

## EXCAVATIONS AT TEL SHUNEM (SULAM), AREAS G AND G1

KAREN COVELLO-PARAN AND ERAN ARIE

### INTRODUCTION

The village of Sulam is located in the Jezreel Valley, at the foot of Giv'at Ha-More and on the banks of Nahal Shunem (map ref. 231688/723579; Fig. 1). At the village center is a tell that extends over an area of c. 2.5 hectares, with a modern cemetery on its summit. The archaeological site is identified with ancient Shunem, mentioned in both Biblical and extra-Biblical sources (Alexandre 2007).

The site was extensively surveyed in the past by the Survey of Western Palestine (SWP) (Conder and Kitchen 1882:87) and Guérin (1874–5:112–113). Almost a century later, Nehemia Zori surveyed the site and noted ancient building remains in both the cemetery and throughout the village along with potsherds dating to the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age I–II and the Roman period (Zori 1977:55–57,

Fig. 21; Pl. 17:2). Zori also retrieved a scarab dating to Dynasty XVIII (Zori 1977: Pl. 17:3). An Egyptian inscribed plaque bead dating to the Late Bronze Age (Givon 1984) was found during a survey of rock-hewn caves and tunnels at the bottom of the Giv'at Ha-More slope (Tepper and Shahar 1984), opposite Tel Shunem. In a subsequent survey, Gal (1998:62\*) noted the destruction of most of the ancient remains by construction works; he retrieved potsherds dating to the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age I–II, and the Persian, Roman, Byzantine, Mamluk and Ottoman periods. During the past two decades numerous small-scale excavations have been conducted at the site on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority (Fig. 2). A complete list of all excavations at the site, including the principal periods of the remains and their publication, is presented in Table 1.




Fig. 1. Location map.

**Table 1. Archaeological Expeditions to Tel Shunem/Sulam arranged Chronologically** (see Fig. 2)

No.	Permit No.	Excavator	Area	Location	Principal Periods	Final Publication
1	A-2958/1998	Gal	A	S of spring	Mamluk Ottoman	Gal and Hana 2002
2			B	E edge of tell	Byzantine/Early Islamic	
3			C	N edge of tell	MB II Byzantine	
4			D	W of tell	Byzantine	
5	A-2995/1999	Gal	E	NE of spring	Late Bronze	
6	A-3144/1999	Gal			Ayubbid and Mamluk	Gal and Hana 2002
7	A-3261/2000	Alexandre	F	N of tell	Iron IIA	Alexandre 2007
8	A-3671/2002	Covello-Paran	G	N of tell	LB III Iron I Byzantine	This article
9	A-3698/2003	Hana		S of tell	Early Islamic	Hana 2008
10	A-4101/2004	Covello-Paran		NE of tell	EB I Roman	Covello-Paran 2010
11	A-4117/2004	Amos		NW of spring	EB I MB/LB Late Byzantine/Early Islamic	Amos 2011
12	A-4323/2005	Ben Zioni		S of village	MB/LB	-
13	A-4872/2006	Alexandre		Village center, S of spring	Mamluk	Alexandre 2008
14	A-4947/2006	Feig	Excavation not carried out			
15	A-4973/2006	Amos		S slope of tell	Early Islamic, Crusader, Mamluk, Ottoman	Amos 2009c
16	A-5136/2007	Cinamon		S foot of tell	Late Roman–Umayyad Byzantine/Early Islamic	Cinamon 2010a
17	A-5195/2007	Amos		SW slope of tell	Iron Late Byzantine/Early Islamic	Amos 2009a
18	A-5220/2007	Amos		N of spring	Early Islamic Crusader–Mamluk Ottoman	Amos 2009b
19	A-5442/2008	Cinamon		W of village	MB/LB, Byzantine, Mamluk, Ottoman	Cinamon 2010b
20	A-5546/2008	Mitler		Village center	Middle Roman, Late Byzantine/Early Islamic, Mamluk	Mitler 2010
21	A-5788/2009	Covello-Paran	G1	N foot of tell	Iron I, Roman, Byzantine	This article

This excavation report presents the results of two excavations, in Areas G and G1, both located at the northern perimeter of Tel Shunem. Following the stratigraphic and architectural analysis of each respective excavation area, the finds from both areas are presented according to period. A correlation of the local stratigraphic phases from Areas G and G1 is set out in Table 2.

