

CLAIRE EPSTEIN

PALESTINIAN
BICROME WARE





Elmer Holmes
Bobst Library

New York
University





DOCUMENTA ET MONUMENTA ORIENTIS ANTIQUI

CO-OPERATIONE INTERCONTINENTALI EDITA AB

W. F. ALBRIGHT et J. VANDIER

Baltimore, U.S.A.

Paris, France

CO-EDITORES FUERUNT

F. M. TH. DE LIAGRE
BÖHL Leiden

W. COUVREUR
Gent

A. FALKENSTEIN
Heidelberg

H. J. FRANKEN
Leiden

G. FURLANI
Roma

H. L. GINSBERG
New York

A. PARROT
Paris

C. E. SANDER-HANSEN
København

J. SIMONS
Leiden

E. A. SPEISER
Philadelphia

L. VANDEN BERGHE
Gent

J. A. WILSON
Chicago

QUIBUS ACTUARIUS ADFUIT B. A. VAN PROOSDIJ, LEIDEN


VOLUMEN DUODECIMUM

PALESTINIAN BICHROME WARE

VT MEMORIA SERVETVR ILLORVM QVI DE HAC SERIE CONSTITVENDA
ET PROPAGANDA BENE MERITI SINT

A. DE BUCK, S. R. K. GRANVILLE, B. HROZNY, J. KÖHLER, E. A. SPEISER







KRATER TYPE A1(a)

From 'Ajjul, T. 1903
(In Pal. Arch. Mus., No. 40.81)

Height: 35. 8 cm

Buff ware with self slip; probably burnished (surface covered with heavy incrustation).
Decoration in black and red.

PALESTINIAN BICHROME WARE

BY

CLAIRE EPSTEIN



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1966


NK
3855
.P2
E6
1966

Copyright 1966 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced
or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or
any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

ISBN 9004 004718

*FOR MY MOTHER
WHO MADE THIS BOOK POSSIBLE*



CONTENTS

	page
List of Figures in the Text	ix
List of Plates	x
Preface	xvii
Abbreviations	xix
Museums and Collections, Abbreviations	xxii
Specific Terms, Abbreviations	xxiii
Note on the Arrangement of the Plates	xxiii
I. Corpus of Bichrome Ware Vessels	1
Introduction	1
Corpus of Bichrome Ware Vessels	6
II. The Decoration	20
Introduction	20
A. Figure Representation	23
1. Figures of Fish	23
2. Figures of Birds	31
3. Figures of Quadrupeds	40
4. Figures of Trees	51
5. Composite Scenes	54
B. Geometrical Design Elements	57
1. The Spoked Wheel	57
2. The Diagonal (or St. Andrew's) Cross	64
3. The Triangle and its Derivatives	68
4. The Latticed Panel	71
5. The Lozenge (or Diamond)	73
6. The Feather Pattern	75
7. The Ladder Pattern	76
8. The Wavy Line	77
9. Diagonal Strapping	81
10. The Cross Line Style	83

IV. A Comparative Evaluation of Bichrome and Associated Wares	88
Introduction	88
1. The Megiddo Assemblages	89
2. The 'Ajjul Assemblages	105
3. The Hazor Assemblages	113
4. Other Palestinian Sites	117
5. a. The Ras Shamra Assemblages	120
b. The Northern Littoral	127
6. Peripheral Regions	129
a. Cyprus	129
b. Alalakh	134
c. Egypt	138
7. Summary	141
V. The Spread of the Hurrians and the Development of Bichrome Ware	144
Introduction	144
I. The North	145
1. The Hurrians and their relationship with the Indo-Aryans	145
2. The domestication of the horse and the use of the spoked-wheel chariot	147
3. The growth of Hurrian power during the sixteenth century B.C. .	148
4. Hurrian influence on ceramic developments	150
II. The South	152
5. Evidence for the presence of Hurrian elements	153
6. The Hurrians in Central Syria	156
7. The Hurrians in Coastal Syria	157
8. The Hurrians in North Palestine	159
9. The Hurrians in Central and South Palestine	165
10. Conclusion	166
VI. Bichrome Ware and its Chronological Setting	170
Introduction	170
1. Megiddo	171
2. 'Ajjul	174
VII. Conclusion	186
Select Bibliography	189
Index	192
Plates I-XX	at the End of the Book

LIST OF FIGURES IN THE TEXT

Fig. 1. Fish figures according to categories	29
Fig. 2. Bird figures according to categories	37
Fig. 3. Figures of quadrupeds	43
Fig. 4. Figures of trees	53
Fig. 5. Variations of the spoked wheel motif	60
Fig. 6. Decoration in the Cross Line Style.	86
Fig. 7. Plan of House Z, Megiddo	90
Fig. 8. The House Z Assemblage at Megiddo (excluding Bichrome Vessels).	92
Map of bichrome ware sites	

LIST OF PLATES

Frontispiece

Krater Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul, T. 1903 (Courtesy, Palestine Archaeological Museum)

DRAWINGS

I. Jugs Type A1(a)

1. From 'Ajjul, T. 17
2. From Milia (presumed)
3. Unknown provenance
4. From 'Ajjul, AF 731
5. Unknown provenance
6. From Milia (presumed)
- 7-9. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV

II. Jugs Types A1(b), A1(c), A1(d) and A1(e)

1. From Megiddo, 2115 (House Z)
2. From Megiddo, T. 75
3. From Beth Shan, T. 42
4. Unknown Cypriote provenance
5. From Megiddo, T. 3027
6. Unknown Cypriote provenance
7. From Megiddo, T. 3070
8. From Tell el-Far'ah, FB 379
9. From 'Ajjul, T. 167
10. From Hazor, T. 8130
11. From 'Ajjul, City II
12. From Megiddo, T. 3063

III. Jugs Types B1(a) and B1(b)

1. Unknown provenance
2. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment (presumed)
3. From Ras Shamra, T. LIV
4. From Aniba, T. 87
5. From Archangelos (tomb)
6. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXXIV

7. From Lefkoniko (tomb)
8. From 'Ajjul, T. 1717
9. From Megiddo, T. 2009

IV. Kraters Type A1(a)

1. From Gezer, house context (2nd Semitic)
2. From 'Ajjul, E 843—suggested reconstruction
3. From Ras Shamra, house context (Ugarit Récent I)

V. Kraters Type A1(a)

1. From Hazor, D2
2. From 'Ajjul, T. 308
3. From Gezer, unstratified
4. From Milia, T. 10

VI. Kraters Type A1(b)

1. From Megiddo, 2114 (House Z)
2. From Ras Shamra, house context (trench near T. XXXVI)
3. From Beth Shemesh, house context (Stratum IVa)
4. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
5. From Ras Shamra, T. LIV
6. From 'Ajjul, KD 1060

VII. Juglets Types A1(a), A1(b), B1(a), B1(b), B2(a) and C1(a)

1. From Milia, T. 10
2. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
3. Unknown Cypriote provenance
- 4-5. From Megiddo, 2115 (House Z)
6. From Milia, T. 13
7. From 'Ajjul, City II
8. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
- Bowls Types B1(a) and B2(a)
9. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
10. From Hazor, Locus 2179
11. From Hazor, Locus 2142
12. From Gezer, unstratified
13. From 'Ajjul, City II
14. From 'Ajjul, T. 1517
15. From Nitovikla, the fortress courtyard
16. From 'Ajjul, PD 989

VIII. Krater Type A1(c)

1. From Enkomi, unstratified
Jars Type B1(a) and B1(b)
2. From 'Ajjul, T. 1717
3. From Megiddo, T. 1145 B
4. From Hazor, T. 8112

PHOTOGRAPHS

IX. Jugs Type A1(a)

1. From 'Ajjul, T. 17
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
2. From Dhenia, T.I
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)
3. Unknown provenance
(Courtesy, Ha-aretz Museum, Tel-Aviv)
4. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1270
(Courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)

X. Jugs Types A1(c) and A1(d)

- 1-2. Unknown provenance
(Courtesy, Ha-aretz Museum, Tel-Aviv)
3. From Milia, T. 10
(Courtesy, Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm)
4. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)
5. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
6. From Megiddo, T. 5013 G
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)

XI. Jugs Types A1(d) and B3(a)

- 1-2. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
3. From 'Ajjul, MP 1017
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
- 4-5. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
- 6-7. From Bamboula, Kourion, T. 12
(Courtesy, The University Museum, Philadelphia)

XII. Jugs Types A1(f), A1(h) and A2(a)

1. From Archangelos (tomb)
(Courtesy, Palestine Archaeological Museum)
2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FE 379
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
3. From Megiddo, N = 3019
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
4. From Megiddo, W = T. 3017
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
5. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)

XIII. Jugs Types B1(a) and B1(b)

1. Unknown provenance
(Courtesy, Ha-aretz Museum, Tel-Aviv)
2. From Aniba, T. 87
(Courtesy, Ägyptologisches Institut, Leipzig)
3. From Lefkoniko (tomb)
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)
4. From Archangelos (tomb)
(Courtesy, Palestine Archaeological Museum)
5. From Maroni, T. 9.
(Courtesy, Trustees of the British Museum)
6. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment (presumed)
(Courtesy, Flinders Petrie Collection of Egyptian Antiquities, London).

XIV. Jugs Types B1(a) and B2(a), Juglet Type B1(a), and selected Cross Line Style sherds

1. From Megiddo, T. 3173
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
2. Unknown provenance
(Courtesy, Clark Collection, Y.M.C.A., Jerusalem, Israel)
3. From Mersin, Trench 60 (Level VII)
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
4. From 'Ajjul, unstratified
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
5. From Jaffa, G6
(Courtesy, Museum of the Antiquities of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa)
6. From Jaffa, G5
(Courtesy, Museum of the Antiquities of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa)
7. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)

- 8. From 'Ajjul, unstratified
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
- 9. From 'Ajjul, T. 272
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
- 10. From 'Ajjul, MV 955
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
- 11. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)

- XV. Juglets Types A1(a), B1(a), B2(a) and D1(a)
 - 1. From Megiddo, N=3099
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)
 - 2. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1262
(Courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)
 - 3. From Deshasheh, T. 44
(Courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)
 - 4. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV
(Courtesy, Professor Schaeffer and Musée du Louvre)
 - 5. From Lachish, T. 1555
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
 - 6. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1289
(Courtesy, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford)
 - 7. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
 - 8. From Galinoporni, T.I
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)

- XVI. Kraters Type A1(a)
 - 1. From Gezer, (2nd Semitic)
(Courtesy, Archaeological Museum, Istanbul)
 - 2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FA 379
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
 - 3. From Milia, T. 12
(Courtesy, Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm)
 - 4. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)
 - 5. From Jaffa, H 5
(Courtesy, Museum of the Antiquities of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa)
 - 6. From Megiddo, Room of T. 3018
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)

7. From Megiddo, E = T. 3004
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
8. From Tell Sukas, unstratified
(A. M. H. Ehrich, *The early pottery of the Jebeleb region*, Pl. XXIV)
9. From Megiddo, SW = 2091
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
10. From Akhziv, from debris of collapsed wall
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)

XVII. Kraters Type A1(a)

1. From Megiddo, S = T. 3018 C
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FC 378
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
3. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)
- 4-6. From Nitovikla, the fortress kitchen
(Courtesy, Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm)

XVIII. Kraters Type A1(a)

1. From Megiddo, 2115 (House Z)
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)
2. From 'Ajjul, MNJ 986
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
3. From 'Ajjul, unstratified
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
4. From Tell el-Far'ah, FB 379
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
5. From Megiddo, NW = 3011
(Courtesy, Oriental Institute, Chicago)

XIX. Kraters Type A1(a). Bowls Types A1(a), B1(a) and B2(a)

1. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)
2. From Alalakh, Pit No. 3 (Level V)
(Courtesy, Trustees of the British Museum)
3. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Courtesy, Israel Department of Antiquities)
4. From 'Ajjul, A Gate
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)

5. From 'Ajjul, OM 968
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
6. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
7. From 'Ajjul, OY 950
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
8. From 'Ajjul, OE 936
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
9. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)
10. From 'Ajjul, PL 955
(Courtesy, Institute of Archaeology, London)

XX. Krater Type A1(c). Zoomorphic vessels

1. From Enkomi, unstratified
(Courtesy, Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm)
2. From Maroni, T. 24—bull
(Courtesy, Trustees of the British Museum)
3. From Akhera, T.I—ram
(Courtesy, Cyprus Museum, Nicosia)

PREFACE

This book was originally submitted as a Ph.D. thesis in 1962 at the end of a rewarding period of study under Miss K. M. Kenyon at the Institute of Archaeology, University of London, without whose assistance and guidance it could not have been written.

A re-appraisal of bichrome ware—frequently in the past designated as “Tell el’-Ajjul Ware”—was prompted by the examination of material from Sir Flinders Petrie’s excavations at that site, so much of which (especially from the first two campaigns) forms a not inconsiderable part of the Institute’s Palestine Collection. The very availability of this and indeed of all the material in the collection, was in itself a contributing factor and led not only to the discovery of much sherd material that had not been published, but eventually to further researches and searches in other museums and collections in various countries which, at one time or another, had sponsored excavations at sites where bichrome ware had been found. These include the Ashmolean and British Museums, the Oriental Institute, Chicago and the University Museum, Philadelphia, Professor Schaeffer’s collection and the Ras Shamra collection in the Musée du Louvre, the Cyprus Museum, Nicosia, the Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm, the Istanbul Archaeological Museum and the Antioch Museum, the collections of the Israel Department of Antiquities and of the Department of Archaeology, the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Ha-aretz Museum, Tel-Aviv and the Museum of the Antiquities of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa. Owing to the lengthy process involved in getting this book through the press, it is now some five years and more since I visited many of the above and I am under a long-standing debt of gratitude to all those on their staffs who went out of their way to assist me by placing at my disposal every facility, by permitting me to examine and photograph material and by taking a friendly interest in my problems. It is with great pleasure that I am now able to place my thanks to them on record. A generous grant from the Central Research Fund of the University of London enabled me to visit the United States and Scandinavia in 1961, while other institutions were visited while travelling between my home and London.

I should also like to thank those museums which I was not able to visit personally and which responded so painstakingly to my requests for information concerning specific vessels in their collections, and especially to Dr. Christa Müller, of the Ägyptologisches Institut, Karl-Marx-Universität, Leipzig.

A book of this kind must of necessity touch upon specialised problems which fall outside its immediate archaeological scope and I have been privileged in obtaining the considered opinions of experts on a number of questions that have arisen. Particularly encouraging was the discussion of the wider implications of the historical background with Professor M. E. L. Mallowan and with Dr. Hayim Tadmor, to both of whom I am indebted for the interest and suggestions.

The bulk of the drawings are the work of Mrs. A. Alarcão who in many instances had the task of transforming mere sketches made in museums and whose industry and patience contributed not a little towards the arrangement of the plates. I was also greatly assisted with the lay-out of the plates by Mr. B. Engelhard and with the compilation of the index by Mr. D. Bahat, to whom my grateful thanks are likewise due.

Last but by no means least, this book and the research that went to the making of it could never have been realised had I not been granted leave of absence lasting for over two years by the *kibbutz* of which I am a member, thereby being freed of my part in the collective responsibility and enabled to devote myself wholly to advanced study during the entire period.

Ginosar,
Israel.

C. E.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAA Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology. Issued by the Institute of Archaeology, University of Liverpool. Liverpool, 1908—1940.

AASOR Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research. New Haven, 1920—

AG I-IV PETRIE, F., Ancient Gaza I-IV. Tell el 'Ajjul. (*BSAE* LIII-LVI). London, 1931-1934.

AG V PETRIE, F., MACKAY, E. J. H. and MURRAY, M. A., City of the Shepherd kings.... and Ancient Gaza V. (*BSAE* LXIV). London 1952.

AJ Antiquaries Journal. London, 1921—

AJA American Journal of Archaeology. Series II. Concord, 1932—

Al. WOOLLEY, L., Alalakh. An account of the excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hattay, 1937-1949. (Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London. No. XVIII). Oxford, 1955.

Albright, *AJSL* LV ALBRIGHT, W. F., "The chronology of a South Palestinian city, Tell el-'Ajjul," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* LV (1938), 337-359.

Anatolian Studies Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. London, 1951—

ANET PRITCHARD, J. B., (Editor), Ancient Near Eastern texts relating to the Old Testament. Second edition. Princeton, 1955.

Aniba II STEINDORFF, G., Aniba, Zweiter Band. Mit Beiträgen von D. Marcks, H. Schleif und W. Wolf. (Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte. Mission archéologique de Nubie, 1929-1934). Glückstadt—Hamburg—New, York, 1937.

Annales Archéologiques de Syrie Published by la Direction Générale des Antiquités de Syrie. Damascus, 1951—

Anthropos International review of ethnology and linguistics. Salzburg—Freiburg, 1906—

Antiquity A quarterly review of archaeology.... Gloucester, 1927—

Arch. Geog. Archaeologia Geographica. Hamburg, 1951—

Ar Or Archiv Orientální. Prague, 1929—

AS III GRANT, E., Rumeileh, being Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine). Part III. (Biblical and Kindred Studies. No. 5. Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania). Haverford, 1934.

AS IV-V GRANT, E. and WRIGHT, G. E., Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine). Part IV (Pottery). Part V (Text). (Biblical and Kindred Studies. Nos. 7, 8. Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania). Haverford, 1938, 1939.

Åström, *MCBA* ÅSTRÖM, P., The Middle Cypriote Bronze Age. Lund, 1957.

BASOR Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. New Haven, 1919—

BCH Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Paris, 1877—

BIES Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society. (Hebrew). Continuing *BJPES*. Jerusalem, 1950—

BJPES Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society. (Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1933-1948.

BMB Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth. Paris, 1937—

BP I PETRIE, F., and TUFNELL, O., Beth-Pelet I. (Tell Fara). (*BSAE XLVIII*). London, 1930.

BP II MACDONALD, E., STARKEY, J. L. and HARDING, L., Beth-Pelet II. (*BSAE LII*), London 1932.

BSAE British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account.

CAH Cambridge Ancient History. Revised edition. Cambridge, 1962—

Cah. H.M. Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale. Paris, 1953—

CPP DUNCAN, J. G., Corpus of dated Palestinian pottery.... (*BSAE XLIX*), London 1930.

CRAI Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Paris, 1857—

Desh. PETRIE, F., Deshasheh, 1897 (Fifteenth Memoir of the Egyptian Exploration Fund). London, 1898.

EA KNUDTZON, J. A., Die El-Amarna Tafeln I, Leipzig, 1915.

Ehrich, EPJR EHRICH, A.M.H., Early pottery of the Jebeleh region. (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society. III.). Philadelphia, 1939.

Gardiner, AEO GARDINER, A. H., Ancient Egyptian Onomastica I. Oxford, 1947.

GJ Journal of the Royal Geographical Society. London, 1893—

Gez. I-III MACALISTER, R. A. S., The excavation of Gezer I-III. London, 1912.

Gjerstad, SPC GJERSTAD, E, Studies on prehistoric Cyprus. Uppsala, 1926.

Haz. I-II YADIN, Y. and others. Hazor I. An account of the first season of excavations, 1955. Hazor II. An account of the second season of excavations, 1956. Jerusalem, 1958 and 1960.

Haz. III-IV YADIN, Y. and others. Hazor III-IV. An account of the third and fourth seasons of excavations, 1957-1958. Plates. Jerusalem, 1961.

Heurtley,
QDAP VIII HEURTLEY, W. A., "A Palestinian vase-painter of the sixteenth century B.C.", *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* VIII (1939), 21-37.

IEJ Israel Exploration Journal, Jerusalem. 1950-1951—

IEJ 14 (1964) AMIRAN, R. and EITAN, A., "A krater of bichrome ware from Tell Nagila", *Israel Exploration Journal* 14 (1964), 219-231.

Iraq Published by the British School of Archaeology in Iraq. London, 1934—

JCS Journal of Cuneiform Studies. New Haven, 1947—

JEA Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. London, 1914—

Jer. I KENYON, K. M., Excavations at Jericho. I. The tombs excavated in 1952-1954. British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. London, 1960.

JKF Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung. Heidelberg, 1950-1953.

JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago, 1942—

JPOS Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Jerusalem, 1921-1948.

KBo FIGULLA, H. H., FORRER, E., WEIDNER, E., and HROZNY, F., Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi I-VI. Leipzig, 1916-1921.

Lach. II TUFNELL, O., INGE, C. H., and HARDING, L., Lachish II. (Tell ed Duweir). The Fosse Temple. (The Wellcome-Marston Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East). Oxford, 1940.

Lach. IV TUFNELL, O. and others. Lachish IV. (Tell ed Duweir). The Bronze Age. Oxford, 1958.

M II LOUD, G., (Field Director). Megiddo II. Seasons of 1935-1939. (*OIP LXII*). Chicago, 1948.

MMC BLISS, F. J., A mound of many cities; or Tell el-Hesy excavated. Second edition, revised. London, 1898.

MJ Museum Journal. Quarterly of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, 1910—1935.

MT GUY, P. L. O. and ENGBERG, R. M., Megiddo Tombs. (*OIP XXXIII*). Chicago, 1938.

OIP Oriental Institute Publications. University of Chicago.

OLZ Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung. Berlin, 1898-1908; Leipzig, 1909-1944. 1953—

PEQ Palestine Exploration Quarterly. London, 1937—

PEQ 1961 EPSTEIN, C., "Bichrome wheel-made tankards from Tell el-'Ajul", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, July-Dec., 1961, 137-145.

PEQ 1965 EPSTEIN, C., "Bichrome vessels in the Cross Line Style", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, Jan.-June, 1965, 42-53 (including Catalogue Numbers 1-51).

PEF QS Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement. London, 1869-1937.

PPS Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society. Cambridge, 1935—

PRU III NOUGAYROL, J., Le palais royal d'Ugarit III. Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales. (Mission de Ras Shamra VI). Paris, 1955.

QDAP Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine. Jerusalem, 1931-1950.

RA Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale. Paris, 1884—

Saller, Dominus Flevit II SALLER, S. J., The excavations at *Dominus Flevit* (Mount Olivet, Jerusalem). Part II. The Jebusite burial place. (Publications of the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. No. 13). Jerusalem, 1964.

SCE I GJERSTAD, E. and others. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition I. Finds and results of the excavations in Cyprus 1927—1931. Stockholm, 1934.

Schaeffer, E-A SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A., Enkomi-Alasia. Nouvelles missions en Chypre 1946-1950. (French Archaeological Mission and Cyprus Government Joint Expedition to Enkomi. Vol. I). Paris, 1952.

Schaeffer, Strat. Comp. SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A., Stratigraphie comparée et chronologie de l'Asie occidentale (III^e et II^e millénaires). Syrie, Palestine, Asie Mineure, Chypre, Perse et Caucase. London, 1948.

Schaeffer, Syria XIX SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A., "La neuvième campagne de fouilles à Ras Shamra-Ugarit (Printemps 1937)", *Syria* XIX (1938), 193-255 and 313-334.

Schaeffer, Syria XX SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A., "Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Dixième et onzième campagnes. (Automne et hiver 1938-1939)", *Syria* XX (1939), 277-292.

Sed. I PETRIE, F., and BRUNTON, G., Sedment I. (*BSAE XXXIV*). London, 1924.

Sellin, TT I SELLIN, E., Tell Ta'anek. (Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Band L. IV). Vienna, 1904.

Sellin, TT II SELLIN, E., Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'anek in Palästina. (Denk-

Sjöqvist, *Problems*

Syria

Tarsus II

Ug. II

Ug. IV

Walters, *BMCV*

Westholm, *QDAP*

VIII

ZA

ZAeS

ZDPV

schriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Band LII. III). Vienna, 1905.

Sjöqvist, E., *Problems of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age*. Stockholm, 1940.

Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie. Paris, 1920—

GOLDMAN, H., *Excavations at Gözlu Kule, Tarsus II*. From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age. Princeton, 1956.

SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A., *Ugaritica II*. Nouvelles études relatives aux découvertes de Ras Shamra. (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique. Tome XLVII. Mission de Ras Shamra. Tome V). Paris, 1949.

SCHAEFFER, C. F.-A. and others. *Ugaritica IV*. Découvertes des XVIII^e et XIX^e campagnes, 1954-1955.....(Bibliothèque archéologique et historique. Tome LXXIV. Mission de Ras Shamra. Tome XV). Paris, 1962.

WALTERS, H. B., *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan vases in the British Museum I*. Part II. Cypriote, Italian and Etruscan pottery. London, 1912.

WESTHOLM, A., "Some Late Cypriote tombs at Milia", *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* VIII (1939), 1-20.

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete. Band 35. NF 1. Berlin, 1924.

Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde. (Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft). Leipzig, 1863—

Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins. Leipzig, 1878—

MUSEUMS AND COLLECTIONS—ABBREVIATIONS

Ashmolean Mus.	The Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
B.M.	The British Museum, London.
Cairo Mus.	Le Musée des Antiquités Egyptiennes, Cairo.
Clark Collection	The Clark Collection, Y. M. C. A, Jerusalem, Israel.
Cyp. Mus.	The Cyprus Museum, Nicosia.
Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv	Ha-aretz Museum, Tel-Aviv.
Haverford College	Haverford College collection, now in the University Museum, Pennsylvania.
Hebrew Univ.	Department of Archaeology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
I of A	The Institute of Archaeology, University of London.
Is. A.D.	The Israel Department of Antiquities.
Istanbul Arch. Mus.	The Archaeological Museum, Istanbul.
Jaffa Mus.	The Museum of the Antiquities of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa, Jaffa.
Mus. du Louvre	Le Musée du Louvre, Paris.
Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm	The Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities (Medelhavsmuseet), Stockholm.
O.I.C.	The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago.
Pal. Arch. Mus.	The Palestine Archaeological Museum, Jerusalem, Jordan.
Petrie Collection	The Flinders Petrie Collection of Egyptian Antiquities, University College, London.
Univ. Mus. Phil.	The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

SPECIFIC TERMS—ABBREVIATIONS

Throughout this book the following abbreviations are used:


MB for Middle Bronze
LB for Late Bronze

T. for tomb
'Ajjul for Tell el-'Ajjul

NOTE ON THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE PLATES

The plates, which have been numbered consecutively, consist of the drawings followed by the photographs. Both drawings and photos have been arranged as far as possible in accordance with the sequence set out in the Corpus, though not all the vessel types are illustrated. The plates have been selected with a view to emphasising the typological conformity of the material illustrated and wherever possible unpublished vessels and sherds have been chosen to exemplify both shapes and decorative details, these being placed side by side with already known and published examples. In some of the drawings a suggested reconstruction is indicated, even though this is based on no more than a small sherd; but in such instances the attribution to an accepted vessel type is sufficiently certain. Descriptions are given of all hitherto unpublished material and in the case of photographs, the height of complete vessels and the size of sherds is added.

Unless otherwise stated, the scale of the pottery drawings is 1:5.



CHAPTER ONE

CORPUS OF BICROME WARE VESSELS

INTRODUCTION

By its very name the term bichrome ware inevitably focuses attention on its distinctive decoration — and rightly so, since it is this more than any other feature which marks it out unmistakably from the pottery which was in use immediately before, although even during MB II some typical jugs and juglets were decorated on the upper shoulder.¹ Painted decoration was not, however, common on local pottery before the middle of the second millennium, although in Syria there had long been a predilection for painted wares, while in Cyprus the tradition was a long-standing one. Thus the introduction and widespread use of painted decoration in sixteenth century Palestine constituted a new departure, not stemming from indigenous ceramic traditions, which can only be interpreted as the result of the impact of outside influences. At the same time this new approach to decoration went hand in hand with the introduction of new shapes, so that the actual vessel forms to which the accepted figure and geometrical design elements were applied themselves exhibit new trends. In the Corpus which follows, it will be seen that there is a very specific range of bichrome ware vessels, the shapes of which are characterised by features of transition and change. At the same time there is a marked Cypriote influence which reflects the growing trade contacts with the island, especially noticeable at those sites situated on or near the coast.² Thus Cypriote-inspired features were taken over and “grafted” on to the local wheel-made wares, so that bichrome ware is seen to be a true expression of the times, epitomising as it does the widening horizons and emphasising the mingling of traditions from a number of cultural sources, notably from Syria, with which there were close links, from the Hurrians³ and from Cyprus. All these affected the local potters and the kind of pottery which they were producing, but there is no indication that there was any sharp break with the ceramic traditions that went before. Rather,

¹ Shoulder-handled jugs and piriform juglets, for the most part decorated in one colour only.

² 'Ajjul, Tell Mor (Tell Kheidar) and Ras Shamra.

³ See Chapter 5.

the innovations are super-imposed on the local shapes, which accordingly undergo change, while the greatest innovation of all is the decoration of the vessels in the bichrome style.

Among the more distinctive characteristics which developed as a result of growing familiarity with Cypriote imports, are the following: On jugs, the handles tend to be flattened, as on Types A1(a) and A1(c),¹ while the body is often ovoid (recalling the shapes of Middle Cypriote vessels), as on Types A1(b) and A1(e), though the latter is in the tradition of earlier local jugs² and retains the shoulder handle (sometimes still two-strand), which was common in MB II.³ Other jugs have tall, wide, concave necks, as on Types A1(c) and A1(d),⁴ and seem to be a local version deriving indirectly from the earlier White Painted III-V tankard forms from the Middle Cypriote repertoire. On Cross Line Style⁵ jugs and juglets, Types B1(a) and B1(b), the vessels are characterised by a gourd-like body with flat base, while the scheme of decoration and its use over the whole body stems directly from Cypriote tradition.⁶ As for the bowls, while the plain wares develop along lines of local tradition, the bichrome-decorated bowl-shapes, Types B1(a) and B2(a),⁷ are modelled quite unmistakably on Cypriote prototypes and illustrate very clearly the fusion of local and foreign ideas, by the application of bichrome decoration to wheel-made vessels which copied contemporary Cypriote shapes, especially of Monochrome Ware bowls and early White Slip wares.

A vessel whose shape is little known prior to its appearance as one of the most typical in the bichrome ware range, is the krater, to whose exact origin it is difficult to point, although a number of related vessels are known from earlier Palestinian and Syrian contexts. At Megiddo, examples occurred in occupation levels in Strata XI and X,⁸ while an even earlier decorated krater fragment was found in a tomb attributed to Stratum XIV.⁹ At Ras Shamra, a krater with decorated shoulder was likewise found in an early context, below a

¹ The vessel types used here — and throughout — are those of the Corpus which follows.

² *M* II, Pl. 23:11; *AAA* XIX(1932), Pl. XL:13; *Jer.* I, figs. 150:1 (decorated) and 189:10 and 11.

³ Pl. II:8-12.

⁴ Pls. II:1-6 and X.

⁵ For Cross Line Style, see Chapter 3, section 10.

⁶ Pl. XIII.

⁷ Pl. VII: 9-16.

⁸ *M* II, Pls. 36:2 and 42:7.

⁹ *M* II, Pl. 13:11.

funerary deposit with MB IIA juglets¹. In the bichrome ware repertoire, it is the two-handled krater, Type A1(a), which predominates,² but there is also the related form with single horizontal shoulder handle, Type A1(b), which would seem to have been influenced by the horizontal handles on bowls.³ Both these are characterised by an exceptionally wide mouth, a short neck and narrow shoulder, while the body is bulging and tureen-like in shape. It is difficult to surmise to what purpose these large open pots were put — unless it be for dry goods — since most storage jars continued to be made with the more practical narrower opening, Types B1(a), B1(b) and C1(a).⁴

Apart from the marked Cypriote influence which can be discerned in many of the details of the shapes of bichrome ware vessels, there are a number which are in the Syrian tradition. Such are the trefoil-mouthed jugs, Types A2(a) and B2(a), and the juglet, Type B2(a), which have affinities with MB II decorated jugs and juglets at Ras Shamra.⁵ These exemplify further the process of fusion and welding together of originally heterogeneous features: a jug, Type A2(a), with figure decoration, was found in Cyprus,⁶ while a jug and a juglet, Types B2(a), both decorated in the Cross Line Style, were found at Ras Shamra. In a similar way, cylindrical juglets, which are common in MB II contexts, are also decorated in the bichrome style: Types A1(b) and B1(b), occurring in tombs at Lachish,⁷ Megiddo, Ras Shamra and Cyprus.⁸ Another feature which is seen to have been taken over and developed from earlier local wares is the splaying rim, which is found on MB II shoulder-handled jugs and on a variety of piriform juglets at most Palestinian sites.⁹ This form of rim is found on jugs, Type A1(a), B1(a) and B1(b)¹⁰ and on many of the juglets.

Thus it is seen that bichrome ware vessels incorporated features coming from the north and from the west — but not yet from Egypt — and that these

¹ *Ug.* II, fig. 99:28.

² Frontispiece.

³ Pl. VI.

⁴ Pl. VIII: 2-4.

⁵ *Ug.* II, figs. 106:11, 108:22 and Pl. XV: 1.

⁶ Pl. XII:1.

⁷ Pl. XV: 5.

⁸ Pl. VII: 3. A further juglet was recently found in Jerusalem. Saller, *Dominus Flevit* II, fig. 34:3.

⁹ e.g. *M* II, Pl. 23:2 and 3; *AAA* XIX (1932), Pl. XXX: 11 (decorated); *Lach.* IV, Pl. 77:741; *Haz.* I, Pl. CXX:1.

¹⁰ Pls. I, III, IX and XIII.

were combined with the local pottery forms. Bearing the imprint of a most distinctive decoration which, it is submitted, owed its inspiration to the presence of a Hurrian element in the population which brought with it its own specific cultural heritage,¹ and adapting certain elements of linear ornament popular in Cyprus (especially the Cross Line Style), the shapes of these wheel-made vessels blended Palestinian, Syrian and Cypriote elements. It was for this reason that bichrome ware was in demand on the mainland as well as in the Cyprus markets, since it contained something to please in both. At the same time there was almost certainly a conscious attempt to produce wares for export to Cyprus, the evidence to date indicating that the reciprocal trade in pots *per se* was growing and expanding throughout the bichrome ware period. This is borne out by the finding of bichrome wheel-made wares in Cyprus — and not only at sites along the east coast — which testify to the extent of exports from the mainland, which may in time be seen to have been as extensive as in the reverse direction.

Bichrome ware is thus seen to reflect the cross-currents affecting contemporary life in sixteenth century Palestine and coastal Syria, this being a period which saw far-reaching changes in the political power groupings, changes in the make-up of the population and important changes in social and economic conditions. On the one hand, there is the influence of Cypriote ceramic forms due to the inclusion of the island within the orbit of closer trade relations; on the other, there is the rise to positions of power of the Hurrian element which brought with it new methods of warfare, a specifically feudal social structure and different cultural traditions. Of the latter, relatively little is known, as these everywhere became fused with the existing cultural background and consequently are difficult to disentangle from the resultant composite forms which arose in the different areas of Hurrian infiltration.² The indications are that these included a new approach to ceramic decoration and in particular the use of figure representations, since it is these which appear, executed in diverse ways, in different regions, but always *subsequent* to the absorption of the Hurrian ethnic element. Thus, bichrome ware can be interpreted as a synthesis of ceramic features, some of which originated far afield and were strange to Palestinian traditions. These, however, became interwoven with

¹ See Chapter 5.

² See, in this connection, review by J. Deshayes, *Syria* XXXVI (1959), 124.

the strands of the indigenous ceramic pattern to produce a unique ware, the vessel shapes and the decorative forms constituting a specific range and style, which was in popular demand both at home and abroad.

In conclusion, it should be remembered that while an attempt has been made to include in the Corpus all possible relevant material, both from published and unpublished sources, there may well be vessels and sherds in collections (in both museums and in private possession) which have been omitted owing to their inaccessibility to the writer. The picture gained from the Corpus is not, therefore, wholly complete, especially as regards the area between the mountains and the sea which runs north from Haifa Bay to Ras Shamra and where, almost certainly, bichrome ware was in use during the period of its *floruit*.¹ This is a littoral which was linked with Palestine throughout many centuries and it is to be regretted that from an archaeological point-of-view too little is known of its detailed history during the second millennium B.C. Yet despite this, a glance at the distribution of the different types of vessels classified in the Corpus reveals a clear pattern of cultural diffusion which, spreading southwards from Ras Shamra along the coastal strip, branched eastwards along the Jezreel Valley and turned northwards again at the Jordan to reach the important stronghold of Hazor. This same diffusion pattern runs south along the coast-line down as far as 'Ajjul, fanning out broadly in the Northern Negev to include a hinterland which reaches to the Judaean foothills. The "off-shoots" which are listed from the peripheral areas, such as Cyprus, Alalakh, Cilicia and Egypt, cannot be considered as indigenous to them and must be regarded as imports from the above cultural region, where the occurrence of bichrome ware in well-stratified contexts enables it to take its place in the pottery sequence of the second millennium B.C.

¹ See Chapter 4, section 5(b).

CORPUS OF BICHROME WARE VESSELS

(Only tomb provenances are indicated; in all other cases vessels are from occupation levels.)

JUGS

A. *Ring base*

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Globular body, sometimes with slightly carinated shoulder, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average height: 26 cm.

'Ajjul	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLVIII:57 H3 <i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXIX:18 (fragmentary) <i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXIX:68 K2 <i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLII:2 <i>AG</i> IV, Pl. LIV:57 H ⁵ (no red shown but presumed) <i>AG</i> IV, Pl. LVI:68 K3 <i>AG</i> IV, p. 18, para 51 and Heurtley, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. VIII:e	T.17 T. 1717 T. 1519 T. 1517 T. 1717
Ras Shamra	<i>Ug.</i> II, fig. 98:15 (fragmentary) Unpublished, in Mus. du Louvre collection (fragmentary—short neck) Unpublished, in excavator's collection (fragmentary) <i>Annales Archéologiques de Syrie</i> XIII (1963), fig. 15	T. XXXV T. XXXV T. XXXV
Sedment	<i>Sed.</i> I, Pl. XLV:71	T. 1270
Milia (presumed)	Heurtley, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. XXIII:d Heurtley, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. XXIII:e (fragmentary) Heurtley, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. XXIII:h	Tomb Tomb Tomb
Dhenia	Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 27) Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 1960/IV- 19/4—fragmentary)	T.I Presumed tomb
Unknown Provenance	Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv (No. 61060) Unpublished, in Cairo Mus. (No. 2784)	

b. Globular to ovoid body, short wide concave neck, handle from rim to shoulder.
Average height: 22 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>MII, Pl. 39:7</i>	T. 3070
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:6</i>	T. 2098
<i>Bahan</i>	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, (No. 144/63) (double handle from immediately below rim)	
c.	Globular to ovoid body, often slightly carinated, tall wide concave neck, handle from rim to shoulder.	
Average height:	25 cm.	
<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M II, Pl. 49:7</i>	T. 2132
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:7</i>	
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:7</i>	T. 3018 D
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:8</i>	T. 5013 G
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:9</i>	T. 3027
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:11</i>	T. 2127
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:13</i>	T. 3013
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:14</i>	
	<i>M II, Pl. 49:17 (less everted rim)</i>	
	<i>M II, Pl. 57:17</i>	T. 3018 A
	<i>MT, Pl. 41:21</i>	T. 75
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG I, Pl. XLIX:68 H6</i>	
<i>Beth Shan</i>	Unpublished, in Field Pottery Register	T. 42
<i>Milia</i>	Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 103) (neck narrowing at top)	T.I
	Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 105) (no neck extant)	T.I

Unknown Provenance Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIV (in B.M.)

d. Globular to ovoid body, shoulder frequently depressed, tall wide concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average height: 25 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M II, Pl. 49:5</i>	T. 3027
	<i>MT Pl. 48:3</i>	T. 1100 C
	<i>MT Pl. 38:11</i>	T. 21
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1961, Nos. 1-6	
<i>Tell el-Hesy</i>	<i>MMC</i> , 63:109 and <i>PEQ</i> 1961, fig. 2:a	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	<i>Ug. II</i> , fig. 50:23 and <i>PEQ</i> 1961, fig. 2:b	
<i>Milia</i>	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. II:1-5	T.10
	Unpublished sherds, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm	

	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. IV: 3-4	T. 10
	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. VII:1	T. 13
<i>Enkomi</i>	Schaeffer, <i>E-A</i> , fig. 71:265	T. V
	Schaeffer, <i>E-A</i> , fig. 775	T. V
	<i>SCE</i> I, Pl. LXXXV 162	T. 13
<i>Maroni</i>	Walters, <i>BMCV</i> , fig. 271:C 732	T. 9
<i>Uncertain Cypriote Provenance</i>	Heurtley <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pls. XX-XXIII: a,b,c,f and g Unpublished, in private collections in Larnaka and Jerusalem, Israel Unpublished, in Univ. Mus. Phil. collection Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, (No. 470) <i>Handbook to the Nicholson Museum</i> , 66, fig. 10 (Nos. 47.23 and 47.24)	
<i>Unknown Provenance</i>	Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv, (Nos. 10360, 60660 and 60860)	
e.	Globular to ovoid body, sometimes with carinated shoulder, short wide concave neck, single or double shoulder handle. Average height: 24 cm.	
<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 39:5	T. 3070
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 39:6	T. 3063
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 39:8	T. 3063
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 39:9	T. 3074
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 39:10	T. 3070
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 48:5	T. 3018 C
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 57:5	
	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 46:16	T. 1100 A
	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 48:2	T. 1100 C
	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 48:14	T. 1100 D
<i>Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLV:38 O3'	T. 167
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLVIII:60 Q10	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLVIII:60 Q11 (exceptionally wide rim)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLVIII:60 M13 (decoration not shown on drawing)	
	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXVIII:60 Q11	
<i>Tell el-Far'ah</i>	Unpublished, in I of A collection (fragmentary)	
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Ha</i> z. III-IV, Pl. CCXLII:1	T. 8130

f. Globular to ovoid body, short concave neck, single or triple shoulder handle.
Average height: 26 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 48:6 (fragmentary)	
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXVII:60 Q11 (no red shown, but presumed)	T. 2056
	g. Globular to ovoid body, sometimes depressed, short wide concave neck, double handle from neck to shoulder.	
	Average height: 21 cm.	
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXI:36 G5 (higher handle juncture)	T. 1500
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXI: 38 S2 (two colours not shown on drawing)	T. 1513

h. Ovoid body, narrow concave neck, handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Height: 42.5 cm.

Unknown Cypriote Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. A/1482).

Provenance

2. Trefoil mouth

a. Globular body, narrow concave neck, elevated handle from rim to shoulder.
Height: 20 cm.

Archangelos Unpublished, in Pal. Arch. Mus. (No. 38.2157)

3. Incurving rim (probably pinched)

a. Globular carinated body, tall neck, widening towards rim, handle from immediately below rim to shoulder.

Height: 17.25 cm.

Bahan Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection (No. 51/63) Tomb

B. *Flat base*

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Globular body, sometimes slightly carinated, narrow neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder (or from immediately below rim).

Average height: 27 cm.

Megiddo *M* II, Pl. 51:6 T. 2009

'Ajjul *AG* I, Pl. XXX:23 (sherd)
AG I, Pl. XXX:26 (sherd)
AG III, Pl. XLII:28 (sherd)
AG IV, Pl. XLV: 17 (sherd)
PEQ 1965, Nos. 3-5 (sherds)

<i>Jaffa</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, Nos. 22-23 (sherds)	
<i>Tell Mor</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 20 (sherd)	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> XIX, fig. 19:N Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> XX, fig. 3:F <i>Ug.</i> II, fig. 73:1 (sherd) <i>Ug.</i> II, fig. 74:18 (sherd)	T. LIV T. LXXV Tomb Tomb
<i>Qalat er-Rus</i>	Ehrich, <i>EPJR</i> , Pl. XXII	
<i>Sedment</i>	<i>PEQ</i> , 1965, No. 48	Presumed tomb
<i>Milia</i>	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. VI:11	T. 13
<i>Maroni</i>	Walters, <i>BMCV</i> , fig. 272:C 733	T. 9
<i>Archangelos</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 39 (pinched rim) Heurtley, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. XIX:e	Tomb Tomb
<i>Kalopsidha</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 41 (sherd)	
<i>Mersin</i>	<i>Prehistoric Mersin</i> , fig. 155:7 (sherd)	
<i>Unknown Provenance</i> <i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 51		

b. Globular body, sometimes slightly carinated, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Average height: 26 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 51:7	T. 5013 A
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. LIV:57 H8	T. 1717
	<i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXVII:57 H9	T. 2018
<i>Milia</i>	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. IV:1	T. 10
<i>Lefkoniko</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 42	Tomb
<i>Aniba</i>	<i>Aniba</i> II, Pl. 83:39(b)2	T. 87

c. Ovoid body with carinated shoulder, wide concave neck, double handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Height: 24.6 cm

<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLIX:34 Z'	T. 1920
---------------	------------------------------	---------

2. Trefoil mouth

a. Globular body, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average Height: 21.3 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 51:8	T. 3173
----------------	-----------------------	---------

Ras Shamra *Ug.* II, fig. 67:5 T. LXXXIV
Unknown Provenance *PEQ* 1965, No. 50

3. Round mouth with rounded, thickened rim
 a. Globular to ovoid body, concave neck (medium width), rounded handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Average height: 29 cm.

Bamboula, Kourion Unpublished, in Univ. Mus. Phil. (No. B 996) T. 12
Milia Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 104) T.I

JUGLETS

A. Ring base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim
 a. Globular to ovoid body, medium to wide concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average height: 14 cm.

Megiddo *M* II, Pl. 49:4 T. 2127
M II, Pl. 49:4
M II, Pl. 49:15
M II, Pl. 49:15 T. 3013
M II, Pl. 49:16
M II, Pl. 57:18 T. 2104
M II, Pl. 57:19 T. 2099
M II, Pl. 57:20
M II, Pl. 57:21
Bahan Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, (No. 67/63) Tomb
Milia Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., (No. 108) T. I

b. Cylindrical body with flattened shoulder, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average height: 12.5 cm.

Ras Shamra Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 4:N T. LXXXV
Milia Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. III:8 T. 10

B. Flat base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim
 a. Globular body, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder (or from immediately below rim).

Average height: 14 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 41:27	T. 77
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLIX:77 V7 (neck, handle and rim missing) <i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXIX:67 A6' <i>PEQ</i> 1965, Nos. 13-14 (sherds) <i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLVI: 32 (fragmentary)	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> , XX, fig. 4:K	T. LXXV
<i>Sedment</i>	<i>Sed.</i> I, Pl. XLV:70 (exceptionally narrow neck)	T. 1289
<i>Galinoporni</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 40	T.I

b. Cylindrical body with flattened shoulder, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Average height: 12 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 45:18	T. 1100 A
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXIX: 74 0 01 (no red shown, but presumed)	
<i>Lachish</i>	<i>Lach.</i> IV, Pl. 77:7772	T. 1555
<i>Unknown Cypriote Provenance</i>	Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus.	No. A. 1994

2. Trefoil mouth

a. Ovoid body, narrow concave neck, handle from rim to shoulder.

Height: 12 cm.

<i>Ras Shamra</i>	<i>PEQ</i> 1965, No. 36	T. XXXV
-------------------	-------------------------	---------

C. Rounded base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Globular body, narrow concave neck, handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Height: 14 cm.

<i>Milia</i>	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. VII:2	T. 13
--------------	---------------------------------------	-------

D. Disc base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Ovoid body, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

Average height: 15 cm.

<i>Deshasbeh</i>	<i>Desh.</i> Pl. XXXIII:26	T. 44
<i>Sedment</i>	<i>Sed.</i> I, Pl. XLV:67	T. 1262
	<i>Sed.</i> I, Pl. XLV:68 (fragmentary)	T. 1254

E. Convex base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Cylindrical body, with flattened shoulder, narrow concave neck, flattened handle from rim to shoulder.

Height: 10 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 59:6	T. 3004
<i>Jerusalem</i>	Salles, <i>Dominus Flevit</i> II, fig. 34:3	Tomb

KRATERS

A. Ring base

1. Round mouth with everted rim

a. Globular to ovoid body, frequently slightly carinated, two shoulder handles.

Average height: 30 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 53:1 (fragmentary)
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 56:4 (fragmentary)
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 56:7 (fragmentary)
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 134:2 (fragmentary)
	Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection (with 2 fish— fragmentary)
	Unpublished sherds, in O.I.C. collection

<i>Ajjul</i>	In Pal. Arch. Mus. (No. 40.81)	T. 1903
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXVIII:4 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXVIII:5 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXIX:6 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXIX:8 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXIX:9 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXX:27 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXXI:47 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XLVI:42 P (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXVIII:1 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXVIII:7 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXVIII:10 (fragmentary, decorated in black)	T. 1500
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXVIII:11 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXVIII:12 (fragmentary)	T. 1500

	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXIX:14 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXIX:22 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXXIX:24 and 25 (fragmentary)	T. 1146
	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXVI:38 Q2 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XLII:27 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XLII:30 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XLIV:76 (fragmentary, decorated in black)	
	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLIII:7 and Pl. XLIV:14A and B (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLV:18 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXIX:16 (fragmentary)	
	<i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXIX:24 (fragmentary)	
	Other published and unpublished sherds	
<i>Ashkelon</i>	<i>PEFQS</i> 1923, Pl. III: 25-27 and 31 (sherds)	
<i>Beth Shemesh</i>	<i>AS</i> IV, Pl. XXV:4, 7 and 8 (sherds)	
	<i>AS</i> IV, Pl. XXXI:7 (sherd)	
<i>Gezer</i>	<i>Gez.</i> II, fig. 324 (fragmentary)	
	<i>Gez.</i> II, fig. 333 (fragmentary)	
	<i>Gez.</i> III, Pl. CXL:7, 10 and 11 (sherds)	
	<i>Gez.</i> III, Pl. CLVII:7 (sherd)	
	Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus. (fragmentary)	
	Other published and unpublished sherds	
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> I, Pl. CXIX:12 (fragmentary, decorated in black)	
	<i>Haz.</i> I, Pl. CXL:17 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CXCVI:18 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXLII:2 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII:22 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII:23 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII:24 (sherd)	
	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCLXIX:29 (sherd)	
	Other published and unpublished sherds	
<i>Jaffa</i>	Unpublished sherds in Jaffa Mus.	
<i>Lachish</i>	<i>Lach.</i> II, Pl. LVIII:1	
	<i>Lach.</i> II, Pl. LVIII:2	
	<i>Lach.</i> II, Pl. LXI:3 (fragmentary)	
	Unpublished sherds in I of A and Pal. Arch. Mus. collections	
<i>Nagila</i>	<i>IEJ</i> 14(1964), Pl. 45 A-B	

Tell el-Far'ab Unpublished, in I of A collection:
 From FA 379—with bull (fragmentary)
 From FB 379—with fish (fragmentary)
 From FC 378—with bird (fragmentary)
 From unmarked findspot—with bird (fragmentary)
 Sherds, possibly from the above vessels

Tell el-Hesy *MMC*, 62:106 (fragmentary)
MMC, 63:108 (sherd)
MMC, Pl. 5:189 (sherd)

Tell Jerisheb Unpublished sherds, in Hebrew Univ. collection

Tell Keisan Unpublished sherd (No. 35/109 — decorated in black)

Tell Mor Unpublished sherds, in Is. A.D. collection

Tell Ta'anach Sellin, *TT I*, fig. 21 (fragmentary)
 Sellin, *TT I*, fig. 50 (sherds—one with bird)

Tell Zakariyeh *Excav. in Pal.*, Pl. 37:14 (sherd—published upside down)
Excav. in Pal., Pl. 41:145 (sherd)

Tell Sukas Ehrich, *EPJR*, Pl. XXIV (sherds)

Ras Shamra *Ug.* II, Pl. XXV
Ug. II, Pl. XXVI (fragmentary)
Ug. II, fig. 50:2, 12, 20, 21 (sherds from same vessel)
Ug. II, fig. 81:5 (fragmentary)
Ug. II, fig. 83:8 (fragmentary)
 Other published and unpublished sherds

Alalakh *Al.* Pl. XCIV:b (fragmentary)
Al. Pl. XCV:ATP/48/64 (fragmentary)
 Unpublished, in B.M. collection (fragmentary)
 Unpublished in Field Pottery Register (ATP/47/106)
 (fragmentary, decorated in black)

Tarsus *Tarsus* II, fig. 315:1085 (fragmentary)

Milia Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm, T. 10
 (fragmentary)

Nitovikla Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm T. 12
 (sherd)

Kalopsidha Åström, *MCBA*, 171, note 7.

b.	Globular to ovoid body, single horizontal shoulder handle. Average height: 26.5 cm.	
<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 53:2	
<i>Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXIV:33 U3 (handle incorrectly drawn) Other published and unpublished sherds (decorated with spoked wheels)	
<i>Akhziv</i>	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection (sherd decorated with spoked wheel)	
<i>Beth Shemesh</i>	<i>AS</i> III, fig. 2:7	
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXLII:25 (sherd decorated with spoked wheel)	
<i>Lachish</i>	Unpublished, in Pal. Arch. Mus., (No. 1422—sherd decorated with spoked wheel)	
<i>Tell el-Hesy</i>	<i>MMC</i> , 65:107 (sherd decorated with spoked wheel)	
<i>Tell Jerisheh</i>	Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, (No. 412 T. — large sherd decorated with spoked wheels)	
<i>Tell Mor</i>	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, (No. B/332-337/60) <i>BIES</i> XXIV(1960), fig. 4:4 (fragmentary—decorated with spoked wheels)	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	Unpublished, in excavator's collection	
<i>Nitovikla</i>	Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> XIX, fig. 19:N Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm (sherd decorated with spoked wheel)	T. LIV

c. Globular to ovoid body, three shoulder handles.

Extant height: 49 cm.

<i>Enkomi</i>	<i>SCE</i> I, Pl. LXX:1
---------------	-------------------------

JARS

A. Ring base

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Globular body, short wide concave neck.

Average Height: 17 cm.

<i>Ras Shamra</i>	<i>Ug.</i> II, fig. 67:2	T. LXXXIV
<i>Aniba</i>	<i>Aniba</i> II, Pl. 82:38(b)1	T. S 11

b. Curved conical body, tapering slightly towards rim, no neck.

Height: 17 cm.

<i>Jaffa</i>	Unpublished, in Jaffa Mus. (No. 350/1A/III)
--------------	---

B. *Flat base*

1. Round mouth with splaying rim

a. Globular to ovoid body, short wide concave neck, two shoulder handles.

Probable height: 35 cm.

<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLII:3	T. 1717
	<i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLIII:4 (lower body missing)	T. 1717

b. Ovoid body, short wide concave neck, thickened rim, two handles at mid-body.

Average height: 40 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>MT</i> , Pl. 51:7	T. 1145 B
<i>'Ajjul</i>	<i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXVII:40 K	T. 2022
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> II, Pl. CXVI:28 (fragmentary)	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> XIX, fig. 19:I (no splaying rim)	T. LIV

C. *Convex base*

1. Round mouth

a. Ovoid body, short wide concave neck, two handles at mid-body.

Extant height: 33.5 cm.

<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCXL:6 (rim missing)	T. 8112
--------------	--	---------

Bowls

A. *Ring base*

1. Curved splaying rim

a. Sharply carinated body, narrow shoulder, cordon at base of neck, horizontal handle from rim to shoulder.

<i>'Ajjul</i>	Unpublished sherd, in I of A collection, (OM 969)
<i>Hazor</i>	Unpublished sherd, in Hazor Expedition collection (no cordon)
<i>Milia</i>	Westholm, <i>QDAP</i> VIII, Pl. VI:20
<i>Kalopsidha</i>	Åström, <i>MCBA</i> , 171

2. Everted rim

a. Globular carinated body, wide spout and strainer, basket handle.

