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The excavation (License No. B-211/2000) was conducted on behalf of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University, financed by Shaked-Nethanel Ltd., and directed by the author. Also participating: A. Tass, Y. Gotlieb, A. Derkach, I. Taksel (Area supervisors); R. Eran (Administration); G. Kobo, Y. Dukhovny and A. Tass (Plans/surveying); P. Shrago (Photographs); Y. Kapelyan and A. Speshilov (Drawings - pottery and stone objects respectively); A. Kaspi (Pottery plates).

INTRODUCTION

The excavation of an area (Map. Ref. 126900-162240/127000-162285) along Yefet Street, to the south of Rabbi Pinhas Street, was carried out in July-September 2000 (Fig. 1). It lies on the eastern slope of ancient Jaffa, within the boundaries of the modern city.

Following the directive of the Israel Antiquities Authority (henceforth IAA) inspectors, the excavation grid was established parallel to the Ottoman period building located at 15 Yefet Street (Fig. 2) and was integrated into an existing grid laid down during previous investigations of the site (Peilstöcker 2000a: Figs. 93-94, 2000b). It lies adjacent to Peilstöcker’s Areas A-D and ca. 13 m to the south of Area E. The main purpose behind establishing a common grid was to avoid possible confusion when comparing results of different expeditions in abutting areas.

Fig. 1: Location of the excavated area.

1 The present article is dedicated to the memory of Gil Kobo, who tragically passed away some years ago. As surveyor and fellow archaeologist, Gil took an active part in the excavation reported here, one of the most recent archaeological projects among the many that benefited from his expertise.
Fig. 2: Aerial view of Jaffà taken in 1917 showing the site on the eastern slope of the ancient mound.

Fig. 3: Aerial view of the site after excavation.

Fig. 4: General plan of Stratum IX.
The excavated area was labelled Area F, continuing the alphabetical sequence established in Peilstöcker’s investigations. The general orientation of the grid is from south to north, with a slight northeasterly deviation. Coordinates were assigned as follows: south to north, letters of the Latin alphabet; west to east, Arabic numerals. The excavation method follows the system developed during the excavations of Tel Beer-Sheba (Aharoni et al. 1973:119-132). A total of ca. 650 m² were excavated (ca. 26 squares), made up the measurements of the excavated area: ca. 43 m (south - north), and ca. 12 m (west - east) (Fig. 3).

Modern construction activities and refuse dumping had severely disturbed the area. Nevertheless, the excavations revealed significant occupational remains that could be attributed to definable chronological phases. The results of the excavations in Area F could be divided into nine strata dating from the 10th/9th centuries BCE (Iron Age IIA) up to the Ottoman period. This article presents the remains and finds of the earliest occupational phase, Stratum IX, unearthed in Area F.

ARCHITECTURE

Traces of five installations were unearthed within the boundaries of the excavated area (Fig. 4). These were round or elliptical pits dug into the natural calcareous sandstone (fossilized dune). Some were lined with small and medium-sized fieldstones. Their inner surfaces were coated with several layers of thick chalky plaster mixed with crushed shells and their floors sloped gently toward small oval depressions at the bottom of each pit. The upper parts of the installation had been destroyed by later activity so that their original depth could not be determined.

**LOCUS 146**

In Square D/2 was a round installation with an outer diameter of ca. 2.40 m and an inner diameter of ca. 1.45 m (Fig. 5). The preserved part varied in depth from ca. 0.90 m to ca. 0.95 m down to the floor, which sloped gently toward a small 0.15 m deep oval depression in its southern part (Figs. 6, 7). Unlike the other installations, Locus 146 which produced a rich ceramic assemblage was found in fairly good state of preservation.

---

2 In continuation of this project, an additional area (Area G) was opened along Rabbi Pinhās Street, adjacent to Area F, in February 2001. Unfortunately, its excavation has not yet been completed. The earliest remains uncovered there so far date to the Hellenistic period.
LOCUS 542
This installation (Fig. 8) was found in Squares I/2-3, under a modern refuse dump. The remains of the stone lining were preserved on the northern side of the pit. The preserved inner plastered part had a diameter of ca. 1.45 m and a depth of ca. 0.40 m. The floor sloped gently down to a small oval depression 0.25 m deep located in its southwestern part.

LOCUS 562
In Square H/1 was an installation (Fig. 9) cut by later pit of the Early Islamic period. The remains of the stone lining of the pit were preserved. The original diameter of the preserved inner plastered part would have been ca. 0.85 m and its depth ca. 0.35 m down to the floor, which sloped gently toward a small oval depression located in its western part. This depression had a depth of 0.06 m.

LOCUS 568
An installation (Fig. 10) was found in Square I/3, under a modern refuse dump. Only a part of the plastered floor of the pit was preserved and this had a diameter of ca. 1.45 m. It sloped gently toward a small oval plastered depression which seems to have been in the centre rather than to one side of the floor as in the other installations uncovered. Its poor state of preservation made it impossible to determine its original depth but the portion preserved had a depth of 0.05 m.
LOCUS 574

The installation (Fig. 11) was found in Square H/2, ca. one metre east of Locus 562. The preserved remains, which included a small part of a plastered floor sloping down to a small depression, were very poorly preserved. Unlike the other installations, Locus 574 abutted on a massive wall (W 103) on its east.

POTTERY

The ceramic assemblage exposed in Stratum IX seems to be homogeneous, and may be securely placed within the Iron Age IIA. Its most prominent feature is a thick, red hand-burnished slip, mainly on bowls and kraters. Although a modest number of stray Iron Age IIA sherds was attested in later strata, the assemblage presented here comes solely from the installations discussed above. The most impressive collection was unearthed in Locus 146. However, other installations, such as Loci 562 and 568 yielded some finds as well.

