

Testament of Time

Selected Objects
from the Collection
of Palestinian Antiquities
in the Museum of Art and Archaeology
University of Missouri–Columbia



With contributions by:
Andrea Berlin, Jane Biers, J. J. Dobbins,
Steven J. Friesen, Sharon C. Herbert, Benton Kidd, Albert Leonard, Jr.,
Kate Mackay, Gloria S. Merker, Patricia V. Podzorski, Marcus L. Rautman,
Kathleen Warner Slane, James Terry,
and
Saul S. Weinberg

Edited by Jane Biers and James Terry

Madison • Teaneck
Fairleigh Dickinson University Press



The Road More Travelled By: Reflections on Changing Attitudes and Practice in the Archaeology of the Holy Land

IN THIS EXHIBITION, THE MUSEUM OF ART AND ARCHAEOLOGY at the University of Missouri–Columbia illuminates not only the long history of human activity in the area of the southern Levant known as the Holy Land, but it also highlights the museum's own pioneering excavations in the region under the direction of its founders, Saul and Gladys Weinberg. The choice of the term "Holy Land" in the title deserves comment, since it illustrates some of the complexities that confront those who work to recover the history of this rich and highly contested corner of the world—complexities that have driven one scholar to suggest calling the area "Region X."¹ The area is not large: a 250-kilometer strip of semi-arable land compressed between the Mediterranean Sea on the west and the desert to the east, forming a bridge between the two ends of the Fertile Crescent. This geographic position laid it open to annexation by the larger states of Egypt and Mesopotamia practically from the time of their inception in the fourth millennium B.C.E. The later history of the land is punctuated by conquest as well. For the past 2500 years its epochs have been named after conquerors: Persian, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, Ummayyad, Abassid, Crusader, Mameluke, Ottoman, and finally British Mandate. The term Holy Land was coined in the Byzantine era and originally referred to sites of Christian pilgrimage. Over time it has come to encompass the area's sacred status for the three great religions of the book: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. In this sense, the term has the advantage of encompassing a longer span of the area's history than any single episode of conquest and signifying its importance to more than one group.

The history of archaeological research in the Holy Land is almost as complex as its politics. The site of over 1.5 million years of human activity and thought to be the home of the first cereal agriculture, the area has attracted more different schools

of archaeology than any other region in the world. Nonetheless it is fair to say that much, if not most, of this archaeology has been inextricably linked to the study of the Bible. It is not just coincidence that the Archbishop of Canterbury (along with Queen Victoria) was one of the founding patrons of the Palestine Exploration Fund in 1865, and that the Franciscan and Dominican religious orders have been in the forefront of archaeological research there. In recent years, due to changes in the direction of both archaeological and biblical research, this connection has begun to break down. This trend in the archaeology of the Holy Land needs to be viewed as part of broader changes in the discipline. Historians and archaeologists of all periods are moving away from an earlier emphasis on specific events and concentrating on long-term systemic developments in human history. This entails the study of various spheres of human activity—economic, religious, political, and domestic, to name just a few—and the interaction of these with the natural environment. The thematic organization of the exhibition reflects some of these developments.

Archaeology is a discipline in which the humanistic and scientific methods of inquiry are used in tandem. The history of the development of archaeology and its various schools can be seen in one sense as an ongoing debate over the relative value of various modes of inquiry. Put another way, it might be characterized as the search for appropriate questions to ask of the archaeological record and the best tools that can be used to extract answers. These all of necessity vary from era to era and from region to region, although one school of archaeology, the processual or "new" archaeology, emphasizes the search for universal laws of human behavior.²

It is generally agreed that the major goal of archaeological research, in the Holy Land and elsewhere, is to gain a better understanding of

past human activity through study of the material record. What has changed most dramatically in recent years is the definition of what is worth studying in that material record. This has been expanded to include recovery and analysis of nonartifactual remains such as pollen, seeds, and animal bones, which can tell us much about diet, animal domestication, and agriculture. Pots are studied not only for their shape and artistic decoration but are also subject to residue analysis, which can tell us their ancient contents, and chemical analyses of their clays, which can tell us their place of manufacture. Missouri researchers have been at the forefront of the development of these interdisciplinary techniques.³ Another important change has been an enlargement of the range of people and activities deemed worthy of study. Moving away from a focus on the "rich and famous" of antiquity, their pots and palaces, self-aggrandizing texts and tombs, archaeologists are now giving equal time to the John and Jane Does of antiquity. The products of anonymous craftsmen are studied for technological developments and the spread of these innovations tracked by distribution maps. Survey archaeologists examine long-term changes in settlement patterns, documenting hierarchies of settlements from large cities to isolated farmsteads and nomadic encampments. Environment and changing subsistence strategies are factored into the interpretation of these settlement patterns with the goal of understanding something of the French *Annales* school's *longue durée* of human history.⁴