For the purpose of explanatory convenience, all compass points mentioned in the text are given as relative to the site's 'grid north' (which is in fact northwest) rather than true north.

**Table 2. Stratigraphic Correlation of Areas G and G1**

Area G	Area G1	Period
I		Modern
II	1	Byzantine
	2	Roman
III	3	Iron I
IV		Early Iron I
V		LB III

## ARCHITECTURE AND STRATIGRAPHY

### AREA G

In July 2002, following the discovery of ancient remains in the courtyard of the Abu Siam family in Sulam, salvage excavations were carried out north of the ancient cemetery, adjacent to the ring road encircling the village (map ref. 231701/723719; Figs. 2, 3).<sup>1</sup> Two squares (total 42.5 sq m) were opened and excavated to a maximum depth of 3.2 m below the modern surface level (Fig. 3).

Five superimposed strata were exposed, revealing a dense stratigraphic sequence. Stratum I contains burial remains from a pre-Mandate period cemetery that penetrates into the Stratum II (Byzantine) settlement remains in Sq A2, and directly into the Stratum III–IV (Iron I) remains in Sq A1. In Sq A2, the Stratum II Byzantine building leveled the Strata III–IV remains; therefore, these strata are only preserved in Sq A1. Stratum V (LB III) is the best preserved level, with architectural




Fig. 2. Location map of archaeological excavations at Sulam (see Table 1).



Fig. 3. Area G: general view, looking east.

remains appearing in both squares. In Sq A2 are segments of two buildings destroyed by fire, resulting in the inward collapse of their walls.


Time constraints prevented us from dismantling the Stratum V remains and we did not reach pre-LB III features such as have been identified in previous excavations.

#### *Stratum V*

Stratum V's relatively good preservation is due to the aforementioned conflagration that destroyed it (Plan 1). The high temperatures of the fire caused the brick walls of the buildings to collapse and consequently seal the room contents *in situ* below a thick layer of burnt mud-brick collapse. Despite the small exposure of this stratum in the excavation, we nevertheless were able to tentatively distinguish between two separate structures in Sq A2, Room 113 and Room 120 (Fig. 4). A double wall defines the abutment of these independent units, but the limited excavation exposure did not permit exploration of the probable connections between them.



Fig. 4. Area G, Stratum V: Rooms 113 and 120, looking west.



Plan 1. Area G, Strata V-III, plan and sections.



*Room 113.*— The single exposed room of this building is bounded by W111 and W112 on its northern and eastern sides, and extends beyond the site limits on the remaining sides (Fig. 5). Wall 111 (0.6 m wide) is preserved to a maximum height of 0.8 m, but is badly damaged by Foundation Trench 110 of Stratum II (Plan 1: Sections 1–1, 2–2). The stone foundation of W111 is two courses high and is constructed from medium-sized stones measuring 15–20 cm. Above the foundation, bricks were laid in a stretcher bond. The bricks are 12 cm high and the bonding is 3–4 cm thick. The conflagration burnt the wall down to its foundation, and the debris from the collapse of W111 is seen throughout the excavation area (Figs. 6, 7). In addition to the white phytolithic material found together with burnt bricks, small fragments of burnt plaster were also retrieved, providing evidence of the wall surface. The slant of the fallen burnt bricks (Plan 1: Sections 2–2, 3–3) suggests that the wall toppled to the east (Fig. 6). The high temperature of the fire is attested to by ash, charcoal chunks and the bright red, orange and even yellow bricks.

The two stone foundation courses of W112 exhibit signs of fire, similar to those of W111.

Numerous fallen bricks are visible in the section above W112 (Plan 1: Section 1–1).

On the floor of Room 113 a large group of shattered pottery vessels were found below the collapsed and burnt brick walls (Figs. 8; 20–24). Together with this rich assemblage, a fired clay bead, a trapezoidal geometric flint sickle blade, charred wood fragments and olive pits were retrieved from this floor. The latter consisted in a concentration of charred olive pits found embedded in the floor (Fig. 9), indicating that olives were kept in this room, either in one of the storage jars or alternatively, in a sack made from organic material.

*Room 120.*— This room clearly extends to the north and east, but only one partial room is within the limits of the excavation area. The room could not be fully exposed because its eastern end was covered by the architectural remains of Stratum II (Fig. 10). Room 120 is bounded by W126 and W124 on the western and southern sides, respectively. Both walls were constructed of a single row of large bricks (33 × 55 cm) with a 3–4 cm bonding. Only the brick superstructure of these walls was exposed; it is most likely



Fig. 5. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113, below Stratum II building remains, looking south.




