above). It seems that such a great difference between the numbers indicates that there may have been
It is thus possible to reconstruct the course of the excavation in Area A: firstly, the southern wing of the gate (Rooms 5, 10) and the adjacent rooms (4, 7, 8) in the northern part of the area were excavated; later, excavation continued southward (15, 17). A similar conclusion may be reached if one compares the results of the first and second seasons of excavation as shown on the plan (Fig. 5). As the final number that can securely be attributed to the assemblages of the northern part of the area is 82 (Locus 4f in Room 4), and the first certain number that may be attributed to the assemblages of the southern part is 98 (Rubbish Dump 15), the numbers from 83 to 97 remain with uncertain attribution.24 All 82 of the first baskets are divided in one manner or another between Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 while all of the baskets numbered between 98 and 246 belong to Rubbish Dump 15 and Courtyard 17. Thus, 33 out of 111 baskets preserved and lacking attribution may be definitely assigned to the group of Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10, but without specific attribution to any one room. It appears that the source of most of these baskets25 is in the upper fills that accumulated at Area A as a result of erosion following the fortress’s abandonment. The majority of the remaining baskets26 certainly originated in Rubbish Dump 15, however, the possible attribution of some of them to the silt that accumulated on the shell paving in Courtyard 17 cannot be rejected.

Areas B-G

Stratigraphic data concerning these areas is incomplete. According to Naveh: “These soundings revealed everywhere one floor only, generally of beaten earth, with an abundance of Greek and local sherds filling in the picture obtained in Area A. The floors were generally laid on bedrock, often covered with a thin layer of clean sand to even out the irregularities of the rock. Collapsed mudbrick walls covered the remains on the floors and helped to preserve them” (Naveh 1962b:96).

24 The baskets kept in the IAA warehouses are numbered: A90, A92, A96, A97.
25 The baskets kept in the IAA warehouses are numbered: A1; A4; A5; A7; A9; A11; A14; A16; A17; A18; A21; A23; A24; A25; A29; A30; A34; A35; A36; A43; A46; A49; A50; A54; A55; A56; A57; A58; A63; A67; A76; A77; A79.
26 The baskets kept in the IAA warehouses are numbered: A100; A101; A102; A103; A104; A105; A109; A111; A113; A114; A115; A117; A120; A121; A122; A125; A126; A127; A129; A131; A132; A135; A137; A138; A139; A141; A143; A144; A145; A146; A147; A148; A150; A152; A153; A154; A155; A157; A158; A160; A161; A162; A172; A173; A175; A176; A180; A184; A186; A187; A188; A190; A192; A197; A199; A201; A207; A211; A213; A218; A219; A220; A221; A222; A224; A225; A227; A229; A232; A234; A236; A244; A245; A246.
Area B

Several structures and rooms are indicated on the plan of Area B, even though only one room was cleared to its floor by Naveh’s excavations (ibid.:95). It is unclear which room this is, as the excavator noted only the location of the building to which it belongs (the northwestern part of the smaller rectangle). Nonetheless, it is reasonable to assume that it is the entrance room (courtyard?) of the building, which is marked B on the plan (Fig. 5). The fact that the finds from Area B are surprisingly similar to those exposed in the courtyard of the building in Area E during Reich’s excavation (Loci 6–86, 7–86 on the basis of my division, see below) further supports this assumption. In both these cases, cooking-pots and jars are numerous, while small bowls are not present at all.

The number of the last basket from Area B is B15, which means that at least 15 baskets were recorded here. Of these, only 14 baskets of sherds\textsuperscript{27} were located in the warehouses, and Naveh has published selected finds from six of these.

\textsuperscript{27} Baskets B10 and B15 were not included among the pottery baskets as the first contained a fragment of a grinding stone and the second, a piece of haematite. Among the 14 baskets of sherds, three were marked BI 2, BI 5 and BI 6, similar to the registering in Areas D and E (see below). These baskets were probably collected from another location within Area B, not in the courtyard. One of the photographs of Area B, prior to excavation (cf. Fig. 14), shows the northern room of the unit designated as BI. Still, there is confusion since Naveh
Seven sherd found in Basket B1, when compared to those in other baskets, are extremely worn. Considering that this was the first basket recorded here, it appears that the source of the sherd is in the fill above the mudbrick collapse that sealed the floor. Since Naveh noted that the pottery from Area B was collected during the clearing of the floor, one may assume that all the finds beginning from Basket B3 (the first among the Area B ceramic types presented in Naveh’s pottery tables) should be attributed to the finds on the floor, sealed by the mudbrick collapse (Naveh 1962b:95). The numerous fragments from Basket B2, which were restored into the ovoid base of a local jar, were apparently found in the level beneath the mudbrick collapse, as it is difficult to assume that such extensive erosion occurred. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 8.

**TABLE 8. AREA B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer or alluvial fill (topsoil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill?</td>
<td>↑ B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21c</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td>B2*; B3*; B4*; B5; B7*; B8*; B9*; B12*; B13; B14; fragment of grinding stone (B10); piece of haematite (B15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21d</td>
<td>Beaten earth floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area C**

In Area C a small room (ca. 4 x 3.5 m.) abutting the southern face of the northern wall in the smaller rectangle was excavated. The final basket was C53, which means that at least 53 baskets were collected there. Only 32 pottery baskets mentioned that only one room was cleared to its floor in Area B (Naveh 1962b:95) and 32 pottery baskets from Area C probably received their own basket numbers, but they could not be located.

---

28 Baskets C14, C26, and C49 were not included among the baskets of pottery, as the first contained a fragment of a grinding stone, the second a fibula and the third, a fragment of a bronze nail. An iron needle and bent iron rod found in Area C probably received their own basket numbers, but they could not be located.
It is not clear if all of the finds were recovered beneath the mudbrick collapse or if part of it originated in later fill that accumulated after the site was abandoned. Nonetheless, there seems reason to prefer the former possibility and to regard the finds as an original assemblage that was sealed by mudbrick collapse. The reasons for this are as follow:

1) In the description of the finds exposed in situ, Naveh notes that three heavy, coarse bowls were found there (Naveh 1962b:95); one of these (Basket C22) was published (ibid.: Fig. 4:16, Pl. 12 E:1). The two unpublished examples originated in Baskets C3 and C31. Moreover, Naveh notes that four local lamps were also found here and one of them (Basket C21) was published (ibid.: Fig. 5:21). Only two of the other three were located, but the important point is that one of these was recorded as Basket C7. Thus, it seems that all the preserved baskets, from C3 to C53, came from the original fill above the floor, sealed by mudbrick collapse.

2) The location of Area C – in the higher area of the fortress – decreases the chance of fills accumulating above the mudbrick collapse as a result of erosion (unlike low-lying Area A).

3) The room exposed in Area C is a space enclosed on all sides, except for an entrance in the eastern part of the southern wall.
It is noteworthy that the large quantity of pottery found in such a small space (Fig. 15) distinguishes the assemblage of Area C from those found in rooms of similar size, such as Rooms 2–86 and 3–86 excavated in Area E during Reich’s excavations (below). The reason for this apparently lies in the fact that this room was no longer in use in the course of the fortress’s existence and became one of its rubbish dumps (see below). The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 9.  

### TABLE 9. AREA C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer or alluvial fill (topsoil)</td>
<td>C3; C7; C8*; C9; C11; C12; C16; C18; C19*; C20; C21*; C22*; C23*; C25; C27*; C30*; C31*; C33*; C35; C36; C38; C39; C42; C43*; C44; C45; C46; C47; C48; C50; C52; C53; fragment of grinding stone (C14); piece of iron fibula (C26); broken iron nail (C49); iron needle; bent iron rod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c</td>
<td>Fill + finds on the floor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31d</td>
<td>Beaten earth floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area D

No floor was reported from the probe excavated in Area D. Only one basket (from fill?) was found in the IAA warehouses. It should be noted that the labelling here, for some reason, was different than in the other areas. Thus, instead of Arabic numerals, Latin ones appear here. A similar registration style was attested in Area E (below).

### TABLE 10. AREA D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>DI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 The finds from baskets C1 and C2, that appear to have been discarded in the course of sorting at the area and were not found in the warehouses, are probably those gathered from the fill that accumulated above the mudbrick collapse, i.e., Locus 31A according to my division.
**Area E**

No floor was reported in the probe excavated in Area E. Only one basket (from fill?) was found in the IAA warehouses. A probe excavated by Naveh was found and incorporated into Reich’s excavation. It probably corresponds to the upper fill of Room 2, which was entirely excavated by Reich (Locus 2a–86 in my division; see details below).

**TABLE 11. AREA E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 = 2a–86</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>EI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area F**

The full description of Area F is presented above. Stratigraphic data concerning the finds uncovered here allow a fairly accurate correlation to be constructed. The last basket was marked F13, so at least 13 baskets were collected there. Of these, only eight baskets of pottery are in the IAA warehouses, and selected finds from these were published by Naveh. Still, there is a certain difficulty in reconstructing the source of these baskets. Naveh notes that beneath the mudbrick collapse, remains of rooms were found and pottery was gathered from their floors (Naveh 1962b:96). Nonetheless, there is no data that allow differentiation between the finds from the various floors. A plan of Area F shows that parts of three small rooms belonging to the same structure were excavated. But a photograph of the area, probably taken at the end of the excavation (Fig. 16), indicates that only one room was entirely excavated and it seems that the two other rooms were only defined on the basis of the outline of their walls. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 12.

**TABLE 12. AREA F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61a = 5–86</td>
<td>Heap of stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61b</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61c</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61d</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td>F2*; F4*; F5*; F7*; F10*; F11*; F12*; F13*; part of bronze fibula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61e</td>
<td>Beaten earth floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area G

It seems that all the baskets from Area G include finds from "on the floor" (ibid.:96) as Naveh explicitly indicated. Further support for this assumption is provided by reference to a local ware bowl (ibid.: Fig. 4:6) among these finds.
The drawing of this vessel published by Naveh records that the bowl belongs to Basket G17, however, my examination revealed that it was reconstructed from fragments marked G1, G17, G30, G37, and G39. Thus, all the baskets from Area G contain material from the floor. The absence of baskets from fill (surface?) that certainly accumulated above the mudbrick collapse may be explained by the fact that it was virgin soil or contained only non-indicative body sherds. The final basket from Area G was marked G47, i.e., at least 47 baskets were gathered there. Of these, only 29 baskets of sherds\(^\text{30}\) are in the IAA warehouses and Naveh published selected finds from eight of these. The total amount of pottery found in Area G is not surprising, as this was a relatively large building. It abutted the southern fortification wall and its northwestern corner is apparent in the plan. While the report contains no information on the assemblage's eastward extent or where the easternmost extremity of the floor lay, the photographs of the area during excavation, stored in the IAA archive (cf. Fig. 17), shows that at least a 5 x 5 m. square was excavated here. The structure in Area G is different from the other structures at the site in that no partition wall of any sort indicating internal division similar to that in domestic structures in Areas B, C, D, E and F was found. The resultant correlation may be summarized as follows:

**TABLE 13. AREA G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pottery Baskets and other Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71a</td>
<td>Virgin soil – sand layer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71b</td>
<td>Mudbrick collapse + alluvial fill?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71c</td>
<td>Finds on the floor</td>
<td>G1; G2; G4; G5; G6*; G7*; G8*; G9*; G10; G11; G14; G16; G17*; G18; G21*; G22; G23; G24; G25; G28; G30*; G31; G32; G36; G37; G38*; G39; G46; G47*; fragment of grinding stone (G42); iron arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71d</td>
<td>Beaten earth floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area S**

"Outside the fortress-wall, in the neighbourhood of the gate, there is... another rubbish dump. The sherds collected there are marked S" (ibid.:95).

\(^{30}\) Basket G42 was not included among the baskets of sherds because it contained a grinding stone.
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Fig. 17. Area G during the excavation, looking southeast.

While the published finds from Area S were designated by Naveh with the numbers S1, S2, etc., these do not seem to reflect the stratification from top to bottom and are only a sequence of numbers for the arrangement of pottery.
plates. This is because all of the examined potsherds from this area were marked with the letter S only (to indicate the area), without any additional number as in other excavation areas. The presentation of finds from Area S in the publication was also in sequential order, from S1 to S15, so that it is not possible to clarify the stratification of this rubbish dump, beyond the fact that all the finds bearing the letter S belong to it. The pile of potsherds in Area S was defined as a waste accumulation, both on the basis of its location (outside the fortification) and in view of the large concentration of finds, which included defective fragments (e.g., Fig. 43:2–3).

Reich’s Excavation

This salvage excavation followed bulldozer activity nearby, and was conducted near the eastern wall of the smaller rectangle (Figs. 18–20). At first, Area E from Naveh’s excavations was identified and, from this point, an area measuring 10 x 10 m. was excavated in a roughly southwesterly direction. Naveh’s probe was located in the network of rooms uncovered here, in Room 2 of Reich’s excavation. During the excavation, almost an entire residential unit was exposed (hereafter Building E-I) and segments of another (hereafter Building E-II), both in the central group of buildings of the smaller rectangle. The former (Loci 2, 3, 4 [rooms]; 6, 7 [courtyard]) is the easternmost of the structures of this cluster and, as such, abuts the eastern fortification wall which Reich referred to as W-1. The other building (Loci 9, 10 [rooms]) is located west of the former, and wall W-6 is the shared wall of the two buildings. Several walls were preserved to a maximum height of ca. 0.45 m. The thickness of the external walls of the building (W-4, W-6, W-9) is 0.8 m. and the thickness of the inner walls (W-2, W-3, W-7, W-8) is 0.53 m.

In the list of loci and baskets that follows, the suffix 86 (the year of excavation, to distinguish it from the loci excavated by Naveh) has been added to each locus number, and the prefix E (the area designation according to Naveh) has been added to each basket number. On the basis of Reich’s report (Reich 1989; and excavation logs), it emerges that the finds from the rooms of Building E-I (Loci 2–86, 3–86, 4–86) and from its courtyard (Loci 6–86, 7–86), and those from the rooms of Building E-II (Loci 9–86, 10–86) were found upon the floors. At the same time, in Room 2 it seems to be possible to distinguish between Naveh’s upper basket (Basket EI), which perhaps represents surface finds, and the baskets from Reich’s excavations. The resultant correlation is summarized in Table 14.
TABLE 14. AREA E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baskets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–86</td>
<td>topsoil</td>
<td>Surface finds collected following bulldozer activity</td>
<td>E1; E2; E3; E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>topsoil</td>
<td>Surface in the vicinity of the heap of the stones 5–86?</td>
<td>E6; E7; E9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–86</td>
<td>topsoil</td>
<td>Unknown provenience</td>
<td>E8; E10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a–86</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>Naveh’s probe (Area E)</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b–86</td>
<td>24.90/24.47</td>
<td>Finds on the floor of the northeastern room of Building E-I</td>
<td>E12; E14; E22; E51; E55; E61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.35/24.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–86</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>Finds on the floor of the eastern room of Building E-I</td>
<td>E5; E11; E13; E19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>24.90/24.73</td>
<td>Finds on the floor of the southern room of Building E-I</td>
<td>E15; E16; E17; E23; E28; E33; E40; E42; E45; E50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–86</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>Heap of stones, west of Locus 8–96 and above the western part of Wall W-4</td>
<td>E18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–86</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>Finds on the beaten earth surface of the northern part of the courtyard of Building E-I</td>
<td>E20; E24; E25; E29; E32; E35; E44; E48; E52; E53; E56; E60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–86</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>Finds on the beaten earth surface of the southern part of the courtyard of Building E-I</td>
<td>E21; E26; E30; E31; E39; E49; E57; E58; E62; E63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–86</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>Eastern end of the southern passageway in the smaller rectangle of the fortress</td>
<td>E27; E34; E41; E46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–86</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>Finds in the northeastern room in the E-II building</td>
<td>E36; E38; E59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–86</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>Finds in the eastern room in the E-II building, south of 9–86</td>
<td>E37; E43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–86</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>Opening which leads to the courtyard of Building E-I</td>
<td>E54; E64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of excavation in Area E make it possible to discuss several aspects of the spatial distribution of the finds encountered, since the dwelling unit (Building E-I) was almost entirely excavated and the data completely documented. As a result, the scatter of artefacts can be examined to determine if it reflects the functional division of the various rooms in this dwelling. In view of the fact that the fortress existed for a relatively short period and only a single floor was found in Building E-I, the finds exposed upon it may be isolated and interpreted as a household assemblage (cf. Blanton 1994).
Such a situation is unusual at multiple-period archaeological sites, where structures were generally in use over long periods of time and represented a sequence of so-called 'household series', thus making it difficult to isolate a 'closed' assemblage (Smith 1992:29).

The data obtained following a count of the finds throughout Building E-I present the following picture:

31 

Locus 2b–86: 2 local bowls (Type B 11); 1 local juglet (Type JgI 2).

Locus 3–86: 1 local bowl (Type B 4); 2 East Greek cooking-pots (Type eg CP 1); 1 local storage jar (Type SJ 5).

Locus 4–86: 1 local bowl (Type B 11); 1 East Greek cooking-pot (Type eg CP 1a); 3 local storage jars (two of them of Type SJ 1 and the third SJ 5a); 1 East Greek amphora lid (Type LA); a piece of raw haematite weighing 1,126 gm.; an engraved stone (weight?).

Locus 6–86: 1 East Greek krater (Type eg K 4); 1 local cooking-pot (Type CP 1); 2 large East Greek cooking-pots (eg CP 1); 1 local storage jar (Type SJ 1); 1 East Greek amphora (Type SA 1).

Locus 7–86: 1 local bowl (Type B 11); 1 local cooking-pot (Type CP 1); 1 small East Greek cooking-pot (Type eg CP 1a); 2 East Greek amphorae (Types SA 2 and CA); a hammer stone and a stopper, both of limestone.

31 The ceramic types are noted in accordance with their definition in Section C (below).
Fig. 19. General plan of Area E in Reich's excavations (after Reich 1989: Fig. 2).

Fig. 20. Area E in Reich's excavations, looking south.
On the basis of this data, it appears highly likely that Room 2 (Locus 2b–86) served as a dwelling only, as unlike the rest of the spaces, no cooking-pots were found here. Yet, one must ask if the spatial distribution documented is the pattern typical of the building over the course of its use. In order to answer this, the distribution of sherds that could be joined was examined, based upon their findspot. This survey was limited to sherds sent to the IAA by Reich at the end of the excavation.

The results achieved are displayed in Fig. 21, in which arrows indicate the links between the various assemblages where restorable fragments of vessels were found. The original location of each vessel, sherds of which were found scattered (according to the inventory list detailed above), was established based upon the assumption that this is the spot where most of the large fragments were found. The longest arrow connecting Areas E and C, presents a different case (see below).

- The first join, the easiest of all to explain, was made between the northern portion of the courtyard (Locus 6–86) and its southern portion (Locus 7–86). Several fragments of an East Greek cooking-pot from Locus 6–86 were found in nearby Locus 7–86.
- The two following joins require a more complicated explanation, as the fragments of an East Greek cooking-pot that originated in Locus 3–86 were found in the courtyard, in both Locus 6–86 and Locus 7–86. On the other hand, fragments of a Samian amphora that originated in the southern part of the courtyard (Locus 7–86) were found in Locus 3–86.
- The two following joins also require a more complex explanation. In two cases, some fragments of the vessels originating in Locus 4–86 (a local storage jar and a small Greek cooking-pot) were found in the northern part of the courtyard (Locus 6–86), which is farther from Locus 4–86 than the southern part of the courtyard (Locus 7–86).

The distribution of the sherds that could be joined would appear to illustrate the final moments of the fortress. The joins made between sherds originating in Loci 3–86 and 4–86 with ones from the northern part of the courtyard (Locus 6–86) derive, in my view, from human behaviour rather than natural factors. Because of the walls dividing these units, the sherds could not have rolled there or have been carried there by erosion (as is possible with the joins which were found among the vessels from Loci 6–86 and 7–86; as well as 3–86 and 7–86).

---

Even if the contents of the upper basket from Room 2 of Naveh’s excavation (Basket E1, Locus 2a–86) originated on the floor, it contains no cooking-pots. The basket included 1 local bowl (Type B 11); 1 heavy East Greek bowl (Type eg HB 1); 3 local storage jars (one of Type SJ 1 and the other two of Type SJ 5).
It seems probable that this distribution came as a result of activities related to the abandonment of the site, such as packing, moving objects from one place to another, lack of tidiness in the living space, etc.

- The longest arrow, connecting Locus 4–86 of Reich’s excavation with Area C in Naveh’s, relates to an amphora from the isle of Lesbos: its lid was exposed in the former place while the amphora itself was found in the latter. An examination of the baskets originating in Area C reveals that the amphora was cast upside-down into the room, as its base was found in Basket C20, and its upper part in Baskets C30, C44 and C50, at a lower level. It is surmised that the amphora was originally placed in Room 4 in Area E. This corroborates the above-mentioned assumption that the room excavated in Area C went out of use during the fortress’s existence and became a rubbish heap for the inhabitants. The fact that so much pottery was found in such a small space, contrary to the situation in similar units in other areas, also supports this assumption.

According to Montgomery’s method (room abandonment measure), which enables examination of patterns of abandonment (early or late within a particular architectonic assemblage) in accordance with the amount of artefacts uncovered in the various rooms, the situation documented for Area C fits the
pattern of a room abandoned prior to the abandonment of the other rooms of a
given assemblage (Montgomery 1993:158–159). This situation is characterized
by the discovery of a small quantity of artefacts upon the floor of the room and
at the same time, a large quantity of fill above these artefacts (ibid.: Group C).³³
The massive fill of broken pottery, as found in Area C, is direct evidence for
the discontinued use of the room and it having become a place for depositing
rubbish. Similar phenomena in closed architectural assemblages (fortified
cities, fortresses, etc.) are well known from all periods (cf. Boone 1987).

Stratigraphic Conclusions

The stratigraphic conclusions may be summarized as follows:

1. The site existed over a short period (single phase) without later settlement
(with the exception of sporadic activity by Bedouin shepherds[?] in modern
times). The absence of architectural change in the buildings (except for raising
the level of the floor in Room 4) and the uniformity of the ceramic finds (see
below), strengthen this assumption.

2. The site formation was influenced by several factors that may be identified
archaeologically. As a result, it is possible to distinguish between the different
assemblages produced in the course of excavations at Mezad Ḥashavyahu, and
to rank them on the basis of find groups, while preserving Schiffer’s (1976;
1985) terminology as follows:

A) Primary Refuse – The finds exposed in the original space in which they
were used, deposited there during the main period of the structure’s use. This
situation is not common, and in my opinion, in most cases stationary
installations integrated into the out-of-use floor, covered by the later one, are
involved. According to Schiffer (1985:24–25), primary refuse is most often
represented by small items that inhabitants of the site lost over the years.
Bearing in mind the perennial cleanup behaviour of the fortress’s inhabitants,
at least in the living spaces, one may conclude that the lost items could be found
mainly in the low traffic areas of the fortress. However, as is pointed out by
Schiffer (ibid.), in more heavily travelled parts of the structure, these artefacts
might actually be pressed into the floor’s earthen surface. At Mezad Ḥashavyahu
one may identify the primary refuse finds in the following places:

³³ See the scheme proposed by Montgomery 1993:158.
In Area A: Locus 4f [the finds upon the lower floor, including the oven. It should be noted, that if the ceramic finds upon the lower floor represent a protective guardian deposition (on this possibility, see above), they should be classified as a ritual deposit (Schiffer 1985:29)]; Locus 7e (levelling the area with a fill beneath Floor 7d). Possible lost items are: in Area C: a needle from Locus 31c?; in Area F: a bronze fibula from Locus 61d?