BOWLS

These fall into two groups:

Rounded bowls included two specimens with a plain rim. Fig. 12:1 has a red slip inside and out which is burnished on the exterior of the vessel. Fig. 12:2 is similar but without burnish. Parallels come from Megiddo, Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.18:1; 11.30:1; 11.36:1); Tel Mevorakh, Stratum VII (Stern 1978:48-49, Fig. 12:1); Tel Michal, Stratum XIV/XIII (Singer-Avitz 1989:Fig. 7.2:2); Tell Qasile, Stratum VIII (Mazar 1985:Fig. 55:3-4); Gezer, Stratum VIII (Gitin 1990:Fig. 9:9); Ashdod, Stratum X (Dothan and Porath 1993:Fig. 47:11).

Fig. 12:3 is a red-slipped bowl, burnished inside and out, with rounded walls and a ledge rim. It has several grooves just below the outer part of the rim. The form and the fabric are in accordance with Zimhoni’s Type B-5 from Lachish, Levels V/IV (Zimhoni 1997:78). It should be emphasized that this type of bowl does not appear at the latest phase of Level IV or in Level III at Lachish (ibid.). At Tell Qasile, a single similar example was reported in Stratum X (Mazar 1985:38, Fig. 46:3). The existence of this type is attested in the renewed excavations at Beth Shemesh, where it was found in constructional fills of the ‘North Gate’ (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2001:139-140, Fig. 11:8), and in Tel Batash, Stratum IV (Mazar and Panitz-Cohen 2001:37, Pl. 84:1). In Ashdod this type begins to appear in Strata X/IX (Dothan and Porath 1993:Fig. 45:9).

Fig. 12:4 presents a medium-sized bowl with rounded walls, slightly burnished inside, and two grooves on the outer part of the rounded rim. Similar bowls were attested in the Iron Age IIA strata, mainly in the southern and coastal assemblages, for example those from Lachish, Level V (Zimhoni 1997:78, Fig. 3.8:12); Ashdod, Stratum X (Dothan and Porath 1982:Fig. 7:4); Beer-Sheba, Stratum VI (Brandfon 1984:53, Fig. 26:10).

Fig. 12:7 represents a rounded red-slipped bowl with a knob handle similar to that from Tell Qasile, Stratum X (Mazar 1985:36-37, n. 23, with earlier references, Fig. 43:14).

Fig. 12:8 is a rounded red-slipped and burnished bowl with a thickened flat rim like that from Tell Qasile, Stratum IX (Mazar 1985:39, Fig. 52:2, Type BL 7). The rounded bowl shown in Fig. 14:1 has a similar shape and rim, but unlike the former example bears no traces of slip or burnishing and there is a groove on the outer part of the body. Parallels come from Lachish, Level V (Aharoni 1975:Pl. 41:12) and Megiddo, Stratum VB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Fig. 11.18:7), although the latter is slipped and burnished.

Carinated bowls (Fig. 12:5-6) belong to a type with a plain everted rim, which has numerous parallels in Iron Age IIA assemblages such as those from Ashdod Stratum X (Dothan and Porath 1993:Fig. 45:8), Megiddo Stratum VB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Fig. 11.23:14, 21), Lachish Level IV (Zimhoni 1997:78, Fig. 3.21:15). They correspond to Tel Batash carinated types BL 11 and BL 27 (Mazar and Panitz-Cohen 2001:40-42).

KRATERS

The bulk of the kraters (Figs. 12:9-14, 17-18; 14:3-4) are rounded or slightly carinated with a thickened rim. This type has numerous variations and is common in the Shephelah, the Negev and the southern Coastal Plain during the Iron Age IIA (for
A Group of Iron Age Wineries from Ancient Joppa (Jaffa)

summary and parallels see Mazar and Panitz-Cohen 2001:62-64, Type KR 14). Fig. 12:13-14 in particular are like those from Tell Qasile Stratum IX (Mazar and Harpazi-Ofer 1994:Fig. 18:19, 21, 23).

Fig. 12:15 is a massive krater with a knob handle and resembles an example from Lachish Level V (Aharoni 1975:Pl. 41:14).

Fig. 12:16 has a grooved thickened rim like similar vessels from Tel Michal Strata XIV/XIII (Singer-Avitz 1989:79, Fig. 7.2:4) and Gezer Stratum VIIB (Gitin 1990:Pl. 8:20), although the latter is without slip. It should be noted that both this krater and the one above resemble the upper part of a group labelled storage jars at Ashdod Stratum X (Dothan and Porath 1982:Fig. 4).

Fig. 14:2 has the shape of cooking-pots from Lachish Level V (Aharoni 1975:Pl. 41:17) and Beth Shemesh (Bunimovitz and Lederman 2001:Fig. 11:17) but its fabric is inconsistent with cooking ware and it is therefore classified as a krater.

COOKING-POTS

Two cooking-pots (Fig. 12:19-20) are wide and shallow, with a concave, elongated rim triangular in section follow the Iron Age IIA tradition (for expanded summary, see Stern 1978:49; Mazar 1985:52-53, Type CP 1b; Mazar and Panitz-Cohen 2001:83 Type 1a). Parallels come, inter alia, from Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.19:2, 11.22:1-5), Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII (ibid.: Fig. 14:1-16. cf. particularly Fig. 14:11, 15 with Fig 12:19 here), Tel Michal Stratum XIV (Singer-Avitz 1989:Fig. 7.1:8-9) and Beer-Sheva Stratum VII (Brandfon 1984:Fig. 22:8).