Average height: 13 cm.

<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 51:9	
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 51:10	T. 3024
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> II, Pl. CIX:13 (fragmentary—spout and strainer uncertain)	
B. <i>Flat base</i>		
1. Incurving rim		
a. Shallow hemispherical body, circular horizontal handle, sometimes slightly elevated.		
Average height: 7 cm.		
<i>Megiddo</i>	Unpublished sherd, in O.I.C. collection (decoration in reddish brown)	
<i>Ajul</i>	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXXVIII:18 S2 <i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXVIII:19 S4 (second handle incorrectly restored) <i>AG</i> II, Pl. XL:34 (fragmentary) <i>AG</i> II, Pl. XL:35 (fragmentary) <i>AG</i> IV, Pl. XLIV:10 <i>AG</i> V, Pl. XXIX:22 (fragmentary)	T. 1517
	Other published and unpublished sherds	
<i>Gezer</i>	Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus. (fragmentary)	
<i>Ras Shamra</i>	Schaeffer, <i>Syria</i> XX, fig. 4:L	T. LXXV
<i>Nitovikla</i>	Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm (fragmentary)	
2. Slightly everted rim		
a. Shallow hemispherical body, slightly carinated shoulder, circular horizontal handle, sometimes slightly elevated.		
Average height: 6 cm.		
<i>Megiddo</i>	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 61:19 (decorated in black)	
<i>Ajul</i>	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXXIX:23 A8 <i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXVIII:19 S6	
	Unpublished sherds, in I of A collection.	
<i>Hazor</i>	<i>Haz.</i> I, Pl. CXXIV:1 (wishbone handle) <i>Haz.</i> II, Pl. CIX:32 (fragmentary—no handle shown) <i>Haz.</i> II, Pl. CXVI:14 (sherd) <i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCLXIX:34 (fragmentary) <i>Haz.</i> III-IV, Pl. CCLXIX:35 (fragmentary)	
<i>Tell Mor</i>	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection (No. 61/2/59—fragmentary)	

C. *Trumpet foot with ring base*

1. Thickened incurving rim

a. Wide, flat body.

Average height: 8 cm.

'Ajjul	<i>AG</i> II, Pl. XXVIII:17 V5	T. 1146
	<i>AG</i> IV, 17	T. 1717
Baban	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, (No. III A/63)	Tomb

GOBLETS

A. *Trumpet foot*

1. Incurving rim

a. Sharply carinated body, narrow shoulder, tall widening upper wall.

Average height: 10 cm. (bowl section only)

Megiddo	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 47:12	T. 3063
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 55:12 (bowl section only)	
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 55:14	
	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 55:15 (bowl section only)	

2. Everted rim

a. Carinated body, narrow shoulder, tall concave upper wall.

Average height: 11 cm. (bowl section only)

Megiddo	<i>M</i> II, Pl. 55:13	
'Ajjul	<i>AG</i> III, Pl. XXXII:31 W3 (bowl section only)	
Hazor	<i>Haż.</i> II, Pl. CXVI:24 (fragmentary)	
b.	Conical body, tall widening upper wall, flaring slightly close to rim.	

Height: 19.5 cm.

Tell Mor	Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection (No. B 365/1/60).	
----------	---	--

STANDS

Both fragmentary—from base

'Ajjul	<i>AG</i> I, Pl. XXXIII:68 (circular cult stand—triangular wall opening)	
Alalakh	<i>Al.</i> Pl. XCVI:d (round everted base)	

ZOOMORPHIC VESSELS

Maroni	Figure of bull	
	Walters, <i>BMCV</i> , Pl. IV:C 802	T. 24
Akhera	Figure of ram	
	<i>BCH</i> LXXXV (1961), fig. 61	T.I

CHAPTER TWO

THE DECORATION

INTRODUCTION

It is over twenty years since W. A. Heurtley made his detailed analysis of bichrome decoration, as the result of which he came to certain conclusions.¹ Some of these still hold good today; many of them, however, can no longer be accepted in the light of present knowledge. The main thesis which he put forward was the existence of a certain itinerant artist to whom, he suggested, could be attributed a large number of vessels decorated with bird and animal figures, painted in a seemingly individual style. Postulating that this artist lived first at Megiddo and later at 'Ajjul, Heurtley went further and declared that "examples of his work were exported to other parts of Palestine and Syria and eventually to Cyprus".²

The conception of one man as the creator of a school of vase-painting is completely alien to Palestine in the sixteenth century B.C. and there is certainly no evidence for schools of vase-painting in the later classical sense at this time. Rather, there was in any given region a succession of ceramic traditions which continued in use, sometimes for a considerable time (as, for example, in the case of Khabur Ware), which with the impact of new ideas and cultural currents, were gradually replaced or superseded. Thus, changes in ceramic forms in the second millennium B.C. in Palestine, Syria and Mesopotamia can only be interpreted and understood in the light of the history of the peoples making and using the various wares, in the light of changing political alignments and commercial contacts and the arrival of new ethnic elements with a different cultural heritage. Above all, any attempt to interpret artifacts of any kind must be based on stratigraphical considerations.

In his article, Heurtley finds "proof" of the hand of the so-called "Tell el-'Ajjul Painter" in a similar manner of drawing parts of an animal's body (such as a leg or tail), without attempting to relate each sherd or vessel to the context

¹ Heurtley, *QDAP VIII*, 21-37.

² *Ibid.*, 33.

in which it occurred; nor does he take into consideration other types of pottery found in association with bichrome ware. Such attempts as he does make to use stratigraphical sequences only lead to confusing results, since these are based largely on the "carefully observed stratification at Megiddo",¹ which at the time of his writing had not yet been finally agreed upon by the excavators and which today cannot be accepted as published in the final report without far-reaching reservations. He further claimed that this hypothetical painter migrated from Megiddo to 'Ajjul, where bichrome ware "has been found on the floors of buildings as well as in tombs".² It is clear that Heurtley did not check the findspots of the 'Ajjul pottery to which he referred, for little bichrome ware was in fact found on the *floors* of buildings and only relatively few sherds can be traced to the rooms of the so-called "Palace" structures.³

That there was a characteristic manner in which both bichrome geometrical as well as figure decoration was executed, had long been evident and scholars had much earlier remarked upon it without being able to place it in its true perspective.⁴ But no convincing proof has so far been submitted for the existence of a single artist as the sole source of so wide a range of ceramic wares found at sites as distant from one another as Tarsus and Mersin in the north and Aniba in the south. The very quantities of bichrome ware now known, the extent of its diffusion and its continued use for some hundred years, make it physically impossible for one man and his school to have been the source of all this material. Any attempt, then, to evaluate bichrome ware today (which must, of necessity, still be far from final) can only be made if "the 'Ajjul Painter" is left out of the picture, if he is forgotten and discarded once and for all as a figment of the imagination: his "presence" only serves to complicate the issue.

Attempts have likewise been made to identify the actual species of the birds and fish depicted on bichrome ware. This was done for the 'Ajjul material by two well-known zoologists from the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who also knew the common local varieties well.⁵ In many cases their identifications

¹ *Ibid.*, 27.

² *Ibid.*, 32.

³ See Chapter 6 under.

⁴ R. A. S. Macalister, "7th. quarterly report on the excavation of Gezer", *PEFQS* 1904, 120; L. H. Vincent, "La peinture céramique Palestinienne", *Syria* V (1924), 187-194; H. Frankfort, *Studies in early pottery of the Near East* II, 167.

⁵ Hilda Petrie, "Fauna of vase paintings", in *AG* V, 20-21.

did not coincide, while in some instances a single figure was considered as resembling one bird on account of its form and another on account of its attitude. This only goes to emphasise the fact that while there may have been an unconscious portrayal of certain *genera* of birds and fish which were familiar from the everyday scene, the figures on bichrome ware are not intended as portraits, being essentially stylised representations. More recently, Professor Bodenheimer (who was one of the two experts consulted by Petrie) wrote as follows on the same subject (still, unfortunately, referring to the mythical "painter"): "We do not believe that the master of animal painting in the middle bronze age has aimed at representing specific birds and fish"; and again, "relatively few of these animals can be identified The fish are hopeless; fins and shape change without apparent constancy or relation to definite species".¹

Clearly, every artist has a picture in his mind's eye of the object he intends to portray, whatever the style he adopts for doing so — naturalistic, impressionist, cubist or the like. In the same way, each potter decorating his wares in the bichrome style almost certainly retained a remembered impression of birds, fish, quadrupeds or trees, this being expressed in a specific decorative manner on his vessels. Such "models" were likely to derive from actual experience, not only from acquaintance with those common along the Mediterranean seaboard, but also from inland regions where birds and fish abound on the streams and lakes. The link with reality is there, but the form of representation on bichrome ware almost invariably conformed to certain accepted conventions which persisted throughout the period of its use.

Stylisation is likewise characteristic of the geometrical design elements used, which when analysed can be reduced to ten basic forms. While these motifs were undoubtedly influenced by related geometrical patterns used in other cultural areas in preceding periods² (many of them originally denoting a definite object), they also included a number which were specific to bichrome ware and which, like those evolving from the idea of the spoked wheel,³ were a stylised representation of it. Thus, once bichrome ware had become established, certain accepted design elements were regarded as being intrinsic to it and the potters conformed to popular demand and taste. Occasionally it is possible to discern a particular scheme for decorating a vessel which may mean, that it was one

¹ F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and man in Bible lands*, 175.

² As on Khabur Ware and Middle Cypriote vessels.

³ See Chapter 3, section 1.

of a series coming from a particular workshop.¹ In general, however, the wider conventions were adhered to, with only here and there the addition of individual elaborations. So it is that the same motifs — both figure and geometrical — occur again and again, at site after site, the whole gamut of the decorative repertoire being employed. So pronounced is this, that a site from which only relatively little bichrome material is known, can create a sense of incompleteness due to the lack of certain expected forms. This is illustrated at Megiddo, where quantities of bichrome ware were found and published. Nevertheless, the overall impression gained from the excavation reports is that certain standard design elements and commonly-used vessel shapes are but poorly represented. An examination of additional, unpublished material, taken in conjunction with the information contained in the unpublished Field Diaries² regarding even larger quantities of bichrome sherd material actually found, corrects this impression of lack of balance at Megiddo and it is seen that the typical kraters decorated with characteristic design elements were, in fact, present.³

While much of the bichrome material was already known at the time when Heurtley was writing, many additional examples of vessels and sherds have since come to light and will doubtless continue to be found as excavation progresses. By considering the old together with the more recent material, it is hoped that a truer appreciation will be obtained and a clearer picture emerge of bichrome ware decoration, which, while exhibiting both flexibility and freshness, nevertheless applied certain accepted conventions not only to figure representation but to the range of geometrical motifs which it used.

A. FIGURE REPRESENTATION

1. FIGURES OF FISH

Position of the figure

The fish is frequently used as a figure placed between geometrical band panels on the shoulder of a vessel. The more usual manner of representation is of a single fish in a horizontal position facing right; but there are instances of more than one fish being depicted or of the figure facing left, as well as of vessels on which the fish are painted in an upright position, as if standing on their

¹ Note the jugs, Type A1(a), found in T. 1517 and in T. 1717 at 'Ajjul; also, three similar jugs found in T. XXXV at Ras Shamra, Pl I: 7-9.

² In O.I.C. archives.

³ See Pls. XVI: 6, 7 and 9, XVII: 1 and XVIII: 1 and 5.

tails. This occurs when the decoration is in the Cross Line Style, the narrow frame formed by the diagonally crossing lines and the vertical bands making this necessary.¹

Figures of fish in a vertical position occur on jugs, Types B1(a) and B1(b), at 'Ajjul, Ras Shamra and Archangelos² and they are used in a similar manner on other kinds of vessels decorated in the Cross Line Style at 'Ajjul.³ Here krater fragments were also found with an upright fish placed close to the vertical band panel on the shoulder⁴ and at Tell el-Far'ah a jug sherd⁵ has an upright fish figure painted in the X-ray Style.⁶ On a krater from Ras Shamra the figure of a fish faces left over the top of a stylised tree opposite a quadruped⁷, while another sherd from 'Ajjul shows two black fish one above the other facing left.⁸ The treatment on the latter recalls the four figures on a tankard sherd from 'Ajjul which has a frieze of small black fish, with red eyes, placed round the shoulder⁹ and a row of remarkably similar fish (tails upward) on a krater sherd from Milia.¹⁰

All the above illustrate the depiction of fish in a manner different from the more usual horizontal position of the figure shown facing right.

Two fish figures

Sometimes two fish figures are used together in the same panel or field of decoration. On a jug from Dhenia,¹¹ Type A1(a), almost the whole of the shoulder is decorated in an ingenuous and pleasing manner with two fish, in the X-Ray style, curving round it. On a krater sherd from Megiddo,¹² two fish

¹ See Chapter 3, section 10.

² *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 13, *AG* IV, Pl. XLII: 1; Schaeffer, *Syria* XX (1939), fig. 3: F; Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XIX: f.

³ Pls. XIV: 11 and XVIII: 2.

⁴ Unpublished, in I of A collection, from AJ 765 and Pl. XVIII: 3—not in Cross Line Style.

⁵ Pl. XII: 2.

⁶ See Category 3 under.

⁷ Schaeffer, *Strat. Comp.*, fig. 327.

⁸ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 6.

⁹ Pl. XI: 4.

¹⁰ Pl. XVI: 3.

¹¹ Pl. IX: 2.—This jug forms part of a tomb group to be published by the Cyprus Museum and I wish to thank the Curator for allowing me to publish a photograph of this vessel prior to the publication of the whole assemblage.

¹² Pl. XVIII: 5.

are shown — one large, one small — swimming one above the other. Only part of the larger figure remains, but sufficient is extant to indicate that its body is depicted in a novel, but characteristic way: outlined by a bichrome band, it is filled with a series of crosses separated by narrow bichrome bars, while dots are shown between the arms of each cross. The smaller fish, which is seen behind the ventral fin of the larger, is painted in a manner which is commonly found.¹ At Milia, two small fish, placed one above the other, are used as part of the neck decoration on a jug, Type A1(c), while a tankard from the same site has a frieze of fish placed one behind the other on the lower neck register.²

Single fish figures

As has already been pointed out, it is the single figure of a fish, placed between vertical band panels, which is most frequently used. In some instances this is the only figure introduced into the general scheme of decoration, as on two jugs, Types A1(a) and A1(f), from 'Ajjul and Megiddo. On the former the second space between the vertical band panels is filled with double bichrome strapping;³ on the latter the fish is in the X-ray style and there may have been a second figure on the section of the shoulder now missing.⁴ Another fish figure from Megiddo occurs on a krater, Type A1(a),⁵ on which the adjacent space between the vertical band panels is filled with diagonal bichrome strapping, as on the 'Ajjul jug above. Both these vessels illustrate the combined use of figure and geometrical design elements in an overall ornamental scheme,⁶ the application of the decoration being, in effect, the same, despite the fact that the fish are differently conceived and the shapes of the pots unlike one another: it is the *approach* to the decoration which is similar and which is characteristic of bichrome ware. This is also exemplified by kraters, Type A1(a), from Lachish and Minet el-Beida where the figure of a fish is balanced by diagonal strapping.⁷ There are, in addition, a number of sherds which could belong to this category, since on them the figure of a fish appears to take up much of the

¹ Category 1 under.

² Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. II: 4.

³ Pl. I: 1.

⁴ Pl. XII: 4.

⁵ Pl. XVIII: 1.

⁶ See Chapter 3, section 9.

⁷ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 2 and *Ug.* II, Pl. XXVI: 1 — where this is not visible.

space available for decoration, although it is uncertain how the figures were placed in the overall scheme. Three such sherds may be mentioned, all from kraters, Type A1(a): from Lachish, on which a fish is placed between vertical band panels, though the partial filling of the body with a dot-filled triangle and the eye placed in the lower part of the head, are unusual;¹ from Megiddo, on which a large fish fills most of the decorative field on one side of the vessel, the figure being almost entirely in black with traces of reddish-purple;² and from Tell el-Far'ah, on which a large fish takes up what would appear to be most of one side of the shoulder of the vessel,³ (the eye being in the lower part of the head and its position determined by the direction in which the fish faces in accordance with the wheel-marks on the inner side).

Fish figures together with birds, quadrupeds and trees

The figure of a fish is also commonly found together with other elements of figure decoration, especially with birds. But whereas it has been seen that geometrical design elements are frequently used as the counterpart to the figure decoration, there are many instances where the emphasis is placed on the figures themselves, the geometrical motifs in the vertical band panels becoming auxiliary decorative elements, whose function is to create the frame in which the figures are set. Kraters, Type A1(a), are commonly decorated in this way and there are many instances of four figures being used, two on either side of the shoulder between the two handles. On a krater from Gezer there are two pairs of alternating fish and birds.⁴ A fish and a bird are depicted on opposite sides of a similar vessel from Lachish, where each is paired with an ibex.⁵ The decoration on these two kraters has many points in common, even though the fish and bird figures are differently conceived. Here, again, it is the approach to the decoration and its application which is seen to be the same on the two vessels, and the following details may also be noted: the use of black vertical lines on the middle and sides of the handles; the second bichrome band on the lower body; the use of wavy lines in the vertical band panels between the figures — all features which frequently occur on kraters.

In discussing the figures of fish placed in an upright position, reference was

¹ *Lach.* II, Pl. LXI: 3.

² *M* II, Pl. 134: 2.

³ Pl. XVIII: 4.

⁴ Pl. IV: 1.

⁵ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 1.

made to three Cross Line Style jugs.¹ On them the shoulder insertions comprise the figures of a fish and two birds. In a similar way fish and birds are used to decorate the shoulder of jugs, Types A1(a) and B3(a), from Cyprus,² on both of which the figures are set between vertical band panels in a horizontal position (as on kraters), demonstrating yet again the predilection for the use of fish and birds together in the same decorative scheme.

The figure of a fish also frequently occurs together with a stylised tree, especially on kraters, Type A1(a). This is exemplified by sherds from the same vessel found at Ras Shamra, although the sequence and arrangement of the decorative elements is not certain.³ It would, however, appear likely that on the complete vessel the shoulder was originally divided into four sections by vertical band panels, possibly all, but at least one of which being filled with the hub and spokes motif (No. 12), and that between them were placed the figure of a fish (No. 2) and subsequently a stylised tree (No. 20), while the rim has the characteristic "nicks" in black and red (No. 21). Additional figures may have been depicted on other sections of the shoulder, or alternatively the decoration may have consisted of geometrical design elements. Another krater decorated with the figures of a fish and a stylised tree, comes from 'Ajjul.⁴ On this fragment a fish is set between two vertical band panels, while to the right can be seen the tip of a stylised tree, the two figures being placed in succession on the shoulder. On the other side of the shoulder there were probably two additional figures, or, alternatively, a geometrical motif. Since two other fragments from a single vessel are recorded from the same findspot, on which two thick-set birds are depicted between vertical band panels,⁵ these may well have formed part of the same krater whose decoration would thus have consisted entirely of figures: a fish, a tree and two birds.⁶ In support of this suggestion, comparison may be made with another 'Ajjul krater sherd on which the framed zones are filled by the figures of a bird, a second bird and a stylised tree.⁷

¹ See 24, note 2.

² Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII: d¹ and d²; and Pl. XI: 6-7.

³ *Ug.* II, Fig. 50: 2, 12, 20 and 21.

⁴ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 7, from E 843.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLIV: 14 A and B.

⁶ Pl. IV:2, for suggested reconstruction.

⁷ It should be noted that according to the drawing, there are three figures at least between the two handles — *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 11.

Fish and other figures combined with geometrical motifs

A fish and a bird are used to decorate a krater from Lachish, but on this vessel each is paired with a geometrical motif¹, the decoration resembling that in which figure and geometrical elements are combined, as on the Megiddo krater discussed above. One of the geometrical motifs on the Lachish krater is that of the spoked wheel which is shown attached to the vertical band panel at one side. Reminiscent of the above combination is that used on a krater from 'Ajjul, on one side of which there is a fish and a bird, the figures being set between the customary band panels.² In the corresponding positions on the other side of the shoulder there are Maltese Crosses within circles which are attached at one side only to the adjacent band panel. On this vessel the figures of bird and fish are paired together, as are the hub and spokes motif in the form of Maltese Crosses.³ Here the geometrical design element on one side of the shoulder is treated as the ornamental counterpart of the figure decoration on the other, thus demonstrating yet again that the combination of figure and geometrical motifs — which is so characteristic of the bichrome ware style — was nevertheless purely arbitrary, depending on the individual choice of the potter.

Fish figures according to categories

In his analysis of figure representation in what he termed the "second style",⁴ Heurtley distinguished between two main categories of fish as depicted on bichrome ware. The bodies of both kinds, he pointed out, are normally shown with a dark centre which is separated from the rest of the body by a red strip, while the gills are usually shown alternately by red and black lines and the eye as a dot placed in a round or elliptical reserved space. Figures of fish which combined the characteristics of both categories were, he considered, exceptional. These two types of figures he classified as follows:

Category 1. The head is pointed and the eye set well forward, while the gills are indicated by stripes across the body, usually painted in bichrome.⁵

Category 2. The head is "blunt" and the eye set further back, while the gills are indicated by semi-circular stripes round it.⁶

Reviewing the wider range of bichrome ware decoration as it is known today,

¹ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 2.

⁴ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, 23.

² *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 24 and 25.

⁵ Fig. 1: 1 and 4.

³ See Chapter 3, section 1.

⁶ Fig. 1: 2 and 5.




Fig. 1. Fish figures according to categories: Category 1—Nos. 1 and 4; Category 2—Nos. 2 and 5; Category 3—No. 3; Category 4—No. 6.

these two categories can still be regarded as covering the majority of fish figures portrayed, provided that individual divergencies and all possible combinations and variations of detail are considered, not as exceptions, but as normal. Because of his *idée fixe* concerning a single arist, Heurtley excluded other categories of fish figures, which should, nevertheless, be considered as integral to the bichrome style and of which additional examples have since come to light:

Category 3—the X-ray style. The head is depicted in the accepted manner, but the body is shown with the major bones indicated by a series of conventionalised lines running obliquely out from a central back-bone. Examples of the X-ray style have been found at Megiddo, Tell el-Far'ah and Dhenia.¹

Category 4—the schematic style. The whole figure is outlined by curving lines which are continued beyond the point of intersection to indicate the tail, where a third line is sometimes added, while the gills, if shown, are indicated by a single transverse line at the back of the head. The body is either barred in bichrome or left in reserve.² Examples of the schematic style have been found at Beth Shan, Bamboula, Enkomi and Milia.³ (It should be noted that both the X-ray and schematic styles are used for the figures of birds).⁴ In addition to the above, dots are sometimes used for the partial or complete filling of the body. Examples of this have been found at 'Ajjul, Ashkelon, Lachish and Minet

¹ Fig. 1:3 and Pls. IX: 2 and XII: 2-4.

² Fig. 1:6

³ Pl. II: 3—with line of dots along centre body and spear-like spike on nose; Pls. XI: 7 and XX: 1; and Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XV: k.

⁴ See section 2 under.

el-Beida.¹ Another method of filling in the body occurs on the larger of the two fish on a krater sherd from Megiddo,² the smaller being depicted in the style of Category 1. The delineation of these two associated figures, each carried out in a different manner only goes to emphasise that the various styles were not only contemporary, but might be used together at will.

Sometimes fish figures are depicted in a different way from those discussed above and cannot be included in any one of the four categories described. Such figures occur at Hazor and 'Ajjul,³ while even less schematic figures than those of Category 4 are known, on which there is no more than an outline, with an eye and a bichrome bar behind the head to suggest a fish, the figure having been reduced to the simplest possible form.⁴

While it is seen that the four categories of styles for depicting the figures of fish cover the majority of representations occurring on many different types of vessels, a detailed comparison of them leads to the conclusion that there was, nevertheless, scope for an individual interpretation. This is illustrated by the manner of depicting details such as the tail, caudal fins, the filling of the body, or the actual shape of the head (especially in the case of the blunt-headed fish, which is that more commonly employed). There are instances, too, where certain details are omitted altogether (such as tail or fins), where conventions usually used on the figures of birds are transferred to those of fish (such as a triangular barred tail, red dots along the body, etc.), or it may be the swift movement of the brush which dictates the form of some specific part (such as tail-shape or fin). Thus, while a large number of fish figures can be placed in Category 2, the degree of "bluntness" of the head varies considerably and often approaches the form of Category 1.⁵ Similarly, the most usual manner of depicting the tail is in the form of a "V", but this may be open or closed, filled in in black or in red, or left plain.

It was the scope for individual treatment and interpretation of the accepted conventions which even in the simple, stylised figure of a fish could—and did—find expression which made possible so many variations and combinations.

¹ *AG* I, Pl. XXXI: 50 and 52 and *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 18; *PEFQS* 1923, Pl. III:27; *Lach.* II, Pl. LXI: 3; *Ug.* II, fig. 50: 23.

² Pl. XVIII: 5.

³ *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII: 22 and *AG* V, Pl. XXIX: 19.

⁴ Pl. XIV: 11 and unpublished, in excavator's collection, from Ras Shamra.

⁵ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 7 and Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 3: F.

Thus figures on one and the same vessel may exhibit differences in execution, as in the case of the two fish on the Dhenia jug, or on the Gezer krater referred to above. The tendency to diversify made possible these countless "variations on a theme" which express themselves not merely in the way in which fish are painted, but also in the manner in which other figures and geometrical motifs are used. The examination of vessel after vessel creates the impression that no two fish are identical in every detail, even though the figures can, in most cases, be allocated to one of the four categories listed above; at the same time, with all their divergencies there is something in the basic approach to the decoration which embraces them all and which stamps them all as being in the specific bichrome style.

2. FIGURES OF BIRDS

Position of the figure

As is the case with fish, the figure of a bird frequently occurs as part of the decoration on larger vessels; and it is doubtless the need for adequate space in which to place this and other stylised figures which precludes them from being used on smaller surfaces, such as shallow bowls and juglets. As has been seen in the foregoing, birds are often introduced in the same way as fish between vertical band panels and they frequently alternate with them. The bird, too, is nearly always depicted facing right, though this does not invariably hold good on Cross Line Style jugs, where the more confined space on the shoulder sometimes leads to the insertion of the figure in a somewhat tilted position, as if perched on one of the groups of crossing lines.¹

Single bird figures

A single bird figure, unaccompanied by other decorative motifs, is rarely found and in most instances where a bird would appear to be the sole ornament, the vessel is fragmentary. A single bird figure, however, does occasionally occur and is found on the neck of a tankard and of a miniature tankard at Milia,² on which the decorative scheme is otherwise entirely geometrical. At the same necropolis there is also an instance of a single bird figure used on the shoulder of a jug, Type A1(c), together with geometrical motifs,³ but as the neck is missing, it is possible that there were other figures with it.

¹ Pls. III: 8 and 9 and XIV: 1.

² Jug, Type A1(d), presumed to be from Milia, Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XX: h and juglet, Type A1(a), unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., from T. I., (No. 108).

³ Unpublished in Cyp. Mus., from Milia T. I., (No. 103).

Birds together with other figures

It is far more usual for a bird to be used as one of a series of figures decorating a vessel, especially on the shoulder, and examples have already been cited when discussing the figures of fish. Thus on a krater, Type A1(a), at Nagila,¹ a bird is followed by a quadruped, the two figures being portrayed statically, one behind the other, without any apparent connection between them, since they do not form part of a composite scene. Elsewhere, the figure of a bird is not infrequently combined with that of a stylised tree, sometimes in the same panel where it is shown sitting upon it.² A bird and a stylised tree are used in consecutive panels on the shoulder of a krater, Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul and it is possible that the decoration on the now indistinguishable remaining panels also included a fish. Another 'Ajjul krater has already been referred to on which two bird figures are combined with a stylised tree in three consecutive sections of the shoulder decoration.³ At Megiddo, a jug, Type A1(e), was found in a structural tomb in use over a long period and until later than that of bichrome ware. This jug is decorated with the figures of two backward-looking birds, placed on either side of a "sacred" tree, but the whole scene is so far removed from the bichrome ware approach, that the vessel cannot be considered as falling within the period.⁴

Bird friezes

Birds are sometimes used in a repetitive frieze in which they seem to walk in procession, following each other beak to tail. This form of decoration is confined almost entirely to tankards and is used either on the shoulder or the neck, and in one instance on the lower body.⁵ Sherds from the necks of tankards from T. 10 at Milia are thus decorated (though they were not recorded or published), as are also three other vessels from Cyprus.⁶ Three other tankards have a shoulder decoration which consists of a bird frieze of this kind: the first is from T. 13 at Milia,⁷ while two others are presumed to be from

¹ *IEJ* 14 (1964), Pl. 45B.

² *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 10-11 and 16.

³ Incorrectly published, *AG* IV, Pl. LI: 38 Q4. See frontispiece.

⁴ *MT*, Pl. 46: 15.

⁵ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XX: b.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. XX: d and f, and Pl. X: 1.

⁷ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. VII: 1, on which the lower part of the body is decorated with a frieze of bulls—see section 3.

Milia.¹ At Hazor, part of the shoulder of a krater was found on which the figures of three incomplete birds are depicted in a manner which recalls the bird friezes on tankards,² though here two birds stand facing one another in the centre, while another can be discerned behind that on the left; but the sherd is too small to enable any further deductions to be made as to the order of the figures.³

Differently executed bird figures on the same vessel

When more than one figure of a bird is used in the decoration of the same vessel, these may exhibit different characteristics, and it is possible that they are intended to represent different species. But if this is so, it is the difference between them which it is wished to stress rather than the likeness to any specific species.

This is exemplified by large sherd from 'Ajjul on which there is a bird with a star on its body. Outlined in black, the body is filled in in reddish brown, while to the left of the band panel, part of another figure is visible which would appear to be the breast of a second bird painted almost in one colour, but showing a narrow reserved space where red might be introduced.⁴ It should be noted that the drawing of this sherd was published together with that of another showing the head of a similar brown bird which resembles the style of the "star" bird; but even though it is indicated that this is not in position here, the drawing creates a misleading impression. Examination of both sherds suggests that this head forms part of yet a third bird figure from the same vessel, which may have been a jar, Type B1(a), since additional, fitting, sherds have come to light and give an indication of the proportions of the lower part of the body and of the extension of the horizontal bichrome bands to lower than is usual on kraters.

As in the case of the bird frieze, complimentary figures on the same vessel belonging to the same category often exhibit minor differences where details of representation are concerned. On a krater from Gezer (already commented upon in connection with slight variations in the fish), the bodies of the two bird figures are not identical, one having a series of red dots on the neck and the other having none.⁵ Similarly, two dot-filled figures of birds on a

¹ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pls. XX: a and XXI: a.

² *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCCXI: 6.

³ Compare the different direction of some of the bull figures on the tankard referred to above, Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XVI.

⁴ *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 4.

⁵ Pl. IV: 1.

black-decorated krater from 'Ajjul are depicted with differences of detail.¹

Uniform bird figures on the same vessel

In many instances there is a clearly-defined attempt at uniformity in depicting the birds used to decorate a single vessel. On krater sherds from 'Ajjul, almost identical birds are shown, each framed between separating band panels;² on jugs, Type A1(a), found in tombs 1517 and 1717 at 'Ajjul, there were doubtless originally three consecutive bird figures on each vessel painted in a very similar manner.³

Other bird figures

Mention must be made here of two other vessels—both found in Egypt in a tomb context—which are decorated with bird figures, though neither of them is characteristic of the way in which birds are usually depicted on bichrome ware. The first is a jug, Type A1(a), from the Mayana cemetery, Sedment, which was considered by the excavators as being Sixteenth Dynasty in date and as having Palestinian affinities.⁴ The vessel, which is decorated with a reddish-brown band between two black ones at mid-body (not shown in two colours on the drawing), has the figures of two birds introduced between vertical latticed panels, which are not bichrome-framed. Only one of the birds is distinct and this figure has a stiff, straight neck shown in outline, and an outlined head and breast, while the back of the body, wing and tail are filled in with uneven brush-strokes. The bird has short, thick legs which end in feet rather than in the usual bird's claws. The second vessel on which a bird forms part of the overall decoration (painted in dark brown and red), is a jar from Aniba.⁵ The jar has no handle, but the ring base and globular carinated body, the wide concave neck and everted rim are reminiscent of jugs, Types A1(c) and A1(d), both of which have handles from rim to shoulder. The introduction of the figure of a bird on the neck ("between four ovals") resembles the way in which tankard necks are decorated. While the bird itself is filled in completely in black, except for the reserved space round the eye, the general shape of the body recalls the bird figures of Category 4 under. The jar from Aniba is described

¹ *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 1, where there are vertical lines in the centre body of one only.

² *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 11 and *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 14 A and B, and Pl. 1V:2

³ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 9 and XLII: 2—where the latter jug has only two extant birds.

⁴ Pl. IX: 4.

⁵ *Aniba* II, Pl. 82: 38 (b)1.

as a “salve pot” by the excavators and is dated to the late Hyksos period or early Eighteenth Dynasty.

In both the above, the figures depicted do not conform to the more accepted manner of delineation of birds on bichrome ware, just as in the case of fish it was seen that there were many figures which could not be included in the four main categories. On the Mayana jug, the shape of the vessel and the approach to the decoration are in the bichrome ware style, though the whole lacks the customary carefulness of execution which is characteristic of the peak period.¹ The Aniba jar, on the other hand, is nearer in conception to Egyptian wares and it may have been made locally under the influence of foreign decorated pottery from the north.² Yet the Aniba jar might also have been made abroad specially for export to Egypt, the bird figure and the ring base being characteristic of the local style, the lack of handle and dot-strung decoration being intended to please in the foreign market for which it was destined.³

Bird figures according to categories

The figures of birds, like those of fish, fall into four main categories, but here, too, infinite variety and individual treatment are the rule, so that there are many instances where a figure appears to require a category of its own, or where there are a number of possibilities for its classification. This is due to the essential fluidity in the manner of representing figures on bichrome ware which at the same time keeps within the bounds of certain characteristic and conventionalised forms:

Category 1 A. The figure is carried out in black with a narrow red band inserted below and parallel to the outline of the body to indicate the folded wing; the neck is of medium length and not too thick; the head is a continuation of the upper neck line; the eye is shown by a dot in the centre of a circular reserved space; the beak is of varying length and curve, and may be painted in outline or in solid black; the legs are slim and usually bent, having three claws; the tail is triangular.

There are many bird figures which can be included in this category and these occur largely on kraters, Type A1(a), as well as on tankards. Bird-decorated kra-

¹ See Chapter 4, section 7.

² See also lidded jar from Qau, which has latticed panel and decoration recalling that of the Cross Line Style and on which a linear bird figure is introduced hap-hazardly. G. Brunton, *Qau and Badari III*, Pl. XVI: 55P.

³ Compare *AG* II, Pl. XXXI: 41 E3—with typical Egyptian shape.

ters and krater sherds of this category have been found at 'Ajjul, Gezer, Hazor, Tell el-Hesy, Lachish, Ras Shamra and in Cyprus, but there is hardly one of them which does not deviate from the above description in respect of one or more features. Bearing this tendency in mind, the following figures can be taken as exemplifying birds of Category 1A: the bird on a krater sherd from Tell el-Hesy¹ and the birds on a tankard shoulder from Cyprus.²

Category 1 B. The figure is in all respects similar to those of Category 1A, except that red is used to indicate the folded wing. This manner of depicting birds has been considered as a departure from the normal treatment, but examples of figures on which the wing is shown in red are so numerous as to leave little doubt that this was one of the accepted methods of painting in details. Vessels thus decorated have been found at many sites: 'Ajjul,³ Lachish,⁴ Hazor,⁵ and Tarsus⁶—all on kraters, Type A1(a); Megiddo,⁷ Ras Shamra,⁸ and Archangelos⁹—on Cross Line Style jugs, Types B1(a) and B2(a); on a jug, Type A1(a), probably from Milia,¹⁰ and on tankards presumed to be from Milia.¹¹

A word may be added here in support of the interpretation put forward above that the insertion of a narrow red band close to the black outline of the body is intended to isolate the shape of the folded wing on the general profile of the figure, as in Category 1 A. It is clear that the introduction of red on figures belonging to Category 1 B served a similar purpose and that it was usual to indicate the wing in one or another of certain conventionalised ways. Thus on a krater sherd from Megiddo decorated with the figure of a bird, the narrow red line which runs parallel to the outline is placed well inside the body to form a

¹ *MMC*, 62: 106—with thick legs and thin red band along the length of the neck, and fig. 2: 1.

² Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XV: a, and fig. 2: 2.

³ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 13, *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 12—where neck, head and beak are in outline and *ibid.*, Pl. XLV: 16—where whole body is in black except for wing and reserved space round eye.

⁴ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 1.

⁵ *Haz.* III—IV, Pl. CCXLIII: 24, and fig. 2: 5.

⁶ *Tarsus* II, fig. 315: 1085, and fig. 2: 4.

⁷ *M* II, Pl. 51: 8.

⁸ Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 3: F.

⁹ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XIX: g and h.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, Pl. XIX: a—where figure has elongated, disc-like head and triangular, all-black tail.

¹¹ *ibid.*, Pl. XV: d, e, i and f—where the wing has degenerated into a cursory narrow red stroke placed low on the body of the latter; No. h (right)—where two alternative methods of indicating the wing are used on figures in the same frieze; and No. j—where birds and fish are depicted in the same way.



Fig. 2. Bird figures according to categories: Category 1 A—Nos. 1 and 2; Category 1B—Nos. 4 and 5; Category 2—Nos. 7 and 9, 6; Category 3—No. 3; Category 4—No. 8.

frame for the black-barred wing which is clearly indicated within the space left in reserve by the red.¹ A similar technique appears to have been used on a jar, Type B1(a), from 'Ajul, on which all three figures of the birds are drawn with a reserved space in the position of the wing, while the fish, which lacks the usually shown external fins, has a similar reserved space where the ventral fin would be.² According to Heurtley, faint "diagonal stripes in red"

¹ Pl. XVII: 1.

² *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 4.

could be discerned barring the reserved space on the birds.¹ This can surely only be interpreted as another method of indicating the wing closely allied to that used on the Megiddo sherd described above. The use of oblique black bars to indicate the wing occurs also on the figures of birds used to decorate the neck of a tankard,² where the bird to the right of the handle has a clearly-shaped wing indicated by a reserved space barred obliquely in black, while the wing on the other two figures has been reduced to a narrow horizontal barred band. On a krater, Type A1(c), from Enkomi,³ there are two figures of birds where the wing is delineated by means of a barred reserved space which runs parallel to the upper curve of the back. Likewise there are a number of krater sherds from the living quarters of the Nitovikla fortress, on two of which there are incomplete figures of a bird showing the wing as a reserved space barred in black.⁴ There can be little doubt, then, that there existed a number of conventional forms which were commonly used for depicting the wing (as was the case for other features) and that the introduction of a narrow red band close to the black outline of the body was one.

Category 2. The figure is in black; the neck is of medium length and not too thick; the head is a continuation of the upper neck line; the eye is shown by a dot placed in a circular reserved space; the beak is comparatively short; the legs are slim and nearly always bent, having three claws; the tail is triangular and barred; the wing is *not* indicated.

The chief difference between the all-black figures of this category and those of categories 1 A and 1 B lies in the non-indication of the wing. That this was intentional is illustrated by three examples of birds of this category on which the wing is shown as projecting from the body in a specifically stylised manner: on a krater sherd from 'Ajjul, where one wing only is depicted, curving over the body and much resembling a palm branch.⁵ A similar method of indicating the wings is used on the neck of a jug, Type A1(c), where the bird faces left, and both wings are shown curving backwards above the body, though they are relatively smaller than on the 'Ajjul figure and the "palm branch" effect is achieved by means of shorter oblique strokes.⁶ The third instance of a

¹ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, 23.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. XXIII: f, and fig. 2: 6.

³ Pl. XX: 1.

⁴ Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm, and Pl. XVII: 4.

⁵ *AG* I, Pl. XXXI: 47, and fig. 2:9—with short neck and no eye.

⁶ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXIV (right)—with large head and short beak.

black bird with wings specially indicated is on a krater from Ras Shamra,¹ where two narrow barred wings are depicted. These figures are indeed exceptions and it is their peculiarity in this respect which makes it clear that the wing is not normally indicated on figures belonging to this category.

Characteristic all-black figures of Category 2 occur on kraters, Type A1(a), at 'Ajjul, Tell el-Far'ah, Tell Ta'anach, Ras Shamra, Tell Sukas and Alalakh.² Similar bird figures are used on jugs, especially on those decorated in the Cross Line Style, Types B1(a) and B1(b), at 'Ajjul and at Milia³ (where a red bar is sometimes added in the tail).

Category 3. The X-ray style, in which the body is depicted in black and the major bones are indicated in red, all the way from neck to tail, in two distinct groups. This technique is known from two jugs, Type A1(a), which were found in tombs 1517 and 1717 at 'Ajjul,⁴ though the shapes and details of the birds on each vessel vary considerably. On the figures decorating the jug from T. 1517 the bone indication is more precise and resembles that used in the X-ray style for fish, especially along the centre body. Another variation of the X-ray style is carried out in dark brown on a sherd from 'Ajjul, on which the head and neck are filled in, the body painted in outline and the radiation of the bones indicated only on the body.⁵ This latter example would seem even closer to the fish figures depicted in this manner.⁶

Category 4. The schematic style, which is almost identical to that used for fish. In this, the figure is outlined in black, the whole of the head and body (with the exception of the eye) being left in reserve; the beak is short and is formed by prolonging the upper line of the head in a single thick stroke; the legs are for the most part not bent and the claws project at an angle from them, being usually two or three in number; across the body there may be a vertical or oblong bar; the tail is formed by the extension of the lines of the curve of the body beyond

¹ Pl. IV: 3.

² *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 10, and fig. 2: 7, and *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 13; Pl. XVII: 2; Sellin, *TT* I, 49, fig. 50; Pl. IV: 3—two larger birds; Ehrich, *EPJR*, Pl. XXIV, (middle right)—incomplete figure; unpublished, in excavator's Field Pottery Register—head and beak only.

³ *AG* I, Pl. XXXI: 44 and 46; *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 2 and 6, and Pl. III: 8 (Cross Line Style); Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. IV: 1 (Cross Line Style).

⁴ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 9 and XLII: 2, and fig. 2: 3.

⁵ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 6.

⁶ Compare especially fish from Tell el-Far'ah, Pl. XII: 2.

the point of intersection, when one or more lines may be added between.¹ This manner of depicting the figures of birds is confined almost entirely to vessels from Cyprus; and since this applies equally to this category of fish figures, it may well be that it was used on vessels intended for export and probably during the later phase of bichrome ware, when the approach to the decoration was beginning to fall short of the earlier carefully executed forms. For the schematic style exhibits less attention to detail and a tendency to over-simplification. This is exemplified by the following figures of birds belonging to this category which are found on jugs, Types A1(c), A1(d) and B3(a), and in one instance on a juglet, Type A1(a): at Milia, in T.I, on two jugs and a juglet;² at Bamboula, in T. 12;³ and on a tankard, presumed to be from Milia.⁴ Related to the above figures is a larger one which occurs on a krater sherd at 'Ajjul.⁵ This would qualify for inclusion in Category 4 were it not that in place of a bichrome bar across the body, the whole is filled in with oblique black lines and the legs are bent and thickened above. The manner in which the beak and tail are painted is typical of Category 4 and the bird has much in common (with the exception of the line-filled body) with that on the Bamboula jug above, both being depicted entirely in black and placed between vertical bichrome-framed band panels. The 'Ajjul krater sherd, however, comes from a findspot immediately outside the walls of "Palace I" at this site⁶ and cannot be attributed to a late phase of bichrome ware, despite the impression given by its style.

As was seen to be the case with the figures of fish, those of birds cannot all be included in the above four categories, thus demonstrating yet again the opportunities for an individual approach within the framework of what was an essentially conventionalised style. The incidence of the bird on bichrome ware is greater than that of any other figure and while this may be due to the accident of discovery, it cannot but be taken as a measure of popularity.

3. FIGURES OF QUADRUPEDS

Quadrupeds are used in bichrome ware decoration mostly on kraters, Type A1(a), since they are essentially large figures requiring a proportionately large

¹ Fig. 2: 8

² Unpublished in Cyp. Mus., the latter figure having no bar across the body, the head, beak and neck filled in and the wing shown in reserve.

³ Pl. XI: 6.

⁴ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII: a—with all-black head and red eye.

⁵ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 7.

⁶ See Chapter 6, section 2.

space in which to be seen to advantage. Such figures are not used frequently, but when they occur are painted in full black or in bichrome and in all cases are completely stylised. While it is unlikely that specific kinds of animals were in fact intended, two distinct groups can be distinguished: caprine figures, or ibexes; and humped oxen, or bulls

Caprine figures

Figures of goat-like animals are used to decorate the shoulder of kraters at 'Ajjul, Gezer, Lachish, Nagila and Ras Shamra. On the Lachish krater¹ two ibexes alternate with a bird and a fish and they have certain traits in common with a figure on a sherd from Gezer² where only the front part is extant.³ Among the characteristics which they share are: an upward-pointing, elevated snout (dotted in red along the centre on the Gezer figure, in a manner reminiscent of the use of dots on the necks of birds); transverse bichrome bands on the neck; a small black-outlined ear; two long backward-curving horns, outlined in black and filled in in red; elongated bodies (uncertain on the Gezer fragment); and obliquely forward-poised front legs, on which the cloven hooves are indicated by a horse-shoe shape at the extremity and the forward leg is shown as a thick triangle. The eye on the Gezer animal consists of a dot in a circular reserved space, while on the Lachish ibexes the heads are shown as black-outlined reserved discs with a dot in the centre to indicate the eye, recalling a similar treatment of the heads of birds. On the Lachish figures the hind legs are depicted in the same way as the front legs, except that these are somewhat more slender and extend obliquely backwards from the body. This applies especially to the ibex which is paired with the fish, which appears to be springing forward, while the second ibex which is paired with the bird is shown in a more static position. Both figures have elongated, curved, narrow bodies, with a curving red insertion in the centre which runs from the base of the neck to the back of the flank.

Another caprine figure which has affinities with those from Gezer and Lachish is seen on a small sherd from Ras Shamra⁴ on which the head and part of the neck are visible. Here, too, the animal has red inserted in the neck, although

¹ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 1, and fig. 3: 2.

² *Gez.* II, fig. 333, and fig. 3: 1.

³ This resemblance was also recognised by Heurtley, *ibid.*, 28, note 3.

⁴ *Ug.* II, fig. 62: 18, and fig. 3: 3.

very little of it is extant; and while it is crowned with two high black horns which probably curved back over the body, there is no red filling between them. The ear, on the other hand, is shown in red, outlined in black and the eye is depicted in the familiar manner as a reserved space with a dot in the centre. The sherd is broken at a point where the muzzle should commence, so that it is not possible to determine how it was shaped, but it may have resembled the snout-like form used on the Gezer and Lachish figures.

Another goat-like figure from Ras Shamra is placed above a stylised tree, facing a fish, on one side of the shoulder of a krater on which a composite scene with preying birds and fish is used on the other¹. This figure is in all-black, except for a red filling between the two horns which likewise curve backwards above an elongated body and it has a short tail above the haunches. But here the head is not lifted, nor is the nose shown in the form of a snout. Instead the head, which is rounded, is lowered and is seen to have a protruding forehead and a small reserved space with a centre dot for the eye, while a short stroke below the horns indicates the ear. As for the legs, these are shorter and stockier than on the Lachish figures, especially the rounded hind-quarters and back legs; but though thicker, the front legs are painted in a manner which is very similar to that of the Gezer and Lachish animals. No cloven hooves are shown, the front feet being denoted by a curved thickening of the upper paw, which recalls the hind-quarters on a krater from 'Ajjul.

At Alalakh, the base of a pottery stand was found² on which part of the decoration is geometrical and in part consists of a caprine figure³ which has a number of points in common with that on the Ras Shamra krater. Executed in all-black, the body tends to be more curving and this curve is continued in the upward line of the neck upon which a forward-looking head, with open mouth, is placed, while a small slit represents the eye. There are two black horns which sweep over and actually though the animal's back, no ear being indicated at all. The tail is shown by a thick downward stroke at the back of the haunches, the spine having a crenellated, zig-zag profile. The stumpy legs are longer than on the Ras Shamra figure and appear to have been added after the rest of the body had been painted (note the second front leg), no attempt being made to indicate either hooves or feet. This very goat-like figure stands framed on

¹ Fig. 3: 5.

² *Al. Pl. XCVI: d.*

³ Fig. 3: 4.



Fig. 3. Figures of quadrupeds: Nos. 1-5, caprine figures; Nos. 6-10, figures of humped oxen or bulls.

one section of the lower part of the vessel and is the only known example of figure decoration on a stand of this kind.

Another goat-like figure, which is distinctive for its exceptionally long neck, occurs on the shoulder of a krater from Nagila.¹ Here the body (which is incomplete) is depicted as long and slender and is set upon short, stumpy legs, thickened at the foot. The head is round and has an open mouth, the eye being indicated in the usual manner by a black dot within a circular reserved space. From the crown of the head two high, narrow horns sweep back in a curve, while the ear—shown as a reserved oval—is placed well towards the back of the head. This animal, while giving a distinctly unique impression, at the same time incorporates a number of features found in the caprine figures already described. Thus, the rounded head recalls that of the Ras Shamra animal placed above a stylised tree; the horns, though higher and not touching the animal's back, are reminiscent of those of the Alalakh figure, where no red is shown between them; the ear, although far less pointed, is indicated in a way similar to the ears of the Lachish ibexes; while the legs again recall those of the Ras Shamra animal (especially the hind legs). Like the figures from Gezer, Lachish and Ras Shamra (small sherd), the Nagila animal's black body is embellished with red, which is introduced as a long stripe running down the middle of the neck and in three short vertical bars on the fore part of the body. The curiously bird-like quality of the rounded head perched on its almost ostrich-like neck is belied by the slender quadruped's body, making of the whole something of a composite figure.

At 'Ajjul a krater sherd was found² which shows on one side a composite scene of predatory birds and fish, as on the Ras Shamra krater above, while on the other half of the shoulder there is a second, incomplete scene with two figures. These consist of the hind-quarters of a quadruped on the left, which much resemble those of the goat-figure on the Ras Shamra krater (note the left back leg and the manner of indicating the foot by a thickening technique), and after a break in the sherd, there appears, on the right-hand side, the front part and head of a so-called "crested bird".³ The "crest", however, is probably the base of an ear and the two black horns which curve back above it. What has been interpreted as a "beak" is not as curved as would appear from the drawing

¹ *IEJ* 14 (1964), Pl. 45B and fig. 6.

² *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 5.

³ See 55-56.

and is doubtless another version of the snout, as portrayed on the Gezer and Lachish animals. From the way in which the chest is drawn in relation to the partly-seen front leg, the animal appears to be in a sitting position. This, together with the painting of the eye as an exceptionally large black disc surrounded by a narrow reserved band, gives the figure a rather unusual air, but does not diminish its essential characteristics, which place it in the same category as the clearly caprine figures described above.

There is also a small fragment from 'Ajjul¹ which has two backward curving horns on what is undoubtedly part of a figure of this kind. The horns on this sherd are shown arching in a high curve above the missing back and below them the tip of the outlined ear is just visible. Petrie, who could not at that time have known the complete figures from Lachish, Ras Shamra and Alalakh, nevertheless recognised that this might be part of the figure of an ibex.²

Figures of humped oxen, or bulls

Even today, over large areas of the Middle East, black humped-back oxen may be seen both in herds and as draught animals, especially in regions where there are rivers and marshlands. They are, no doubt, the descendants of the humped-back oxen frequently shown as part of the tribute brought by Syrians to Egyptian notables in scenes depicted on the walls of tombs of Eighteenth Dynasty date.³ These animals were indigenous to the north and foreign to Egypt; and in all such scenes showing the arrival of merchants or the bringing of gifts, they are drawn with a characteristic slightly humped back. The fact that at this period they were considered as valuable items of import from Syria makes it almost certain that at a somewhat earlier date they were being bred and used in lands north of Egypt. Thus it is not surprising to find just such humped-back figures on bichrome ware.

These figures are mostly found on kraters since a large surface is required in order to depict such large animals. On a krater fragment from 'Ajjul⁴ most of the body and head of a humped-back bull is depicted, the head being small and triangular in shape and crowned with a pair of horns in the form of a cres-

¹ *AG* III, Pl. XLII: 18.

² *Ibid.*, 12.

³ T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Four Eighteenth Dynasty tombs*, 26 ff. and Pl. XXIII, (tomb of Nebamun); N. de G. Davies and R.O. Faulkner, "A Syrian trading venture to Egypt", *JEA* XXXIII (1947), 45 and Pl. VIII, lower right register, (tomb of Kenamun).

⁴ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 1, and fig. 3: 7.

cent, below which a narrow pointed ear is seen above the curve of the humped back. On this figure the eye is a black dot in a small reserved circle. But the interesting feature is the bright red outline round the figure and the introduction of four vertical red stripes across the middle of the animal's body. Unfortunately the legs are missing, but they were doubtless depicted in any one of the ways usually used on such figures. The use of a contrasting colour to outline what is in nature a wholly black animal can only be considered as characteristic of the bichrome style, so strong was the tendency to use two-colour decoration. A second krater sherd on which there is an outer red line rimming the black body of the quadruped (which would seem by the upward curve of the back to have been a humped-back bull) comes from the Nitovikla fortress.¹ Only the back and haunches, as well as the beginning of the tail are visible, while the body is filled with black dots.

Another humped-back bull figure which gives the impression of being outlined in a different colour was found at Tell el-Fa'rah.² In this instance the effect is due to the use of diluted paint on the brush at the edges of the figure which is painted in a purplish-black colour, and this appears as light violet in the faded banding on the lower part of the vessel. This figure represents a tethered ox, with triangular nose and head (the latter showing the bulge of the forehead) and a pair of V-shaped horns, no ear being indicated. The front part of the muzzle, to which the tether rope is attached, is shown in reserve and it is evident that the rope—at which the animal appears to be pulling—causes the head to remain low. Two straight front legs are depicted, recalling those of the ibexes on the Lachish and Gezer kraters, the front leg being triangular in form above a hoof of horse-shoe shape. The second front leg appears to be slimmer and likewise ends in a cloven hoof. The curve of the humped back rises immediately behind the head but is not as marked as on the 'Ajjul figure above, though it is clearly indicated. This figure probably filled the whole of the space between the vertical band panels, since the end of the tether rope (which is shown somewhat surprisingly as a wavy line) is pegged down in the extreme right corner in the angle made by the vertical band panel and the horizontal banding below. It is unfortunate that not only the hindquarters of the figure are lost, but that in the position where the eye should be, the surface

¹ *SCE* I, Pl. LXX: 3 (c)—from a findspot attributed to the later phase of the building.

² Pl. XVI: 2 and fig. 3: 6.

has flaked off, so that it is impossible to tell what kind of tail and eye the artist gave to this docile-looking beast.