B) **Secondary Refuse** – The finds exposed in the original space that became a rubbish accumulation into which inhabitants intentionally threw things during the existence of the site. At Mezad Ḥashavyahu this situation is reflected in the following places:

In Area A (Locus 15); in Area S and in Area C (Locus 31c [except the lost needle?, Group A above]).

C) **De facto Refuse** – The finds left upon the floor when the site is abandoned. At Mezad Ḥashavyahu such finds were discovered in the following assemblages:

Upon floors – Area A: Loci 4c, 7c, 8c (including a clay furnace that apparently was used in metalworking), 10c, 17c; in Area B: Locus 21c; in Area E: Loci 2b–86, 3–86, 4–86, 6–86, 7–86, 9–86, 10–86, 11–86; in Area F: Locus 61d; in Area G: Locus 71c. Despite most of these artefacts having been found beneath the mudbrick collapse and having a fairly high degree of restorability, no complete vessel was found at the site. 34 This, together with the distribution of the restorable sherds documented in Area E (Fig. 21), makes it possible to define the entire assemblage of de facto refuse as abandonment refuse, related to the abandonment of the site. The principle characteristic in this situation is the waste that was left in the living spaces (Stevenson 1982). It is probable that certain groups of vessels will practically never be found in the living space that is characterized by de facto/abandonment refuse, but mainly among the secondary refuse, which represents the period of the site’s existence. The reason for this apparently lies in the fact that these were vessels of value which were taken away at the time the fortress was abandoned (see below).

D) **Post-Abandonment Uses** – A term describing the human activity within the site’s structures, following its abandonment. At Mezad Ḥashavyahu it is reflected in the construction of the heap of stones (Loci 61a/5–86) and in a single Hellenistic coin.

---

34 As already pointed out (above, footnote 17), the pottery unearthed at Mezad Ḥashavyahu was in a poor state of preservation. Reich (1989:232, n. 7) notes that in most cases it was possible to save only thick pieces of exposed vessels, such as rims, handles and bases, while some vessel walls attested during the excavation, crumbled during removal. Therefore, there is a possibility that a few complete vessels indeed were present at the site.
E) *Post-Occupational Disturbances* – The natural processes that changed the original de facto refuse. These processes are expressed primarily in finds exposed in the upper assemblages of low-lying Area A, due to the differences in elevation between it and the other parts of the fortress and the constant erosion towards the sea.

3. In view of the fact that no burnt stratum indicating destruction was found at Mezad Hashavyahu, it was proposed that the site was voluntarily abandoned (Naveh 1962b:98–99; Waldbaum and Magness 1997:38–39). On the basis of the above analysis, the abandonment may be assumed to have been orderly, a pattern referred to as “planned abandonment without anticipated return” (Stevenson 1982:255–261). The finds exposed at the site reflect a homogeneous assemblage, however it is insufficient to permit reconstruction of the behaviour patterns of the inhabitants during its existence, as it reflects only the fortress’s last moments.

**Architectural Issue**

The fortress has no architectural parallels: its unusual plan resembles none of the contemporary fortresses discovered in the Land of Israel or in neighbouring countries (Kletter 1999a:41). Assuming that the site was active under Egyptian hegemony, Na'aman (1991b:46) proposed that it was constructed following an Egyptian plan, although he did not present any Egyptian parallel.

A relatively similar structure, but from an earlier period, is Semna el-Gharb, a large Egyptian fortress in Nubia at the Second Cataract. It was first described by Clarke (1916), and excavated by a Harvard University expedition under the direction of Reisner. The results of the excavation, published later by Dunham and Janssen (1960), largely verified the preliminary conclusions of Clarke.

This fortress, while twice as big as Mezad Hashavyahu, is nonetheless similar to it in form (L-shaped), in method of construction (mudbrick walls with foundations of stone combined with buttresses) and especially in internal spatial division (Fig. 22). Still, it is not possible to directly compare these two fortresses as there is an approximate 1,300-year gap between them.

The Semna el-Gharb fortress belongs to the network of Egyptian fortifications in Nubia erected under the 12th Dynasty (Lawrence 1965) and dates to the days of Sesostris III (Dunham and Janssen 1960:5–15; see also Obsomer 1995:337–359). During the reign of Thutmose III a modest temple was constructed in the fortress and a massive rampart was erected in order to accomplish this (Clarke 1916:171; Dunham and Janssen 1960:10). Secondary use of Middle Kingdom fortresses by New Kingdom pharaohs is well known in Nubia (Lawrence 1965:88; Shaw 1991:20), although this activity is not always indicative of defensive needs, as the border shifted over the years to the Fourth Cataract.
The next phase in the history of the fortress began during the reign of Taharka (690–664 BCE) of the 25th Dynasty, who built a large temple next to the temple of Thutmose III (Clarke 1916:171; Dunham and Janssen 1960:12–13; Emery 1965:220). It appears that the fortress was still in use during the 7th century BCE, although mainly for cultic purposes; its walls were preserved and the builders of the temple of Taharka took them into consideration.

I do not claim that Mezad Ḥashavyahu was constructed following the plan of the Semna fortress. However, in the absence of other evidence, the fortress is reminiscent in style of construction and form to the Egyptian military architectural tradition. In both cases, the fortresses were constructed upon a rocky hill and their L-shaped forms were intended to facilitate their defense while taking maximum advantage of the hill’s topography (cf. Shaw 1991:21). Other Egyptian fortresses in Nubia contemporary with Semna (e.g., Buhen, ʿAniba) were constructed according to a similar plan and some bear a resemblance to the archaic Egyptian tradition at Hierakonpolis (Badawy 1966:210, n. 244).

Another explanation that regards Mezad Ḥashavyahu as an ‘Israelite’ fortress has been proposed by Hoglund (1992:182–183). The unique form of the fortress, in his opinion, derives from the fact that it was constructed in two stages. The first stage included the larger rectangle: a central courtyard surrounded by a casemate wall, similar to the ‘Israelite’ fortresses in the Negev. In the second stage, the smaller rectangle was placed adjacent to it to increase the storage area.

This explanation is not acceptable for the following reasons:

1) Aside from two floors in Room 4, no architectural changes of any sort attesting to a later addition were noted at the site.

2) There is no evidence that the larger rectangle, serving as a courtyard, was surrounded by a casemate wall, since only in two locations (Areas A and D) were rooms abutting the outer wall of the fortress found.

3) The method of construction and the thickness of the walls are uniform in both parts of the fortress. The southern wall is shared by both parts of the fortress, and no later attachment is visible on this wall. Moreover, the eastern offset in the wall is located precisely at its center, which attests to it having been part of it from the beginning, taking its present length into consideration (Fig. 5). The imaginary line dividing the larger rectangle of the first phase from the addition in the second phase in Hoglund’s reconstruction cuts this offset into two unequal parts. It is not credible that a third of the offset was constructed during the first phase and its construction completed only in the second phase.

4) According to Hoglund, the smaller rectangle was constructed for storage purposes only, however, the pottery assemblage contradicts this. Storage jars and amphorae constitute only ca. 25% of it, while the rest are bowls, kraters, cooking-pots, decanters, juglets and lamps, not a typical warehouse assemblage.
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Fig. 22. An isometric reconstruction of Semna el-Gharb, looking south (after Clarke 1916: Pl. XXXI).
The theory proposed by Hoglund should, therefore, be rejected. The plan of the fortress indicates that it was planned and constructed in a single operation. Its attribution to a particular architectural tradition remains uncertain, and it appears that its form stems from adaptation to the site's topography. Nonetheless, the great similarity between Mezad Ḥashavyahu and the Egyptian fortresses in Nubia is in line with the assumption that the fortress was constructed and operated under Egyptian rule.

C. THE FINDS

Pottery: Local and Imported Assemblages

This section will deal with describing and analyzing the ceramic finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu. It includes both discussion of typology and statistical analysis.

The discussion of typology, aimed at creating a pottery corpus, generally relates to undisturbed assemblages (cf. Gitin 1996). At a multi-layered site, only entire vessels should be relied upon, as small sherds may find their way into later assemblages (Finkelstein 1998:211). Small sherds may be included in the corpus provided that they are found in well-defined strata (floors, destruction layers, rubbish pits and homogenous fills), without later disturbances. Nonetheless, even in such cases, caution is best as sherds from earlier strata are liable to be found in later contexts for a variety of reasons.

Mezad Ḥashavyahu provides a rare opportunity to discuss an entire pottery corpus while relating to all of the finds uncovered, as it is a single stratum site that was inhabited for a short period of time. For the purposes of discussion, we have first defined the typological groups such as bowls, kraters, cooking-pots, jugs, jars, etc. Each group is divided into prototypes on the basis of vessel form (rim, body, handle and base characteristics) and finish (slip, burnish, etc.). Sometimes, sub-types also appear alongside the prototypes (cf. McClellan 1975:462–463). The finds are divided into two main assemblages: local, which included the types originating in the Land of Israel in its wider definition

---

35 A. Faust (2001) pointed out that there is a tendency toward eastward orientation in Judean structures during the Iron Age. He suggests that no functional explanation seems to account for this phenomenon, and that eastward orientation relates to the cosmological principles of the ancient Judean society. According to him, the westward orientation of Mezad Ḥashavyahu may point to an Egyptian origin (ibid.:134).

36 During the study of Mezad Ḥashavyahu's pottery assemblage, a number of petrographic analyses were conducted on selected pottery types. These analyses were made by Prof. Y. Goren in the laboratory of the Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University with assistance from the author. The results are incorporated into the individual descriptions of the types which were sampled.
Fantalkin: Mezad Ḥashavyahu

(including Judean, Northern and Coastal regions); and imported, which included the types originating mostly in the East Greek region (including Cyprus) as well as other parts of Greece and Egypt.

The Local Assemblage

Bowls – (B)\textsuperscript{37}

Type B 1 – Fig. 23:1* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:2 (e.g., ibid: Fig. 4:1).

Flat and shallow bowl with thickened, everted rim, either rounded or cut and straightened. The walls are usually straight from base to rim. In most cases, they are slipped in shades of pink or red with dense wheel-burnishing inside and/or out. The core is pink; exterior and interior are reddish buff. They are common in 8th-7th century BCE assemblages, primarily throughout Judah, but are also known in coastal regions and in the Shephelah.

Parallels: Ashdod (Ashdod I: Fig. 40:6); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:2); Gezer (Gezer III: 184–185, Type 62, Variant 2, Pl. 45:24); Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pl. 47:7; 49:3; 50:1); Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pl. 7:3); Ramat Raḥel, Stratum VA (Ramat Raḥel II: Pl. 16:1, 3–9, 14–17); ṢEn Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: 26, Fig. 15:3).

Type B 2 – Fig. 23:2* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:5.

Flat, shallow bowl, with a plain rim, slightly rounded on top, and two grooves on its exterior. It is slipped in shades of pink or red and densely wheel-burnished inside and/or out. The core is grey; exterior and interior are reddish brown. It is common during the 8th-7th centuries BCE, particularly in Judah and the Shephelah.

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VB/VA (Gezer III: 201, Type 80, Pl. 24:7); Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pl. 7:26); ṢEn Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 14:16).

Type B 3 – Fig. 23:3.

Flat, shallow bowl, with delicately formed rim, slightly flattened and everted at the upper end. It has thin walls, slightly carinated in the middle, and it is red-slipped inside and out. The core is pink; exterior and interior are reddish buff. It may be generally dated to the 8th–7th centuries BCE horizon throughout Judah and the Shephelah.

Parallels: Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pls. 16:24, 18:9).

\textsuperscript{37} A very small fragment of a local red-slipped platter(?) was found in Basket A185 (Fig. 23:22), however due to its size, it was not included in the comparative and statistical study.
FIGURE 23. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: BOWLS AND CUP-AND-SAUCER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>A75</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>A62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.*</td>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>7e</td>
<td>A73</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>B 5</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>G17</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:6/60–395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>B 6</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A123</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:8/60–391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>B 6a</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:20/60–394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>B 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>B 7a</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.*</td>
<td>B 8</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.*</td>
<td>B 9</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C27</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:7/60–390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.*</td>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>A194</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.*</td>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.*</td>
<td>B 11</td>
<td>10c</td>
<td>A26</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>B 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>A18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.*</td>
<td>B 12</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.*</td>
<td>B 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.*</td>
<td>B 14</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A243</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>B 15</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.*</td>
<td>C&amp;S</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>A195</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Type B 4 – Fig. 23:4* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:3._

Rounded, shallow bowl with an everted ledge rim. Its walls could have a slight carination in the middle. It is slipped in shades of pink and densely wheel-burnished inside and/or out. The core is brown with small white grits; exterior and interior are red. Prevalent during the 8th-7th centuries BCE, they are particularly common in Judah.


_Type B 5 – Fig. 23:5* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:6._

Bowl with carination beneath everted rim, with a flat base. Although published by Naveh as unslipped, remains of a red slip are visible on the outside and rim. The core is brown-pink; exterior and interior are red. This type is known from the Phoenician sphere and is widespread mainly on the northern coast from the late 8th into the 7th centuries BCE (for a chronological summary, see Dor IB: 3).
Fig. 23. Local pottery assemblage: bowls and cup-and-saucer.
Its presence in Stratum VII at Tell Qasile (Tell Qasile II: 109, Fig. 55.25) attests to its continued existence in the second half of the 7th century as well.38

Parallels: Ras el-Bassit, Phase 7, Assemblage E (Braemer 1986:234, Fig. 5:25); Al-Mina, from Level VII–V (Taylor 1959: Fig. 6:24); Dor, Area A, Phase 9 (Dor IB: 3, Type BL 5b, Fig. 1.3:8); Tell Keisan, Stratum 5 (Tell Keisan: 170–171, Pl. 40:1–5).

**Type B 6** – Fig. 23:6* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:8.

Deep bowl with plain, pointed, slightly everted rim; flat or ring base, with sharp carination at the lower part of the walls. The core is brown-pink; exterior and interior are reddish-brown. It is dated to the end of the Iron Age and is particularly common on the southern coast, in the Shephelah and in Judah.

Parallels: Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:4, 9); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 16:3); Jerusalem, Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: Fig. 4:27); Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pls. 2:40, 7:21, 10:16).

**Sub-type B 6a** – Fig. 23:7* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:20.

This has been defined as a separate sub-type only because its base differs from other bowl bases. It is probably a variant of Type B 6.

**Type B 7** – Fig. 23:8–9.

Rounded, shallow bowl, with thickened, everted rim, triangular in section. The most distinctive feature is the thick groove below the rim. The core is grey with many white grits; exterior and interior are brownish. It is common during the 8th-7th centuries BCE, primarily in Judah.

Parallels: Jerusalem, Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: Fig. 5:1, 3–4); Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pl. 2:25); 'En Gedi, Clark Collection (En-Gedi: Fig. 29:3).

**Sub-type B 7a** – Fig. 23:10.

Rounded, shallow bowl with minor carination at the center of the walls and a thickened, everted rim. There is a similarity between this type and Type B7. However, it was designated as a sub-type and presented separately because of the difference in rim and the absence of a groove under the rim, which occurs in Type B 7. The core is dark grey; exterior and interior are brownish. It is common during the 8th-7th centuries BCE, primarily in Judah.

Parallels: Jerusalem, Ophel (Ophel: Pl. 7:4); Jerusalem, Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: Fig. 2.5–6); 'En Gedi, Clark Collection (En-Gedi: Fig. 29:2).

---

38 Although the rim of the bowl from Tell Qasile is not like Type B 5, its general form is identical to this type. The bowls from Tell Keisan, similar to Type B 5, strengthen the assumption that this type existed throughout the 7th century BCE (cf. Tell Keisan: 177).
Type B 8 – Fig. 23:11* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:18.

Very delicate, small bowl with plain, thin rim, rounded sides, and disc or ring base. The core is grey; exterior and interior are pink. It is common during the 8th-7th century BCE, particularly in Judah.

Parallels: Jerusalem, Ophel excavations (Ophel: Pl. 2:39); En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: 26, Fig. 15:9).

Type B 9 – Fig. 23:12* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:7.

Small, rounded bowl with folded and thickened everted rim, creating a significant groove on the exterior. The core is reddish-brown; exterior and interior are brownish-yellow. It is common at the end of the Iron Age, primarily in the southern Coastal Plain and in the Shephelah.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VIIIB (Ashdod IV: 34, Fig. 19:5, Pl. 19:2); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig.16:3); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:7).

Type B 10 – Fig. 23:13*-14* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:11, 13.

Bowl with rounded body and slight carination below thickened, outward-folded rim, creating a kind of groove below the lip. The core is dark grey with white grits; exterior and interior are brownish. It is common during the 8th–7th centuries BCE in the north and in the Coastal Plain.

Parallels: Hazor, Strata VA and IV (Hazor I: Pls. LXIII:7, LXXV:3; Hazor II: Pls. LXXXI:25, XCVIII:10); Dor, Area A, Phase 9 (Dor Ib: Fig. 1.4:6); Samaria, Period VII (Samaria III: Fig. 11:2, 6); Tell Keisan, Strata V/IV (Tell Keisan: Pls. 30:1, 41:3); Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (Tell Qasile II: Fig. 55:18); Ashdod, Stratum VI (Ashdod II-III: Fig. 52:26).

Type B 11 – Fig. 23:15* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:12; Fig. 23:16.

Rounded bowl with slight carination below folded rim. The core is grey or brown with many small white grits; exterior and interior are yellowish-buff. At Mezad Ḥashavyahu this type is unslipped. It is common during the 8th-7th centuries BCE in all parts of the Land of Israel, but mainly in Judah (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 168–172, Type 50, folded rim tradition).

Parallels: Ramat Rahel, Stratum V (Ramat Rahel I: Fig. 28:22–27); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1994: Fig. 2.13:5).

Type B 12 – Fig. 23:17* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:4.

Rounded bowl with folded and thickened rim, grooved on the exterior; some have a double fold that creates a rim with two grooves and a protruding ridge between them. There is a slight carination at the midpoint of the walls.
Sometimes traces of yellow or reddish slip occur on its outer surface. The core is grey; exterior and interior are reddish-brown. This type, like the previous one, belongs to the folded rim tradition, and is common during the 8th–7th centuries BCE in Judah and the Shephelah.

Parallels: Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pl. 47:16).

**Type B 13** – Fig. 23:18* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:9.

Rounded bowl with folded, slightly inverted rim, characterized by a triangular profile. It is usually red-slipped and wheel-burnished inside and out. The core is grey; exterior and interior are pink. It is common throughout the entire 7th century BCE, both in the Shephelah and in Judah (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 195, Type 71).

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VA (ibid.: Pl. 27:28); Ramat Rahel, Stratum VB (Ramat Rahel II: Fig. 35:7), Stratum VA (ibid.: Fig. 17:38); Tell en-Naṣbeh, water cistern 370 (Wampler 1941: Fig. 4:x165).

**Type B 14** – Fig. 23:19* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:10.

Large bowl with thickened, inverted rim and pronounced carination below the rim. Red-slipped and wheel-burnished inside and/or out. The core is reddish-brown or gray with small white grits; exterior and interior are buff. According to Gitin, such a cyma-shaped folded rim type occurs only in the 7th-6th centuries BCE (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 199, Type 76). It is widespread mainly in Judah.

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VA (ibid.: Pl. 27:27); Ramat Rahel (Ramat Rahel I: Fig. 11:9; Ramat Rahel II: Fig. 18:6); En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 16:3).

**Type B 15** – Fig. 23:20.

Rounded deep bowl with thickened, inverted rim, with flat upper edge. The core is dark grey; exterior and interior are brownish-grey. Generally it may be dated to the 8th–7th centuries BCE horizon.

Parallels: Jerusalem, Ophel excavations (Ophel: Pls. 9:14, 18:15)

**Cup-and-Saucer – (C&S)**

**Type C&S** – Fig. 23:21* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:19.

Such vessels first appear during the Late Bronze Age and existed until the end of the Iron Age. According to Stern, they are more widespread during the first part of Iron II, particularly in the north (for their distribution in the north, see Tel Mevorakh I: 51, n. 17). Still, their presence in Judean assemblages from
the 8th–7th centuries BCE, such as Jerusalem or Lachish, indicate a broader
distribution. Their function is not clear, however they are commonly connected
with cult (ibid.). At Mezād Ḥashavyahu, only one vessel of this type was found.
Parallels: Tell Keisan, Stratum 6 (Tell Keisan: Pl. 49:8); Ashdod Stratum VII
(Ashdod II-III: Fig. 58:28); Samaria (Samaria III: Fig. 27:7–11); Lachish, Levels
II-III (Lachish III: Pl. 81:116); Jerusalem, Ophel excavations (Ophel: Pl. 3:8);
Jerusalem, Armenian Garden excavations (Jerusalem I: Fig. 1:33); Jerusalem,
Ketef Hinnom (Barkay 1985:269–270, Fig. 126:9).

Heavy Bowls – (HB)

Type HB 1 – Fig. 24:1* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:15.

Rounded, large, heavy bowl, with thickened, folded rim, slightly inverted.
The core is brown; exterior and interior are yellowish-brown. Similar bowls are
common in the 8th–7th centuries BCE horizon throughout different parts of the
Land of Israel (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 176, Type
57, Variant 5).
Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod II-III: 35, Fig. 94:3; Ashdod IV: 35,
Fig. 19:13); Jerusalem, Ophel excavations (Ophel: Pl. 10:18); Beersheba, Stratum
II (Beer-Sheba I: Pl. 72:11).

Type HB 2 – Fig. 24:2* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:14.

Carinated, large, heavy bowl, with thickened, inverted rim. Characterized by
sharp carination beginning below the loop-handle that extends from the rim.
Burnished interior; the core is gray with medium white grits; exterior and
interior are buff. Numerous variations of this type are common in the 8th–7th
centuries BCE horizon throughout different parts of the Land of Israel.
Parallels: Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (Tell Qasile II: Fig. 56:2); En Gedi, Stratum
V (En-Gedi: 26–27, Fig. 16:5, not an exact parallel, but the shape is similar).

Kraters – (K)

Type K 1 – Fig. 24:3.

Straight-sided krater with carination at midpoint of body and thickened rim.
The core is dark-brown with medium white grits; exterior and interior are
brownish-red.

Sub-type K 1a – Fig. 24:4.

Similar tradition to the previous specimen. However, its walls are extended
at the midpoint of the body.
FIGURE 24. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: HEAVY BOWLS AND KRATERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>HB 1</td>
<td>21c</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:15/60–395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>HB 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>K 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>K 1a</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>G25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>K 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>K 3</td>
<td>21c</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:9/60–398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>K 4</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A166</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type K 2 – Fig. 24:5.

Large, massive krater, with thickened, inverted rim. Below it, on the vessel exterior, are two ridges with a wide groove between them. Massive loop-handles extend from the rim. The core is brownish with medium white grits; exterior and interior are orange-red. Petrographic examination indicates that it is made of marl originating in the Moza formation combined with dolomitic sand, i.e., locally produced (cf. Goren 1996:51).

Parallels: Dor, Area A, Phase 9 (Dor 1b: Type BA 3a, Fig. 1.7:10), dated by the excavators as 720–650/30 BCE (ibid.:15). At Dor such a vessel was labelled as a basin, perhaps due to its dimensions.