STORAGE JARS

A group of storage jars includes a neckless jar (Fig. 13:4) comparable to those from Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.29:2, 11.35:3) and Arad Stratum XI (Singer-Avitz 2002:113, Fig. 4:9). A short necked jar (Fig. 13:5) resembles examples from Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.29:4, 11.35:5) and Arad Stratum XII (Singer-Avitz 2002:Fig. 3:14). The straight medium-long neck jar with a plain, slightly inverted rim (Fig. 13:6) has parallels from Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.28:4, 11.29:3, 11.34:4; 11.35:4) and Arad Stratum XI (Singer-Avitz 2002:113, Fig. 9:4-5). All of them appear to be at home in the Iron Age IIA horizon.

Fig. 13:7, although designated as a jar, may actually be a jug. It has a straight long neck with two parallel grooves on the surviving part.

A few body sherds found in Locus 146 of what might have been storage jars seem to be of Egyptian origin (not illustrated). Their fabric and temper which resulted in a dark red surface and purple core may point to Nilothic clay. In this regard, the few Egyptian storage jars exposed in Stratum VIII of neighbouring Tell Qasile (Mazar 1985:56) may be of interest.

JUGS AND JUGLETS

A red slipped jug (Fig. 13:8) has a plain, slightly thickened rim and a long straight neck with the handle extending from the rim. It can be compared with one from Kuntillet ʿAjrud (Ayalon 1995:168, Fig. 14:2). Fig 13:9 has a wide neck and is red slipped and burnished. Although its upper part is missing, it seems to resemble the example reported from Megiddo Stratum VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Fig. 11.35:2). The examples shown in Fig. 13:10-11 have some painted decoration. However, their clay appears to be local. A decorated globular jug (Fig. 13:24) resembles a type attested in the Omride enclosure in Jezreel (Zimhoni 1997:52, 54, Fig. 2.15:1). Two rims (Fig. 13:12-13) belong to juglets. In both cases only a small part of a neck with the beginning of the handle survived. Fig. 14:5 may belong to amphoriskos.

VARIA

Fig. 12:21 is perhaps a basin like those from Ashdod Stratum X (Dothan and Porath 1993:93, Fig. 44:7) and Dor, Area C 2, phase 7 (Gilboa 1995: Fig. 1.9:7), although the latter is from a later context.

Fig. 13:1-3 have no exact parallels, and are presented here for the sake of completeness. It should be noted that although the shape of those in Fig. 13:1-2 resembles a Middle Bronze Age tradition, their fabric seems to be different.
Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, not a single Middle Bronze Age sherd was reported to have been retrieved from outside Jaffa's Middle Bronze Age fortifications.

Fig. 13:14 represents a cup-and-saucer. The initial appearance of this type is attested during the Late Bronze Age. According to Stern (1978: 51, n. 17), during the Iron Age IIA they are more widespread in the north. It is interesting to note that during the final stages of the Iron Age these vessels seem to have a broader distribution which includes Judahite sites (Fantalkin 2001a:58-59). Parallels from the same chronological horizon as our Stratum IX come from, inter alia, Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.27:15, 11.38:5) and Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII (Stern 1978:Fig. 13:12).³

Fig. 13:15 depicts a lamp of a type common in Iron Age IIA strata. They have been found at many sites such as Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Figs. 11.27:18, 11.38:7), Lachish Level V (Aharoni 1975:Pl. 42:12-13) and Arad Stratum XI (Singer-Avitz 2002:Fig. 9:3).

Fig. 13:16 has an unusually thick base.

Fig. 13:17 is a part of a zoomorphic figurine.

Two examples of potter’s marks are presented in Figs. 13:18, 14:6. The former belongs to a type with a thumbprint like that from Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII (Stern 1978: Fig. 16:15, 17). The latter has an incision in a form of a cross, also paralleled in Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII (Stern 1978:Fig. 16:12-14; for summary and parallels for both types, see ibid. 51-52, n. 20).

A few decorated sherds are too small to be attributed to a particular ceramic form. Fig. 13:19 has a bichrome (red and black) painted decoration seen in Tell Abu-Hawam Stratum III (Hamilton 1935:24, No. 97). Its ware seems to be local. Fig. 13:20 belongs to the so-called Ashdod Ware, first appearing at Ashdod in Stratum Xb (Dothan and Porath 1993:94). According to Master (2001:27), the petrographic profile of Ashdod Ware points to the northern coast of Lebanon as its place of origin. However, since the specimen which he analyzed comes from Ashkelon’s late 7th century BCE context, it does not provide a conclusive answer for the origin of Ashdod Ware from earlier periods, such as in our case. For more recent discussion of the subject see Ben-Shlomo et al. 2004.

For the sake of completeness, a single Late Bronze Age I Bichrome sherd (Fig. 16:1) should be mentioned.⁴ It comes from Locus 146 and seems to be a part of krater's shoulder. The decoration, although only small part survived, consists of two horizontal registers. In the upper, the legs of a bird may be distinguished and, according to their position, the bird is facing right (Epstein 1966:31). The lower panel may be defined as an enclosed space between two parallel lines, divided by a vertical double band filled in red. Bichrome Ware is attested at Jaffa (cf. Kaplan 1964a: photo on page 272; Epstein 1966:119-120, nos. 7-9), and reportedly unearthed in Area A Level VI of Kaplan’s excavations during the 1950s (Kaplan and Ritter-Kaplan 1993:657). This stratum was dated by the excavators to the Late Bronze Age I (ibid.).⁵ A few examples of Bichrome Ware were found at Tel Michal (Negbi 1989:59, Fig. 5.9:13-16) and Tel Gerisa (Epstein 1966:119, nos. 5-6), both in the geographic vicinity of Jaffa.