Fig. 6. Area G, Stratum V, Room 113: collapsed bricks from W111 above a shattered flask (Fig. 22:2), looking south.



Fig. 7. Area G, Stratum V, Room 113: collapsed bricks from W111, bowl (Fig. 20:6), looking north.



Fig. 8. Area G, Stratum V, Room 113: collapsed bricks beside the shattered storage jar (Fig. 23:2) and duck bowl (Fig. 20:7), looking south.



Fig. 9. Area G, Stratum V, Room 113: concentration of charred olive pits embedded in the floor, looking west.



Fig. 10. Area G, Stratum V, Room 120: stone pavement, looking south.

that the foundations were of fieldstones. Wall 126 is preserved to a maximum height of four courses in the southern section (Plan 1:

Section 2–2). The preservation state of this room is very poor.

The surface (L120) was paved with medium-sized flat stones (Fig. 11). Over this floor were large quantities of ash, burnt organic material and burnt bricks from the collapsed surrounding walls (L119; Plan 1: Section 1–1). There were only sparse quantities of pottery sherds in the overlaying brick debris (Fig. 24:3, 4). This area was also partially disturbed by the Stratum II Foundation Trench 110 and associated leveling activities (see below).

*Room 123.*— Located in Sq A1, this partially excavated space is bounded on the south by W122 (Fig. 12). The two lowermost courses of W122's stone foundation were in a fragmentary state of preservation (Plan 1: Section 4–4). The brick superstructure of the wall was not *in situ*, but rather had collapsed on both its sides. A basalt grinding stone (Fig. 32:1) was found in secondary use in the wall. The abutting floor of Room 123 was minimally exposed and exhibited a whitish phytolithic material directly overlaying its surface. No finds could be securely associated with this floor; however, stratigraphically it is clearly below W117 of Stratum IV.

The pottery finds associated with this stratum date it to LB III (see below).





Fig. 11. Area G, Stratum V, Room 120: stone pavement, looking north.



Fig. 12. Area G, Square A1: Stratum V (W122), Stratum IV (W106, L114) and Stratum III (W104), looking south.

#### *Stratum IV*

This stratum was not well-preserved; the extant architectural features include W106 and W117 and Floor 114, all in Sq A1 (Fig. 12).

Wall 106, the primary architectural feature of Stratum IV, is preserved to a height of over one meter. Its exact width was difficult to

determine, but can be estimated at 0.55–0.60 m. We identified six extant courses of the dark-brown brick superstructure; its foundation—probably of stone—was not excavated. The stone foundation of an additional wall, W117, was only detected in the eastern baulk of Sq A1. The probable juncture of W106 and W117

is also in the baulk and therefore, was not exposed in this excavation. A hard packed floor (L114) abuts W106's northern side.

Pottery vessels found shattered on this floor enable us to date Stratum IV to early Iron I (Figs. 25, 26).

### *Stratum III*

*Room 103.*— The fragmentary remains of Room 103 include W104, patches of floors and an installation (L109). However, the stratum to which this room belongs was only detected in Sq A1; in Sq A2 it was entirely destroyed by Stratum I construction. Even in Sq A1, several Stratum I burials penetrated into Stratum III.

Wall 104, preserved to a length of 1.2 m, is 0.6 m wide and constructed of two faces of medium-sized fieldstones, surmounted by a brick superstructure. This wall is abutted by Floor 103 and probably also by the overlying Floor 125; however, a modern trench destroyed this latter connection (Plan 1: Section 4–4). Floor 125 was visible only in the baulk as a distinct and compact layer of grayish burnt earth. The elevation of this floor suggests that it represents a later phase of this stratum, i.e., the raising of the floor level in this room. Buried upright

beneath the surface of Floor 125 was a neck-less storage jar (L109), the opening of which was integrated with the floor (Fig. 13). It is probable that this jar functioned as an installation for the storage of liquids; however, alternatively, it may have been used for interment, an interpretation that would explain the presence of a pyxis (Fig. 27:12) inside the jar. Unfortunately, the fragmentary condition of the jar, damaged by Stratum I burials, does not permit a definite conclusion.

The pottery finds associated with this stratum date it to Iron I (Fig. 27).