Type K 3 – Fig. 24:6* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:9, Pl. 12 G.

Krater with a thickened and folded everted rim, two loop-handles extend from it to the body. It is bag-shaped, since the walls are slightly inclined inward. The core is brown with medium white grits; exterior and interior are yellowish-brown.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod II-III: Fig. 57:1). This parallel is not precise, since the folded rim is slightly inverted. In other details, the similarity is greater. It should be noted that another comparable example comes from Lachish, Level V (Zimhoni 1997:107, Fig. 3.31:7), dated at the latest to the 9th century BCE horizon (ibid.:173).

Type K 4 – Fig. 24:7* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:9.

Krater with a ledge rim and carinated upper wall. The core is yellow with small white grits; exterior and interior are pink-buff. The sole example from Mezad Hashavyahu exhibits traces of red slip on its outer surface. It has a limited distribution through the 8th-7th century BCE, mostly in the southern Coastal Plain and the Shephelah.
Fig. 24. Local pottery assemblage: heavy bowls and kraters.
Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VIII (*Ashdod II-III*: Fig. 40:7); Gezer, Stratum VA (*Gezer III*: 210, Type 97E, Pl. 28:6); Jerusalem, Armenian Garden excavations (*Jerusalem I*: Fig. 11:4–5); Lachish, Level II (Zimhoni 1997: Fig. 5.32:1); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (*En-Gedi*: Fig. 15:12). In the three latter examples, the parallels are not entirely accurate and relate mainly to the rim of the vessel. Thus, the rim and neck of the kraters from Lachish and ‘En Gedi appear identical to our Type K 4, though the body is globular and not carinated like our specimen.

**Type K 5** – Fig. 25:1* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:8; Fig. 25:2.

Krater with globular body, without neck or shoulder. The rim is ledge-like and everted, slightly sunken at its base, creating a groove between it and the interior of the vessel. The core is grey with small white grits; exterior and interior are brownish or reddish. It is common mostly in the 7th century BCE in the southern Coastal Plain and the Shephelah.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VIII (*Ashdod II-III*: Fig. 47:5); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 16:10); Ekron, Stratum IB (*Naveh 1958*: Fig. 5:7; Gitin 1994: Fig. 2.13:15); Gezer, Stratum VA (*Gezer III*: 208, Type 94, Pl. 28:5).

**Cooking-pots** – (CP)\(^39\)

**Type CP 1** – Fig. 25:3*–5* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:1–3.

Cooking-pot with everted grooved rim; the body is slightly squat, with rounded carination. Metallic-type fabric; the core is grey with small and large white grits; the exterior and interior are brown. A clearly Judean type that is widespread through the entire 7th century BCE (Aharoni and Aharoni 1976:85, Fig. 6:3; 87, Fig. 7:3; 89, Fig. 8:3), and is also found in the Shephelah and on the coast.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (*Ashdod I*: Fig. 40:19), Stratum VI (*Ashdod II-III*: Fig. 55:20), Gezer, Stratum VA (*Gezer III*: 220, Type 106, Pl. 27:11–14); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 17:2); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:12); Jerusalem, Armenian Garden excavations (*Jerusalem I*: 18, Fig. 4:7); Ramat Rahel, Stratum V (*Ramat Rahel II*: Pl. 47:19–20); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (*En-Gedi*: 28, Fig. 18).

**Type CP 2** – Fig. 25:6* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:4.

Cooking-pot characterized by a high rim with a sharp upper ridge. The core is grey; exterior and interior are reddish-brown. Referred to as ‘Coastal’, but also known in the Shephelah and even in the North (with an example from Tel Dan)

\(^{39}\) It is noteworthy that cooking-pots of a clearly Judean southern type (a deep pot with a high ridged neck, distinct from the body, in which the width and height are nearly equal, cf. Amiran 1969:227–232, Pl. 76:15–17), are not present at Mezad Ḥashavyahu.
and found only in the strata dated to the end of the 7th century BCE. Petrographic examination conducted on one of these cooking-pots from Mezad Ḥashavyahu showed that it consist of hamra soil of local origin.

Parallels: Tel Dan, Stratum I (Pakman 1992:234, Fig. 4:7); Ashdod, Stratum VII/VI (Ashdod I: Fig. 41:12; Ashdod II-III: Fig. 55:4), Stratum VI (ibid.: Fig. 55:1); Ashkelon, Babylonian destruction layer (Stager 1996a: Fig. 3 in the middle); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 17:1); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:13); Lachish, under the foundations of the ‘Solar Shrine’ (Lachish V: Pl. 51:13).

Sub-type CP 2a – Fig. 25:7.

Variant of the previous type, differentiated from it by its smaller dimensions and a body that is less globular.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod II-III: Fig. 50:7); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:16).

Type CP 3 – Fig. 25:8.

Cooking-pot with globular body and vertical, slightly inverted rim. The core is grey; exterior and interior are brown. Parallels occur in pre-7th century BCE assemblages. Nonetheless, as the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu constitute a closed assemblage, it may be assumed to have continued to the end of the Iron Age. It should be noted that the identification of this vessel as a cooking-pot with two handles is uncertain, owing to its state of preservation, and, there is a possibility that it should be reconstructed as a large cooking jug.

Parallels: Tel Mevorakh, Stratum VIII (Tel Mevorakh I: 49, Fig. 13:14–15).

Storage jars – (SJ)

Type SJ I – Fig. 25:9* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:15; Fig. 25:10–12 (e.g., Reich 1989: Fig. 4:12).

Flat-shouldered biconical storage jar that narrows to a pointed base. The rim is thickened and short; the shoulder creates a sharp angle with the sides. Two ridged loop-handles extend from the edge of the shoulder to the body. Generally characterized by well-fired clay, it ranges in colour between brown and orange, with various sized grits, sometimes accompanied by reddish-brown ochre.40

---

40 Petrographic examination conducted on a storage jar of this type from Tel Michal showed it to be a local product of the Carmel Coastal Plain (Tel Michal: 264, 266, Fig. 9.3:7); an examination of these vessels from Apollonia showed their local Coastal Plain origin (Taqiya formation with dolomitic chalk and sand) (Apollonia-Arsuf I: 187, Table 4.10:28, 40). Based on Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA), on the other hand, the excavators of Tell el-Ḥesi claimed that a large number of examples of this type that they sampled
FIGURE 25. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: KRATERS, COOKING-POTS AND STORAGE JARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>K 5</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>K 5</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.*</td>
<td>CP 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A112</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.*</td>
<td>CP 1a</td>
<td>21c</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:2/60–405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>CP 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A204</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>CP 2</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A118</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CP 2a</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CP 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.*</td>
<td>SJ 1</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SJ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SJ 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>SJ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>A179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is one of the predominant storage jars occurring in the Land of Israel from the 8th century BCE to the Early Hellenistic period (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 73, 229–231, Type 122; Apollonia-Arsuf I: 103–104).

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod IV: 36, Fig. 22:2); Stratum VII/VI (Ashdod I: 143, Fig. 41:26); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 18:8–9).

**Type SJ 2** – Fig. 26:1–2.

Similar to the previous one, but with a short, straight neck. According to Gitin, this type first appeared during the 7th-6th centuries BCE.

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VA (Gezer III: 124–125, Type 5c, Pl. 26:19); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 18:5); Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pl. 50:10); Migdol (Oren 1984: Fig. 21:2, 4).

**Type SJ 2a** – Fig. 26:3.

Variant of the previous type, however, the rim is straighter and the vessel’s dimensions are larger.

**Type SJ 3** – Fig. 26:4 (e.g., Reich 1989: Fig. 4:16).

A very short neck, slightly inclined inwards, ending with a thickened rim. Occasionally, there is red-slip on the body. It generally resembles the bell-shaped examples from Gezer, Stratum VB/VA (Gezer III: 145, Type 18, Pl. 23:4).

originated in Lebanon (Tell el-Hesi III: 207–210). It is noteworthy that in all these cases, Persian period vessels were sampled.
Fig. 25. Local pottery assemblage: kraters, cooking-pots and storage jars.
However, since only upper fragments of these vessels were preserved at Mezad Hashavyahu, they may have a sack-shaped body as well.

_Type SJ 4 – Fig. 26:5._

Elongated body, without shoulder or neck. The everted rim is crescent-shaped. Petrographic analysis of the vessel from Mezad Hashavyahu showed that the clay consists of _terra rossa_ with various grits apparently originating in the Shephelah. According to Gitin, it is most common at the end of the 7th century and beginning of the 6th century BCE (for expanded summary and parallels, see _Gezer III:_ 144).

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VA (_Gezer III:_ 144, Type 14, Pl. 26:1).

_Type SJ 5 – Fig. 26:6* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:14 (e.g., Reich 1989: Fig. 4:13)._ 

A straight-necked storage jar with a straight rim, slightly thickened on its upper part. The body is cylindrical, narrowing toward its pointed base. The shoulder is carinated, but rounded, creating a sharp angle with the side (however, less sharp than Types SJ 1 and SJ 2). Two ridged loop-handles extend from the edge of the shoulder to the body. It is generally characterized by well-fired clay ranging in colour between dark and light brown, with large white grits varying in size. It is common in the 7th century BCE, particularly in Judah, in the Shephelah and on the Coastal Plain.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (_Ashdod II-III:_ Fig. 57:4); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 18:6); Gezer, Stratum VA (_Gezer III:_ 141, Type 13D, Pl. 26:11); Lachish, Level II (_Lachish III:_ Pl. 94:479; _Lachish V:_ Pl. 49:11); Tell en-Naṣbeh, water cistern 361 (Wampler 1941: Fig. 11:x33); En Gedi, Stratum V (_En-Gedi:_ Fig. 22:1).

_Sub-type SJ 5a – Fig. 26:7* = Reich 1989: Fig. 4:14._

Variant of the previous type, with slightly folded rim.

_Type SJ 6 – Fig. 26:8–9._

Jar with everted rim, elongated body, without shoulder or neck. The everted rim creates a prominent groove between it and the body. The core is brown with many medium white grits; exterior and interior are reddish.

_Type SJ 7 – Fig. 26:10._

Jar with everted ledge rim, thickened in its lower portion; elongated body, without shoulder or neck. The core is grey; exterior and interior are brownish.
Type SJ 8 – Fig. 26:11.

Jar with thickened everted rim, elongated body, without shoulder or neck. The core is grey with white grits; exterior and interior are reddish. According to Gitin, similar types appeared as early as the 8th century BCE, although at Gezer it existed only at the end of the 7th century and the beginning of the 6th century BCE (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 144, Type 15, Pl. 26:3).

Type SJ 9 – Fig. 26:12.

Jar with straight, vertical rim characterized by several grooves creating a sort of double fold; elongated body. The core is dark grey; exterior and interior are brownish.

Type SJ 10 – Fig. 26:13* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:10.

Reminiscent in form of a holemouth storage jar with recessed rim, but as it has two large loop-handles extending from slightly below the upper edge of the body, it is defined as a storage jar. The core is yellow with tiny white grits; exterior and interior are reddish-buff.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod IV: 36, Fig. 23:3).

Holemouth Jars – (HM)

The holemouth jar group is represented at Mezad Ḥashavyahu by two main types. This group is rarely found in the north, while in Judah there are several variants. Petrographic analysis of Type HM 1 (published in Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:11) revealed it to be of Moza formation clay mixed with terra rossa.

Type HM 1 – Fig. 26:14* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:11.

A holemouth jar with ridged rim and elongated body. The core is grey; exterior and interior are brown-buff. According to Aharoni and Aharoni (1976:83) this type was replaced during the 7th century by a vessel with a plain rim. A. Mazar pointed out that this is perhaps true only for certain areas of Judah, but in the Shephelah and on the coast, the ridged holemouth jars continue through the entire 7th century BCE (Tell Qasile II: 110, n. 16). In view of the parallels, this view appears correct.

Parallels: Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (Tell Qasile II: Fig. 57:7–13); Ashdod, Stratum VIII (Ashdod II–III: Fig. 51:4–6); Stratum VII (Ashdod IV: Fig. 27:4–5); Gezer, Stratum VA (Gezer III: 132–134, Type 11E, Pl. 26:23–25); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 19:2); Ekron, Strata IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.12:3); Beersheba, Stratum II (Beer-Sheba I: Pls. 70:2; 73:1–3).
FIGURE 26. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: STORAGE JARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SJ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SJ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SJ 2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>BI-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SJ 3</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SJ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>SJ 5</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>SJ 5a</td>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>Reich 1989: Fig. 4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SJ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SJ 6</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SJ 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SJ 8</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>SJ 9</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.*</td>
<td>SJ 10</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>A32</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.*</td>
<td>HM 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A133</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:11/60–407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.*</td>
<td>HM 2</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A159</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.*</td>
<td>HM 2</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A142</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type HM 2 – Fig. 26:15*–16* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:12–13.

The most common type in the holemouth jar category, characterized by a relatively large number of variants. It is particularly widespread in Judah in the 7th century BCE, but also in the Shephelah and the coast, and even in Transjordan (for expanded summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 135).

Decanters – (D)

Decanters are widespread during the Iron Age, both in the north and the south (Amiran 1969:259), but, with a clear difference between the two geographic areas. All decanters excavated at Mezad Hashavyahu (except Type D 4) belong to the southern type, characteristic mainly of 7th century BCE Judah and the Shephelah, however, they appear in earlier assemblages as well. This type has a flaring rim, sometimes thickened and rounded, sometimes axe-shaped; a wide, often double-ridged handle is attached from a sharp ridge at the centre of the neck to the lower part of the shoulder. Some examples have a clumsy, broad body, while others are elongated and tall and may be asymmetrical; all of them end in a small ring-base. The decanter is usually made of a hard fabric consisting of grey or reddish clay, which may contain small iron oxide grits. The outer surface is either unslipped, red- or grey-slipped. The difference in rims makes further classification possible within this type.
Fig. 26. Local pottery assemblage: storage jars.
The petrographic examinations carried out on decanters from the burial cave at el-Arub near Hebron and from Ḥorvat ‘Anim, similar to those from Meẓad Hashavyahu, point to local (Judean) production and may be divided into three main groups:

1. those made of marl originating in the Moza formation, mixed with dolomitic sand.
2. those made of marl originating in the Moza formation mixed with terra rossa and chalky sand.
3. those made of terra rossa clay with various additions, including grits from the Shephelah region (Yezerski 1997:27, and see more details there).

_TYPE D 1_ – Fig. 27:1.

Flaring, thickened and rounded rim. An obviously Judean type, it appears in the 7th century BCE on the coast and in the Shephelah as well.

Parallels: Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (Tell Qasile II: Fig. 57:16–19); Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pls. 49:5, 50:3); Jerusalem, excavations at Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: Fig. 2:10–11); Arad, Strata VII-VI (Aharoni and Aharoni 1976: Fig. 7:8); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 31:3).

_TYPE D 2_ – Fig. 27:2; Fig. 27:3* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:16.

Flaring, outwardly protruding rim. Dating and distribution same as Type D 1.

Parallels: Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pls. 47:26, 50:5); Beersheba, Stratum II (Beer-Sheba I: Pl. 62:19).

_SUB-TYPE D 2a_ – Fig. 27:4.

Variant of Type D 2 with a more delicate, outwardly lapped rim creating an obvious groove between it and the outside of the neck. It is made of reddish clay.

Parallels: Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pl. 50:14; Zimhoni 1997: Fig. 5.34:3).

_SUB-TYPE D 2b_ – Fig. 27:5.

Similar to the former, however, the edge of the rim is different, the neck flares upward (contrary to the straight neck of Sub-type D 2a), and the ridge on the neck where the handle attaches is very close to the beginning of the body. It is made of greyish clay.

_TYPE D 3_ – Fig. 27:6*–8* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:14–15, 17.

Similar to Type D 2, but with a very narrow, elongated body and neck.

Parallels: Gezer, Stratum VA (Gezer III: 153–154, Type 33, Pl. 25:11); Jerusalem, excavations at Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: Fig. 2:12); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 20:2).
Type D 4 – Fig. 27:9*-10* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:10–11.

Special vessels which may be referred to as ‘small decanters’. Naveh published them as juglets with parallels from Rhodes and Vroulia, though in his opinion, they originated in the east. Petrographic examination verified this: they are made of Moza formation clay with dolomitic sand. The similarity between this type and the so-called Sidonian bottles (Culican 1975) should be noted. This type appears to be at home in the 7th century BCE on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea (for additional parallels, see Lehmann 1996:401, Form 221).

Jugs – (Jg)

Type Jg 1 – Fig. 27:11* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:6.

Characterized by a ridge below the rim, which is sometimes trefoil. Broad neck and handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. The core is grey with white grits; exterior and interior are brown. It is widespread in Judah and in the Shephelah during the entire 7th century and the beginning of the 6th century BCE, and probably appeared even earlier.

Parallels: Beth Shemesh (Bunimovitz and Lederman 1997:47, lower photograph); Jerusalem, excavations at Armenian Garden (Jerusalem I: 19, Fig. 4:17); Lachish, Level II (Lachish V: Pl. 50:13); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 20:7).

Type Jg 2 – Fig. 27:12* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:7.

The rim is straight, pointed at the outside edge and cut down toward the interior. Broad neck and handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. The core is grey; exterior and interior are buff. It is particularly widespread on the southern coast and in the Shephelah.

Parallels: Ashdod, Stratum VIII (Ashdod II-III: Fig. 46:103); Ruqueish, Phases IV–III (Oren et al. 1986:87, upper photograph from the left); Gezer, Stratum VA (Gezer III: Pl. 45:4).

Juglets – (Jgl)

Type Jgl 1 – Fig. 27:13 (e.g., Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:5).

Small juglet with a rim which is generally straight, but sometimes slightly inverted, globular body, narrow neck and handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. The core is brown; exterior and interior are reddish buff. This is a typical Judean vessel of the 7th century BCE.

Parallels: ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: 28, Fig. 19:1–5).
FIGURE 27. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: DECANTERS, JUGS AND JUGLETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A205</td>
<td>/60–408b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>D 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A225</td>
<td>/60–408c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.*</td>
<td>D 2</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>D 2a</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>D 2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>A117</td>
<td>/60–408d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>D 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A128</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>D 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td>D 3</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.*</td>
<td>D 4</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A203</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:10/60–411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.*</td>
<td>D 4</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>A70</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:11/60–410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.*</td>
<td>Jg 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A223</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.*</td>
<td>Jg 2</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A205</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:7/60–408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Jgl 1</td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>A72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Jgl 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Type Jgl 2 – Fig. 27:14 (e.g., Reich 1989: Fig. 4:17).

Small juglet with splayed rim, globular body, narrow neck and handle extending from the rim to the shoulder. The core is brown; the exterior and interior are pinkish. It is common in the coastal region, Shephelah and Judah during the 7th century BCE.

Parallels: Tell Qasile (Tell Qasile II: 110, Fig. 57:21); Ashdod, Stratum VII (Ashdod II-III: Fig. 56:12); ‘En Gedi, Clark Collection (En-Gedi: Fig. 30:1–6).

Lamps – (L)

The lamps are divided into two main groups on the basis of their form and the colour of their clay, and in each group there are examples of different sizes. Their distribution is somewhat distinct: Type L 1 is common both in the north and in the south, while Type L 2 is largely represented in southern (Judean) assemblages (Amiran 1969:291), though known in smaller quantities in the north as well. The lamps date to the second half of the 7th century and beginning of the 6th century BCE. Petrographic examinations undertaken on the lamps from Ḥorvat ʿAnim, from Mamilla and from a cave at Tel Ḥalif, which are similar to Type L 2 here, demonstrated that they were produced throughout Judah (Yezerski 1997:27).
Fig. 27. Local pottery assemblage: decanters, jugs and juglets.
**Type L 1** – Fig. 28:1*–2* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:19–20.

An open lamp with a broad, flat and elevated base and emphasized rim, made of pink clay.

Parallels: Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 19:6); 'En Gedi, Stratum V (*En-Gedi*: 35, Fig. 23:1–4). For additional parallels, see Lehmann 1996:446, Form 425.

**Type L 2** – Fig. 28:3*–4* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:18, 21.

An open lamp with a high, heavy disc base and emphasized rim, made of brownish-orange clay.

Parallels: Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (*Tell Qasile II*: Fig. 57:23–25); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 19:7); Lachish, Level II (*Lachish III*: 285–286, Pl. 83:153; *Lachish V*: Pl. 48:3–4); Jerusalem, excavations at Ophel (*Ophel*: 67, Pl. 3:4–6); 'En Gedi, Stratum V (*En-Gedi*: 35, Fig. 23:8–9). For additional parallels, see Lehmann 1996:446–447, Form 426.

**Sub-type L 2a** – Fig. 28:5.

Resembling Type L 2, however, with a lower, lighter base.

Parallels: Lachish, Level II (*Lachish V*: Pl. 48:2); 'En Gedi, Stratum V (*En-Gedi*: 35, Fig. 23:5–7).

**The Imported Assemblages: East Greek and Egyptian**

**The East Greek assemblage**

The bulk of the imported types belongs to the so-called East Greek pottery. Its origins are attributed by most scholars to a group of islands in the eastern Aegean Sea and the western Anatolian coast (see an up-to-date summary in Cook and Dupont 1998), although it has also been suggested that some of the types originate on the southern Anatolian or north Syrian coast (Lehmann 2000). The East Greek pottery uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu is varied and includes various types such as bowls, cups, kraters, cooking-pots, oinochoai, amphorae and lamps, and the parallels to them have primarily been found in assemblages dated to the end of the 7th – beginning of the 6th century BCE.

**East Greek Bowls – (eg B)**

**Type eg B 1** – Fig. 28:6* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:15.

A shallow carinated bowl with thin walls and ring base. Black stripes are

---

41 In addition to the main East Greek assemblage, a possible Corinthian aryballos found at Mezad Hashavyahu should be noted (and see below).
painted upon the delicate rim, the upper part of which is slightly straightened and everted. Red bands occasionally appear on the outside of the vessel. The core is brown; the exterior and interior is buff.

Parallels: Tocra (Tocra I: 50, Fig. 26:654; Tocra II: 30, Fig. 14:2057).

**Ionian Cups – (IC)**

The term ‘Ionian cups’ relates to a rather broad group of open drinking vessels with two horizontal, slightly uplifted handles, which first appear toward the end of the 7th century BCE. In early research, it was proposed that their origin is from the island of Rhodes (Hanfmann 1956). Based upon the great variety of styles in this family and petrographic and NAA examination, they are today commonly attributed to several production centers, foremost of which are Miletus and Samos (Catling and Shipley 1989; Kerschner 1997:193–194, 212–213; Cook and Dupont 1998:129–131; von Schlotzhauer 1999). The division into the various types within this family is still incomplete, as a result of which there are at least 14 different typological classification systems. Recently, an attempt was made to create a kind of concordance of all of the known systems (Catling and Shipley 1989:197–199, Table 1). This, together with new information from Ephesus (Kerschner 1997) and Miletus (von Schlotzhauer 1999) will probably eventually lead to creation of a single typology acceptable to all.

The discussion below will relate mainly to the three accepted classification systems, which, being very specific, constitute the broadest basis for comparison. They were proposed on the basis of the results of excavation at the following sites: Megara Hyblaea (Villard and Vallet 1955), Tocra (Tocra I: 111–134; Tocra II: 55–58) and Tell Sukas (Sukas II: 27–38).