Another bull figure, occupying the whole of one side of the shoulder, occurs on a krater from Nagila.¹ It is likewise tied by a tether rope (shown as a wavy line) which is pegged down in the right-hand corner and attached by a ring to the animal's nose. But here the resemblance between the Fa'rah and Nagila bulls ceases—in so far as the incomplete figure of the former allows of comparison. The bull on the Nagila krater appears to be far less docile, its thick-set rounded head having crescent-like horns placed low on the forehead so that they appear tilted forward in a position which recalls that of the butting bull on the Milia tankard (see below), a position which is emphasised by that of the black barred ear placed upright on the head behind the horns. The animal is shown with little neck, the head being set on heavy shoulders behind which a markedly pointed hump rises, to descend in an even steeper line towards an elongated back, from which a flourishing tail emerges from well in front of the curving hindquarters. Only part of one of the back legs is extant, but these may well have resembled the two front legs which are shown as heavy schematic triangular protruberances ending in large pad-like feet, at the back of which is a spur-like spike or claw. The eye is depicted as a small black dot within a large reserved circle and the nose, which is elongated, ends in an open mouth. Unique among the portrayals of bull figures on bichrome ware is the attempt to indicate the heavy dew-lap which is shown as a barred semi-circle below the muzzle. The all-black body of this formidable creature is embellished on the hump and shoulder with three semi-circular red bands, one below the other, while three similar red bands on the hind-quarters are topped by a short horizontal red bar. Two wide red vertical bars mark the commencement of the back, recalling those on the caprine figure on the other side of the same vessel.

While the Nagila bull is without doubt a distinctive and at the same time truly imposing figure, it nevertheless is characterised by features occurring on bull figures used in the decoration of other vessels. Thus the muzzle, crescent horns, eye and red stripes on the body are reminiscent of the bull from 'Ajjul outlined in red described above²; the somewhat elongated body recalls those of the bulls from Milia and Enkomia, the latter having a similar pointed hump; the heavy feet resemble those on a fragmentary figure from the Shephelah (see

¹ *IEJ* 14 (1964), Pl. 45A and fig. 5.

² See 48 and 50.

below); while the tether rope, as has been seen, occurs on the Fa'ra krater.

Figures of bulls forming a frieze occur on the lower body of a tankard (jug, Type A 1(d)) found in T. 13 at Milia,¹ which also has a frieze of birds on the upper shoulder. Not one of the four humped-back oxen shown in the lower frieze is, however, complete. In the centre of this unique scene, two animals face one another, that on the right being depicted on its knees and butting its adversary on the left. This latter bull² retains more of the front of the body and of the upper line of the back than any of the other three, and its treatment is seen to be typical of the quadrupeds described above. Here the head partakes of the traits of both the 'Ajjul and Tell el-Far'ah figures, being essentially triangular in shape, but with a rounded head and forehead, on which hairs are shown. The horns, which are in outline, are also depicted in a manner which is half-way between the curving crescent of the 'Ajjul bull and the V-shape of the Tell el-Far'ah animal; and while the ear is visible, it in no way resembles that of the former, but is painted in outline as an elongated triangular reserved space, being placed low above the back. The eye consists of a large reserved circle with a black dot in the centre (the line which appears to bisect it being the tip of the horn of the butting bull). There is also a thin red line running from behind the eye to the throat (shown as reserved space on the drawing). The head is down and the neck is longer than on the examples described above, curving up to indicate the hump and down to the centre of the extremely narrow back. On this is perched a curious, six-legged, hairy animal, which baffles identification. The bull's front leg is rather short and ends in a hoof. This, however, is not indicated by a horse-shoe shape, but is placed forward from the line of the leg and shown as a solid black square, except where it curves round to join the leg above. The hoof of the second hind leg is depicted in a similar manner, as are the hooves of the other bulls, where these are still visible. But in three instances the leg is shown as ending in a foot on which claws are clearly indicated, and one bull has one hind leg which ends in a hoof and the other with a clawed foot at its end! This only adds to the impression made that the figures were executed in accordance with certain conventional forms, here used indiscriminately, since the thickened paw-like feet to which claws are added seem to be a combination of the characteristics of bird figures and those of quadrupeds.

Turning now to the butting bull on the right, only part of the head of this

¹ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. VII: 1 = Heurtley, *ibid.* Pl. XVI.

² Fig. 3:8

figure is still visible and it is seen to be identical with that of its adversary. The attacking figure nevertheless retains most of the hindquarters and tail, as does the figure on its right which is depicted in a back-to-back position. On both animals the haunches resemble those of the caprine figure on the Ras Shamra krater,¹ although the tails of the bulls are much longer and end in tassel-like tufts.

A similar tassel-like representation of the tail occurs on a sherd from 'Ajjul² where the lower part of the hind leg is also seen. Petrie considered this to be a palm tree with a bunch of dates;³ but although the presumed leg and foot is somewhat differently indicated here than on the bull figures discussed above, there is a far greater resemblance to the leg and tail of an ox than to any kind of stylised tree.⁴ On another sherd showing the hindquarters of a quadruped,⁵ the animal is shown facing left and it may have been part of a composite scene. The figure is incomplete and the shoulder not extant, so that it is not certain whether this is indeed a humped ox, though, on the analogy of other figures, it would seem likely. The feet of this animal are treated in the same way as on the 'Ajjul krater above,⁶ but the tail is long and reaches to the ground and likewise ends in a tuft, while there is no indication whether or not it was humped-back. Two other sherds from 'Ajjul, probably from the same figure,⁷ show the hindquarters and the beginning of the long tail, as well as the head and muzzle of an ox. The haunches and tail recall those on the figure from the Shephelah, although here facing right. On the 'Ajjul sherd, the black horns are bow-shaped and are placed on the crown of the head, a long, all-black ear appearing beneath. The head, which is round, is quite different from those of the other oxen described and resembles those of the ibexes with a snout, though the muzzle is shown as slightly more curved. Here the eye takes up most of the space in the head and is shown as a large circular reserved space with a black dot in the centre rimmed by a black circle. An even smaller sherd showing part of a very similar figure of a bull, was found at Megiddo,⁸ on which the animal has a round head and where the beginning of a snout-like muzzle can just be

¹ Likewise noted by Heurtley, *ibid.*, 31.

² *AG* IV, Pl. XLV: 19.

³ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁴ See, also, M. Welker, *The painted pottery of the Near East in the second millennium B.C.*, 218.

⁵ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XIV: e—from a tell in the Shephelah.

⁶ *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXI: 41 and 42, and fig. 3: 9.

⁸ Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection, from unmarked findspot, fig. 3: 10.

discerned. Here, however, the black dot representing the eye is set in a small circular reserved space and is surrounded by a bichrome encircling band, while red is also used as a filling for the pair of crescent horns which crown the head (recalling the treatment of horns on ibexes). Behind the left horn, the beginning of a small black ear can be distinguished. While this sherd retains so little of the complete animal as to make identification difficult, the close resemblance to the above 'Ajjul head, which is part of a figure having the unmistakable hindquarters and tail of a bull, makes it likely that the Megiddo sherd belongs to a similar figure, though in neither instance is there any evidence of a humped back.

Another humped-back bull figure occurs on a krater, Type A1(c), found in an unstratified context at Enkomi.¹ Owing to its considerably larger size, this vessel has three handles and the field of decoration on the shoulder is likewise divided into three sectors, each of which is bordered by vertical bichrome band panels. On either side of the bull there are figures of a bird and of a fish and a bird, thus demonstrating yet again that the humped-back ox motif was integral to the bichrome ware repertoire and was used in combination with the more usual bird figures, as in the case of the bird and bull friezes on the Milia tankard discussed above. The bull on the Enkomi krater is painted entirely in black and, although no eye is shown, it has many points in common with other humped oxen. Thus, the head is triangular and is crowned with curving, V-shaped horns, behind the left of which the ear is visible. The neck is short and there is a pronounced, pointed hump on the shoulder, while the body is elongated and the haunches well emphasised. The long, rather thick tail stands out stiffly from the hindquarters and is not tufted. The animal is shown standing on obliquely-poised, forward-pointing, straight legs on which the feet are indicated by a square thickening at the extremity (recalling the legs of the Alalakh caprine figure, on which no feet or hooves are shown).

There are other sherds on which the back legs of quadrupeds are seen, but which may not have been bull figures. These include a number from 'Ajjul, an unpublished sherd from Gezer—where the animal has flat-pointing feet—and a black-outlined figure filled in in brownish-red on a krater sherd from Nitovikla.²

Reviewing the figures of quadrupeds, it again becomes clear that there was an accepted canon for their portrayal on which the potter could draw and to which he might add details in accordance with his own predilection. In

¹ Pl. XX:1.

² *SCE* I, Pl. LXX:3(a).

this, both the caprine and the bull figures resemble others belonging to the bichrome ware repertoire and are seen to be typical of the style.

4 FIGURES OF TREES

The figure of a tree occurs less frequently as an element of bichrome ware decoration, but even so it has often failed to be recognised, since it is usually depicted in a highly stylised manner. In using the tree motif only the essential characteristics of the trunk and curving top on either side are shown, so that the figure tends to become purely geometrical. This is borne out by the incorporation of accepted geometrical design elements in the tree figure itself, such as the placing of three arms of a Maltese Cross on the top of a trunk at 'Ajjul,¹ or the filling of the trunk with the hub and spokes motif at Ras Shamra,² and with a diagonal cross at Milia.³ It is also not unusual for blossom to be indicated, sometimes in a contrasting colour, while occasionally leaves are shown.

The stylised tree motif was used in a number of ways, all of which are characteristic of bichrome ware and many of which have already been discussed in the foregoing sections of this chapter. The tree is thus seen to fall into place as one of the standard elements of figure decoration.

Trees together with other figures

The figure of a stylised tree is frequently used between vertical band panels, when other figures alternate with it round the shoulder of a vessel, especially on kraters, Type A1(a). Thus at 'Ajjul, a tree alternates with the figure of a bird,⁴ with the figures of two birds,⁵ with the figures of a fish and two birds,⁶ and with unknown figures;⁷ while in another instance two trees are shown, each with a bird perched upon it,⁸ a similar representation being found on another vessel.⁹ Another krater is decorated with a tree on which the branches—with leaves indicated—project on either side from the upper part of the trunk,¹⁰

¹ *AG* IV, Pl. XLV: 17.

² Fig. 4: 2 (with figures omitted).

³ Fig. 4: 8.

⁴ Frontispiece and fig. 4: 6.

⁵ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 11.

⁶ See Pl. IV: 2 for suggested reconstruction.

⁷ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 12, and fig. 4: 5.

⁸ *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 10 and 11, and fig. 4: 10 (birds omitted).

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 16, and fig. 4: 1 (bird omitted).

¹⁰ *AG* I, Pl. XXIX: 6, and fig. 4: 12.

while on yet another fragment two trees are shown with a series of oblique, upward-pointing branches fanning out on either side of the upper part of the trunk.¹ At Ras Shamra there are two kraters on which a stylised tree alternates with a fish,² and with a fish and a goat. A stylised figure is likewise used between vertical band panels on the shoulder of a jug, Type A1(d), from T. 10 at Milia,³ the shape of the tree much resembling that on a Cross Line Style jug from Sedment (see under), differing only in the delineation of the trunk by three parallel black lines and of the tree-top by a black outlined reserved space in which black dots represent blossom. On Cross Line Style jugs, Types B1(a) and B1(b), the figure of a tree is introduced between the groups of crossing lines on the shoulder, where it alternates with purely geometrical motifs, thus demonstrating yet again its hybrid character, half-figure, half-geometrical. Such jugs have been found at Megiddo, Ras Shamra and Sedment. At Megiddo, two tree figures are used on which a bichrome bar represents the trunk, on either side of which the tree-top is indicated by a globular reserved space outlined in black and filled with black dots to represent blossom.⁴ At Ras Shamra there is a tree figure, similar to those used on the Megiddo jug, differing only in the delineation of the trunk by a single thick black line and of the blossom by red, as well as by black dots.⁵ In the Mayana cemetery, Sedment, a tree figure occurs on which the trunk is depicted by a double bichrome band, while the two curved sections of the tree-top projecting from it on either side, are shown in red and black.⁶

Representation of the trunk

As has been seen, the trunk of the stylised tree might be depicted in a number of ways: by a vertical bichrome band, or by a double bichrome band; by two non-contiguous bichrome bands; by a thick vertical black line, or by two vertical black lines (each supporting the side of a tree-top), or by three vertical black lines; by a vertical band panel, bichrome-framed, filled with the hub and spokes motif or with a diagonal cross.

¹ *AG* III, Pl. XLI: 7, and fig. 4: 14.

² *Ug.* II, fig. 50: 2 and 20, and fig. 4: 3.

³ Fig. 4: 7.

⁴ *M* II, Pl. 51: 7, and fig. 4: 9.

⁵ Pl. III: 3 and fig. 4: 11.

⁶ Pls. III: 2 and XIII: 6 and fig. 4: 4.



Fig. 4. Figures of trees.

Representation of the tree-top

The top of the tree is usually depicted as extending on either side of the trunk in one of the following ways: by black and red curving lines; by a curving bichrome band; by black-outlined, down-drooping curves between which are black dots; by a bichrome bar below and a black curving line above, the intervening space being filled with parallel vertical black lines; by a thick black-outlined elliptical reserved space, filled with dark dots; by an oval reserved space outlined in black and filled with black dots, another similar figure having red dots at intervals along the black outline; by three triangular barred sections of a Maltese Cross. On a jug, Type A1(c), part of the neck decoration consists of a tree on either side of whose trunk curving branches are shown, one above the other.¹ This has been likened to the volute tree,² and is executed in quite a different style from the other tree figures discussed.

The combination of the use of the stylised figure of a tree together with animal and bird figures or with geometrical motifs, demonstrates the basic elasticity of bichrome decoration which enables one accepted form to be merged and used in conjunction with another, while yet conforming to the conventions intrinsic to and characteristic of the style.

5. COMPOSITE SCENES

In discussing the figures introduced into the decorative scheme used on any one vessel, it has been seen that these were usually applied singly, set between vertical band panels and succeeding each other round the shoulder, which was thus divided into a number of sections (mostly two or four). Similarly it has been noted that the most popular figures employed were those of birds and fish. Sometimes, however, instead of being used consecutively, the figures were combined to form a single scene, which frequently showed birds preying on fish. This theme has a long history in ceramic decoration which it is beyond the scope of this study to trace. Suffice it to say that when this motif occurs on bichrome ware, the individual elements are usually treated in the accepted manner used for depicting single figures. Such composite scenes are essentially stylised—like the figures of which they were composed—and the preying bird is often shown out of proportion to the much larger fish which it is attacking. This makes it unlikely that there was any intention to depict specific kinds

¹ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIV, of unknown provenance, and fig. 4: 13.

² M. Welker, *The painted pottery of the Near East in the second millennium B.C.*, 218.

of fish or birds, or that the birds shown were ospreys.¹ On a well-known krater from Ras Shamra, some attempt at naturalism has, however, been made, since the fish is shown floating upside down and appears to be dead, as was duly remarked upon by the excavator.²

Composite scenes of this kind are found on jugs, Type A1(d), on kraters, Types A1(a) and A1(c), and on jars, Type B1(a). On one of the latter found at 'Ajjul, the bird is about the same size as the fish upon which it stands,³ while on the neck of a tankard decorated with this motif, the birds are only slightly larger than the fish they are eating.⁴ On two other krater sherds from 'Ajjul, birds which are distinctly smaller than the fish they are supposed to be feeding upon, are shown.⁵

An examination of these composite scenes shows that they lack naturalism, so much so that the birds frequently appear uninterested in their prey and are sometimes shown with their beaks just touching the fish, while sometimes they appear merely to be perched upon them and exhibit none of the fury and voraciousness of the predatory bird. Despite this, there was scope for individual treatment, as is demonstrated by the krater from Ras Shamra, where the composition includes two similar black birds—albeit of different size—standing behind and actually on the fish, while a third bird is depicted pecking at the nose of the fish. The latter bird has an elongated head and body, with two narrow elliptical barred wings extending from it, although it does not appear to be in flight.⁶

On the other side of this vessel the field is filled by a stylised tree, over the top of which a fish and a caprine figure face one another and this may be considered as another version of a composite scene, used to balance the more traditional theme on the other side. Similarly, there is a krater fragment from 'Ajjul on which there is a composite scene on one side showing predatory birds and fish.⁷ Here two faintly-discerned red birds are perched on the backs of the fish and of a larger bird (standing in front of the fish) which is painted in the conventional manner (Category 1 A). The other side of this vessel (which is

¹ F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and man in Bible lands*, 175.

² C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Missions en Chypre*, 53.

³ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 4; Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. VIII: c.

⁴ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XV: j.

⁵ *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 5 and *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 8.

⁶ Pl. IV: 3.

⁷ *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 5(a).

incomplete) is also taken up with what is in all probability a composite scene consisting of two caprine figures, one sitting, the other standing.¹ For the so-called "crested bird" is not, as has been shown, endowed with any avian characteristics and is far closer to the goat-like figures used on bichrome ware.² Despite its heavy features (snout and elephantine front leg) it has been suggested that this may have been intended to represent a pheasant³ or a peacock.⁴

Another version of a composite scene was found at Alalakh on a large krater sherd.⁵ Here the head of a fish can be seen close to the long tail of a bird whose legs are doubled up under its body so that it almost touches the tail of another figure (possibly a fish) on which it may be preying. Yet another fragmentary vessel also probably decorated with a composite scene—is a jar, Type B1(a), from 'Ajjul, only one side of which is published.⁶ This shows that the shoulder on one side is decorated with a large fish, while on the other—which is not illustrated—there is a second, slightly smaller fish together with a partially distinguishable figure of a bird behind it, possibly pecking at it.⁷ Figures of bird and fish are likewise shown together in one panel on the shoulder of a large three-handled krater, Type A1(c), from Enkomi.⁸ Here the fish is placed schematically and statically above the bird with which it appears to be entirely unconnected, in contrast to the basic idea underlying composite scenes of birds preying on fish. This is an example of the process of stylisation which has been carried to such a degree that the original scene and the relationship between the different elements of it, have completely disappeared, leaving no more than the juxtaposed figures of fish and bird.

¹ *Ibid.*, 5(b).

² See 44-45.

³ *AG* V, 20—Professor Bodenheimer.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Professor Aharoni.

⁵ *Al*, Pl. XCV: ATP/48/64.

⁶ Pl. VIII: 2.

⁷ Restored vessel now in Pal. Arch. Mus.

⁸ Pl. VIII: 1.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DECORATION (continued)

B. GEOMETRICAL DESIGN ELEMENTS

In considering the figure representations in use on bichrome ware, it has been seen that these frequently are combined with geometrical patterns which balance them in the overall scheme of decoration. At the same time, the vertical band panels whose function is to break up the decorative field on the shoulder and form the frame in which the figures are set, are likewise composed of geometrical design elements. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the different motifs which make up the repertoire of bichrome ware geometrical decoration.

1. THE SPOKED WHEEL¹

This motif consists of three separate elements: the outer rim, the hub and the spokes. It was extensively used, often employing only two of the above features. In whatever guise it is found, it is quite clear that any conscious representation of the wheel had long been forgotten and, as in the case of other motifs based in the first instance on the representation of specific objects, it had become completely conventionalised.

Joined spoked wheels

The version of this motif which most closely resembles the original is that of joined wheels, which have either red or black spokes.² This is used as a shoulder decoration on kraters, Type A1(b), at Megiddo,³ Beth Shemesh,⁴ Tell Mor⁵ and Ras Shamra.⁶ It is also used frequently on the neck and shoulder of tankards.⁷ In addition, sherds—mostly from kraters—showing part of this

¹ Fig. 5.

² Fig. 5: 1.

³ Pl. VI: 1.

⁴ Pl. VI: 3.

⁵ Pl. VI: 4.

⁶ Pl. VI: 2.

⁷ Walters, *BMCV*, fig. 271, from Maroni, T. 9; Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. II: 3, from Milia, T. 10; Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XX: g; Pl. X: 4, of unknown Cypriote provenance; Pl. XI: 3, from 'Ajjul,—to record but a few examples of many.

design (with spokes in black or in red) have been found at widely separated sites, including Megiddo,¹ Hazor,² Tell Jerisheh,³ Tell el-Hesy,⁴ Lachish,⁵ 'Ajjul⁶ and Nitovikla.⁷

The joined spoked wheel motif enjoyed great popularity: the single-handled kraters from Megiddo, Beth Shemesh, Tell Mor, Tell Jerisheh and Ras Shamra were all found in occupation contexts and testify to a day-to-day usage, while the many tankards decorated with this motif—albeit often of uncertain provenance—are further proof of widespread use. On the latter type of vessels the joined spoked wheel motif vied with groups of oblique lines as a standard form of shoulder decoration, while on both neck and shoulder the spokes are painted either in black or in red.⁸

A simplified form of this motif occurs on a krater sherd from Ras Shamra, on which only horizontal spokes are indicated and neither the hub nor the radiation of the spokes is shown.⁹ Yet another version of the spoked wheel motif is seen on a krater, Type A1(a), from Lachish, on which only one wheel is depicted, this being attached to the top of the adjoining vertical band panel at one side only.¹⁰ The attached spoked wheel motif also occurs on the lower body of a tankard, where three of these are “suspended” at intervals from the lowest of the horizontal bichrome bands at mid-body, so that the wheel decoration comes close to the base of the vessel.¹¹

Single spoked wheels

Single wheels, with black or red spokes, are used as a shoulder decoration on jugs and juglets, mostly when combined with the Cross Line Style. A sherd from what was probably a jug of this kind was found at 'Ajjul,¹² while a jug,

¹ *MT*, Pl. 38: 13 and Pl. XVI: 9.

² *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII: 25.

³ Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, (No. 412 T—large krater fragment).

⁴ *MMC*, 63: 107.

⁵ Unpublished, in Pal. Arch. Mus., (No. 1402), from 100 Rooms.

⁶ *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 31-33, *AG* III, Pls. XLII: 44 and XLIII: 69, and unpublished, in I of A collection, from OX 1063.

⁷ Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. and Stockholm.

⁸ *SCE* I, Pl. LXXXV; 162 and Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XX:e—to cite two examples of many.

⁹ *Ug.* II, fig. 50: 4, and fig. 5: 5.

¹⁰ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 2

¹¹ Pl. X: 4.

¹² *AG* III, Pl. XLII: 28—spokes in black.

Type B2(a), from Ras Shamra has this as one of the shoulder insertions¹ and a juglet, Type B1(a), from Galinoporni is also thus decorated.² Another variation is used on a cylindrical juglet, Type A1(b), from Milia³ on which what the excavator has described as "stars" are, in fact, a series of non-contiguous black-spoked wheels having a contrasting red rim.⁴ Another example of variation on this theme occurs on Cross Line style jugs, Type B1(a) and B1(b), on which the decoration of the handle is carried down beyond the lower juncture to end on the shoulder in a wheel with black rim and spokes.⁵

The most usual number of spokes shown is eight, but this is by no means a hard and fast rule and multiple spokes, as well as wheels which have fewer than eight spokes also occur.⁶

The Maltese Cross

Closely allied to the joined spoked wheel motif is that in which each alternate pair of spokes is joined at the extremities to form a Maltese Cross within a circle.⁷ This form of decoration occurs on a krater from 'Ajjul, on which the wheel is attached at one point only to the adjoining bichrome band.⁸ Another 'Ajjul sherd shows only the wheel-inscribed Maltese Cross,⁹ while at Beth Shemesh a sherd was found with the same kind of decoration.¹⁰ The Maltese Cross also occurs without the outer wheel rim, when the hub and spokes alone are depicted, the resultant simple form being found on different kinds of vessels.¹¹ This variant is frequently used as a shoulder decoration, especially to fill in the space between the groups of crossing lines on Cross Line Style jugs, Types B1(a), B1(b) and B2(a). At Megiddo, two jugs belonging to these cate-

¹ Pl. III: 6.

² Pl. XV: 8.

³ Pl. VII: 1.

⁴ Fig. 5: 4.

⁵ Pl. III: 5 and 7.

⁶ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXI: c, with multiple spokes and hub picked out in red; *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 31, with fourteen visible spokes and hub emphasised in black, and fig. 5: 2; Schaeffer, *E-A*, fig. 71: 275, with four spokes; J. Garstang, *Prehistoric Mersin*, fig. 155: 13, with four spokes; unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm, from Nitovikla, fig. 5: 3, with four spokes.

⁷ Fig. 5: 6.

⁸ *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 25 and *AG* V, Pl. XXIX: 24.

⁹ *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 20.

¹⁰ *AS* IV, Pl. XXV: 7.

¹¹ Fig. 5: 7 and 8.




Fig. 5. Variations of the spoked wheel motif.

gories are thus decorated;¹ a number of sherds from 'Ajjul almost certainly come from similar jugs;² three jugs from Ras Shamra have this shoulder decoration,³ while at Mersin, a small sherd from a jug of this kind can probably be considered as an import from Ras Shamra;⁴ at Milia, a similarly decorated jug was found in T. 13,⁵ while a second jug, Type A1(a)—possibly also from this necropolis—has three Maltese Crosses on the shoulder.⁶ On kraters, Type A1(a), the motif occurs at Megiddo, 'Ajjul, Tell Sukas and Nitovikla,⁷ while the same decoration is found at 'Ajjul on shallow bowls.⁸

The hub and spokes motif

The spoked wheel motif commonly occurs in another form in which the hub

¹ *M* II, Pl. 56: 1 and 2.

² *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 23 and 26, *AG* V, Pl. XXVII: 57 H9, and Pl. XIV: 7.

³ *Ug* II, fig. 73: 1 and Pl. III: 3 and 6.

⁴ Pl. XIV: 3.

⁵ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, 16, No. 11.

⁶ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXIII: e.

⁷ Pl. XVI: 7; *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 22, *AG* III, Pl. XLII: 27 and 30; Pl. XVI: 8; unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu. Stockholm.

⁸ Pl. VII: 14, and unpublished in I of A collection, from OJ 1040.

and spokes, without the felloe, appear to be set in a square. This has frequently been referred to as the "Union Jack" pattern, but when examined it is seen that basically it is a variation of the stylisation of the spoked wheel motif. Petrie recognised that these design elements were closely related and placed them together in the same section on his table showing the ranges of painted pottery.¹ The fact that this form is also used with multiple spokes points to the original conception on which it is based. This is further emphasised by the use of a related form of decoration on the neck of a tankard, where not only the hub at the centre of the eight spokes is picked out in red, but the extremities of the spokes themselves are red-tipped and the whole is not confined by a frame of any kind.² Here it is the *radiation* of the spokes which continues to hold the latent suggestion of the wheel, although the decoration has become stylised. This applies equally to the use of the motif when placed between the confines of an upright panel whose bichrome borders, together with the horizontal dividing bars, create the impression of a square frame. For the potter decorating his vessels in the contemporary conventional fashion, there was no "Union Jack" and no square frame, since to the left and right of most vertical panels it was usual to add a bichrome border. The arbitrary use of short horizontal bars between the recurrent motif shows that these were nothing but space dividers, depicted in black, in bichrome or in red, by a single, double or more lines. This is illustrated by the decoration of a jug, Type A1(e), from Megiddo on the shoulder of which there are four vertical band panels, each set in a bichrome border.³ In two of these the recurrent hub and spokes motif is placed one above the other, with no horizontal dividing bars between.

The decoration consisting of radiating spokes was very widely used, both as a filling for vertical panels on the shoulder and horizontally below the rim on shallow bowls. Closest to the original conception is the form of this motif showing multiple spokes and an emphasised black hub.⁴ Another instance of the many-spoked wheel motif is used on the body of an animal vase from Akhera, T.I.⁵ Here the oblong body of the ram has a central decoration which

¹ *AG* II, Pl. XLII.

² Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXIII: c, and fig. 5: 9.

³ Pl. II: 12.

⁴ *AG* II, Pl. XL: 35; Pl. XIX: 9 and fig. 5: 12—from below the rim of shallow bowls, Types B1(a) and B2(a).

⁵ Pl. XX: 3.

consists of sixteen alternating red and black spokes, with no hub delineated.¹ In many instances the hub is picked out in red, as in the case of the joined wheel and Maltese Cross motifs. This occurs on a jug, Type A1(e), at Megiddo,² on a large jug, Type A1(h),³ and on a jug, Type A1(a), presumed to be from Milia;⁴ on kraters, Type A1(a), from Megiddo, 'Ajjul and Tell Ta'anach;⁵ and on tankards.⁶ While the red hub and the black spokes were in contrasting colours and quickly caught the eye, emphasis was also given to the hub when no contrasting colour was used.⁷ This is seen on kraters at 'Ajjul,⁸ and also on a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(b), from Milia⁹ on which this is the shoulder decoration opposite the handle.

Thus it is seen that the most commonly used and popular form of the design element which embodies the idea of the wheel with its radiating spokes is also the simplest, the decoration having been reduced to a minimum and having become so completely stylised that it is far removed from the original. At this stage the object which first gave rise to the representation was most certainly no longer in the mind of the potter. Yet it is this motif which is found used on all kinds and shapes of vessels, more usually in black, but also in red. The black version is practically ubiquitous, being found at all sites where bichrome ware occurs. In red, the motif of the hub and spokes is rarer,¹⁰ occurring on two sherds from 'Ajjul,¹¹ on a krater sherd from Tell Jerisheh¹² and on a tankard neck, where the decorative elements are depicted alternately in black and red.¹³ Another exceptionally large tankard has a neck decoration consisting chiefly of panels composed of blocks of three-by-three registers of contrasting black and red versions of the hub and spokes motif.¹⁴ Also in red, but with only

¹ Fig. 5: 11.

² *MT*, Pl. 48: 14.

³ Pl. XII: 5.

⁴ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII: d.

⁵ Pl. XVI: 6; *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 27; Sellin, *TT* I, fig. 50.

⁶ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXIII: c.

⁷ Fig. 5: 10.

⁸ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 10 and 11.

⁹ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. IV: 1.

¹⁰ Fig. 5: 13.

¹¹ Unpublished, in Ashmolean Mus., from MN 1100 and in I of A collection, from MH 922.

¹² Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, (No. 45 T).

¹³ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XX: e and description, 35.

¹⁴ Pl. X: 4 and fig. 5: 15.

six spokes, this motif occurs inserted between the groups of the crossing lines on a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a), from Egypt.¹

The solid wheel

It has been seen that the idea of the spoked wheel gave rise to a large number of derivative motifs; in exactly the same way, the solid wheel can be considered as having provided the original inspiration for a related form which occurs on a number of vessels, so far found mainly in Cyprus.² These are decorated on the neck or shoulder with a joined wheel motif in which only the outer rim and hub (but no spokes) are shown, the hub being delineated as a black dot, sometimes outlined by a red circle. This motif is used chiefly on tankards, but in one instance the neck of a Cross Line Style juglet is thus decorated. It likewise occurs on a krater fragment from Tell Mor, this being the only example of the solid wheel motif as yet found at a Palestinian site³.

Here again is evidence of the tendency to stylise and to simplify, which is characteristic of bichrome ware decoration, especially when there is a pictorial conception underlying the motif. In this connection it may be recalled that the solid wheel on ox-carts continued in use for purposes of haulage and in agriculture long after the spoked wheel had been introduced.⁴ This is borne out by the depiction on early New Kingdom Egyptian monuments of chariots with spoked wheels, while both spoked and solid wheels, on chariots and ox-carts, are shown on the walls of the temple at Medinet Habu.⁵ Even today ox-carts with solid wheels may still be seen in countries of Asia Minor, sometimes side by side with tractors.⁶

The presence of two kindred motifs, each stemming from the representation of a different but related object, only serves to strengthen the interpretation submitted here for the origin of these design elements. It is, however, almost

¹ Pl. III: 2 and fig. 5: 14.

² Fig. 5: a and b.

³ Westholm, *ibid.*, Pl. II: 4 and 5, from Milia, T. 10; Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pls. XX: b and XXI: b, presumed to be from Milia; Schaeffer, *E-A*; figs. 71: 265 and 77: 5, from Enkomi, French T. V—all from tankards; on a Cross Line Style juglet, Type B1(a), from Galinoporni, Pl. XV: 8; on a krater sherd from Tell Mor, *BIES* XXIV (1960), 124, fig. 4: 4.

⁴ V. G. Childe, "The first waggons and carts—from the Tigris to the Severn", *PPS* XVII (1951), 188.

⁵ *Medinet Habu* I, Pl. 34.

⁶ H. Z. Koşay, *Alaca-Höyük*, Pls. 117 and 221.

impossible on the basis of existing material—so much of which is unstratified or whose provenance is tombs containing multiple burials—to point to any precise sequence in the development of the variations of the spoked wheel motif. Nevertheless it is worth noting that at Megiddo, the joined spoked wheel motif occurs on a krater found in a room of House Z,¹ while in adjoining rooms of the same house two other kraters were found on which part of the decoration consists of the hub and spokes motif.² This is an illustration of the contemporary use of two related motifs and there can be no question of one ousting or superseding the other. Further evidence of the contemporaneous use of these same two motifs is provided by sherds found in the rubbish dumps outside temple 2048,³ indicating that the vessels in which the votive offerings were brought might be decorated in either way. In support of this, there is additional evidence from an early context at 'Ajjul for the use of the wheel motif both with and without the delineation of the outer rim. In "Palace I", a sherd was found in one of the rooms of the building, decorated with a Maltese Cross set in a circle, while associated with the same building is a second sherd on which there is a Maltese Cross without the surrounding wheel rim.⁴ Here again it is clear that these closely related forms existed side by side. On purely logical grounds, then, it seems reasonable to suggest that the more complete version, on which rim, spokes and hub are shown, preceded the more stylised form on which some of the attributes of the original model were omitted.

2. THE DIAGONAL (OR ST. ANDREW'S) CROSS

This is one of the simplest forms of decoration and it would seem that it was this very simplicity which invited elaboration, such as the filling in of the space between the arms of the cross. Usually depicted in black, this design element is frequently associated with groups of lines or horizontal bars, and is common as a handle decoration and as a frieze below the rim on shallow bowls. It is also found on the necks of tankards.

There are a few instances where the shoulder decoration between the vertical band panels consists of a large diagonal cross composed of bichrome strap-ping. This occurs on jugs, Types A1(c), A1(d), and A1(e), at Megiddo, 'Ajjul

¹ See Chapter 4, section 1 and Pl. VI: 1.

² M II, Pls. 53: 1 and 56: 7.

³ C. Epstein, "An interpretation of the Megiddo sacred area during MB II", *IEJ* 15 (1965), 204-221.

⁴ See Chapter 6 and *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 20 and 21.

and in Cyprus,¹ and on kraters, Type A1(a), at Tell Jerisheh and 'Ajjul.² There are likewise krater sherds from Megiddo, 'Ajjul and Gezer on which the diagonal cross is used as filling for the vertical band panels, separated by horizontal bichrome or black bars used as space dividers, as in similar panels containing the hub and spokes motif.³ There is also a jug, Type A1(e), from 'Ajjul on which two of the vertical band panels are similarly filled⁴ and a pottery stand from Alalakh where large diagonal black crosses fill the upper register of the broad horizontal decoration above the base.⁵

A common use of the diagonal cross is as a handle decoration and below the rim on shallow bowls, where it is combined with groups of horizontal or vertical lines. When used on handles, it is found chiefly on Cross Line Style jugs and on tankards on which it is one of the standard forms of decoration. The handles of jugs, Types B1(a) and B1(b), are decorated in this way at Megiddo,⁶ Ras Shamra,⁷ Mayana cemetery, Sedment⁸ and Maroni,⁹ and also on a juglet, Type B1(a), from Galinporni.¹⁰ The range of handle decorations published by Heurtley¹¹ includes most of the variations found at other sites and it is clear that they were commonly used. At 'Ajjul, and Tell Jerisheh, similarly decorated unattached handles were found which probably belonged to one of the above types of jugs,¹² while occasionally handles from other types of vessels were also thus decorated.¹³

A diagonal cross placed between groups of vertical lines, either in black or in a combination of black and red, is a common decoration below the rim on

¹ *M* II, Pls. 132: 12, (with a series of bichrome crosses between vertical bands) and 39: 8 (crosses not visible on drawing); Pl. II: 11; Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII: c (with frieze of bichrome crosses between vertical bands).

² Unpublished, from Tell Jerisheh, in Hebrew Univ. collection and *AG* IV, Pl. XLIX: 33 W 2.

³ Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection, (No. 03318); *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 28 and 29; and unpublished sherds—possibly from same vessel—in Istanbul Arch. Mus.

⁴ Pl. II: 9.

⁵ *Al.*, Pl. XCVI: d.

⁶ *MII*, Pl. 51: 6 and 7.

⁷ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 19: N and *idem.*, *Syria* XX, fig. 3: F.

⁸ Pl. XIII: 6.

⁹ Pl. XIII: 5.

¹⁰ Pl. XV: 8

¹¹ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XVIII: m, q, u and y.

¹² *AG* I, Pl. XXX: 36 and unpublished, in I of A collection, from City II; unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, from Trench 251.

¹³ On a jar, Type B1(a), from 'Ajjul—*AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 4; on a krater, Type A1(a), from Ras Shamra—*Ug.* II, Pl. XXV (not visible on photograph).

shallow bowls, Types B1(a) and B2(a). The band is usually framed in bichrome above and below and there are mostly four vertical lines between the recurrent cross motif. The majority of the bowls have a black cross, but red is also found. They occur at Megiddo,¹ at Hazor,² at Tell Mor,³ at Nitovikla,⁴ and are extremely common at 'Ajjul, though only some of them have been published.⁵ Another method of applying the motif of a recurrent cross placed between groups of lines is seen on two bowls, Type B1(a) from 'Ajjul, which are decorated with bands of strapping running from rim to base.⁶ Likewise from 'Ajjul comes a circular fragment from the neck of a tankard on which one of the registers consists of diagonal red crosses alternating with groups of contiguous black and red vertical lines.⁷ A narrow band composed of similar decorative elements occurs immediately below the rim of a large tankard on which a diagonal black cross between two non-contiguous vertical bichrome bars recalls the use of this motif below the rim on shallow bowls.⁸

"Hourglass" and "Butterfly" Variations

In many instances the plain, unadorned cross was rendered more elaborate by filling in the space between alternate pairs of arms. The resultant design element has been called the "hour glass" when upright and the "butterfly" when horizontal, but, in fact, these are the same, since it was a matter of choice as to which sectors were selected for filling in in solid black (or with some other decoration). Both variations were much used and are found on jugs and kraters, almost always placed within a bichrome-framed panel. A large jug, Type A1(h), has a vertical shoulder panel in which a black "hour glass" fills the upper part and a black "butterfly" the lower, the centre of both being picked out in red.⁹ A small krater sherd from Megiddo is similarly decorated, the "butterfly" and the "hour glass" being separated by bichrome bars.¹⁰ On a krater sherd

¹ Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection, from W=3019—decoration in reddish-brown.

² *Haz.* I, Pl. CXXIV: 1.

³ Unpublished, in Is. A. D. collection—cross in red.

⁴ Pl. VII: 15.

⁵ *AG* I, Pl. XXXVIII: 18 S2, *AG* II, Pl. XL: 34—crosses in red, *AG* V, Pl. XXIX: 25, and Pl. VII: 16.

⁶ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 10, and Pl. VII: 14—crosses in red, and *AG* V, Pl. XXIX: 22.

⁷ *PEQ* 1961, 142, No. 6.

⁸ Pl. X: 4.

⁹ Pl. XII: 5.

¹⁰ Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection, from N=3099.

from 'Ajjul a recurrent "butterfly" motif with red centre is separated by bichrome bars.¹ At Megiddo, a number of jugs are decorated with various forms of these motifs: a jug, Type A1(c), has one shoulder panel composed of a large latticed "hour glass", the other of two similar motifs in black, placed one above the other and divided by a horizontal bichrome bar.² On other jugs, Types A1 (b), A1(c) and A1(e), there are panels on which the space between the arms of the cross is filled in either in black or with lattice-work,³ while one jug is decorated with a panel on which the space between the four sections between the arms of the cross are filled in alternately in black and with lattice-work.⁴ A spouted basket bowl, Type A2(a), has a broad "hour glass" frieze below the rim composed of a series of diagonal black crosses separated by vertical bichrome bars, while the upper and lower spaces between the arms are filled in red.⁵ On a carinated bowl, Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul, the latticed "hour glass" motif is set in a bichrome frame on the upper shoulder and alternates with groups of oblique lines.⁶ A lattice filling is used for the "hour glass" motif on a krater, Type A1(a), from Gezer which is further embellished by the addition of "bows" on each side at the centre.⁷ On a similar krater from Hazor, decorated in black only, the latticed "hour glass" is without the addition of the centre bows.⁸ On tankards, variations of both the latticed "hour glass" and the latticed "butterfly" occur, especially as a neck decoration. In one instance the entire length of the neck is decorated with these alternating motifs.⁹ Sometimes dots are used to fill in the background, as on a krater sherd from Gezer, on which the lower section of the "hour glass" is filled in in black.¹⁰ An unusual combination of dots and the diagonal cross occurs on a krater sherd from Megiddo, where the body of a large fish is filled in with a series of diagonal crosses separated by bichrome bars, while four dots are placed between the arms of each.¹¹

¹ *AG* II, Pl. XL: 33 (red centres not indicated).

² *M* II, Pl. 49: 9.

³ *Ibid.*, Pls. 39: 9, 49: 6 and 56: 10; *MT*, Pls. 41: 21 and 48: 2 and 14.

⁴ *M* II, Pl. 49: 11 = Pl. 56: 9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. 51: 10.

⁶ Pl. XIX: 5.

⁷ Pl. V: 3.

⁸ Pl. V: 1.

⁹ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXII: e.

¹⁰ Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus., from unmarked findspot.

¹¹ Pl. XVIII: 5.

3. THE TRIANGLE AND ITS DERIVATIVES

As an element of ceramic decoration the triangle has a long history which it is not the purpose of this study to trace. It was frequently used on Khabur Ware and is found on MB wares from Palestine and Syria. It likewise occurs on Middle Cypriote wares; and it continued to be used, with additions and variations, in the bichrome ware repertoire.

The plain linear triangle, used unadorned, is only rarely found, but in the form of bichrome strapping it is commonly used on different classes of vessels. It occurs on the shoulder of jugs, Type A1(c) and A1(e) and on juglets, Type A1(a), where the triangles cover the whole of the decorative field. Jugs and juglets thus decorated were found at Megiddo.¹ Double bichrome strapping is used in a similar way on the shoulder of a krater, Type A1(b), at Ras Shamra.² The same kind of shoulder decoration is employed on a similar krater from 'Ajjul on which, in place of the bichrome strapping, the triangles are multilinear, each being composed of four parallel black lines.³ Triangular bichrome strapping is likewise used for the decoration on the whole length of the neck of jugs, Types A1(d) and A1(e), as well as on a goblet, Type A2(a) at Megiddo⁴ and on a tankard from Cyprus.⁵ Another tankard has groups of multiple lines forming triangles on both of its neck registers.⁶ The use of parallel lines to outline triangles is thus seen to be an alternative method of decoration closely allied to the use of bichrome strapping. Groups of lines forming triangles are used below the rim of a shallow bowl, Type B1(a), at Ras Shamra and on the upper shoulder of a cylindrical juglet, Type A1(b), from the same tomb group.⁷

On all the above vessels the triangular decoration is conceived as a band composed either of bichrome strapping or of groups of oblique parallel lines which isolate an inner reserved space in the form of a triangle. The latter is most commonly used as a shoulder decoration on tankards and, less frequently, below the rim on shallow bowls. Tankards bearing this shoulder decoration

¹ *M* II, Pl. 132: 11 and *MT*, Pl. 46: 16—jugs; *M* II Pl. 49: 4 and 15—juglets.

² Pl. VI: 5.

³ Pl. VI: 6 (showing suggested horizontal handle restoration).

⁴ *M* II, Pls. 39: 10 and 49: 5; *MT*, Pl. 38: 11—jugs; *M* II, Pl. 55: 13—goblet.

⁵ Pl. II: 4.

⁶ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII: b, presumed to be from Milia.

⁷ Pl. VII: 2 and 9.

have been found at many sites, including Megiddo,¹ 'Ajjul,² Enkomi,³ and Milia.⁴ The number of parallel lines in each group differs and occasionally they are replaced by groups of bichrome bands, this, in effect, being the same decoration, but with the addition of a red line between two black ones. Thus, double bichrome strapping is applied to the shoulder of a tankard,⁵ while triple groups of bichrome strapping are used below the rim of a shallow bowl at 'Ajjul.⁶

A different variation of the use of the triangle occurs on the shoulder of a jug, Type A1(c), at Megiddo, where there is a succession of solid black-outlined triangles filled in alternately in black and red.⁷ Yet another variation is seen on the shoulder of a krater sherd from 'Ajjul, on which there is a panel containing double-lined triangles placed apex to apex and separated by double horizontal lines.⁸

By the simple process of transposing a design element from a horizontal to a vertical position, new effects were achieved. This applies to motifs composed of groups of lines isolating a triangular reserved space, such as are used so frequently on the shoulder of tankards. By transposing this motif to form a vertical panel a variant is created. This is used on one side of a cylindrical juglet, Type B1(b), from Megiddo—where the other side is decorated in the Cross Line Style—and also on the shoulder panels of a juglet, Type D1(a), from the Mayana cemetery, Sedment.⁹

Another variation of the above consists of a related motif composed of a band of linear or bichrome-framed triangles which are filled in above and below with groups of alternating parallel lines. This is used commonly in both horizontal and vertical panels and is found on a wide range of vessels, especially in the vertical form.¹⁰ Used horizontally, it occurs on the necks of tankards, where the basic triangle design is outlined in bichrome.¹¹ It also occurs, used

¹ *MT*, Pl. 48: 3.

² Pl. XI: 2.

³ *SCE* I, Pl. LXXXV: 162.

⁴ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. II; 2 and 3.

⁵ Pl. X: 1.

⁶ Unpublished, in I of A collection, from OH 992.

⁷ *M* II, Pl. 49: 13.

⁸ *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 23.

⁹ *MT*, Pl. 45; 18; Pl. XV: 2.

¹⁰ Triangle patterns filled with groups of parallel lines are known from the Middle Cypriote repertoire and occur on White Painted II-IV wares.

¹¹ Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pls. XX: g, XXI: d, XXII: i and XXIII: f; Schaeffer, *E-A*, fig. 77: 5; Pl. II: 6.

in this way, on a spouted basket bowl, Type A2(a), at Megiddo.¹ When used in the form of a vertical band panel the triangles appear as a continuous zig-zag and the whole has been likened to plaiting. Set almost always in a bichrome frame (with bichrome banding on either side), it is used on jugs, Types A1(a), A1(e), A1(f) and A2(a), on kraters, Types A1(a) and A1(c) and on a jar, Type B1(a). This variation of the triangle used to form a pattern in a decorative panel occurs in the following ways: (a) triangles outlined in black against an overall dot-filled background; (b) triangles outlined in black and filled, above and below, with alternating parallel lines in black; (c) triangles outlined in black and filled, above and below, with alternating parallel lines in red; (d) triangles outlined in bichrome and filled, above and below, with alternating parallel lines in black; (e) triangles outlined in bichrome and left in reserve. The popularity of this design element is demonstrated by its extensive use and it must be considered as one of the standard forms of bichrome ware decoration. So common is it that it is not possible to do more than refer to the sites at which vessels and sherds thus decorated have been found: Megiddo, 'Ajjul, Ashkelon, Gezer, Hazor, Nagila, Tell el-Far'ah, Tell el-Hesy, Tell Keisan, Tell Sukas, Archangelos, Milia, Nitovikla, Enkomi and elsewhere in Cyprus. In view of its widespread distribution, it is surprising that examples of this design element have not been found at Ras Shamra. Related to the above derivative of triangular decoration, is a further variation which occurs on the base of an incense stand at 'Ajjul,² on which, close to the triangular aperture runs an upright panel, framed in black and dark red, while half-way along its extant height is a black-outlined triangle, above and below which run lines parallel to two of its sides.

It has been seen that the tankard was frequently decorated with all possible forms of derivatives of the triangle. Distinctive to it are two variations which are only rarely found on other vessels: the latticed triangle,³ framed in bichrome which is used—chiefly on the neck—pointing either upwards or downwards; and a single bichrome zig-zag band which throws into prominence above and below it a series of reserved triangles, this being often elaborated to form a compact group of such bands, placed close together within a bichrome-framed

¹ *M* II, Pl. 51:9.

² *AG* I, XXXIII: 68.

³ A frieze of down-pointing latticed triangles also occurs on the upper part of a carinated goblet, Type A1(a), at Megiddo—*M* II, Pl. 55: 12.

square or rectangular panel. These variations are so common that it is unnecessary to refer to their use on individual vessels and they have been admirably illustrated by Heurtley.¹

It has been pointed out that once a design element had been introduced into the bichrome ware repertoire, it tended to be developed along stylised lines until the original idea on which it had been based was quite lost sight of, as in the case of the spoked wheel motif. In discussing triangular decoration on bichrome ware it is clear that the initial conception of an outlined triangular reserved space came to be so much elaborated and diversified that it frequently became obscured. This is exemplified by the last-mentioned compact ornament set in a square panel on the necks of tankards: in this, the triangular reserved space has become of secondary importance and is often discerned with difficulty at the top and bottom of the pattern. Yet a further variation of the above occurs on the shoulder of a tankard from Milia.² Here the reserved triangle is discernible only at the base of the panel containing the decoration, which consists of a series of non-contiguous, acute-angled bichrome bands placed one above the other so that the intervening space takes a similar form. This latter derivative contains hardly a trace of the triangle. Thus it is only by following the permutations and extensions of the triangular motif that it is possible to identify the relationship of a number of derivatives with the original, simple, geometrical form.

4. THE LATTICED PANEL

This is another of the design elements which bichrome ware can be said to have made its own after it had enjoyed a widespread use on earlier wares in many areas. A square or diamond lattice is generally employed within bichrome-framed panels and this commonly occurs on jugs and juglets, as well as on other types of vessels. Sometimes the latticed panel constitutes the chief element of decoration, sometimes it is combined with figure representations and sometimes it forms one of a series of differing panel fillings.

The following exemplify the use of the latticed panel when this is the main decoration on a vessel:

On jugs: Type A1(a), from Ras Shamra;³ Type A1(b), from Megiddo;⁴ Type

¹ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XVII—3rd and 5th row.

² Pl. X: 3.

³ Pl. I: 7-9.

⁴ Pl. II: 7.

A1(e), from Megiddo¹ and from Tell el-Far'ah²; Type B1(c), from 'Ajjul.³

On juglets: Type A1(b), from Ras Shamra;⁴ Type D1(a), from Mayana cemetery, Sedment⁵ and from Deshasheh.⁶

On kraters: Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul.⁷

On goblets: Type A2(a), from 'Ajjul.⁸

Whereas on the above vessels the latticed panel constitutes the chief decoration, on others the lattice motif is of secondary importance, being used to fill the vertical band panels between which figures are placed:

On jugs: Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul⁹, and from Mayana cemetery, Sedment;¹⁰ Type A1(c), from Beth Shan.¹¹

On kraters: Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul,¹² Ashkelon¹³ and Ras Shamra.¹⁴

Latticed panels are likewise used in conjunction with geometrical motifs:

On jugs: Type A1(a), from an unknown provenance;¹⁵ Type A1(e), from Megiddo;¹⁶ Type A1(g), from 'Ajjul.¹⁷

On juglets: Type A1(b), from Milia.¹⁸

On kraters: Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul.¹⁹

On a zoomorphic vessel: from Maroni²⁰ (latticed panels on flanks).

Sherds decorated with the latticed panel and other geometrical motifs have

¹ *M* II, Pl. 39: 5.

² Pl. II: 8.

³ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIX: 34 Z'.

⁴ Pl. VII: 2 (main decoration on body).

⁵ *Sed.* I, Pl. XLV: 68.

⁶ Pl. XV: 3.

⁷ *AG* III, Pl. XXXVI: 38 Q2 and unpublished in I of A collection.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXII: 31 W3.

⁹ Pl. IX: 1, with fish.

¹⁰ Pl. IX: 4, with birds.

¹¹ Pl. II: 3, with fish.

¹² *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 24 and 25, with bird, fish and Maltese Crosses.

¹³ *PEQ QS* (1923), Pl. III: 31, with bird.

¹⁴ Pl. IV: 3, with composite scene.

¹⁵ Pl. I: 3.

¹⁶ *M* II, Pl. 39:6 and *MT*, Pl. 48: 14.

¹⁷ *AG* II, Pl. XXXI: 38 S2.

¹⁸ Pl. VII: 1.

¹⁹ *AG* III, Pl. XLII: 27.

²⁰ Pl. XX: 2.

been found at many sites, including Hazor, Gezer, Tell Mor and in Cyprus. Variations of the open-meshed lattice also occur: on a jug Type A1(e), from 'Ajjul the lattice is composed of straight and diagonally crossing lines,¹ while an open lattice effect is achieved by the use of rows of large squares, one above the other, on a sherd from Gezer.² A latticed band, rather than a panel, fills the whole of the upper section of a carinated bowl, Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul,³ while small rectangular latticed panels—often alternating with reserved panels—are frequently used on the necks of tankards.⁴

The variety of combinations in the use of lattice work on many different kinds of vessels illustrates its popularity. This is another geometrical motif which has a long history and which is found in the decorative repertoires of many regions. By the time of its use on bichrome ware, the latticed panel was entirely geometrical, but it is possible that originally it had been intended to depict the net, used for snaring birds and for fishing. In this connection it is of interest to recall a cylinder seal from Ur (of uncertain date) on which is shown a geometrical pattern consisting of a seven-spoked wheel (with the hub clearly delineated) and a net.⁵ This seal not only suggests the possible object from which the latticed panel might well have originated, but by the use of a wheel pattern in juxtaposition to it, recalls similar highly conventionalised forms used in the bichrome ware repertoire.

5. THE LOZENGE (OR DIAMOND).

This design element is not commonly used on bichrome ware, but when it is found, it occurs chiefly as a panel filling. A number of kraters have this as part of their decoration, as have likewise a jar and a fragmentary jug. The lozenge, however, is used for the most part as a decoration on the necks of tankards, most of which were found in Cyprus, though sherds occur also at 'Ajjul and at Minet el-Beida on the mainland. This distribution may well indicate that the lozenge was intentionally incorporated into the range of decorative patterns

¹ *AG* I, Pl. XLVIII: 60 Q10.

² Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus.

³ Pl. XIX: 5.

⁴ Pls. II: 6 and X: 2. It should be noted that on the latter jug the shoulder decoration consists of a series of rectangular panels of lattice work, alternating with a reserved space of similar size, across which there runs diagonally a broad latticed band.

⁵ L. Legrain, *Ur Excavations, X. Seal Cylinders*, 41, No. 554.

on bichrome ware on those vessels which were intended for export, especially in view of the popularity of the lozenge in Cyprus, where it had long been part of the local decorative repertoire, being commonly employed on White Painted II-V Wares during the Middle Cypriote period. In Late Cypriote I, strings of latticed lozenges became one of the distinctive features of White Slip I wares, many of which were imported to the mainland and which, at 'Ajjul, are frequently found in bichrome ware contexts.¹ It was doubtless the proximity of 'Ajjul to the coast which was the direct cause of the high percentage of vessels from Cyprus found there, since it was through the harbour towns that the flow of Cypriote wares passed and vice versa; nor is it surprising to find the local potters being influenced by design elements which were at home in the island repertoire, especially as it may well have been they who produced the supply of bichrome ware for the reciprocal trade in pots.

At 'Ajjul, lozenges are used in one of the band panels of a figure-decorated krater, Type A1(a),² where each is threaded with cross-lines. On a jar, Type B1(a), there is a single vertical panel, in this instance filled with latticed lozenges.³ Two other 'Ajjul vessels on which lozenges are used as a panel decoration, are in black only; both are kraters, Type A1(a), one being decorated with purely geometrical motifs, the other also with the figures of birds.⁴ At Minet el-Beida a large sherd was found⁵ which it has been suggested was part of a tankard,⁶ where the shoulder decoration includes a vertical panel composed of dot-filled, bichrome-framed lozenges. In Cyprus, bichrome ware vessels occur which have lozenges as part of their decoration: a jug, Type A1(a),⁷ a cylindrical juglet, Type 1A(b), on which there is a bichrome-framed, compact group of lozenges in two wide panels on the body⁸ and a large krater, Type A1(c) from Enkomi, on which the alternate vertical band panels are composed of latticed lozenges.⁹ Apart from the above, there are a number of tankards on which lozenges are used in one of the neck registers. These are filled either

¹ See Chapter 6.