³ The credibility of the Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII assemblage as secure has been questioned recently (Schreiber 2001). Indeed, according to the excavation report, the Iron Age IIA cup-and-saucer for instance, was found in a Persian period locus (Stern 1978:Figs. 13:12, 26). Apparently, this inconsistency may result from inaccurate registration, and in no way undermines the importance of the total assemblage. However, it is also clear that in dealing with this assemblage for comparative purposes, caution is advisable.

⁴ The Late Bronze Age I dating for this sherd is definitely tentative since it is well known that the initial appearance of Bichrome Ware in the Land of Israel is already attested during the final stages of the Middle Bronze Age (Artzy et al. 1973; Artzy et al. 1976; 1978).

⁵ It should be noted that a number of stone-lined Late Bronze Age pit graves were exposed in Peilstöcker’s excavations in the immediate vicinity of Area F. Each of these graves contained one or two skeletons, and the few ceramic vessels among the grave goods included Cypriote Base Ring Ware (Peilstöcker 2000a:49⁹). Those graves, however, were attributed to a later stage within the Late Bronze Age sequence than the strata containing Bichrome Ware.
Fig. 12: The pottery assemblage from Locus 146.
FIGURE 12: THE POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE FROM LOCUS 146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1059/1</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1057/1</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1059/2</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brownish-grey core, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1057/2</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, dark grey core, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1060/1</td>
<td>Dark brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1063/1</td>
<td>Brownish-grey clay, brownish-grey core, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1065/1</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1063/2</td>
<td>Brown clay, light brown core, large white grits, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1057/3</td>
<td>Dark brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1061/1</td>
<td>Dark brown clay, brown core, large white grits, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1063/3</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1063/4</td>
<td>Brown clay, brown core, red slip, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1059/3</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, horizontal hand burnish, horizontal impressions on the outer side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1063/5</td>
<td>Brown clay, brown core, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1061/2</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1063/6</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1057/4</td>
<td>Brownish-red clay, brown core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1057/5</td>
<td>Brown clay, brown core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Cooking-pot</td>
<td>1065/2</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Cooking-pot</td>
<td>1061/3</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>1057/6</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brown core, white grits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 13: THE POTTERY ASSEMBLAGE FROM LOCUS 146

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>1065/3</td>
<td>Light brown clay, brown core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>1063/6</td>
<td>Brown clay, black core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Container</td>
<td>1063/7</td>
<td>Handmade; Brown clay, straw organic inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1059/4</td>
<td>Light brown clay and core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1063/8</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1057/6</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>1059/5</td>
<td>Brown clay, dark grey core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1060/2</td>
<td>Light brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1063/10</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, red slip, vertical hand burnish decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1059/6</td>
<td>Light brown clay, brownish-grey core, large white and grey grits, painted red decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1057/7</td>
<td>Orange clay, brownish core, white grits, painted black and red decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>1061/4</td>
<td>Light brown clay, grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Juglet</td>
<td>1061/5</td>
<td>Light brown clay, traces of yellowish slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Cup-and-Soucer</td>
<td>1065/4</td>
<td>Orange-brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1065/5</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1063/9</td>
<td>Brown clay, grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Zoomorphic figurine</td>
<td>1060/3</td>
<td>Brown clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Storage jar (handle)</td>
<td>1065/6</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, thumbprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Decorated sherd</td>
<td>1060/4</td>
<td>Greenish clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, painted black and red decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Decorated sherd</td>
<td>1061/6</td>
<td>Brown clay, red slip, painted black decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1060/5</td>
<td>Reddish clay, light brown core, painted black and red decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>1059/7</td>
<td>Light brown clay, grey core, white wash, painted black decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Decorated sherd</td>
<td>1059/8</td>
<td>Light brown clay, grey core, white wash, painted black decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1061/7</td>
<td>Light brown clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 13: The pottery assemblage from Locus 146.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>3145/1</td>
<td>Light brown clay, brownish-grey core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>3085/1</td>
<td>Grey-greenish clay, brownish core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>3145/2</td>
<td>Dark brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>3085/2</td>
<td>Dark brown clay, brownish-grey core, white grits, horizontal hand burnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Amphoriskos</td>
<td>3145/3</td>
<td>Light brown clay, greyish core, yellowish slip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Storage jar</td>
<td>3085/3</td>
<td>Brown clay, brownish-grey core, cross incision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 14: The pottery assemblage from Locus 562.

**FIGURE 15: SELECTED CERAMIC FINDS FROM LOCI 146 AND 562**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cup-and-saucer</td>
<td>1065/4</td>
<td>Fig. 13:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Potter’s mark</td>
<td>3085/3</td>
<td>Fig. 14:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Potter’s mark</td>
<td>1065/6</td>
<td>Fig. 13:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1063/9</td>
<td>Fig. 13:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>1065/5</td>
<td>Fig. 13:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>1061/7</td>
<td>Fig. 13:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Zoomorphic figurine</td>
<td>1060/3</td>
<td>Fig. 13:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Decorated sherd</td>
<td>1057/7</td>
<td>Fig. 13:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Decorated sherd</td>
<td>1060/4</td>
<td>Fig. 13:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 15: Selected ceramic finds from Loci 146 and 562.
CYPRIOTE POTTERY

A small amount of Cypriote pottery retrieved includes the upper part of a Bichrome II/III bowl (Figs. 13:21, 16:2). It should be noted that this type is reported mainly from northern sites such as Megiddo Stratum VB (Finkelstein et al. 2000:Fig. 11.23:4), Tel Mevorakh Stratum VII (Stern 1978:59, Fig. 18:5, Pl. 34:4) and Dor Phase 8 in Area B 1 and 8b in Area D 2 (Gilboa 1999:123, Fig. 7:4-10). The comparable Bichrome open vessels unearthed in Dor (ibid.) were described as belonging to the Cypro-Geometric III horizon. Based on radiometric analysis, the strata in which they were found were recently dated after 850 BCE instead of to the 10th century BCE (Gilboa and Sharon 2001:1347, Table 1B). Fig. 13:22 (Fig. 16:3) seems to be a rim of a White Painted II/III jug (Gjerstad 1948:52).