### *Stratum II*

The latest building phase in this area, Stratum II, includes fragmentary architectural features of what seems to be a single structure in Sq A2, Room 115 (Plan 2). The grave-digging activities of Stratum I penetrated into this stratum and destroyed or disturbed most of the remains.

The walls of this room, W107 and W108, are both preserved to a height of two courses. They were constructed according to a similar technique: a row of large dressed blocks (averaging  $0.70 \times 0.25 \times 0.30$  m) alongside another of medium-sized fieldstones. Both walls incorporate foundations built of medium-





Fig. 13. Area G, Stratum III: storage jar (L109) below Floor 125, looking west.



Plan 2. Area G, Strata II-I (for sections, see Plan 1).



Fig. 14. Area G, Stratum II: W107, W108 and Floor 115, overlying Stratum V, looking west.

sized stones. Wall 108 originally abutted another wall, of which only Foundation Trench 110 was preserved (Plan 1: Sections 1–1, 2–2). Alternatively, Trench 110 can be interpreted as a robber's trench, on account of the haphazard order of the stones in it. This trench, filled with

loose debris and large stones, disturbed and cut Stratum V W111 and W124.

Stone Floor 115 meets the northern side of W107 (Fig. 14). This floor was constructed from large slabs of limestone and basalt, laid directly over the collapsed brick W111 of Stratum V. An

additional floor, L128, seems to be associated with both W107 and W108; it was noted only in the western baulk of Sq A2 (Plan 1: Section 2–2) by successive layers of burnt debris above a stone foundation (134.61 m asl).

The pottery sherds from this stratum are dated to the Byzantine period (Fig. 29:1–3).

### *Stratum I*

Directly below the modern surface are a number of poorly preserved cist graves from a modern cemetery (Sq A1: L101; Sq A2: L102; Plan 1: Sections 1–1, 2–2, 4–4). The graves all seem to have been stone-lined and covered by a stone slab. They were aligned on an east–west axis and presumably faced south. These finds, as well as additional skeletal remains uncovered in infrastructure activity to the north of the present excavation, indicates that the cemetery on the tell's summit originally extended as far north as this plot, and even further. The Stratum I graves penetrated into Strata II and III.

Since the osteological and other remains from these graves were not fully studied,

we can only loosely attribute them to burial activities dating to the beginning of the twentieth century CE.<sup>2</sup>

### AREA G1

In December 2009, a further small-scale excavation was conducted in a plot located 25 m north of Area G (map ref. 231714/723744; Fig. 2), again on the property of the Abu Siam family.<sup>3</sup>

Area G1 measures  $7.5 \times 4.0$  m, and was excavated to a maximum depth of 4 m below the modern surface level (Fig. 15). The trial trenches dug prior to the excavation revealed that the archaeological remains in the southern part of the area were preserved at a higher elevation than those in the northern part, which were buried beneath almost two meters of colluvial soil. Three superimposed strata were exposed: Stratum 1 (Byzantine), Stratum 2 (Roman) and Stratum 3 (Iron I). This excavation area yielded a low density of archaeological remains.




Fig. 15. Area G1, general view of excavation area prior to exposure of Stratum 3, looking south.



Stratum 3 (Plan 3)

The sole architectural feature attributed to Stratum 3 is a stone-lined circular installation (L314; interior diam. 2 m), which most likely functioned as a silo (Fig. 16). This feature

was not excavated in its entirety, its eastern side being beyond the excavation limit. Silo 314 appears to have been subterranean. Four courses of its wall (W312; 0.2–0.3 m wide) are preserved to a height of 0.8 m and its interior



Plan 3. Area G1, plan and sections.



Fig. 16. Area G1, Stratum 3: Silo 314, looking southwest.

surface is plastered (3 cm thick; Fig. 17). The floor of the silo is of small stones set into an orange clay/brick matrix. Pottery sherds were found on this floor under a layer of stone debris. Silo 314 was later cut by Pit 315 of Stratum 1, and was subsequently disturbed by the archaeological trial trenches prior to excavation. A probe below the floor revealed that this feature was dug into sterile soil.

The pottery finds from the undisturbed part of the silo, albeit a small sampling, all date to Iron I (Fig. 28).

#### *Stratum 2*

A short wall segment (W307) and associated living surface (L309) were exposed in a small probe at the southern end of the excavation area. Wall 307 (preserved length 1 m, width 0.3 m) is oriented east–west and continues into the western baulk. This wall is abutted by Surface 309, on which smashed, *in situ* pottery vessels were found. The excavation in this probe was not completed due to time constraints. Thus, the nature of Stratum 2 is not defined in its entirety.