Archaeological research starts first with the discovery of ancient remains, whether through new fieldwork, such as the Missouri excavations at Jalame and Tel Anafa highlighted in this exhibition, or through "excavating" museum basements and private collections. After discovery the archaeologist's job becomes one of explanation, teasing the story out of the artifactual assemblage. This process of contextualization and explanation of the archaeological record has been the subject of ongoing controversy. As early as 1880 Samuel Birch, then Keeper of Oriental Antiquities in the British Museum, labeled excavations that had any purpose other than the production of museum objects "emotional archaeology."⁵ Over a century later the post-processual school of archaeology, which strives to recapture specific historical and cognitive contexts,⁶ could be attacked as "archaeology's latest messianic cult, that anti-science, anti-materialist, anti-comparative movement."⁷ Much of this con-

troversy can be traced to the nature of the material record. With the exception of inscribed objects that record does not talk for itself. Consequently, the archaeologist's search for meaningful explanation is interpretative and to a certain extent inventive. This process is often referred to metaphorically as "reading the past,"⁸ but archaeologists must always beware of slipping from "reading" into ventriloquism, that is, allowing our own presuppositions and concerns to invent a nonexistent past that fulfills "the dreams of the present."⁹

Nowhere more than in the Holy Land, with its complex and still-contested ownership, is the process of reading the past subject to modern concerns, be they academic, nationalistic, or religious. In the past, the close connection of archaeological excavation with biblical exegesis dictated to a large extent the direction of archaeological inquiry in the Holy Land. The long-continuing debate over the Israelite conquest of Canaan as described in the books of Joshua and Judges is a case in point. The issue of the Israelite conquest continues to hold the attention of archaeologists and historians alike because it comes at a critical point in the emergence of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, the first demonstrably Jewish states. The historical veracity of that conquest has been upheld by one school of archaeologists following W. F. Albright and citing Early Iron Age (ca. 1200 B.C.E.) destruction levels at Hazor, Lachish, and other sites.¹⁰ Others, following the work of Albrecht Alt,¹¹ see instead a peaceful infiltration of pastoral nomads. Still others posit a kind of internal Marxist socialist revolution.¹²

It is important to note that all three hypotheses are based on different readings of the same archaeological data set, but only that of Albright invokes the biblical conquest story. In recent years, the wisdom of using the Bible as a roadmap for Early Iron Age migrations of people has been called into question even more by the so-called minimalist school of biblical scholarship. These scholars emphasize the problems inherent in the five-century gap between the late thirteenth-century destruction levels and the biblical narratives in Judges and Joshua, possibly composed as late as the seventh century B.C.E. or even later.¹³ Archaeologists' interpretations of the growing survey data and recent excavations join in to present a more complex picture of multiple factors to explain the changing archaeological landscape of the Early Iron Age Holy Land. These factors include the internal collapse of the Late Bronze Age city-state system, which

brought about new subsistence strategies and settlement patterns among the indigenous Canaanites, changing relations between the settled and nomadic populations, re-emerging Egyptian influence and, yes, some new peoples. In the words of Israel Finkelstein, one of the more prominent voices in the debate, "the emergence of early Israel (and other 'national' entities in the southern Levant) was . . . determined by a combination of long-term history and short-term circumstances, and by a balance between local developments and external influences"—not a simple picture, but one more in keeping with the archaeological record than the biblical account.¹⁴

Many of the objects in the current exhibition testify to the constant interaction between the local and the external in the Holy Land, not only in the Iron Age but for the preceding and succeeding epochs as well. Egyptian and Syrian products predominate, but the sample of Greek, Cypriote, and Italian materials testify to the wider world within which the peoples of the Holy Land operated throughout their history. The artifacts on display are all drawn from the collections of the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri-Columbia, a fact that illustrates the museum's own long involvement with the archaeology of the Holy Land. This involvement combines an active program of excavation with astute purchasing and acquisition. The excavated items on display come from Saul Weinberg's fieldwork at Tel Anafa and Gladys Davidson Weinberg's excavation of Jalame, both pioneering projects in the archaeology of Israel.