Perhaps the body sherd in Fig. 13:23 came from the same vessel.

A possible example of a Black-on-Red I juglet is presented in Fig. 13:13. Although the sherd is in a poor state of preservation, traces of the characteristic slip (Brodie and Steele 1986) are discernable on its exterior. A Cypriote Black-on-Red juglet was reported from Kaplan’s excavations in Area B at Jaffa. Several examples from the Iron Age II tomb at Azor, located near Jaffa, are also worthy of mention (Dothan 1961:173-174, Tomb No. 79, Pl. 34:7-8).

The appearance and distribution of Cypriote pottery on the Levantine coast during the Iron Age is discussed at length in numerous studies (e.g. Matthers et al. 1983; Gilboa 1989; 1999; Sörensen 1997; Crielaard 1999).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Description and Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>1061/8</td>
<td>Light brown clay, brown core, painted black and red decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>1060/5</td>
<td>Fig. 13:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>1059/7</td>
<td>Fig. 13:22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 16: The Cypriote pottery from Locus 146.
Fig. 17: Stone objects from Locus 146. 1) Basalt bowl; 2) Polishing implement; 3-4) Basalt grinding slabs.

Fig. 18: Miscellaneous finds from Locus 146. 1) Pegmatite; 2) Serpentine; 3-5) Bear bones.
MISCELLANEOUS FINDS

The non-ceramic finds were unearthed mainly in Locus 146. The few stone objects recovered were a basalt bowl (Fig. 17:1), a polishing implement (Fig. 17:2) and two basalt grinding slabs (Fig. 17:3-4). In addition, they included a lump of pegmatite (Fig. 18:1) and one of serpentine (Fig. 18:2).

Also found were some animal bones and shells, noteworthy among them being a Tridachna shell originating in the Red Sea. The animal bones recovered represent domesticated (sheep/goat, cow and horse) and wild species. The latter include a single fish bone and three bear bones, which were identified as belonging to a single adult animal (Fig. 18:3-5). The bear bones are of special interest. Combined with the relevant Old Testament sources (2 Kgs 2.24; Isaiah 59.11), the presence of bear bones in a number of Iron Age sites such as Tell Qiri (Davis 1987:Table 1), Jaffa (on the summit of the mound; M. Sadeh, pers. comm.) and Tel Hadid (M. Sadeh, pers. comm.) indicates that bears played a part in the Iron Age landscape. Analysing the subsistence economy of the Judaean Highlands during the Iron Age I, Rosen (1994:340) states that hunting played a secondary, but still important, role in the economic system, supplying meat, hides, horns and bones. It seems that such an observation may apply to the Iron Age II A reality as well and may be extended to include the coastal areas. A few bones were also unearthed in the depression of Locus 562. The identifiable fragment belongs to a donkey.

DISCUSSION

Although the remains attributed to Stratum IX were damaged, they could be identified with a high degree of certainty as collecting vats of wineries. This conclusion is based on several criteria, foremost of which is their method of construction. The entire installation is plastered and the floor is gently inclined towards a small oval depression. It is thus clear that their initial purpose was to receive liquids. The fact that the plastered walls of Locus 146 were preserved to a height of at least 1 m suggests that this installation can be identified as a comparatively large collecting vat. The dimensions of the collecting vat are of particular importance in differentiating between wine and olive oil presses. According to Frankel (1999:138) “in the winery there was a treading floor with a comparatively large collecting vat and no olive-crushing device, while in the oil press the reverse was true: there was an olive-crushing device-from the Hellenistic period on, a round rotary olive crusher, a comparatively small collecting vat and no treading floor”.

At Jaffa treading was most probably conducted on a separate treading surface, located on a higher level. The grapes were first trodden on the treading surface whence the must flowed to a collecting vat via connecting channels. Treading surfaces were not discerned around any of the pits unearthed at Jaffa, having probably been destroyed over the ages. The fact that Loci 562 and 574 are close to one another may suggest that both vats were part of the same installation and shared a common treading floor which has not survived. In support of this view is the size of the vats which seem to be considerably smaller than those in Loci 146, 542 and 568. The discovery of a massive wall (W 103), attached to Locus 574 from the east, provides additional corroboration for the assumption that Loci 562 and 574 may be considered as two separate vats serving one winery. All the collecting vats clearly belong to the same chronological horizon being built by the same technique and using a similar type of chalky plaster which contains a large quantity of crushed shells.

ABSOLUTE DATING

The absolute dating suggested for the ceramic assemblage uncovered is the 9th century BCE. The rich ceramic assemblage unearthed in Locus 146 did not contain any intrusive material from
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later periods and may be safely placed in the Iron Age IIA. Similarly dated sherds were discovered accumulated in the depressions of Loci 562 and 568. The former is presented in Fig. 14, while the latter included a few typical red slipped and burnished sherds (not illustrated).