**Type IC 1** – Fig. 28:7* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:12.

A thin cup (pottery known as eggshell ware), black-slipped interior and exterior. Characterized particularly by a decoration consisting of three white-red-white stripes painted over the slip on the exterior, on the interior of the rim and below the handles on both sides of the body.

---

42 It should be noted that the preservation of the rims of several Ionian cups does not enable us to attribute them to any typological group. These vessels have been included in the statistical study under the code IC (−).

43 Local parallels for Ionian cups are rare, and the published information about them is often incomplete. As a result, the local parallels mentioned here relate only to published types. From the summary of Waldbaum and Magness (1997), one learns that additional types were found at Ashkelon, Ekron and Tel Batash, however it was not possible to establish their typological attribution as full information about them has not yet been published. Another Ionian cup, found at Netiv Ha-Asara (ca. 15 km. southeast of Ashkelon) Stratum III, dated to Iron III (Yasur-Landau and Shavit 1999:81*) has not yet been fully published.
FIGURE 28. LOCAL POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: LAMPS; IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: IONIAN CUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>G47</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:19/60–402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A198</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:20/60–403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.*</td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A156</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:18/60–404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.*</td>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C21</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 5:21/60–401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>L 2a</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>A199</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>IC 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A106</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A181</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>A111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>IC 3</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:5/60–1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.*</td>
<td>IC 4</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.*</td>
<td>IC 5</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.*</td>
<td>IC 5</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallels: Megara Hyblaea (Villard and Vallet 1955: Type A 1); Tocra (Tocra I: 112, 120, Rhodian Type III, Fig. 55:1194); Tel Sukas (Sukas II: 29, Group 2, Pl. V:102).

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Ashkelon, Babylonian destruction layer (Stager 1996a:67*, Fig. 12, upper left; Waldbaum and Magness 1997: Fig. 3, lower); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:8; Waldbaum and Magness 1997:27, Figs. 2a–b).

**Type IC 2** – Fig. 28:8* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:1; Fig. 28:9.

Black-slipped interior and exterior, except for the rim and a reserved band at the level of the handles on the exterior.

Parallels: Megara Hyblaea (Villard and Vallet 1955: Type A 2, Fig. 3:a–b); Tocra (Tocra I: 113–114, 120–124, Rhodian types VIII/IX, Figs. 55:1218; 56); Tel Sukas (Sukas II: 29, Group 5, Pl. V:105–109).

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Tel Kabri (Niemeier 1994:*32, Fig. 19:6).

**Type IC 3** – Fig. 28:10* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:11.

Black or brown-red slipped exterior and interior, except for a reserved band at the level of the handles on the exterior.
Fig. 28. Local pottery assemblage: lamps. Imported pottery assemblage: bowl and Ionian cups.
Parallels: Megara Hyblaea (Villard and Vallet 1955: Type A 1, variant); Tocra (Tocra I: 112, 120, Rhodian Types I/II, Fig. 55:1193–1193); Tel Sukas (Sukas II: 29, Group 3, pl. V.103); Tarsus (Tarsus III: Fig. 96:1397, 1403).
Parallels in the Land of Israel: Tel Kabri (Niemeier 1994:*32, Fig. 19:4–5); Tell Keisan (Tell Keisan: 126, Pl. 22:2).

Type IC 4 – Fig. 28:11* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:2.

Brown-red slipped exterior and interior, except for a reserved band at the top of the lip on the interior. Differs from the other types mainly in thickness and size. Diameter of up to 22–25 cm. and wall thickness ca. 5 mm.

Type IC 5 – Fig. 28:12*–14* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:3–5, 7 (e.g., ibid.: Fig. 7:7).

Black or brown-red slipped exterior and interior. Usually four unslipped bands on the exterior, starting at the bottom edge of the handle and extending upward may be recognized.
Parallels: Megara Hyblaea (Villard and Vallet 1955: Type A 2, variant); Tocra (Tocra I: 115, 124, Samian Type II, Fig. 55:1299); Al-Mina, unstratified (Robertson 1940:6, Fig. 7:n); Tarsus (Tarsus III: Fig. 95:1392).
Parallels in the Land of Israel: Tell Keisan (Tell Keisan: 126, Pl. 22:1).

Type IC 6 – Fig. 29:1* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:6, Pl. 12 H.

Partially black or brown-red slipped exterior and interior. Over the slip, on exterior and interior, are brown or red painted stripes.

Type IC 7 – Figs. 29:2; 42:1.

Differs from the other types in form and decoration. Interior is unslipped; exterior has brown-dark red/black slip on the upper half of the rim, an unslipped groove between the rim and body of the vessel, two dark red-painted stripes below that and a wavy band beneath the stripes. Despite no parallels having been found for this vessel, a wavy band is attested on Ionian cups from Ephesus (Kerschner 1997: Taf. XI:79–80, Abb. 39), Samos (Isler 1978:77, n. 47, Fig. 3), Tarsus (Hanfmann 1956: Fig. 8; Tarsus III: Figs. 95:1386, 145:1383, 1386) and from Al Mina (unpublished, mentioned in Tocra I: 115, n. 6), though in all published examples it appears on the upper part of the rim on the exterior and not on the body of the vessels. Despite it not having been found at Tocra, the type was defined by the excavator as Samian Type III (ibid.). It should be noted that the shape of our Type IC 7, at least in the upper part, seems to be identical to the example from Ephesus (Kerschner 1997: Taf. XI:83).
Type VIC – Votive Ionian Cup? – Fig. 29:3.

A small Ionian cup seems to be a votive vessel. Its interior is unslipped, except for a brown/dark red slip reserved band at the top of the lip; the exterior is unslipped, except for a stripe consisting of three black-red-black painted lines between the rim and body of the vessel.

Bird Bowl? – Figs. 29:4*; 42:2 = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:13.

Identification of this vessel as a Bird Bowl is uncertain as only the lower portion, a ring-base, was found. It is possible that this is the base of an Ionian cup. The preserved part is of a fine clay of a light brownish colour. Black-red-black painted stripes are visible on the exterior, while the interior is black-slipped. The typology and chronology of the Bird Bowls were established by Coldstream (1968:298–301), and recently revisited by Kerschner (1997:189–190, 211, with earlier literature). For a long time, the Bird Bowls have been generally considered as a Rhodian product, however, the petrographic analysis showed that they were most probably produced in Ionia (Jones 1986:649). On the eastern Mediterranean shores, the Bird Bowls were attested mostly in the 7th century BCE coastal assemblages (Al Mina [Robertson 1940:14; Boardman 1999:147]; Ras el-Bassit [Coubrin 1978:41, Fig. 6]; Tyre [Coldstream and Bikai 1988:43, Nos. 114–117, Pl. XIII]; Tell Keisan [Tell Keisan: 125, Fig. 35]). Additional unpublished examples from Dan, Akko, Dor and Ashkelon were mentioned by Waldbaum (1994:59, n. 23).

Rosette Bowl? – Fig. 42:3–4.

Similar to the previous specimen, the identification of this type is uncertain, as only the lower portions of two vessels were found. Both examples, made from a finely micaceous ware, are presented with a low disc-base with a small central cavity (cf. Tocra I: 46, 53, 55; Fig. 28:723; Pl. 38:723, 729; Tocra II: 20, 24, Fig. 9:2031–2032, Pl. 13:2031–2032). The Rosette Bowls began to appear in the final quarter of the 7th century BCE and lasted into the second half of the 6th (Cook and Dupont 1998:26–27). However, there is also a possibility that these are the bases of the early, 7th century BCE banded bowls (cf. Tocra II: 23, Fig. 8:2015, 2028; Pls. 12:2021, 13:2025).

East Greek Heavy Bowls – (eg HB)

The large, mould-made (partially) heavy bowls (mortaria) uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu belong to the early type with a flat disc base (Stern’s Type 5a). This type is widespread in the Land of Israel at the end of the 7th century and beginning of the 6th century BCE (Stern 1982:96–98; Dor IB: 53).
FIGURE 29. IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: IONIAN CUPS, BIRD BOWL?, HEAVY BOWLS (MORTARIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>IC 6</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>A81</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:6</td>
<td>42:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>IC 7</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A106</td>
<td></td>
<td>42:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.*</td>
<td>Bird Bowl?</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:13</td>
<td>42:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>eg HB 1</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>A70</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:17/60-392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>eg HB 1</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>eg HB 2</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4.16/60-393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>eg HB 2</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>eg HB 3</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>G8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Stern, the origins of this early type are East Greek, while the late type with a thick, high ring base (Stern’s Type 5b) is the local imitation (ibid.). Petrographic examination of mortaria from Mezad Hashavyahu showed that they were produced in an ophiolitic region, probably Cyprus. In the present study these bowls will be discussed as part of the East Greek assemblage. However, it should be noted that if one does not accept this attribution, the quantitative analysis and the ratio between the local and imported assemblages would be accordingly slightly different than those expressed here.

The typological division below is based mainly upon vessel thickness, though there is a minor difference in rim form. The obvious difference in wall thickness between the various bowls apparently indicates a functional division, that is, a different use for each type. This is probably related to dietary habits.

44 The petrographic and NAA tests of the mortaria of the late type, with high ring base, common mainly during the Persian period (5th-4th centuries BCE) showed that the clay and the temper are not local, apparently from northern Syria or southern Anatolia (Blakely and Bennett 1989:57; Tell el-Hesi III: 203), as opposed to Stern’s view, that its development was local (Stern 1982:98, Type 5b). Recently, Sapin (1998) proposed that mortaria were used as grinding vessels, and following grinding they were utilized to serve grain and nuts. In his view, the bowls were utilized by nuclear families, as opposed to Blakely and Bennett’s view (1989:60–62) that the Persian ring-base type mortaria were imperial grinding bowls that served the units of the Persian army in the Land of Israel during the 5th century BCE. According to O. Tal, this conclusion ignores the fact that most of the Persian period sites in Israel where such bowls were found are of a clearly civilian nature (Apollonia-Arsuf I: 98). The wide distribution of these heavy bowls at the end of the Iron Age and during the Persian period strengthen this view. Still, it is possible that their initial appearance in Iron Age assemblages is indeed related in some fashion to the presence of mercenaries of East Greek origin.
Fig. 29. Imported pottery assemblage: Ionian cups, heavy bowls (mortaria).
Following Sapin (1998), one may assume that the thick bowls served mainly for grinding and the thinner ones were for serving. The difference may also stems from the need to divide between different varieties of grain in the coarse of their serving.

*Type eg HB 1* – Fig. 29:5* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:17, Pl. 12 E:2; Fig. 29:6.

Thickened rim with triangular section and especially thick wall (ca. 1.4–1.5 cm.). The core is dark orange with some small white grits. The exterior and interior surfaces of the vessel are dark grey (for summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 210–212, Type 98).

*Type eg HB 2* – Fig. 29:7* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:16, Pl. 12 E:1; Fig. 29:8.

Thickened and folded rim, and the wall is ca. 0.9–1 cm. thick. Two sub-groups may be distinguished: 1) Bowl with light grey core with some small white grits and many bits of flint. Exterior and interior surface of vessel is dark grey; 2) Bowl with light grey core with many small white grits. Exterior and interior surface of vessel surface is orange (for summary and parallels, see Gezer III: 210–212, Type 99; Lehmann 1996:389–390, Form 161).

Parallels for both types in the Land of Israel: Tell Keisan, Stratum 4 (Tell Keisan: Pls. 28:1; 31:5); Tell Qasile, Stratum VII (Tell Qasile II: Fig. 58:3–4); Ashdod, Strata VIII–VII (Ashdod II-III: Figs. 45:15; 50:1; 59:11–12; Ashdod IV: Fig. 19:14); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Kelm and Mazar 1985: Fig. 16:7); Ekron, Stratum IB (Gitin 1989: Fig. 2.13:10); ‘En Gedi, Stratum V (En-Gedi: Fig. 16:1–2).

*Type eg HB 3* – Fig. 29:9.

With slightly thickened and pointed rim, immediately below which is a thin groove. Wall thickness is ca. 0.7–0.8 cm.; core is light orange with very many small white grits; exterior and interior surface is light gray.


**East Greek Kraters – (eg K)**

*Type eg K 1* – Figs. 30:1*; 42:5 = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:14, Pl. 12 I:1.

This type belongs to the group of East Greek kraters with wave or banded decoration, known as Red-Glaze Kraters (Hanfmann 1956:182) because of the red slip/glaze appearing as the reserved bands or waves upon the body. The rim is thickened and everted and it also sometimes bears red-painted stripes. The clay is mostly buff with a grey core. Parallels dated to the second half of the 7th and beginning of the 6th centuries BCE are from Samos, southeastern Anatolia, northern Syria and Cyprus, though Hanfmann (ibid.) notes that this type was
also noted at Al Mina, Ephesus and Smyrna.

Parallels: Samos (Technau 1929:32, Fig. 24:4; Isler 1978:78, Figs. 57–58); Mersin (Garstang 1953:258, Fig. 161:10); Tarsus (Hanfmann 1956:183, Fig. 27:28; *Tarsus III*: 316, Fig. 148:1570); Tel Sukas (*Sukas II*: 25, Pl. 4:95); Amathos (Thalmann 1977:72–72, Pl. 6:8).

*Sub-type eg K 1a* – Fig. 30:2* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:16, Pl. 12 I:2.

This is a variant of type eg K 1, however in this case the bands and waves are black-slipped and the stripes on the rim are black-painted.


*Type eg K 2* – Fig. 30:3.

Slightly everted ledge rim, bearing dark red painted stripes. The clay is buff with a brown core and inclusions of mica. The exterior is covered by a dark red slip with painted black stripes above it. The everted ledge rims, similar to our Type eg K 2, are attested in numerous krater examples, and widespread primarily in the Phoenician part of the eastern Mediterranean coast since ca. the end of the 8th through the 7th centuries BCE, both as local products (e.g., Lehmann 1996:396–397, Forms 202a, 202b, with numerous parallels) or as a Cypriote import (e.g., *ibid.*:510, Form 225).

*Type eg K 3* – Fig. 30:4* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:17, Pl. 12 K.

Slightly everted ledge rim; long neck and rounded shoulders with two folded loop-handles attached to them. The clay is brown with dark brown core and a thick dark grey slip on its exterior. This type may belong to the group known as Aeolian Grey Ware (see extensive discussion with parallels [including Al Mina and Naukratis] in Cook and Dupont 1998:135–136), however, the similarity of the rim's form to the previous Type eg K 2 should be emphasized.

*Type eg K 4* – Fig. 30:5* = Reich 1989: Fig. 4:11.

High, vertical rim, with upper part slightly thickened. Below the rim are several grooves. Two loop-handles extend upward from the upper part of the body. The clay is pinkish with a brown core. Petrographic examination of this krater from Mezad Ḥashavyahu showed that it was produced in an ophiolitic region, probably Cyprus. The only parallel for this type is from Cyprus, however it is dated to the early Iron Age. Similar vessels probably existed in Cyprus into the late Iron Age. It should be noted that the form of this vessel may fit the definition of a cooking-pot, however, other characteristics such as fabric, absence of sooting and abrasion allow it to be considered rather as a krater.
FIGURE 30. IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: KRATERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. *</td>
<td>eg K 1</td>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:14</td>
<td>42:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. *</td>
<td>eg K 1a</td>
<td>SF3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:16/60–1023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>eg K 2</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. *</td>
<td>eg K 3</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C43</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 7:17/60–416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. *</td>
<td>eg K 4</td>
<td>6-86</td>
<td>E35</td>
<td>Reich 1989: Fig. 4:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallels: Maa-Palaeokastro (*Maa-Palaeokastro*: 171, No. 356, Pls. CXXVII, CCXXVII); an additional example, while from coarser ware (*ibid.*:105, No. 241, Pls. XLIV, CLXX).

**East Greek Cooking-pots – (eg CP)**

The salient feature of the East Greek cooking ware, obvious even to the untrained eye, is the large amount of mica in the fabric. Petrographic examination conducted on one of the pots (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:8) showed that its composition was identical to that of the East Greek cooking-pots from Tel Batash (a group examined by Y. Goren): the clay is rich in iron oxides, micaeous minerals and silt containing primarily quartz and feldspars. The grits are of metamorphic rocks, primarily mica-schist. This description fits the geological composition of the Aegean islands, however it equally well fits western and southern Anatolia.45

*Type eg CP I – Fig. 31:1 (e.g., Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:7–8; Reich 1989: Fig. 4:1–2).*

Globular body, with everted thickened rim, single handle and wide neck. This is the most common type of East Greek cooking-pot and is the most common at Mezad Hashavyahu as well.

Parallels: Athenian Agora (Brann 1961a:123–24, 130–131, 136, 145, Pl. 22: L45–48, N18, O38, Q10, R20; Brann 1961b:340, Pl. 83: F 49; *Agora VIII*: 55, Pl. 11.203–10; *Agora XII*: 224–225, 371, Fig. 18.1922, 1932, Pl. 93); Kerameikos at Athens (*Kerameikos VI*: 482, 492, 512, form S 192, Taf. 105); Corinth (*Corinth XIII*: 118, Pl. 35:250–13); Ephesus (Kerschner 1997:202, Taf. XII:92); Tocra (*Tocra I*: 135, Fig. 66:1412–1413).

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Kabri (Gershuny 1987: Fig. 16:13; Niemeier 1990: Fig. 22:4; 1994:*33, Fig. 19:10); Ashkelon, Babylonian destruction layer (Waldbaum and Magness 1997: Fig. 11); Tel Batash, Stratum II (*ibid.*: Fig. 10).

45 Mica-schist are also found in Israel in the vicinity of Eilat and in southern Sinai, however, it is quite unlikely that these vessels were made there.
Fig. 30. Imported pottery assemblage: kraters.
FIGURE 31. IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE:
COOKING-POTS, OINOCHOAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>eg CP 1</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>A166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>eg CP 1a</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A243</td>
<td>42:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>eg CP 2</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>eg CP 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>SF5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>eg OI 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>eg OI 1</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A231</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 10:1/60–1020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>eg OI 1a</td>
<td></td>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td>eg OI 1a</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A228</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 9:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parallels are primarily from the second half of the 7th century BCE, though as a type it appeared first at the end of the 11th century BCE in Attica (e.g., Kerameikos VI: Pls. 154–155). At Lefkandi in Euboea it occurs in the 10th-8th centuries BCE (e.g., Lefkandi I: 343, Fig. 20), both in the settlement (ibid.: Pl. 34:11–12) and in the nearby cemeteries at Skoubris (ibid.: Pl. 99:21) and Toumba (ibid.: P1. 168:2, 4; 184:28.2). In the 8th century BCE it occurs in the Athenian Agora (Papadopoulos 1994:453, 471, Fig. 14, Pl. 118:b, c).

Type eg CP 1a – Figs. 31:2; 42:6.
Smaller version of the previous type. According to Brann (1961b:317, n. 65) these cooking vessels may be identified as chytra in ancient Greek literature.

Type eg CP 2 – Fig. 31:3.
Massive and heavy vessel with highly micaceous fabric. Splayed, everted rim becomes very wide in its upper portion. Although its form resembles Aiginetan cooking-pots (cf. Tocra I: 135, Fig. 66:1406; Tocra II: 58–61, Fig. 24:2247), it has been classified here as belonging to the East Greek assemblage. Contrary to the remarkable Aiginetan thin fabric, this specimen is very thick.

Type eg CP 3 – Fig. 31:4.
Very wide vessel with short everted rim. Its exact dimension is uncertain owing to poor preservation of the single piece uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu. A similar form was noted at Tocra Deposit I in the late 7th century BCE assemblage, however it was defined as a local type because its temper included mostly crushed shells without mica (Tocra I: 142–144, Fig. 70:1461). The sherd from Mezad Hashavyahu has a highly micaceous fabric.
Fig. 31. Imported pottery assemblage: cooking-pots, oinochoai.
East Greek Oinochoai – (eg OI)

Wild Goat Style Oinochoai

Oinochoai of this type belong to so-called Wild Goat Style group. The clay is generally coarse and gritty; grits are of metamorphic rock, primarily mica-schist. These vessels are well fired and have a slipped exterior; the slip is thick and ranges from yellow to near white. The salient feature is the painted decorations: the division into panels decorated with animals and birds, including floral and geometric ornaments (for summary and parallels, see Cook 1997:111–119). All of the oinochoai of this type from Mezad Ḥashavyahu belong to the Milesian Middle Wild Goat II Style. Its distribution in the Greek world and outside it and the date of its appearance were recently summarized in detail (Cook 1992; Kerschner 1997; Cook and Dupont 1998:39–69). The dating of these vessels, ca. 625–600 BCE, was established in large measure based upon the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu, though there are also other chronological markers (Cook 1969; Kerschner 1997:189–190, 206, 210–211).

Type eg OI 1 – Fig. 31:5*–6* = Naveh 1962b: Figs. 8:5; 10:1; Fig. 39:9 (e.g., ibid.: Figs. 9:1–3; 10:2–9).

This type is characterized by dark-brown decorations.

Sub-type eg OI 1a – Fig. 31:7*–8* = Naveh 1962b: Figs. 8:8; 9:7; Fig. 39:8 = ibid.: Fig. 8:9 (e.g., ibid.: Fig. 9:4–6).

This type is characterized by red painted decorations. It sometimes appears without animal decorations and instead has a simple geometric decoration (such as red tongues, cf. Tocra I: Pl. 30:590).

Parallels in the Land of Israel for both types: Kabri (Niemeier 1994:31*–32*, Fig. 19:2–3); Tell Keisan, Stratum 4 (Tell Keisan: 151, Pls. 32:1–2, 35:10); Ashkelon, unknown provenance (Phytian-Adams 1923: Pl. IV:1, 14, 17), Ashkelon, Babylonian destruction layer (Stager 1996a:67*, 69*, Fig. 10; Stager 1996b:60, colour photograph; Waldbaum and Magness 1997:30, Fig. 6); Netiv Ha-‘Asara, Stratum III (A. Yassur-Landau and A. Shavit pers. com.); Tel Ruqefish (not published, mentioned by Waldbaum and Magness 1997:30, n. 56); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Waldbaum and Magness 1997:30, Fig. 7a–b); Ekron, Stratum IB (not published, mentioned by Waldbaum and Magness 1997:30, n. 52); Tell el-Ḥesi, unstratified (Tell el-Hesi III: 93, Figs. 85:1, 86); Tell Jemmeh (Iliffe 1933:17, Pl. 5a:3); Tel Harasim (Fischer 1994: Fig. 14:15); Tel Malḥata (Kochavi 1970:23, lower photograph).
Black-slipped/Black Polychrome decorated Trefoil Oinochoai

Type eg OI 2 – Fig. 32:1* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:7, 10 (e.g., ibid.: Fig. 8:6).

This type has a highly micaceous orange clay and a black slip on the exterior. Sometimes white or white-and-red horizontal painted stripes are visible on various parts of the vessel exterior. The latter design may be considered as made in the Black Polychrome technique (cf. Cook 1989:52); numerous examples of this were present in the sanctuary of Hera at Samos (Technau 1929:29). Occasionally, a white-painted wavy band may occur on the vessel’s neck.

Parallels: Athens (Young 1939:178, Type C 124, Fig. 125); Corinth (Corinth XIII: Pl. 21: Deposit 2-b); Ephesus (Kerschner 1997:201, Taf. XII:87, XVI:129); Vroulia (Vroulia: Pl. 11:3).