Gladys Weinberg's expedition to Jalame (1963-1971) was the museum's first major excavation in the Holy Land. Weinberg selected Jalame, a small glass factory in the Western Galilee, for excavation after extensive survey and testing of other possible glass manufacturing sites throughout the region.¹⁵ Her goal, as with much of her well-known work on ancient glass, was to reach a better understanding of the technology of ancient glass manufacture. Weinberg's interest in the technology of glass predated by some years the wider focus of current archaeology in the Holy Land and her careful pre-excavation survey was also ahead of its time. Her subsequent excavations demonstrated Jalame to be one of the most informative glass production sites found to date. On display from the site are a number of glass discards and wasters. From these finds and others at Jalame Weinberg was able to

demonstrate the techniques of ancient glass manufacture as never before possible. Her publication of the site and its glass¹⁶ has been hailed as "undoubtedly the most important contribution to the study of glass from Byzantine Palestine in recent years."¹⁷ The museum's purchased collection of glass, several pieces of which are on display in this exhibition, has long profited from Gladys Weinberg's deep knowledge and unerring eye for a prize piece.

The museum's second major field project in the Holy Land was Saul Weinberg's excavation at Tel Anafa, a predominantly Hellenistic and Roman settlement in the Upper Galilee (1968-73, 1978-81, 1986). The project, co-sponsored in its later years by the Kelsey Museum at the University of Michigan, revealed the most famously a luxurious Hellenistic villa of the second century B.C.E. On display here are a number of pieces of the elegant stucco that adorned the walls of the villa. Also on display is a selection of pottery and other household artifacts from the villa. Saul Weinberg's expedition to Tel Anafa was among the first explicitly "problem-oriented" excavations in the Holy Land.¹⁸ His research plan, which was based on meticulous recording and total retrieval of the cultural material, allowed the reconstruction of the entire assemblage and context of an ancient household to an extent never before possible in the Holy Land.¹⁹ Analysis of this complete assemblage allowed the publication team to identify diverse cultural elements; the most prominent among these were Greek and Phoenician.²⁰ The clearly recorded stratigraphy allowed accurate dating for eastern sigillata A, the most popular Hellenistic fine pottery of the southern Levant; it also made it possible to compare the origin and development of this regional industry with the most important sigillata industry, that of Italy.²¹

The Weinbergs' excavations in Israel focussed on the later periods of the Holy Land's occupation. The "Testament of Time" exhibition with its beautifully displayed range of artifacts dating from the fourth millennium B.C.E. to the eighth century C.E. shows the much wider scope of their interests. Fostered by the Weinbergs, the Museum of Art and Archaeology at the University of Missouri-Columbia grew from a small display in a few rooms of the university's Ellis Library to the impressive collections the visitor can see today. *Testament of Time: Antiquities from the Holy Land* shows off in depth the museum's holdings from one region of the ancient world; the permanent collections are a testament to

a tradition of responsible and educated collecting, a tradition we expect and hope to continue in the times to come.

—S.C.H.