² *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 5.

³ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 4.

⁴ Pl. V: 2 and *AG* IV, Pl. XLV: 15.

⁵ *Ug.* II, fig. 50: 23.

⁶ *PEQ* 1961, 140 and fig. 2: b.

⁷ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, 37, No. 29.

⁸ Pl. VII: 1.

⁹ Pl. VIII: 1.

with lattice work, dots or a centre dot.¹ There is one instance of the use of lozenges on the whole length of the neck where the purpose of these panels is to divide up the decorative field.²

6. THE FEATHER PATTERN

This motif occurs as a filling for vertical panels on relatively few vessels. Based on a completely stylised representation of the feather, it shows only the central quill shaft and the barbs which project from it on either side, these being depicted as a series of oblique lines placed one above the other, no attempt being made to indicate the tapering at the top. On two kraters, Type A1(a), from 'Ajjul, the feather pattern occurs together with the figures of birds,³ while another krater decorated with this motif is in black only.⁴ Another krater sherd likewise shows geometrical decoration, in this instance in bi-chrome.⁵ Much resembling the above black-decorated krater from 'Ajjul is one found at Gezer,⁶ on which the feather pattern is also used.

In addition to the above, Petrie records the finding at 'Ajjul of a number of sherds decorated with this motif,⁷ which he designates as "V lines", showing a related form which has no central shaft and on which the "V lines" are in a reversed position. From the incidence of these motifs as recorded on the above table it does not seem as though the feather pattern had been widely used and this bears out the evidence from other sites. Yet another version of this pattern, which is a variant of the reversed position, was found at Megiddo. Here, on two jugs, Types A1(c) and A1(e), the original feather pattern has been completely transposed, thus demonstrating the tendency to vary the positions in which conventionalised design elements were employed—possibly due to the position in which the vessel was held when the decoration was applied. On one of these jugs,⁸ the panel containing the reversed form of the feather has not been entirely filled and the lines representing the barbs are painted in red;

¹ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pls. II: 2 and 3 and IV: 3 and 4; Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XVII, row 2 and row 6, right.

² Heurtley, *ibid.*, Pl. XXI: a.

³ *AG* I, Pl. XXVIII: 4 and *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 7.

⁴ Pl. V: 2.

⁵ *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 14.

⁶ Pl. V: 3.

⁷ *AG* II, Pl. XLII.

⁸ *MII*, Pl. 39: 9.

on the second jug,¹ the feather pattern is shown in a reversed position and this may well have been for the reason suggested—the decoration being applied while the vessel was held by the neck, which is plain. Two other jugs, Type A1(a), likewise have a shoulder panel consisting of the feather pattern; one is from 'Ajjul, where the shaft is shown² and the other is fragmentary, from Dhenia, on which no shaft is indicated.³ Also from Cyprus, comes a tankard on which one of the motifs used in two of the neck registers consists of the feather pattern.⁴

7. THE LADDER PATTERN

Also used but occasionally, this design element may be defined as a series of short horizontal parallel lines placed one above the other within a vertical bichrome frame. Essentially a simple motif, it occurs on a jug at Ras Shamra which can be considered as slightly antedating the bichrome ware period.⁵ On this vessel the "rungs" are widely spaced and are bichrome-bordered. A similar panel occurs on an unmarked sherd from 'Ajjul⁶ on which the space between every four or five of the horizontal lines is filled in in red, recalling the bichrome bars used as space dividers in panels containing the hub and spokes motif. On a shallow bowl from Hazor, Type B2(a), there are recurring groups of the ladder pattern placed at intervals below the rim and, as is usual on bowls of this class, the whole is framed by horizontal bichrome bands.⁷ Similarly-shaped bowls are decorated with the ladder pattern used with the "rungs" transposed from a horizontal to a vertical position, thus once again demonstrating the ease with which an accepted decorative element was applied in a variety of positions once the original conception underlying it had been forgotten.⁸ This latter scheme of decoration is used on a similar bowl from Hazor.⁹

¹ Pl. II: 1.

² *AG* IV, Pl. LIV: 57 H5.

³ Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus. (No. 1960/IV-19/4).

⁴ Pl. II: 6.

⁵ Schaeffer, *Syria*, XIX, fig. 36: P, and compare handle and short neck on jug, Type A1(f), at Megiddo, Pl. XII: 4.

⁶ Unpublished, in I of A collection.

⁷ Pl. VII: 10.

⁸ Compare the different positions in which variations of the triangle and the feather pattern were employed.

⁹ Pl. VII: 11.

and also on sherds from bowls, Type B1(a), at 'Ajjul¹ and Gezer.² Despite the fact that the ladder motif became popular in Cyprus at this time and was widely used on White Slip I wares which were being increasingly imported to the mainland, it does not appear to have been extensively used on bichrome ware, except on shallow bowls, whose very shape and handle undoubtedly developed under the influence of contemporary Cypriote wares.

8. THE WAVY LINE

This form of decoration is found in a variety of combinations and is used on many different kinds of vessels. It is sometimes depicted in an accentuated, pointed manner, sometimes with rounded curves; there may be a hardly perceptible divergence from a straight line, painted in a thick brush-stroke, or the delineation may be unequal and hap-hazard. The wavy line occurs both horizontally and vertically, in black and in red, singly or in groups of two and three, unadorned or with the addition of a bichrome frame, as a filling for a shoulder panel or as a space-filler between vertical band panels. It seems unlikely that this motif was originally intended as the representation of a specific object (unless it be the stitching on leather, in imitation of Cypriote wares), for it is essentially a simple motif which nevertheless has many possibilities and is readily adaptable to many shapes and parts of a vessel. It is doubtless these characteristics which kept it in vogue throughout the bichrome ware period, so that in the following phase of decline, it continued to be used in different combinations.³

Used horizontally, the wavy line is commonly found between two straight ones on kraters, Type A1(a), both below the rim and at mid-body (where there is more usually a bichrome band); on shallow bowls, Type B2(a), in a band below the rim, usually framed in bichrome; and on tankards, either on the neck or round the mid-body. On the majority of the vessels on which it is used, the horizontal wavy line is shown in black, either between two straight black lines or between bichrome bands. On some tankards, however, the necks are decorated with one or two red wavy lines placed between bichrome bands.⁴ In black, a wavy line between two straight ones occurs on kraters, Type A1(a),

¹ *AG* II, Pl. XXVIII: 19 S4 and unpublished in I of A collection, from OE 950 and AP 770.

² Pl. VII: 12.

³ Note, especially, in conjunction with down-pointing triangles on biconical vessels, *M* II, Pl. 58: 3.

⁴ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXII: a and f.

together with both geometrical and figure decoration and it is thus used immediately below the rim of a krater, Type A1(b), from Beth Shemesh, where the wavy line takes the place of the more usual bichrome band.¹ A very similar black wavy line likewise occurs below the rim of a krater, Type A1(a), from Tell el-Hesy which is decorated with a bird.² On a krater, Type A1(a), from Gezer, which has purely geometrical decoration, there is a single black wavy line between two straight ones both below the rim and at mid-body.³ A sherd of what appears to be a very similar krater at 'Ajjul has a wavy line above and below the field of decoration on the shoulder,⁴ that at the base of the neck being bordered by two black lines, while at mid-body there is a straight black line above and a narrow bichrome band below. Very close in conception to the above is a krater from Hazor on which the geometrical decoration is entirely in black.⁵ This vessel has a single thick and curving wavy line round the mid-body and recalls three black-decorated kraters from 'Ajjul, which have wavy lines between straight ones both above and below the field of decoration. One of these resembles the Gezer and Hazor kraters in that the decoration is entirely geometrical.⁶ Here the band at mid-body is composed of two wavy lines set between straight ones. On the two other kraters there are figures of dot and line filled birds between the vertical panels.⁷

A horizontal black wavy line is used below the rims of shallow bowls in an open or a closer curve, generally between two bichrome bands. Bowls, Type B2(a), decorated with this motif occur at 'Ajjul,⁸ while another bowl is decorated entirely in black, with a black wavy line between two straight ones.⁹ The wavy line is found below the rim and at carination line on another bowl from 'Ajjul where the space between is filled with groups of vertical lines.¹⁰ At Hazor, a shallow carinated bowl is decorated with another variation of this motif consisting of a frieze below the rim composed of a black, pointed wavy

¹ Pl. VI: 3.

² *MMC*, 62: 106.

³ Pl. V: 3.

⁴ *AG* II, Pl. XXXIX: 14.

⁵ Pl. V: 1.

⁶ Pl. V: 2.

⁷ *AG* III, Pls. XXXIII: 33 W1 and XXXVI: 38 Q 4, (now reconstructed in Pal. Arch. Mus.) and *AG* IV, Pl. XLV: 15.

⁸ Unpublished, in I of A collection, from BL 740 and MN 985; Pl. XIX: 10.

⁹ *AG* II, Pl. XXVIII: 19 S6.

¹⁰ Unpublished, in I of A collection—unmarked sherd.

line between two straight red ones.¹ Another sherd from Hazor would appear to be from a very similar bowl—possibly Type B2(a)—on which the colour of the decoration is the reverse of the above and consists of a pointed red wavy line between two black ones.² On tankards, the neck decoration sometimes includes one or two black wavy lines placed between horizontal bichrome bands,³ while on another vessel this decoration is also used at mid-body.⁴

When used vertically, the wavy line lends itself to many variations and is frequently placed between bichrome bands in an upright panel. It also occurs in both red and black as a space-filler introduced between vertical bands on jugs, Types A1(a) and A1(e), at 'Ajjul and Ras Shamra.⁵ A black wavy line is used in a similar way on the upper shoulder of a cylindrical juglet, Type B1(b), from Cyprus.⁶ A single black wavy line set between bichrome bands is used as a vertical panel on a number of different types of vessels: at 'Ajjul, on a jug, Type A1(a);⁷ at Megiddo, on a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(b),⁸ where this is one of the shoulder insertions between the crossing lines; at Maroni, on a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a), where all three of the shoulder insertions consist of this motif;⁹ at Ras Shamra, on a similar jug where this motif is one of the shoulder ornaments, with the addition of dots between the points of the zig-zagging wavy line;¹⁰ at Milia, a large jug, Type B3(a) is decorated with three vertical panels composed of a thick black wavy line set between bichrome bands.¹¹ On kraters, a black wavy line framed in bichrome is also used in the panel decoration on the shoulder, both in conjunction with figure representations and frequently with diagonal bichrome strapping. This is the filling of the vertical band panels separating the birds and fish on a krater, Type A1(a), from

¹ *Haz.* II, Pl. CIX: 32—attributed to MB, but found together with vessels frequently associated with bichrome ware.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. CXVI: 14.

³ Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXI: b, presumed to be from Milia and Schaeffer, *E-A*, fig. 71: 265, from Enkomi.

⁴ Pl. II: 6.

⁵ *AG* I, Pl. XLVIII: 60 Q 10, in red; *AG* IV, Pl. LIV: 57 H 5, in black; and Pl. I: 8, in black between two red lines.

⁶ Pl. VII: 3.

⁷ Pl. I: 4.

⁸ *M* II, Pl. 51: 7.

⁹ Pl. XIII: 5.

¹⁰ Pl. III: 3.

¹¹ Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., from T. I (No. 104).

Gezer¹ and on a krater sherd from Ashkelon;² while at 'Ajjul there are a number of sherds from kraters, Type A1(a), on which a vertical band panel of this kind occurs with diagonal lines of strapping.³ An unusual elaboration is used on a geometrically-decorated krater at Gezer where black wavy lines are added outside the framing bichrome bands of a latticed panel, while elsewhere on the same vessel there is a two-strand wavy line motif with a straight line between them.⁴ This latter variation of the use of the double wavy line is also found as a panel filling on a jug, Type A1(c), at Megiddo, where it alternates with latticed panels⁵ and on a krater sherd from 'Ajjul.⁶

Multiple wavy lines placed within a bichrome-framed band panel are frequently used, the colour and the number of the lines varying from vessel to vessel. At Lachish, Tell Mor and Jaffa krater sherds were found on which the vertical panels contain two wavy black lines.⁷ Double red wavy lines occur on a jug, Type A1(a), at 'Ajjul⁸ and at Megiddo on a Cross Line Style jug, Type B2(a), which has a shoulder ornament composed of two red wavy lines between black ones.⁹ Two red wavy lines also occur in a vertical band panel on a krater sherd from Tell es-Šafi,¹⁰ as well as on an unstratified sherd from 'Ajjul.¹¹ Vertical panels containing three red wavy lines between bichrome bands separate the figures of birds, fish and quadruped on a krater from Lachish, a similar panel occurring on a sherd from 'Ajjul.¹² Three black wavy lines occur in a panel on a krater sherd from Ras Shamra,¹³ while on a geometrically-decorated krater fragment from Alalakh there are vertical panels in which a red wavy line is placed between two thick black ones.¹⁴ Groups of four wavy

¹ Pl. IV: 1.

² *PEFQS* (1923), Pl. III: 25—with bird's beak.

³ *AG* I, Pl. XXXIII: 63, *AG* IV, Pl. XLIX: 33 W2 and unpublished, in I of A collection, from MV 980 and OT 1010.

⁴ Pl. V: 3.

⁵ Pl. X: 6.

⁶ *AG* I, Pl. XXXIII: 66.

⁷ *Lach.* II, Pl. LXI: 3; unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, (Nos. B 345 and B 348); unpublished, in Jaffa Mus., (No. 3722/III).

⁸ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIV: 9.

⁹ *M* II, Pl. 51: 8, and Pl. XIV: 1.

¹⁰ F. J. Bliss and R.A.S. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine*, Pl. 37: 14, with fish's head.

¹¹ Unpublished, in I of A collection.

¹² Unpublished, in I of A collection, from MR 985.

¹³ Unpublished, in excavator's collection, with head of fish.

¹⁴ Pl. XIX: 2.

lines in red placed between two bordering black lines are introduced between the main panel decoration on a jug, Type A1(a), presumed to be from Milia.¹

Another variation occurs on a krater, Type A1(a), where one and more different coloured wavy lines are introduced as pendants, these being "dropped" from the band at the base of the neck, mid-way between diagonal bichrome strapping to intersect at mid-body at a point halfway between the vertical band panels.²

9. DIAGONAL STRAPPING

As has been seen, it is a characteristic of bichrome ware to divide up the field of decoration on the shoulder by means of bichrome-framed panels containing a variety of geometrical design elements, thus creating a metope effect, both when figures are used and when the ornamentation is entirely geometric. On the former, the vertical band panels take second place, the eye being naturally drawn to the stylised representations of bird, fish, tree or quadruped; when, however, geometrical motifs alone are used, it is the band panels themselves which become the focal point of the decoration.

It has been seen that while on some bichrome vessels the space between the vertical band panels is left plain, it is more usual—no matter what shape the vessel—to break up the otherwise vacant field by introducing diagonal bichrome strapping which runs, above, from the top of the shoulder to the horizontal band at mid-body. This occurs on jugs, Types A1(c) and A1(e), at Megiddo.³ Double diagonal strapping of the same kind is found on jugs, Type A1(a), at 'Ajjul and of unknown provenance,⁴ the former having a single fish figure on the shoulder, the latter being entirely geometrical in decoration. Also decorated entirely with geometrical motifs and using a single-strand diagonal strapping is a jug, Type A1(h), from Cyprus,⁵ while the reverse form of strapping runs diagonally from the vertical band panels at mid-body to a point half-way between them at the base of the neck on a sherd from Megiddo and a on jug from 'Ajjul.⁶

¹ Pl. I: 2.

² Unpublished, in I of A collection, from unknown findspot.

³ *M* II, Pls. 39: 8, 49: 8 and 11 and *MT*, Pl. 48: 2 and 14.

⁴ Pl. IX: 1 and 3.

⁵ Pl. XII: 5.

⁶ *MT* Pl. 16: 11 and *AG* I. Pl. XLVIII: 60 Q11—which gives the impression of being decorated with a large "W".

It is, however, on kraters that this method of filling in the otherwise empty space between vertical band panels most frequently occurs, the diagonal strapping commencing at the upper corners on either side of the unfilled space between these panels and meeting at a point mid-way between them below.¹ At Megiddo and Lachish, figure-decorated kraters, Type A1(a), have diagonal strapping to fill the shoulder space on which no figure is introduced, as on the 'Ajjul jug referred to above, while at Milia on the same type of krater, the decoration consists of vertical band panels containing a geometrical motif, the intervening shoulder space between them being filled with diagonal bands.² There are also many examples of geometrically decorated kraters using variations of single-strand bichrome strapping: a sherd from Tell el-Hesy has a diagonal band panel composed of recurrent crosses in red set between bichrome bars and framed in bichrome;³ on a sherd from Hazor there are red-black-red lines in place of the bichrome band;⁴ on a sherd from Tell Mor and on a large krater fragment from Alalakh there are double and triple black lines;⁵ while at 'Ajjul there are many published and unpublished sherds on which some form of diagonal strapping is used. Frequently a double band of bichrome strapping occurs, sometimes two non-contiguous bands and in one instance, a thick wavy line bordered by red and black lines.⁶

A desire for balance in the decorative field is characteristic of bichrome ware, the simplest method of achieving this being by the use of vertical band panels, which, when placed at regular intervals round the shoulder, give a pleasing sense of proportioned decoration—especially on smaller vessels. Should, however, a figure be introduced into the scheme, additional or similar ones were required to be placed in a matching position in the remaining vacant fields. When only a single figure on a jug, or three (in place of four) on a krater were painted in, a lack of balance was created and there was an inherent need to fill in the non-decorated sections with compensating ornamentation. Even when the vessel was decorated with purely geometrical design elements, the tendency

¹ Examples of this have already been referred to in the section dealing with the wavy line.

² Pl. XVIII: 1; *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII: 2; Pl. V: 4.

³ *MMC*, 63: 108.

⁴ *Haz.* I, Pl. CXL: 17.

⁵ Pl. XIX: 1-2.

⁶ *AG* I, Pls. XXIX: 9, XXX: 37, XXXIII: 66 and from MP 1007 and OE 1005—all with double bichrome strapping; *AG* IV, Pl. XLV: 18, with non-contiguous two-strand strapping; and Pl. XIX: 4, with a wavy line between straight ones.

to fill in remained, especially on larger vessels, such as kraters. It was this basic approach to the application of the decoration that made diagonal strapping so popular, since it could be used—and was used—to give a sense of balanced proportion to any kind of vessel, when for some reason (perhaps from a wish to give prominence to a single figure), further figures were not added; at the same time, diagonal strapping was also used for its own intrinsic decorative value.

10. CROSS LINE STYLE DECORATION¹

This is basically geometrical in character and exemplifies the epitome of the fusion and blending of native bichrome ware design elements with traditional Cypriote forms. For not only are the shapes to which this kind of decoration is applied Cypriote-inspired, but the decoration of the whole of the surface of the vessel is likewise a Cypriote feature which developed from the Middle Cypriote White Painted Cross Line Style in one colour only, which employed groups of crossing lines all over the body. In the bichrome Cross Line Style the Cypriote influence is strongly felt, but it has been adapted and merged with contemporary local techniques. Thus the pattern of decoration takes on a specific and standardised form consisting of broad vertical bands in two colours, combined with groups of crossing lines. There are many variations both of the vertical elements and the diagonally crossing lines as far as the colour and number is concerned, but these invariably adhere to the basic scheme. This divides the body of the vessel into four main sections which in their turn are subdivided by the groups of the crossing lines, the vertical bands corresponding to the characteristic vertical band panels on other types of bichrome vessels which break up the field of decoration on the shoulder, while the diagonally crossing lines recall the use of diagonal strapping. Further, although some Cross Line Style jugs carry purely geometrical decoration, others are embellished by the addition of shoulder insertions which are drawn from the accepted range of bichrome ware figure representations and geometrical motifs.

The Cross Line Style of decoration is used chiefly on globular-bodied jugs, Types B1(a), B1(b) and B2(a), and on juglets, Types B1(a) and B2(a), but it

¹ See fig. 6. The term Cross Line Style has been taken over from its use in a Cypriote context by Åström, *MCBA* 66, and it is here used to designate its bichrome ware derivative, which is closest to his White Painted IV-VI Cross Line Style.

is also found used on others kinds of vessels, including kraters¹ and a cylindrical juglet Type B1(b),² these being examples of the extension of the use of this specific form of ornamentation once it had been taken over and become integral to bichrome ware.

The typical fabric—especially for jugs—is well-fired, covered with a creamy-yellow slip and burnished, while the decoration is painted in a contrasting full black and a bright or orangy red. At 'Ajjul, however, sherds were also found made of coarser ware on which the decoration is applied with less precision and the colours are less contrasting,³ while a jug of unknown Palestinian provenance has a characteristic shape but is of coarse ware with the decoration less carefully executed.⁴ Such vessels likewise indicate the extension of the Cross Line Style of decoration, once this had become established in the bichrome ware repertoire, to a wider range of shapes and pots, including kraters and less fine-ware jugs.

On the other hand, it is possible to follow the stages in the development of the fully-formed bichrome Cross Line Style as it grew out of the earlier Cypriote models. In this connection two jugs may be cited, both decorated in the Cross Line Style in one colour only, which were found at Megiddo⁵ and Ras Shamra.⁶ The decoration on these two jugs combines vertical elements and groups of diagonally crossing lines and in this respect much resembles the decoration on numerous jugs and juglets at Kalopsidha which carried a variety of such patterns.⁷ Both the above jugs are from tomb contexts which cannot have antedated the bichrome period by more than some quarter of a century⁸ and on both there is a far larger number of crossing lines than is usual in the bichrome Cross Line Style, while in the Middle Cypriote schemes of decoration there might

¹ Pl. XVIII: 2, and *PEQ* 1965, Nos. 17-19.

² Pl. XV: 5.

³ Pl. XIV: 9 and 11.

⁴ Pl. XIV: 2.

⁵ M II, Pl. 34: 4.

⁶ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 26: ZA.

⁷ P. Åström, *Excavations at Kalopsidha and Ayios Iakovos in Cyprus*, (forthcoming), White Painted Cross Line Style 3.

⁸ The Megiddo jug is published as coming from a Stratum XI tomb which, on the basis of its contents, should probably be attributed to Stratum X. The Ras Shamra jug comes from a structural tomb in use for some time and containing a number of burials. It forms part of a funerary deposit which had been pushed aside to make room for later burials and can likewise be dated to the end of the seventeenth century.—See also, Åström, *MCBA*, 263, note 16.

be as many as nine lines in each group.¹ Thus they are seen to be intermediate types related to the earlier Middle Cypriote ornamental schemes but foreshadowing the later bichrome ware Cross Line Style in the use of vertical elements and diagonally crossing lines. Even closer to the bichrome Cross Line Style is a sherd from 'Ajjul² which is likewise in one colour, but on which there are no more than four crossing lines in each diagonal group and the vertical elements are in the form of solid bands (as distinct from the parallel lines on the Megiddo and Ras Shamra jugs). These are features which are characteristic of the bichrome Cross Line Style on which the usual number of crossing lines is either three or four.³ Typologically this sherd is closer in time to the bichrome ware period than either of the above-mentioned jugs and this is borne out by its stratigraphical position since it was found in "Palace I", in which bichrome ware also occurred⁴.

The bichrome Cross Line Style is characterised by the following features:

On bichrome Cross Line Style vessels the most common method of delineating the vertical elements is by a wide black ribbon-like band threaded through on either side, close to the edges, with narrow red ones.⁵ This is not, however, invariably used and there are vessels on which black and red lines are combined in various ways and others on which there is, in addition, a narrow reserved space.⁶ Likewise, the number and form of the diagonally crossing lines varies from vessel to vessel, as do also the colours and combinations used, while there is a very characteristic tendency for the crossing lines to become transformed into bands of bichrome strapping,⁷ thus showing a predilection for yet another feature which is typical of bichrome ware decoration on other kinds of vessels. Further, the use of shoulder decoration above the point of intersection of the diagonally crossing lines appears to have been arbitrary and was doubtless no little dependent on the amount of space available. Many of the jugs are thus decorated, but there are instances where no shoulder ornaments are used.⁸ On the other hand, most of the juglets were too small to

¹ *Ibid.*, 66.

² Pl. XIV: 10.

³ Fig. 6: I and II.

⁴ Compare Schemes 7a², 7b, 7c and 8b at Kalopsidha, Åström, *op. cit.*, note 7 above.

⁵ Fig. 6: A.

⁶ Fig. 6: C, E and F.

⁷ Fig. 6: X, XI and XII.

⁸ On jugs from Aniba, Archangelos, Lefkoniko and unknown provenance, Pls. III: 1, 4, 5 and 7 and XIV: 2.




Fig. 6. Decoration in the Cross Line Style. A-F: variations of vertical bands. I-XII: variations of crossing lines.

enable this additional ornament to be inserted effectively and there is only one known juglet on which this space is not left plain.¹

Altogether some fifty vessels decorated in bichrome in the Cross Line Style (including certainly identifiable sherds) can be listed and this type of decoration cannot but be considered as integral to the bichrome range and repertoire. Because it was not previously recognised, it is likely that in the past other such sherds were considered unimportant and hence were not recorded. 'Ajjul itself is an illustration of this; for while many of the Cross Line Style fragments come from sherd material which was—fortunately—preserved (which does not seem to have been the case at Megiddo), much of it remained unpublished. A study of the sherds from 'Ajjul is especially rewarding, in that it shows

¹ Pl. XV: 8.

unmistakably that with the increasing popularity of this style of decoration on the more standard forms of jugs and juglets, its use was extended and applied to other types of vessels. There is, then, good reason to expect that at sites where the bichrome level is reached, vessels and sherds will come to light decorated with every possible variation of the Cross Line Style applied to different kinds of fabric. Already bichrome vessels in the Cross Line Style are known from at least sixteen different sites, stretching from Aniba in the south to Mersin in the north, thus demonstrating their popularity both in the home and foreign markets.¹

¹ Since the above was written a detailed catalogue of this material has been published, *PEQ* 1965, 48-51.

CHAPTER FOUR

A COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF BICHROME AND ASSOCIATED WARES

INTRODUCTION

In attempting to appraise specific wares in any one region, it is essential to be able to see them in their true perspective and to take into account the ceramic background of the time. This applies equally to bichrome ware, which must be appreciated both objectively as a new departure in decorated pottery and also as part of a wider range of vessels in contemporary use. To this end a rewarding comparison is of assemblages from reliable contexts where the relation of the painted bichrome to the plain wares is clear. Such assemblages may come from well-defined occupation levels or from tombs, provided that the latter constitute grave goods from complete burials and do not originate from among the piled-up funerary offerings from previous ones, which are so often encountered round the sides of tombs which were in use over a considerable period.¹ Failure to note this common practice can lead—and has led—to no little confusion and incorrectness of interpretation. This applies to many of the tombs at Megiddo² where a presumed “upper” and “lower” layer were observed, in which the chronological sequence of the emplacement had already been lost in antiquity. A similar lack of clarity prevails with regard to other tombs with multiple burials located on the tell at Megiddo, among which are tombs 3070, 3018 and 5013 all of which, contain bichrome ware. Similarly, at ’Ajjul, T. 1717 may be cited, in which so-called “strata” were postulated. These, however, were arbitrarily marked at intervals from the top of the pit in which this tomb was situated. Such “layers” can give no assistance in understanding the different phases of the tomb’s usage. It is likewise difficult to distinguish the successive groups of funerary offerings in many tombs in Cyprus. This is especially true of those excavated at Milia, since these were robbed—sometimes during the actual progress of the excavation!³ In addition, it would appear

¹ *Jer.* I, 263; and Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, 209 and 216.

² Especially those published in *MT*, e.g. T. 1100 A.

³ Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, 1.

that here only such vessels were recorded as were more or less complete, so that despite the charts showing the distribution of the finds in the tombs, the overall picture of their contents cannot be regarded as exhaustive.¹

The greatest caution, then, must be exercised if tomb groups are to be used in order to ascertain the relationship between bichrome and associated wares and it is for this reason that assemblages from single burials and from well-defined house contexts are more reliable for comparison. It is the purpose of this chapter to re-examine such assemblages from the chief sites where bichrome ware has been found and to attempt to clarify and establish their inter-relationship. It is hoped thereby not only to establish the stages of development and growth within the period of the *floruit* of the ware, but also to determine the range of vessels which are most commonly found in association with it.²

1. THE MEGIDDO ASSEMBLAGES

As has already been remarked, Megiddo and 'Ajjul are the two Palestinian sites which, to date, have been extensively excavated at the bichrome ware level and it is from them that the most satisfactory comparative material comes.

One of the most instructive assemblages containing a variety of bichrome and other vessels was found in a Stratum IX house at Megiddo.³ This is a house whose rooms include the marked loci 2116, 2114 and 2115, which will herein-after be referred to as House Z.⁴ This building was situated on the edge of the east slope of the mound, in sector BB, and it was doubtless this position which was responsible for its unusual and elongated plan, instead of the more common arrangement of rooms ranged round a central courtyard.⁵ The natural formation of the hillside had for centuries dictated the alignment of the buildings at this point and, in the course of time, had made necessary the erection of a retaining wall to counteract the growing steepness. Thus, in stratum after stratum the lateral walls of the structures erected here reproduced a recurrent

¹ Unpublished sherds from more than twenty different jugs, Type A1(d), were identified by the writer among the residual material from T. 10.

² While it is not possible to indicate in advance the conclusions likely to result from a comparative study of bichrome ware assemblages with which this chapter deals, attention is drawn to section 7 in which the sequence and characteristic features of the bichrome period are summarised.

³ *M* II, fig. 401, Squares O 15 and N 15. Unless otherwise stated, all references in this section, other than to figs. 7 and 8, are to *M* II.

⁴ Fig. 7.

⁵ Compare fig. 242.




Fig. 7. House Z at Megiddo.

and constant element of curve, which is seen very clearly in the line of the so-called city wall shown on the plan for Stratum XII.¹ This same alignment is reflected in the ground plan of House Z, which is characterised by its oblong shape and whose lateral walls curve in conformity with the lie of the land.

The house was approached along a north-south street, 2113, and probably entered through the middle of the south transverse wall by a door-way which led directly into courtyard 2116. Beyond the courtyard, the usual series of small rooms opened off from it, these probably serving the needs of the occupants of the house and their animals—as is so often the case in many countries of the Middle East today. Room 2114, lying immediately adjacent to the court-

¹ Fig. 398, loci 3181 and 3182.

yard, had a lime-plastered floor, which appears broken on the plan; but it is very likely that at this point along the room's north wall (where the floor breaks off) there was a continuation of the east wall of room 2115, perhaps only in mud-brick, so that a second adjoining room E=2114, can be presumed. Most of the outside east wall of House Z appears to have been lost down the hillside and it was in all probability washed away in antiquity; but it doubtless ran parallel with the west lateral wall and included the fragmentary remains which the excavators found. It is worth recalling here that the stone walls as shown on the plan are almost certainly foundational and formed the substructure of a mud-brick building. This explains the apparent lack of entrances to the rooms, especially noticeable where the lower courses of all the walls remained, as in room 2115 (in which the lime floor was also intact), as well as in the room of tombs 2127 and 2132. Next to room 2115, on the east, was a similar-sized room, E=2115, leading into another, which was irregularly shaped and not square like the rest and which may have been used for some specific household purpose. The northern wall of the house was a continuation of the broken and incomplete but nevertheless substantial wall which is shown in the most northerly position in Square N 15. Of the house next-door, on the west side, only some vestiges remained, while the western half of House Z itself seems to have been the best preserved and it is here that a great deal of pottery, including bichrome and plain wares, was found. Since in two of these rooms there was a floor, it is likely that the vessels were in use during the latest occupation of the house and thus they provide an indication of the *milieu* of bichrome ware and form an important assemblage with which to compare other similar pottery groups.

*Artifacts found in House Z.*¹

Courtyard 2116

No. 3—jug with sloping carinated shoulder, widening neck and slightly in-curved rim, ring base and handle from rim to shoulder.

No. 4—jug, as above, but with trefoil mouth (wide aperture) and convex base.

No. 5—White Painted VI globular juglet with sloping trefoil mouth (narrow aperture), flat base and handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

No. 16—small deep bowl with carinated body, everted rim and ring base.

No. 10—cooking pot with marked sloping carinated shoulder, thick everted rim, circular base and no handles.

¹ See fig. 8 to which the vessel numbers refer.




Fig. 8. The House Z assemblage at Megiddo (excluding bichrome vessels).

No. 6—lamp with moderately pinched rim.

Room 2114 (adjoining courtyard).

No. 1—globular jug with wide neck and everted rim, shoulder handle and ring base—burnished. (Shape resembles bichrome jugs, Type A1(e)).

No. 8—medium-sized storage jar with ovoid body, wide neck and thick everted rim, shoulder handle and flat base. Covered with white wash.

No. 9—large storage jar with wide neck and stepped everted rim, shoulder handle and collar of rope decoration. (Reminiscent of MB types).

No. 13—shallow bowl with curved walls, high foot and ring base.

No. 11—deep bowl with splaying sides, thickened rim and high ring base. Covered with red wash.

No. 12—bowl, as above, but smaller and having a double ridged base. (No wash).

No. 7—lamp with pinched rim.

Alabaster pommel.

Red-decorated juglet¹ resembling bichrome juglets, Type A1(a).

Bichrome Ware

Krater, Type A1(b), decorated with joined wheels motif.

Room E=2114 (adjoining courtyard).

No. 4—large trefoil-mouthed jug similar to that from courtyard.

No. 7—lamp with pinched rim.

Room 2115

No. 2—jug with sloping carinated shoulder, wide neck, everted rim, ring base and handle from mid-neck to shoulder.

No. 18—burnished dipper juglet with elliptical body, pinched rim, handle from rim to shoulder and rounded base.

No. 12—wide splaying-sided bowl similar to that from room 2114.

No. 14—wide splaying-sided bowl with thickened rim and trumpet foot.

No. 17—medium-sized carinated bowl with ring base.

No. 15—small deep carinated bowl with flat base. (Apart from variant base, reminiscent of No. 16 from courtyard).

No. 20—top of pottery stand.

¹ Pl. 49: 3.

No. 6—lamp with moderately-pinched rim.
 No. 19—alabastron with wide flat rim and flat base.

Bichrome Ware

2 jugs, Type A1(c).
 2 juglets, Type A1(a).
 Goblet, Type A1(a).
 Krater, Type A1(a), decorated with fish.

Room E=2115.

Bichrome Ware

Krater, Type A1(a), decorated with fish.

No vessels were found in the remaining rooms of the house.

Reviewing the above ceramic evidence from House Z, it will be seen that it constitutes a typically transitional group bridging the MB II and advanced LB periods. The assemblage lacks the pronounced characteristics of MB II forms (e.g. piriform juglets, pedestal vases, shallow carinated bowls), but at the same time certain features are still present (e.g. shoulder handles on Nos. 1, 8 and 9; rope cordon on No. 9; carinated shoulder on No. 17). On the other hand, the shapes of the vessels do not yet exhibit any of the ungainly forms such as are associated with Stratum VIII (e.g. baggy dippers, biconical jugs, stump-based storage jars), and only the red-decorated juglet foreshadows the later decorated wares in one colour.¹ The House Z assemblage can, then, be taken as typical of Stratum IX and both from the point-of-view of the bichrome and plain wares contained in it, it is particularly suited to serve as a yard-stick against which to evaluate other assemblages.

Turning now to the tomb groups which contained bichrome ware, there are many in which the funerary offerings have much in common with the repertoire from House Z. These must now be assessed in the light of the material from House Z. Among them are three which were considered by the excavators as belonging to Stratum X—an attribution which has led to confusion as to the *terminus a quo* at Megiddo for bichrome ware. A careful examination of these three tombs, however, shows this attribution to be incorrect.

T. 3074 contained two vessels, one a bichrome jug, Type A1(e), and the

¹ See section 7 under.

other a jug similar to No. 3 from House Z.¹ Neither of these jugs occurs in the Stratum X occupation level. Unfortunately there is no description or photograph of this tomb, nor of T. 3063, which was likewise ascribed to Stratum X, but it seems likely that both were dug down deep, so that in each case the base of the tombs rested level with Stratum X, where the excavators encountered them and attributed them accordingly. On typological grounds both these tombs can only belong to Stratum IX, since the range of vessels contained in them does not occur in Stratum X, but is found again and again in other Stratum IX tombs and is exemplified by the House Z assemblage. This is borne out by an examination of the vessels in T. 3063, which comprised: two jugs, Type A1(e), a goblet, Type A1(a)—greatly resembling that from House Z—two dippers, one of which is very similar to that from room 2115 (No. 18), the other belonging to a category frequently found in association with bichrome ware, and a small votive bowl with pierced ear handle, of a type similar to one found in the deposit outside Temple 2048 in Stratum IX.²

The third tomb containing bichrome ware which was attributed to Stratum X is T. 3070. This is a structural tomb with multiple burials, which was in use over a prolonged period and which was comparatively small in size, the chamber (excluding the narrow passage leading from the entrance) being no more than 4 square metres and a little over 1 metre high.³ It contained the usual agglomeration of bones, most of which appear to have been pushed aside into the south-east portion, farthest away from the entrance, together with the offerings which had originally accompanied them, which included piriform juglets and platters.⁴ In the sector of the tomb closer to and facing the entrance, a large collection of vessels was found placed against the east wall, which consisted chiefly of larger jugs, a storage jar and large bowls.⁵ Comparing the tomb repertoire with the identifiable vessels on the photo, it is possible to recognise the following as being in position here: a large storage jar,⁶ placed between the central pillar-stone and the tomb wall; west of the storage jar is a bichrome jug,⁷ partly hidden by the pillar-stone, but recognisable on another, unpub-

¹ Pl. 41: 25.

² Compare Pl. 53: 4 and see C. Epstein, *IEJ* 15 (1965), 204-211.

³ Fig. 231.

⁴ Fig. 233 and tomb repertoire, 170.

⁵ Fig. 232.

⁶ Pl. 42: 3.

⁷ Pl. 39: 5.

lished photo¹ where the shoulder handle is visible; to the left of the latter is a lamp,² of which altogether four were found in the tomb; between the large storage jar and the east wall of the tomb, a trefoil-mouthed jug lies on its handle,³ with a large ring-based bowl lying base upwards over it;⁴ to the right lies a bichrome ware jug,⁵ the bands of paint on the neck being easily discernible; to the right of the latter there is a second trefoil-mouthed jug,⁶ against which can be seen a carinated bowl;⁷ to the left of the storage jar lies a large bichrome jug on which no decoration can be distinguished but which is recognisable by the shape of its body;⁸ behind it and close to the base of the large storage jar—from which it may well have fallen—lies a dipper;⁹ to the right of the cover stone and slightly inwards from it are two splaying-sided bowls¹⁰ and there are others visible in the south-east corner of the tomb which it is not possible to identify since they are fragmentary. All the above vessels form only a small percentage of the total number recorded as having been found in T. 3070, the remainder of which were doubtless in less visible positions (i.e. in lower emplacements), as a result of the clearance of the tomb chamber during the earlier periods of its usage.

Typologically, the pots found in the vicinity of the bichrome ware jugs are just such as might be expected to have been in use contemporaneously with them and while exhibiting slight variations as to details of shape, nevertheless resemble those from the House Z assemblage.¹¹ At the same time those vessels which are clearly from among the funerary offerings from the earlier burials (e.g. piriform juglets with button base) were not found in association with them. Further, there is nothing in the tomb indicating its usage during a period post-

¹ In O.I.C. archives.

² Probably Pl. 47: 1.

³ Pl. 41: 27.

⁴ Possibly Pl. 45: 6.

⁵ Pl. 39: 7.

⁶ Pl. 41: 28.

⁷ Probably Pl. 44: 14.

⁸ Pl. 39: 10.

⁹ Pl. 41: 16.

¹⁰ Probably Pl. 45: 11 and 13.

¹¹ Compare: trefoil-mouthed jug, Pl. 41: 28 with No. 4—slight difference in slope of shoulder and of base; large splaying-sided bowl, Pl. 45: 11 with No. 11—slightly different base; bowl, Pl. 45: 6 with No. 12—somewhat shallower and having no double ridged base; burnished footed bowl, Pl. 45: 13 with No. 13—slightly variant rim; burnished dipper, Pl. 41: 16 with No. 18—rim not pinched; lamp, Pl. 47: 1 with No. 7.

dating that of the bichrome ware vessels, so that the pots found in position along the east wall can be considered, not as the result of the piling up of offerings from previous burials, but rather as themselves constituting the funerary deposit placed in the tomb together with the last interment. This is borne out by an entry in the Field Diary for 14.2.38, describing the clearance of the tomb by the excavators after the cover stones had been removed,¹ in which it is noted that in the so-called "upper level" there were many pots of various types, together with two skeletons—possibly, a mother and child—and that animal bones were found mixed with the pots. A later entry, for 3.3.38, refers to T. 3070 and mentions specifically that "the painted pots therein were found on top".

When found the tomb was covered by a number of stone slabs which roofed it in² and which rested *on top* of the walls forming the tomb chamber. That these were the walls attributed to Stratum X is made evident by a comparison of the plans and the photographs showing the walls surrounding the tomb in Strata XI and X.³ On fig. 234, the lowest courses of the Stratum X south wall are distinctly visible above the corresponding Stratum XI wall (left of metre stick). These Stratum X wall courses, could no longer have been in use as part of a building at the time when the covering stones were placed in position over the tomb, so that the period of its final use must have been later than Stratum X. Since there is no gap in the corresponding building strata in the occupation levels, the placing of the cover stones over T. 3070—as found—could only have taken place some time during Stratum IX.

As has already been demonstrated, the funerary offerings accompanying the latest burial were those found in position along the tomb's east wall, and included all the bichrome ware vessels found in the tomb. Thus, while T. 3070 was first used during Stratum X, the last burial was placed in it during Stratum IX. This point cannot be over-emphasised, since according to the published report bichrome ware occurred at Megiddo earlier than at other sites, despite its absence from the Stratum X occupation level,⁴ where characteristic associat-

¹ Unpublished, in O.I.C. archives.

² Figs. 230 and 231.

³ Figs. 399 and 340; also figs. 214, 230 and 234.

⁴ A single unpublished krater sherd is in the O.I.C. collection, with the marked provenance, 3037. This locus is a right-angled wall fragment (shown on the plan for Stratum X), which, it is suggested, served to confine one of the rubbish dumps for discarded offerings from Temple 2048, now shown to have been originated in Stratum XII. See C. Epstein, "An interpretation of the Megiddo sacred area during Middle Bronze II", *IEJ* 15 (1965), 204-221. In view of the impression of uncertainty as to the exact attribution of sherds found all round the

ed wares were likewise not found. The inclusion of bichrome ware vessels in a Stratum X context is now seen to be incorrect: in the case of T. 3070, the latest burial (with all the bichrome ware) post-dates Stratum X both for architectural and ceramic reasons, while T. 3063 and T. 3074 must on typological grounds be attributed to Stratum IX; and all three tomb groups show affinities with the House Z assemblage. The two latter are typical examples of the tendency to attribute the Megiddo tombs by equating the absolute levels to which they were dug with the absolute levels of surrounding structures, which has resulted in stratigraphical confusion.

By comparing the so-called "Stratum X" tombs which contained bichrome ware with the House Z assemblage, it has been possible to show that these should, in fact, be attributed to Stratum IX, which is the bichrome ware stratum *par excellence* at Megiddo. The contents of other tombs—rightly attributed—substantiate this, the bichrome vessels in them being frequently associated with plain wares greatly resembling those found in House Z. These, in their turn, must now be examined.

T. 2127 contained a jug, Type A1(c), with handle just below the rim; a plump juglet, Type A1(a); a large dipper,¹ and a medium-sized jug with trefoil mouth and globular body,² greatly resembling Nos. 3 and 4 from House Z.

T 5013 contained multiple burials,³ of which skeleton G appears to have been found more or less as placed in the grave, while the bones from other burials do not seem to have been in articulation.⁴ No description is given of the tomb, while on the plan on which it is shown⁵ it is not indicated as being a structural tomb. According to the report, it contained seven burials,⁶ all attributed to Stratum IX; but it is not possible to check the allocation of artifacts to specifically-lettered burials, especially as no pottery is visible on the only published photograph. Two jugs are, however, recorded as being associated with skeleton G: a jug, Type A1(c) and a medium-sized trefoil-mouthed jug

temple given by the unpublished Field Diary, and bearing in mind that such rubbish dumps of accumulated throw-outs cannot be used for accurate dating purposes, this isolated sherd is not considered as sufficiently reliable evidence for the occurrence of bichrome ware in Stratum X.

¹ Pl. 50: 9.

² Pl. 50:27.

³ Fig. 346.

⁴ Skeleton H, above metre stick.

⁵ Fig. 401, Square N 12.

⁶ Burials A, B, C, G, H, J and K.

which in shape resembles and combines features of Nos. 3 and 4 from House Z.¹ Attributed to burial A is a jug, Type B1(b), decorated in the Cross Line Style, and it seems very likely that the two bichrome jugs originally formed part of the same group of offerings, since they are very close to one another in time.²

T. 2098 contained three vessels of which one was a jug, Type A1(b). There was also a splaying-sided bowl with ring base similar to No. 12 from House Z, and a burnished cylindrical juglet with double handle,³ such juglets—with single-strand handle—also occurring with bichrome decoration (Type E1(a)).

Another tomb which should be considered here is T. 2117, despite the fact that it has no bichrome ware among its contents. These included a large storage jar decorated with horizontal banding over the shoulder and neck, filled with a criss-cross pattern in red.⁴ While it will be shown that vessels decorated in one colour only, even when occurring together with bichrome ware, presage the period of the latter's decline,⁵ the remaining four vessels in the tomb, as well as the jewellery found in position, all indicate that it should be considered as contemporary with the other tombs discussed above and also with those at other sites (especially at 'Ajjul). Besides the large storage jar with handles at mid-body and red decoration on the upper part, the repertoire included a large trefoil-mouthed jug, a second large jug and two shallow, but markedly carinated bowls. These two jugs greatly resemble those from House Z (Nos. 4 and 3), while the two bowls—which recall earlier MB II shapes—are related to the larger carinated bowl from that assemblage.⁶ The tomb, in which, apparently, two skeletons of adults were found and also the traces of an animal,⁷ contained a great deal of delicately-worked jewellery, including an elaborate pair of "winged" ear-rings in gold and fayence, an embossed gold head filet, found *in situ*,⁸ two silver rings, a knobbed gold toggle pin with attachment for bead head, four other gold ear-rings with bars of small fayence beads, and the remains of necklaces composed of beads of crystal, amethyst, fayence, and gold with paste inlay. The latter were found, together with a silver scarab ring and the gold

¹ Pl. 50: 27 and compare Pl. 133: 14 and 15.

² Pl. 49: 8, attributed to burial G and Pl. 51: 7, attributed to burial A.

³ Pl. 50: 3.

⁴ Pl. 52: 2.

⁵ See 102 under.

⁶ Pl. 53: 17 and No. 17.

⁷ See text under fig. 341.

⁸ Fig. 342.

toggle pin, close to the shoulder of one of the skeletons; and despite the rather every-day quality of the pottery, it may be inferred from the jewellery that the tomb was that of persons of some substance.

T. 2104 was published as belonging to Stratum VIII, but the repertoire is such that there is every reason to consider it as contemporary with the later tombs from Stratum IX. Its contents included: a juglet, Type A1(a), a shallow bowl, Type B2(a)—albeit decorated only in black—two dippers, a bronze spearhead, a twisted gold toggle pin and a squat alabastron. Reviewing this repertoire, the following points should be noted: although decorated only in black, the shallow bowl belongs to the same class as those decorated in bichrome; of the two dipper juglets, one has no pinched rim¹ but otherwise closely resembles No. 18 from House Z, being both similar in shape and burnished; the second dipper² recalls three from T. 3013 and belongs to a category which developed later into the dipper with “baggy” body, characteristic of Stratum VIII. The presence of the black-decorated bowl and the last-mentioned dipper are an indication that this tomb should be considered as coming towards the end of the bichrome ware period.

T. 2132 contained only three vessels: a jug, Type A1(c), a burnished dipper with pinched rim of the kind found in House Z (No. 18) and a bowl in Monochrome Ware.³ Another group with a very similar repertoire to that just described was found in T. 75:⁴ a jug, Type A1(c); a burnished dipper with pinched rim,⁵ greatly resembling No. 18 from House Z, and two black lustrous juglets with flat base and handle from immediately below the rim.⁶ Black lustrous juglets occur in association with bichrome ware in a number of contexts: at Megiddo, also in T. 3004 and T. 2009; at Lachish, in T. 1555; at Hazor, in T. 8112; at Ras Shamra, in T. LIV; at Aniba, in T. 87. Returning to a consideration of Megiddo, it will be noted that the funerary offerings placed in T. 75 and in T. 2132 are almost identical in range, differing only in the inclusion of a Monochrome Ware bowl in the latter, while to offset this, the former contains two black lustrous juglets. While the Monochrome Ware bowl is Cypriote, in the writer's opinion the black lustrous juglets are not, these having developed

¹ Pl. 58: 14.

² Pl. 58: 5.

³ Pl. 54: 22.

⁴ *MT*, Pl. 41: 21-24.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. 41: 22.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. 41: 23 and 24.

from the common black lustrous ware, with typical MB shapes, which occurs frequently at Ras Shamra and other Syrian sites in the period preceding that of bichrome ware.¹ In the later contexts the globular black lustrous juglets exhibit just those hybrid characteristics which have been remarked upon in connection with bichrome ware shapes² and it is significant that these Cypriote-inspired influences should have been incorporated in different kinds of vessels contemporaneously. It should be noted that the black lustrous juglet occurs only rarely in Cyprus and is considered by Cypriote archaeologists to be Syrian,³ doubtless, also, because it is always wheel-made. Its frequent occurrence in bichrome ware contexts makes it one of the typical associated wares indicating as surely as those of the House Z assemblage that it is part of the same ceramic background.

T. 3004 has already been mentioned as containing black lustrous ware. In this tomb, in which two skeletons were found,⁴ there were two such juglets,⁵ as well as a cylindrical juglet, Type E1(a), a White Painted VI zoomorphic vase,⁶ fayence beads and a bronze crescent pendant. Although the shape of the zoomorphic vessel is quite different, it nevertheless belongs to the same class of ware as the tilted trefoil-mouthed juglet, No. 5, from House Z. This tomb was attributed by the excavators in the published report to Stratum VIII, but in the Field Pottery Register it was recorded as Stratum IX. In view of its contents, which tie in with so many tombs, as well as the House Z assemblage, the original attribution is to be preferred. On quite different grounds this tomb has been similarly dated by Åström,⁷ who considers that it belongs to the second quarter of the sixteenth century on the basis of the occurrence in it of the black lustrous juglet and the White Painted VI zoomorphic vase, which class of animal vessel is dated by him to Middle Cypriote III and Late Cypriote I.

T. 2009⁸ contains a similar range of pottery: a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a); a burnished dipper with pinched rim, resembling No. 18 from House Z;

¹ *Ug.* II, fig. 129: 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 14 and 15; H. Ingholt, *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes des fouilles à Hama en Syrie*, Pl. XVI: 4.

² See Chapter 1, introduction.

³ Gjerstad, *SPC*, 201; Sjöqvist, *Problems*, 55 and 86; Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, chart opposite 20.

⁴ Fig. 370.

⁵ Pl. 59: 5.

⁶ Pl. 247: 5.

⁷ Åström, *MCBA*, 224.

⁸ Fig. 408.

a black lustrous juglet,¹ a bone inlay box;² a fayence necklace with fayence-decorated pendants;³ gold circlet ear-rings;⁴ and a blue fayence figurine of the fertility goddess, having black markings to indicate the hair, facial features, jewellery, bodily attributes and cloak⁵—the above catalogue being typical of contemporary tomb repertoires.

In T. 3173⁶ there was a trefoil-mouthed Cross Line Style jug, Type B2(a) and a burnished dipper.⁷ The former is almost identical in shape with one from T. LXXXIV at Ras Shamra,⁸ though this latter tomb also contains Base Ring I jugs and should consequently be considered as coming towards the end of the bichrome ware period.

The above statement requires some elucidation; and in order to demonstrate its truth, two other Megiddo tombs may be cited, both of which contained, in addition to bichrome ware, Base Ring I Ware and red-decorated linear jugs. These are T. 3027 and T. 3018 A, of which the former was attributed to Stratum IX by the excavators and the latter to Stratum VIII. While it has been seen that T. 2117 contained a two-handled storage jar with a criss-cross decoration on the shoulder in red only, but was nevertheless considered—on the basis of the remaining artifacts found in it—to belong to the main bichrome ware period, the presence of jugs with red linear decoration is, in general, a sure indication of a later phase. Such jugs, whether with handle from rim (or immediately below) to shoulder,⁹ or with shoulder handle,¹⁰ are typical of the decline of bichrome ware and are not found during the initial period of its *floruit*.¹¹ Hand in hand with the use of red linear decoration goes the production of ungainly, less elegant shapes, the vessels having a distinctly debased character which makes them easily distinguishable from the true bichrome ware out of which they developed.

T. 3027 and T. 3018 A both contained not only bichrome jugs, Type A1(c),

¹ Pl. 51: 4.

² Pl. 195: 18 and fig. 344.

³ Pl. 212: 55.

⁴ Pl. 225: 10.

⁵ Pl. 241: 5.

⁶ Fig. 381.

⁷ Pl. 50: 15.

⁸ See section 5(a) under.

⁹ Pls. 48: 17 and 18, 49: 1, 57: 14, and *MT*, Pls. 41: 1, 42: 7 and 8.

¹⁰ Pl. 57: 1 and 2 and *MT*, Pls. 46: 14 48: 1 and 51: 6.

¹¹ See section 7 under.

but also red-decorated jugs,¹ and Base Ring I Ware.² In T. 3027, there was also a jug, Type A1(d) and a dipper with somewhat pointed base (a feature which is typical of the LB II shaved dippers). It is in a context of this kind, in which the vessels are characterised by features which are typical of the end of the bichrome ware period, that Base Ring I occurs. Thus, the presence of Base Ring I Ware must also be taken as an indication of the comparatively late date of an assemblage, even when there is bichrome ware in it.

A word must be said here concerning T. 3018, which contained multiple burials. Of these, burials C, D, E and F were attributed by the excavators to Stratum IX and burials A and B to Stratum VIII. It is not clear on what basis this attribution was made, nor what was the relation of the burials one to another. From the photographs,³ it would appear that a number of intact skeletons were found in the tomb together with their accompanying funerary offerings, but that there were also bones which were not in articulation. This applies to burial C in which scattered bones can be seen and where there is little sign of the ten vessels recorded as making up the accompanying funerary offerings.⁴ A glance at these is sufficient to demonstrate their lack of contemporaneity and from a typological point-of-view it would be surprising to find that they had been placed in the tomb at one and the same time. Among them there is a bichrome jug, Type A1(e) and two bowls (similar to Nos. 11 and 13 from House Z) which might well have been contemporary with it. Also probably belonging to the same group is a black lustrous juglet.⁵ The remainder of the recorded repertoire for this burial is certainly later, especially the biconical jug⁶ whose shape and decoration are characteristic of the debased bichrome forms which post-date the *floruit* of true bichrome ware; while the red-decorated jug with up-pointing triangles⁷ and the black lustrous jug, with long, wide neck and handle from mid-neck to shoulder,⁸ are both late types. The bichrome-decorated jug, with flat base and handle from mid-neck to shoulder, likewise belongs to a late category⁹, the shape and all-over scheme of decoration, as well as the shape

¹ Pls. 48: 18 and 57: 14.