Unslipped/Undecorated Trefoil Oinochoai

Type eg OI 3 – Figs. 32:2; 42:7.

Unslipped and undecorated oinochoai. Highly micaceous orange clay.

Parallels: Athens (Brann 1961b:355, Pl. 83:G 43); Corinth (Corinth XIII: 111, Pl. 23:157-g).

The attribution of two last types – eg OI 2 and eg OI 3 – to East Greek region solely is uncertain, since similar vessels appeared in other Greek regions as well. Nevertheless, those exposed at Mezad Hashavyahu seem to be belong to the East Greek assemblage, as well as the balk of the imported pottery.

Amphorae – (A)

East Greek Table Amphorae – (eg TA)

Type eg TA – Fig. 32:3.

Small table amphora with a wide, straight neck and slightly everted ledge rim. Strap handles extend from the top of the neck. The fabric is highly micaceous with some small white grits. The exterior and interior surfaces of the vessel are orange. Similar vessels were designated by the excavators of the Athenian Agora as 5th century BCE Corinthian household ware (cf. Boulter 1953:94, Pl. 34:109–110), but its presence within the Mezad Hashavyahu assemblage points to an earlier appearance of this type in the 7th century BCE. It may belong to the East Greek assemblage as well as the bulk of the imported pottery.
FIGURE 32. IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: OINOCHOAI, AMPHORAE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>eg OI 2</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A223</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:7, 10/60–421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>eg OI 3</td>
<td>A209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>eg TA</td>
<td>A120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.*</td>
<td>eg SA1</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:2/60–409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>eg SA 1</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Samian Amphorae – (SA)**

These are amphorae which were attributed to the island of Samos (Grace 1971). The Archaic examples are characterized by a massive, protruding echinoid rim; short neck, sometimes widening toward its top and sometimes straight; handles with oval cross-section; globular or pear-shaped body, and a straight-profiled ring-foot, sometimes slightly convex at its center. The clay is micaceous, as is typical of the Aegean region. The petrographic analysis conducted on one of the Mezad Hashavyahu specimens (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:2) shows a similarity to Whitbread’s analysis (1995:122–133, esp. Pl. 4.32). These amphorae are widespread beginning at the end of the 7th century BCE at many sites around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (for updated summary and parallels, see Cook and Dupont 1998:164–169).

It seems, that in accordance with Dupont’s observation (ibid.:165), two closely related Archaic series could be distinguished:

*Type SA 1* – Fig. 32:4* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:2; Fig. 32:5; Fig. 33:1* = ibid.: Fig. 6:1 (e.g., Reich 1989: Fig. 4:9).

Massive vessels with neck that widens slightly toward the top; ranging in colour from light buff to brown-gray.

*Type SA 2* – Fig. 33:2*-3* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:3, 5; Figs. 33:4, 42:10.

Rather more delicate than the preceding group, with straight neck; ranging in colour between different nuances of orange.

Parallels for both types: Athenian Agora (Grace 1971: Fig. 2:2); Vroulia (*Vroulia*: Pl. 29z); Salamis (Calvet and Yon 1977:19, Pl. XI:115–116); Tel Sukas (*Sukas II*: 84–85, Nos. 387–389); Naukratis (*Naukratis*: Pl. XVI:2).

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Kabri (Niemeier 1994:*33, Fig. 19:9); Ashkelon, Babylonian destruction layer (Stager 1996a:66*-67*, Fig. 6); Tel Batash, Stratum II (Waldbaum and Magness 1997:33, Fig. 12).
Fig. 32. Imported pottery assemblage: oinochoai, amphorae.
Milesian Amphorae – (MA)

Type MA – Figs. 33:5-7; 42:11-12.

The most characteristic feature of the Milesian amphorae is the profile of its lip. It is high (3–3.5 cm.), thin and convex, sometimes with a few ridges on the neck, which usually widens towards the top. The clay is obviously micaceous. The core is grey or brown; exterior and interior may vary from buff to orange. Except for isolated cases, most of the amphorae found outside Miletus are unslipped and undecorated (Cook and Dupont 1998:174). Widespread since the end of the 7th century BCE, it occurs mostly around the Black Sea, but is not rare in the Mediterranean area (for updated summary and parallels, see ibid.: 170–177).

Parallels: Salamis (Calvet and Yon 1977: Pl. XI:117–119); Ephesus (for the decorated specimen, Kerschner 1997:202, Taf. IV:27); Migdol (Oren 1984:20, Fig. 23:5).

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Kabri (Niemeier 1994:*33, Fig. 19:8).

Clazomenian Amphora – (CA)

Type CA – Figs. 33:8* = Reich 1989: Fig. 4:3.

The place of origin of these amphorae was identified only recently, in light of petrographic and chemical analysis. The identification of a Mezad Hashavaya specimen as Clazomenian is not certain, although the decoration (painted bands on the body and the handle, and two crossing bands on the handle), the torus rim, the squat neck and the broad, bow-like handles, lend support to this identification. The core is brownish; exterior and interior are buff. These amphorae were widespread since the end of the 7th century BCE mostly around the Black Sea, whereas in the Mediterranean (except North Ionia) finds are rather sparse (for updated summary and parallels, see Cook and Dupont 1998:151–156).

Fig. 33. Imported pottery assemblage: amphorae.
FIGURE 34. IMPORTED POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE: AMPHORAE, LAMPS, ARYBALLOS, JARS, LID AND GAZA WARE JAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.*</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Reich 1989: Fig. 4:4/89–2772</td>
<td>42:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.*</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C30</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:4</td>
<td>42:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>eg BhA</td>
<td>A179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>eg BhA</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>A178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.*</td>
<td>eg BhA</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:13/60–400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.*</td>
<td>eg L</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:1/60–425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.*</td>
<td>eg L</td>
<td>SF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.*</td>
<td>eg L</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:3/60–426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Cor Ar</td>
<td>S16</td>
<td>/89–2704</td>
<td></td>
<td>43:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>S17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>A193</td>
<td></td>
<td>43:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.*</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:12/60–399</td>
<td>43:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Gaza Ware</td>
<td>1–86</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesbian Amphora – (LA)

Type LA – Figs. 34:1*, 42:13 = Reich 1989: Fig. 4:4; Figs. 34:2*, 42:14 = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:4.

The amphorae attributed to the island of Lesbos are divided into sub-groups distinguished mainly on the basis of the clay composition, although there are also differences in form (Clinkenbeard 1982). The term ‘Lesbian amphorae’, as it is used today, relates primarily to the so-called ‘grey group’. The main characteristics are: grey clay and massive cylindrical handles whose lower portions taper down the shoulder into a ‘rat-tail’ form (Grace 1961: Fig. 53; for petrographic analysis, see Whitbread 1995:154–164, with earlier literature). The concave rim of the Arhaic examples is generally slightly everted, occasionally with a ridge below it, and usually has a wide ring-base (ca. 10 cm. diam.). The earliest secure dates for the grey group goes back to the 7th century BCE, and there are several examples around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea (for updated summary and parallels, see Cook and Dupont 1998:156–163).

Parallels: Antisa, Lesbos (Spenger 1995: Fig. 12); Athenian Agora (Brann 1961b:346, PIs. 86, 89); Tocra (Tocra I: 139, Pl. 90); Migdol (Oren 1984:27, Fig. 23:6, 39, 40).
Fig. 34. Imported pottery assemblage: amphorae, lamps, aryballos, jars, lid and Gaza Ware jar.
East Greek Basket-Handled Amphorae – (eg BhA)

Type eg BhA – Fig. 34:3–4; Fig. 34:5* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:13.

Biconical amphora with massive ‘basket handles’ and outwardly protruding rim (Stern 1982:110–111, Type I 1). Only a single example of this type was published by Naveh (Fig. 34:5*; 1962b: Fig. 6:13). Based upon the recent reclassification of the basket-handled amphorae by Humbert (1991:583–585, Fig. 6), it belongs to his Type E (ca. 600 BCE). Nonetheless, the vessel was found without a rim, and it is therefore difficult to attribute it to a specific group. The additional examples may be defined with relatively great certainty as Type eg BhA (e.g., Fig. 34:3–4), and they show signs of the later group in Humbert’s typology (Type F, dated to the 5th century) (ibid.:585, Fig. 7). Thus, this typology has certain shortcomings since it is not possible to stretch the existence of Mezad Hashavyahu to the Persian period (such attempts have been made in the past; see details below, Section D).

NAA testing carried out on approximately 30 amphorae of this type from Tell Keisan, dating to the end of the Iron Age, identified the eastern part of Cyprus as the place of origin (Gunneweg and Perlman 1991). Still, the scholars (ibid.:597) do not entirely reject Stern’s proposal that the early type of the basket-handle amphorae was produced in Rhodes (Stern 1982:111). On the other hand, petrographic examination of a few basket-handled amphorae from the Persian period indicates local clay (Tel Michal: 265, Nos. 5–7; Apollonia-Arsuf I: 187, Table 4.10:29, 30). It seems that these vessels, which appeared at the end of the Iron Age and whose distribution is mainly limited to the coastal region, are East Greek imports (and have therefore been included here among the imported pottery), while local imitations were widespread during the Persian period.

Parallels: Cyprus, Salamis (Salamis II: Pls. CXCIX:I07, CIL:13); Migdol (Oren 1984:17, Figs. 21:1, 3, 5, 11; 28). For additional parallels, see Lehmann 1996:444, Form 421c.

Parallels in the Land of Israel: Tel Kabri (Lehmann 1994:23*–24*, Fig. 17:5); Tell Keisan, Stratum 4 (Tell Keisan: Pl. 24:7).

East Greek Lamps – (eg L)

Type eg L – Fig. 34:6*–8* = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 8:1–3.

These lamps were defined in the excavations of the Athenian Agora as Type 9 (Smyrna lamps) and dated to the period between approximately the third quarter of the 7th century and 600 BCE (Agora IV: 20–22, Type 9). The lamps
are wheel-made, except for the spout, which is handmade. The base is flat and the rim is flat and occasionally grooved. At the join between the spout and the body there is sometimes a potter's mark which was made while the clay was still leather-hard. According to the excavators of the Athenian Agora, these lamps were produced in the vicinity of Smyrna in Asia Minor, in view of the large number found there (ibid.:21, n. 20), although Attic imitations are known (however, see Brann 1961b:357 for a possible Samian origin). In the Southern Levant this type occurs sporadically (cf. Lehmann 1996:448, Form 431).

**Corinthian Aryballos – (Cor Ar)**

*Type Cor Ar – Figs. 34:9; 43:6.*

The presence of Corinthian pottery in the Land of Israel at the end of the Iron Age has been discussed lately by Waldbaum and Magness (1997:34–36). The sherd from Mezad Ḥashavyahu was defined as such by Waldbaum, though due to its poor state of preservation, it is difficult to attribute it to a specific type (ibid.:35, n. 90).

**The Egyptian Assemblage**

Until now, the view that no Egyptian artefacts were found at Mezad Ḥashavyahu has prevailed (Waldbaum 1997:5; Waldbaum and Magness 1997:39; Stern 2001:142). The present re-examination of all of the finds, aided by petrographic analyses, facilitates the unequivocal definition of a group of vessels as Egyptian in origin.

*Type 1 – Small jar with a narrow groove just below the rim (Fig. 34:10).*

Its clay appears to be of the Nile silt category, however due to the small dimensions of the preserved rim, a petrographic examination was not conducted. Similar vessels were attributed by French to the latter part of the Late Dynastic period, however, he does not reject that similar forms begin to appear much earlier (French 1992:89–90, Fig. 20:25–26).

*Type 2 – Jar (Figs. 34:11; 43:7).*

According to petrographic analysis, the sherd is of Nilotic clay. It may be compared with vessels found at Elephantine (*Elephantine XIX*: Pl. 51:1597), where they are defined as small jars with two handles and dated to the 7th century BCE (for additional parallels from the Saite period, see French 1992 and Aston 1996).
Type 3 – Lid (Figs. 34:12*; 43:5 = Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:12)

Although originally published by Naveh as a bowl, this is an Egyptian lid (of a cooking-pot?) Such lids are primarily typical of the Saite period (Oren 1984: Fig. 20:19), however, according to Aston (1996:74, Fig. 218:e), their initial appearance is attested even earlier (Aston’s Phase III, dated to 775/725–650/625 BCE). A petrographic examination of the vessel from Mezad Ḥashavyahu showed that it has Nilotic clay, but on the basis of the plutonic rock inclusions, it could have been produced at Nubia in Upper Egypt.

Quantitative Comparison

The main problem the researcher faces in conducting a statistical study at a site he or she did not excavate is the lack of knowledge concerning the quantity of finds discarded during processing. The examinations conducted on Naveh’s finds indicate a clear methodology as follows:

1. Local pottery – all rims were retained; some of the handles and bases were retained; most of the body sherds were discarded.

2. East Greek pottery – all finds were retained (including even the smallest body sherds).

46 A characteristic example of far-reaching conclusions reached following quantitative comparison at a site excavated many years ago is the case of Al Mina, recently identified as Ḥa-ta-[a] (Zadok 1996). Thus, attempts were made at refuting, through statistical analysis, the conclusions of Graham (1986), who disagreed with the assumption concerning the special status of Al Mina as a Greek emporion on the Phoenician coast from ca. the beginning of the 8th century BCE (Boardman 1990; 1999; Kearsley 1995). With the aid of quantitative comparisons in accordance with the sizes of the excavated areas at various sites in northern Syria and the Phoenician coast, Boardman attempted to demonstrate that the amount of Greek pottery at Al Mina (Strata X-VIII) is much greater (more than 50%) than the amount of local (Phoenician) pottery, contrary to the situation at the other sites (such as Tyre, Ras el-Bassit, Tell Sukas and elsewhere) (Boardman 1990:171–175, Table 1). His approach was supported by Kearsley (1995; see also Hodos 2000:150); according to her the statistical analysis of these assemblages indeed indicate a Greek settlement at Al Mina, at least during the first phase of its existence. The problem in this analysis stems from the fact that the amount and character of the finds discarded by the Woolley expedition following the excavation remain unknown (for a summary of the excavation, see Woolley 1938, and most recently, Boardman 1999). The publication of the local pottery by Taylor (1959) suffers lacunae, since the ratio between it and the imports is unclear. Moreover, the new publication of Greek sherds from Tyre by Coldstream (1998) may alter Boardman’s comparative study. It appears that all of the historical conclusions concerning Al Mina, based on the statistical evaluations, are incorrect. It is not surprising that its identification as a Greek emporion exclusively based upon the amount of imported pottery has recently been referred to by Coldstream as: "...a modern myth, created by one interpretation of Sir L. Woolley’s finds at Al Mina in the 1930s..." (ibid.:354).
Proof of this is the statistical sample from Area A – the main one in Naveh’s excavation – with the following results: local pottery – 18 bases, 89 handles, 38 body sherds; East Greek pottery – 88 bases, 89 handles, 1,376 body sherds. Nevertheless, due to the fact that the ceramic assemblage retrieved from Mezad Ḥashavyahu is virtually undisturbed, and all the local and imported rims (even the smallest specimens) were apparently retained, conducting a statistical study is of great importance.

The results of the count are presented in Tables 15 and 16 and in the pie charts in Figs. 35–38. In conducting the count, considerable care has been taken in order to avoid over-counts, that is, more than one rim per vessel. Primarily rims have been counted, and in certain cases, vessels have been included on the basis of particularly indicative parts. Since pottery vessels are liable to break into a large number of sherds (cf. Sinopoli 1991:87), the dimensions of the rims has been taken into consideration in the count and a comparison conducted of all the rims of particular types, again, in order to prevent over-counting. Still, it should be emphasized, that since the identification and counting are more subjective than certain, other counts could differ.

Results of the statistical count show that the ratio between the local and imported assemblages is: 227 local vessels (53.04%) as opposed to 201 imported vessels (46.96%). The distribution of vessels based upon families and the ratio between the local and imported vessels based upon type, are presented graphically in Figs. 35–38. The conclusions resulting from the count have been combined in the summaries in Sections C and D below.

Stone Vessels

Few stone vessels uncovered in Naveh’s and Reich’s excavations are significant in attempting to establish the settlement type of Mezad Ḥashavyahu.

\[47\] For example, a body sherd of an Egyptian jar (Fig. 34.11; 43:7) was counted as a vessel although the rim was not preserved.

\[48\] The M.A. thesis on which this study is based included a complete list of all the pottery finds uncovered at the Mezad Ḥashavyahu excavations, including statistics and a description of bases, handles and body sherds. Here, the limits of the space permit only the final results of the quantitative comparison. It should be noted, however, that the results presented there in the complete list of finds are slightly different from those expressed here. The reason for this is to prevent over-counting; in certain cases, non-adjoining rim sherds (appeared identical in workmanship) were also counted as a single vessel. Such a count was made based on their stratigraphic position, e.g., two non-adjoining rim sherds of a local krater (Type K 2) found in Baskets A1 and A29 were counted as a single vessel because of the great similarity between them and the fact that is a large vessel that was likely to have broken into a large number of sherds.

\[49\] The numbers presented in the pie charts in Figs. 35–38 have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
TABLE 15: NUMERICAL DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL POTTERY VESSELS ACCORDING TO EXCAVATION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery Type</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
<th>Area D</th>
<th>Area E</th>
<th>Area F</th>
<th>Area G</th>
<th>Area S</th>
<th>Surface and unknown provenience finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh's Loci Nos. 4-10</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 6a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 7a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking-Pots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Jars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 2a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 5a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holemouth Jars</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decanters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jugs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jg 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juglets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jgl 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jgl 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lamps</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL        | 31| 85| 9 | 12| 1 | 19| 4 | 9 | 48| 9 |
TABLE 16: NUMERICAL DISTRIBUTION OF IMPORTED POTTERY VESSELS ACCORDING TO EXCAVATION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery Type</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
<th>Area D</th>
<th>Area E</th>
<th>Area F</th>
<th>Area G</th>
<th>Area S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naveh's Loci Nos.</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>15, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Greek and related wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls and Cups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg B 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg HB 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg HB 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg HB 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg K 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg K 1a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg K 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg K 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg K 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking-Pots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg CP 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg CP 1a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg CP 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg CP 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oinochoai and Aryballos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eg OI 1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg OI 1a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg OI 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg OI 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Ar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amphorae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eg TA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eg BhA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lamps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eg L</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Egyptian ware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 35.** The ratio between local and imported wares.

- **East Greek and Related Wares**: 46%
- **Local Ware**: 53%
- **Egyptian Ware**: 1%
Fig. 36. Division by types of pottery families.

Fig. 37. Division by types of local ware vessels.

Fig. 38. Division by types of imported ware vessels.
These artefacts are listed below by excavation area and basket number; the material from which the vessel is made is noted in parentheses.\(^{50}\)

**Area A**

Basket A58 (due to its number, it may definitely be attributed to the northern sector of Area A, possible options: Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10) – fragment of bowl or mortar rim (basalt) (Figs. 39:1; 44:4).

**Area B**

Basket B10 (Locus 21c) – fragment of grinding stone (beachrock) (Figs. 39:4; 44:2).

**Area C**

Basket C14 (Locus 31c) – fragment of grinding stone (beachrock) (Figs. 39:5; 44:1).

**Area G**

Basket G42 (Locus 71c) – grinding stone (limestone) (Fig. 44:8).

**Area E**

Basket E27 (Locus 8–86) – grinding stone (basalt) (Figs. 39:3; 44:3).
Basket E28 (Locus 4–86) – pierced sea pebble (weight?) (Fig. 44:7).
Basket E62 (Locus 7–86) – hammer stone (limestone) (Fig. 44:10).
Basket E62 (Locus 7–86) – stopper? (limestone) (Fig. 44:9).

**Area S**

Grinding stone? stopper? (beachrock) (Fig. 44:6).

**Unregistered**

Fragment of pestle (basalt) (Figs. 39:2; 44:5).

**Metal Artefacts\(^{51}\)**

Some of the metal artefacts described below are conserved in the warehouses without registration of any sort. Nonetheless, since they were stored in the original boxes together with labelled artefacts, they probably all originate at Mezad Hashavyahu. The assemblage is divided into several groups.

---

\(^{50}\) Since it is not possible to distinguish between morphological changes in ground stone tools during most periods (cf. Wright 1992), the finds alone have been presented.

\(^{51}\) Two bronze artefacts (Fig. 45:5–6) appear to be waste from tool production at the site. However, since these objects bear no labelling of any sort, this cannot be proven.
TABLE 1. STONE AND METAL ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bowl/Mortar</td>
<td>A58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pestle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>8–86</td>
<td>E27</td>
<td></td>
<td>44:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>21c</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td>44:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td></td>
<td>44:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Gate</td>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Pl. 12 D:2/61–450</td>
<td>47:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>71c?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C26</td>
<td></td>
<td>46:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>????</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sickle blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Raw materials**

**Area A**

Basket A18 (possible options: Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10) – a small piece of haematite weighing 18.39 gr.

Basket A30 (possible options: Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10) – a small piece of haematite weighing 11.41 gr. (Fig. 45:4).

Basket A38 (Locus 5b) – a small piece of haematite weighing 77.32 gr. was found in the gate tower, (Fig. 45:3; Naveh 1962b:94).

Unknown basket (Locus 8g) – a piece of burnt haematite, which turned into iron as a result of exposure to high temperature, was found on the floor of Room 8 near the clay installation that perhaps served in the production process (Fig. 45:2; Naveh 1962b:93, n. 6). Because of the burning, it was broken into many smaller pieces, the largest of which is shown in the photograph. Its entire weight is 1,895 gr.

**Area B**

Basket B15 (Locus 21c) – a small piece of haematite weighing 88.81 gr. was found in this area (Naveh 1962b:95).

---

52 During an undersea survey at the harbor of nearby Yavneh-Yam, there were pieces of raw haematite among the Late Bronze Age finds (Galili and Sharvit 1991:118; Galili et al. 1998). One cannot exclude the possibility that they may be dated later.
Fig. 39. Stone and metal artefacts.
Area E

In the corner of Room 4, next to the doorway leading to the courtyard, a piece of raw haematite weighing 1,126 gr. was found during Reich’s excavations (Fig. 45:1; Reich 1989:231, Fig. 5).

Arrowheads

Area A

Basket A15 (Gate-entrance) – fragment of an iron arrowhead (Figs. 39:6; 47:1; Naveh 1962b:93, n. 6, Pl. 12 D:2).

Unknown basket (Locus 4c) – fragment of an iron arrowhead (ibid.:93, Pl. 12 D:3).

Unknown basket (Locus 8g) – fragment of an iron arrowhead (ibid.:93, Pl. 12 D:1).

While these arrowheads are poorly preserved, all appear to belong to Type 3C in Snodgrass’ classification (1964:152–153, Fig. 10).

Area G

Unknown basket (Locus 71c) – an iron spearhead was noted (Naveh 1962b:96), but it was never published. In the warehouses, together with the other metal artefacts from Mezad Hashavyahu, there is a long iron arrowhead (Figs. 39:7; 47:2), apparently interpreted by Naveh as a spearhead. Its definition as an arrowhead is based on its length (11.5 cm.) and its tang, since spearheads are generally socketed (Snodgrass 1964:115–139) and have a length between 20–30 cm. (Anderson 1991:23). Nonetheless, as this object is not labelled, its attribution is not entirely certain.