NOTES

1. N. Yoffee, "Conclusion: A Mass in Celebration of the Conference," in *Archaeology of Society* 542.
2. C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice* (New York, 1991), 426.
3. W. R. Biers, K. O. Gerhardt, and R. A. Braniff, *Lost Scents: Investigations of Corinthian "Plastic" Vases by Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry* (Philadelphia, 1994); K. W. Slane, et al., "Compositional Analysis of Eastern Sigillata A and Related Wares from Tel Anafa (Israel)," *JAS* 21 (1994): 51-64.
4. M. Bloch, *French Rural History: An Essay on its Original Characteristics* (London, 1966); F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II* (rev. ed., trans. S. Reynolds) (London, 1972).
5. M. Drower, "The Early Years," in T. G. H. James, ed., *Excavating in Egypt* (Chicago, 1982), 14.
6. I. Hodder, *Reading the Past* (Cambridge, 1986), 146; C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice* (New York, 1991), 431-34.
7. K. Flannery, "Introduction to the Second Edition" in *Archaeology of Society*, xvi.
8. I. Hodder, *Reading the Past* (Cambridge, 1986).
9. N. Silberman, *Between Past and Present* (New York, 1989).
10. G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (Philadelphia, 1960), 56-60.
11. A. Alt, *Essays in Old Testament History and Religion* (trans. from *Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palästina* 1925) (Oxford, 1966), 135-69.
12. N. Gottwald, *Tribes of Yahweh* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1979)
13. D. V. Edelman, ed., *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact and Israel's Past*, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Supplement Series 127. (Sheffield, 1991).
14. I. Finkelstein, "The Great Transformation: The 'Conquest' of the Highlands Frontiers and the Rise of the Territorial States," in *Archaeology of Society*, 362.
15. G. D. Weinberg, "Glass Factories in the Western Galilee," *IEJ* 14 (1964); G. D. Weinberg, "Search for Glass Factories," *Archaeology* 17 (1964): 283-84.
16. Weinberg, *Jalame*.
17. S. T. Parker, "The Byzantine Period: An Empire's New Holy Land," *NEA* 62 (1999): 166.
18. S. S. Weinberg, "Tel Anafa—A Problem-Oriented Excavation," *Muse* 3 (1969): 16-23.
19. Herbert, *Tel Anafa I*.
20. S. Herbert, "The Graeco-Phoenician Settlement at Tel Anafa: A Case Study in the Limits of Hellenization," in A. Biran, ed., *Biblical Archaeology Today* (Jerusalem, 1990); A. Berlin, "The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery: The Plain Wares," in Herbert, *Tel Anafa II*, i, ix-244.
21. K.W. Slane, "The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery: The Fine Wares," in Herbert, *Tel Anafa II*, i, 247-406.



1

Death and Burial in the Early Bronze Age

OF ALL THE TRAITS THAT DEFINE OUR HUMANITY, perhaps the earliest to reveal itself in the archaeological record was respect for the dead. The simple act of burying another human being, in order to protect the body from scavenging animals or defilement by human agents, is among the most basic practices of all societies. It suggests a belief that death is not the end of things, but is part of a spiritual trajectory that can be sensed by instinct but never completely understood. The presence of grave goods (weapons, tools, cooking pots, and/or jars of comestibles) points to a belief in an afterlife in which such commodities would be desired or necessary. Alternatively, these offerings may be seen as a form of conspicuous consumption, whereby family members buried valuable items with the deceased in order to make a statement about the financial status or social position of the family.

The grave groups presented here are from the site of Bâb edh-Dhrâ, situated on a wide plain to the southeast of the Dead Sea, overlooking the Lisan Peninsula to the west. The area was first explored during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by biblical scholars who were mainly interested in locating the "Cities of the Plain," especially the notorious Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 19:24–28). The wider archaeological importance of Bâb edh-Dhrâ, however, was first recognized by W. F. Albright during a brief survey of the region conducted in 1924. In 1965, Paul Lapp began an archaeological project at the site with the immediate goal of determining the nature and extent of its prehistoric cemetery. One of the major successes of the initial season was the isolation of a series of small tombs entered from above through vertical shafts. These tombs contained a new and distinctive corpus of pottery representing the earliest phase of the Early Bronze Age (Early Bronze IA). Until his untimely death in 1967, Lapp continued to work at Bâb edh-Dhrâ, where he succeeded in defining or redefining all of the major subdivisions

of the Early Bronze Age. In 1975, Lapp's work was resumed by two of his students, Walter Rast and Thomas Schaub. They pursued excavations at the site as well as a program of publication in order to make the finds of the earlier seasons available to scholars.

During the Early Bronze IA period, groups of seasonal pastoralists (nomads) discovered the site of Bâb edh-Dhrâ and used it as a cemetery for secondary burial. They returned to the site on a more or less regular schedule to graze their flocks and bury the remains of their dead, which they brought with them from other locations. In each early Bronze IA shaft tomb, disarticulated skeletons were placed in the center of the burial chamber, with funerary goods arranged around the perimeter. From two to ten individuals were buried at the same time in this way.