² Pls. 51: 1 and 58: 20.

³ Figs. 353-356 and 364.

⁴ Register of Finds, 167.

⁵ Pl. 51: 4.

⁶ Pl. 49: 18.

⁷ Pl. 49: 1.

⁸ Pl. 51: 2.

⁹ Pl. 49: 10.

of the neck, marking it out as being related to similar jugs found in Cyprus which are examples of the more careless form of decoration which followed the peak bichrome period. The presence in T. 3018 C of vessels such as the last-mentioned, the biconical jug and the later type of black lustrous juglet leaves no choice but to infer that this burial was incorrectly recorded and that in all probability this was due to the confusion of non-contemporaneous funerary offerings which had been placed in the tomb during two successive periods of its use.

T. 3013 is another tomb group which, on the grounds of some of the vessels in it, should be placed at the end of the bichrome period. It contained skeletons of three children and one adult and the following artifacts: a jug, Type A1(c), decorated with a geometrical pattern characteristic of the decline of bichrome ware; a juglet, Type A1(a); a large coarse-ware bowl; a cooking pot of similar shape as No. 10 from House Z; a burnished dipper with pinched rim of the same type as No. 18 from House Z; three other dippers with piriform body and elongated concave neck, two of them burnished;² a burnished dipper with baggy body;³ another dipper of a type occurring frequently in the tomb groups discussed above;⁴ two lamps, similar to No. 7 found in House Z; a gold bead spacer; a single gold circlet ear-ring; and a bone whorl. While the above repertoire contains vessels which have their counterpart in the House Z assemblage, there are others which are later. Thus, the bichrome jug which has a decoration of up-pointing triangles in black and red, foreshadows the common use of this design element on later red-decorated wares occurring in the post-bichrome ware period, especially when combined with wavy lines⁵ and it would therefore seem to be a late bichrome vessel. Similarly, the distinctly baggy dipper is found later rather than in typical bichrome ware contexts.

Before considering related assemblages from other sites, it may be recalled that a red-decorated juglet⁶ was found in room 2114 in House Z, together with wares which, it has been shown, are usually associated with bichrome ware. In view of the assertion made above regarding the later date of wares decorated in one colour only, but in the bichrome style, it should not be forgotten that the

¹ Pl. 54: 3, with flat base.

² Pl. 50: 16.

³ Pl. 50: 18.

⁴ Pl. 50: 15.

⁵ Pls. 57: 2, 58: 3, 60: 5 and many others.

⁶ Pl. 49: 3.

House Z assemblage, while providing a valuable comparative group, nevertheless represents an advanced stage in the bichrome ware sequence, probably to be equated with the end of phase I.¹ This is borne out by the presence in the assemblage of the red-decorated juglet—but not of Base Ring I Wares—and also by the fact that the vessels were in use by the latest occupants of the house, which does not appear to have been rebuilt in subsequent strata.² It is not for this reason any the less representative; but the single juglet decorated in one colour presages the coming decline.

2. THE 'AJJUL ASSEMBLAGES

Because it is an integral group with a very typical pottery range, the House Z assemblage at Megiddo has enabled a more complete evaluation of bichrome ware to be made, so that it is seen to be not an isolated phenomenon, but part of the contemporary ceramic pattern. At 'Ajjul, it is difficult to find a corresponding house complex (with no intrusive material) which contains a comparable assemblage. However, during the first season's excavations a sector of the city's southern occupation level was dug³ which contained complete house structures as well as streets.⁴ Adjoining what Petrie designated as the "main house," was a room AW, which may have been connected with the shrine AF, with which it had a party wall. The following vessels are recorded as having been found in room AW:⁵ a sherd from a jug, Type A1(a), decorated in a characteristic manner, on the left side of which is part of a barred triangle from below the handle juncture, in continuation of the handle decoration;⁶ a sherd, showing the tail of a bird, from a krater, Type A1(a);⁷ two very similar carinated bowls with ring base,⁸ recalling, although considerably larger than the carinated bowl from House Z;⁹ a fragment from a splaying-sided bowl,¹⁰ of a type found in House Z; a miniature bowl¹¹ which would seem to have been

¹ See section 7 under.

² Compare position of House Z on figs. 402 and 403.

³ *AG I*, Pl. LIV.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 5, para. 23.

⁵ It is possible that there were other vessels, not specially drawn, which cannot be checked, since no detailed register of artifacts according to finds spots in the town area was published.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXIX: 18 and compare Pl. XLVIII: 57 H3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXIX: 8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXIX: 23 K25' and 23 K25''.

⁹ Fig. 8: 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVIII: 21W.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVII: 6 E14.

connected with some votive practice or may have been used as a lamp; an oval dipper juglet,¹ having a somewhat pointed base and handle springing from immediately below the rim; a White Slip I sherd;² and part of the perforated stand-section of a chalice sherd.³ The presence of the miniature bowl and the chalice sherd, both of which could be interpreted as having a cultic use, lends weight to the assumption that room AW was an adjunct of the shrine AF. The remainder of the repertoire, including the bichrome vessel sherds, is seen to be characteristic of the period and while exhibiting less domestic features than the House Z assemblage, is nevertheless close to it in time, though the former may be slightly earlier, since it contains none of those features which are indicative of the end of the bichrome period. As for the White Slip I sherd, it will be shown that, at 'Ajjul, such imports are present early in the bichrome ware period,⁴ so that its occurrence in the AW room does not provide grounds for an attribution to a late phase. In the AW group, the bird-decorated krater sherd corresponds to the fish-decorated kraters of House Z and in both contexts bichrome jugs occur, albeit of different shapes. Nor is this surprising, for while the narrow-necked jug, Type A1(a), appears to have been popular at 'Ajjul where it occurs in a number of groups, including tombs, it is not found at Megiddo, where the variants of the wider-necked jugs seem to have been in vogue (Types A1(b), A1(c) and A1(e)—the latter with shoulder handle).

The tomb groups from 'Ajjul must now come under review and their repertoires be evaluated in relation to the House Z assemblage from Megiddo. T. 17 contained a single burial with six vessels, of which one was a fish-decorated jug, Type A1(a)⁵, three were plain ware jugs,⁶ one a carinated bowl⁷ and one a dipper juglet.⁸ All three jugs have their counterparts in the House Z assemblage:⁹ 36 G4 greatly resembles No. 3, but has the trefoil mouth of No. 4; 59 R5, with shoulder handle, short neck and ring base, can claim a common ancestor with No. 1. Similarly, the carinated bowl, 23 K3, is a variant of No. 17. Only the dipper, 53 B3, cannot be matched at Megiddo, especially in view of what would

¹ *AG I.*, Pl. XLVII: 50 G2.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXIV: 99.

³ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVIII: 17B.

⁴ See Chapter 6, where it is seen that White Slip I is present in "Palace I".

⁵ Pl. IX: 1.

⁶ *AG I.*, Pls. XLV: 36 G4, XLVIII: 59 R5 and XLVI: 39 K5.

⁷ *CPP*, 23 K3.

⁸ *AG I.*, Pl. XLVII: 53 B3.

⁹ Fig. 8.

appear to be a button base. Thus it is seen that the overall range of the tomb's repertoire parallels closely the Megiddo tomb groups and the House Z assemblage.

Another tomb whose repertoire is characteristic is T. 1519. It contained the following three vessels: a jug, Type A1(a), a bowl with splaying sides and high ring base¹ and a White Painted VI juglet with sloping, trefoil mouth.² The jug is published as being decorated in black only but was, in all probability, originally in two colours, since faded; the bowl, with its high ring base, belongs to the same class as those from House Z;³ and the White Painted VI juglet is of the same category as the one found there.⁴

A comparable repertoire, but one having a far wider range, was found in T. 1517, which contained the following vessels: a jug, Type A1(a), a bowl, 12 G5 and a White Painted VI juglet—all of which have their counterparts in T. 1519; in addition, the group contained: a bowl, Type B1(a), decorated with Maltese Crosses,⁵ a Monochrome Ware bowl;⁶ and two spouted bowls with pierced ear handle and ring base.⁷ There was also a twisted gold toggle pin and a fragment of bone inlay.⁸ This tomb group resembles the bichrome ware assemblages at Megiddo, having a similar and very typical range, though the bichrome ware bowl with its decoration of Maltese Crosses does not occur there.⁹ Among the associated wares, the bowl and White Painted VI juglet can be matched by similar vessels from House Z, the Monochrome Ware bowl (with variant rim and handle) by that from T. 2134¹⁰ and the gold toggle pin by one found in T. 2104.¹¹ The somewhat unusual pots are the two small spouted bowls which may have been used as lamps, though there is no record of their retaining any marks of burning.

At 'Ajjul, as at Megiddo, tombs with multiple burials were not uncommon.

¹ *AG IV*, Pl. XLVII: 12 G5.

² *CPP*, 89 A.

³ Fig. 8: 11 and 12.

⁴ Fig. 8: 5.

⁵ Pl. VII: 14.

⁶ *AG IV*, Pl. XLVII: 19 N4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pls. XLVII: 18 N1 and LV: 64 A10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pls. XVIII: 98 and XXXVII: 101.

⁹ This type of decoration is not unique at 'Ajjul—See *AG V*, Pl. XXIX: 22.

¹⁰ *M II*, Pl. 54: 22.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. 223: 72.

Among them was T. 1717 which contained a considerable number of bichrome ware vessels and which consisted of a stone-lined pit which had a diameter of nearly 1.50 metres and a depth of some 1.65 metres. The detailed description of the finding of the contents,¹ together with the reference to the tomb having given the impression of being "disturbed" (despite the fact that the stone covering was in place when found), leave little doubt that it, too, had been subject to the same process of clearance as had occurred in other tombs in which interments had been made over a period of time. T. 1717 calls to mind T. 3018 at Megiddo (which was, however, situated in a square chamber, and not in a pit). In the latter, the burials fall into two groups belonging to two successive periods, of which that of the bichrome ware is the earlier, the later burials belonging to the period immediately following. In T. 1717, the only recognisable skeleton was found at the base of the pit,² while the majority of the bichrome pots were found in a broken condition in the so-called "Stratum V", which was close to the top. This would be accounted for had they been displaced from their original positions round the earlier burial (or burials) in order to make room for subsequent ones, such a process being bound to cause disorder in the pit.³ An examination of the tomb's repertoire only goes to confirm this, since it is unlikely that such a large number of vessels would have been placed round a single burial; neither do they form a homogeneous group.

Thus it is, only possible to indicate the vessels which in all probability were in association with the bichrome ware and, on the other hand, those which could not have been contemporary with it and must have been placed in the tomb at a later date. Among the vessels associated with the later burials are a large, squarish, two-handled jar⁴ and a small sherd of White Slip II ware⁵—sure indications of the tomb's later usage during a period which considerably post-dates that of bichrome ware. A sherd of White Slip I,⁶ a Base Ring I juglet⁷ and two bichrome-ringed footed bowls, Type C1(a), may also belong to a later period of the tomb's usage; but they could equally well belong to assemblages

¹ *AG* IV, 16-18.

² *AG* IV, 17, para. 50.

³ Note the finding of sherds belonging to the same pots at different "levels"—*ibid.* 16.

⁴ *AG* III, Pl. XXXII: 31 V 10.

⁵ *AG* IV, Pl. XLIII: 5B.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 5 A.

⁷ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVI: 89 J 1.

containing bichrome ware, since White Slip I was found in "Palaces" I and II,¹ Base Ring I is likely to occur towards the end of the bichrome period,² and a bichrome-ringed footed bowl occurs in another 'Ajjul tomb context, together with a figure-decorated krater.³ To the earlier burials can be attributed all the bichrome ware vessels, which comprised: two jugs, Type A1(a); a jug, Type B1(b); and two jars, Type A1(a). Among the plain wares, the following were probably in association with them: jugs, 34 Z 1, 34 Z 7, 34 Z 10' and 38 B 1, of which the first three are described in detail⁴ and are seen to be very like the larger jugs from House Z.⁵ Jug 60 Q9' can also be assigned to the earlier group, for while the neck is longer its shape recalls a bichrome jug found in another Megiddo house context.⁶ Jug 60 Q 18 also with a shoulder handle (and button) has a wide neck, as tall, almost, as the carinated body and recalls the shape of bichrome jugs, Type A1(e) and No. 1 from House Z. It, too, probably formed part of the grave goods round the earlier burials and when found was in a displaced position in "Stratum V", in close proximity to the majority of the bichrome ware.⁷ Next to it was found a large pedestal vase of alabaster, R 59, and it is likely that the second alabastron, R 37, also formed part of the earlier group.⁸ Two cooking pots are also recorded as having been found in the tomb, of which the one without handles is of the same type as those found in House Z and in T. 3013 at Megiddo.⁹

Reviewing the range of vessels found in T. 1717, it is surprising that there are only two bowls and one dipper, all of which could have formed part of either the earlier or later contexts. Yet despite the presence of a certain number of vessels which are transitional types, two distinct periods of the tomb's usage are easily distinguished. It is only the lack of more precise details—as is so often the case when there are accumulations of pots from previous burials—that makes it difficult to give clear-cut attributions in respect of a larger number of them. T. 1717 is important in that it contained such excellent specimens of

¹ See Chapter 6.

² See section 7 under.

³ See T. 1146 under.

⁴ *AG* IV 16, para. 49.

⁵ Fig. 8: 3 and 4.

⁶ Pl. XII: 4.

⁷ *AG* IV 17, para. 50.

⁸ Compare the non-carinated alabastron from House Z, fig. 8: 19.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLIX: 32 E 4 and fig. 8: 10.

bichrome ware belonging to diverse types which thus serve to illustrate their inter-relationship one to the other.

T. 167 is another tomb which has a very typical repertoire: a jug, Type A1 (e), probably with double shoulder handle; a large, splaying-sided bowl with high ring base which is very similar to those found in House Z;¹ and a large pottery stand with two elaborate handles.²

T. 1500 contained a total of four complete vessels and two sherds: a jug, Type A1(g); a plain-ware jug with tall, wide, neck fanning out towards the rim, which much resembles a jug from House Z;³ a two-handled storage jar with flat base;⁴ a dipper with handle from just below the rim;⁵ and two krater sherds, Type A1(a). One of these is decorated in black only, but uses design elements characteristic of the bichrome style; the other is decorated in two colours with a stylised tree. In view of the somewhat depressed body of the jug, which is decorated only with bands round the mid-body and below the rim and the monochrome-decorated krater sherd, this tomb group should be placed towards the end of the bichrome ware period, in phase II.⁶

In T. 1513 the repertoire comprised the following: a jug, Type A1(g); a large carinated bowl on high ring base;⁷ and a jug⁸ of the same type as one found in T. 1717, which much resembles that from T. 1500 and belongs to the same category as jugs found in House Z. Another tomb, T. 1920, contained only three pots: a jug, Type B1(c); a carinated bowl;⁹ and a footed bowl,¹⁰ recalling vessels in the House Z assemblage.

Two other tombs must now be considered in which the bichrome vessels were not jugs, as in most of the 'Ajjul tombs already discussed, but kraters. The first is T. 1903, which contained the only complete krater¹¹ among the many found at 'Ajjul, though strangely enough it is not illustrated in the

¹ *AG* I, Pl. XXXVIII: 21 B and fig. 8: 11 and 12.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. L: 96 L 3'.

³ *AG* II, Pl. XXX: 34 Z 8 (with two-strand handle) and fig. 8: 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXII: 43 C2'.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXIV: 51 P 5.

⁶ See section 7 under.

⁷ *AG* I, Pl. XXXIX: 23 K 22.

⁸ *AG* II, Pl. XXX: 34 Z 7'.

⁹ *CPP*, 23 K 21.

¹⁰ *AG* III, Pl. XXX: 17 V 7.

¹¹ Frontispiece.

published report, while the shape is erroneously shown as having only one handle and as being undecorated.¹ This krater, Type A1(a), is decorated in a characteristic manner, using typical design elements (including a bird and stylised tree); together with it were found a jug with angular, elevated handle and low carination line,² and a dipper with rather globular body.³ The jug is reminiscent of, but not identical with those from the House Z assemblage, while the shape of the dipper brings to mind the baggy dipper from T. 3013 at Megiddo.⁴ Another tomb whose repertoire contained a krater, Type A1(a), is T. 1146. Of this, only the upper part of the vessel was found, but it is sufficiently complete to make it clear that it was decorated with standard bichrome design elements. In addition, the tomb contained: a footed bowl, Type C1(a), two bowls (of different size) with splaying sides and high ring base;⁵ a cooking pot without handles;⁶ a lamp;⁷ and the lower half of what may have been another krater with some horizontal banding round the mid-body.⁸ While the bichrome krater, the two wide bowls, and the cooking pot are typical of the bichrome period, having parallels in the House Z assemblage at Megiddo,⁹ the flat high-footed bowl with bichrome bands on the inner surface, belongs to a class of vessel which occurs in the post-bichrome period, dated at Lachish by its occurrence in the Structure II Fosse Temple¹⁰ and at Ras Shamra by the presence of a similar bowl *outside* the entrance to T. LIV, where it is associated with the latest phase of the tomb's usage.¹¹ Decorated footed bowls of this kind were also found in T. 1717 and they were likewise considered as belonging to the end of the bichrome period—or even later.

T. 308 likewise contained a krater, which is decorated with geometrical design elements in black only. That this krater formed part of the tomb repertoire is not at first sight evident from the published data, since it is recorded as coming from LA 911.¹² In room LA and likewise in the neighbouring room

¹ *AG* IV, Pl. LI: 38 Q 4.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. XLIX: 34 U 8.

³ *AG* III, Pl. XXXVIII: 51 P 8.

⁴ *M* II, Pl. 50: 18.

⁵ *CPP*, 6 C 3 and *AG* II, Pl. XXXVII: 15 L 5.

⁶ *CPP*, 27 P.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 91 A 3.

⁸ *AG* II Pl. XXX: 33 G.

⁹ Fig. 8: 10, 11 and 12.

¹⁰ *Lach.* II, Pl. XLVI: 107.

¹¹ See 122 under.

¹² Pl. V: 2.

LE, the walls are shown at a considerably higher level than that at which the krater was found,¹ while the dividing wall between these two adjacent rooms is later in date.² On either side of this later wall, two graves were dug, T. 308 and T. 309, and despite their low level, Petrie was at pains to emphasise that both were later than the wall beside which they had been sunk.³ It is clear, then, that in rooms LA and LE, it was only the tombs 308 and 309 which were excavated down to such absolute low levels, far below the floor. That the black-decorated krater was, in fact, from T. 308 is emphasised yet again by Petrie's comment that it was found "on base level"⁴, which can only refer to the base of the tomb. Nor need it be a cause for surprise that this vessel was recorded without any indication that it had been found in a tomb at all, since such discrepancies are not infrequent in the report.⁵ Nevertheless sufficient evidence is published to show that a krater did indeed form part of the few funerary offerings from T. 308, since a vessel, Type 38 Q 4, is recorded as having been found in it⁶ and this can be no other than the above black-decorated krater. According to the Register of Tombs, a second vessel was also found here: an angular bowl with splaying sides and ring base, which belongs to the general category of bowls of this kind found in tomb after tomb both at Megiddo and 'Ajjul, as well as in the House Z assemblage.⁷ In the adjacent, and almost certainly contemporary T. 309 in LE, two vessels as well as jewellery were found, typical of that which in other contexts is frequently associated with bichrome ware, though none was actually present here. In T. 309 the repertoire consisted of the following: a jug⁸ which is a smaller form (with somewhat narrower neck) of a jug from House Z;⁹ a small deep carinated bowl¹⁰ of the same type as that from House Z;¹¹ a gold head fillet,¹² embossed with a design which is almost identical with that on the head fillet found

¹ *AG III*, Pl. XLVII.

² Shown in black on the above plan.

³ *Ibid.*, 3, para. 14 and 7, para. 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁵ An ear-ring found on a skull in the adjacent burial is likewise not given its tomb provenance, but the level in room LE at which it was found.

⁶ Register of Pottery, *ibid.*, Pl. LII.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXX: 12 G 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVIII: 57 F 2.

⁹ Fig. 8: 3.

¹⁰ *AG II*, Pl. XXVIII: 23 K 23.

¹¹ Fig. 8: 16.

¹² *AG III*, Pl. XIV: 6.

in position in T. 2117 at Megiddo;¹ and a single ear-ring with globules.²

In attempting to appraise the repertoires of the above "twin" tombs, both of which exhibit affinities with assemblages from the peak bichrome period, the presence in T. 308 of the black-decorated krater leaves no alternative but to attribute both to a later phase. This is likewise the conclusion to be drawn from the attribution of the architectural features of the rooms in which the tombs were situated. This again bears out the reliability of the interpretation that vessels decorated in only one colour indicate the decline of bichrome ware and should be attributed to a late phase of its usage.³

The above review of 'Ajjul assemblages containing bichrome ware—including the AW room which was situated in a predominantly urban area—emphasises yet again that it was integral to the range of contemporary pottery and occurred in association with specific types of plain wares. At the same time it is evident that bichrome ware exhibits at 'Ajjul those same characteristics which have been seen to be typical of it at Megiddo.

3. THE HAZOR ASSEMBLAGES

Although the excavation of the areas dug in the Lower City at Hazor reached a level at which bichrome ware could be expected to occur, it was only during the last two seasons that vessels and sherds began to be found in sufficient quantity to warrant the inference that here, too, it formed an integral part of the contemporary repertoire. With the publication of the final plates volume⁴ it becomes clear that not only in the Lower City was bichrome ware in use, but also on the tell, where the corresponding level has only been touched here and there and a few unstratified sherds have come to light.⁵ Such sporadic evidence would in itself be insufficient to enable any far-reaching deductions to be made; when, however, these sherds are seen as part of a far wider range, coming from both occupation levels and tomb groups in the Lower City, then their significance becomes apparent and they—like the rest—are seen in true perspective.

Most of the bichrome material comes from Areas F and H, where Stratum II of the Lower City was quite extensively excavated, though still not on a sufficient

¹ *M* II, Pl. 227: 5.

² *AG* III, Pl. XIV: 2.

³ See section 7 under.

⁴ *Haz.* III-IV—the text has yet to appear.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pls. CLVII: 33 and CXCVI: 18, from Area A, and Pl. CXCIX: 7 from Area B.

scale to make it possible to isolate reliable assemblages from house contexts comparable with that from House Z at Megiddo. This is due, no doubt, to the fact that in both these areas the buildings found were either places of worship or structures whose function was primarily connected with the practice of a cult. In addition to the above, bichrome ware also occurred in Areas C, D and E.¹ This material, while as yet constituting a relatively small group is nevertheless very characteristic and there can be little doubt that at Hazor—as at other contemporary Palestinian sites—bichrome vessels were in use, the examples found conforming both to the standard shapes as well as to the accepted design elements.²

In further support of this, T. 8112 in Area F can be cited as a typical group, having features in common with those already discussed. Eleven artifacts are recorded as making up the tomb repertoire, of which nine were pottery vessels, one a small steatite scarab³ and an ivory stopper, carved in the shape of the head of the goddess Hathor. The tomb contained the following: a jar, Type C1(a), two bowls on high ring base,⁴ a black lustrous juglet,⁵ a dipper with pinched rim,⁶ three lamps⁷ and a small alabastron.⁸ (The ivory stopper,⁹ will be discussed under). This group shows a marked resemblance to the House Z and contemporary assemblages at Megiddo, where bichrome ware occurs in association with very similar plain wares. Thus, while the two bowls from T. 8112 have slightly different profiles from those in House Z, their affinity is so close that they could be intermediate types;¹⁰ the dippers are of similar shape,¹¹ the lamps are closely-allied forms¹² and while the clay alabastron is more carinated than the alabaster vase from House Z, both have the characteristic flat

¹ *Haz.* II, Pl. CIX: 13—attributed to MB II, but found in Room 6199 where many of the vessels resemble those from House Z at Megiddo; *ibid.*, No. 32; Pl. CXVI: 14, 24 and 28—all from Area C; *Haz.* I, Pls. XCIX: 12 and CXXIV: 1 and 4, from Area D; Pls. CXXXII: 15 and CXL: 17, 18 and 19, from Area E.

² See also *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCCXI: 1-8, 12 and 13.

³ *Ibid.*, Pl. CCXLV: 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. CCXL: 1 and 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 3.

⁷ *Ibid.* Nos. 7, 8 and 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 10.

¹⁰ Compare *ibid.*, Nos. 1 and 2 with fig. 8: 13.

¹¹ Compare *ibid.*, No. 3 with fig. 8: 18.

¹² Compare *ibid.*, No. 8 with fig. 8: 7, both with rather pinched nozzle.

everted rim. No black lustrous juglet was actually found in House Z, but it has been seen that juglets of this kind occurred together with bichrome ware in contemporary tomb groups both at Megiddo and at other sites.¹ Thus T. 8112 can be considered as forming an integrated ceramic group which is typical of the main bichrome ware period.²

A word must be said here concerning the ivory stopper which was found in T. 8112, which might be considered as dating the whole context to the post-bichrome ware period. Heads of women, surmounted by a "spoon" or hand, were used as decorative stoppers for precious ointment-holders made of tusks and horns,³ and are frequently seen in the hands of Syrians bringing tribute on the walls of Eighteenth Dynasty tombs.⁴ Tusks carved as women are considered to be Canaanite,⁵ while the use of the head of the goddess Hathor in her capacity as lady of the toilet clearly indicates Egyptian influence, which is not inconsistent with an early Eighteenth Dynasty date. At Megiddo, similar twin heads, made of gold foil, were found in a treasure hoard in locus 3100,⁶ the pierced "spoon" showing that they had originally served as stoppers.⁷ That perfume-holders of this kind—especially when made of horn as opposed to ivory were objects of daily use at an earlier date, is borne out by the finding of a horn container surmounted by a bird's head and "spoon" in a basket together with toilet articles in a Seventeenth Dynasty grave at Qurneh;⁸ while an even more mundane use of such a container is indicated by an oil-horn surmounted by a wooden stopper in the form of a hand, found in a basket together with other carpenter's tools in a tomb at Thebes (date uncertain, but probably Eighteenth Dynasty).⁹ The stopper from T. 8112 would not, then, be out of

¹ See 100 above.

² See section 7 under.

³ Ivory-tusk vessels of this kind were probably in use in North Syria already in the MB II period—R. Amiran, "The 'arm-shaped' vessel and its family", *JNES* XXI (1962), 166.

⁴ N. de G. Davies, *The tomb of Rekh-mi-re^c at Thebes* I, 28, n. 58 and Vol. II, Pl. XXII; N.M. Davies, *Ancient Egyptian paintings*, Pl. XLII, from Theban tomb 63.

⁵ H. J. Kantor, "Syro-Palestinian ivories", *JNES* XV (1956), 167.

⁶ M II, Pl. 232: 5.

⁷ The date of the objects in the hoard can almost certainly be considered to be earlier than Stratum VIII, since articles of value were frequently in use for generations and note their position below the floor of Stratum VIII, *ibid*, figs. 55 and 56.

⁸ F. Petrie, *Qurneh*, 7 and Pl. XXV.

⁹ J. G. Wilkinson, *The manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians*, I, 401, fig. 172: 9. The oil horn is in the B.M. and the broken thumb in front of the hand-like scoop is clearly visible, though no fingers are indicated.

context in a repertoire which, on typological grounds, can be given a terminal date of c. 1500 B.C.

There is another burial in Area F which contains characteristic bichrome vessels. This is in locus 8130, from which more than twenty pots are recorded, although only two are designated as coming from the burial itself. In the absence of the text volume (accompanying the plates) it seems probable that there was a burial in this general locus, since so large a number of vessels would not ordinarily be placed round a single body. It is not pertinent to consider the whole assemblage here; but the extremely characteristic shape and decorative motifs of the two bichrome vessels should be noted: a jug, Type A1(e), which is typical of jugs of this category and a krater, Type A1(a),¹ which can be paralleled by similar vessels from practically any site where bichrome ware occurs.

It has been seen that whenever bichrome ware is found in association with other vessels decorated in only one colour, this is an indication of the end of the period of its use.² At Hazor, splaying-sided bowls decorated on the inner surface with concentric bands of red paint are a very distinctive feature of the LB I horizon.³ In two instances bowls of this kind occur together with bichrome ware and it is possible that the same inference should be made here as elsewhere, although in neither of these two small groups are there other criteria for a later phase of its usage, which the presence of Base Ring I Ware would inevitably give. While this may be due to chance, it may well be that bowls decorated in red on the inside should be considered as characteristic of Hazor. Whatever the case, the following are worthy of note: a fragmentary krater, Type A1(a), decorated with vertical geometrical band panels, was found together with a straight-sided bowl decorated with internal rings of red paint;⁴ two small krater fragments, Type A1(a)—one of which is decorated with the hub and spokes motif—were found together with a shallow bowl, Type B1(b),⁵ and with a straight-sided bowl with internal rings of red paint.⁶

It must be admitted that the above catalogue is a comparatively small one when compared with the quantity of bichrome ware—both published and

¹ *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXLII: 1-2.

² See 102 above.

³ *Haz.* II, 94.

⁴ *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXLIII: 23 and 3, from locus L 1 in Area F.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. CCLXIX: 31, 32 and 35.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. CCLXII: 15—from locus 2142, north of the Orthostat Temple.

unpublished—from Megiddo and 'Ajjul; but it cannot be over-emphasised that the bichrome material from Hazor is made up of typical vessels decorated in a characteristic manner, so that what has already come to light gives confidence to the expectation of wider and more complete assemblages when excavation at this important site is resumed.

4. OTHER PALESTINIAN SITES

Excavations at many sites have brought to light bichrome ware in greater or smaller quantities. Many of these were conducted over half a century ago when modern methods were unknown and when the documentation of finds was inadequate. Despite this, the important fact emerges that bichrome ware was indeed found and that it occurred in occupation levels where the ordinary folk lived (as opposed to "aristocratic" contexts). Thus at Tell el-Hesy sherds were found in City II and below the foundations of City III;¹ at Tell Ta'anach sherds occurred in a room of a house in the "Westburg";² at Ashkelon krater sherds were found in house contexts;³ while at Gezer most of the published sherds, which appear to be from kraters, Type A1(a), were found in unspecified findspots on the tell.⁴ Turning to sites excavated at a somewhat later date, it should be recalled that although no bichrome ware was recorded from Tell el-Far'ah, characteristic sherds occurred in an area—not very adequately dug—above the Hyksos gateway.⁵ These included krater sherds, Type A1(a), with figure decoration in the true bichrome ware style,⁶ as well as fragmentary jugs.⁷ At Lachish, two fine examples of kraters, Type A1(a), decorated with fish, birds quadrupeds and the spoked-wheel motif, were found in deposits of dumped rubbish in the Fosse,⁸ though the remains of the contemporary houses were not found. Other krater sherds also occurred, as well as a cylindrical juglet, Type B1(b),⁹ which formed part of a tomb group whose repertoire contained associated wares common in bichrome ware contexts (including black lustrous

¹ *MMC*, 61-3 and figs. 106-109 and Pl. 5: 189.

² Sellin, *TT* I, 49. See also sherd with fish from Level 16, Sellin, *TT* II, 14, fig. 13.

³ W. J. Phythian-Adams, "Report on the stratification of Askalon," *PEFQS* (1923), 60 ff.

⁴ *Gez.* II, figs. 324 and 333, *Gez.* III, Pls. CXL: 10 and 11—the latter upside-down—CLVII: 7 and 9, CLX: 7.

⁵ *BP* II, 29, para. 18.

⁶ Pls. XVI: 2, XVII: 2 and XVIII: 4.

⁷ Pls. II: 8 and XII: 2.

⁸ *Lach.* II, Pl. LVIII and *Lach.* IV, 35 and 65.

⁹ Pl. XV: 5.

juglets). At Beth Shemesh, some bichrome sherds are recorded. These, together with a complete krater, Type A1(b),¹ were found in and around two adjacent structures,² one of which is a house whose ground plan is very similar to that of other contemporary houses, in which a series of rooms is ranged round a court.³ The other building appears to have been used as a store-room and work-yard and it, too, was quite clearly in every-day use. Thus at Beth Shemesh—as elsewhere—bichrome ware vessels are seen to have formed part of the daily household wares. Another site where no bichrome ware is known to date, is Beth Shan, but evidence that it was not abandoned at this period is provided by an unpublished chamber tomb, T. 42, which contained the funerary offerings from many burials placed in it over a long period of time and dating to both before and after the *floruit* of bichrome ware. Among them is a jug, Type A1(c),⁴ as well as a number of vessels which can be paralleled in the House Z assemblage.

More recently sherds and vessels have come to light as a result of surface surveys and excavations at a number of sites up and down the country. Thus at Tell Mor (Tell Kheidar)—possibly an inland port for the city of Ashdod—bichrome ware was found in what seems to have been a pit containing the discarded offerings from a shrine.⁵ Most of this material comes from Level XII⁶ and it includes krater sherds, Type A1(a), with characteristic geometrical and figure decoration,⁷ a complete krater⁸ and a fragmentary krater,⁹ Type A1(b), a sherd from a jug in the Cross Line Style,¹⁰ part of a shallow bowl, Type B2(a)¹¹ and an unusually decorated goblet, Type A2(b).¹² Other vessels found in Level XII included footed bowls of a type similar to those from House Z and T. LIV at Ras Shamra,¹³ bowls resembling those found in bichrome

¹ Pl. VI: 3.

² *AS* III, Map IV and *AS* V, figs. 2 and 3.

³ Compare *M* II, fig. 242.

⁴ Pl. II: 3.

⁵ "Notes and News", *IEJ* X(1960), 123-124.

⁶ I am indebted to Dr. M. Dothan of the Israel Department of Antiquities, for having permitted me to examine this material and to use photographs and drawings prior to their publication.

⁷ Pls. XVII: 3 and XIX: 1 and 3.

⁸ Pl. VI: 4.

⁹ *BIES* XXIV (1960), 124, fig. 4: 4.

¹⁰ No. 365/72/60.

¹¹ No. 61/2/59.

¹² No. 365/1/60.

¹³ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 21: N.

ware contexts at 'Ajjul¹ and a Monochrome Ware bowl. At the same time, in Level XII there were other vessels and sherds, some of which cannot but be considered as slightly antedating the bichrome ware period, while others would appear to be later.² While the material from Tell Mor is important because of its individuality and at the same time because of its conformity, no reliable deductions as to the horizon of bichrome ware at this site can be made until further excavation brings to light additional evidence from well-stratified occupation levels. There can be no question, however, about its day-to-day use at Tell Mor, since its occurrence in association with what appears to have been a cult place to which worshippers brought their offerings, indicates a general use.

Isolated sherds of bichrome ware have been picked up on the surface at other southern sites, among them Tell Jemmeh and Tell Abu Hureireh³ (both of which have been suggested as candidates for Biblical Gerar); while during the course of excavations at Tell Nagila, a unique and at the same time typical figure-decorated krater was found in an occupation context in the eastern part of the tell.⁴

In the central region, excavations conducted at Tell Jerisheh, Jaffa and Bahān have likewise brought to light bichrome ware. At the former, most of the material is confined to krater sherds, Type A1(a), these being decorated with characteristic design elements, including the head of a fish and the hub and spokes motif.⁵ In addition, a large krater fragment was found decorated with the joined spoked wheels motif,⁶ which when used on kraters is confined to Type A1(b). At Jaffa, bichrome ware with both figure and geometrical decoration was excavated, including krater sherds, Type A1(a),⁷ sherds from Cross Line Style jugs⁸ and a jar, Type A1(b).⁹ The latter occurred in a context

¹ CPP, 23 K 3, from T. 17.

² These include a Red-on-Red spouted bowl and local wares whose shapes indicate a late MB II date, as well as Base Ring I bowls.

³ In the local collection at Mishmar Ha-Negev, Israel.

⁴ IEJ 14 (1964). I wish to thank Mrs. Amiran, Field Director of the Nagila Expedition and Mr. R. A. Mitchell, Director of the Institute of Mediterranean Studies, for kindly allowing me to examine this vessel and to study details of its decoration.

⁵ Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, Nos. 158 T, 183, 216, 237, 45 T and others.

⁶ Unpublished, in Hebrew Univ. collection, No. 412 T, decorated with three extant red-spoked wheels.

⁷ Unpublished, in Jaffa Mus., Nos. 1974/II, 4608/III, 3722/III and Pl. XVI: 5.

⁸ Pl. XIV: 5 and 6.

⁹ Y. Kaplan, *The archaeology and history of Tel-Aviv—Jaffa*, colour plate following Pl. 8 where bichrome jar and footed bowl are both shown.

together with a black lustrous juglet, a footed bowl and a large storage jar. This group is thus seen to tie in well with other bichrome assemblages—the footed bowl and the black lustrous juglet recalling similar vessels found together with bichrome ware at Megiddo and elsewhere. At Bahān,¹ black lustrous juglets of the usual types, as well as a number of exceptional shape, were found in three tombs which also contained bichrome ware. On the evidence of their contents, the tombs would appear to have been in use between the sixteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. Among the four hundred and more vessels found in them—unfortunately not in a reliably stratified context—four were bichrome, decorated with geometrical motifs, notably with lattice and ladder pattern panels, combined with diagonal strapping.² There were likewise in these same tombs a number of undecorated wares much resembling vessels from House Z at Megiddo and their presence makes it likely that together with the bichrome vessels, they formed part of a specific tomb group (or groups).

In the north, what would appear to be late bichrome ware sherds have been found on the surface at a number of sites, including Tell Rehov (Tell es-Sarem),³ Qarnē Hattin and Tell el-'Oreimeh.⁴ These are but isolated occurrences which nevertheless point to the extent and diffusion of bichrome ware.

An appraisal of the material discussed here, considered together with the evidence from those sites where bichrome ware has been found in well-stratified contexts, lends weight to the contention that bichrome vessels should be regarded as an integral part of the contemporary ceramic horizon and that they are to be expected at every site in Palestine which was flourishing during the sixteenth century B.C. and at major sites along the Syrian coast.

5(a) THE RAS SHAMRA ASSEMBLAGES

The importance of Megiddo and 'Ajjul for the study of bichrome ware has already been noted, since at these two sites an appreciably large area of the occupation levels was dug in which it could be expected to occur. In attempting to apply the same process of comparison of assemblages from town levels

¹ The tombs were cleared under the auspices of the Israel Antiquities Department to whom I am indebted for having been permitted to examine their contents and to refer to them here.

² Nos. 51/63 and 144/63—jugs; No. 67/63—juglet. There was also a footed bowl, No. IIIA/63, decorated on the interior with alternate bands of black and red.

³ *The Beth Shean Valley*, Pl. 21: 5, with bird's head.

⁴ Sherds in the Tiberias Municipal Museum—Tell el-'Oreimeh is the site of the city of Kinnereth mentioned in the Egyptian emissaries' list—see Chapter 5 under.

and tomb groups at the extremely important Syrian coastal site of Ras Shamra, it should be recalled that the bichrome ware level here was only revealed to any appreciable extent during the campaigns of the thirties,¹ and it is not possible to isolate complete assemblages from house complexes against which to evaluate the tomb groups. This does not mean that no bichrome ware was found in the town: on the contrary, a number of sherds are recorded from different points in the city, some of which are still unpublished. It is because of this sporadic occurrence that it is to be hoped that in the course of time, this stratum will be dug even more extensively. For, to judge by the tomb groups which contain an even more varied range of vessels, it is likely that the occupation levels will eventually yield bichrome ware as characteristic as at Megiddo and 'Ajjul. Nor is it the writer's opinion that life in the city of Ugarit was brought almost to a standstill about 1600 B.C. as the result of plague or some other natural catastrophe—a theory which has been put forward by the excavator.² It can therefore be confidently predicted that additional remains of the bichrome ware stratum will be brought to light as excavation opens up increasingly wider areas; for during a period of expanding trade and commerce, at a time when there were growing contacts between the political centres of the day, there is every reason to expect that the town of Ugarit, with its important harbour, would have been prosperous and flourishing—especially when it is remembered that the cities of the Asiatics had not yet felt the full impact of the Egyptian thrust to the north, which resulted from the successive campaigns of "conquest" under the Eighteenth Dynasty pharaohs.

Despite the lack of co-ordinated ceramic groups from occupation levels, there are a number of tombs in which pottery assemblages with both bichrome and its associated wares occur, though it should be borne in mind that some of them were in use over a prolonged period and exhibit all the expected signs of successive piling up of grave goods round the periphery which makes it extremely difficult to sort out associated vessels. One such tomb is T. LIV, in which were found eight recognisable skeletons and the bones from many more. According to the excavator, the tomb was in use from the eighteenth century

¹ Little bichrome ware has been published from the campaigns subsequent to the 1938 season. Isolated sherds have come to light in soundings made during subsequent seasons, notably *Ug. IV*, Pls. III: 12 and 18 (black-decorated krater sherd) and IV: 23. In 1961, a jug, Type A1(a), was found in the south acropolis area, *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie XIII* (1963), fig. 15, opp. 127.

² Schaeffer, *Strat. Comp.*, 27-28.

down to the fifteenth century B.C.;¹ but among the vessels shown as originating in the "lower layer," there are none which can be dated earlier than the seventeenth century.² In the so-called "upper layer," a number of characteristic bichrome ware vessels are recorded. A detailed examination of the data, however reveals three, rather than two distinct periods of usage, the bichrome and associated wares belonging to a well-defined middle period. That these antedate the latest groups of vessels is not overlooked by the excavator³ who considers them to be a link between the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. A close study of the published plans showing the position of the objects when found⁴ suggests the following interpretation: skeleton A⁵ was the latest interment to be made in the tomb; it was found lying intact just inside the entrance, with the funerary offerings round it, as originally placed.⁶ In front of the doorway—outside the chamber—three lamps and two footed bowls were found⁷ together with animal bones. It would appear that this deposit was in the nature of a last-minute offering, brought soon after the tomb door had been closed and not long after the last interment had been made within. Whatever the case, this little group of vessels and meat seems to have been connected with the latest burial, and consequently the footed bowl with black and red encircling lines on the inner side⁸ cannot be considered as belonging to the true bichrome period, since the latest burial post-dates this. Reverting to an analysis of the finds in the interior of the tomb, it should be noted that the vessels associated with skeleton A are shown in a circle round it.⁹ In the south-east corner of the tomb, a large storage jar¹⁰ is shown lying with its base *on top of* and touching vessels from the above encircling group, together with a pile of bowls resting upon it.¹¹ This jar should, therefore, also be considered as part of the grave goods accompanying skeleton A; and from their position, it is likely that a number of other vessels likewise

¹ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, 222.

² *Ibid.*, fig. 22; and see Åström, *MCBA*, 242, where the bottom layer is dated by him "to the 17th and early 16th centuries B.C."

³ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, 218.

⁴ *Ibid.*, figs. 17 and 18.

⁵ Skull shown on *ibid.*, fig. 17 and whole skeleton on fig. 18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 216 and Pl. XXI: 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fig. 19: C, A and B and Pl. XXI: 2.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 19: B, Type C1(a).

⁹ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 6, 7, 25-27, 42, 46-51, 53 and 70 and fig. 18: 71.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 52.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 28-32.

belonged to this assemblage.¹ In contrast, the pots shown adjacent to the northern sector of the east wall² would seem to form a separate group, possibly associated with skeleton B.³ Typologically, this latter group is close in time to the assemblage round burial A, but its position and the manner of its emplacement differentiate it from the vessels underneath, which lay heaped against the back of the chamber alongside the north-west wall. The latter belong to another group which includes three bichrome vessels, as well as a number of plain wares of a kind which are frequently found together in other contexts and it would seem likely that they had originally formed part of the grave goods round an earlier burial, or burials. When these were moved aside in order to make room for later interments (probably for A and B), the whole group was pushed together towards the back of the chamber. As found, they were lying in front of the "ossuary,"⁴ which can only be interpreted as representing the accumulation of bones from earlier burials. Thus when burial B was placed in the tomb, surrounded by funerary offerings, some of them were actually placed resting on the earlier agglomeration of pots.⁵

In this chronologically intermediate assemblage, which was later than the so-called "lower layer" and which antedates the so-called "upper layer", there was a total of fifteen vessels.⁶ Of these, three are decorated in bichrome: a storage jar, Type B1(b), a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a), and a krater, Type A1(b). Of the remaining vessels, the following can be identified⁷ and can be paralleled by similar vessels at Megiddo, also in association with bichrome ware: a White Painted VI globular juglet, with flat base and sloping, trefoil mouth,⁸ similar to that from House Z;⁹ a black lustrous juglet,¹⁰ whose shape resembles those from tombs 75, 2009 and 3004; a Monochrome Ware bowl¹¹ which recalls the bowl found in T. 2132; a wide, splaying-sided bowl with high foot,¹² and another which is more curvilinear in shape and has a shorter

¹ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 33-37, 44 and 45.

² *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 2-5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 19, 38-41.

³ *Ibid.*, fig. 18.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁵ Note especially the storage jars, *ibid.*, fig. 17: 2, 4 and 5, and jugs 9 and 12.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 1a, 8, 10, 11, 15-18, 20-25, 74.

⁷ Compare *ibid.*, 331-332.

⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 19: K = fig. 20: 3, upper right.

⁹ Fig. 8: 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 24 = fig. 21: E.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 18, not otherwise illustrated.

¹² *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 20 = fig. 21: Q.

foot,¹ both of them belonging to the general class of bowls found in House Z;² a plain ware jug with flat base,³ which recalls, but is not identical with two of the jugs from House Z.⁴ There are two other vessels which probably formed part of this assemblage, although they are shown on the plan for the "lower layer". These are a Monochrome Ware bowl⁵ and a black lustrous juglet,⁶ both of which were lying directly beneath the later vessels placed round burial B. While the black lustrous juglet might have been part of the repertoire of the later burials, it could not have been contemporary with the earliest and its position indicates that it is likely to have belonged to the intermediate group. Similarly, the Monochrome Ware bowl could not have belonged to the earliest grave goods in the tomb. This vessel has also been commented upon by Sjöqvist⁷ who includes it among his Early Monochrome Ware and considers its attribution to the tomb's lower level to be erroneous.

As regards the vessels from the funerary offerings placed round the earlier burial, or burials, it is clear that they, too, had been pushed aside in order to make way for subsequent interments and most of them would appear to have been moved to the south-east corner,⁸ while a number—notably the juglets—seem to have been cleared to the north eastern sector of the chamber. All these vessels belong to the period immediately preceding the appearance of bichrome ware and they give an indication of the earliest usage of the tomb.

T. LIV, then, is also of importance from the point-of-view of the evaluation of bichrome ware. For, not only does it contain an assemblage in which characteristic bichrome vessels are found in close proximity to the kind of contemporary wares usually associated with them in undisturbed contexts elsewhere, but the fact that the assemblage in which they occur represents an intermediate stage, falling as it does both chronologically and typologically half-way between the first and last periods of the tomb's usage, helps to place bichrome ware in its true perspective.

Another tomb containing bichrome ware, which was also in use over a

¹ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 17: 10 = fig. 21: R.

² Fig. 8: 13-14.

³ *Ibid.*, fig. 17: 21 = fig. 21: T.

⁴ Fig. 8: 3-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, fig. 18: 87 = fig. 22: N.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fig. 18: 88 = fig. 21: D.

⁷ Sjöqvist, *Problems*, 161.

⁸ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 18.

considerable period, is T. LXXV, of which scant information has been published. Considered by the excavator to be a collective tomb, probably in use from the late seventeenth century B.C.¹ and certainly down to the middle of the fourteenth century² it contained a large number of pots and a considerable accumulation of bones. It was situated in one of the well-populated quarters of the town of Ugarit at the foot of the eminence on which stood the temples of Ba'al and Dagon³ and it was a chamber tomb, although nothing is recorded concerning its shape, structure or dimensions, nor of the emplacement of the pottery in it when excavated. Despite this, it is clear that here, too, there had occurred the usual process of the pushing aside of the earlier burials in order to make room for the new, which is such a common feature of chamber tombs. If this is borne in mind, it renders redundant the categories shown under the drawings⁴ where a distinction is made between vessels found in the funerary chamber proper and artifacts found in the upper and lower layers of the ossuary. In view of the lack of published tomb plans, it is difficult to suggest with any degree of accuracy which vessels were associated together round succeeding burials. But here, also, there would appear to have been three distinct periods of usage, of which the second was that of the bichrome and associated wares. It is this phase of the tomb's usage which is pertinent here and it is submitted that the four bichrome vessels all belong to it. These comprise: a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a); a Cross Line Style juglet, Type B1(a); a cylindrical juglet, Type A1(b), which is published as decorated in black only, but which is presumed to be in two colours,⁵ and a shallow bowl, Type B1(a). Of the associated wares, it is very likely that the Monochrome Ware bowl⁶ and the White Painted VI juglet⁷ formed part of the same group since both types of vessel are common in bichrome ware contexts. It is likely, then, that the above six vessels made up the deposit placed round a single burial and that this

¹ *Idem, Strat. Comp.*, 28.

² *Idem, Syria* XX, 280.

³ *Idem, Strat. Comp.* 28.

⁴ *Idem, Syria* XX, figs. 3-5.

⁵ On the basis of the close similarity with a cylindrical juglet from T. 10 at Milia, Pl. VII: 1 and 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, fig. 3: K.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fig. 4: J—but note the circular rim in place of the more usual sloping trefoil mouth, as in House Z. Compare also the White Painted VI juglet with narrow neck and splaying rim, *Sed. I*, Pl. XLV: 69. See in this connection Åström, *MCBA* 263, note 1, where the Ras Shamra juglet is considered to be “of late Hyksos date”.

represented the sole use of T. LXXV during the bichrome ware period.

Another tomb containing bichrome ware is T. XXXV. It does not appear to have been in use over a long period, since all six vessels found in it are contemporary. Only one of them, however, was published.¹ This is the upper part of a jug, Type A1(a), which is decorated with three vertical, bichrome-framed band panels filled with the lattice motif. In the excavator's collection there is a smaller sherd from a very similar jug, decorated in black and orange; while half of the upper body of a third jug (in the Mus. du Louvre collection) is decorated with the same motifs, with the addition of a narrow bichrome panel introduced between the two wider ones.² All three jugs have a barred triangle below the handle juncture—on the first two, in black, on the last-mentioned, in bichrome. The neck of this jug is shorter than that of the first and also rather shorter than is usual on jugs of this type; it is banded regularly in black above bichrome at its base. Despite minor differences, these three jugs resemble one another closely and all three belong to the same category. The fourth vessel found in the tomb is a Cross Line Style juglet, Type B2(a).³ In shape it is reminiscent of the White Painted VI juglets so frequently found in association with bichrome ware, while its decoration is typical of Cross Line Style vessels, although it is unusual to find both neck and handle undecorated. The fifth vessel from this group is a splaying-sided bowl with ring base⁴ which is similar to the bowls from House Z.⁵ There was also a sherd from a sixth vessel which may have been Red-on-Black Ware. Since no further information is recorded in the excavator's Field Notes, this sherd cannot be used as dating evidence; but its presence in the T. XXXV assemblage would by no means be out of context.⁶ In T. XXXV there is a preponderance of bichrome over other wares, while three of the jugs belong to the same type of vessel. A further point to note is the apparent absence of figure decoration, though this by no means detracts from the value either of the vessels themselves or from the tomb group as a whole. By virtue of its having contained a single burial, rather than a succession of burials covering a long period of usage, T. XXXV provides

¹ *Ug.* II, fig. 98: 15.

² Pl. I: 7-9.

³ Pl. XV: 4.

⁴ Unpublished, No. RS 8494.

⁵ Fig. 8: 11 and 12.

⁶ Åström, *MCBA*, 163. See also the finding of Red-on-Black Ware in "Palace II" at 'Ajjul, *AG* III, Pl. XXX: 10 U2.

valuable additional evidence of the existence of a bichrome ware level at Ras Shamra.¹

Another tomb containing a single burial is T. LXXXIV. Of the five vessels published as being found in it, one² may have belonged to the repertoire from T. LXXV³ and since, on typological grounds, it would seem to be somewhat earlier, it is extremely likely that it belongs to the earlier burials from that tomb. The four vessels found together in T. LXXXIV were: a Cross Line Style jug, Type B2(a); a jar, Type A1(a); and two Base Ring I jugs.⁴ The presence of the latter in this group indicates that it belongs to a late phase and this may also be inferred from the use of black-framed, down-pointing triangles as decoration on the upper neck register of the jar.⁵ The trefoil-mouthed Cross Line Style jug shows a striking resemblance to that found in T. 3173 at Megiddo, although the height and decorative motifs used are different.

Reviewing the above four Ras Shamra tombs, it will be seen that they cover the whole span of the bichrome ware period, their sequence being as follows: T. XXXV, T. LXXV, T. LIV and T. LXXXIV. This only emphasises the likelihood of there being an extensive contemporary occupation level in the town of Ugarit itself, yet to be revealed by the excavator's spade.

5(b). THE NORTHERN LITTORAL

It has already been remarked that there is little known bichrome material whose provenance is from that sector of the coast which stretches from Haifa Bay to Ras Shamra. The reason for its non-discovery rather than its non-occurrence along this littoral is due to the relatively limited areas that have been excavated—or excavated down to appropriate levels. Historical considerations all point to a common cultural background during the greater part of the second millennium and to a related pattern of ceramic development in Northern Palestine and the Lebano-Syrian coastal plain. Thus particular importance attaches even to smaller sites where traces of bichrome ware have been found.

Such are Tell Sukas and Qal'at er-Rus, situated south of Ras Shamra, at, which soundings were made over twenty years ago and at the former of which

¹ Information concerning this tomb has kindly been communicated verbally by Professor Schaeffer.

² *Ug*, II, fig. 67: 1.

³ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁴ *Ibid.*, fig. 67: 3 and 4.

⁵ See section 7 under.

excavations conducted by a Danish expedition are again in progress. In the earlier soundings at Tell Sukas, at least four bichrome krater sherds were found showing both geometrical motifs and figure decoration.¹ Another sherd, from Qal'at er-Rus, is decorated with a wide, vertical black panel bordered in bichrome from which black lines run obliquely² and this is probably from a jug (or juglet) decorated in the Cross Line Style. The description of the fabric of these sherds³ strengthens their interpretation as bichrome ware; while a more recent pointer to the existence of a contemporary stratum at Tell Sukas was the finding of a number of bichrome sherds from a single krater in a mixed fill between two floors in a later house from Level 11 (dated to the fourteenth century B.C.), these being decorated in bichrome with characteristic motifs.⁴ While no stratigraphical deductions can be made from a fragmentary krater found in secondary usage of this kind, its very presence provides further evidence of a bichrome ware level at Tell Sukas. It seems reasonable therefore to suggest that bichrome ware was in use south from Ras Shamra and north from the Haifa-Acre region, along that part of the coast which has not yet been extensively excavated. In substantiation of this, it should be noted that two sherds decorated in black, but in the bichrome ware style, are recorded as having been found in a small sounding made at Tell Keisan, in the Plain of Acre, which can probably be attributed to Level XIV.⁵ While it has been shown that decoration carried out in one colour only is indicative of a late phase of bichrome ware, the finding of these two sherds lends colour to the supposition that there are also earlier examples of the ware at this site, where work was interrupted and was not later resumed. Likewise, at Nahariya, situated a little further north and actually on the coast, some bichrome sherds were found in a slightly later context than that of the Middle Bronze Age temple which was the chief object of excavation there,⁶ implying that there was in all probability a

¹ Ehrich, *EPJR*, Pl. Pl. XXIV (top)—upper mid-right: back and legs of bird; lower left: Maltese Cross, and Pl. XVI: 8; lower centre: krater rim with bichrome bands; lower right: bichrome-bordered vertical band panel with fish(?), tail visible to right.