Armour Scale

Probably Area E

One bronze armour scale was found among the metal objects from Reich’s excavation, without any labelling (Fig. 46:6).

Fibulae

Area C

Basket C26 (Locus 31c) – the lower portion of an iron fibula (Figs. 39:9; 46:4).
Fantalkin: Mezad Ḥashavyahu

**Area F**

Unknown basket (Locus 61d) – a bronze fibula was mentioned (Naveh 1962b:96); but it has not been published. Only a single fibula fragment of bronze (Figs. 39:8; 46:3) was found in the warehouses, and it may reasonably be assumed that this is the same artefact. Despite only a small portion being preserved, it clearly belongs to the carinated type ('knee type'). The upper portion of the fibula (the spiral) is decorated with grooves (for typology and distribution of this type, see Moorey 1980:85–86).

**Spatula**

**Area A**

Unknown basket (Locus 8c) – a bronze spatula (Naveh 1962b:93, Pl. 12 D:4), belonging to the simple type with carinated spreading surface (for typology and distribution of this type, see Moorey 1980:98–99).

**Needles**

**Area C**

Unknown basket (Locus 31c) – an iron needle (Naveh 1962b:96, Pl. 12 D:6). Unknown provenience – a bronze needle (Figs. 39:10; 45:10).

**Nails**

**Area A**

Basket A21 (due to its number, it may definitely be attributed to the northern sector of Area A; possible options: Rooms 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10) – fragment of an iron nail.

**Area C**

Basket C49 (Locus 31c) – fragment of an iron nail. A few bronze nails, stored without labelling were uncovered in Naveh’s excavations (Fig. 45:21–24).

**Fishing Hook**

Unknown provenience – a bronze fishing hook from Naveh’s excavation (Fig. 46:9).

**Fishing Weights**

Unknown provenience – three bronze fishing weights from Naveh’s excavation (Fig. 45:7–9).
FIGURE 40. INCISED POTTERY ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C32</td>
<td>/99–2217</td>
<td>47:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>E28</td>
<td></td>
<td>47:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/60–429</td>
<td>47:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sickle**

Unknown provenience – an iron sickle blade (Figs. 39:12; 47:3) was found unlabelled in one of Naveh's boxes.

**Objects Lacking Clear Identification**

Unknown basket (Locus 31c) – bent iron rod (Naveh 1962b:96, Pl. 12 D:5).

Unknown provenience – several small bronze objects (Fig. 45:11–20), all unlabelled. These are probably fragments of needles, however, the object in Fig. 45:17 could be a chisel.

Unknown provenience – an iron object (Figs. 39:11; 46:5) was found unlabelled in one of Naveh’s boxes.

Unknown provenience – two bronze objects, both unlabelled (Fig. 46:1–2).

Unknown provenience – two bronze scales, from Area E(?) (Fig. 46:7–8).

**Incised Marks on Pottery**

A number of simple incised marks, apparently potter's marks, were published by Naveh (1962b). Such simple potter’s marks are common in all periods in the Aegean region (Papadopoulos 1994) and in the Levant (Kletter 1999b). They probably indicate various workshops (for updated summary, see ibid.:354–359).

**Local assemblage**

1. On the base of a bowl, here Type B 6a, is an incised line, crossed by two incised parallel diagonal lines. The incision was made after firing (Fig. 23:7*; Naveh 1962b: Fig. 4:20).

2. An identical incision was found on a pottery object exposed in Area S and defined by Naveh as a polishing implement (Fig. 41:1; ibid.:100, n. 17, Fig. 4:21).

**Imported assemblage**

1. On the lower portion of a Samian amphora handle, here Type SA 1, near the place where it is joined to the body, a round mark was incised while the vessel’s clay was leather hard (Fig. 33:1*; Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:1).
Fig. 40. Incised pottery artefacts.
2. On the lower portion of a Samian amphora handle, here Type SA 1, near the place where it is joined to the body, a V-shaped mark was incised when the vessel's clay was leather hard (Fig. 32:4*; ibid.: Fig. 6.2).

3. On the lower portion of a Samian amphora handle, here Type SA 2, near the place where it is joined to the body, a (+) mark was incised when the vessel's clay was leather hard (Figs. 33:3*; 42:10; ibid.: Fig. 6:5).

4. On an East Greek lamp, here type eg L, at the place where the spout is joined to the body, a double (one inside the other) V-shaped mark was incised when the vessel's clay was leather hard (Fig. 34:8*; ibid.: Fig. 8:3).

Seven hitherto unpublished incised marks should be added to the above. Some of these may represent numerals:

1. On the rim of a heavy bowl (mortarium), apparently of type HB 2. The incision, probably a numeral, was made after firing (Figs. 40:1; 47:5).

2. On the rim of a local jar of Type SJ 1 (Figs. 40:2; 47:6). This incision, executed when the vessel's clay was leather hard, probably indicates four shekels, as there is similarity between it and the sign [כ'] which is known on weights at the designation of 4 shekels (cf. Kletter 1991:134, Table 4). The mark [כ'] appears several times on artefacts from Mezêd Ḥashavvahu: in ink upon Ostracon 6 (Naveh 1962a:30–31, Pl. 6:A, C), and as an incision upon a dome-shaped stone weight (ibid.:31–32, Pl. 6:D).

3. On a Samian amphora fragment, apparently of Type SA 2, near the neck. The incision, probably a potter's mark or a numeral, was made after firing (Figs. 40:3; 43:1).

4. On a body sherd of a local storage jar. The incision, probably a numeral (number 15?), was made after firing (Figs. 40:4; 47:7).

5. On the inside(?) of an unidentified sherd. This star-shaped(?) incision was made after firing (Figs. 41:2; 47:8).

6. On the base of a heavy bowl (mortarium), apparently of Type HB 1 or HB 2. The cruciform incision was made after firing (Fig. 41:3).

7. On the base of a local red-slipped and burnished bowl. The incision, in the form of stripes crossing at different angles, was made after firing (Fig. 41:4).
Fig. 41. Incised pottery artefacts.
Varia

Unknown provenience – a shell with remains of red ochre in it was found in one of Naveh’s boxes, without any labelling (Fig. 47:4).

Primary Conclusions from the Archaeological Data

A. The finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu enable us to establish the ethnic identity of its inhabitants with a high degree of certainty.

1. The written finds – ostraca bearing Yahwistic names – are clear evidence for a Judean presence at the site. An ostracon with a Phoenician name containing the theophoric element ‘baal’ may indicate a Phoenician presence. The heterogeneity of the local pottery assemblage, which comprises types characteristic of various regions of the country: Judean, Northern and Coastal, strengthens the view formed on the basis of the written finds.53

2. The assemblage of imported vessels uncovered at Mezad Ḥashavyahu indicates the presence of Greeks.

53 Assemblages with similar features are not common. So far, examples belonging to the Mezad Ḥashavyahu chronological horizon are attested in Stratum VII at Tell Qasile (Tell Qasile II: 109–110) and Stratum II at Tel Batash (Kelm and Mazar 1985).
Fig. 42. Selected ceramic finds.
FIGURE 43. SELECTED CERAMIC FINDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket. No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Local jug base</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Local jug base</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>East Greek lid?</td>
<td>A155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Egyptian lid</td>
<td>61d</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:12/60–399</td>
<td>34:12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cor Ar</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>/89–2704</td>
<td>34:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Egyptian jar</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>A193</td>
<td></td>
<td>34:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using ‘archaeological tools’ it is possible to demonstrate the presence of a foreign ethnic group at the site alongside the local population. As the imported wares alone are not sufficient to prove such a presence, scholars tend to relate more to dietary habits that may serve as an indicator for specific ethnic groups (cf. Crabtree 1990; Hesse 1990). Imported cooking-pots, for example, are open vessels unsuitable for transporting products commercially. They are also relatively coarse and it is difficult to imagine that they had any intrinsic commercial value (such as fine wares). As a result, their presence at the site is most probably indicative of the foreign ethnic groups that actually brought them.

The numerous East Greek cooking-pots found at the site indicate a Greek presence. Their relative proportion — 33 imported pots vs. 15 local ones — enables one to surmise that Greeks constituted the main element among Mezad Ḥashavyahu inhabitants. The lid of a possible Egyptian cooking-pot could be considered in a similar way.

B. The spatial distribution of the pottery finds (Tables 15–16) permits one to make several assumptions concerning the behavioural patterns of the residents of the site during its existence and at the time of its abandonment.

1. Comparison of the finds from the rubbish heaps (Locus 15b in Area A; Locus 31c in Area C and Area S) to those found in the rooms shows that certain types of pottery are mainly represented in rubbish heaps and not in the dwellings.

54 The importance of animal bones found at a settlement for establishing dietary habits, and following that, the ethnic identity of the ancient inhabitants, should be emphasized. Unfortunately, bones from the Mezad Ḥashavyahu excavations were not retained.
Assuming that the heaps were formed during the existence of the fortress, it may be suggested that these vessel types would have been in use in the rooms prior to and at the time of abandonment but, being of value to the inhabitants, were removed by them when they left. For example, East Greek oinochoai decorated in the Wild Goat style were found mainly in the rubbish heaps (some 20 vessels) and not in the rooms. The discovery of a few body sherds decorated in this style in the dwellings (one sherd in Area B, one in Area F and six in Area G), strengthens the view that these vessels were in every-day use but were removed at the time the site was abandoned. A similar picture emerges from the groups of local vessels such as decanters and jugs. In the rooms of Area A, only two decanters were found, and an additional one in Area F, while 11 other decanters were found in the rubbish heaps. Concerning the local jugs,
FIGURE 44. STONE ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>31c C14</td>
<td>39:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>21c B10</td>
<td>39:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>8–86 E27</td>
<td>39:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bowl/Mortar</td>
<td>A58</td>
<td>39:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pestle</td>
<td></td>
<td>39:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pierced sea pebble</td>
<td>4–86 E28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>71c G42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stopper</td>
<td>7–86 E62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Hammer stone</td>
<td>7–86 E62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The picture that emerges is even more extreme: all 19 vessels (of Types Jg 1 and Jg 2) were found in the rubbish heaps. The absence of a particular group of vessels from dwelling areas apparently indicates their having been of considerable value to the users, who took them all with them during the abandonment of the site (cf. Lightfoot 1993). On the other hand, it is also probable that relatively small vessels, such as oinochoai and jugs, were all taken, as their dimensions make them easily transportable as opposed to amphorae and jars (see Schiffer 1985:26–27; 1987:94–96 concerning the connection between the ‘curate behaviour’ [cf. Binford 1976], the transport of items during abandonment to the next occupational site and several characteristics which influence ‘curate priority’, such as the distance between settlements, item’s size, weight, replacement cost, etc.).

An additional behavioural pattern emerges from the spatial distribution of the cooking-pots within secondary refuse contexts. It is worth noting that except for a single example of a local cooking-pot (Type CP 1) exposed in the rubbish heap in Area S, outside the fortress, all other discarded cooking-pot examples (24 vessels) were found in the rubbish heaps located within the fortress (Area A, Locus 15b; Area C, Locus 31c). A similar spatial distribution for discarded examples of East Greek heavy bowls (mortaria) should be noted. On the other hand, all other pottery types are represented in the rubbish heap in Area S, outside the fortress, as well as in the rubbish heaps inside the fortress. It seems that such a premeditated discard of cooking vessels points to inhabitants’ desire not to attract various animals, such as jackals, foxes, etc., to the immediate vicinity of the fortress. The discarded cooking vessels most probably emitted smells attractive to the animals but indiscernible to humans.
Fig. 44. Stone artefacts.
### FIGURE 45. METAL ARTEFACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Raw haematite</td>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>E50</td>
<td>Reich 1989: Fig. 5/89–2771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Burnt haematite</td>
<td></td>
<td>8g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Raw haematite</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>A38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Raw haematite</td>
<td></td>
<td>A30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fishing weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Fishing weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Fishing weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Chisel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Needle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still, the majority of discarded cooking-pots is found in the rubbish heap in Area A, Locus 15b, far from the residential quarters. The uncertainty of the proposed reconstruction should be definitely emphasized.

2. Had the fortress been entirely excavated, there would be sufficient data for establishing the frequency of every type of pottery in the rooms, and by comparison with the amount discarded as secondary refuse (in rubbish heaps), it would be possible to evaluate the duration of the site's occupation (Schiffer 1976:59–62, 1987:53–55; Lightfoot 1993; Varien and Mills 1997).
Fig. 45. Metal artefacts.
However, even in the absence of complete data, it is theoretically possible to evaluate this because dwelling unit E-I was almost entirely excavated and the finds uncovered there may serve as a kind of model for the other units.

In order to examine the frequency of finds in the rooms in relation to their frequency in the rubbish heaps, cooking-pots have been chosen, as these are present everywhere. Likewise, their short life span (as compared to storage vessels, for example; see Arnold 2000:115-116, with earlier literature) allows for greater precision in searching for the duration of the site’s occupation time-span (Varien and Mills 1997). On the basis of ethnographic studies, it is assumed that the median use-life expectancy of a cooking-pot varies between 1.7 and 2.2 years. This is based by comparing data among numerous estimated cases, collected from geographically distant ethnographic groups (see summaries in Mills 1989:137, Table 4; Varien and Mills 1997:152, Table II, Appendix 1; Tani and Longacre 1999:306, Table 2; all with earlier literature). The sensitivity of use-life data is highly variable and depends on numerous factors (cf. Varien and Mills 1997). However, for the purpose of a strictly theoretical exercise, in Mezad Hashavyahu’s case, it is easier to estimate the average use-life expectancy of a cooking-pot as simply 2 years.

At Mezad Hashavyahu, sherds belonging to 49 different cooking-pots were found: 33 East Greek, 15 local and a lid of a possible Egyptian example. Fifteen East Greek cooking-pots were retrieved from the rooms (Area A: 3; Area B: 3; Area E: 6; Area F: 1; Area G: 2), and 15 in rubbish heaps (Area A: 11; Area C: 4). Fragments of three additional East Greek cooking-pots are unregistered.
Fig. 46. Metal artefacts.
Six local cooking-pots were found in the rooms (Area A: 2; Area B: 1; Area E: 2; Area G: 1) and 9 in rubbish heaps (Area A: 7; Area C: 1; Area S: 1). In all, in the rooms adjacent to the gate in Area A, 5 cooking-pots were found; in the room in Area B, 4 cooking-pots; in the dwelling unit E-I in Area E, 8 cooking-pots; in the room in Area F, 2 cooking-pots (apparently including the presumably-existent Egyptian cooking-pot); and in the excavated part of the dwelling unit in Area G, 3 cooking-pots. As dwelling unit E-I in Area E was the only one almost entirely excavated, the maximum number of cooking-pots in all units stands at 8, which is the number of cooking-pots found in the E-I unit’s rooms and courtyard. Still, it is possible that in the other dwelling units the situation was different. Thus, according to the average obtained from all the dwelling units, it may be proposed that the minimum number of cooking-pots in each of them was approximately 4. The results of the excavation show that the amounts vary from one unit to another, but each of them included a particular number of cooking-pots in their ceramic repertoire.

Now, the number of dwelling units must be estimated. While their exact number is unknown, the maximum number in the eastern wing of the fortress (the smaller rectangle) which served as dwellings cannot be greater than 7 units in each of the three blocks that are divided by passageways. Hence, the maximum estimated number of dwelling units is 21. This number appears unrealistic as it is likely that most of the central block was occupied by the ‘governor’s residence’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Basket No.</th>
<th>Previous Publication/IAA No.</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>71c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sickle blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Shell with ochre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>C32</td>
<td>/99–2217</td>
<td>40:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td>4–86</td>
<td>E28</td>
<td>/60–429</td>
<td>40:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Incised mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 47. Metal artefacts, incised pottery artefacts and shell.
In addition, the southern block of dwellings was narrower than the northern block and its internal division was probably different (Reich 1989:229). Another fact that makes the existence of 21 dwelling units simultaneously impossible is that certain rooms ceased to be used as dwellings and rubbish was deposited in them during the fortress's existence (for example, Area C). Thus, it seems that a minimum estimate of 10 dwelling units could have been in simultaneous use at the site.

Based upon a maximum estimate of 8 cooking-pots in each dwelling unit, one would expect that approximately 80 broken cooking-pots (from the 10 presumably-existent dwelling units) were discarded in the rubbish heaps over the course of approximately 2 years (the median use-life expectancy of a cooking-pot), and that a similar number of cooking-pots would be found in the dwelling units (if the site had continued to exist and had not been abandoned). If a minimum estimate of 4 cooking-pots per dwelling unit is adopted, then about 40 cooking-pots would have been broken and discarded to the rubbish heaps in the course of approximately 2 years, with approximately 40 cooking-pots in the rooms (if the site had continued to exist and had not been abandoned).

The total number of cooking-pots at Mezad Ḥashavyahu relates to five dwelling units,55 which yielded 22 cooking-pots and a possible cooking-pot lid, while 24 cooking-pots were found in the rubbish heaps (within Areas A and C), and three additional cooking-pots were unregistered. The ratio obtained clearly shows that the site did not exist more than 4.5–5 years, even based on the minimum estimate of the number of dwelling units and number of pots in each room. Calculation of the ratio using the maximum estimates will reduce the length of the site's occupation even further.

Undoubtedly, this analysis is not unequivocal and there is no disputing the fact that there are numerous possibilities for defining the average assemblage in a specific context (Cordell et al. 1987).56 Moreover, the finds uncovered constitute only part of all the cooking-pots used at the site, and there is no way of knowing how many were broken after the inhabitants left the site for different missions or how many were thrown into the rubbish heaps which were not located in the course of the limited excavation at the site. Since no complete
cooking-pot was found on the floors, it is unknown how many complete cooking-pots were taken at the time of the site's abandonment. On the other hand, there is a possibility that contrary to the East Greek oinochoai and local jugs, the cooking-pots were not taken at all. It appears that the number of cooking-pots documented attests to the site having been occupied for a few years only, though these calculation should only be utilized in establishing the minimum duration of the site's occupation and not its overall occupational time-span.

C. The small number of stone vessels for processing food products found at the site likely indicates it having been an administrative center, whose inhabitants were not themselves involved in primary processing of agricultural products, but received them pre-processed by local farmers. This evidence fits the contents of the 'Reaper's Letter' that attests to corvée workers engaged in activity in Ḫazar Asam near the fortress.

D. The assemblage that was exposed in Room 8 of Area A, may be considered with a high degree of certainty as connected with metalworking. Using Tournavitou's (1988) methodology for the identification of a workshop space within a given archaeological site, although developed for Mycenaean period sites in Greece, one may conclude that the finds from Room 8 follow her general model, which relates to "crafts, as practiced in a workshop, and do require particular built-in facilities" (ibid.:448ff., Group B).

The indicators for presumably existent metallurgical workspace are as follows:

Location: far from the living quarters which were located in the smaller rectangle of the fortress. Moreover, as Room 8 is the easternmost of the gate chambers, it has direct access to the open area (the courtyard of the larger rectangle), which could be utilized for work activities.

Facilities: the presence of permanent built-in facilities, such as a clay furnace, located in the northeastern corner of the room. This furnace may have been used for melting the alloy preparatory to pouring it into the mould cavity, etc. It should be emphasized that the bottom of the furnace and the floor of the room were full of ashes.

Materials: the presence of raw material – a big piece of burnt haematite. Since this piece of haematite was changed into iron as a result of exposure to high temperatures, it may be designated as half-worked material. The presence of finished objects in the vicinity of the furnace, such as an iron arrowhead and spatula, should be mentioned.

Tools: it is worth noting that the lack of tools connected to metal production is in line with the assumption that the site was voluntarily abandoned with no intention of returning. Therefore, the presumably existent tools were most probably all taken from the site in the course of the abandonment.
D. CONCLUSIONS: CHRONOLOGICAL-HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Absolute Dating

The importance of the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu for the purpose of establishing the absolute chronology of the end of the Iron Age both in the Aegean world and in the Land of Israel has been emphasized in the literature (e.g., Cook 1969; Aharoni and Aharoni 1976; Waldbaum and Magness 1997). Most scholars accept Naveh's view that the site existed at the end of the 7th century BCE. However, in assessing the duration of the site's occupation and the date of its abandonment, strong differences of opinion have emerged. The various datings proposed, though only slightly different, are based on greater conceptual differences.

Clearly, every attempt to establish the dating of a site should rest upon a combination of archaeological and historical evidence. Based solely on archaeological considerations, the date of Mezad Ḥashavyahu may be shifted to the beginning of the 6th century BCE (cf. Wenning 1989; Niemeier 1994:*34; contra Wightman 1985:628), as the present state of research does not permit the unequivocal identification of the typological differences between the pottery from the end of the 7th century and the beginning of the 6th century BCE (cf. Stern 2000). The so-called 'clear Babylonian' assemblages do not allow the definition of typological characteristics that relate solely to the Babylonian period.

57 Since no chronological anchor that would make it possible to link some historical events to archaeological finds from the Iron Age strata has been found in Greece proper, the Aegean scholars have to seek comparative material from the East (for the most recent summary, see Fantalkin 2001). Although there appears to be a reliable absolute Greek chronology from the second half of the 8th century BCE (Hannestad 1996; Morris 1996), until recently the dating of certain groups of East Greek pottery were based upon circular reasoning. Waldbaum and Magness (1997:25–26) have noted the difficulties arising from such argumentation in establishing the dates for Mezad Ḥashavyahu (including Middle Wild Goat II style pottery found there), whereas Naveh relies upon Cook's dating (Naveh 1962b:97; Cook 1960:118–126), and later, Cook bases his views on the dating of Naveh (Cook 1969:14; 1972:264). The development of the view of Aegean scholars on the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu may be demonstrated by the following quotes, between which there is a considerable gap in time: “the fort was occupied by Judah; but Judah can hardly have held this area after 609, when its king Josiah was defeated and killed by the Egyptians at Megiddo. The finds at Mesad Ḥashavyahu should then be no later than 609...” (Cook 1969:14); “...(Mezad Ḥashavyahu) must have come to an end between 609 and 598: here there was Wild Goat pottery of Middle II style and not early in that style...” (Cook and Dupont 1998:9).

58 Such as Stratum IIb at Tell el-Ful, Stratum IIIc at Tel Ḥarasim, Phase A at Khirbet Nimra in Hebron, and the burial assemblages from Beth Shemesh (Cave 14), Ketef Hinnom and Mamilla (for updated summary, see Lipschits 1998).
A few scholars have been led astray by Naveh’s preliminary conclusions concerning the finds uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu (“...a large number of sherds were collected belonging to the end of the Iron Age II and to the Persian period...” [Naveh 1960:129]), corrected by him in later publications (Naveh 1962b). Two groups of vessels – basket-handled amphorae and heavy bowls (mortaria) – were dated by some scholars to the Persian period only. According to Lapp (1970:183, n. 21), basket-handled amphorae, including those from Mezad Hashavyahu (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 6:13) are dated to the 5th century BCE (Group III-IV within his classification). Likewise, he states that the mortaria began to appear only in the 5th century BCE and continued until the Hellenistic period (ibid.:184–185). In view of the above, Holladay (1976:281, n. 33) proposed that other groups from the pottery repertoire of Mezad Hashavyahu are likewise dated to the period following 600 BCE. The erroneous conclusions mentioned above are understandable in view of the time of their writing, although even at that time, the finds from 8th/7th century strata of Ashdod had already been published and included a number of mortaria similar to those of Mezad Hashavyahu. Today, following continued research concerning the material culture at the end of the Iron Age, it is clear that the basket-handled amphorae and the mortaria with a flat disc base appeared in the second half of the 7th century BCE, if not earlier. Nonetheless, several scholars still insist on placing Mezad Hashavyahu in the Persian period (Francis and Vickers 1985:137; Tuplin 1987:202, n. 121, Map 4; for a general critique of Francis and Vickers’ low chronology, see Cook 1989; and concerning Mezad Hashavyahu in particular, see Waldbaum and Magness 1997:39–40). This is not the place to discuss the low chronology of Francis and Vickers, however, beyond a few important points raised by these scholars concerning the difficulties inherent in the absolute chronology of Greece during the Iron Age (see Fantalkin 2001), as their interpretations in all that concerns Mezad Hashavyahu demonstrate a basic misunderstanding. This site could not have existed following the Babylonian period, as all of the ceramic indicators of the Persian period in the Land of Israel (such as black-glazed Attic pottery and local vessels that belong solely to the Persian period) are absent from its assemblage. While its true that some of the local ceramic shapes continued into the Persian period, it is clear that in this case, these common shapes (following traditional manufacturing methods) cannot be used for dating purposes.