The later evidence from Bâb edh-Dhrâ illustrates the transition from nomadic existence to settlement. By Early Bronze IB, a sizeable town had developed at the site, which was later (Early Bronze II–III) protected by an impressive stone wall about 7 meters wide. At first the early settlers buried their loved ones in round funerary buildings constructed of mudbrick. By the time the defensive wall was completed, they also built larger, rectangular funerary structures. As the settlement became more permanent and its population increased, burial became more labor-intensive, with mudbrick charnel houses requiring laborers who specialized in their construction. Shortly thereafter the settlement was destroyed by a conflagration, which was followed by a return to the practice of burial in shaft tombs.

The University of Missouri collection contains two tomb groups from Paul Lapp's work at Bâb edh-Dhrâ: Tomb A70 from Cemetery A and Tomb C3 from Cemetery C, both of which are dated to the earliest period (Early Bronze IA). The tomb groups were presented to the Museum of Art and Archaeology by the Department of Antiquities

of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. For an introduction to the site of Bâb edh-Dhrâ, see Lapp, "Cemetery," and "Bâb edh-Dhrâ Tomb A76"; Rast and Schaub, *Southeastern Dead Sea Plain*; and Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*.

CEMETERY A

Tomb A70 presented a burial chamber that was circular in plan, although roughly "flattened" on its southern side where it joined the vertical shaft through which it was entered. The burial chamber had been closed by a roughly oval blocking stone, which did not prevent water from entering the tomb. Water action moved the grave goods from their original position(s) and contributed to the destruction of much of the organic material in the tomb. In the center of the chamber, in line with the axis of the entrance, lay a fragmentary and disarticulated pile of bones that had originally been placed on a mat on the floor. To the west of the bone pile, four skulls were encountered lying on, or very close to, the traces of matting. The skulls may have originally formed part of the pile, but in any case there was an insufficient number of other bones to completely represent four individuals. The assemblage of seven vessels for four people seems a bit stingy and may indicate a removal (or reuse) of some of the original offerings by the diggers of contemporary Tomb 72S, which intruded upon the burial chamber of Tomb A70 on its southwestern perimeter.

NOTES

For a discussion of Tomb A70, complete with plan and section drawings of the pottery pieces in situ: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110–115, and figs. 62 and 66 (1–7).

For a similar treatment of Tomb C3: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 192–95, and figs. 120–22.

A.L.

1 LARGE BOWL

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70

H. 0.13, D. rim 0.22, D. base 0.087

Pottery; chips in rim; five cracks extending from rim to body; exterior surface flaking

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.1)

The fine-to-medium-textured, light brown clay with white, black and some micaceous inclusions, straw casts, and a gray core is covered by a reddish-yellow slip. The bowl is handmade with a flat base, flaring sides, and a slightly everted rim. The surfaces are probably wet-smoothed.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Deep Bowl Form (0562) in medium size and lightly closed shape. It has a rounded rim (Type 11), a concave juncture with the wall (Type 15), and a flat base.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:5. Tomb A70, P#1 (Reg. No. 91239).

NOTES

For similar but smaller bowl with same clay:

Wampler, *Tell En-Nasbeh*, 163, pl. 51:1117.

Parallels from Jericho and Megiddo: Wampler, *Tell En-Nasbeh*, 98.

Discussion of the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 244.

A.L.

2 SMALL BOWL

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70

H. 0.045, D. rim 0.079

Pottery; chipping and large piece missing from rim; broken into six pieces and reconstructed
Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.2)

Handmade of a coarse, pink clay with large gray-black and white grit, and straw casts, the bowl is formed with a flat disc foot and a flaring open body. The surface is probably wet-smoothed.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Small Deep Bowl Form (0774) with open form and curved walls. It has a simple-direct tapered rim (Type 12) and a simple (Type 50) ring base.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:6. Tomb A70, P#2 (Reg. No. 91240).

NOTES

For parallel forms but with punctate band near rim: Lapp, "Bâb edh-Dhrâ Tomb A 76," 21, fig. 8:2 and 22, fig. 9:14.



1-7 Vessel Assemblage from Tomb A70, Cemetery A

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6-8, 245-46.

A.L.