Parallels for this repertoire come mainly from Megiddo Strata VB/VA-IVB, Tell Qasile Strata IX/VIII, Ashdod Strata X/IX, Tel Batash Stratum IV, Lachish Levels V/IV, Beer-Sheba Strata VII-V and Arad, Stratum XI. The general 9th century BCE dating for these strata is definitely in accordance with the low chronology perspective (after Finkelstein 1996; 1998). It should be emphasized, however, that even using the so-called conventional chronology, there is no difficulty in placing at least some of these strata (e.g. Arad Stratum XI or Lachish Level IV) within the 9th century BCE. The slow development and a long span of various pottery types attested during the Iron Age IIA (Mazar 1997:159; Ben-Tor and Ben-Ami 1998:30), as well as possible differences in the length of existence of the relevant strata (Fantalkin 2001b), leads to certain vagueness in establishing the exact dating for the said strata. It seems that at the present state of research it is better to speak in terms of chronological horizons when dealing with the absolute chronology of the Land of Israel during the Iron Age IIA. The general shift toward Finkelsten’s low chronology appears to be correct, and seems to be corroborated by a wealth of new data (Coldstream 2003; Gilboa and Sharon 2001, 2003; Finkelstein 2002; Finkelstein and Piasezyk 2003). In suggesting dating the remains of Stratum IX on the eastern slope of ancient Jaffa, however, it is preferable to attribute it to the 10th/9th century BCE horizon, despite the fact that the pottery unearthed points to the 9th century BCE. The several layers of plaster that covered the inner parts of the installations discovered suggests prolonged use. It is thus logical to assume that while the pottery unearthed should be placed in the 9th century BCE, the installations could have been erected earlier. Strictly speaking, it is impossible to pin-point the exact date of their construction so they could well have been built during the 9th century BCE. However, it seems more than plausible to suggest a general 10th/9th centuries BCE dating for their operation. Theoretically, the installations could have been built even earlier although the discovery of a single Late Bronze Age I sherd within the assemblage of Locus 146 is meaningless since sherds from earlier periods may find their way into later strata, and vice versa. Furthermore, one would have to assume that the installations remained exposed over the centuries until the 9th century BCE inhabitants decided to use them as refuse dumps. Such a possibility, especially for a site located on the coast with its permanent dune activity (Fantalkin 2001a:20, n. 14) appears to be highly unlikely.

COMPARISONS

The 10th/9th centuries BCE date for the wineries appears to be in agreement with additional Iron Age IIA remains discovered on the mound of ancient Jaffa and in its immediate vicinity. Furthermore, the group of wineries discovered in the present excavation has a number of close parallels from the neighbouring sites dated to the same chronological horizon. The closest parallel, and not just geographically, is the group of wineries discovered around Tell Qasile (Ayalon 1993, 1994). This group consisted of seven pits, six of which appear in pairs. According to Ayalon (1994), they belong to a particular type of small winery in which the treading floor and the collecting vat were built together as one structure with no pipe connecting them. He suggests that the treading of the grapes and the collecting of the
must that accumulated with the pulp in the settling depression were conducted in the same pit without being separated. All the pits discovered had a round or elliptical form and were well plastered with several layers of plaster which included gravel and shells. Ayalon states that similar installations were previously discovered in at least three other places around Tell Qasile but have not been systematically excavated. In his opinion, the finds from those excavated point to the 11th/10th century BCE horizon. This date, apparently according to the conventional chronological scheme, is probably too high and should be lowered in accordance with the low chronology.

An additional similar installation was recently excavated at the bottom of the northwestern slope of Tell Qasile (Ayalon and Harpazi-Ofer 2001). It consists of a round pit (1.6 x 1.7 m; preserved depth 0.5 m) hewn in the kurkar bedrock and coated with a layer of white lime-mortar mixed with numerous shell fragments. This was overlaid with a layer of grey plaster. Its floor sloped gently to the southwest toward an oval depression (0.75 x 1.00 m, depth 0.35 m). The installation became a refuse pit once it was no longer in use. The ceramic assemblage from this installation seems to be similar to that discovered in Jaffa, Area F (cf. ibid.: Fig. 89, especially bowls, jugs and jars). According to the excavators, the installation was probably a small wine press. At a distance of 0.8 m to its northeast, an earthen deposit was distinguished on the bedrock, which perhaps points to the existence of an additional installation. In this regard, it is important to recall that B. Mazar (1950-1951:137) has already pointed out that the remains of oil and wine industries were particularly evident at Tell Qasile Stratum IX, and were found in Building J. Here, near the eastern wall of the court (J 8), a plastered wine-vat was built, with a press, also plastered, in the southeastern corner. A similar press was found in Building K, east of Building J (ibid.:139). The pottery collected from the wineries scattered around Tell Qasile seems to correspond to Strata IX/VIII on the mound, which is in line with B. Mazar’s observation.

Another significant parallel comes from Tel Michal (Herzog 1989:73-75, Fig. 6.9, Pls. 18-19). Its particular importance stems from the fact that, unlike the previous examples, here two entire impressive winery complexes were discovered. They were located in the open area east of Tel Michal, with no additional building remains nearby. Both complexes were dug and constructed in the ground. A thick layer of chalky plaster, containing a considerable amount of shell fragments, coated each. Each winery had a treading surface connected by channels to two receiving vats. The larger vats had diameters of 1.50 m and 1.10 m, and were 1.50 m and 1.30 m deep. These dimensions are comparable to the remains discovered at Jaffa, Area F. The dating of the Tel Michal complexes seems to be secure since a few pottery sherds found in and around the wineries are all from the Iron Age IIA. Moreover, Herzog has pointed out that from typological point of view these wineries are completely different from those belonging to the later periods exposed at Tel Michal. Considering the low chronology perspective, the wineries of Tel Michal may be dated to the 10th/9th century BCE horizon.