An additional point in favor of the possible ‘Babylonian dating’ for Mezad Hashavyahu emerges in a passage of Alcaeus, a Greek poet from the isle of Lesbos, describing the return of his brother Antimenidas from service in the Babylonian army (Lobel and Page 1955). It is generally accepted that Antimenidas participated as a mercenary in the army of Nebuchadnezzar in the destruction of
Ashkelon in Kislev 604 BCE. The poem of Alcaeus is thus dated to ca. 603 BCE (Quinn 1961) and indicates that Greeks served as mercenaries in the Babylonian army (cf. Parke 1933:3). Still, compared to the considerable involvement of Greek mercenaries in events that took place in Egypt during the days of the 26th Dynasty (Austin 1970:15–34; Braun 1982; Sullivan 1996), it appears that their employment by Babylonia was sporadic. The Babylonians

There is little evidence for the presence of Greeks in Babylonia proper during the 6th century BCE. Although a group of individuals called ia-a-ma-na-[A+<A>] (Ionians=Greeks) is mentioned in Neo-Babylonian sources and may well have also served as mercenaries, most of the personal names are Anatolian, making it difficult to establish their ethnic identity (Brinkman 1989; cf. Zgusta 1964). A modest number of Greeks, bearing Anatolian names, were most probably brought to Babylonia as a result of Nebuchadnezzar’s campaign to Cilicia (cf. Weidner 1939). Another source from the end of the 6th century BCE mentions the presence of Carians ([K]ar-sa-[A+<A>]) at Borsippa (cf. Eilers 1940:190–191), who may be Carians who were transferred from Egypt. In both cases these deportees were used in the service of the temples and not as mercenaries (cf. Bongenaar and Harring 1994:64).

R. Zadok states (pers. comm.) that there is a special relationship between Carians and Egyptians in Babylonia. A deed from Borsippa, 2.XII.517/6 BCE (Ungnad 1908:123, archive of Iliya) records Tu-tu-bi-is-su and her son Na-ši-ir-šû; the reading Ka-ar-sa?-a?-tu, Kar-sa-A?+<A> respectively cannot be confirmed by collation according to Eilers 1940:198ff. (cf. 191ff.; on Tutubissu cf. Zgusta 1970:107). In BM 26756 from Borsippa, 9.IV.517/6 BCE (same archive), the same Tu-tu-bi-e-su and her son Na-ši-ir-šû are both defined as Egyptians. In BM 26612 from Borsippa, 9.XI sometime between 519/8 and 513/2 BCE (same archive), Na-ši-ir-šû (without his mother’s name, but the latter may be mentioned in a damaged context) is defined as “Carian” ([K]ar-sa-A+A). Another individual in the same document who is defined as Carian, bears the Egyptian name Šá-mu-ū. It is noteworthy that a homonymous individual (son of Ū-ba/ma(?)-a-zi) is defined as Carian in a document from Babylon (concerning rations) dated to 17.II.514/3 BCE (see Zadok 1992:142f.). Are we dealing with the same person? Carians and Egyptians are also mentioned together in two deeds from the archive of another Borsippean, namely Šaddinnu son of Balâssu descendant of Bēliyā: BM 29488 from 14.III.516/5 BCE records rations distributed to Carians by the archive owner and Puhhûru son of Šamaš-mûkin-apli via Nabû-sišin (probably a Carian) and Pa-tê-es-si² (an Egyptian name). Both were in all probability the Carians’ foremen. The same Puhhûru and Ta-e-si² (an Egyptian name), the mother of Nabû-silim, are involved in the distribution of rations to Egyptians according to BM 29107 from 2.IX.516/5 BCE. Among the four witnesses to this deed there are two Carians. All these unpublished BM tablets are quoted here by kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

An examination of personal names in various archives from the beginning of the Persian period, such as Muraššu (Stolper 1985; Donbaz and Stolper 1997) or Kasr (Stolper 1990), unmistakably reveals that the Greek names do not occur there either. A single Greek who is recorded in the Muraššu archive, bore an Iranian (not Greek) name, namely Us-ta-na-[luJa], interpreted by R. Zadok as “field of Uštana the Greek” (pers. comm.; in the original publication of the document, the reading “field of Uštana and a Greek” is proposed [Donbaz and Stolper 1997:104, No. 32, 2f.]). Zadok’s “Uštana the Greek” is based upon the restoration of [luJ, which defines ethnic groups and professions. At first glance one may assume that since this Greek person bears an Iranian name, there may be other undetected Greeks hidden under non-Greek names, however, due to the specific
utilized mercenaries from various regions, including Greeks, Carians, Lycians, Lydians and others, without preference for any particular group. Moreover, in contrast to their Assyrian predecessors and in large measure also to the Egyptians, Babylonian policy in the Land of Israel was expressed mainly in the form of planned destruction which resulted in the ruin of the Kingdom of Judah and the Philistine cities (Lipschits 1997:171–336; Na’aman 2000; Stern 2001:303–350; contra Barstad 1996). Throughout the years of Babylonian rule, no effort was ever made to integrate the conquered region into the political realm of the new kingdom further than its use as a buffer zone with Egypt, or to create an economic mechanism that fostered building and development activity and trade links (contrary to what is referred to in the literature as the ‘Assyrian world system’; see Gitin 1997, with earlier literature). On the other hand, the ostraca from Mezad Ḥashavyahu indicate the existence of an active administrative unit with a developed agricultural hinterland – a situation that does not correspond to the destruction of Philistia in the wake of the Babylonian campaigns. Thus, the assumptions that Mezad Ḥashavyahu existed under Babylonian rule and that the Greek mercenaries there were serving the Babylonians should be rejected.

Of vital importance in dating Mezad Ḥashavyahu is the destruction date of Ashkelon by Nebuchadnezzar in the month of Kislev 604 BCE, as reported in the Babylonian Chronicle (Wiseman 1961:68–69, 85; Stager 1996a:61*, n. 1). The pottery assemblage exposed in the destruction layers at Ashkelon, which includes local and imported vessels (East Greek), parallels those of Ekron IB, Tell Batash II and Mezad Ḥashavyahu (Waldbaum and Magness 1997). Based upon this, one may conclude that Mezad Ḥashavyahu should be dated toward the end of the 7th century BCE. Nonetheless, in the absence of historical evidence concerning the destruction and abandonment of these sites in 604 BCE, one may assume that they were destroyed between 609 and 586 BCE (Kelm and Mazar 1985:117). Na’aman’s new reading, according to which a Babylonian campaign was not conducted against Philistia in 603 BCE (Na’aman 1992), strengthens the assumption that these sites were destroyed or abandoned in 604 BCE. According to Na’aman the destruction of Ekron may be placed in the fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar (601/600 BCE) following his unsuccessful campaign against Egypt, or even after 595 BCE, the final year for the Babylonian Chronicle indication of Uštana as a Greek, it is unlikely that in other cases Greek persons bearing non-Greek names will appear without ethnic identification. R. Zadok points out that another Greek with a non-Greek (Akkadian) name, Muššizib-Nabû (a slave, ṃûšu E-lam-mu, 549/8 BCE), is explicitly defined as “Ionian” (scripción I-ma-na-A+A, Dillard 1975: FLP 1574, 5). In addition, only seven of 664 Babylonian seals published from the archives of Murasû have been defined as containing Greek elements or influences (Bregstein 1993: Nos. 580, 583, 593, 596, 599, 612, 613).
concerning this region (ibid.:44). However, it is unlikely that the Babylonians would have destroyed only Ashkelon in 604 BCE and not other Philistine cities such as Ekron and Timnah (Tel Batash), who were allies of the Egyptians (Na’aman, too, agrees with the possibility that Ekron was already destroyed in 604 BCE, and see pers. comm. in Gitin 1998:276, n. 2; see also Gitin’s proposal to date the destruction of Ekron IB to 604 BCE [ibid.], as opposed to 603 BCE, as he had previously proposed [Gitin 1989:46]). Moreover, according to the Chronicle, the retreat of the Babylonian army began in the month of Shevat (January/February), following the destruction of Ashkelon in Kislev (November/December), thus they would appear to have had sufficient time to carry out a systematic destruction of most of the cities of Philistia (except for Gaza?, see Katzenstein 1994:42).

The documented destruction of Ashkelon in 604 BCE may serve as a lower chronological anchor for the finds uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu. Establishment of an upper anchor in absolute terms would appear to be impossible, although analysis of the stratigraphy and the material finds undertaken above indicates that the site was inhabited over a short period. In addition, based on the results of excavations at nearby Yavneh-Yam and Ashdod, a re-evaluation of the upper chronological anchor at Mezad Hashavyahu is proposed.

Settlement remains dated to the second half of the 7th century BCE were recently discovered at Yavneh-Yam and designated as Stratum IX (Fischer and Fantalkin, forthcoming). Stratum IX was primarily exposed in Area A (over a 125 m.² area), located ca. 1,700 m. northwest of Mezad Hashavyahu. Here, part of a monumental structure was found, with a destruction layer on its floor. The poor remains of this stratum were also uncovered in Area B, located ca. 120 m. northeast of Area A, and in Area C, located ca. 20 m. west of Area A. In this stratum at Area A, two Judean weights were found, one of which is inscribed ‘pim’ (cf. Kletter 1991), as well as a scaraboid and two scarabs.⁶⁰

The first scarab (Fig. 48:1) is made of blue frit and bears the Horus name of Psammetichus I (uah-ib-Ra).⁶¹ Identical examples are attested so far only at Cumae in southern Italy, although from an uncertain context (cf. Höbl 1979a:152–153, 1979b:198–199, Nos. 918–924, Taf. 108; Gorton 1996:109–111, Type XXXB, Fig. 24). According to Gorton (ibid.:92, 183), the fabric and motifs of this type are very close to those of the Naukratis workshop, however,

---

⁶⁰ The scarabs were identified and the parallels provided by N. Lalkin.

⁶¹ It should be noted that the Horus name uah-ib-Ra may belong to Apries as well (cf. Höbl 1979b:198), however, based on the context in which this scarab was unearthed (Yavneh-Yam Stratum IX) and the general historical picture in the region during the reign of Apries (above), this possibility seems highly unlikely.
it most probably appeared before the establishment of the Naukratis factory, which is primarily attributed to the reign of Psammetichus II and Apries (von Bissing 1951; Gorton 1996:177–178). Still, the appearance of a group of scarabs bearing the name of Psammetichus I, made in a technique similar to those of the Naukratis workshop (ibid.:91–131, Types XXVIII–XXXVI), allows them to be attributed quite close to the first phase of the settlement at Naukratis, probably ca. 620 BCE by the accepted dating (Boardman 1980:118–133; Sullivan 1996).

The second scarab (Fig. 48:2) belongs stylistically to the earlier group (cf. Gorton 1996:81–83, esp. No. 14, Type XXVA), which is defined by its fine technique and a particular composition; the scarab’s middle register includes a cartouche inscribed men-ka-Ra which appears to be an anachronistic use of the name of the pharaoh from the 4th Dynasty (Lalkin, pers. comm.). According to Gorton (1996:80), this name may be interpreted as that of a prince of the 25th Dynasty, however, most of the scarabs of this type are known from the 7th century BCE horizon.

The pottery assemblage of Stratum IX parallels the finds of other contemporary sites, such as Ashkelon’s Babylonian destruction layer, Ekron IB, Tel Batash II and Mezad Hashavyahu. However, the East Greek repertoire attested at Yavne-Yam is quite scanty. It includes several flat-base mortaria, at least one basket-handled amphora, a few pieces of Ionian cups (one of them our Type IC 1) and a couple of the East Greek cooking-pots rims (our Type eg CP 1). So far not a single sherd of East Greek pottery of the Wild Goat Style was found at Yavne-Yam, while such examples were found at Mezad Hashavyahu, Ashkelon, Ekron and Timnah (Waldbaum and Magness 1997:28–30). It appears that the end of Yavneh-Yam Stratum IX may be similarly set at 604 BCE.

The discovery of a scarab of Psammetichus I in Stratum IX at Yavneh-Yam is consistent with his operations in the southern coastal region as mentioned by Herodotus (II:157). The latter states that Pharaoh laid siege to Ashdod for 29 years before finally taking the city. Since this number appears to be exaggerated, it has been proposed that the conquest of Ashdod took place in the 29th year of Psammetichus I’s reign, that is, in 635 BCE (Tadmor 1966:102). The historical source does not clarify why Psammetichus I destroyed Ashdod. According to Tadmor (ibid.), the fact that he was an ally of the Assyrians in their struggle against Babylonian expansion indicates that Ashdod was destroyed only after proclaiming its independence from Assyria. Miller and Hayes (1986:384) likewise believed that Egypt attempted to show its strength against the Philistine city-states when they proclaimed their independence.
Fig. 48. Two scarabs from Stratum IX, Area A at Yavneh-Yam.
Other scholars have attempted to link the 29 year siege with Herodotus’ comment (1:106) on the 28 years of Scythian rule in Asia (for summary with earlier literature, see Na’aman 1991a:39-40). According to Na’aman (ibid.), the siege was extended to 29 years as a result of Herodotus’ chronological speculation, in which Herodotus states that the siege began when Psammetichus I set out to meet the Scythians on the Philistine coast and persuaded them to withdraw, and it ended after the Scythians were defeated by the Medes 28 years later, putting an end to their rule in Asia (Her. I:105). It seems that this assumption should be accepted, since even if the weakening of Assyrian rule began as early as 631 BCE, resulting from the death of Ashurbanipal and the rise of Ashur-et-il-ilani to power, this date still does not fit the attempt to explain the 29 year siege of Ashdod as the time of its destruction in the 29th year of Psammetichus I’s reign, i.e., 635 BCE. The reason for this is because it is difficult to imagine such a daring Egyptian maneuver during the reign of Ashurbanipal (for the date of Assyrian withdrawal from Palestine, see Na’aman 1991a:34-40). According to Na’aman, even the revolt that broke out in Assyria following the accession of Ashur-et-il-ilani in 631 BCE was only an isolated episode, so that no player endangered Assyrian control over the region of Syria-Palestine until the outbreak of the revolt in Babylonia in 626 BCE, and the outbreak of the civil war in 623 BCE (Na’aman 1991a:38; 1991b). It appears that insofar as Psammetichus I indeed did destroy Ashdod, this activity could have taken place between the years 626–623 BCE, in the course of the Assyrian efforts to suppress the rebellion in Babylonia, or even later.

The excavators of Ashdod have attempted to identify Stratum VIIB at Ashdod as that destroyed by Psammetichus I (Ashdod I: 11, 141, n. 46; Ashdod II-III: 115; Ashdod IV: 57; Dothan 1993:93). The excavation reports do not provide any real evidence for such a scenario, as no significant destruction remains were found in this stratum. However, the fact that not a single sherd of East Greek pottery was found at Ashdod indicates a settlement gap during the period of Mezad Hashavyahu’s existence.

It seems that if Mezad Hashavyahu, Ashkelon, Ekron, Timnah and Yavneh-Yam IX did indeed cease to exist in 604 BCE, then the end of Ashdod VIIB preceded it by a few years, but probably not before the 620s BCE.63

62 Since Ashurbanipal’s last dated tablet from Nippur is from his 38th year, i.e., 631 BCE, it is impossible to antedate his death earlier than this year. Other proposed dates for his death, such as 627 BCE, are even later (for the establishing of the absolute chronology of the Late Assyrian empire, see most recently Na’aman 1991b, with earlier literature).

63 According to Finkelstein and Singer-Avitz (forthcoming), the site of Tel Ashdod was not inhabited in the 7th century BCE, except for possible squatters’ activities. However, since
This is based on the beginning of Psammetichus I’s actions on the southern coast and the lack of East Greek pottery at this site. If one accepts this reconstruction, it is highly probable that Mezad Ḥashavyahu existed between the 620s and 604 BCE (contra Wightman 1985:625, 823, who believes that an upper terminus for Mezad Ḥashavyahu’s occupation should belong to 650/630 BCE horizon).

Theoretically, it is possible to compress even this short time-span. The absence of Wild Goat Style pottery at Yavneh-Yam Stratum IX may point to a certain chronological gap between its destruction and the abandonment of Mezad Ḥashavyahu. That the absence of this pottery at Yavneh-Yam stems from cultural rather than chronological factors seems doubtful. In the anthropological literature, there are documented examples of ‘cultural boundaries’ between various tribes, which certain vessel types of special cultural significance do not cross (cf. Hodder 1979). However, in the case of Mezad Ḥashavyahu and Yavneh-Yam, the distance separating the sites is less than 2 km. Moreover, since a modest number of East Greek pottery was attested at Yavneh-Yam, there may be Wild Goat Style pottery that has not yet been found.

Still, there is the possibility that Stratum IX at Yavneh-Yam was destroyed by Pharaoh Necho II in 609 BCE – the first year of his reign, during which a major campaign was undertaken to northern Syria in an effort to assist his ally Ashuruballit II in his struggle against the Babylonians and Medes (Freedy and Redford 1970:474–475; Redford 1982). But this theory is weak, as it makes it necessary to date the settlement at Mezad Ḥashavyahu between 609 and 604 BCE, a period that apparently fits the estimated time-span for the site’s occupation, established on the basis of the quantitative and accumulative analysis of the finds. However, as is pointed out above, the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu may be utilized in establishing the minimum occupational time-span of the site rather than in calculating its overall occupational time-span. Moreover, if Mezad Ḥashavyahu was established following the destruction of Yavneh-Yam, it is hard to explain why it was not located at the Yavneh-Yam harbor, but ca. 2 km. to the south. In view of this, the former dating, which is consistent with the existence of the settlement at Mezad Ḥashavyahu within an approximate 15-year period, appears more likely.

Ashdod is mentioned in the historical records from this period, they propose that 7th century BCE Ashdod is actually located at nearby Ashdod-Yam.

An additional corroboration for this assumption emerges from the Babylonian Chronicle – according to it Psammetichuṣ I and his army came to the aid of Assyrian king Sin-shar-ishkun in 616 BCE, and fought alongside the Assyrians in the far north, in the vicinity of Qablinu (Wiseman 1961:11–13, 44, 54–55; Spalinger 1978a:49–50).
The Nature of the Settlement at Mezad Hashavyahu

As stated in Section A above, there is a lack of agreement over the interpretation of the finds uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu. Its excavators regarded it as a settlement of Greek mercenaries (Naveh 1962b; Reich 1989), and according to many scholars, it also served as a Greek trading post (emporion) (Strange 1966:138; Galling 1968:70; Weinberg 1969:90; Weippert 1988:620; Kelm and Mazar 1989:49; Waldbaum 1994:60–61).

These assumptions are based upon intuitive interpretation which takes for granted the connection between the material finds (such as fortifications or remains of metalworking alongside concentrations of East Greek pottery) and the settlement pattern of Greek mercenaries and traders, which perhaps fits such finds. Therefore, it is possible to consider alternative explanations.

In order to clarify this issue, the assumed model of a Greek traders’ settlement on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean during the Iron Age may demonstrate why the Greek settlement at Mezad Hashavyahu was not an emporion. The restriction of the proposed model to a limited geographical region stems from the fact that, in contrast to Greek settlement models characteristic of major stages of Archaic Greek colonization, their settlement in the eastern Mediterranean basin followed an entirely different pattern. The presence of the great powers of the ancient Near East in these regions dictated to the Greeks a form of settlement distinct from that of the apoikiai (colonies) and emporia (trading posts) such as those established in southern Italy, around the Black Sea and in northern Africa. In the East, settlements of mercenaries and emporia were established under the control of the host rulers.

A settlement of traders, whether founded as a separate settlement or as an enoikismos (an enclave of foreign ethnic origin within an existing settlement),65 will most likely be located in a densely populated area so as to facilitate appropriate trade links. The material remains of such a settlement change over the years as a result of cultural assimilation (cf. Adams 1968; Bunimovitz and Yasur-Landau 1996). However, maintenance of constant links with the mother country (for trade purposes) would have prevented the settlers from losing their ethnic and cultural identity. A traders’ settlement should be characterized by numerous objects obtained through trade, however, not always archaeologically visible. If the trade is in pottery, one would expect to find these objects at regional sites near the trading settlement. Moreover, there may be vessels produced in the mother country based on the needs/tastes of the local market.

---

65 “Community colonies” is Branigan’s (1981:26–27) terminology. This phenomenon is well known in the Greek world and is also documented for earlier periods – the Assyrian settlements in Anatolia (ca. 1900–1830 BCE), where they are called kārum or wabartum.
Some of these pottery forms might be rare in the mother country where they were produced.

Among the early Greek ceramic repertoire, plates, for example, are a relatively rare find, as the Greeks utilized skyphoi for drinking and for eating during this period (Howe 1958:49, n. 24; Coldstream 1998:354). In large pottery assemblages from cemeteries at Lefkandi in Euboea, only four plates decorated with the usual Euboean pendant concentric semi-circle design (e.g., Popham 1994:32, Fig. 2.15:c) were found in graves of the 10th and early 9th centuries BCE (Coldstream 1998:354). On the other hand, as pointed out by some scholars (Coldstream and Bikai 1988:39; Coldstream 1989:92), this shape occurs much more in the east, among Euboean exports to Cyprus and the Levant (especially Tyre) (cf. Popham 1994:27, Fig. 2.12). This fact points to the attempts of Euboean craftsmen to adapt their product to the needs of the Phoenician market (Coldstream 1998). A similar situation may be seen in the distribution of the products of an Athenian ‘Nicosthenic’ ceramic workshop during the second half of the 6th century BCE for the Etruscan market. The adoption of Etruscan buccher pottery shapes shows that this Athenian workshop was producing specifically for a foreign market (Osborne 1996). Likewise, a similar picture arises from the distribution of Attic pottery in the Achaemenid empire (cf. De Vries 1977). Thus, certain groups of Attic vessels, e.g., the so-called ‘Castulo’ cup, are virtually unrepresented in Attica itself (where they were produced), but are found in other lands (Shefton 1996; 2000).