3 JUG

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100-3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70

H. 0.104, D. rim 0.050

Pottery; broken and mended, about one-third missing (part of base, body, and rim); chip in handle; flaking on bottom; slip worn

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.3)

The medium-textured, mottled pink clay with large black and white grit is covered by a light red

slip. The rounded base is attached to an ovoid body with its maximum diameter below the median, an offset neck, and a straight-sided, slightly flaring and out-turned rim. One strap handle is attached from the body to the neck.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Juglet Form (0445) with tall neck, round body, round to flattened base, and mid-range tangent. Its handle is their Type 22 (loop handle attached from below rim to shoulder), with a lightly flared, curved-out rim (Type 62) and a simple, round base (Type 20).

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:3. Tomb A70, P#3 (Reg. No. 91241).

NOTES

For a parallel form: Lapp, "Bâb edh-Dhrâ Tomb A 76," 21, fig. 8:10.

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 240.

For similar jugs from Bâb edh-Dhrâ (Tomb A78NW) that have been used as a standard for the repertoire of Early Bronze IA funerary pottery at the site: Schaub in Rast and Schaub, *Southeastern Dead Sea Plain*, 85, fig. 3:2–6 and the chronological discussion on pp. 69–70.

A.L.

4 JAR

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.
Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70
H. 0.106, D. rim 0.051

Pottery; mended but still missing pieces; chip in rim, base flaked (in antiquity?), slip worn and surface slightly abraded

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.4)

Although the reddish-yellow clay with medium black-gray grit is covered by an orange slip, the surface has a mottled finish and scorch marks on its body. The handmade form has a flattened bottom, ovoid body with maximum diameter below the median, an offset neck leading to a straight-sided, slightly flaring and out-turned rim. The clay was probably wet-smoothed.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Jar Form (0265) with tall, wide neck, round to flattened base, low tangent, and ovoid shape. It has a tapered simple-direct rim (Type 12) and a simple round base (Type 20).

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:4 from Tomb A70, P#4 (Reg. No. 91242).

NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 238–40.

A.L.

5 JAR

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.
Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70
Preserved H. 0.103, preserved D. rim 0.052

Pottery; missing part of body and about 80% of rim

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.5)

The medium-coarse, reddish-yellow clay with large black and white grit has a mottled finish and scorch marks on its body. The vessel is handmade, with a flat bottom and globular body with offset neck. The surface was probably wet-smoothed.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Juglet Form (0444) with tall neck, round body, round to flattened base and mid-range tangent. Its handle is their Type 22 (loop handle attached from below rim to shoulder), with a tapered simple-direct rim (Type 12), and a simple, round base (Type 20).

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:1. Tomb A70, P#5 (Reg. No. 91243).

NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 240.

A.L.

6 JUG

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.
Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70
Preserved H. 0.075, preserved D. rim 0.048

Pottery; mended; missing small fragment from body, strap handle, neck and rim (handle and neck probably broken off in antiquity)
Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.6)

The fine reddish-yellow clay is covered by a burnished orange slip. The handmade jug has a flattened bottom, an ovoid body with maximum diameter below the median, and the remains of a strap handle attachment on its body.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Juglet Form (0445) with tall neck, round body, round to flattened base, and low tangent. Its handle and rim are missing, preventing type designations, but it has a flattened base (Type 31) with interior concavity.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and figs. 66:2, 66:7. Tomb A70, P#6 (Reg. No. 91244).



NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 9, 240.
A.L.

7 BOWL

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group A70

H. 0.097, D. rim 0.142

Basalt; chipping in rim, otherwise intact

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.77.7)

The bowl has a flat base, slightly flaring body with slightly out-turned rim and a double line of twisted rope (“knob”) decoration below the rim. The surface is smoothed. Similarly shaped cups in terracotta with “twisted rope” decoration also appear often at Bâb edh-Dhrâ.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 110, 114, and fig. 66:7. Tomb A70, P#St.1 (Reg. No. 93380).

NOTES

For the similar cups in terracotta: Lapp, “Bâb edh-Dhrâ Tomb A 76,” 20, figs. 10:8 and 13.

For a basalt cup in this form with a vestigial raised band and even rim: Lapp, “Bâb edh-Dhrâ Tomb A 76,” fig. 9:St1 and fig. 13.

A.L.