² *PEQ* 1965, Pl. XV: 29.

³ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁴ Unpublished information kindly communicated by Dr. P. J. Riis, Copenhagen.

⁵ "Excavations in Palestine, 1934-5", *QDAP V* (1935), 207-8 and unpublished pottery notes by I. Ben-Dor, in I of A.

⁶ Not illustrated—M. Dothan, "The excavations at Nahariya: Preliminary report (Season 1954-55)", *IEJ* VI (1956), 22.

bichrome ware stratum somewhere in the vicinity (though the site of the town has not yet been located).

Recent excavations at Akhziv, which have hardly touched the bichrome level here, have brought to light a typical sherd decorated with the joined spoked wheels motif. This was found together with a sherd of Red-on-Black Ware in a context which cannot yet be precisely dated, but which is considerably earlier than the eleventh century "Warrior's" cist grave (below which it was found in the debris of a collapsed wall) and which would appear to belong to the end of the MB II or the early LB I phase.¹

In presenting such sporadic and unstratified evidence, the intention has been to stress the likely results of reliable excavation along the northern littoral. For just as in the southern and central regions present-day knowledge must nevertheless take account of surveys and soundings made many decades ago² and of inadequately stratified excavations at such sites as Gezer, so in the north no scrap of evidence can be ignored which goes to show that bichrome ware was part of the contemporary pottery repertoire and was in daily use there.

6. PERIPHERAL REGIONS

(a) *Cyprus*

It has been seen that by a comparison of assemblages from tomb groups and occupation levels it has been possible to follow the stages in the development of bichrome ware in relation to the range of associated wares found together with it and thus to place each successive phase in an appropriate horizon. This method can, unfortunately, only be applied to a limited degree in Cyprus since it is difficult to isolate reliable comparative assemblages from undisturbed contexts and much of the relevant material comes either from a general provenance, lacking all details as to findspot, or it is altogether of unknown origin. At sites where tombs containing bichrome ware have been excavated, the stratification is often uncertain, as at Milia, where not only was the cemetery robbed both before and during the excavations, but where many sherds and fragments were not even recorded.³ This applies equally to the tombs at

¹ Pl. XVI: 10—I wish to thank Mr. M. Prausnitz, Field Director of the Akhziv Expedition, for kindly having allowed me to photograph these sherds and reproduce one of them here; also for having placed at my disposal all the known details regarding their context.

² F. J. Bliss and R.A.S. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine during the years 1898-1900*, Pl. 37: 14 and probably other sherds, difficult to identify from the drawings.

³ The residual material is now in the Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm.

Dhenia, Archangelos and many other sites; and it is especially true of tombs which were in use over a long period and which did not necessarily have a continuous usage. It is, then, of importance to be able to point to a complete tomb group consisting of a single burial. Such was T. 9 at Maroni, which was excavated during the last century and which included two bichrome vessels among the funerary offerings. These were: a tankard, jug Type A1(d), and a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a), the remaining two pots being a Base Ring I jug and juglet.¹ The presence of the latter indicates that the whole group should be placed towards the end of the bichrome ware period.²

Another tomb with bichrome ware, which had been used for at least two burials, is T.I at Akhera, situated in Central Cyprus.³ The finding of the remains of two skeletons is recorded; but the quantities of pottery and especially of jewellery and weapons, would seem to point to a much larger number of burials, this being further borne out by the occurrence of pottery in a broken condition which had been pushed aside in order to clear a space for the two burials found. Much of this can be dated to Middle Cypriote III, but the presence of Proto-White Slip Wares indicates that the tomb was also in use during the earlier part of Late Cypriote I. Among the funerary offerings found here was a zoomorphic vessel in the shape of a ram, decorated in bichrome with a variation of the hub and spokes motif.⁴ This animal vase is clearly inspired by those of the White Painted V-VI class,⁵ some of which were exported to the mainland and occur in contexts together with bichrome ware.⁶ The bichrome-decorated ram is an example of the fusion of Cypriote traditional forms with those of contemporary Syro-Palestine, and it can be considered as a conscious attempt on the part of the makers of the pot to cater for the Cypriote market. Described as being "d'une facture bichrome syrienne", the zoomorphic vessel from Akhera was found not far from the copper mines of Mitsero, which at this time were undoubtedly sending much of their output to the mainland, and its occurrence in a tomb whose latest usage can be dated to the early sixteenth century provides additional evidence of the reciprocal trade between the two regions and demon-

¹ Walters, *BMCV*, Nos. C 134 and C 147.

² See section 7 under.

³ V. Karageorghis, "Chronique des fouilles à Chypre en 1960", *BCH*, LXXXV (1961), 310.

⁴ Pl. XX: 3.

⁵ Åström, *MCBA*, 76-77 and fig. XVIII: 2 and 3.

⁶ T. 3004 at Megiddo; and at Ras Shamra, originally in a tomb context, probably with a Cross Line Style jug—*Ug.* II, fig. 74: 20 and 18.

strates that already then, distinctive, bichrome wheel-made wares were being imported into Cyprus. Another bichrome-decorated animal vase (in the form of a bull) was also found in Cyprus, in T. 24 at Maroni. Bichrome vessels of this type have not been found as yet either in Palestine or Syria and this only serves to emphasise the plausibility of the supposition that they were made specially for shipment to the island.

A similar case is that of tankards—likewise wheel-made—whose shape is essentially Cypriote in inspiration, but whose decoration conforms to the accepted bichrome ware canons and which seem to have been made primarily—though not only—for the Cypriote export market. Large numbers of them have been found in Cyprus, but for the most part in uncertain contexts. They occur in tombs at Enkomi (Swedish T. 13 and French T.V), both of which were in use over a prolonged period. For this reason most of the pots were not found as originally placed, but in positions to which they had been moved when the tomb chambers were cleared in order to make room for the later burials. In T. 13, a tankard was found on the floor, close to the wall of the chamber,¹ while on top of it were lying three Monochrome Ware bowls.² It is tempting to surmise that these four vessels had in their original emplacement formed part of the same repertoire, but there is no certainty for such an assumption and there are no means of determining with what other vessels the tankard was in the first place associated.

A very similar situation prevails with regard to T.V,³ which was in use for a long time with a considerable intermediate period of non-usage. The earliest burials appear to have been placed in the tomb in Middle Cypriote III (excavator's "couche I"), while the latest burials, found in position with their accompanying funerary offerings, can be dated to Late Cypriote III. The plans show that the tomb had been cleared at various periods in order to make room for new occupants, and incomplete skeletons together with the accompanying offerings were found pushed back to a less central position in the tomb.⁴ A tankard⁵ was found close to the inner wall of the chamber, and on its left lay a Monochrome Ware bowl.⁶ Somewhat further to the left and above the

¹ *SCE* I, 527, fig. 201: 13, No. 162.

² *Ibid.*, Nos. 160, 161 and 163.

³ For plans, see Schaeffer, *E-A*, Pls. XXXV-XXXVIII.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVIII.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXVIII: 265.

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 266

latter was a White Painted VI juglet, with sloping trefoil mouth¹ of the same type as that found in House Z at Megiddo,² a second similar juglet lying close to it.³ Both these juglets could have formed part of the same group as the tankard, as could also the Monochrome Ware bowl, and, possibly, two others which were lying somewhat apart to the right of the tankard.⁴ At the same time, immediately beyond the first White Painted VI juglet and closer to the wall of the tomb, was found a White Painted Wheel-made jug⁵ upon which were lying two Base Ring I juglets⁶ and there can be little doubt that the former post-dates the bichrome tankard. This is an illustration of the uncertainty of interpretation of artifacts found in tombs with a prolonged usage, when it is often impossible to disentangle the successive groups of pottery. For similar reasons the second bichrome tankard from this tomb⁷ which was found in a fragmentary condition scattered over the floor of the chamber, cannot be assigned to a specific group, since it was almost certainly broken in antiquity when the burial and accompanying grave goods of which it formed part were pushed aside. Thus, in spite of careful documentation during excavation, the majority of the Cypriote tombs afford little conclusive evidence of integrated assemblages from successive burials, and just because of this, it is to be regretted that, to date, only a few buildings from corresponding occupation levels have been uncovered from which contemporary pottery groups could provide valuable comparative material.

The fortress at Nitovikla, therefore, is of special significance,⁸ since to some extent it is able to fill this gap. This building (which is later than the earliest settlement at the site), was erected towards the end of Middle Cypriote III. Two main periods of occupation were distinguished (referred to as Periods IIA and B, and IIIA and B), the earlier of them corresponding in part to the period of bichrome ware. It is fortunate, then, that among the overwhelming preponderance of plain, coarse-ware sherds found in the building there are a number of bichrome sherds, some of which come from findspots in well-defined rooms

¹ Schaeffer, *E-A*, Pl. XXXVIII: 274

² Fig. 8:5.

³ *Ibid.*, No. 269.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Nos. 262 and 263.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 270.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Nos. 271 and 272.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fig. 77: 5.

⁸ *SCE* I, 371 ff.

of the fortress. A few of these have been published,¹ but many have not.² A total of twenty-three bichrome sherds is recorded as having been found on the floor of the "kitchen",³ which belongs to the earlier phase of the building. Among these, are a number of krater sherds, which although only small, show some kind of figure decoration.⁴ It has already been seen that kraters are more commonly found in house contexts than in tombs, and it is symptomatic that at Nitovikla (which has provided the largest number of krater sherds of any one site in Cyprus), it is in the rooms and courtyard—where the garrison was presumably quartered—that these fragments were found. It is all the more to be regretted that other typical wares, usually found together with bichrome vessels, cannot be isolated among the ceramic material from the fortress, but most of this consisted of fragments and sherds from large storage jars and coarse cooking pots, no complete vessels being found at all.⁵ In addition to the above krater sherds, a number of sherds from a shallow bowl, Type B1(a) was found in the courtyard close to the altar. The bowl is decorated with a characteristic motif and greatly resembles similar bowls from other sites,⁶ providing an additional indication that the first phase of the stronghold coincides with the bichrome ware period, when a wide range of vessels was being imported to the island from the mainland.

On the basis of the evidence from the tombs alone, the vast majority of the bichrome vessels found in Cyprus would appear to be jugs of various shapes and especially tankards. But this is an impression which may well be corrected as more excavations reach well-defined occupation levels. The figure-decorated krater sherds and the very typical shallow bowl from Nitovikla, the surface find at Enkomi of a large bichrome krater⁷ and the occurrence in tombs 10 and 12 at Milia of krater fragments,⁸ all point to the real balance which can be expected from a less one-sided knowledge of bichrome ware sites in Cyprus, and, in time, they may prove to be very similar in range to those of the mainland.⁹

¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. LXX: 3 a-d.

² The residual material is now in the Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm.

³ *Ibid.*, 405-406.

⁴ Pl. XVII: 4-6.

⁵ *SCE* I, 403.

⁶ See Chapter 3, section 2 and Pl. VII: 15.

⁷ Pls. VIII: 1 and XX: 1.

⁸ Pls. V: 4 and XVI: 3.

⁹ It should be noted that a hand-made tankard of typical Cypriote shape, decorated in two

(b) *Alalakh*

North-east of Ugarit, beyond Mount Cassius, lay Alalakh, the capital of a sub-kingdom closely associated with the more powerful kingdom of Aleppo. Here, too, bichrome ware was found in findspots unconnected with burials and coming in one instance from a building with a floor (the later Level VI fortress). However, the impression gained from the report of the excavations that throughout Level V "the polychrome ware with the 'Union Jack' motif is relatively common",¹ is not borne out by the published drawings, by the Field Pottery Register, or by the residual material. All these sources together yield a total of five fragmentary vessels decorated in the bichrome style. One of these is from Level VI and four are from Level V, while on only two of them is the hub and spokes motif used.² These sherds are mostly from kraters, Type A1(a), and no jugs or juglets of any kind appear to have been found. The following vessels in bichrome were found in Level V: a large sherd from the shoulder of a krater decorated with figures of fish and a bird,³ almost certainly forming part of a composite scene.⁴ This krater is typical not only because of the theme and stylised manner of the decoration, but also because of its shape. It was found in a rubbish-pit attributed to Level V in a sounding made beneath the central courtyard of Niqme-pa's Palace.⁵ A second krater sherd which is decorated with characteristic geometric motifs likewise comes from a pit (No. 3 in Level V).⁶ Its decoration consists of diagonal bichrome strapping on the shoulder, between vertical band panels composed of wavy lines between straight bichrome bands. Both the geometrical design elements used and the ware are typical. A third krater sherd with the figure of a bird in browny-black was found in Level V.⁸ From the drawing, this sherd would appear to belong to a late phase of bichrome ware, since it is clear that only one colour is used

colours (No. 59 from T. 2) was found at Stephania. The vessel comes from a robbed deposit, not yet published. The cemetery contained Late Cypriote forms which are earlier than those hitherto considered as marking the beginning of the period.—J. B. Hennessy, *Stephania. A Middle and Late Bronze-Age cemetery in Cyprus*. See, also, Åström, *MCBA*, 190 and 224.

¹ *Al.*, 387.

² *Ibid.*, Pls. XCIV: b and XCVI: d.

³ *Ibid.*, Pl. XCV: ATP/48/64.

⁴ See Chapter 2, section 5.

⁵ *Al.* 106 ff. and fig. 43a.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. XIX: 2.

⁷ Unpublished, in Field Pottery Register, ATP/47/106.

for the decoration, both in the painting of the bird's beak, neck and head and in the vertical band panel composed of two narrow wavy lines between two broader bands. Also attributed to Level V is a rather unusual bichrome ware fragment from the base of a pottery stand whose decorative details have already been discussed.¹ Apart from these four sherds, there is no record of any other bichrome ware in Level V, so that it is difficult to understand the excavator's statement concerning the frequency of its occurrence in this stratum. In addition to the above, another krater sherd was found in a well-stratified findspot in the later phase of the Level VI fortress.² This is the only instance of bichrome ware in Level VI, although it might be inferred from the published report that other "polychrome" vessels had also been found.³ This is somewhat misleading, since the other fragments referred to and illustrated as being decorated with geometrical, or bird and animal motifs, cannot be considered as bichrome ware and are quite clearly examples of Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware, on which the decoration is carried out in a dark paint on a light ground.⁴ It is this latter ware which was indigenous to Alalakh,⁵ while the few examples of bichrome ware found there were undoubtedly imported—probably from near-by Ras Shamra — as was the case at Tarsus, where a single imported bichrome krater sherd occurred.⁶

Turning now to the ceramic contents of Levels VI-V at Alalakh, it is emphasised by the excavator that it was everywhere difficult to distinguish between the two strata with any degree of certainty and that "the attribution of pottery fragments was only too often unreliable and the two periods had to be considered together".⁷ In view of this and in the face of the general scarcity of pottery attributed to Level VI (only 57 vessels are recorded),⁸ these two strata will be considered together here and no attempt will be made to assign specific dates to each of them. For it is important to obtain a more or less clear picture of the ceramic background at Alalakh at the time when the little bichrome ware that was found there was in use.

¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. XCVI: d—and see 42-43 and 65.

² *Ibid.*, Pl. XCIV: b.

³ *Ibid.*, 316.

⁴ H. J. Kantor, in McEwan and others, *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*, 24, note 13.

⁵ See Chapter 5, section 4 for discussion of Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware.

⁶ *Tarsus* II, 200: 1085 and fig. 315.

⁷ *Al.*, 315.

⁸ See tables, *ibid.*, 332 ff.

It has been pointed out by Albright¹ that the preceding stratum, Level VII, contained wares which correspond to those typical of MB II in Phoenicia and Palestine. "This is the pottery of Megiddo XII-X and Tell Beit Mirsim E-D". It follows, then, that the succeeding Stratum IX at Megiddo (Tell Beit Mirsim was not occupied at this time), corresponds to the period immediately following at Alalakh, namely, Levels VI-V. This has been independently demonstrated in chart form, where it is seen that this combined period can be dated to the sixteenth century, the early Eighteenth Dynasty and the early Mitannian period before Saustatar.² Further, of the wares frequently found together with bichrome ware at other sites—and especially in the House Z assemblage—characteristic pottery types have been remarked upon. At Alalakh, it is difficult to isolate assemblages from specific loci, since no clearly tabulated registers are available of pottery found in occupation contexts and since the number of drawings has been reduced to a minimum by giving one example for each pottery type which may not always be the median one.³ In the tables showing the incidence of ceramic types in succeeding levels at Alalakh⁴ there are a number of vessels which are related to plain wares found in bichrome ware contexts elsewhere. In the undermentioned list the comparisons given are for Megiddo, including the House Z assemblage:

<i>Alalakh Levels VI-V</i>		<i>Megiddo Stratum IX</i>
Type 5	recalls	House Z, Fig. 8: 12.
Type 24	recalls	T. 2117—M II, Pl. 53: 17.
Type 67b	recalls	T. 2127 and T. 5013 G—M II, Pl. 50: 27.
Type 68c	recalls	House Z, Fig. 8: 4 (variant base).
Type 104a	recalls	House Z, Fig. 8: 15.

In addition to the above plain wares at Alalakh, two examples of Monochrome Ware bowls are recorded as having been found in Levels VI-V⁵ and it has already been seen that Monochrome Ware is found in contexts together with bichrome ware. Similarly, it would appear that two black lustrous juglets were also found, though neither is stratified or can be ascribed to a specific findspot. The first of these is recorded as having been found at the end of the

¹ W. F. Albright, "Stratigraphic confirmation of the low Mesopotamian chronology", *BASOR* CXLIV (1956), 27 and 29.

² H. J. Kantor, "Syro-Palestinian ivories", *JNES* XV (1956), 158-159, n. 22.

³ See also in this connection, Albright, *op. cit.*, 27, n 6.

⁴ *Al.*, 332 ff.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 356, ATP/47/63 and ATP/39/219.

1946 season, but was added to the Field Pottery Register of the subsequent campaign.¹ The second retains few traces of burnish and is uncertainly marked.² Its unusual feature is the downward slope of the handle away from the neck at its upper juncture. Since black lustrous juglets occur in contexts together with bichrome ware, it would seem likely that the two Alalakh specimens are from a contemporary horizon and they can probably be assigned to Levels VI-V. In the rubbish pits of Levels VI-V, two fragmentary Red-on-Black Ware spouted bowls were found,³ bowls of this kind occurring together with bichrome ware at other sites.⁴ Two Base Ring I jugs—or juglets—were also found in contexts which can with certainty be ascribed to Level V.⁵ One is from a Level V grave (ATG/46/1), in which there was also a trefoil-mouthed jug which, although decorated in two colours, seems to be closer to the tradition of Syrian painted wares than to bichrome ware. The second Base Ring I jug was found in contemporary debris in a room at the back of the Level V temple⁶ and this position would appear to indicate the end of the period of the temple's use. This accords well with the evidence from contexts at other sites where bichrome ware is found together with Base Ring I, since the occurrence of the latter only begins towards the end of the bichrome ware period.⁷

From the above it will be seen that, while no specific assemblages containing bichrome ware were found at Alalakh, the general character of the ceramic background of the levels in which it occurs has much in common with that of well-stratified assemblages elsewhere and this ties in well with the contemporary evidence from further south where bichrome ware was at home. At the same time, it provides additional proof for the correct dating of Levels VI-V, which are thus seen to fall into place within the general chronological framework of the sixteenth century B.C.

¹ Unpublished, ATP/47/186, where it is described as a flask of "dark grey-black pebble-burnished clay".

² Unpublished, in B.M.

³ *AI*, 355-6.

⁴ See section 5(a) above.

⁵ A fragmentary bull-vase, ATP/39/220, is recorded as having been found in Level VI. This is included in a catalogue of Base Ring I sherds some of which cannot be thus classified (e.g. ATP/39/221—examined).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 357, ATP/48/2.

⁷ See section 7 under.

(c) *Egypt*

At a number of sites in Egypt, including Aniba in Nubia, the pottery found in certain tombs is quite clearly not of local manufacture and exhibits affinities with wares in Palestine and Syria. Most of these tombs have been dated as late Hyksos or early Eighteenth Dynasty.¹ These vessels were foreign to Egypt not only because of their shape, but because they were frequently painted at a time when painted wares were not being produced there. A number of these are typical of bichrome ware and were found together with other wares commonly associated with it elsewhere. The relatively small number which found their way to Egypt suggests that they should be regarded not as part of the normal exchange of goods, but rather as souvenirs or gifts brought back by Egyptian travellers, or by merchants engaged in the important timber trade with coastal Syria.² Such presents from foreign countries may well have been considered sufficiently unique as to have been of special worth in the eyes of their owners (often, apparently, women) and as such were included with other possessions among the grave goods placed round the dead. This is borne out by the fact that not a few of the vessels found were juglets with exceptionally narrow necks suitable for use as containers for perfumes and unguents. (In one instance, a juglet was actually found in a woman's toilet basket together with jewellery and trinkets).³ These would have been the counterpart of the presents of French perfume so often brought back by modern travellers today.

In the Mayana cemetery, near Sedment, graves containing pottery decorated in bichrome were found. There were coffins in only a few of them, matting being used instead in the majority of the graves, no doubt because wood was scarce and consequently expensive. Thus it seems that most of the people buried there were not wealthy, but, on the contrary, ordinary folk.⁴ In addition to the four graves published as containing bichrome vessels, a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(a), has been reconstructed from unmarked sherds, and it is presumed that this likewise comes from Mayana,⁵ where it would certainly not be out of context.

¹ *Sed.* I, 20; H. Frankfort, *Studies in the early pottery of the Near East* II, 167; *Aniba* II, 134; S. Smith, *Alalakh and chronology*, 68 ff.

² L. Woolley "Syria as the gateway between east and west", *GJ* CVII(1946), 182.

³ *Sed.* I, 16. See Pl. XV: 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 19 and 20.

⁵ According to the considered opinion of Dr. A. J. Arkell, of the Petrie Collection, UCL, where the vessel is on exhibition. (The sherds from this jug were in Petrie's residual material from Egypt). Pl. XIII: 6.

T. 1289 contained a Cross Line Style juglet, Type B1(a), which has an exceptionally narrow neck and must originally have been intended to hold perfume. It was found together with a White Painted VI juglet¹ which is also distinctive for its narrow neck and wide, splaying rim. While recalling the more common form with sloping, trefoil mouth so frequently found in bichrome ware contexts, this juglet is different in fabric and may have been turned on the wheel.² In shape, it recalls a similar juglet found in T. LXXV at Ras Shamra³ and the latter seems to point to the origin of the Mayana and other such juglets found in Egypt.

In T. 1254 a fragmentary juglet, Type D1(a), was found,⁴ this being the only vessel left in the grave when excavated, which like many others had been robbed in antiquity. A second, similar juglet (also probably intended for perfume) was found in T. 1262. This grave showed clearly that it had been ransacked by tomb-robbers who had overlooked a toilet basket and all it contained which included a small alabastron⁵ resembling that found in House Z at Megiddo.

In T. 1270 there was a much larger decorated jug which, far from being a perfume container was obviously intended to hold contents of a different kind. This is a jug, Type A1(a), published as being decorated in one colour only, but which has a brownish-red band between two brownish-black ones at mid-body, though the vertical band panels of lattice work have no bichrome frame, neither is a second colour used in the figures of the two birds.⁶ This tomb had also been disturbed and it is likely that a blue glaze jar and a grey limestone kohl pot, also found here, as well as three pottery vessels⁷ had been forgotten by the robbers. Two scarabs of a type considered by the excavators to be typically Hyksos were also found,⁸ but it should be remembered that at the time of writing, this term was used generally to cover scarabs which might today be considered post-Hyksos and in any case scarabs alone cannot be used as reliable dating evidence. The jug, with its rather flat upper shoulder, markedly carinated body (which is in contrast to the more usual globular to ovoid bodies

¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLV: 69.

² This impression was endorsed by Dr. H. W. Catling of the Ashmolean Museum, when the juglet was examined a second time. Pl. XV: 6.

³ See section 5(a) above.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLV: 68.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLI: 33.

⁶ See 34 above and Pl. IX: 4.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pls. XLI: 31 and 32, XLIV: 13 and XLV: 58 and 59.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pl. XLIII: 15 and 16.

of this type of vessel) and the scant use of a contrasting colour in its decoration, indicates a later, rather than an earlier phase of bichrome ware, as do the figures of the birds, which are somewhat carelessly executed and exhibit none of the stylised qualities of the peak period.¹

At Deshasheh, T. 44 contained a juglet, Type D1(a),² so similar to the one found in T. 1262 at Mayana that it could well have been made in the same potter's workshop. Of the three other vessels recorded from this group, two were large jars (not illustrated) and one a White Painted VI juglet, with sloping, trefoil mouth,³ of the same type as that found in House Z at Megiddo. The presence of the two juglets in a single context reflects a characteristic association of wares, as does the finding of the two juglets in T. 1289 at Mayana: in each case a bichrome vessel occurs in a repertoire containing a White Painted VI juglet—this being a common feature of such assemblages elsewhere.

In Nubia, which was still further away from the place of manufacture of these wares, tombs were excavated at Aniba which contained an even wider range of foreign pottery. In T. 87, which was a chamber tomb in use over a prolonged period, more than one burial was found,⁴ together with close on thirty vessels. The latter included: a Cross Line Style jug, Type B1(b),⁵ two black lustrous juglets⁶ and a small splaying-sided bowl.⁷ Among the remaining vessels the following can almost certainly be attributed to earlier burials: Kerma Ware bowls, a Tell el-Yahudiyeh juglet with button base⁸ and an unburnished carinated juglet with button base.⁹ Since no indication is given of the position of the vessels when found, it is not even possible to suggest which of them might, in the first place, have formed part of the same group. Despite this, the finding in the tomb of a Cross Line Style bichrome jug, of black lustrous juglets and a splaying-sided bowl lends colour to the surmise that these had originally

¹ H. J. Kantor, *apud* R. W. Ehrich, *Relative chronologies in Old World archeology*, 13, considers that this jug should be dated to the end of the Second Intermediate period, but there is no evidence to support this, while both the shape and decorative style are typical of the beginning of the decline of bichrome ware.

² Pl. XV: 3.

³ *Desh.*, Pl. XXXIII: 25.

⁴ See reference to the finding of one complete and one fragmentary mummy mask, *Aniba* II, 97.

⁵ Pl. XIII: 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Pl. 81: 36(b).

⁷ *Ibid.*, Pl. 70: 8(a)5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Pl. 86: 45(a)1.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Pl. 86: 45(a)5.

been placed in the tomb together, since such wares so often occur in the same assemblages at other sites.¹

In spite of the relatively limited diffusion of bichrome vessels in Egypt, those found there conform to the accepted shapes and decorative patterns. The fact that they appear to belong to a somewhat late phase of the ware is a reflection of the growing contact with the north which resulted from Egyptian expansion under the Eighteenth Dynasty.

7. SUMMARY

In the foregoing it has been seen that a number of distinctive wares are found in association with bichrome ware—especially as exemplified by the House Z assemblage—and that certain Cypriote imported wares are likewise commonly found together with it. At the same time, during the period of its *floruit*, certain features can be discerned which are characteristic of an earlier phase, while others appear only towards its end. Since the true bichrome period does not seem to have lasted for more than some hundred years (from c. 1575—c. 1475), this span² may be separated into a main, or peak period—I—and a later phase—II.

I. During the peak period the decoration on the vessels is clear and every attempt is made to obtain the greatest effect by the use of two contrasting colours. The shapes of the vessels are well-proportioned and this applies particularly to the shoulder which provides the chief field of decoration, though necks are also decorated and, in the case of Cross Line Style jugs and juglets, the whole body. Associated with bichrome ware, the following vessels are commonly found:

1. Monochrome Ware bowls, either with slightly in-turned or everted rim—e.g. T. 2132 at Megiddo³ and T. 1517 at 'Ajjul:⁴
2. White Painted VI globular juglets with sloping trefoil mouth and handle from mid-neck—e.g. House Z at Megiddo⁵ and T. LIV at Ras Shamra;⁶

¹ Compare T. LIV at Ras Shamra, 123 above.

² See Chapter 6.

³ *M* II, Pl. 54: 22.

⁴ *AG* IV, Pl. XLVII: 19 N4.

⁵ Fig. 8: 5.

⁶ Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 20: upper right.

3. globular black lustrous juglets with handle from below the rim—e.g. T. 75 at Megiddo¹ and T. 8112 at Hazor;²
4. jugs with ring base, sloping carinated shoulder, tall widening neck and slightly in-turned rim—e.g. House Z;³
5. jugs similar to the foregoing but with flat base and trefoil mouth—e.g. House Z;⁴
6. dipper juglets with slightly rounded base, elliptical body and pinched rim—sometimes burnished—e.g. House Z;⁵
7. bowls with high foot, sometimes almost pedestal—e.g. House Z;⁶
8. small deep carinated bowls with flat or ring base—e.g. House Z.⁷

II. During the later phase of bichrome ware usage the decoration on the vessels is frequently far less carefully applied, the contrast in the colours tends to be less marked and the fabric of the wares is often coarse and unburnished. While the accepted bichrome motifs are still in use, these also occur contemporaneously in one colour only—e.g. T. 1500 at 'Ajjul, with black-decorated krater with bird figure;⁸ T. 308 at 'Ajjul, with krater decorated with geometrical motifs in black, and likewise at Hazor;⁹ T. 3027 at Megiddo, with red linear decorated jug.¹⁰ Another sure indication of the decline of the decoration is the use of up and down-pointing triangles in one colour only—especially in red—e.g. jug attributed to T. 3018 C at Megiddo¹¹ and a jug from T. 211 at 'Ajjul.¹² Side by side with these features, there can be discerned a tendency for the shapes of the vessels to be less well-proportioned, for the shoulder especially to become depressed, the dippers more baggy and the lamps more pinched—characteristics which become more pronounced in the following LB period. While many of the associated wares common in the earlier phase continue to be found, Base Ring I Wares—chiefly juglets—now also occur—e.g. T. 3027 at

¹ *MT*, Pl. 41:23.

² *Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXL: 4.

³ Fig. 8: 3.

⁴ Fig. 8: 4.

⁵ Fig. 8: 18.

⁶ Fig. 8: 11, 13 and 14.

⁷ Fig. 8: 15 and 16.

⁸ *AG* II, Pl. XXXVIII: 10.

⁹ Pl. V: 1-2.

¹⁰ *M* II, Pl. 48: 18.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Pl. 49: 1.

¹² *AG* I, Pl. XXXIII: 76.

Megiddo¹ and T. LXXIV at Ras Shamra,² these being completely absent from the earlier assemblages.

While phases I and II above contain many features in common, the comparison of assemblages has emphasised the differences between them and has enabled the salient characteristics of each to be defined. Once these are recognised, the elements of contemporaneity emerge clearly as each group comes under review and a glance at an assemblage is in most cases sufficient to enable it to be placed early or late in the bichrome ware sequence. Similarly, in tombs in which piled-up offerings from earlier burials were found heaped together along the sides of the chamber, it has been possible to suggest what may have been the original association of groups of vessels. This process can be even more extensively applied to similar tombs which have not been examined in this study, since it was wished to deal only with the more reliable material in order to obtain the ceramic criteria for the occurrence of bichrome ware.

¹ *M* II, Pl. 51: 1.

² *Ug.* II, fig. 67: 3 and 4.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SPREAD OF THE HURRIANS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF BICHROME WARE

INTRODUCTION

Any attempt to assess the *floruit* of bichrome ware or to interpret its origins can only be made against a wide canvas of events in countries and kingdoms far beyond its own distribution limits, while in order to achieve any degree of approximation to the truth it is necessary to relate the period of its use during the sixteenth century B.C. to such contemporary happenings as can be more or less vouched for historically. At the same time it must be remembered that pottery itself and its progressive development over a given period is not unaffected by external events: on the contrary, these, by implication, are often reflected in the changes that occur. Thus new features are introduced through the impact of foreign artistic influences due to the changing political scene, or to expanding trade contacts and the consequent widening of horizons. Again, innovations may result from the admixture to the population of new ethnic elements originating in a distant ancestral homeland, which they themselves may never have known, yet many of whose traditions, religious myths and language traits (especially in personal names), they nevertheless have preserved as part of their cultural heritage. Should the incursions of such new groups have been on a relatively small scale and their penetration into a specific region have been in the form of a slow-moving yet steady flow, the time and conditions of their arrival will prove difficult to estimate, and it is only *after* they have merged with the already existing population that their adherence to it will be able to be detected.

Thus, for example, little is known of the *coming* of the Hyksos to Egypt or of the actual history of their attaining power there. It is only once they have become entrenched as the rulers of the land that it is possible to perceive the new features which emerge as the result of their presence. From what peoples these Asiatic conquerors were sprung, the exact causes which brought about their invasions of territories so far south, and by what means they were able to make themselves masters of such a great country as Egypt—even at a time

of internal weakness—about all these factors there is much that is still conjectural today.

I. THE NORTH

1. THE HURRIANS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE INDO-ARYANS

Much less is known of the coming into Western Asia of other important groups who have been designated as “the peoples of the mountains.”¹ Among them were the Hurrians whose presence in the Upper Khabur valley in the eighteenth century B.C. is attested by texts from Chagar Bazar.² Hurrian personal names, including those of petty dynasts, likewise occur in the more or less contemporary Mari archives,³ among which are some half a dozen religious texts written in Hurrian. Recently, another contemporary correspondence from a site close to the Zagros mountains situated on the upper reaches of the Lesser Zab river, has provided additional evidence of Hurrian names.⁴ These occur in an area east of the Tigris dominated by the Turukkaeans, by whom—as is known from the Mari letters—Šamši-Adad and his sons were constantly being harassed and against whom they undertook a number of military expeditions. Some two centuries later the Hurrians had become masters of many of the petty kingdoms into which they had previously penetrated, an early reference to Hurrian kings being contained in a Hittite document⁵ which has been dated to the late seventeenth or early sixteenth century.⁶ Its importance lies in the fact that already at this time the Hurrians are seen to have been ruled by kings bearing Indo-Aryan names.⁷ It follows, then, that these two

¹ S. Moscati, *The Semites in ancient history*, 63.

² C. J. Gadd, “Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak, 1937-38”, *Iraq* VII (1940), 34 and n. 4.

³ J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*, 229-232.

⁴ J. Laessøe, *The Shemshâra Tablets*, 29 n. 30, 69, 74 and 75, and *idem*, *People of ancient Assyria*, 144, 145, 150-155.

⁵ *KBo* III, 60 = 2 *BoTU* 21, translated by H. G. Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonien und Hethitern bis 1200”, *ZA* XLIV, NF. 10 (1938), 109.

⁶ W. F. Albright, “New light on the history of Western Asia in the second millennium B.C.”, *BASOR* LXXVIII (1940), 30-31; B. Landsberger, “Assyrische Königsliste und ‘Dunkles Zeitalter’”, *JCS* VIII (1954), 58, n. 120(a); R. T. O. Callaghan *Aram Naharaim*, 64.

⁷ P. E. Dumont *apud* Albright, *op. cit.*, *BASOR* LXXVIII (1940), 30; W. Brandenstein, “Die alten Inder in Vorderasien und die Chronologie des Rigweda”, *Frühgeschichte und Sprachwissenschaft*, 139; W. Belardi, “Sui nomi ari nell’Asia anteriore antica”, *Miscellanea Galbiati* III, 67-68.

distinct groups, each with its own language and traditions, must at an even earlier date have joined forces and found a *modus vivendi* in order to create a feudal social structure in which the Indo-Aryan element, at the head of a body of chariot-warrior nobles, constituted the ruling class. For it is this relationship which from the first characterises the Hurrian kingdoms, as later the powerful state of Mitanni which emerged from them and which, by the beginning of the fifteenth century had become sufficiently strong to mobilise round it a wide coalition of the forces of Upper Mesopotamia and Syria in opposition to the expanding Egyptian empire of Tuthmosis III.¹

The date of the Hurrian incursions from the mountainous regions of the north-eastern steppes is difficult to determine and it is possible that there were Hurrian and Indo-Aryan elements among the Hyksos who participated in the great thrust southwards which bore them forward through Syria and Palestine as far as the Nile.² The lack of documentary evidence makes it even more difficult to point with any degree of certainty to the period when the Hurrians began to dominate the petty kingdoms which later allied themselves in a loose confederacy known as the Hurri Lands. The indications are that this was already happening during the latter part of the eighteenth and early seventeenth centuries³. About this time, Hurrians are found as an important element in the population of North Syria, and particularly at Alalakh, where there are seen to be "strong Hurrian elements in the older texts of Alalakh VII in the form of Hurrian personal names, Hurrian month names and Hurrian glosses and liguistic forms."⁴ Following on the entry of this new ethnic element on to the contemporary political scene, the existing power alignments broke up and thus the way was paved for their final overthrow by the Hittites at the very commencement of the sixteenth century which culminated in the sack of Babylon by Muršiliš I, recently dated to 1595 B.C.⁵

¹ R. Labat, "Le rayonnement de la langue et de l'écriture akkadienne au deuxième millénaire avant notre ère", *Syria* XXXIX(1962), 11.

² A. Alt, *Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht*, 8-9; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 103.

³ S. Smith, "Uršu and Haššum", *Anatolian Studies* VI(1956), 43; J.-R. Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", *CAH* II, Chapter I, revised edition, (Fascicle 14), 39; J. Laessøe, *op. cit.*, 158.

⁴ I. J. Gelb, "The early history of the West Semitic peoples", *JCS* XV(1961), 39.

⁵ M. B. Rowton, "Chronology: Ancient Western Asia", *CAH* I, Chapter VI, revised edition, (Fascicle 4), 43.

2. THE DOMESTICATION OF THE HORSE AND THE USE OF THE SPOKED-WHEEL
CHARIOT

It is now generally agreed that at the time of their earliest penetration into Upper Mesopotamia one of the outstanding achievements of the Hurrian Indo-Aryan symbiosis groups was the domestication of the horse and eventually the harnessing of it to the light spoked-wheel chariot.¹ There can be little doubt that from the standpoint of the second millennium the possession of a new strategic weapon of this kind was as important as the possession of atomic weapons is today and it clearly endowed the Hurri people and their chariot-warrior aristocracy, designated by the Indo-Aryan term, *maryannu*,² with an overwhelming supremacy. As is the case with atomic weapons today, once the chariot had been used in warfare, no army could afford to be without it, so that by the middle of the sixteenth century B.C. it had become widely diffused over the ancient Near East³—though it was probably not as yet employed by large bodies of cavalry troops, being restricted in its use to kings, chiefs, petty princes and nobles.⁴ Since there were Hurrians in the Khabur region during the early eighteenth century it seems likely that it was they who were connected with the horse-breeding known to be practised there.⁵ The frequent references to fodder for horses in the tablets from Chagar Bazar are evidence of the extent of horse-breeding in general, further emphasised by the fact that prince Iasmah-Adad, ruler of Mari, kept teams of horses and chariots in the royal stables there, which were cared for by grooms and a horse-trainer.⁶ Figures of miniature horses,⁷ as well as of spoked wheels in unmistakable Khabur Ware were found

¹ V. G. Childe, "The first waggons and carts from the Tigris to the Severn", *PPS* XVII, (1951) 188; F. Schachermayer, "Streitwagen und Streitwagenbild im alten Orient und bei mykenischen Griechen", *Anthropos* XLVI (1951), 710-711; F. Hančar, *Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit*, 501-502; E. D. Phillips, "New light on the ancient history of the Eurasian steppe" *AJA* LXI (1957), 272.

² A. Thumb and R. Hauschild, *Handbuch des Sanskrit* I, 86; R. T. O'Callaghan, "New light on the *maryannu* as 'chariot-warrior'", *JKF* I (1951), 309.

³ F. E. Zeuner, *A history of domesticated animals*, 318.

⁴ O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 105; G. Hanfmann, "A Near Eastern horseman", *Syria* XXXVIII (1961), 252.

⁵ M. E. L. Mallowan, *Twenty-five years of Mesopotamian discovery*, 18-19 and *idem*, "The excavations at Tall Chagar Bazar", *Iraq* IV (1937), 129.

⁶ C. J. Gadd, *op. cit.*, *Iraq* VII (1940), 31 and Tablets Nos. 972 and 981, and 946.

⁷ M. E. L. Mallowan, *op. cit.*, *Iraq* IV (1937), fig. 10: 29 and 32.

here¹ and also elsewhere in the same region.² These are from models of votive chariots; and in this connection it is interesting to note that another, fragmentary, spoked-wheel model, likewise decorated in red, was found in a contemporary level at Megiddo in a findspot situated close to the temple area there.³ Such flimsy evidence, however, cannot be used for postulating the use of Khabur Ware at Megiddo! The importance of this object lies rather in the fact that it is the representation of a wheel with raised hub, on which the felloe and the single extant spoke have been intentionally painted in a contrasting colour and the finding of it in the sacred area makes it highly probable that it, too, formed part of a votive chariot model. Its presence testifies to familiarity with the spoked wheel at Megiddo in the eighteenth century B.C.

3. THE GROWTH OF HURRIAN POWER DURING THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY B.C.

Throughout the seventeenth century there was a constantly growing Hurrian influx into North Syria, the rate of penetration becoming steadily greater. Certainly the proportion of Hurrians in the population at Alalakh as reflected in the source material from Level VII had grown considerably by the time of the later tablets from Level IV and it may be justifiably deduced that the intervening period—namely, that of Levels VI-V—was one of substantial Hurrian growth, both numerically, politically and culturally.⁴ At the time of the Level IV tablets, not only can a greater Hurrian influence be seen in the population, but the term *maryannu* had become established in order to designate a specific class of person who was frequently qualified as being the possessor of a chariot and who often bore a Hurrian name.⁵ This is quite clearly the upper class, while those belonging to the social class immediately below the *maryannu* were the “*hanaens*”, in many instances classified in the census lists by the Hurrian form of the word.⁶ Most of these later texts come from the reigns of Niqmepa and Ilimilimma II during the early fifteenth century. The former was a vassal of the Hurrian Great King, Saustatar, who, like his ancestors before him, styled himself king of Mitanni. Even before this, Idrimi—the

¹ M. E. L. Mallowan, *Iraq* III (1936), fig. 6: 17 and *Iraq* IV (1937), fig. 10: 31.

² Tell Ailun—A. Moortgat, “Archaeologische Forschungen der Max Frhr. von Oppenheim-Stiftung im nördlichen Mesopotamien, 1956”, *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie* VII (1957), 29.

³ MII, Pl. 257: 5, from Square N13 in Stratum XIII.

⁴ J.-R. Kupper, *op. cit.*, *CAH* II, Chapter I, revised edition, (Fascicle 14), 37.

⁵ D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets*, 11.

⁶ I. J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, *JCS* XV (1961), 37 and 39.

father of Niqmepa—had regained most of his inheritance and kingdom with the support of Paratarna, “the mighty king, king of the Hurri warriors”,¹ the latter being quite clearly his overlord with whom he renewed the treaty of his forebears by taking the customary oath of allegiance. From this passage in the inscription on the statue of Idrimi, it is evident that the vassalage was of long-standing, probably going back for a number of generations.² Since Idrimi was the first of the kings of Alalakh associated with Level IV, it is reasonable to suppose that during Levels VI-V, Alalakh—if not Aleppo as well—had recognised the suzerainty of the Great King of the Hurri, especially when it is recalled that towards the end of the sixteenth century there is evidence for Hurrian political ascendancy in Upper Mesopotamia and North Syria.

A careful study of the above inscription reveals yet another significant fact: namely, the Indo-Aryan aristocracy as an integrated part of the Hurrian social structure, since Paratarna bears an Indo-Aryan name and he is probably identical with the king referred to in a tablet from Nuzi, who was cremated.³ While the inscription of Idrimi makes it clear that he was a contemporary of Paratarna, at the same time it is apparent that the latter was his senior who had probably been reigning for more than the “seven years” prior to his own come-back; again, the reference to the forebears of both kings indicates that there had for some generations been continuity of descent in the line of dynasts in the Hurri lands. The date which is now more generally accepted for Paratarna is the last quarter of the sixteenth century and it appears that he was, in fact, king of Mitanni, being next in succession to Šuttarna I, son of Kirta,⁴ both of whom bear Indo-Aryan names.⁵ This corroborates the information implied in the Idrimi inscription, which takes back for a period of at least two generations the Indo-Aryan line of kings before Paratarna who were ruling over the warriors of the Hurri people. The mention of warriors is in keeping with the familiar Hurrian social pattern, in which the leaders came of Indo-Aryan stock and were supported by an aristocracy composed of *maryannu*; and it may well

¹ A. Goetze, “On the chronology of the second millennium B.C.”, *JCS* XI(1957), 67 and n. 149.

² B. Landsberger, *op. cit.*, *JCS* VIII(1954), 55, where he suggests that there is an indication of four or five generations for this relationship.

³ A. Goetze, *op. cit.*, *JCS* XI(1957), 67, n. 150; B. Hrouda, “Die Churriten als Problem archäologischer Forschung”, *Arch. Geog.* VII(1958), 15.

⁴ Dynastic seal used by Saustatar on ATT/8/52 and ATT/8/144, S. Smith, “Account of new tablets from Atchana”, *AJ* XIX (1939), 43.

⁵ R.T.O’Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, 56, No. 1 and 57, No. 9.

be that the Hurrian Great King employed as one of his subsidiary titles a term expressing this close connection with the warriors, since it is thus that Idrimi refers to his overlord¹ and Niqmepa to Saustatar.² Further, from the reference in Idrimi's autobiography to the vassalage of his ancestors to a strong neighbouring Hurrian king, it seems clear that after the sack of Babylon, it was the Hurrians who became the dominating political force in Upper Mesopotamia and North Syria, as did the Kassites in the lower regions of the Land of the Two Rivers.

4. HURRIAN INFLUENCE ON CERAMIC DEVELOPMENTS

In a previous chapter it has been seen³ that at Alalakh, Levels VI-V correspond to Stratum IX at Megiddo and that it is in these levels that bichrome ware was found. At Alalakh, however, it has been shown that this was probably not locally made, while side by side with it these same levels contained another kind of pottery, likewise decorated with bird and animal motifs.⁴ But here the design elements are not in two colours, as on bichrome ware, but are carried out in a dark paint on a light ground—a scheme of decoration which is characteristic of Khabur Ware. The decorative motifs themselves are, however, completely alien to the repertoire of the latter and greatly resemble those used later on Mitannian Ware, on which they are invariably depicted in a light paint on a dark ground. This pottery is thus seen to be intermediate and it has been aptly termed Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware.⁵ Examples of it have also been found at other sites, notably at Tell Billa,⁶ Tell Brak (in house Area HH),⁷ Tell Jidle⁸ and Tell Fakhariyah.⁹

An examination of the decorative elements, which combine geometrical

¹ S. Smith, *The statue of Idri-mi* 17, lines 43-44.

² D. J. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, 30, No. 2, lines 73-74: "...(if) either with the Hurrian-warriors or with the king of the Hurrian-warriors I am in opposition and (if) I do not observe the oath of the king of the Hurrian-warriors, my lord.....".

³ Chapter 4, section 6(b).

⁴ *Al.*, Pls XCIII: 1, m and r, XCIV:a and XCV—excluding the bichrome ware krater, ATP/48/64.

⁵ H. J. Kantor, in C. W. McEwan and others, *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*, 24.

⁶ E. A. Speiser, "The pottery of Tell Billa", *MJ XXIII*(1932), Pls. LX: 3 and LXIII—both from Stratum 3.

⁷ M. E. L. Mallowan, "Excavations at Brak and Tall Chagar Bazar", *Iraq IX*(1947), Pls. LXXVII: 1, 2 and 5 and LXXVIII: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12—all from Level 3.

⁸ *Idem*, *Iraq VIII*(1946), fig. 11: 6 and 10—from Level 2.

⁹ H. J. Kantor, *op. cit.*, 23-24 and 39-40, sherds 109, 110 and 114.

and figure motifs—particularly birds and schematic quadrupeds, as well as some crudely depicted human figures (perhaps hunters)—reveals a similarity of approach¹ which differentiates the Transitional Khabur-Mitannian material from what went immediately before and anticipates the full development of what was to come. Its stratigraphical position at all the sites where it has been found so far is likewise intermediate: for either it belongs to a stage which is earlier than true Mitannian Ware, as at Alalakh, or else it occurs in contexts in which Mitannian Ware is only just beginning to appear, as at Tell Brak and Tell Jidle. At Tell Fakhariyah it is attributed to the earliest phase of Mitannian Ware.

It is, however, at Alalakh where it occurs side by side with bichrome ware in Levels VI-V, that Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware is seen to represent a distinct stage in the ceramic development, which belongs chronologically to the period immediately preceding the reign of Saustatar. This is a period of considerable growth of the Hurrian element in the population, which had been steadily increasing since the seventeenth century—if not earlier.² Thus there is every justification for attributing the introduction of hitherto unknown and very distinctive decorative motifs on pottery constituting a completely new departure from the long-accepted ceramic traditions, to the presence of this new ethnic element, whose growing influence—especially in the cultural sphere—was contemporaneously making itself felt.³ It is also significant that the newly-introduced figure motifs on the transitional ware are depicted in accordance with the old-established technique of dark paint, thus emphasising the merging of the new with the old conventions.

It is precisely this ability to amalgamate and coalesce which is everywhere characteristic of the Hurrians and which likewise holds good of the metallurgic forms which became diffused over wide areas as the result of Hurrian penetration.⁴ It has been pointed out that even after the establishment of a strong Mittanian kingdom, there was a marked tendency, in the artistic sphere, to

¹ Note especially the goat-like figures at Alalakh and Tell Brak—*Al.*, Pl. XCV: AT/46/272 and *Iraq* IX, Pl. LXXVIII: 11; birds at Tell Jidle and Tell Brak—*Iraq* VIII, fig. 11: 6 and *Iraq* IX, Pl. LXXVIII: 8; also the frequent use of chequers, triangles and hour-glass patterns in combination with dots at all the sites.

² J.-R. Kupper, *op. cit.*, *CAH* II, Chapter I, revised edition, (Fascicle 14), 25.

³ B. Hrouda, *Die bemalte Keramik des zweiten Jahrtausends in Nordmesopotamien und Nordsyrien*, 43-44.

⁴ J. Deshayes, *Les outils de bronze de l'Inde au Danube (IV^e au II^e millénaire)* I, 414 and 427.

combine designs, motifs and techniques of quite separate origins.¹ This is the pattern which repeats itself in every region into which the Hurrians infiltrated and settled, the resultant changes, both political and cultural, only gradually becoming manifest *after* they had become incorporated in the local population complex. A similar synthesis between the old and the new can be discerned in pottery, this being expressed chiefly in terms of the approach to and manner of its decoration. There is, then, every reason to see in the Hurrians the factor which brought about this marked change, especially in view of the occurrence of Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware in what was the Hurrian expansion area, from Tell Billa, east of the Tigris, through Brak, Tell Fakhariyah and Jidle, to Alalakh in North Syria. This is the region which coincided later with the hegemony of Mitanni, with which is associated the distinctive Mitannian Ware, with its specific range of decorative motifs. The latter has been considered first and foremost a "palace" or luxury ware,² made to suit the tastes of the local rulers, who in the fifteenth century can quite certainly be identified with the *maryannu* warrior class.

The development of a transitional type of pottery which is characterised by the introduction of bird and animal figures into its decorative repertoire and which, both as regards time and style, is clearly intermediate, coming as it does between the older Khabur and the innovating Mitannian Wares and exhibiting some of the features of each, can only be interpreted when seen against the background of the history of those regions in Upper Mesopotamia and North Syria in which it was found; while its unheralded appearance there can only be correctly understood when seen as an expression of the presence and growing influence in them of the Hurrians.

II. THE SOUTH

In the foregoing it has been shown that there was a steady stream of Hurrians infiltrating into Upper Mesopotamia and Northern Syria and that from the end of the seventeenth century B.C. and during the course of the sixteenth century this new element in the population was responsible for bringing about political, strategic and cultural changes of far-reaching importance, and eventually for the setting up of feudal states led by a chariot-warrior aristocracy. It also

¹ H. Frankfort, *The art and architecture of the ancient orient*, 144; J. -R. Kupper, *op. cit.*, *CAH* II, Chapter I, revised edition, (Fascicle 14), 41.

² M. E. L. Mallowan, *Twenty-five years of Mesopotamian discovery*, 36: *idem*, *Iraq* IX (1947), 242-243.

created additional pressures on the existing population centres in those areas which resulted in further Hurrian penetration southward,¹ probably by routes through inland Syria and the Lebanon trough, into Palestine. Once again the evidence is inferential and documents are non-existent for the period of infiltration. But the basic similarity of the political and social structure that is seen to emerge by the time that this movement had spent itself, as well as the effect of new cultural currents on prevailing traditions, makes inevitable the deduction that in each case—in the south as earlier in the north—this situation was brought about by the impact of the Hurrians on the local population and by their subsequent merging with it.

5. EVIDENCE FOR THE PRESENCE OF HURRIAN ELEMENTS

In the north, the period of migration is seen to have preceded the emergence of the Hurrian states ruled by kings bearing Indo-Aryan names and supported by an aristocracy of *maryannu* warriors, the few relevant extant documents recording not the setting up of this confederacy, but the situation which takes for granted its existence and that of the vassalage which bound the sub-kings to their overlord. Farther south—in inland Syria and in Palestine—the position was not entirely parallel because of the proximity of another great power, namely Egypt.² In the early fifteenth century, however—which is the period *subsequent* to that of the actual migration—the documents reveal a very similar set-up: for pitted against Egypt was a coalition of petty kingdoms united under the leadership of a more powerful one, all quite clearly having a ruling class of chariot-warriors. The latter are frequently specifically designated by the term *maryannu*, and some are seen to have Indo-Aryan names. This is the picture which emerges from the records of the campaigns of Tuthmosis III

¹ W. F. Albright, *The role of the Canaanites in the history of civilisation*, 19.