The simplified interpretation of the East Greek pottery assemblage of Mezad Hashaviah as the direct evidence for pottery trade appears to be an excellent example of what is referred to as ‘positivist fallacy’ (Snodgrass 1980:126–128). I am far from claiming that Greek pottery found overseas was not traded at all as a commodity in its own right (Gill 1991, 1994; contra Boardman 1988; Arafat and Morgan 1989; Salmon 2000). However, the diffusion of this pottery must be scrutinized carefully, taking into consideration a wide spectrum of circumstances which may distinguish the various regions during different time periods. It seems that the East Greek pottery from Mezad Hashaviah reflects daily use by Greek residents who brought it there. This assemblage with a variety of types (bowls, cups, kraters, cooking-pots, oinochoai, amphorae, lamps, etc.) does not include vessels that are not common in East Greece. Moreover, the sparse finds of East Greek pottery from the late 7th century BCE in the Land of Israel, reviewed above, make it seem unlikely that these vessels were of commercial value among the local population. Its distribution, restricted

66 It appears that in Egypt the situation was different, as a group of Greek vessels apparently produced especially for the Egyptian market was found at Naucratis. Thus, for example, the Chios Polychrome group of vessels which, on the basis of petrography and typology
mainly to the coast and the southern Shephelah, and its limited quantity (except for Mezad Ḥashavyahu), strengthen this claim. The occurrence of similar pottery at sites such as Tell Malḥata in the northern Negev does not alter this picture, as these are singular examples. The attested distribution and the nature of the East Greek finds in the region toward the end of the 7th century BCE are insufficient to prove either the existence of a purposeful pottery trade or the existence of a directional exchange of other goods, which may be less archaeologically visible (such as grain, oil, wine, etc.). Thus, even in the latter case, one would expect to find the necessary containers, such as amphorae, for these soft goods. The modest number of East Greek amphorae attested in the region does not permit the reconstruction of any trade model, beyond the supposition that those used by the Greeks were brought with them.

An additional point which does not support the assumption that Mezad Ḥashavyahu was a trading settlement is its location far from the natural basin of Yavneh-Yam and Nahal Sorek. If one accepts that Mezad Ḥashavyahu was established following the destruction of Yavneh-Yam, the condition of a densely populated area around the trading settlement is not met here either. On the other hand, if those two settlements existed simultaneously, which seems more likely, the scanty finds of the East Greek pottery attested at Yavneh-Yam Stratum IX, also negates the identification of Mezad Ḥashavyahu as a trading post for distributing East Greek pottery. All the above lead to the conclusion that Mezad Ḥashavyahu was not an emporion.

The appearance of East Greek pottery on the coastal plain and in the Shephelah in the Land of Israel at the end of the 7th century BCE and its subsequent disappearance after only several years,67 seems to lead to the conclusion that these assemblages represent Greek mercenaries serving the Egyptians. This conclusion is based upon several facts:

---

originated in workshops on Chios, was not found on the island itself, but at Naukratis and in the Greek mainland (Boardman 1986:252; see however, Cook 1997:122), showing that they were most probably produced for trade. Boardman (ibid.) proposed that the Chios clay was brought to Naukratis in Greek trading ships so as to produce this pottery there. This assumption does not affect my basic supposition that if one considers the existence of presumed trading post distributing pottery of foreign origin among the native population, a particular groups of pottery especially developed to satisfy the local market should exist (concerning other Chios groups specially produced for the Egyptian market, see Boardman 1956; concerning developed trade links between Greece and Egypt during the Iron Age, see Guralnick 1997, with earlier literature).

67 A significant difference (that finds expression in the pottery repertoire) must be noted between the East Greek assemblages from the end of the 7th century BCE and renewal of East Greek imports observed toward the end of the 6th century BCE, which most probably points to commercial activity. During the 5th century BCE, the East Greek pottery is gradually replaced by Attic imports.
1. The Greek mercenaries were a significant element in the army of the rulers of the 26th Dynasty according to historical records (Herodotus [II:30, 152]; in the Annals of Ashurbanipal, Gyges, king of Lydia, is accused of sending his army to the aid of Psammetichus I [Luckenbill 1927:297–298; Cogan and Tadmor 1977; Spalinger 1978b]), and based on the archaeological finds from Egypt proper (Austin 1970:15–34; Boardman 1980:133–141).  

2. The relatively massive appearance of East Greek pottery on the Coastal Plain and in the Shephelah continued for a limited period that fits the time-span during which the area fell under Egyptian rule, following Assyrian withdrawal from the region (Freedy and Redford 1970:477–478; Miller and Hayes 1986: 388–390; Na'aman 1991a:44–55). Greek pottery of any kind rarely appeared in the Land of Israel prior to the end of the 7th century BCE, as opposed to the well-developed trade links between Euboea and Phoenicia during the Iron Age (cf. Waldbaum 1994; Haider 1996; both summaries with earlier literature). Moreover, the Egyptian withdrawal from the region marks an end to the presence of East Greek pottery in the local assemblages until it reappears toward the end of the 6th century BCE.

3. The East Greek pottery assemblages found at the coastal sites from the end of the 7th century BCE consist mainly of a few types that include Ionian cups, cooking-pots, Samian or Milesian amphorae and oinochoai in Middle Wild Goat Style II. The quantitative aspect of this pottery varies from one site to another, however there is a general tendency toward uniformity of the types that appear at the various sites. Other types, documented at Mezad Hashavyahu and elsewhere, constitute an insignificant percentage.

4. The appearance of East Greek pottery in the region is in line with two 7th century BCE ostraca found in Philistia bearing possible Greek names (Naveh 1985:14).  

In view of the above, the finds uncovered at Mezad Hashavyahu reflect the presence of mercenaries of East Greek origin. The East Greek finds from other sites such as Tell Kabri, Ashkelon, Ekron and Timnah should be interpreted in a similar fashion (contra Stager 1996a:67*). The quantitative aspect of these mercenaries may vary from site to site; their main encampments seem to be located primarily along the coast: Ashkelon, Mezad Hashavyahu and Kabri. There may be other undetected encampments between Mezad Hashavyahu and

---

68 Psammetichus I is mentioned in a 7th century BCE inscription from the vicinity of Priene, dedicated by a Greek soldier who served in the Egyptian army (Masson and Yoyotte 1988).

69 The appearance of the name of a Greek goddess, πτγυ, in the royal dedicatory inscription from Ekron (Gitin et al. 1997; Schäfer-Lichtenberger 2000) is consistent with the presence of Greek mercenaries in Philistia. However, this possibility is uncertain as it may relate rather to an ancient Aegean tradition preserved by the Philistines through the ages.
The East Greek finds from Ekron and Timnah should be considered rather as a reflection of Greek mercenary activities in the area connected to the main encampments on the coast. The presence of Greek mercenaries during this period may only be attributed to the Egyptian administration, as there is no historical or archaeological basis for supposing that such mercenaries also served the kings of Judah, as proposed by some scholars (Helm 1980:135; Yadin and Geva 1983:247, 252; Dalley and Reyes 1998:97; West 1999:617; Stern 2001:223–227). Reference to units of Kittim (ktym) in the Arad documents\(^70\) (Aharoni 1981:12–13; for the origins of Kittim, see Na’aman 1991a:47–48, n. 59, 60, with earlier literature), dated to this period (Ussishkin 1988), confirms this conclusion in which the East Greek pottery and the Arad documents together provide direct evidence for the activity of these mercenaries in the service of Egypt (cf. Na’aman 1991a:44–48).

The appearance of Greek mercenaries in the East and their employment by the different Near Eastern powers near the end of the Iron Age is a subject of controversy. According to historical sources, there were only two Eastern powers that used Greek mercenaries during this period: mainly Egypt, and to a lesser extent, Babylonia (see above). The possible presence of Greek or Carian mercenaries in the Assyrian army is lacking both historical and archaeological bases (cf. Helm 1980:135–151; \textit{contra} Dalley and Reyes 1998:97). The reference in Polyaeus (VII:3) (Haider 1996:93, n. 170, with earlier literature), mentioning Carian mercenaries in the service of Psammetichus I, is interpreted by Freedy and Redford (1970:476, n. 69) as “a re-write of the last Kushite attempt in 663 B.C. to take Egypt, in which the historical role of the Assyrians is transferred to the founder of the Saite house” (cf. Spalinger 1976:137–138, n. 31; Braun 1982: 35–36). Even if this problematic interpretation is correct, such a late source does not appear to indicate the possible hiring of Carian mercenaries by the Assyrian army, since it is not corroborated by any authentic Assyrian sources.\(^71\)

The same is true as to the speculative attribution of Greek mercenaries to the kings of Judah\(^72\) as was done in the case of Mezad Ḥashavyahu (see Section A), or to their employment by Tyre as in the case of Tell Kabri (Niemeier 1994).

\(^{70}\) It should be noted that Yadin (1974:30–32) tried to interpret the inscription on the bowl from Arad as Greek. However, this reconstruction is highly uncertain.

\(^{71}\) An additional datum emerges from a siege scene on a silver bowl from Amathus (Cyprus) – soldiers dressed like Greek hoplites appear among the eastern troops. However, this scene should be considered rather as mythological and not as describing a real event (Barnett 1977; Helm 1980:140, with earlier literature).

\(^{72}\) It has already been pointed out that East Greek pottery of any kind is absent from the Judean core area. The single piece of evidence that may point to a Greek presence in Jerusalem is a couple of supposedly Greek signs inscribed on pottery sherds found in the Babylonian destruction layer (Sass 1990). However, this identification is highly uncertain.
In both cases, attributing Greek mercenaries to the relatively small and dependent local powers is based on an analogy with Egyptian employment of Greek mercenaries. The biblical passages in Ezekiel (27:13, 19) mention the important role of Greeks in Tyrian trade but do not provide any clue for the assumption that the Greeks were used by Tyre as mercenaries. On the other hand, it definitely mentions the Lydians in Tyre’s military service (Ezek. 27:10). Still, it is not impossible that among these Lydian mercenaries there were Greeks and Carians. However, since it is uncertain, the presence of Greek mercenaries at Tell Kabri may be considered rather as evidence of their employment by the Egyptians and not the Tyrians.

In this regard, one should mention Kearsley’s (1999) proposal to interpret Level 9 at Al Mina as an Euboean mercenary encampment. Her historical reconstruction of Al Mina Level 9 is based on the hypothetical assumption that there were Euboean mercenaries “among the Ionians and Carians moving around the Eastern Mediterranean in the 8th and early 7th centuries” (ibid.:124), and on the analogy with Mezad Hashavvahu and Tell Kabri (ibid.:129). According to her, there is a possibility that the presence of Euboean mercenaries at Al Mina Level 9 was sanctioned by the ruler of the kingdom of Unqi, prior to its incorporation within the Assyrian Empire in 738 BCE, or alternatively, the Euboeans had camped at the mouth of the Orontes, which they knew from earlier visits to be unoccupied (ibid.). It has already been pointed out that the Greek pottery uncovered at Al Mina could not be connected with the actual massive Greek presence at the site in the 8th century BCE, since the exact ratio between the local and imported pottery could not be established (see footnote 46, with earlier literature). The absence of cooking-pots of any sort, which were probably discarded during the excavation (except two unidentified examples, cf. Kearsley 1995:74–75, n. 248), and especially Greek cooking-pots, does not provide archaeological grounds for Kearsley’s reconstruction. Moreover, from an historical point of view, if Zadok’s (1996) identification of Al Mina as Ah-ta-[a] in the Tiglath-pileser III inscription on an Iranian stele (Tadmor 1994:91–110) is correct, it is totally contradictory to Kearsley’s interpretation, since in 737 BCE at the latest (ibid.:92) (= Level 9 in Kearsley’s chronology?), Ah-ta-[a] is described as an emporion on the seashore (for a different location

---

73 A quite similar scenario as to the presence of Greek mercenaries in the Land of Israel was proposed by Helm. According to him: “except for the small garrison at Mesad Hashavvahu, it seems likely that we should think in terms of individual adventurers or small groups of free-lance soldiers, not of sizable contingents of hoplites-for-hire.” (Helm 1980:137). In my opinion, such a reconstruction is unacceptable since both historically and archaeologically the presence of Greek mercenaries may be explained rather as organized movement led by a central authority (Egypt) who placed them in the conquered land and not as individual mercenary adventurers.
of *Ah-ta-[a], see *ibid.:*104; it should be noted that Zaclok’s identification is also accepted by Na’aman [pers. comm.]).

The dating proposed here for the finds from Mezad Ḥashavyahu – from the 620s (at the earliest) to 604 BCE (at the latest) – makes it possible to attribute its establishment to the troops of Psammetichus I, or alternatively, to Necho II. This period of time began at the end of Josiah’s reign, through the short rule of Jehoahaz and the beginning of Jehoiakim’s. Still, there is no support for Wenning’s claim (1989; cf. Dion 1992) that the settlement was established and operated between 600 and 598 BCE under the reign of Jehoiakim during a brief period of independence from Babylonia. This view is based upon the problematic attribution of one sherd(!) from Mezad Ḥashavyahu to the Late Wild Goat Style.74 Jehoiakim’s relations with Pharaoh Necho II were those of vassal and lord, for it was Necho II who crowned Jehoiakim in Riblah and imposed a heavy tax on the Kingdom of Judah (II Kgs. 23:31–35).75 The brief period of Jehoiakim’s independent policy, as expressed in the biblical text (II Kgs. 24:1; cf. Rainey 1975:57), should be considered against the background of Egypt’s return to the region (601/600 – 599/598 BCE) and its attempt to re-establish control over the local vassals. The corroboration for this may be found in Jeremiah’s and Herodotus’s statements (Jer. 47:1; Her. II:159). In both cases it seems that Necho II reconquered Gaza (Katzenstein 1994:42–43; Rainey 2001:61) following Nebuchadnezzar’s return to Babylonia as a result of his unsuccessful campaign against Egypt in 601/600 BCE (Wiseman 1961:70–71). Jehoiakim most probably stopped paying tribute to Nebuchadnezzar in these years (II Kgs. 24:1), however, this could be the result of a direct Egyptian order rather than an independent policy.76

74 Up to now, no single sherd that may be typologically attributed to the Late Wild Goat Style has been found in the Land of Israel (Waldbaum and Magness 1997:30, n. 48). Wenning (1989) regarded this small, isolated sherd (Naveh 1962b: Fig. 9:1) as evidence for the existence of an entire typological group, on which he made his unreasonable historical claims.

75 It may reasonably be assumed that similar relations existed between Josiah and Necho II, and most probably between Josiah and Psammetichus I at the end of his reign. In 612 BCE, Psammetichus I’s rule extended at least as far as the Lebanese coast, as attested by various written evidence in which the tribute brought by the kings of Phoenicia to Egypt is mentioned (for expanded summaries, see Freedy and Redford 1970:477; Spalinger 1977:228–229; 1978a:55, n. 27; Miller and Hayes 1986:388–390; Na’an 1991a:51–52). It seems that both the historical and the archaeological evidence clearly indicate that the great kingdom of Josiah never existed (Na’an 1991a), for he was never able to free himself of the burden of foreign rule (whether Assyrian or Egyptian).

76 Ostensibly, it may be considered that the establishment of Mezad Ḥashavyahu took place between 601/600 and 599/598 BCE as a result of Necho II’s attempting to regain control over the local vassals (see above). However, it seems highly unlikely to compress the occupational time-span of Mezad Ḥashavyahu to two years only. Moreover, the founding of
It is thus clear that the assumption of independent Judean control over the strategic coastal region, even between 601/600 and 599/598 BCE, should not be accepted.

Assuming that the fortress was ruled by the Egyptians, it seems unreasonable that an Egyptian fortress would remain standing while the Babylonian army advanced towards Ashkelon. It thus seems impossible to extend its existence beyond 604 BCE as Wenning (1989) proposes. It is worth noting that there is a similarity between the abandonment of Mezad Ḥashavyahu with the approach of the Babylonian army, and the letter of Adon – apparently king of Ekron (Porten 1981) – who requests assistance from the pharaoh because the Babylonians have already reached Aphek. The form of the letter from Saqqara and its date have been widely discussed in the literature (for summary, see ibid.). It seems that the abandonment pattern attested at Mezad Ḥashavyahu, which as was shown earlier may be designated as abandonment with no intention of return, appears to support the dating of the letter of Adon to 604 BCE.

Finally, the question of the Hebrew ostraca discovered at Mezad Ḥashavyahu should be dealt with. It seems that they do not indicate Judean control over the site, rather they only suggest that the corvée workers, who provided for the needs of Mezad Ḥashavyahu and were employed nearby in Ḥazar Asam, were of Judean origin.77 The obedience to biblical law, as it emerges from the ‘Reaper’s Letter’ points to Egyptian non-interference in personal legal matters. Moreover, the adoption of the laws of a conquered land by a conqueror is known throughout the periods (cf. Wilson 1983:247–248), and there is no reason to assume that the Egyptians would want to force their complex legal system (cf. Allam 1991) upon the population of Judah.

An additional point that emerges from the ‘Reaper’s Letter’ is that a person in charge of the Greek garrison was apparently a Judean official.78 Likewise, it is not

Mezad Ḥashavyahu against the background of contemporaneous evidence for the presence of Greek mercenaries in Egyptian service show a well-established Egyptian regime in the Land of Israel, which only existed in the area prior to 604 BCE. It seems that Necho II’s assumed re-conquest of Gaza was a short-term historical event and although he probably re-established control in the region for one or two years, it was not accompanied by building activities.

77 On the Judean population in the vicinity of Ekron, not far from Mezad Ḥashavyahu, which became attractive to some of the refugees who fled Judah in the wake of Sennacherib’s campaign, see Gitin 1989 and Na’aman 1995:113.

78 For the multiple positions which a high official of Mezad Ḥashavyahu (מַשָּׁבָּה) may have had, such as supervisor on the corvée, military commander and judge, see Suzuki 1982, and most recently, Sacher Fox 2000:154, 274. The latter also pointed out an interesting parallel between the position and the duties held by the šr of Buhen – the Egyptian governor of the Nubian fortress of Buhen – to those of the מַשָּׁבָּה of Mezad Ḥashavyahu.
impossible that alongside the Greek mercenaries there were also mercenaries from Judah at Mezad Hashavyahu. Here, it should be remembered that the use of Judean mercenaries by the Egyptians was not uncommon, and this was apparently the case at that time at Migdol, Tahpanhes and Memphis (e.g., Jer. 44:1; 46:14; cf. Porten 1968:8–16) and in a later period, at Elephantine (ibid.:28–61).

However, dealing with the presence of the Greek mercenaries in the service of Egypt toward the end of the 7th century BCE in the Land of Israel, one should consider their role in the fighting methods from that period (Eph'Al 1983:105). According to Eph'Al, there is an uncertainty as to the use of Greek mercenaries stationed as garrisons in fortresses such as Mezad Hashavyahu. Since the advantages of Greek mercenaries were mostly in open-field battles,\(^79\) it is unclear why they were preferred over local soldiers (Eph'Al pers. comm.). It seems that the preference for Greek mercenaries over local (Judean) ones stems rather from their undisputed loyalty to the Egyptian authorities than from their military expertise. As to the Judean mercenaries in the service of Egypt, those seem to be more involved in the events that occurred in Egypt proper or Nubia. Thus, the Egyptian rulers may have thought it better not to use the Judean mercenaries in their homeland. It appears that the kings of Judah were obligated to provide supplies to the Greek mercenary units, and to cooperate with these Egyptian representatives in any possible way. In the light of the previous discussion one may consider that the settlement model for Mezad Hashavyahu is the same as the general model proposed by Branigan in relation to Minoan colonization, which he refers to as a ‘governed colony’ (Branigan 1981, 1984):\(^80\)

...Governed colonies... have a foreign administration or government imposed upon them by force. Such force would normally be military in nature, although it could conceivably be economic. The settlement is then governed for, and in the interests of, the foreign state. Such colonies do not require the permanent re-settlement of large numbers of ‘colonists’; only a ‘governor’ (whatever his title), perhaps a small administrative staff, and some sort of garrison to ensure the security of the ‘governor’ and the adherence of the colony. The purpose of such colonies varies, but is usually either strategic or commercial.... The physical features of such colonies should include a residence for the governor., accommodation and equipment for a garrison. The governor, and perhaps his staff, will import luxuries from the homeland, but the mass of the population will live much as before and use locally made products....

\(^79\) From a military point of view, the so-called ‘hoplite reform’ is expressed in the development of the phalanx – its advantages may be found in open-field battles rather than as defensive garrisons (cf. Snodgrass 1965; Hanson 1989; Van Wees 1995).

\(^80\) The concept of colony here does not denote apoikia, but refers to any kind of settlement.
Ancient examples which are testified historically might include the city-states of Palestine in the time of the New Kingdom, since though the ‘governors’ were often local rather than Egyptian (e.g., Higginbotham 1996 – A.F.), they were certainly supported by resident Egyptian garrisons in many cases. (Branigan 1981:25–26).

It appears that, from the standpoint of general concept, certain conquerors sometimes preferred to appoint local rulers on their behalf in certain places, who were supported by mercenary troops of the ruling power. Such a tendency may be perceived in the region discussed as early as the Late Bronze Age and appears to have continued into later times. After all, a basic similarity may be seen between Greek mercenaries of the Egyptian army placed at Mezad Ḥashaviyahu in order to defend the powers of a Judean fortress commander, who was likewise appointed by the Egyptians, and Gedaliah and the Babylonian garrison that defended him at Mizpeh (cf. II Kgs. 25:22–25).

The finds from Mezad Ḥashaviyahu, as presented in the context of this work, strengthen the view of scholars who believed that the fortress was established under Egyptian rule. The multi-faceted nature of the finds, which combines a variety of cultural elements (including a strong element of Greek mercenaries, but also Judean, Phoenician and Egyptian elements), the plan of the fortress, its strategic location and the date of its establishment all clearly indicate this. These conclusions support the reconstruction of the borders of the Kingdom of Judah, toward the end of the Iron Age, based upon the spatial distribution of the material finds identified as clearly Judean (such as lmlk and rosette stamped jars, pillar figurines and inscribed weights [see summary in Kletter 1999b] and so-called bench tombs [Yezerski 1999]). These boundaries81 were created during the 8th century BCE, the period of the emergence of the full-blown state in Judah (Jamieson-Drake 1991; Finkelstein 1999; contra Master 2001), and probably did not change until the Babylonian destruction (except, perhaps, to become smaller as a result of Sennacherib’s campaign).

The placement of a Greek garrison in Mezad Ḥashaviyahu, as well as in Ashkelon and Tell Kabri, together with the employment of Kittim along the Beersheba Valley route, may be explained from two perspectives: first, to protect the coastal plain – the main route to the north; and second, to protect the southern Arabian trade networks, which the Egyptians inherited from the Assyrians (cf. Finkelstein 1995:148, 152–153, with earlier literature). The first

81 To the north, the border ran through the territory of Benjamin, with Tell en-Nasbeh or perhaps Bethel the northernmost settlement; to the east, the border ran along the shores of Dead Sea; to the south, in the Arad Valley; and to the west, Beth Shemesh and Lachish in the Shephelah marked the border (Na‘aman 1991a).
perspective should be considered against the background of the increasing importance of the naval forces under the Saite Dynasty (cf. Lloyd 1972). The second perspective shows a clear Egyptian tendency to fill the void created by the Assyrian withdrawal from the region. In spite of certain turmoil toward the end of the Iron Age in the Land of Israel, the time-span between the end of Assyrian control and the beginning of the Babylonian invasion reflects continuity under Egyptian hegemony. This stability was brutally interrupted as a result of the Babylonian destructions and renewed only under the Persian Empire.
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