A group of subterranean installations constructed in the sandy soil was recently discovered at Lod (Yannai and Marder 2000). It consisted of a row of four pits (min. diam. 1.2 m; depth 1.2 m) all lined with several layers of thick white plaster. At the base of each was a small depression for draining liquids. The upper portions of the pits were damaged and therefore their original depth is unknown. According to the excavators, no treading floors were observed around the pits, but apparently the upper levels had been destroyed. The pits were dated to the Iron Age IIA, based on fragments of pottery from the 9th century BCE which were uncovered inside them (ibid.:65*). The pottery discovered within the installations at Lod is very like that presented in this report (Yannai, pers. comm.).

An additional similar installation, hewn into the kurkar bedrock, was discovered in the dunes of Rishon Le-Zion (Segal 2000). It is oval in shape with a diameter of ca. 1.1 m. As in other cases, its walls were lined with several layers of plaster mixed with crushed shells. At the bottom of the installation was an irregular depression (depth ca. 0.2 m). According to the excavator, the installation served as a collecting vat for a winepress, the treading
floor of which has not survived. The installation was dated generally to the Iron Age II because of the scant ceramic finds but based on comparison with similar vats from Tel Michal.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL CONCLUSIONS

The sparseness of the Iron Age IIA remains discovered at Jaffa led Kaplan to remark that archaeologically this period is much better represented at neighbouring Tell Qasile (1972:85). It seems, however, that even the meagre data collected so far leads to certain conclusions.

A few Iron Age burnished sherds from Jaffa, apparently from the Iron Age IIA horizon, were already mentioned in the University of Leeds excavation report (Bowman et al. 1955:242, 247, Pl. III:1a-1b). In 1960, during Kaplan’s excavation below the floor of the Turkish bathhouse (Hamam), adjacent to what is now the Tel Aviv-Jaffa Museum of Antiquities building (located in Kaplan’s Area B), part of a glacis was discovered, running from north to south (Kaplan 1961; 1964a:275, photo on page 274). According to Kaplan, it sloped up from east to west and its external revetment was made of small stone slabs. Beneath these slabs alternate layers of sand and beaten earth were found, and underneath these was a layer of sand and beaten earth. The total thickness of the combined layers of this glacis is 5 m, but its preserved length is not reported. Initially, the glacis was dated by the finds to the 9th century BCE (Kaplan 1961; 1964a). In 1964 an additional excavation was carried out near the Hamam. It consisted of a trench, 30 m long and 4.5 m wide. A glacis, structurally similar to that discovered in 1960, was found in the eastern sector of that trench. It was generally dated to the Israelite period (Kaplan 1964b) with no attempt to suggest a more precise dating. In addition, Kaplan (1970) mentioned remains from the Iron Age IIA, found in Area A, during the excavation campaign, which he carried out in 1970. There is, however, a certain degree of confusion as to the dating of the remains mentioned above. In the latest publication, the glacis from Area B is described as belonging rather to the 8th century BCE, which makes it contemporaneous with Level IIIA in Area A (Kaplan and Ritter-Kaplan 1993:658).

Examination of the Iron Age II pottery from Area A of Kaplan’s 1970 excavation campaign, mentioned in his preliminary reports and currently stored in the warehouses of the Tel Aviv-Jaffa Museum of Antiquities, revealed a few typical Iron Age IIA sherds. These represented mainly red-slipped and burnished kraters similar to those presented here. Contemporary finds from Area B, located within and near the Hamam, were also detected by the present author. Although relatively small, this assemblage is much richer than that from Area A. It includes some local pottery as well as some Cypriote imports (such as a Black-on-Red juglet). The dating of the glacis unearthed in Area B, however, remains unclear, as well as its connection with the above-mentioned finds which may point to domestic activity in this area during the Iron Age IIA.

Recent archaeological excavations undertaken on the summit of ancient Jaffa (Kaplan’s Area A), directed by Herzog on behalf of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University have so far revealed a number of Iron Age IIA fills containing the pottery from this period.

The large-scale excavations undertaken on behalf of the IAA on the eastern slope of ancient Jaffa, in the immediate vicinity of our Area F, unearthed additional remains that may be attributed to the same chronological horizon. The remains discovered in IAA Areas A-D, to the east of Area F, consisted of a number of Iron Age IIA surfaces, walls and pits (Peilstöcker, pers. comm.; Peilstöcker 2000a; 2000b; Peilstöcker and Sass 2001). The latter are of particular interest since some of them may represent receiving vats of Iron Age IIA wineries similar to those discovered in Area F.

Bronze Age remains at Jaffa were discovered mostly on the summit of the mound (Peilstöcker 2000b:1349). The discovery of a group of Late Bronze Age pit graves in Peilstöcker’s excavations (2000a:49*) is in line with the assumption that during this phase of the Late Bronze Age the
settlement was restricted mainly to the summit, and the graves were located outside it. During the Iron Age IIA the settlement seems to have been extended eastward and to have been of a different nature. It is difficult to decide whether the installations uncovered in Area F should be considered as located within Jaffa’s city-limits or outside them. The location of the bulk of Iron Age wineries in the fields surrounding cities (including those found by survey) suggests that grapes were usually pressed outdoors by the population of the ancient Land of Israel (Walsh 2000:144). On the other hand, there are a few examples from the Iron Age IIA which were found in buildings located within the settlements, for instance at Tell Qasile Stratum IX (Mazar 1950-1951:130, 137, 139), Beth-Shemesh (Grant and Wright 1938: Pls. 18:2-4; 20:2) and from the end of the Iron Age at Ashkelon (Stager 1996a:64, photo pg. 67).