Fig. 17. Area G1, Stratum 3, Silo 314: interior face of W312, exhibiting partially preserved plaster lining.



Fig. 18. Area G1, Stratum 1: W303 and W305, looking south.

The pottery sherds and glass fragments from the living surface date Stratum 2 to the Middle/Late Roman period (Fig. 29).

#### *Stratum 1*

The architectural remains of Stratum 1 were found approximately one meter below the modern surface and include wall fragments (W303, W305) and two pits (L310, L315).

Walls 303 and 305 run parallel on an east–west axis and continue beyond the excavation limits at both ends (Fig. 18). Wall 303 (exposed length 3.5 m, width 0.6 m) is well-constructed from a single row of very large, dressed stones (e.g.,  $0.5 \times 0.6 \times 0.7$  m) mixed with smaller stones. In the space between these walls and resting against them is a layer of stone debris (L301), which contained pottery sherds, glass fragments,<sup>4</sup> groundstone tools, white tesserae and *ṭabun* pieces. The discovery of a burial that cut L301 forestalled further exploration of this area. Moreover, we were unable to confirm whether this was an ancient burial, or a modern one from the same cemetery as that in Stratum I in Area G.

The two circular pits, L310 and L315, are located north of W303 and penetrated down




Fig. 19. Area G1, Stratum 1: Pit 310.

through a thick layer of colluvial soil. Pit 315 (diam. 1.00–1.35 m), which cut into the fill of Stratum 3 Silo 314, contained loose brown debris mixed with numerous pottery sherds. Pit 310 (diam. 0.8 m) was not excavated to its full depth, but its form could be discerned. Its fill was made up of small stones, loose soft debris and pottery sherds (Fig. 19).

The numerous finds retrieved from Stratum 1 are dated to the Byzantine period (Figs. 30:4–11; 32:3–5).

## THE FINDS

The pottery for each period is presented in the text by Stratum, according to type. The pottery assemblages from the earlier periods (LB III–Iron I) were subjected to quantitative analysis and are discussed in terms of the Jezreel Valley regional typology (see below). The pottery from the later periods (Roman and Byzantine) was sparser and follows a general typological format.

## LATE BRONZE AGE III–IRON AGE I POTTERY

The pottery repertoire retrieved from Areas G (Strata V–III) and G1 (Stratum 3) at Sulam is relatively limited due to the size of the excavation area. However, in light of the wealth and importance of the LB III assemblage, it was decided to count all diagnostic sherds

and engage in statistical analysis. Given the proximity of ancient Shunem to Tel Megiddo, and the well-established and extensive typology published for the LB III and Iron I strata there (Arie 2006; 2013), it was decided to compare the pottery types from Sulam to those from Megiddo (Table 3). Therefore, the Sulam pottery type numbers follow those used at Megiddo. (Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Sulam repertoire does not include a full range of the types known at this much more extensive site.) Since most of the pottery types found at Sulam have been discussed in great detail in the Tel Megiddo publications, the following discussion focuses rather on patterns and general characteristics of the LB III–Iron I pottery assemblages at Sulam. The complete typological breakdown and quantitative analysis of the Sulam assemblages from Strata V–III is presented in Table 4.

**Table 3. Pottery Typology for Tel Shunem LB III–Iron I Strata, following Megiddo (Arie 2006)**

Type	Definition according to Megiddo Typology	Megiddo Reference	Tel Shunem Stratum	Fig. in Current Publication
BL1	Rounded bowl with simple rim	Arie 2006:192–193	V	20:1
			IV	25:1
BL2	Rounded bowl with inverted rim	Arie 2006:193	V	20:2, 3
			III	27:1
			3	28:1
BL3	Carinated bowl with ‘cyma’ profile	Arie 2006:193–194	V	20:4
			IV	25:2
BL5	Shallow carinated bowl with flat base	Arie 2006:194	?	
BL11	Shallow carinated bowl with thickened, diagonally inverted rim		V	20:5, 6
BL?	Varia		V	20:7
			IV	25:3
K1	High carinated krater with folded rim	Arie 2006:196–197	V	20:8, 9
			IV	25:4
			III	27:2, 3
			3	28:2, 3
K2a	Carinated krater with two handles and spout	Arie 2006:197	V	21:1
K?	Varia		IV	25:5, 6
			III	27:4
CH1	Carinated chalice with flaring rim	Arie 2006:199	IV	25:7, 8
			III	27:5



Table 3. (cont.)