² It should be noted that in some Egyptian sources dating from the Eighteenth Dynasty this region is referred to as Khōr (or Kharu). It has been pointed out by Gardiner that the name probably came to be applied as the result of contact by the conquering Egyptian armies with "no inconsiderable portion" of the population who called themselves *Hurri* and that in time this term came to be applied to the inhabitants as a whole, irrespective of whether they were of Semitic or non-Semitic stock—Gardiner, *AEO* I, 183* and 186*. It may be added that it is likely that the term was used in the first instance after contact with the princes and dynasts who constituted Egypt's chief enemies.—See also in this connection, E. A. Speiser, "Ethnic movements in the Near East in the second millennium B.C.", *AASOR* XIII (1933), 31 and *idem*, "The Hurrian participation in the civilisations of Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine", *Cab. H. M.* I (1953), 321; W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Cbr.*, 275.

against the northern alliances: this is the picture which emerges from two vivid accounts of the battle of Megiddo, where the petty dynasts were led by the powerful king of Kadesh from the Orontes valley further north. It was against Kadesh that a number of subsequent military operations were directed, during the course of which an Egyptian soldier relates how he captured *maryan-nu* prisoners which he presented to the pharaoh.¹ The longer-known account of the battle of Megiddo is that contained in the "Annals" at Karnak; but the Gebel Barkal stela contains details which give added point to the story:² "He [Amon-re] entrusted to me the foreign countries of Retenu on the first campaign, when they had come to engage with my majesty, being millions and hundred-thousands of men, the individuals of every foreign country, waiting in their chariots—330 princes, every one of them having his [own] army Then they fled immediately or fell prostrate. When they entered into Megiddo, my majesty shut them up for a period up to seven months, before they came out into the open Then that enemy and the princes who were with him sent out to my majesty, with all their children carrying abundant tribute: gold and silver, all their horses which were with them, their great chariots of gold and silver, as well as those which were painted, all their coats of mail, their bows, their arrows and all their weapons of warfare," (lines 19-23). After the surrender, when the city had capitulated—but was not razed to the ground—the account goes on to describe how the petty kings were allowed to return to their homes in what must have been for them, a most ignominious manner. "Then my majesty had them given leave to [go to] their cities. They all went on donkey [back], so that I might take their horses," (line 25). From this and the Karnak account it is abundantly clear that the enemy army facing the Egyptians at Megiddo, in 1481,³ was composed of contingents from many cities, probably from the whole of the region between Megiddo and Kadesh, including the Valley of Jezreel, Lower and Upper Galilee, the Ante-Lebanon and the Lebanon, right up to inland central Syria,⁴ but no doubt excluding the adjacent

¹ The biography of Amen-em-heb, translated by J. A. Wilson, *ANET*, 240-241, lines 15-20; and see introduction for the chronological sequence of the events described.

² G. A. and M. B. Reisner, "The Gebel Barkal Stela of Tuthmosis III," *ZAS* LXIX (1933), 31 ff; and translated by J. A. Wilson, *ANET*, 238—which is the version quoted here.

³ W. C. Hayes, "Chronology: Egypt—to the end of the Twentieth Dynasty", *CAH* I, Chapter VI, revised edition, (Fascicle 4), 17-18.

⁴ According to the "Annals", lines 21-24, the allies supporting the king of Kadesh came from regions situated considerably further north, *ANET*, 235.

harbour towns of the coastal plain against which Tuthmosis launched more than one later attack. Further, the unmistakable presence of the *maryannu*, while not explicitly so called in the text, is confirmed by the description of the chariot-warriors who, after the surrender, had perforce to debase themselves by returning to their cities on the ubiquitous and very common-place donkey; while the importance accorded in the list of booty to the large and elaborately-decorated chariots, as well as to the numbers of the horses, only serves to emphasize the character of the opposing forces in which all the chieftains were supported by strong contingents of chariot-warriors. The prominence given in the accounts of all the campaigns to the capture of chariots and horses—while the numbers may have been exaggerated—nevertheless gives an idea of the value attached by the Egyptians to what was, for them, still a comparatively new weapon of warfare, not yet widely used; at the same time it demonstrates the part played by chariotry in the military strategy of the opposing petty dynasts and their nobles,¹ who are constantly seen to be associated with it.

Owing to the contemptuous manner in which it was customary to refer to an adversary in all these accounts, the names of the kings who were the enemies of the pharaoh are not recorded: when any name is mentioned it is mostly that of the city or country of the foe. In the Amarna letters, however, written, some century later, many of the princes of those very cities which earlier came under Egyptian domination are seen to have Indo-Aryan names.² Despite this anonymity regarding the local chieftains, there is evidence that there were *maryannu* in the region of Palestine and South Syria as early as the reign of Tuthmosis I and that Hurrian and Indo-Aryan names were borne by some of the local aristocracy in the mid and late fifteenth century. From this it can be assumed that the first appearance of the Hurrians here must have antedated considerably the last quarter of the sixteenth century (i.e. the reign of Tuthmosis I), since some time must have elapsed between the period of their initial immigration and that of their establishment as a ruling warrior class within the social framework of the population with which they had mingled.

¹ S. Yeivin, "Canaanite and Hittite strategy in the second half of the second millennium B.C.", *JNES* IX (1950), 106.

² P. E. Dumont *apud* R. T. O. Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, 151-153.—It should be borne in mind that by the Amarna period, some two hundred years after the arrival of the Hurrians and Indo-Aryans, these had in all probability become traditional dynastic names reflecting the origins of the earlier rulers rather than the pure ethnic character of the fourteenth century dynasts. See, in this connection, W. Helck, *op. cit.*, 521.

6. THE HURRIANS IN CENTRAL SYRIA

The *maryannu* material has been most ably and extensively collated,¹ yet there are some aspects worth while recapitulating here. In the inscription from the tomb of a certain Amosis, who was captain of a Nile vessel, in the time of Amosis I and Tuthmosis I, there are two passages of special interest. The first concerns the three-year siege of Sharuhem, at the time of the expulsion of the Hyksos, of which this is the only extant record; the second, which refers to the Syrian campaign of Tuthmosis I, tells of the captain's prowess in the service of the pharaoh, when the latter "went forth to Retenu" and "reached Naharin . . . I carried off a chariot, its horse, and him who was in it as a living prisoner."² In the above passage the term *maryannu* is not employed, but once again a chariot-warrior is explicitly mentioned; at the same time it is not stated exactly where the chariot-warrior was captured. According to the text this could have occurred in either of the two countries referred to, but it seems likely that the incident took place somewhere in the north of Palestine or in Syria.³

Evidence of another kind and of a later date, but referring retrospectively to a period of at least five, and possibly more generations, is contained in texts found at Qatna.⁴ These are inventories of gifts made to the long-established temple of the goddess Nin-Egal and among the donors are kings and persons of rank whose names contain both Semitic and Hurrian elements.⁵ The longest list, which is also the latest⁶ represents the bringing up-to-date of the previous ones recording the items in the temple treasure as it had accumulated over the years and the centuries. This was compiled at the beginning of the reign of a certain king Idadda, who probably lived during the latter part of the fifteenth century and this date is supported by linguistic and graphic considerations.⁷ Since the names of the kings mentioned prior to Idadda can be considered to have been those of his predecessors on the throne, their combined regnal years can be estimated as going back for about a century, that is, to the late sixteenth century B.C. The names of the rulers of Qatna and their consorts

¹ R.T.O'Callaghan, *op.cit.*, 66-68; idem, "New light on the *maryannu* as 'chariot-warrior' ", *JKF* I (1951), 309 ff.

² *ANET*, 234.

³ R.T.O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, 132: "presumably he refers to Palestine and beyond".

⁴ J. Bottéro, "Les Inventaires de Qatna", *RA* XLIII (1949), 1-40 and 137-215.

⁵ J. Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 7-8.

⁶ Inventory I, D.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 32-33.

reflect the presence of Hurrians in a predominantly Semitic population,¹ while the first donor to be named in the inventories—and also the earliest from a chronological point-of-view—bears the much-discussed name of Ewari-šarri,² and he is clearly a person of importance who may have been king. Other Hurrian names are recorded in the inventories,³ as well as in other documents which are economic in content,⁴ where some names also contain Indo-Aryan elements. None of these, however, appear to have been of persons of rank, nor are they qualified as belonging to a warrior class, or as being the possessors of chariots, as at Alalakh. These texts were not found in a datable context, but may be presumed to belong to the same general period as the inventories.

From the evidence of the Qatna sources it is apparent that in the fifteenth century the population of the city contained a considerable percentage of Hurrians,⁵ while Indo-Aryan names were not uncommon, though they did not necessarily designate members of a patrician class. The latter names, however, point to the expected pattern of integration of the two groups, while this would appear to have been no new phenomenon, since already for some generations persons belonging to the ruling class had borne names which contained Hurrian and non-Semitic elements. At the same time inferential evidence regarding Duruša, king of Kadesh, (probably in the early fifteenth century) is also provided by these texts, and as might be expected, he, too, bears a name which is by no means Semitic.⁶

7. THE HURRIANS IN COASTAL SYRIA

Documentary evidence from coastal Syria is relatively scarce for the period in which it might be expected that Hurrians, in their customary association with Indo-Aryans, had penetrated there. But as has already been pointed out, even where there are later indications of their presence, for the actual period during which they were in the process of settling down side by side with the local population, there are almost no written sources.

¹ *Ibid.*, 33, para. 51.

² H. L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler (Mazar), "Semitised Hurrians in Syria and Palestine", *JPOS* XIV (1934), 251; P. M. Purves, *Nuzi personal names*, 212.

³ J. Bottéro, *op. cit.*, 7.

⁴ *Idem*, "Autres textes de Qatna", *RA* XLIV (1950), 112-118.

⁵ *Idem*, *op. cit.*, 118 and Ch. Virolleaud, "The Syrian town of Katna", *Antiquity* III (1929), 313-314.

⁶ C. Epstein, "That wretched enemy of Kadesh", *JNES* XXII (1963), 242-6.

Thus at Ras Shamra the rich harvest of tablets post-dates the period under review, the texts belonging for the most part to the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. Among them, are a number written in Hurrian and a bi-lingual text (in Akkadian and Hurrian) which testify to the knowledge and use of the language at Ugarit.¹ There is likewise evidence for Hurrian personal names² and for a certain number of Indo-Aryan names.³ But these do not provide a sufficiently reliable basis for estimating the proportion of Hurrians in the population make-up, though they would appear to have been less numerous here than elsewhere.⁴ Of interest is the suggested Sanskrit origin of the name of the town itself, the first syllable of which has been equated with the name of a god—possibly the patron of the city.⁵

Also of importance when considering the evidence for Hurrians at Ugarit, are references to *maryannu*. The term is found in both the Ugaritic and Akkadian forms and, from the contexts in which it occurs, in every case is used to indicate a definite group, albeit not that of chariot-warrior nobles. In one instance the term occurs in a list of persons coming from towns in the territory of Ugarit, many of whom bear Hurrian names and some of whom bear Indo-Aryan names, all of them being designated as the drivers of chariots.⁶ Clearly they are not members of an *élite* aristocracy, so that although the connection with chariotry is preserved, the original meaning—so specific in the earlier source material—is no longer implicit. It has been suggested that the reference to *mrynm* in another

¹ See in this connection, J. Nougayrol, *CRAI* (1960), 169: "Il ne fait pas doute....qu'en publant ainsi une édition 'augmentée' du vocabulaire S^a, le scribe d'Ugarit nous apporte la preuve que hourrite et ougarite étaient les deux langues courantes de son pays".

² H. L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler(Mazar), *op. cit.*, *JPOS* XIV(1934), 250-256; M. Noth, "Die syrisch-palästinische Bevölkerung des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr. im Lichte neuer Quellen", *ZDPV* LXV(1942), 54-58; C. F.-A. Schaeffer, "Les fouilles de Ras Shamra—Ugarit, 15^e, 16^e et 17^e campagnes", *Syria* XXXI (1954), 24; Ch. Virolleaud, "Les nouveaux textes alphabetiques de Ras Shamra", *CRAI* (1963), 93.

³ R.T.O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 63., n. 1 and 66-67, n. 7; S. Segert and L. Zgusta, "Indo-germanisches in den alphabetischen Texten aus Ugarit", *ArOr* XXI(1953), 272-274; *Purzanu*, *PRU* III, 193, text No. 12. 34, line 27 = Ch. Virroleaud, "Les nouvelles tablettes de Ras Shamra, (1948-1949)", *Syria* XXVIII(1951), 52, which is equivalent to *Brzn*, as in *Mémorial Lagrange*, 45—see R.T.O'Callaghan, *op. cit.* 63, n. 1; *Šubantu*, *PRU* III, text No. 12. 34, line 37 = Ch. Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, 53, which also occurs in *EA* 301-306.

⁴ I. J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, *JCS* XV (1961), 40.—With the publication of additional texts the proportion of Hurrians may prove to have been considerably higher.

⁵ C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic handbook*, 207; S. Segert and L. Zgusta, *op. cit.*, *ArOr* XXI(1953), 273.

⁶ *PRU* III, 192-193, text No. 12. 34, lines 24 ff; Ch. Virolleaud, *op. cit.*, *Syria* XXVIII (1951), 49-53.

text represents a category of professional soldiers.¹ Other texts record the granting of *maryannu* status by the king,² which would appear to be a rank equivalent to that of "count", over which the "master of the chariots" has no authority.³

The above evidence is insufficient to enable a clear picture to be obtained of the strength of the Hurrians in the population at Ugarit, neither does it permit of the inference of their presence there in the period preceding that of the tablets, or of the existence of a distinctly feudal organisation of society characterised by an upper stratum of chariot-warrior nobles on the pattern of neighbouring regions. Negative evidence, however, from the silence of documents—or from their not yet having been brought to light—can be misleading. Thus, despite the wealth and importance of the written material which has been found at Ras Shamra, nothing conclusive can as yet be deduced regarding the presence of Hurrians at Ugarit during the seventeenth to sixteenth centuries B.C.

8. THE HURRIANS IN NORTH PALESTINE

Our attention—like that of the Hurrians of old—must now be focussed on regions farther south and especially on North Palestine. Here the pivotal cities of Galilee and Esdraelon are well known, not only from the later Amarna letters and biblical accounts, but from actual excavation.

This applies particularly to the strongholds of Hazor and Megiddo, both of which were situated in key positions at the intersection of vital highways which passed through difficult terrain.⁴ The battle of Megiddo, which took place during the first quarter of the fifteenth century,⁵ resulted in a victory for the Egyptians which was by no means conclusive and it was only after a long series of campaigns that Tuthmosis III was able to guarantee for Egypt the control over both the inland and coastal routes to the north which were essential in order to maintain supplies of important raw materials at a time of expansion and growing economic prosperity.⁶ The long series of Syrian cam-

¹ *Idem*, *Mémorial Lagrange*, 41; J. Gray, *The legacy of Canaan*, 166-167.

² PRU III, 80, text No. 16. 239, lines 17-19; *ibid.*, 128, text No. 15. 155, lines 1-5; *ibid.*, 40, text No. 16. 32, lines 1-6.

³ *Ibid.*, 81, text No. 16. 239, lines 31-2. See also *ibid.*, 80, n. 1, 219 and 234; J. Nougayrol, "Guerre et paix à Ugarit", *Iraq* XXV (1963), 117 and n. 47; A. F. Rainey, "The military personnel of Ugarit", *JNES* XXIV (1965), 19-22. Compare the grant of *maryannu*-ship by the king at Alalakh, D. J. Wiseman, *op. cit.*, 31, No. 15.

⁴ E. C. Semple, *The geography of the Mediterranean region; its relation to ancient history*, 182.

⁵ See 154, n. 3.

⁶ L. Woolley, "Syria as a gateway between east and west", *GJ* CVII (1946), 182.

paigns was also necessary in order to break the power of the northern alliances and especially to reduce the threat of encroachment by Mitanni. The first clash between the opposing power groups took place in Palestine, against a more southerly arm of "the wretched Naharin".¹ But the character of the enemy at each stage of the Egyptian thrust northwards is seen to be so analogous that an inherent basic pattern in the social and political structure of the forces arrayed against the pharaoh can be postulated; and indeed there is a reference in the "Annals" recording the capture of the towns of Yano'am,² Nuges and Heren-keru where it is expressly stated that *maryannu* prisoners were taken.³ This was doubtless in a subsidiary engagement which took place either shortly after the battle of Megiddo, or during the seven months' siege of the city.

Additional evidence for the presence of *maryannu* is contained in an Egyptian document of no apparent political import, which lists supplies distributed to emissaries coming from a number of cities in Palestine who in all probability were bringing the tribute to Egypt. This text has been attributed to the second half of the reign of Tuthmosis III and may be dated to the second quarter of the fifteenth century.⁴ In this text the messengers from Djahy are specifically designated as *maryannu*, hailing from the following eleven cities, most of which are in the north of Palestine: 1. Megiddo, 2. Kinnereth, 3. Achshaph, 4. Shimron 5. Ta'anach, 6. Mishal, 7. T-N-N, 8. Sharon, 9. Ashkelon, 10. Hazor, 11. H-T-M.⁵ Excluding numbers 7 and 11, which are difficult to identify, and disregarding for the present the southern coastal town of Ashkelon, it is seen that the remaining names are all those of cities situated either in the Valley of Jezreel, the Plain of Acre, or in Lower and Upper Galilee, all of them no more than a day's journey one from the other, whether by donkey or by the more

¹ S. Yeivin, "The third district in Tuthmosis III's list of Palestino-Syrian towns", *JEA* XXXVI (1950), 51.

² Yano'am has been identified with Tell Abediyeh which is situated south of the point where the Jordan leaves the Sea of Galilee, Y. Aharoni, *The settlement of the Israelite tribes in Upper Galilee*, 124-125.

³ *ANET*, 237. All three towns were considered to be in the Huleh region by Gardiner, *AEO* I, 168*.

⁴ W. Golénischeff, *Les papyrus hiératiques No. No. 1115, 1116 A et 1116 B de l'Ermitage Impéiale à St. Pétersbourg*, No. 1116 A vs., lines 68-78 and 183-190; W. M. Müller, "Ein ägyptischer Beitrag zur Geschichte Palästinas um 1500 vor Chr.", *OLZ* XVII (1914), 103 ff.; and quoted and discussed by R.T.O. 'Callaghan, *op. cit. JKF* I (1951), 310-311.

⁵ These readings have been kindly checked by Dr. R. O. Faulkner.

aristocratic chariot. Further, while there is no strict geographical order,¹ and while adjacent towns are not listed consecutively, nevertheless numbers 1-6, 8 and 10 can all be considered as being in the same zone. The proximity of these cities is further demonstrated by the references to them in the later biblical sources, and particularly in the list of kings conquered by the Israelites,² and in the lists of towns forming the inheritance of the tribes.³ Thus it would seem as if these *maryannu*, sent as emissaries by their princes, had made the journey down to Egypt as an organised delegation from some of the petty kingdoms which had formerly been members of a loose confederacy (as in the case of the earlier confederacy of the Hurri states in the north) and which had almost certainly participated earlier in the alliance against Tuthmosis at Megiddo. Since then, the original political potential of such a confederacy had been weakened by Egyptian suzerainty over the whole region; but this did not affect the intrinsic character of these petty kingdoms, whose ethnic composition and social stratification remained unchanged. This is borne out by the evidence of the Amarna letters of some eighty to a hundred years later, which show that the rulers of Megiddo, Achshaph, Sharon and Ashkelon (Nos. 1, 3, 8 and 9 in the Egyptian list of *maryannu* emissaries) still bore Indo-Aryan names, as did also the king of Kadesh; while tablets from Ta'anach, which are more or less contemporary with the Egyptian emissaries' list show that some patricians of that city also had Indo-Aryan names and belonged to a chariot-warrior aristocracy.⁴ What could be more natural, then, than for a group made up of representatives of the chariot-warriors from neighbouring cities to join together on the journey necessitated by the bringing of their tribute to the pharaoh?

A word must be said here concerning the city names Nos. 7 and 11, which have proved difficult to identify. Regarding the first of these, a northern location would seem likely since, apart from Ashkelon, the southernmost city named is Ta'anach. Nor need T-N-N necessarily have been situated within the confines of Palestine, since the emissaries are described collectively as coming from Djahy—a term which was also used to include regions lying considerably farther north.⁵ It has been suggested that No. 7 be identified with

¹ R.T.O'Callaghan, *op. cit.* 311.

² Joshua XII, 18(b)-21(b), where Nos. 8, 10, 4, 3, 5, and 1 occur.

³ Joshua XIX, 25, 26 and 35, where Nos. 3, 6, and 2 are mentioned; see also J. Garstang, *Joshua-Judges*, 188, Map 13. ⁴ See 164-165 under.

⁵ Gardiner, *AEO* I, 145*-146*. See also the "Annals" describing Tuthmosis III's fifth campaign, where Djahy is used when referring to the Tunip region, *ANET* 238 and n. 2.

modern Tennūneh,¹ which in mediaeval times was known as Tanūniyah.² This village, which lies west of Homs, is situated in the Orontes region between the site of ancient Kadesh to the south and ancient Qatna to the north-east. It has likewise been proposed as the equivalent of the cuneiform *Tunanat*, mentioned in the Amarna correspondence.³ Such an identification of No. 7 would still permit the term Djahy to be applied to T-N-N. At the same time there can be little doubt that in the mid-second millennium B.C. the town occupying the site of modern Tennūneh lay within the political orbit of the powerful nearby kingdom of Kadesh, so that there is every reason to expect that here too, there would be a ruling class composed of *maryannu* nobles.

As for No. 11, there is a certain amount of confusion due to the uncertainty of its recording by the scribe, who in each of the two lists wrote this name with a variant orthography.⁴ After both entries, a larger amount of rations is recorded for its representatives than for those from the other cities, from which it might be inferred that this was a place of some size which had sent a larger contingent of tribute-bearers to Egypt. Since, however, the towns of Hazor and Megiddo are both included in the lists, it is unlikely that H-T-M would have been of greater size or prominence, seeing that the former were the two most important cities of North Palestine. A far more plausible explanation would seem to be that No. 11 had originally completed the second list (as it did the first) and that the quantities of beer and corn recorded here represent the sum total of the day's ration for the whole party.

Although carelessness in copying makes it difficult to suggest an identification which would satisfy both variants of the name, and despite the doubling of the 'T' in the second entry, H-T-M may indeed be a corrupt form of *Huma*,⁵ which occurs in Tuthmosis III's List I (No. 118) and this has been identified with modern Ham.⁶ It lay on the important caravan route, passing through Bashan, which linked Damascus with Elath.⁷

¹ C. Epstein, "A new appraisal of some lines from a long-known papyrus", *JEA* XLIX (1964), 53.

² R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*, 110.

³ *EA* 53, line 43. Thus identified by Dussaud (see n. 2), but this is not accepted by W. Helck, *op. cit.*, 308.

⁴ In the first list, line 78, it is written as H-T-M, with the determinative for town; in the second list, line 184, it is written as H-T-T-M, with the determinative for man and is the first of the cities mentioned.

⁵ First suggested by W. M. Müller, *op. cit.*, *OLZ* XVII (1914), 103.

⁶ W. F. Albright, "New Israelite and pre-Israelite sites", *BASOR* XXXV (1929), 10-11.

⁷ B. Maisler (Mazar), "Die Landschaft Basan im 2 vorchr. Jahrtausend", *JPOS* IX (1929), 82.

With regard to the city of Ashkelon (No. 9 in the *maryannu* list), it can surely only have been a matter of chance that brought the representative of this southern coastal town to Egypt together with those of the northern region—unless it is assumed that the group of *maryannu* from the north spent the night at Ashkelon during the course of their journey, the representative of the local dynast joining the party there. Such a suggestion may well be close to the truth; for it is known that in the Amarna period the prince (or king) of Ashkelon bore an Indo-Aryan name,¹ so that the evidence for the presence of Hurrians and Indo-Aryans there is contained not only in the reference to the *maryannu* emissary who was entertained at government expense in Egypt in the first half of the fifteenth century, but also by the prominence later of the city's ruler in the politics of the Amarna period. Thus the group of chariot-warriors from the north might well break their long journey down to Egypt in a city where they were assured of finding their "brethren", rather than in one where the social and ethnic structure was less like that of their home-towns. And indeed, the same Egyptian document records the distribution of rations to a messenger from another South Palestinian town, situated not far from Ashkelon. In the second line of the same text (No. 1116 *vs.*) reference is made to the emissary from Lachish. This separate mention of a representative of another of the tributary princes of Palestine— who is *not* designated as belonging to the *maryannu*—may be interpreted as indicating that he and his party did not join the group of chariot-warriors from the north to which the Ashkelon emissary attached himself and that the former arrived in Egypt on his own.

The importance of the above lists lies to no little extent in their being contemporary records of a purely official nature connected with the commissariat department; their purpose was not to aggrandise the pharaoh or to show the magnitude of his exploits abroad, as in the great lists of conquered cities at Karnak. Thus their very routine character adds to their reliability as documents reflecting an unadorned reality. This is the existence of a ruling class composed of a chariot-warrior aristocracy of *maryannu*, which from documentary evidence further north is known to have been an integral feature of the Hurrian social structure, and which is thus seen to have been the dominant element in wide areas in Northern Palestine in the second quarter of the fifteenth century.

Nor is there an entire lack of evidence concerning the expected Indo-Aryan

¹ R.T.O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, 62, No. 78.

names; for while the Egyptian source material at this time does not mention any but the names of cities and geographical regions, an important series of letters found at Ta'anach contains—as do the Amarna letters—not only the names of the writers and the names of the addressees, but also references to other persons and therefore a special interest attaches to the names they bear. The letters have been dated to the period following the battle of Megiddo.¹ On linguistic and paleographic grounds these texts appear to be earlier than the Amarna letters and they may be considered as being more or less contemporary with the above-mentioned Egyptian *maryannu* list of emissaries,² in which Ta'anach also figures (No. 5 above). Two of the local aristocracy bear Indo-Aryan names³—one of them being referred to as king—and they are quite clearly members of a chariot-warrior class, as is also another prince to whom four of the letters are addressed and whose name would seem to be Egyptian.⁴ Their connection with chariots is emphasised by the contents of the letters which contain requests for chariots and their spare parts⁵ and for their personnel, who are referred to as the “brethren” of those to whom the letters are addressed.⁶ These requests are unmistakably for military support for operations—presumably conducted locally—and they are not always acceded to. “Send me thy brethren together with their chariots...and as for all the captives, ...send them to me tomorrow at Megiddo”.⁷ In another, incomplete text, a complaint is voiced to the local ruler who has sent a contingent of *bupšu* (the lowest class of inhabitants) instead of the “brethren” requested.⁸ From other references in which chariots are mentioned in the same context, it

¹ W. F. Albright, “A prince of Ta'anach in the fifteenth century B.C.”, *BASOR* XCIV (1944), 16 ff., whose translation is referred to here.

² B. Landsberger has suggested that since two of the letters can be regarded as royal letters written by Amenophis II himself, the correspondence should be dated to his reign, which according to Hayes is to be placed in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. This would make the letters slightly later than the emissaries' list contained in the P. Hermitage. B. Landsberger, *op. cit.*, *JCS* VIII (1954), 59, n. 123 and W.C. Hayes, *op. cit.*, *CAH* I, Chapter VI, revised edition, (Fascicle 4), 18.

³ R.T.O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 61, Nos. 57 and 62; W. Belardi, *op. cit.*, *Miscellanea G. Galbiati* III, 65.

⁴ See explanation put forward by Albright, *op. cit.*, *BASOR* XCIV (1944), 6, n. 20 and Landsberger's interpretation of the hybrid character of this name, part Egyptian and part Indo-Aryan, *op. cit.*, *JCS* VIII (1954), 59, n. 124.

⁵ Letter No. 2, lines 8-9.

⁶ Letters Nos. 5 and 6.

⁷ Letter No. 5, lines 4-5, 9-10 and 13-14.

⁸ Letter No. 6.

is understood that the "brethren" were of the same class as the dynast and that all were, in effect, *maryannu*, though the term is not specifically used.¹ Ta'anach, then, which was the nearest of Megiddo's neighbouring cities, had at the time of the letters (little more than one generation after the stand made at the battle of Megiddo against the Egyptians) a ruling aristocracy of chariot-warriors, some of whom bore Indo-Aryan names,² while among other persons mentioned there are many with Hurrian, as well as Semitic names.³ Thus these texts reflect a social structure characterised by the class distinctions typical of those centres where the Hurrians and Indo-Aryans had gained the upper hand, even where they were a minority in the local population—and this is confirmed by the diversified origin of the names borne by the inhabitants of Ta'anach at this time.

9. THE HURRIANS IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH PALESTINE

Less specific, but quite clear evidence of the Hurrian element is contained in source material found at Shechem, in central Palestine. Situated on a spur of the central spine of highlands which runs from north to south, Shechem had been an important strategic city at least from MB times.⁴ In two tablets found by the earlier German excavators, two Indo-Aryan names occur, one of which is clearly that of a person of rank.⁵ In the first letter, which is fragmentary, there is a list of personal names, one of which is Indo-Aryan, while the father's name has been interpreted as Hurrian.⁶ The second text is a letter addressed to a notable whose name is Indo-Aryan and in whose house the tablet was found. The Shechem material is considerably closer in time to the Amarna period than to the battle of Megiddo. Nevertheless, the occurrence of these names is significant and indicates the presence there earlier of a Hurrian ruling class, elsewhere associated with *maryannu*. While these texts are somewhat later than the

¹ Compare a somewhat later juxtaposition of "his *maryannu*, his brothers", when referring to the capture of Šutatarra of Kadesh.—Historical introduction to the treaty between Šuppiluliumaš and Mattiwaš of Mitanni, *ANET*, 318.

² The use of Indo-Aryan names by the local dynasts continued at least until the Amarna period, when a prince of Ta'anach was named Yašdata, *EA* 248 and R. T. O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 61, No. 59.

³ A. Gustav, "Die Personennamen in der Tontafeln von Tell Ta'anek", *ZDPV* L(1927), 7 ff. and *idem*, *ZDPV* LI(1928), 177-179.

⁴ L. E. Toombs and G. E. Wright, "The fourth campaign at Balātah (Shechem)", *BASOR* CLXIX(1963), 6-7.

⁵ W. F. Albright, "A teacher to a man of Shechem about 1400 B.C.", *BASOR* LXXXVI (1942), 28 ff.; R. T. O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, 60, No. 70.

⁶ H. L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler (Mazar), *op. cit.*, *JPOS* XIV(1934), 251-2.

period of those already discussed, they serve to hint at the original extent of the diffusion of the Hurrians throughout the country.

Turning now to the more southerly sector of the coastal plain, there is once again inferential evidence concerning the town of Jaffa. This is contained in an Egyptian text¹ which was written during the Nineteenth Dynasty, but which relates an incident involving a well-known historical personage who lived during the reign of Tuthmosis III and who was among his most prominent empire administrators. The setting of the story is the harbour town of Jaffa and it concerns a ruse whereby the Egyptian soldiers were able to gain entry into the city which was strongly defending itself. Once again the *maryannu* are mentioned and their connection with horses is explicit, though their exact standing is not made very clear. Towards the end of the text there is a passage which refers to the "charioteer of the Enemy of Joppa", who is instructed to return into the city in order to give a message to the ruler's wife concerning the parleys being held outside the walls. It has been suggested that this charioteer was merely the driver of the transport which had brought the prince to the conference,² whereas it would be far more likely that he was, in fact, one of the *maryannu* nobles (especially in view of the earlier reference to them), who had accompanied the local dynast to the meeting with the Egyptians. Whatever the interpretation, this text provides yet another instance of the finding of *maryannu* in Palestine—and that in a region much farther south than is elsewhere indicated in the documents for this period. Yet, as has been seen above, they were to be found in a town which lies in an even more southerly position in the coastal plain, namely Ashkelon. This is the furthest point south from which there is evidence for the presence either of Hurrians or of *maryannu* in the early part of the fifteenth century B.C.

10. CONCLUSION

From a study of the Egyptian source material and of that contained in locally-written texts, it becomes more and more manifest that in addition to the indigenous population which was unmistakably Semitic in the middle of the second millennium B.C.,³ there was, both in North and Central Syria, as well as in Palestine, an admixture of a small but powerful element composed of Hurrians

¹ *ANET*, 22-23.

² *Ibid.*, 23, n. 9.

³ I. J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, *JCS* XV (1961), 41.

and Indo-Aryans. Supported by their chariot-warrior nobles, they succeeded in imposing their own essentially feudal social system on the regions in which they settled and in due course many of them became the rulers of some of the most important cities.

In attempting to evaluate bichrome ware and to analyse the different sources which together gave it its specific character, the conclusion seems inescapable that the unheralded introduction of related, but differently-executed bird and animal motifs into the ceramic repertoires of the north and of sixteenth century Palestine cannot but be connected with the advent of those same Hurrian elements and their absorption into the existing local population.¹ That they brought new ideas—and not only in the sphere of ceramic decoration—seems certain and these undoubtedly had far-reaching effects on contemporary cultural and social concepts. The cultural background in the north and in the south was, however, not identical; and while the Hurrian groups, in their closely-knit relationship with the Indo-Aryans, were present in both regions, the traditions with which they mingled and ultimately became absorbed were not the same. This accounts for the emergence in each region of a decorated pottery which drew for its inspiration on new conceptions which had not been part of the older local traditional forms. These new ideas did not entirely replace and oust what had gone before but became tempered with it, and, in the case of bichrome ware, with other contemporary ceramic influences, all of which together combined to form something entirely new. Thus, about the same time there appeared two distinctive kinds of wares both using different, but related decorative motifs: the Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware of Upper Mesopotamia and North Syria and the bichrome ware of Syro-Palestine.

On bichrome ware, the new approach to ceramic decoration and to the manner of its application—which kept to the convention of two contrasting colours—went hand-in-hand with the introduction of new shapes, which were greatly influenced by contemporary Cypriote wares with which there was a

¹ A similar conclusion was arrived at in the thirties, although at the time there was far less evidence available, either from pottery or from written sources. E.A. Speiser made an important contribution towards this interpretation by his study, "Ethnic movements in the Near East", *AASOR* XIII(1933), 13 ff. Later, members of the Megiddo expedition took these deductions a step further, linking them with the bichrome pottery found at that site and elsewhere R. M. Engberg, *The Hyksos reconsidered*, 19; *idem.*, *apud* H. G. May, *The material remains of the Megiddo cult*, 35 ff; G. M. Shipton, *Notes on the Megiddo pottery of Strata VI-XX*, 13-14.

growing familiarity resulting from expanding trade with the island. This applies particularly to the harbour towns through which there was a steady flow of new ideas in both directions. Thus the repertoire of shapes, whose manufacture was continued with no apparent break from later MB times, was changed and expanded so as to incorporate new ceramic features of which the use of a distinctive figure decoration was one. This accounts for the hybrid and transitional character of bichrome ware, which also in this respect resembles Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware.

A word must be said here concerning the origin of certain design elements which, in a stylised form, have come to be considered as the hall-mark of bichrome ware. In a previous chapter, it has been seen that one of the most widely-used geometrical motifs was that of the spoked wheel;¹ and while there is no known Hurrian explanation for a predilection for the bird and animal figures which are seen to have been typical of the various kinds of wares which owed their inspiration to them, there can be no doubt of the close association of the spoked wheel with horse-drawn chariots with which the history of Hurrian progress through different countries and centuries is inevitably bound up. This connection between the representation of the object and the people who, dominated by an Indo-Aryan *élite*, had first made the most advantageous use of the light spoked wheel chariot, is further emphasised by the evidence provided by the Egyptian emissaries' list discussed above, in which *maryannu* chariot-warriors are recorded from eleven towns in Palestine. Of these, only four have been excavated to date; but it can hardly be mere chance that in all four of them bichrome ware has been found in occupation contexts—and decorated in the characteristic manner which includes the spoked-wheel motif. These are the cities of Megiddo, Ta'anach, Ashkelon and Hazor,² while sherds in the bichrome style have been found on the surface at Tell el-'Oreimeh, the site of ancient Kinnereth³ and in a sounding made at Tell Keisan,⁴ which has been proposed as the possible location of Achshaph,⁵ or alternatively of Mishal.⁶ Although other identifications have been put forward for Achshaph,

¹ See 57-64 above.

² Nos. 1, 5, 9 and 10 in the Egyptian emissaries' list.

³ No. 2 in the above list.

⁴ See 128 above.

⁵ No. 3 in the above list—J. Garstang, *Joshua-Judges*, 99 and 190.

⁶ No. 6 in the above list—Y. Aharoni, *The land of Israel in biblical times—a geographical history*, 142.

there is general agreement that it was situated in the Plain of Acre, of which Tell Keisan is one of the dominating mounds, still awaiting excavation. Likewise at Jaffa, where it has been seen that *maryannu* chariot-warriors were closely associated with the local dynast, bichrome ware—including the spoked-wheel motif¹—has also been found.

The combined evidence for the presence of bichrome ware from excavated sites and from surveys gives promise of a far richer harvest in the future, when it may be confidently expected that much additional material will be revealed,² both ceramic and possibly, also, written tablets (as at Ta'anach), thus giving further documentary confirmation of the presence among the inhabitants of the Hurrians, the Indo-Aryans with whom they were so closely associated and the *maryannu* warriors and their chariots.

¹ Pl. XVI: 5.

² Recent excavations conducted during 1963 have already borne out the truth of this. On the one hand they have brought to light the outstanding, yet typical krater at Nagila, and on the other characteristic bichrome ware at Bahān and a single unmistakable sherd at Akhziv. The occurrence of bichrome ware at the two latter sites is important from the point-of-view of their position: the one is situated in the Sharon Plain close to the foothills of Samaria, while the other lies near the seaboard in the north of the country, situated in the coastal strip which, from Ras Shamra and Tell Sukas southward, has so far given the impression of being devoid of bichrome ware sites.

More recently still, a hitherto unknown site has been discovered, situated on the coast approximately half-way between ancient Ashkelon and Ashdod, where among the surface finds are bichrome ware sherds, decorated with typical figure and geometrical design elements (including the joined spoked wheel motif), as well as characteristic associated plain wares and Cypriote imports.

CHAPTER SIX

BICHROME WARE AND ITS CHRONOLOGICAL SETTING

INTRODUCTION

Having interpreted bichrome ware as the outcome of the fusion and blending of a number of ceramic traditions—the indigenous Syro-Palestinian, the Cypriote and that stemming from the Hurrians—it now remains to attempt to place it more precisely in its true chronological setting. To this end the history and stratigraphy of the two Palestinian sites of Megiddo and 'Ajjul can be of considerable assistance, since even today the contemporary level has nowhere been as extensively excavated. In addition, their positions in the north and in the south of the country make the history of each a contrasting one, with different events affecting the two cities during the same period, since they were subject to different political alignments and diverse external pressures.

It has been shown that during the latter part of the seventeenth century B.C. and at the beginning of the sixteenth, the Hurrians were beginning to push slowly southwards through Central Syria into North Palestine, such a movement being probably gradual and indicative of a venturing forth ever further afield by tribal groups, rather than of a steady stream of migration. This process would seem to have been going on throughout the first quarter of the sixteenth century and was accompanied by the progressive assimilation of the new ethnic element with the local population in which it constituted a minority and over which it had not as yet gained the ascendancy. Clearly, the rise of the Hurrians to positions of leadership required time and may well have been accelerated by the creation of a void after the collapse of the Hyksos in Egypt and the subsequent loss of their political supremacy in Palestine. This applies especially to the north, where Egyptian control at the commencement of the Eighteenth Dynasty was tenuous.

Despite undoubtedly changes in the regional power-groupings of the sixteenth century, most Palestinian sites exhibit none of the familiar signs of upheaval and abrupt change in the overall pattern of living such as are reflected in changes in architecture or in cult and burial practices. On the contrary, the specifically novel feature distinguishing one level from the next is the development of a

new kind of pottery—namely, bichrome ware, while at the same time, there is an increase in the import of Cypriote wares due to a growing trade with the island, the first signs of which were already apparent in the previous century. It is for this reason that it is the ceramic innovation of the appearance of bichrome ware which has been taken as an indication of a new period or stratum, commencing after the Hyksos expulsion from Egypt and ending with the battle of Megiddo. While these two events were indeed landmarks, their repercussions were not identical in all parts of the country and it is because of their rather different impact on the two important towns of Megiddo and 'Ajjul, that an examination of them during the bichrome ware period is likely to prove particularly rewarding.

1. MEGIDDO

Despite the incorrect attribution to Stratum X of a number of tombs which contained bichrome vessels,¹ it has long been recognised that the ware was characteristic of Stratum IX and this has been repeatedly emphasised throughout the present study. Now, the end of Stratum X and the beginning of Stratum IX was dated by the excavators to 1550 B.C., presumably on the basis of a date in the mid-sixteenth century for the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. Neither the date nor the event to which it refers are viable when applied to Megiddo, nor can the appearance of bichrome ware there be shown to have been affected by either. The expulsion of the Hyksos and the foundation of the New Kingdom by Amosis I has recently been dated to 1567 B.C.,² while the fall of Sharuhene, signalling the final defeat, probably occurred a few years later. There is no evidence that the Egyptians continued the pursuit of their enemies very much further than this or that any of the northern cities were directly implicated³ and shortly afterwards Amosis turned his attention to the securing of his southern border and set out to recapture Nubia.⁴ Even at the time of Tuthmosis I's drive northwards, some 40 years later, when he reached Naharin, there is nothing to indicate that he destroyed Megiddo on his way, if indeed he took the route which passed by it.

Throughout the sixteenth century Megiddo does not appear to have been

¹ See Chapter 4, section 1.

² W. C. Hayes, "Egypt: from the death of Ammenemes III to Seqenenre II", *CAH* II, Chapter II, revised edition, (Fascicle 6), 24 n. 3.

³ T. Säve-Söderbergh, "The Hyksos rule in Egypt", *JEA* XXXVII (1951), 71.

⁴ *ANET*, 234.

the scene of violent military action and certainly not at the time of the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. Nor is there any evidence of destruction between Strata X and IX, such as would undoubtedly have left its mark had the city been involved in any way in the final clash between Egyptians and Hyksos. On the contrary, both in Areas AA and BB the town plan exhibits a marked continuity, there being no radical changes during the long period between Strata XI and VII A, and when changes do occur, they are due to innovations and rebuilding rather than to a complete re-orientation of any of the major structures. Further, the period of the early Eighteenth Dynasty—particularly until the end of the reign of Hatshepsut—would seem to have been one during which the Palestinian cities situated north of the Gaza region had been left very much to their own devices. It is during this same period that the Hurrians in North Palestine were gradually gaining the control which they clearly had at the time of the battle of Megiddo. This was, in all likelihood, indirectly due to the influence which the growing power of Mitanni exerted farther north over the kingdoms of Northern Syria, which were progressively coming within her orbit. This applies equally to the kings of Qatna and Kadesh, with the latter of whom the rulers of Megiddo were in close alliance.

A careful study of the architectural remains at Megiddo gives just such an impression of gradual change and this was remarked upon at the time by the excavators who noted in the Field Diary¹ on 10. 1. 37: "More and more IX and VIII are to be tied up with X as one long period without complete destruction, but with sporadic building as individual structures collapsed." Again, referring to Area CC: "Our present IX seems to employ extensive re-use of X and would be a period of rebuilding". In the final, published report, the same note is struck: "Here [in Stratum X, in Area AA] for the first time one becomes conscious of the partial continuity of plan existing successively in Strata XI-VII A, a fact likewise apparent in Area BB. In each stratum within this range new structures are introduced, but there is always some re-use of the old. The implication is obvious: during the period of these strata there must have been no wholesale destruction at any one time".² This is true not only of the dwelling houses, but of the public buildings and fortifications: the "palace" and the city gate, in Area AA, are considered to have been constructed in the first instance in Stratum X and to have continued in use, with various changes,

¹ Unpublished, in O.I.C. archives.

² *M* II, 15-16.

until Stratum VII A;¹ Temple 2048 and its precincts, as well as the house complexes on its east flank, in Area BB, are now seen to have undergone a series of rebuildings which did not materially alter the original plan initiated in Stratum XII and which continued basically unchanged until Stratum VII.²

Thus it would seem that at Megiddo the normal course of life continued without any violent upheavals to mark the transition from Stratum X to Stratum IX, the striking and distinguishing feature (specific to the latter) being the presence of bichrome ware. This, it is submitted, was a ceramic synthesis, which combined features stemming from the local Palestinian traditions with others inspired by contemporary Cypriote wares, while at the same time assimilating and adapting a decorative approach introduced by the Hurrian element in the population. Thus it could only have evolved *after* the arrival of the Hurrians. By postulating some quarter of a century during which one generation could achieve adult-hood in the new places of settlement, a date c. 1575 is arrived at, and it is this date which it is here proposed for the beginning of Stratum IX at Megiddo and as a *terminus post quem* for the beginning of bichrome ware there. As for the duration of Stratum IX, it would seem that it came to an end not long after the battle of Megiddo in 1481,³ though once again it must be stressed that neither the Egyptian records nor the results of excavation provide evidence for the destruction of the town by Tuthmosis III. There was, however, complete capitulation and a change of administration, which presumably did not immediately affect the tenour of daily life. For this reason the end of the bichrome ware period from a ceramic point-of-view is difficult to determine exactly; and it has been shown above that during the later phase of its usage there were already signs of deterioration both as regards decoration and the actual vessel shapes.⁴ By allowing a few years following on the battle of Megiddo for true bichrome ware to die out, the date of c. 1475 is arrived at, giving a very slight overlap into Stratum VIII. While such dates remain arbitrary, it seems reasonable to suggest no more than a century for the period of bichrome ware and there is no evidence for its use longer elsewhere. This is corroborated by its stratigraphical position at other sites, including those beyond the borders of Palestine, which favours a short, popular usage, which was fol-

¹ *Ibid.*, 33 and figs. 380-384.

² C. Epstein, "An interpretation of the Megiddo sacred area during Middle Bronze II", *IEJ* 15, (1965), 204-221.

³ See 154, n. 3 above.

⁴ See Chapter 4, section 7.

lowed by the development of distinctly debased types of decoration, with which were associated later types of imported wares.

2. 'AJJUL

The sequence of events at 'Ajjul was very different from that affecting the northern cities. Situated as it was not far from the Sinai desert and only a mile or two from coast, its position was doubly important in that it lay at the junction of vital routes and at the same time was well-placed for maritime trade. Its history is linked with that of the Gaza region, which also included Tell el-Far'ah, whose identification with Sharuhem has now been generally accepted. That the two cities formed part of a province which was closely allied to Egypt during the period of Hyksos rule is attested by the finding at both of scarabs bearing the name of a well-known treasurer and keeper of the seal¹ who appears to have been responsible for the administration of the whole of Egypt, including the provinces of Nubia and of South Palestine.² It was to this friendly hinterland that the Hyksos retreated in order to make their last stand against the Egyptians and it may be assumed that the towns in the vicinity all sent contingents in support of their allies, much as was the case nearly a century later at the battle of Megiddo. After a siege of three years, the fall of Sharuhem brought the Hyksos resistance to an end and during the course of this campaign there appears to have been widespread Egyptian destruction throughout the region. Evidence of such destruction has been found at a number of sites in the south which, on stratigraphical grounds, can be attributed to this period. Thus Stratum D at Tell Beit Mirsim was destroyed by fire and the town only resettled after a considerable period of time had elapsed;³ while at Lachish, Level VIII likewise exhibited signs of intense burning.⁴ Nor is the evidence of destruction by burning lacking at 'Ajjul; and it seems logical to associate this large-scale sack of towns in the south with the final clash between the Hyksos and the Egyptians,⁵ even though knowledge of this event is based on meagre documentary evidence.

During the first season's work at 'Ajjul two distinct levels of occupation

¹ W. C. Hayes, *op. cit.*, *CAH* II, Chapter II, revised edition, (Fascicle 6), 21.

² T. Säve-Söderbergh, *op. cit.*, *JEA* XXXVII (1951), 65 and fig. 3.

³ W. F. Albright, *The excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim I*, *AASOR* XII (1932), 35-36.

⁴ *Lach.* IV, 48.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 35.

were found which were separated by a thick burnt layer,¹ while in the course of the following two seasons, a series of super-imposed buildings were excavated which were considered by Petrie to be palaces,² between the earliest and second of which there was a considerable layer of ash.³ As long ago as 1938, Professor Albright convincingly demonstrated that in both these areas of the tell, the occupation level which lay beneath the burnt layer (that is, Palace I and City III), were contemporary⁴ and it seems clear that the destruction of both occurred at the same time, either during or shortly after the final defeat of the Hyksos, when the city of 'Ajjul was razed to the ground and houses and public buildings alike were covered by a thick layer of burnt debris. Likewise, there seems every reason to accept Albright's proposed date for the construction of Palace I in the late seventeenth century B.C., especially on the basis of the interpretation of the sequence of successive occupation periods,⁵ though little ceramic evidence was recorded from the contemporary houses. An understanding of the true function of the Palace I building only goes to strengthen this, since an examination of its plan leads to the conclusion that far from being a palace, it was intended as a stronghold, the ranges of rather small-sized rooms surrounding a large open courtyard conforming more to the requirements of a fort than to those of the residence of the local dynast. Even more indicative of its purpose is the fact that the building was erected at the same time as the great fosse, the cutting of which made available great quantities of blocks of the local sandstone which were used in the lower courses of its walls. It seems clear that these two undertakings were not only contemporary—as Petrie originally believed⁶—but that they were also complementary, being part of a system of defence works carried out during the Sixteenth Dynasty.

Turning now to the remains of the building itself, it will be noted that very little apart from the stone substructure of the walls was found (from below floor level). When standing, the upper wall courses had undoubtedly been built of mud-brick, as was usual at this period.⁷ Very little remained of the floors

¹ *AG* I, 3, para. 12.

² For the sake of clarity the original nomenclature of the "Palace" buildings will be retained here, but it should always be understood that their true function was of an entirely different nature.

³ *AG* II, 4, para. 17.

⁴ Albright, *AJS* LV, 348-349.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 350.

⁶ *AG* II, 3 and *AG* III, 1, para. 4.

⁷ Note the finding of the remains of a black brick wall, *ibid.*, 3, para. 12.

of the building (except for the plastered bathroom floor, in MK), while the stone foundations were themselves incomplete and fragmentary.¹ This makes it difficult to associate with the building the artifacts which had been in use in it. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the accumulated debris from its rooms would contain pottery contemporary with the final phase of occupation and this debris had been sealed off by the ash and earth which lay over it. A detailed checking of such sherds, based on the various registers, tables and findspots recorded below pottery drawings² and verified wherever possible by comparison with the residual material gives revealing results.³ For this purpose, only areas actually inside the Palace I building or close to the line of walls are taken into consideration, since the great expanse of the courtyard cannot be regarded as reliable for dating purposes and this applies equally to most of the southern wing, where very little even of the stone sub-structure remained. This examination yields the following results:

1. Apart from the jar set in plaster in the bathroom (MK), only relatively few sherds of plain ware vessels are recorded from loci inside the building.
2. 14 bichrome ware sherds were found inside the rooms and close to the walls: 2 from OX (inside the building) and 12 from OE, OM, OY, ML, MU and OF (outside the building).
3. Examples of wares which are associated with bichrome ware also occurred: from ML (outside), a sherd from the upper body of a black lustrous juglet (unpublished) and a Monochrome Ware bowl (19 F1); from MV (inside) and from OE, OM, OG and MU (outside), 9 White Slip I sherds; from MV, a sherd decorated in brown in the Cross Line Style;⁴ from OY (outside), 2 sherds of Red-on-Black Ware—probably from the same vessel.

Reviewing the above evidence, the interesting fact emerges that bichrome ware was present in the debris of Palace I, mostly from kraters, Type A1(a), and shallow bowls, Types B1(a) and B2(a), as well as from a carinated bowl, Type A1(a)⁵ and that a number of sherds from other wares, elsewhere associated with bichrome ware also occurred. It is, however, rather unexpected to find a comparatively large number of White Slip I sherds in an early bichrome

¹ *AG* III, Pl. XLVI.

² *AG* II and III.

³ In I of A collection.

⁴ Pl. XIV: 10.

⁵ Pl. XIX: 5.

ware assemblage, but this was doubtless due to the position of 'Ajjul as a harbour town, as compared with Megiddo, which was essentially an inland city. It may be recalled here that bichrome ware was found in Cyprus in a context which included Proto-White Slip Ware,¹ thus testifying to early reciprocal trade exchanges in pottery.

The vessels from which the above sherd material comes would have been in use during the final phase of Palace I, prior to its destruction, which, as has been seen, probably occurred between 1567 and 1564 B.C. In discussing the first appearance of bichrome ware at Megiddo, a commencing date c. 1575 was proposed for its introduction there and it is submitted that this date, or soon afterwards, is not inapplicable at 'Ajjul. For once bichrome ware had become established in the north, where there were present those factors out of which it developed, it would find its way further afield, carried by caravans and traders overland, as well as by seamen plying between the ports the whole length of the coast as far as Ugarit. Thus, not so long after it had come into use, bichrome ware would be likely to reach other areas, including the south, where it can be assumed that it would make its first appearance in those towns which were also trading centres; and once established, the ware would in due course be copied locally and gradually achieve a wider circulation. This process would, however, require a certain amount of time. Because of its important position on converging routes as well as on the coast, 'Ajjul was likely to be among those centres which bichrome ware reached soon after it began to be diffused and this explains the sherds found in Palace I from vessels which had been in use not long before the building was destroyed. Similarly, because of its position, 'Ajjul would, like other harbour towns, be among the first to receive the flow of Cypriote imports.²

On the other hand, towns which did not lie directly on the main arteries of trade diffusion, would be less likely to introduce a new ware at the beginning of its *floruit*. This explains the absence of bichrome ware from the last phase of Stratum D at Tell Beit Mirsim³ which was contemporary with the last phase of Palace I at 'Ajjul where, sherds from the building's debris indicate that it was beginning to come into use there. At Lachish, altogether less than a dozen

¹ See 130 above.

² Sjöqvist, *Problems*, 162.

³ W. F. Albright, *The excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim II*, *AASOR* XVII (1938), 59 "... more probably [bichrome ware] was still rare at the time of its close".

sherds are recorded from Level VIII,¹ but here too the absence of bichrome ware can be attributed to the same reason as at Tell Beit Mirsim and it was only some time later, with the presumed building of the city which the earliest Fosse Temple must have served,² that bichrome ware occurred.³ The relatively small quantity of bichrome vessels known from Lachish can almost certainly be attributed to the fact that no traces were found of the sixteenth century town; yet the very characteristic examples that did occur here only serve to show that with its wider diffusion, the ware was in use, as at most other contemporary sites. This gives added weight to the submission that time must be allowed for the establishment of a new ceramic ware—and bichrome ware was no exception. By allowing for a period of what probably amounted to less than a decade between the beginning of the production of bichrome ware c. 1575 and its subsequent introduction and use at 'Ajjul, during the last phase of Palace I, a date is arrived at which is close to the period of the final clash between the Egyptians and the Hyksos, which culminated in what appears to have been a campaign of devastation in the south and which caused the destruction of many cities, including 'Ajjul itself. This meant that there was a longer or a shorter interval before towns were rebuilt and normal life in them resumed. It is only then that bichrome ware begins to be found; and by the second half of the sixteenth century it is clear that it was widely in use throughout the region, as is borne out by its occurrence at every site where even the most limited excavation has been carried out.⁴

The interval of non-occupation at 'Ajjul (after the Egyptian destruction), does not appear to have lasted for any great length of time; and this again can almost certainly be attributed to the town's vital position on essential highways and, to a lesser degree, because of its value as a port. At all events, the dwellings situated in the southern sector of the town were rebuilt on the burnt layer which represented the destruction of City III.⁵ But the great fortress which had occupied a dominating position in the north-west sector does not appear to

¹ Lach. IV, 55.

² *Ibid.*, 48.

³ *Ibid.*, 197. This included a cylindrical juglet in the Cross Line Style from T. 1555, Pl. XV: 5.

⁴ Ashkelon, Bahān, Beth Shemesh, Gezer, Jaffa, Lachish, Nagila, Tell el-Far'ah, Tell el-Hesy, Tell Jerisheh, Tell Mor and Tell Zakariyeh. See Chapter 4, section 4 above.