In contrast to the rich body of information regarding the importance of Jaffa as an Egyptian government centre during the Late Bronze Age, its history and status during the Iron Age is still vague. As Singer rightly remarks “the fact that at a much later period, during the campaign of Sennacherib, Joppa was under the jurisdiction of Ashkelon tells us nothing about Iron Age I” (Singer 1994:308). In fact, the same appears to be true regarding the Iron Age IIA, remains of which were unearthed inter alia in Area F. According to Singer (1994:308), “it is hard to surmise to whom the city fell with the Egyptian retreat; in any event, it is surprising that, as an Egyptian seat of government, Joppa did not become a Philistine centre, unlike its sister cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ashdod. Joppa is not mentioned in descriptions of the struggles between the Philistines and Israel in the Books of Judges and Samuel; accordingly there is no evidence supporting the hypothesis that it was included within the boundaries of Philistia” (contra Aharoni 1979:18). However, in this author’s opinion, Jaffa should be regarded as part of Philistia during the Iron Age period. Its geographic setting, a certain amount of Philistine pottery discovered in the Iron Age I Level IIIIB (Kaplan and Ritter-Kaplan 1993: 656, 658), its possible subordination to one of the Philistine centres such as Tell Qasile during the Iron Age IIA, and its certain subordination to Ashkelon toward the end of the 8th century BCE, all point to Philistine affiliation.

Judging by the modest and rather rural character of the remains discovered on the eastern slope, it seems that in the Iron Age IIA Jaffa lost the important administrative (and possibly cultic) status it had held as the Egyptian centre during the Late Bronze Age.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WINE PRODUCTION

The archaeological and biblical data regarding viticulture in the Land of Israel in ancient times, and the Iron Age in particular, has been summarized in a number of extensive studies (e.g. Borowski 1987:102-114; Eitam 1993; Frankel 1999; Walsh 2000). The discovery of the group of Iron Age IIA wineries on the eastern slope of ancient Jaffa, with their counterparts from Tell Qasile, Tel Michal, Lod and Rishon Le-Zion, contributes considerably to our knowledge and points to the existence of a flourishing wine production industry in the central coastal plain during the 10th/9th centuries BCE (Herzog 1989).

A possible forerunner for these wineries comes from the Late Bronze Age context of Tel Aphek. According to Kochavi (1989:76, Figs. 60, 79), two wineries discovered near the Governor’s Residence belong to its final stage, Palace VI. If the Aphek

---

7 A poorly preserved structure, so-called Lion Temple, consisted of a rectangular hall (4.4 X 5.8 m) with two bases for wooden columns along the long axis, was discovered in Area A. According to Kaplan it was belonging to a pre-Philistine Stratum, which should be placed between the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 12th centuries BCE (Kaplan and Ritter-Kaplan 1993:658; see also Burdajewicz 1990). The most recent investigation, however, suggests that the temple should be placed in the LB IIA (Herzog, pers. comm.). In addition, Mazar has pointed out that although this structure predates Philistine settlement in the region, it might have served Sea People mercenaries in the service of the Egyptian troops at Jaffa. According to him, the skull of a lion with a scarab seal near its teeth found on the floor of the structure may point to an unusual cult that was carried out here (Mazar 2000:220).
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Wineries indeed date from the late phase of the Late Bronze Age, it is the single example that points to the existence of systematic wine production before the Iron Age IIA in the region discussed. It should be noted that there is a certain similarity between the Late Bronze Age wineries at Aphek and those from the Iron Age IIA. However, in order to clarify this issue the detailed final publication of Aphek’s Late Bronze Age remains, including the pottery from the wineries, must be awaited.

All of the Iron Age IIA wineries discussed above belong to the same type, which seems to be an outcome of local development and suitability to a particular geographic and geological environment (Avimelech 1950-1951). For example, a plaster which includes a large amount of crushed shells is used in the coastal plain while in the central highlands the pits are cut into bedrock.

Several studies have illustrated a close parallelism between Levantine and Anatolian rock-cut wineries. Thus, according to Diler (1995), the simple type of rock-cut winery might have been introduced into Cilicia from the region of Palestine. Carrying this assumption still further, Tüfekçi-Sivas (2003) has recently suggested that during the 8th/7th centuries BCE, this type of press was introduced into Phrygia from Cilicia. However, its simple construction technique consisting of treading floors and collecting vats suggests that it might have been developed independently, both in Cilicia and Phrygia, and was not necessarily introduced from Palestine to Anatolia.

Be that as it may, it is indisputable that our present understanding of the highly complicated social processes that may be connected to wine production and consumption in the Land of Israel during the Iron Age is far from being satisfactory. Indeed, a recently published study by C.E. Walsh (2000) appears to be the first significant attempt to deal with a wide range of sociological, biblical and archaeological aspects of viticulture in the Land of Israel. Feasting and drinking ceremonies seem to have been of particular importance for Philistines as well as for Israelites. It seems that the plethora of archaeological data collected so far on this subject calls for a re-evaluation of the possible social and cultural significance of wine production and consumption during the Iron Age (cf. for example, Dietler 1990; McGovern et al. 1996; Dietler and Hayden 2001; Hamilakis 2002:20-21, with earlier references). The sandy soil and warm climate of the coastal plain undoubtedly favours viticulture (Stager 1996b:64*). Nevertheless, the unusual concentration of Iron Age IIA wineries on the northern fringe of Philistia, as reported here, close to Israelite lands, may perhaps indicate some degree of cooperation between the Philistines and the northern Kingdom of Israel where vines also flourished. Therefore, the possibility that Israelite vineyards supplied Philistine wineries located on the coast in order to export their produce should not be ruled out.
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It should be emphasized that the Near Eastern feasting and drinking ceremonies, including those of the Land of Israel during the Iron Age, may had played a crucial role in the shaping of the Greek Archaic symposium (cf. Burkert 1991; Carter 1997; Morris 2000:182-183, with earlier references).
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