Type	Definition according to Megiddo Typology	Megiddo Reference	Tel Shunem Stratum	Fig. in Current Publication
CH?	Varia		?	
G1	Goblet	Arie 2006:199	III	27:6
CP1a	Cooking-pot with pinched straight rim	Arie 2006:200	V	24:3
CP1b	Cooking-pot with pinched inverted rim	Arie 2006:200	IV	25:9–11
			3	28:4
CP2a	Cooking-pot with triangular straight rim	Arie 2006:201	V	21:3
			III	27:7
CP2b	Cooking-pot with triangular inverted rim	Arie 2006:201	III	27:8
CP-LB			V	21:2
CJ1	Cooking jug with low neck and flaring rim	Arie 2006:201–202	IV	25:12
CJ?	Varia		?	Not illustrated
J1	Jug with high neck and handle from rim to shoulder		III	27:9
J3	Large jug	Arie 2006:204		
J7a	Strainer jug with carinated body and basket handle	Arie 2006:205	IV	25:13
J7b	Strainer jug with rounded body	Arie 2006:206	III	27:10
J?	Varia		?	Not illustrated
F1b	Small lentoid flask decorated with spiral or concentric circles	Arie 2006:208–209	III	27:11
F2	Large lentoid flask with monochrome decoration	Arie 2006:209	V	Fig. 22:2
F?	Varia		V	22:1
PX1	Pyxis with flat, rounded or ring base	Arie 2006:210	V	22:3
			III	27:12
AM1	Amphoriskos with rounded base	Arie 2006:211	III	27:13
AM2	Amphoriskos with ring base, two handles and spout	Arie 2006:211	IV	25:15
SJ1	Ovoid storage jar	Arie 2006:211–212	V	23:4
SJ1a	Ovoid storage jar with a ridged rim	Arie 2006:212	V	23:1, 2
			IV	26:1, 2
			III	27:14, 15
			3	28:5, 6
SJ1b	Ovoid storage jar with thickened rim	Arie 2006:213	V	23:5, 6
			IV	26:4
SJ2	Decorated storage jar	Arie 2006:214	V	23:3
			IV	26:3, 5
SJ?	Varia		V	23:7, 8
P1	Collared-rim pithos	Arie 2006:215–216	III	27:16
			3	28:8
UI	Unidentified			

**Table 4. Distribution of Vessel Types according to Stratum (Complete Vessels and Sherds) from Area G, Strata V–III**

Stratum Type	V		IV		III	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
BL1	8	11.8	3	3.3	1	1.5
BL2	5	7.4	4	4.3	2	3.0
BL3	3	4.4	3	3.3	1	1.5
BL5			1	1.1		
BL11	2	2.9				
BL?	7	10.3	8	8.7	3	4.5
<i>Total BL</i>	25	36.8	19	20.7	7	10.4
K1	15	22.1	13	14.1	20	29.9
K2	1	1.5				
K?			4	4.3	1	1.5
<i>Total K</i>	16	23.5	17	18.5	21	31.3
CH1			1	1.1	1	1.5
CH?			2	2.2	5	7.5
<i>Total CH</i>			3	3.3	7	10.4
G1					1	1.5
<i>Total G</i>					1	1.5
CP1a	1	1.5	1	1.1	2	3.0
CP1b			3	3.3		
CP2a	1	1.5	1	1.1	1	1.5
CP2b			1	1.1	1	1.5
CP-LB	1	1.5				
<i>Total CP</i>	3	4.4	6	6.5	4	6
CJ1			1	1.1		
CJ?			2	2.2	1	1.5
<i>Total CJ</i>			3	3.3	1	1.5
J1			4	4.3	1	1.5
J3					1	1.5
J7a			1	1.1		
J7b					1	1.5
J?	2	2.9	9	9.8	6	9.0
<i>Total J</i>	2	2.9	14	15.2	9	13.4
F1b					2	3.0
F2	1	1.5				
F?	1	1.5				
<i>Total F</i>	2	2.9			2	3
PX1	1	1.5			1	1.5
<i>Total PX</i>	1	1.5			1	1.5
AM1					1	1.5
AM2			1	1.1		
<i>Total AM</i>			1	1.1	1	1.5