⁵ *AG* I, 3, para. 12.

have been replaced as quickly. This is attested by the accumulation of some 3 feet of earth above the layer of ash which covered the ruins of Palace I; however, Petrie's suggestion that this represents a gap of six centuries¹ is quite untenable. A far more plausible explanation was put forward by Albright² and it can be assumed that the washed-down earth probably represents an interval of no more than five years.³ It seems likely, then, that the much smaller structure eventually built on the site of the earlier stronghold, was erected c. 1560. The plan of this new building—which owed nothing to the old—indicates a complete change of function and —to judge by its dimensions—it was nothing more than a large mansion (or “Herrenhaus”), its position somewhat above and quite apart from the houses situated to its south,⁴ making it extremely likely that it was the seat of the local chieftain. Certainly in plan, Palace II resembles contemporary houses elsewhere⁵ and it may well be that room OG served as a court round which the other rooms were ranged. Apart from purely architectural considerations, it should be remembered that under the Egyptian administration inaugurated with the New Kingdom, it was the neighbouring city of Gaza which became the headquarters of the district and it was to remain so for centuries,⁶ so that even Albright's suggestion that it was the residence of the local Egyptian representative seems improbable.

Assuming that Palace II was built (with a change of function and plan) in about 1560 and that City II began to be rebuilt shortly before, it now remains to examine the evidence for determining the length of the duration of each which, it is suggested, was not identical. At Megiddo, the last sixty years of the sixteenth century fall within Stratum IX and were characterised by the common use of bichrome ware. During this same period bichrome ware likewise enjoyed great popularity at 'Ajjul, much of the sherd material and many of the vessels being marked II,⁷ while other distinctive wares (such as black lustrous juglets

¹ *AG* II, 1, para. 5.

² Albright, *AJS* LV, 351-2.

³ Since the thirties when both Petrie and Albright were writing, the flood-waters which rush down the wadis from the hill-country, have been harnessed and used to fill great reservoirs for irrigation purposes. Untrammelled, these quickly bring down large quantities of silt deposit.

⁴ Compare *AG* II, Pls. XLV-XLVI and *AG* III, Pl. XLVII.

⁵ Compare *AS* V, fig. 3 and *M* II, fig 242.

⁶ Albright, *op. cit.*, 352. and n. 41. Note also the later biblical phrase: “Gaza, its towns and villages, unto the River of Egypt, the Great Sea being the border thereof”, Joshua, XV, 47.

⁷ *AG* I and unpublished in I of A collection.

and certain Cypriote imports) which are found in association with it elsewhere, occur here, too. The same is true of the contemporary tombs which have already been discussed.¹ In Palace II, however, Base Ring I is absent from these assemblages, as are also vessels decorated in one colour only, especially in red with triangular motifs. From this it can be deduced that the building was no longer in use during the later phase of bichrome ware.²

In examining the material from Palace II, the same principle has been adhered to as in the case of the earlier building; and here, even greater caution is needed, since there was no sealing layer of ash above, but on the contrary, evidence of disturbance, especially in the north-west corner where the walls were found to have been largely denuded. Similarly, it is not possible to take into consideration the area east of the building which covered what had been the inner courtyard at the time of the Palace I fortress, since no walls were found here and it was only later that the "Cenotaph" was erected at OY-OZ. Thus the sherds found in this general area at levels which "correspond" to those of Palace II are not sufficiently reliable to be used as dating evidence and have not been included here:

1. Only relatively few vessels and sherds are recorded from findspots which are inside the building, a number of which come from room MV, in which there was a great deal of disturbance.
2. 6 bichrome ware sherds are recorded from inside the building: 4 from MV, 1 from MO and 1 from OH.
3. In the bathroom OH there was also a plain ware water jug (31 Y20), as well as sherds of White Slip I Ware and Monochrome Ware bowls.³
4. In room MU, where some courses from all the four walls were preserved, a small globular, trefoil-mouthed jug of plain ware was found (59M), together with a rim sherd of White Slip I Ware.
5. In the adjoining room, MT, a hemispherical bowl of Red-on-Black Ware was found, (10 U2);⁴ also a small sherd decorated in brown, possibly in the Cross Line Style.
6. A further 10 sherds of bichrome ware—mostly from shallow bowls and kraters—were found adjacent to the walls in the following loci: MH, MG,

¹ See Chapter 4, section 2.

² See Chapter 4, section 7.

³ *AG* II, 4, para. 18, the latter being described as "thin, brown Cypriote bowls".

⁴ Possibly incorrectly drawn; see Åström, *MCBA*, 226, n. 14.

OL, OM and OE, while two additional sherds each with part of the figure of a bird, occurred at MR, some way from the south-east corner of the building.

7. A spouted Red-on-Black bowl is recorded from MH (10 U), as well as a coarse-ware shoulder sherd decorated in brown in the Cross Line Style.

8. 5 sherds of White Slip I Ware are recorded from loci round the building: from MH, OE, OM, OK and MP.

The general picture which results from a study of the above sherd material resembles that from Palace I. In both, bichrome ware occurs associated with wares which are characteristic of the main period of its *floruit* and it is probably mere chance that the only black lustrous juglet sherd occurred in Palace I and that while a Monochrome Ware bowl is recorded from Palace I, in Palace II only uncertain sherds were found in the bathroom. While Red-on-Black Ware and White Slip I Ware were found in both buildings, nothing appears to have come to light of the expected White Painted VI trefoil-mouthed juglets so common in bichrome ware assemblages.

On the basis of an interpretation of its architectural features seen against the historical background, Palace I represents an early stage in the bichrome ware period. In Palace II, the bichrome ware period is more advanced, though there is no direct evidence for this, since there was much disturbance in and around the building at the time of the erection of Palace III; but this can be inferred by the postulation of a not over-long interval represented by the burnt layer between Palace I and Palace II.

Apart from the above sherd material, there are other artifacts which can assist in providing useful dating evidence. Among these is a fayence plaque which can only be associated with Palace II, since it was found just outside its east lateral wall, at OJ 1000;¹ and while an object of this kind could have continued in use for some time—as is the case with scarabs—the finding of it here helps towards establishing the duration of the Palace II building. It has been suggested by Albright² that the awkward hieroglyphs representing the name of Sit-Amun indicate that this was probably a local copy of a similar plaque bearing the name of the Egyptian princess, daughter of Amosis I who was later the wife of Amenophis I (1545-25).³ The non-Egyptian character

¹ *AG* II, Pl. VIII: 111.

² Albright, *AJSL* LV, 352.

³ W.C. Hayes, "Chronology—Egypt to the end of the Twentieth Dynasty", *CAH* I, Chapter VI, revised edition, (Fascicle 4), 17.

of the letters, together with the typically Canaanite subject on the obverse, clearly reflect the political situation of the time and lend colour to the suggestion that Palace II was the residence of the local dynast who was anxious to demonstrate his loyalty. The plaque, then, provides evidence that the Palace II building was occupied during the third quarter of the sixteenth century and, in all probability, until later.

In attempting to establish the date at which Palace II was superseded by Palace III, an examination of the data connected with the latter can also be of assistance, since it is clear that the later structure was a planned replacement of the earlier building. This is emphasised by the considerable re-use of quantities of serviceable bricks from its walls and by Petrie's observation that Palace II was still in good condition when Palace III was built.¹ Moreover, the character of the new building which now arose once again indicates a change of function, its plan and the thickness of the walls bearing witness to its defensive purpose.² The decision to replace Palace II by a more formidable structure can only have sprung from a sense of insecurity; and it seems more than likely that already at the turn of the century there were being formed those alliances in the north whose incipient danger to Egypt was immediately recognised by Tuthmosis III after he gained sole control, but which during his so-called joint reign with Hatshepsut was completely ignored. The danger-signals were none-the-less there; and it would be natural for precautionary measures to be taken at 'Ajjul, even at a time when the rulers of Egypt were busy with expeditions to Punt. For not only would the city be vulnerable in the face of any threat of enemy attack from the north, but its vital position on major highways made it essential to keep these lines of communication open. It is suggested, then, that the building of the Palace III fortress on what continued to be—from a strategic point-of-view—the city's key position, took place some time during the first decade of the fifteenth century, but that there was no substantial change in the life of the town itself, such as would be expressed by material or cultural innovations.

Evidence for the erection of Palace III not long after 1500 B.C. is provided by a dated artifact found just outside the building at a level almost identical with that at which the massive west wall was preserved at this point. This is the upper part of a jug whose shoulder is stamped with the cartouches of Tuth-

¹ *AG* II, 4, para. 21.

² Note the adjacent tower and the second connected building flanking it on the north.

mosis III and Hatshepsut.¹ This vessel can only have been in use during the period of the co-regency, dated to 1503-1482,² and it can reasonably be associated with Palace III, in whose debris it was found. Albright, (whose dating scheme for the successive buildings requires that this sealing be associated with Palace II), admits that it presumably came from a wall of Palace III.³ It thus provides a *terminus a quo* for the existence of Palace III which superseded the earlier residential building during the period of the joint rule. Moreover, the use of the twin cartouches is an indication of the earlier part of Hatshepsut's reign, since during her later years Tuthmosis seems to have become a shadowy figure in the background, so that this would place the jug bearing the two names close to 1500 B.C. Thus architectural, ceramic and historical evidence concur in pointing to this same period for the erection of the Palace III fortress, which marked the end of the Palace II residence.

Albright has suggested two phases for Palace III—A and B—with a terminal date for the former in the early fourteenth century. Petrie has indicated that this building was in use for an exceedingly long time, since he found walls covered with many renewed coats of plaster.⁴ He also records signs of partial reconstruction "of more than one date".⁵ Further, his Palace IV was, in effect, only another stage in the life of Palace III,⁶ as a comparison of the plans shows.⁷ The formidable fortress was sufficiently solid to stand unaffected by time for over two centuries, with only structural repairs, re-decoration and renewal, as well as changes in the internal arrangement of the rooms to mark the passing of the years. All this indicates a long occupation, the stages of which are difficult to define with any degree of exactitude (especially as successive floor levels were not recorded), but which must certainly be tied to the successive stages in the occupation levels of the town itself as reflected in the changing ceramic fashions which were manifest everywhere, right down to the thirteenth century B.C.

Since it has been suggested that the erection of Palace III took place in the time of City II, it will repay to examine this occupation level in an attempt to

¹ *AG* II, Pls. V and VIII: 117, from MG 1089.

² W. C. Hayes, *op. cit.*, *CAH* I, Chapter VI, revised edition, (Fascicle 4), 17-18.

³ Albright, *AJSL* LV, 355.

⁴ *AG* II, 4, para. 21.

⁵ *Ibid.*, para. 22.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 5, para. 23 and also Albright, *AJSL* LV, 355.

⁷ *AG* II, Pls. XLVIII and XLIX.

establish the length of its duration and its relationship to the early phases of the Palace III fortress. It has been seen above that the construction of City II took place some time close to 1560 B.C., when bichrome ware was well established at Megiddo and it is this stratum which is seen to be the bichrome ware level here, just as Stratum IX can be thus described at Megiddo. For the end of the latter a date c. 1475 has been proposed and this represents a late phase of bichrome ware, when together with it in the same contexts there begin to be found the more debased forms of decorated wares by which it was eventually replaced. Now, in the range of pottery recorded from City II at 'Ajjul there is much that is characteristic of true bichrome ware, both from the point-of-view of shape and of decoration; but at the same time there is material which can only be considered as belonging to a later period still, which is equivalent to Stratum VIII at Megiddo. While only some of this has been published,¹ nevertheless much was in fact found on which the decoration is carelessly applied and roughly conceived, the paint either in monochrome or in two barely distinguishable shades and the fabric of the vessels coarse and unburnished. These examples are later than Phase II of bichrome ware, the whole approach to the decoration having deteriorated and the very shapes of the vessels exhibiting features which are characteristic of the advanced LB age. In addition, Cypriote wares which are later than those usually associated with bichrome ware, are also recorded from City II. These include: a large Base Ring I jug,² the neck and rim of a Base Ring II juglet³ and White Slip II sherds.⁴ This evidence cannot be ignored: its presence in City II can only mean that this occupation level did not come to an end until some time late in the fifteenth century, at the same time as the end of the second phase of Palace III. It can, then, be considered as including the two phases of occupation which were differentiated by Petrie during the third campaign,⁵ but which he failed to distinguish during the first season's work, when everything above the burnt layer was designated as "II". Thus, only those artifacts which are marked as coming from a known provenance in a specific house complex, such as the AW room,⁶ can be regarded as coeval

¹ See especially *AG* I, Pls. XXXV: 106, (with head of ox and Maltese Cross) and XXXI: 45 (with extremely schematic bird).

² *Ibid.*, Pl. L: 89 G3.

³ Unpublished in I of A collection.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. XXXIV: 92 and 93, as well as unpublished examples.

⁵ *AG* III, Pl. XLVII, where the earlier of the two is shown in diagonal shading, the later in black.

⁶ *AG* I, Pl. LIV, and see Chapter 4, section 2.

with the bichrome ware period. In the main, this corresponds to Stratum IX at Megiddo which came to an end shortly after the battle of Megiddo. Although this event had no vital repercussions on the history of 'Ajjul (except that Tuthmosis III and his army spent the night in the region on their march northwards), the above date is applicable in the south, since about this time ceramic changes—especially in so far as bichrome ware is concerned—can be observed. Albright reaches a similar conclusion, though on different grounds.¹

Thus at 'Ajjul, what may be termed City II A can be dated from shortly after the Hyksos expulsion, in c. 1560, until c. 1475 B.C. During this period, the Palace II mansion was built, to be replaced in c. 1500 by the Palace III, Phase 1 fortress. This can be considered as coming to an end at the same time as Level II A, in c. 1475, especially as it contained bichrome ware but no evidence of the truly debased forms or of the accompanying later Cypriote wares. This was followed by Phase 2 of Palace III and by City II B (which included the later of the two layers excavated during the third season), both of which can be equated to the second part of Albright's Palace III A, while his Palace III B would be designated as Phase 3 and Petrie's Palace IV, as Phase 4. The following table clarifies this:

¹ Albright, *AJSL* LV, 353, top of page.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

In examining the different aspects of bichrome ware, its distinctive vessel forms (as exemplified by the Corpus), the specific conventions of its decoration and the diverse influences which combined to create it, it has been seen that while in due course it became diffused throughout Palestine, it seems to have originated in the north, where there existed those conditions necessary for its evolution, namely, the indigenous ceramic traditions, those introduced by the Hurrians and those resulting from increased familiarity with imported Cypriote wares. Further, when discussing the *milieu* of bichrome ware, it was seen that it was likewise at home at Ras Shamra on the Syrian coast where it can be considered as a local contemporary ware. While there is a lack of evidence from which it could be inferred that there was any kind of Hurrian ascendancy there during the sixteenth century B. C. — as has been shown was almost certainly the case in North Palestine—nevertheless there was probably already then a certain percentage of Hurrians in the population. Moreover, the town of Ugarit was a centre of trade throughout the sixteenth century; and while the tablets date from a later period, many of them reflect a situation which was in all probability of long-standing. This is corroborated by the importance of this littoral and its harbour towns to Egypt, who depended on them for vital imports (notably timber), and likewise by the close connections which existed with Cyprus. That there was considerable trade and commerce along the coast southwards from Ras Shamra is demonstrated by countless references in the source material from the ensuing period. Particularly instructive in this connection are economic documents from the fourteenth to thirteenth centuries which refer to the more southerly ports in which Ugarit had trading interests. These include the well-known harbour towns of the Syro-Palestinian coast, Arutus (Arvad), Gubla (Byblos), Tyre, Acre, Ashdod (with its nearby harbour) and Ashkelon, where, it would seem, that the subjects of the king of Ugarit were living as merchants and possibly enjoyed extra-territorial status as Ugariteans.¹

¹ C. F. A. Schaeffer, "Résumé des résultats de la XIX^e campagne à Ras Shamra", *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie*, VII(1957), 66 and *Ug.* IV, 140-142 and 145.

If such was the case in the late fourteenth century, it may well be that a similar situation had existed earlier when it can be assumed that there were close commercial relations between Ras Shamra and the coastal towns of Palestine, while the brisk maritime trade with the more southerly Egyptian ports would facilitate and encourage the flow not only of goods—including pottery—but also of new ideas.

In the MB II period at Ras Shamra, there was already a noticeable tendency to decorate the upper shoulder of jugs and juglets with geometrical motifs, sometimes in two contrasting colours and often with horizontal banding,¹ such vessels continuing an older Syrian tradition for painted pottery which likewise contributed towards creating the climate in which not long afterwards bichrome ware developed and flourished. This gives added weight to the submission that bichrome ware originated in the north of the Syro-Palestinian region, rather than in the south, and emphasises the contact which existed especially between the harbour towns. The apparent concentration of a considerable number of bichrome ware sites in the south is due to the pre-occupation with this area during the initial period of interest in soundings and excavations in Palestine. The fact that Megiddo, Hazor and Ugarit—all extremely important cities—have yielded bichrome vessels as part of their normal ceramic repertoire in the sixteenth century B. C., in contexts containing a range of similar associated wares, is a sure indication of the kind of picture that is likely to emerge as more and more northern sites are excavated. This is borne out by the recent finding of a bichrome ware sherd at Akhziv, in Western Galilee, close to the Ladder of Tyre. While a single sherd constitutes but scant evidence, it is nevertheless a pointer to additional bichrome material—possibly of vessels *in situ*—which may well come to light in the course of future excavations when it is to be hoped that this level will be able to be more extensively and thoroughly dug.

As for the south, it has been seen that bichrome ware came into use at 'Ajjul not long after it had become established at Megiddo and that its somewhat later appearance at other sites in the vicinity can only be interpreted in the light of the part played by the former as a centre of trade which would be likely to receive newly-introduced wares before they reached other less important towns, while the interruption of occupation at many of them subsequent to the Hyksos

¹ *Ug.* II, figs. 107: 2 and 108: 22 and Pl. XV, left; Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, figs. 26: Z and 36: R and Pl. XXV: 4.

expulsion from Egypt co-incided with the decade which followed the commencement of the bichrome ware period at Megiddo, c. 1575 B.C.

Finally, any attempt to evaluate bichrome ware must take into account the common denominator which underlies the varied but related forms of decoration which are seen to have developed as the result of the mingling of an extra-neous with local ceramic traditions, which made itself felt in different regions in different ways, but always following on the absorption of Hurrian groups, not only in Upper Mesopotamia and in North Syria, but in North Palestine. This was expressed by a predilection for the use of essentially stylised bird and animal figures which were the distinguishing feature not only of Transitional Khabur-Mitannian Ware, which was in use during the period which corresponds to the main phase of bichrome ware, from c. 1575-1500 B.C., but also of the later Mitannian Ware which overlaps the later bichrome phase, dated to c. 1500-1475 B.C. At the same time, the outstanding characteristic of bichrome ware itself, which adapted and used geometrical motifs, in part taken over from those employed on Cypriote wares, was the introduction of figures—principally of birds, fish animals and trees—and, above all, the use of two contrasting colours. Bichrome ware was comparatively short-lived, enjoying a vogue of no more than some hundred years and those occurring in a century which witnessed far-reaching changes in the political and consequently in the cultural spheres. Only by appreciating bichrome ware against the background of its times can any true evaluation of it be obtained, any clearer limitation of its chronological setting arrived at, or any real understanding of its diverse origins achieved.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

AHARONI, Y., *The settlement of the Israelite tribes in Upper Galilee*. (Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1957.

—, *The land of Israel in biblical times—a geographical history*. (Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1962.

ALBRIGHT, W. F., *The role of the Canaanites in the history of civilization*. Extract from "Studies in the history of culture presented to W.G. Leland". Manasha (Wisconsin), 1942.

ALT, A., *Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht*. (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Band 101—Heft 6). Berlin, 1954.

BETH SHEAN VALLEY, The, *The seventeenth archaeological convention, Israel Exploration Society*. (Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1962.

BLISS, F. J. AND MACALISTER, R. A. S., *Excavations in Palestine, during the years 1898-1900*. London, 1902.

BODENHEIMER, F. S., *Animal and man in Bible lands*. (Collection de travaux de l'Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences, No. 10). Leiden, 1960.

BRANDENSTEIN, W., (editor) *Frühgeschichte und Sprachwissenschaft*. (Arbeiten aus dem Institut für allgemeine und vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft I). Vienna, 1948.

BRUNTON, G., *Qau and Badari*, III. (BSAE L). London, 1930.

DAVIES, N. de G., *The tomb of Rekh-mi-rē at Thebes*, I and II. (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition, Vol. XI). New York, 1943.

DAVIES, N. M. and GARDINER, A. H., *Ancient Egyptian paintings*. (Special publication of the O.I.C.). Chicago, 1936.

DESHAYES, J., *Les outils de bronze de l'Inde au Danube (IV^e au II^e millénaire)*, I. Paris, 1960.

DUSSAUD, R., *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*. Paris, 1927.

EHRICH, R. W., (editor) *Relative chronologies in Old World archeology*. Chicago, 1954.

ENGBERG, R. M., *The Hyksos reconsidered*. (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilisation, No. 18). Chicago, 1939.

EPIGRAPHIC SURVEY, The, *Medinet Habu*, I. *Earlier historical records of Ramses III*. (OIP VIII). Chicago, 1930.

FRANKFORT, H., *Studies in early pottery of the Near East*, II. *Asia, Europe and the Aegean, and their earliest inter-relations*. (Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain. Occasional Papers, No. 8). London, 1927.

—, *The art and architecture of the ancient Orient*. (Pelican History of Art). Harmondsworth, 1954.

GALBIATI, G., *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, III. (Fontes Ambrosiani, 27). Milan, 1951.


GARSTANG, J., *Joshua-Judges*. London, 1951.

—, *Prehistoric Mersin. Yümük Tepe in Southern Turkey*. (The Neilson Expedition in Cilicia). Oxford, 1953.

GELB I. J., PURVES, P. M. and MAC RAE, A. A., *Nuzi personal names*. (OIP LVII). Chicago, 1943.

GOLÉNISCHEFF, W., *Les papyrus hiératiques No. No. 1115, 1116 A et 1116 B de l'Ermitage Impériale à St. Pétersbourg*. [St. Petersburg], 1913.

GORDON, C. H., *Ugaritic handbook*. (Analecta Orientalia. Commentationes scientificae de rebus Orientis antiqui, 25). Rome, 1947.





GRAY, J., *The legacy of Canaan—The Ras Shamra texts and their relevance to the Old Testament*. Supplement to *Vetus Testamentum*, V. Leiden, 1957.

GURNEY, O. R., *The Hittites*. (Penguin Books). London, 1952.

HANČAR, F., *Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit*. (Wiener Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Linguistik. Band XI). Vienna, 1955.

HAYES, W. C., *Egypt: from the death of Ammenemes III to Seqenre II*. CAH II, Chapter II, revised edition. (Fascicle 6). Cambridge, 1962.

HAYES, W. C., ROWTON, M. B. and STUBBINGS, F. H., *Chronology—Egypt; Western Asia; Aegean Bronze Age*. CAH I, Chapter VI, revised edition. (Fascicle 4). Cambridge, 1962.

HELCK, W., *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen. Band 5). Wiesbaden, 1962.

HENNESSY, J. B., *Stephania. A Middle and Late Bronze-Age cemetery in Cyprus*. (Colt Archaeological Institute Publications). London, 1964.

HROUDA, B., *Die bemalte Keramik des zweiten Jahrtausends in Nordmesopotamien und Nordsyrien*. (Istanbuler Forschungen. Band 19). Berlin, 1957.

INGHOLT, H., *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie, 1932-1938*. Copenhagen, 1940.

KAPLAN, Y., *The archaeology and history of Tel-Aviv-Jaffa*. (Hebrew). Tel-Aviv, 1959.

KOŞAY, H. Z., *Alaca-Höyük. Das Dorf Alaca-Höyük. Materialen zur Ethnographie und Volkskunde von Anatolien*. (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınlarından VII. Seri—No. 12). Ankara, 1951.

KUPPER, J. -R., *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Fascicule CXLII). Paris, 1957.

—, *Northern Mesopotamia and Syria*. CAH II, Chapter I, revised edition (Fascicle 14). Cambridge, 1963.

LAESSØE, J., *The Shemshára Tablets: a preliminary report*. Copenhagen, 1959.

—, *People of Ancient Assyria*. London, 1963.

LAGRANGE, M. -J., *Mémorial Lagrange*. (Cinquantenaire de l'École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem). Paris, 1940.

LEGRAND, L., *Ur Excavations, X. Seal Cylinders*. (Publications of the joint expeditions of the British Museum and of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, to Mesopotamia). London 1951.

MC EWAN, C. W. and others *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*. (OIP LXXIX). Chicago, 1958.

MALLOWAN, M. E. L., *Twenty-five years of Mesopotamian discovery, 1932-1956*. (British School of Archaeology in Iraq). London, 1959.

MAY, H. G., *Material remains of the Megiddo cult*. (OIP XXVI). Chicago, 1935.

MOSCATI, S., *The Semites in ancient history. An enquiry into the settlement of the Beduin and their political establishment*. Cardiff, 1959.

NICHOLSON MUSEUM, The, *Handbook to the Nicholson Museum*. Second edition. Sydney, 1948.

O'CALLAGHAN, R. T., *Aram Naharaim*. (Analecta Orientalia. Commentationes scientificae de rebus Orientis antiqui, 26). Rome, 1948.

PETRIE, F., *Qurneh*. (BSAE XVI). London, 1909.

SÄVE SÖDERBERGH, T., *Four Eighteenth Dynasty tombs. Private tombs at Thebes*, I. (The Griffith Institute, University of Oxford). Oxford, 1957.

SCHAEFFER, C. F-A., *Missions en Chypre 1931-1935...* (Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Fondation Marius Fontane. Voyages archéologiques). Paris, 1936.

SEMPLE, E. C., *The geography of the Mediterranean region; its relation to ancient history*. New York, 1931.

SHIPTON, G. M., *Notes on the Megiddo pottery of Strata VI-XX*. (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, No. 17). Chicago, 1939.

SMITH, S., *Alalakh and chronology*. London, 1940.

—, *The statue of Idri-mi*. (Occasional publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, I). London, 1949.

THUMB, A. and HAUSCHILD, R., *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, I. I. Teil: *Grammatik*. 1. *Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Third edition. Heidelberg, 1958.

WELKER, M., *The painted pottery of the Near East in the second millennium B.C. and its chronological background*. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. New Series—Volume 38, Part 2). Philadelphia, 1948.

WILKINSON, J. G., *The manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians*, I—A new edition revised and corrected by S. Birch. London, 1878.

WISEMAN D. J., *The Alalakh Tablets*. (Occasional publications of the British Institute at Ankara, No. 2). London, 1953.

ZEUNER, F. E., *A history of domesticated animals*. London, 1963.

INDEX

(excluding Corpus of Bichrome Ware Vessels)

Achshaph 160, 161, 168
Acre 186; Plain of 128, 160, 169
Akhera 61, 130
Akhziv 129, 87
Alalakh 5, 39, 42, 45, 50, 56, 65, 80, 82, 134-137, 146, 148, 149, 150-152, 157
Albright, W. F. 175, 179, 181, 185
Aleppo 134, 149
Amarna letters 155, 159, 161, 162, 164; period 163, 165
Amenophis I 181
Amosis I 156, 171, 181
Amosis, son of Eben 156
Aniba 21, 34-35, 87, 100, 138, 140
Archangelos 24, 36, 70, 130
Arutus (Arvad) 186
Ashdod 118, 186
Ashkelon 29, 70, 72, 80, 117, 160, 161, 163, 166, 168, 186
Asia Minor 63
Åström, P. 101

Ba'al, temple of 125
Babylon 146, 150
Bahan 119, 120
Bamboula (Kourion) 29, 40
Bashan 162
Beth Shan 29, 72, 118
Beth Shemesh 57, 58, 59, 78, 118
Bodenheimer, F. S. 22

Canaanite 115, 182
Chagar Bazar 145, 147
Cilicia 5
Cypriote, archaeologists 101; ceramic influence 1, 2, 3, 4, 83, 84, 170; imports 2, 141, 177; wares 74, 77, 100, 167, 171, 173, 184, 185, 186, 188
Cyprus 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 27, 32, 36, 40, 43, 65, 68, 70, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79, 81, 88, 101, 104, 129-133, 177, 186

Dagon, temple of 125
Damascus 162
Deshasheh 72, 140
Dhenia 24, 29, 31, 76, 130
Djahy 160, 161, 162

Duruša 157

Egypt 3, 5, 35, 45, 63, 138-141, 144, 153, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 170, 171, 172, 174, 182, 186, 188
Egyptian, ceramic influence 35, 115; Eighteenth Dynasty 35, 45, 115, 121, 136, 138, 141, 170, 172; monuments and records 45, 63, 161, 164, 166, 168, 173; political activity 141, 146, 160, 178, 179; ports 187; princess 181, Seventeenth Dynasty 115; Sixteenth Dynasty, 115, 175; travellers 138
Egyptians 165, 166
Elath 162
Enkomi 29, 38, 47, 50, 56, 69, 70, 74, 131, 133
Ewari-šarri 157

Galinoporni 59, 65
Galilee 154, 159, 160, 187
Gaza 172, 174, 179
Gebel Barkal Stela 154
Gezer 26, 31, 33, 36, 41, 45, 46, 50, 65, 67, 70, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 117, 129
Gubla (Byblos) 186

Haifa Bay 5, 127
Hathor 114, 115
Hatshepsut 172, 182, 183
Hazor 5, 30, 33, 36, 58, 66, 67, 70, 73, 76, 78, 79, 82, 100, 113-117, 142, 159, 160, 162, 168, 187
Herenkeru 160
Heurtley, W. A. 20-21, 23, 28, 29, 37, 65
Hittites 145, 146
hupšu 164
Hurrians 1, 4, 144-169, 170, 172, 173, 186, 188
Hyksos, conquest 144, 146; expulsion 156, 170, 171, 172, 175, 178, 187; gateway 117; period 35, 138, 139, 174

Iasmah-Adad 147
Idrimi 148-150
Idadda 156
Ilimilimma II 148
Indo-Aryan, aristocracy 167, 169; names 145, 147, 149, 153, 155, 157, 158, 161, 163, 164, 165
Indo-Aryans 163, 169

Israelites 161

Jaffa 80, 119, 166, 169

Jezirol (Esdrælon) Valley 5, 154, 159, 160

Jordan 5

Judean foothills 5

Kadesh 154, 157, 161, 162, 172

Kalopsidha 84

Karnak 154, 163

Kassites 150

Khabur Valley 145, 147

Kinnereth 160, 168

Kirta 149

Lachish 25, 26, 28, 29, 36, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 58, 80, 82, 100, 111, 117, 163, 174, 177, 178

Lebanon 153, 154; coastal plain 127

Mari 147; letters 145

Maroni 65, 72, 79, 130, 131

maryannu 147-149, 152-169

Mayana cemetery, Sedment 34-35, 52, 65, 69, 72, 138-140

Medinet Habu 63

Megiddo 2, 3, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 36, 38, 49-50, 52, 57-58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89-105, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123, 127, 136, 141, 142, 143, 148, 150, 154, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 168, 170, 171-174, 177, 179, 184, 185, 187, 188; battle of 154-155, 159, 164, 171, 173; Field Diary 23, 97, 172; House Z assemblage 64, 89-94, 95-118, 120, 123, 126, 132, 136, 140-142

Mersin 21, 60, 87

Mesopotamia 20; Upper 146, 147, 149, 150, 152, 167, 188

Milia 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 47, 48-49, 51, 52, 59, 60, 62, 69, 70, 71, 72, 79, 81, 82, 129, 133

Mishal 160, 168

Mitanni 146, 148, 149, 152, 160, 172

Mitannian, kingdom 151; period 136

Mitsero 130

Muršili I 146

Naharin 156, 160, 171

Nahariya 128

Nile 140, 156

Nin-Egal 156

Niqmepa 134, 148, 149, 150

Nitovikla 38, 46, 50, 58, 60, 66, 70, 132-133

Nubia 171, 174

Nuges 160

Nuzi 149

Orontes Valley 154, 162

Palestine 1, 4, 5, 20, 68, 131, 136, 138, 146, 153, 155, 156, 160, 161, 166, 168, 170, 186, 187; central 165; north 127, 159, 162, 163, 172, 186, 188; princes of 163; south 163, 167, 174, 186, 187

Palestinian, ceramic traditions 2, 4, 34, 173; cities 172; sites 63, 89, 174

Paratarna 149-150

Petrie, Sir Flinders 22, 45, 49, 75, 105, 112, 175, 179, 182, 183, 184, 185

Phoenicia 136

Punt 182

Qal'at er-Rus 127

Qarnē Hattin 120

Qatna 156-157, 162, 172

Qurneh 115

Ras Shamra (Ugarit) 2, 3, 5, 24, 27, 36, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 68, 70, 71, 72, 76, 79, 80, 84, 85, 100, 101, 102, 111, 118, 120-127, 128, 134, 135, 139, 141, 143, 158-159, 177, 186-187; Minet el-Beida 25, 29, 73, 74

Retenu 154, 156

Šamši-Adad I 145

Saustatar 136, 148, 150, 151

Semitic, names 156, 165; population 166

Sharon 161

Sharuhem 156, 171, 174

Shechem 165-166

Shephelah 47, 49

Shimron 160

Sinai Desert 174

Sit-Amun 181

Suttarna I 149

Syria 1, 20, 45, 68, 131, 146; central 153, 154, 156, 166; coastal 4, 127, 138, 157, 186; north 148, 149, 150, 152, 172; south 155

Syrian, campaigns 159; ceramic traditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 187; coastal site 121

Syrians 45, 115

Syro-Palestine 130, 167, 170, 186, 188

Tarsus 21, 36, 135

Tell Abu Hureireh 119

Tell Beit Mirsim 136, 174, 177, 178

Tell Billa 150, 151, 152

Tell Brak 150, 151, 152

Tell el-'Ajjul 5, 20-21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55-56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84,

86, 88, 89, 99, 105-113, 117, 119, 120, 121, 141, 142, 170, 171, 174-185; Painter 20-21

Tell el-Far'ah 24, 26, 29, 39, 46-47, 48, 70, 72, 117, 174

Tell el-Hesy 36, 58, 70, 78, 82, 117

Tell el'-Oreimeh 120, 168

Tell es-Safi 80

Tell Fakhariyah 150, 151, 152

Tell Jemmeh 119

Tell Jerisheh 58, 62, 65, 119

Tell Jidle 150, 151, 152

Tell Keisan 70, 128, 168-169

Tell Mor (Tell Kheidar) 57, 58, 63, 66, 73, 80, 118-119

Tell Nagila 32, 41, 44, 47, 70, 119

Tell Reḥov (Tell es-Sarem) 120

Tell Sukas 39, 60, 70, 127-128

Tell Ta'anach 39, 62, 117, 160, 161, 164-165, 168, 169

Tennüneh 162

Thebes 115

Tigris 145, 152

Turukkaeans 145, 146

Tuthmosis I 155, 156, 171

Tuthmosis III 146, 153, 155, 159, 160, 161, 162, 166, 173, 182-183, 185

Tyre 186; Ladder of 187

Ur 73

Wares:

Base Ring I 102, 103, 108, 109, 116, 127, 130, 132, 137, 142, 184

Base Ring II 184

Black lustrous 100-101, 102, 103, 105, 114, 117, 120, 123, 124, 136, 140, 142, 176, 181

Kerma 140

Khabur 20, 68, 147, 148, 150-152

Mitannian 150-152, 188

Monochrome 2, 100, 107, 119, 123, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 136, 141, 176, 180, 181

Red-on-Black 126, 129, 137, 176, 180, 181

Tell el-Yahudiyeh 140

Transitional-Khabur-Mitannian 135, 150-152, 167, 168, 188

White Painted III-V 2, 74

White Painted VI 91, 101, 102, 107, 123, 125, 126, 130, 132, 139, 140, 141, 181

White Slip, Proto- 130, 177

White Slip I 2, 74, 77, 106, 108, 109, 176, 180, 181

White Slip II 184

Yano'am (Tell Abediyeh) 160

Zab, Lesser 145

Zagros 145

PLATES

PLATE I

JUGS TYPE A1(a)

1. From 'Ajjul, T. 17
(*AG* I, Pl. XLVIII:57 H3)
2. From Milia (presumed)
(Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII:h)
3. Unknown provenance
(Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv, No. 61060)
See Pl. IX:3 for description.
4. From 'Ajjul, AF 731
(*AG* III, Pl. XXXIX:68 K2)
5. Unknown provenance
(Unpublished, in Cairo Mus., No. 2784)
Light buff ware with yellow slip; burnished.
Decoration in black and red.
6. From Milia (presumed)
(Heurtley, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. XXIII:e)
7. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV
(*Ug.* II, fig. 98:15)
8. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV
(Unpublished, in Mus. du Louvre)
Buff ware with yellowish slip; burnished.
Decoration in black and orange.
9. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV
(Unpublished, in excavator's collection)
Cream ware with pink slip; burnished.
Decoration in black and orange.

PLATE I









PLATE II

JUGS TYPES A1(b), A1(c), A1(d) and A1(e)

1. From Megiddo, 2115 (House Z)
(*M* II, Pls. 49:7 and 132:10)
2. From Megiddo, T. 75
(*MT*, Pl. 41:21)
3. From Beth Shan, T. 42
(Unpublished, in excavator's Field Pottery Register)
Reddish ware with self slip. Decoration in black and purple-red.
4. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Unpublished, in Univ. Mus. Phil. collection)
Buff ware with cream slip; may have been burnished (surface in bad condition.)
Decoration in black and dark red (faded).
5. From Megiddo, T. 3027
(*M* II, Pl. 49:5)
6. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Unpublished, in private collection, Jerusalem, Israel)
Buff ware with cream slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in black and dark plum-red.
7. From Megiddo, T. 3070
(*M* II, Pl. 39:7)
8. From Tell el-Far'ah, FB 379
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Reddish-brown ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in black and dark red.
9. From 'Ajjul, T. 167
(*AG* I, Pl. XLV: 38 03')
10. From Hazor, T. 8130
(*Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCXLII:1)
11. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*AG* III, Pl. XXXVIII:60 Q11)
12. From Megiddo, T. 3063
(*M* II, Pl. 39:6)

PLATE II.














PLATE III

JUGS TYPES B1(a) and B1(b)

1. Unknown provenance
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 51)
See Pl. XIII: 1 for description.
2. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment (presumed)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 48)
See Pl. XIII:6 for description
3. From Ras Shamra, T. LIV
(Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 19:N)
4. From Aniba, T. 87
(*Aniba* II, Pl. 83: 39(b)2)
5. From Archangelos (tomb)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 39)
See Pl. XIII: 4 for description.
6. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXXIV
(*Ug.* II, fig. 67:5)
7. From Lefkoniko (tomb)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 42)
See Pl. XIII:3 for description.
8. From 'Ajjul, T. 1717
(*AG* IV, Pl. XLII:1)
9. From Megiddo, T. 2009
(*M* II, Pl. 56:2)

Scale: 2: 5

Scale: 2: 5

Scale: 1: 4

Scale: 2: 5

PLATE III











PLATE IV


KRATERS TYPE A1(a)

1. From Gezer, house context (2nd Semitic)
(*Gez.* II, fig. 324)
2. From 'Ajjul, E 843—suggested reconstruction
(*AG* IV, Pls. XLII:7 and XLIV: 14A and 14B)
3. From Ras Shamra, house context (Ugarit Récent I)
(Schaeffer, *Strat. Comp.*, fig. 307)

PLATE IV



1



2




3

PLATE V


KRATERS TYPE A1(a)

1. From Hazor, D2
(*Haz.* I, Pl. XCIX: 12)
2. From 'Ajjul, T. 308
(*AG* III, Pl. XLIV: 76)
3. From Gezer, unstratified
(Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus.)
Buff ware with self slip. Decoration in dull black and browny-red.
4. From Milia, T. 10
(Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm, No. 354)
Dull buff ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in grey-black and browny-red.


PLATE V




1



2



3



4

PLATE VI

KRATERS TYPE A1(b)

1. From Megiddo, 2114 (House Z)
(*M* II, Pl. 53: 2)
2. From Ras Shamra, house context (trench near T. XXXVI)
(Unpublished, in excavator's collection)
Pinkish-buff ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange-red.
3. From Beth Shemesh, house context (Stratum IVa)
(*AS* III fig. 2: 7)
4. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, No. B/332-337)
Pink ware with buff slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange-brown.
5. From Ras Shamra, T. LIV
(Schaeffer, *Syria* XIX, fig. 19:M)
6. From 'Ajjul, KD 1060
(*AG* III, Pl. XXXIV: 33 U3)

PLATE VI







PLATE VII

JUGLETS TYPES A1(a), A1(b), B1(a), B1(b), B2(a) and C1(a);
BOWLS TYPES B1(a) and B2(a)

1. From Milia, T. 10
(Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. III: 8)
2. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
(Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 4: N)
3. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., No. A. 1994)
Buff ware with darker buff slip; burnished. Decoration in black and red.
4. From Megiddo, 2115(House Z)
(*M* II, Pl. 49:15)
5. From Megiddo, 2115(House Z)
(*M* II, Pl. 49: 16)
6. From Milia, T. 13
(Westholm, *QDAP* VIII, Pl. VII: 2)
7. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 13)
Buff ware with creamy-buff slip; traces of burnishing.
Decoration in dark brown and rust-red.
8. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
(Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 4:K)
9. From Ras Shamra, T. LXXV
(Schaeffer, *Syria* XX, fig. 4: L)
10. From Hazor, Locus 2179
(*Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCLXIX: 34)
11. From Hazor, Locus 2142
(*Haz.* III-IV, Pl. CCLXIX:35)
12. From Gezer, unstratified
(Unpublished, in Istanbul Arch. Mus.)
Light pink-buff ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in black and plum-red.
13. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*AG* I, Pl. XXXIX:23 A8)
14. From 'Ajjul, T. 1517
(*AG* IV. Pl. XLIV: 10)
15. From Nitovikla, the fortress courtyard
(Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm)
Pinkish-buff ware with buff slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange.
16. 'Ajjul, PD 989
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Buff ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange-red.

Scale: 1: 4

PLATE VII




PLATE VIII

KRATER TYPE A1(c); JARS TYPES B1(a) and B1(b)

1. From Enkomi, unstratified
(*SCE* I, Pl. LXX: 1—restored vessel in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm)
2. From 'Ajjul, T. 1717
(*AG* IV, Pl. XLII: 3—restored vessel in Pal. Arch. Mus., No. 35. 4109)
3. From Megiddo, T. 1145 B
(*MT*, Pl. 51: 7)
4. From Hazor, T. 8112
(*HaZ*. III-IV, Pl. CCXL:6)


PLATE VIII




1



2



3




4

PLATE IX


JUGS TYPE A1(a)

1. From 'Ajjul, T. 17
(*AG* I, Pls. XXXI: 51 and XLVIII: 57 H3) Height: 26 cm.
2. From Dhenia, T.I
(Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., No. I/27)
Buff ware, self slipped and burnished. Decoration in black and red (faded). Height: 27 cm.
3. Unknown provenance
(Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv, No. 61060).
Pink-buff ware with buff slip; slightly burnished. Decoration in black (faded) and dark red. Height: 25 cm.
4. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1270
(*Sed.* I. Pl. XLV: 71) Height: 25.5 cm.


PLATE IX




1



2



3



4

PLATE X

JUGS TYPES A1(c) and A1(d)

1. Unknown provenance Height: 20 cm.
(Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv, No. 60660)
Pink ware, wet-smoothed. Decoration in black (faded) and deep red.
2. Unknown provenance Height: 21 cm.
(Unpublished, in Ha-ar. Mus. Tel-Aviv, No. 60860)
Buff ware decorated in black and red.
3. From Milia, T. 10 Size of sherd: 7 x 9 cm.
(Unpublished in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm)
Dark yellowish buff ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in black and orange-red.
4. Unknown Cypriote provenance Height: 38 cm.
(Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., No. 1951/111-2/2)
Buff ware decorated in black and orange-red.
5. From 'Ajjul, City II Diameter of sherd: 4.5 cm.
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 6)
6. From Megiddo, T. 5013 G Height: 27.5 cm.
(*M* II. Pl. 49: 8)

PLATE X



1




2




3



4



6



5

PLATE XI

JUGS TYPES A1(d) and B3(a)

1. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 1) Size of sherd:
5.5 x 3 cm.
2. From 'Ajjul, City II 1017
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 2) Size of sherd:
4.5 x 5 cm.
3. From 'Ajjul, MP 1017
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 3) Size of sherd:
6. x 4.5 cm.
4. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 5) Size of sherd:
4.5 x 4 cm.
5. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*PEQ* 1961, No. 4) Size of sherd:
3 x 4.5 cm.
- 6-7. From Bamboula, Kourion, T. 12 Height: 21.3 cm.
(Unpublished in Univ. Mus. Phil., No. B 996)
Buff ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in browny-black
and browny-red.

PLATE XI






PLATE XII

JUGS TYPES A1(f), A1(h) and A2(a)

1. From Archangelos, (tomb)
(Unpublished, in Pal. Arch. Mus., No. 38.2157)
Buff ware decorated in brown and red (faded).
Height: 20.5 cm.
2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FE 379
(Unpublished in I of A collection)
Red ware with black decoration.
Size of sherd:
3.5 x 5 cm.
3. From Megiddo, N=3019
(Unpublished in O.I.C. collection)
Thick buff ware with self slip. Decoration in black and plum red.
Size of sherd:
8 x 6 cm.
4. From Megiddo, W=T. 3017
(M II, Pl. 48:6)
Extant height:
10.5 cm.
5. Unknown Cypriote provenance
(Unpublished, in Cyp. Mus., No. A. 1482)
Pinkish ware with creamy-pink slip; burnished. Decoration in
black and dark plum red.
Height: 42.5 cm.

PLATE XII







PLATE XIII

JUGS TYPES B1(a) and B1(b)

1. Unknown provenance
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 51)
Buff ware with self slip; slightly burnished. Decoration in black and orange-red (faded).
Height: 23 cm.
2. From Aniba, T. 87
(*Aniba* II, Pl. 83: 39(b)2)
Height: 21 cm.
3. From Lefkoniko, (tomb)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 42)
Buff ware, self slipped and burnished. Decoration in black and dark red (faded in parts to grey and orange).
Height: 23 cm.
4. From Archangelos, (tomb)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 39)
Buff ware, self slipped. Decoration in red and black.
Height: 22.4 cm.
5. From Maroni, T. 9
(Walters, *BMCV*, fig. 272:C 733)
Height: 24.5 cm.
6. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment (presumed)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 48)
Pink ware with creamy-yellow slip; burnished. Decoration in black and red.
Height: 25 cm.

PLATE XIII







PLATE XIV



JUGS TYPES B1(a) and B2(a); JUGLET TYPE B1(a)

1. From Megiddo, T. 3173
(*M* II, Pl. 51:8) Height: 19 cm.
2. Unknown provenance
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 50)
Pink ware with creamy-buff slip. Decoration in black and red (faded). Height: 20.5 cm.
3. From Mersin, Trench 60 (Level VII)
(J. Garstang, *Prehistoric Mersin*, fig. 155:7) Size of sherd:
5 x 4.5 cm.
4. From 'Ajjul, unstratified
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 3)
Buff ware with creamy-yellow slip; burnished. Decoration in black and rust-red. Size of sherd:
5 x 6 cm.
5. From Jaffa, G6
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 22)
Light buff ware—soft texture—with creamy slip; wet-smoothed.
Decoration in black and light red. Size of sherd:
4 x 6 cm.
6. From Jaffa, G5
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 23)
Pinkish ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in black and red. Size of sherd:
4.5 x 5 cm.
7. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*AG* I, Pl. XXX:26) Size of sherd:
3.5 x 2.2 cm.
8. From 'Ajjul, unstratified (juglet)
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 14)
Pink ware—soft texture—with creamy-buff slip. Decoration in black and plum-red. Size of sherd:
5 x 5 cm.

SHERDS DECORATED IN THE CROSS LINE STYLE
(from other types of vessels)

9. From 'Ajjul, T. 272 (large coarse-ware jug)
(*AG* I, Pl. XXXIII:77) Size of sherd:
12 x 12 cm.
10. From 'Ajjul, MV 955 ("Palace I")
(*PEQ* 1965, 47)
Light buff ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in dark brown. Size of sherd:
3 x 5.7 cm.
11. From 'Ajjul, City II (shoulder of large vessel)
(*AG* I, Pl. XXXI: 48) Size of sherd:
6 x 6.5 cm.

PLATE XIV



1


2




3



4



5



6



7




8



9



10



11

PLATE XV

JUGLETS TYPES A1(a), B1(a), B2(a) and D1(a)

1. From Megiddo, N= 3099
(*M* II, Pl. 57: 20) Height: 16 cm.
2. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1262
(*Sed.* I, Pl. XLV: 67) Height: 15.6 cm.
3. From Deshasheh, T. 44
(*Desh.*, Pl. XXXIII: 26) Height: 16.8 cm.
4. From Ras Shamra, T. XXXV
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 36)
Creamy-pink ware with cream slip. Decoration in red and black. Height: 12 cm.
5. From Lachish, T. 1555
(*Lach.* IV, Pl. 77:772) Extant height: 9 cm.
6. From Mayana cemetery, Sedment, T. 1289
(*Sed.* I, Pl. XLV:70) Height: 13 cm.
7. From 'Ajjul, City II
(*AG* I, Pl. XLIX:77 V7) Extant height: 13.5 cm
8. From Galinoporni, T.I
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 40)
Light buff ware with lighter slip; may have been burnished
(surface in bad condition). Decoration in black and dark orange-red. Height: 15 cm.

PLATE XV





PLATE XVI

KRATERS TYPE A1(a)

1. From Gezer, (2nd Semitic)
(*Gez.* II, fig. 324) Extant height: 20 cm.
2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FA 379
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Light buff ware with greenish-cream slip; burnished. Decoration in purple-brown and yellowish-red. Size of sherd: 15.5 x 15 cm.
3. From Milia, T. 12
(Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm)
Greenish-buff ware with self slip; slightly burnished. Decoration in browny-black. Size of sherd: 7 x 7.5 cm.
4. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, No. B 365/74)
Buff ware with self slip; traces of burnishing. Decoration in browny-black and dark red. Size of sherd: 6 x 4 cm.
5. From Jaffa, H5
(Unpublished, in Jaffa Mus., No. 20/5/60)
Buff ware with creamy slip; burnished. Decoration in black and browny-red. Size of sherd: 5 x 6.5 cm.
6. From Megiddo, Room of T. 3018
(Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection)
Pink ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in black and dark red. Size of sherd: 10 x 8 cm.
7. From Megiddo, E=T. 3004
(Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection)
Light buff ware with greenish slip; burnished. Decoration in dark purple-black and brown. Size of sherd: 8.5 x 7 cm.
8. From Tell Sukas, unstratified
(Ehrich, *EPJR*, Pl. XXIV (top)—lower left) Size of sherd: 7 x 7 cm.
9. From Megiddo, SW= 2091
(Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection)
Buff ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in purple-black and browny-red. Size of sherd: 7.5 x 3.5 cm.
10. From Akhziv, from debris of collapsed wall
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection)
Buff ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange. Size of sherd: 3.2 x 5.9 cm.

PLATE XVI





PLATE XVII

KRATERS TYPE A1(a)


1. From Megiddo, S=T. 3018 C
(*M* II, Pl. 56:4) Size of sherd:
12.5 x 13.5 cm.
2. From Tell el-Far'ah, FC 378
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Light buff ware with greenish-cream slip; burnished. Decoration
in purple-black and orange-brown (faded). Size of sherd:
11 x 18 cm.
3. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, No. B/88/2)
Buff ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in brownish-black
and light red. Size of sherd:
6 x 6 cm.
4. From Nitovikla, the fortress kitchen
(Unpublished in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm) Size of sherd:
7.2 x 6.5 cm.
Buff ware with greenish slip. Decoration in faded black.
5. From Nitovikla, the fortress kitchen
(Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm) Size of sherd:
6 x 6.5 cm.
Buff ware with greenish slip. Decoration in grey-black and brown.
6. From Nitovikla, the fortress kitchen
(Unpublished, in Mus. Med. Antiqu., Stockholm) Size of sherd:
9.3 x 4 cm.
Buff ware with greenish slip. Decoration in black.
(Nos. 4-6 possibly from same vessel)

PLATE XVII



1

2



3

4

5

6

PLATE XVIII

KRATERS TYPE A1(a)

1. From Megiddo, 2115 (House Z)
(*M* II, Pl. 53:1) Extant height:
13 cm.
2. From 'Ajjul, MNJ 986
(*PEQ* 1965, No. 17) Size of sherd:
7.5 x 7 cm.
Thick, light reddish ware with self slip. Decoration in dull black and bright red.
3. From 'Ajjul, unstratified
(Unpublished, in I of A collection) Size of sherd:
12 x 14 cm.
Buff ware with cream slip; slightly burnished. Decoration in dull black and dark red (faded).
4. From Tell el-Far'ah, FB 379
(Unpublished, in I of A collection) Size of sherd:
10 x 10.5 cm.
Light buff ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in purple-black and reddish-brown.
(Possibly part of the same vessel as Pl. XVI:2)
5. From Megiddo, NW=3011
(Unpublished, in O.I.C. collection) Size of sherd:
17.5 x 17 cm.
Light buff ware with self slip; traces of burnish. Decoration in purple-black and browny-red.

PLATE XVIII




PLATE XIX

KRATERS TYPE A1(a); BOWLS TYPES A1(a), B1(a) and B2(a)

1. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, No. B/256/35)
Buff ware with self slip; wet-smoothed. Decoration in black and dull, dark red.
Extant height: 19 cm.
2. From Alalakh, Pit No. 3 (Level V)
(Unpublished, in B.M. collection)
Pink ware with light pink slip. Decoration in black and bright red.
Extant height: 12.5 cm.
3. From Tell Mor, Locus 118
(Unpublished, in Is. A.D. collection, No B/365/65)
Thick, orange ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in black and orange-red.
Size of sherd: 7.5 x 18 cm.
4. From 'Ajjul, A Gate
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Pink ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in black and bright orange.
Size of sherd: 4 x 7.5 cm.
5. From 'Ajjul, OM 968
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Light buff ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in browny-mauve and orange-yellow.
Size of sherd: 10 x 9 cm.
6. From 'Ajjul, City II
(AG I, Pl. XXXVIII:19S)
Size of sherd: 35 x 6 cm.
7. From 'Ajjul, OY 950
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Cream ware with self slip. Decoration in browny-mauve and red-brown.
Size of sherd: 3.7 x 5.5 cm.
8. From 'Ajjul, OE 936
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Pink-buff ware with cream slip; burnished. Decoration in black and bright orange.
Size of sherd: 3.2 x 3.5 cm.
9. From 'Ajjul, City II
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Buff ware, self slipped and burnished. Decoration in black and orange.
Size of sherd: 4.7 x 2 cm.
10. From 'Ajjul, PL 955
(Unpublished, in I of A collection)
Buff ware with self slip; burnished. Decoration in black and dark red.
Size of sherd: 3.2 x 10 cm.


PLATE XIX




1



2



3




4



5



6



7



8



9




10


PLATE XX


KRATER TYPE A1(c); ZOOMORPHIC VESSELS

1. From Enkomi, unstratified (<i>SCE</i> I, Pl. LXX:1)	Extant height: 49 cm.
2. From Maroni, T. 24—bull (Walters, <i>BMCV</i> , Pl. IV:C 802)	Height: 13.2 cm. (excluding handle)
3. From Akhera, T.I—ram (V. Karageorghis, <i>BCH</i> LXXXV (1961), fig. 61)	Height: 13 cm. (excluding handle).

PLATE XX









New York University
Bobst Library
70 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10012-1091

DUE DATE	DUE DATE	DUE DATE

Bobst Library
RETURNED
AUG 11 2001
MAY 11 2001
CIRCULATION

BOBST LIBRARY



3 1142 02073 3237