CEMETERY C

Tomb C3 consisted of a single, small chamber, roughly oval in plan. It was originally approached from above by a vertical shaft. The shaft was separated from the burial chamber by a blocking wall that had been disturbed at some time prior to its excavation. In spite of the confusion caused by the collapse of the original ceiling and the large quantity of sand and gravel washed in through the entrance, the tomb seems to have been used for only a single burial. The bones may have been laid out on a north-south axis with the head supported by, or positioned next to, a flat stone. Near the skull was found the handleless jar (78.79.1), while at the opposite end of the tomb, where the feet would be expected, the two bowls were found, with the smaller (78.79.2) nested inside the larger (78.79.3). Completing the offerings were a fragment of a

worked bone whistle (?) found in the smaller bowl (78.79.2) and a group of beads that had, evidently, been worn around the neck of the deceased. A one-handed jug that had been built into the blocking wall has been included in the tomb inventory (78.79.2).

For a discussion of Tomb C3 complete with plan and section drawings: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 192–95, and figs. 120–22.

8 JAR

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group C3

H. 0.112, D. rim 0.057, D. base 0.036

Pottery; three chips in rim, neck broken and restored, two hairline cracks in body

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.79.1)

The medium-textured, light brown clay with medium to large black and white grit is overlain by a horizontally burnished pink to red slip. The handmade jar has a depressed base, a globular body, and an offset neck with flaring rim.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Jar Form (0271) with tall, wide neck, wide, flat base, mid-range tangent, and globular to rounded shape. It has a lightly flared, curved-out rim (Type 62) with a concave juncture with the wall and a lightly concave, flat base (Type 16).

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 194 (P1), and fig. 122:1. Tomb C3, P#1 (Reg. No. 91860).

NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 238–40.

A.L.

9 BOWL

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group C3

H. 0.057, D. rim 0.155, D. base 0.051

Pottery; chips in rim; broken and restored; slip worn

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.79.2)

The reddish-yellow clay is covered by a light red, burnished slip with scorch marks on the surface.



8–11 Vessel Assemblage from Tomb C3, Cemetery C

The flat-based form consists of a shallow, flaring bowl with a straight-sided, slightly flaring rim. A twisted rope (“knob”) decoration is applied at the line of carination (body to rim).

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Medium-Small to Small Deep Bowl Form (0734) with carinated walls. It has a lightly flared, curved-out rim (Type 62), a concave juncture with the wall (Type 15), and a flat base.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, fig. 122:4. Tomb C3, P#2 (Reg. No. 91861).

NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 244.

A.L.

10 LARGE BOWL

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group C3

H. 0.144, D. rim 0.367, D. base 13.7

Pottery; four large and many small chips in rim; large crack from rim to base; surface abraded
 Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.79.3)

The coarse, light red clay with large black and white grit and straw casts is coated by a light red to very pale brown burnished slip. The handmade vessel has a flat disc base, flaring bowl, and a straight-sided rim with slightly everted lip. A row of twisted rope (“knob”) decoration is placed at the line of carination (body to rim).

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Deep Bowl Form (0555) with medium-large size and carinated, open shape. It has a simple-direct rounded rim (Type 11) and a concave juncture

with the wall, and a lightly concave, flat base (Type 16).

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, fig. 122:3. Tomb C3, P#3 (Reg. No. 91862).

NOTES

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–9, 242–43.

A.L.

11 JUG

Early Bronze IA, ca. 3100–3000 B.C.E.

Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Jordan, Tomb Group C3

H. 0.110, D. body 0.106 (rim not preserved)

Pottery; about 50% body and neck missing, broken into three pieces and mended

Courtesy of the Department of Antiquities of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan (78.79.4)

The medium-coarse, light reddish brown clay with large black and white grit is overlain by a light

reddish brown slip with micaceous inclusions. The rim is painted with a weak red slip line on the interior. The handmade form has a flat disc base, a globular body, an offset neck with a slightly flaring rim, and one strap handle attached from the body to just below the rim.

Schaub and Rast assign this vessel to their Basic Juglet Form (0451) of medium size, with tall neck, round body, wide base, and mid-range tangent. Its handle is their Type 28 (loop handle with horn at crest), with a lightly flared, curved-out rim (Type 62), a concave juncture with the wall (Type 15), and a flat base.

PUBLISHED

Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, fig. 122:2. Tomb C3, P#4 (Reg. No. 91863).

NOTES

For a parallel piece: Lapp, "Bâb edh-Dhrâ, Tomb A 76," 22, fig. 9:18.

For the type: Schaub and Rast, *Bâb edh-Dhrâ*, 6–8, 240–41.

A.L.