Stratum Type	V		IV		III	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SJ1	4	5.9			1	1.5
SJ1a	6	8.8	25	27.2	11	16.4
SJ1b	3	4.4	1	1.1	1	1.5
SJ2	1	1.5	2	2.2		
SJ?	4	5.9	1	1.1		
<i>Total SJ</i>	18	26.5	29	31.5	13	19.4
P1					1	1.5
<i>Total P</i>					1	1.5
UI	1	1.5				
<i>Total U</i>	1	1.5				
<i>Total</i>	68	100%	92	100%	67	100%

*Stratum V* (Area G) (Figs. 20–24)

Room 120 yielded only four diagnostic potsherds (Fig. 24:3, 4). By contrast, Room 113 contained 15 complete vessels and 49 diagnostic potsherds (Fig. 20). The assemblage of complete vessels is relatively varied and includes four bowls, two kraters, two flasks and seven storage jars.<sup>5</sup>

*Bowls.*— Among the rounded (Fig. 20:1–3) and carinated (Fig. 20:4–7) bowls, one has a bar handle (No. 6). Of special note is a small, deep, carinated “duck bowl” (No. 7) with a simple rim (counted as Type BL?). On one side, the potter added to the rim exterior a plastic element in the shape of a tail, and almost opposite were added a neck and head (not preserved). Petrographic analysis of this bowl indicates it was made in the Jezreel Valley (see Shapiro, this volume). Bowls with a similar profile were found at Bet She’an, both in Strata S5–S3 (Martin 2009:440, BL74) and in the northern cemetery (Oren 1973: Fig. 42a:9); however, none of those examples incorporate plastic decoration. Although there is no exact parallel for the Sulam “duck bowl”, it most likely should be associated with the group produced from various materials (some

pottery), to which bird-like plastic decoration was added in the form of head, tail and wings (Adler 1996: Figs. 15, 16). The fact that this bowl morphologically resembles the Egyptian bowls from Bet She'an (a type lacking entirely in the Megiddo repertoire), coupled with the fact that the source of origin for the plastic bird-like decoration is most likely Egyptian, strongly suggests that the Sulam "duck bowl" is a unique and important addition to the Egyptianized pottery assemblage found in Israel (Martin 2005). The relative proximity between Sulam and Bet She'an, which was an Egyptian outpost during this period, strongly supports this hypothesis.

*Kraters.*— A clear majority of the kraters from Stratum V belong to the Megiddo Type K1 (Fig. 20:8, 9), unambiguously diagnostic of LB III and Iron I (Arie 2011: j116–119). However, one of the Sulam kraters is Type K2a (Fig. 21:1). Apparently, this vessel was used for separating immiscible liquids, such as oil and water. In the lower part of the krater is a hole for draining the heavier liquid that would settle at the bottom, and in its upper part is a pinched spout that enabled the drawing off of a lighter liquid.

*Cooking Pots.*— Only three cooking-pot sherds were retrieved from Stratum V. Room 113 yielded two: an everted triangular-profiled rim (Fig. 21:2), and a large sherd showing almost

a full profile of cooking pot type CP2a (Fig. 21:3). The latter has an identical parallel in the form of a complete vessel from Megiddo K-6 (Arie 2013: Fig. 12.68:1). The presence of the characteristic everted-rim Late Bronze Age cooking pots (Fig. 21:2), together with the typical Iron Age cooking pots that have upright triangular rims (Figs. 21:3; 24:3), has been taken at Megiddo as a clear indicator of Stratum VIIA (Arie 2013:494–497).

*Flasks.*— Of the two painted flasks uncovered in Stratum V, one (Fig. 22:1) has no parallels in shape and decoration, and the other (Fig. 22:2) is one of the most complete and most beautiful examples of the Type F2 flask to be found in the northern valleys (Arie 2013:510). This latter bears brown decoration in the form of concentric circles; the broad space between the inner and outer clusters of lines is divided into metopes by four lattice-filled swatches. Petrographic analysis of this vessel indicates its origin to be the Bet She'an valley.

*Pyxis.*— Stratum V yielded only one pyxis: a red-decorated fragment of Type P1 from L113 (Fig. 22:3).

*Storage Jars.*— Unfortunately, the rims of most of the restored storage jars excavated in Stratum V were not preserved. However, two (Fig. 23:1, 2) correspond with Type SJ1a, the

Fig. 20 ►

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>ii</sup>
1	Bowl <sup>i</sup>	1024/3	BL1	Brown clay	
2	Bowl <sup>i</sup>	1050/1	BL2	Buff clay	
3	Bowl	1048/1	BL2	Reddish brown clay	
4	Bowl	1033/2	BL3	Gray clay; red decoration	
5	Bowl <sup>i</sup>	1022	BL11	Dark brown clay; red decoration	3
6	Bowl <sup>i</sup>	1045	BL11	Reddish brown clay; bar handle	1
7	Duck bowl <sup>i</sup>	1036	BL?	Brown clay; remains of soot inside	1
8	Krater	1053/1	K1	Buff clay	
9	Krater <sup>i</sup>	1039/1	K1	Reddish brown clay	

<sup>i</sup> Complete vessel.

<sup>ii</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.




Fig. 20. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113 pottery.






Fig. 21. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113 pottery (cont.).

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>ii</sup>
1	Krater <sup>i</sup>	1049	K2a	Brown clay	3
2	Cooking pot	1034/1	CP-LB	Dark reddish brown clay	
3	Cooking pot	1024/1	CP2a	Dark brown clay	

<sup>i</sup> Complete vessel.

<sup>ii</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.



Fig. 22. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113 pottery (cont.).

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>ii</sup>
1	Flask <sup>i</sup>	1021/1	F varia	Brown clay; red decoration	
2	Flask <sup>i</sup>	1035	F2	Buff clay; brown decoration	4
3	Pyxis	1018/10	PX1	Gray clay; red decoration	

<sup>i</sup> Complete vessel.  
<sup>ii</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.




Fig. 23. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113 pottery (cont.).

◀ Fig. 23

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>ii</sup>
1	Storage jar <sup>i</sup>	1043	SJ1a	Reddish brown clay	1
2	Storage jar <sup>i</sup>	1039	SJ1a	Light brown clay	3
3	Storage jar <sup>i</sup>	1046/1	SJ1	Brown clay	3
4	Storage jar <sup>i</sup>	1050	SJ2	Dark brown clay; red decoration	
5	Storage jar	1018/1	SJ1b	Brown clay	2
6	Storage jar	1033/4	SJ1b	Brown clay	
7	Storage jar	1039/2	SJ varia	Buff clay	
8	Storage jar	1021/5	SJ varia	Buff clay	

<sup>i</sup> Complete vessel.

<sup>ii</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.

most ubiquitous storage jar type in the Jezreel Valley during LB III–Iron I (Arie 2013:517, 518). The jar in Fig. 23:1 has a distorted neck and rim. The rim sherd count of this vessel suggests a discernible preference for this type over the second most common Type SJ1b ( $n = 3$ ; Fig. 23:5, 6)—a predilection reflected at all Jezreel Valley sites (Arie 2011:139).

*Decorated Sherds.*— Only a limited number of decorated vessels were found in Stratum V: three bowls (two BL3 and one BL11; Fig. 20:4, 5), two flasks (F2 and F?; Fig. 22:1, 2), a pyxis (PX1; Fig. 22:3), a storage jar (SJ2; Fig. 23:4), and two jar handles (Fig. 24:1, 2). Typically for this period, all were decorated with red paint, primarily in horizontal bands, but also more complex motifs such as metopes and wavy lines (on flasks). Noteworthy is the painted red band on the bowl rims, a well-known phenomenon from Megiddo VIIA (Arie 2013:531).

*Stratum IV* (Area G) (Figs. 25, 26)

No whole vessels were found in Stratum IV, but a total of 92 diagnostic sherds provide a typological picture. A full breakdown of the types is presented in Table 4. Most of the pottery assemblage of Stratum IV is closely related to those of Strata V and III. Rounded

and carinated bowls (Fig. 25:1–3) and carinated kraters (Fig. 25:4, 6) are of similar types to those found in other phases, dated to LB III and Iron I. The cooking-pot rims (Fig. 25:9–11) are all of the straight-stance rim type (CP1, CP2), a variation on the Late Bronze Age type that appeared in Stratum V.

Despite the limited size of the Stratum IV ceramic assemblage, notable are a number of ceramic types that appear for the first time in Iron I: BL5 (not illustrated; see Table 4), chalices of Type CH1 (Fig. 25:7, 8), and a spouted amphoriskos of Type AM2 (Fig. 25:15); the appearance of a decorated basket handle (most probably from a strainer jug of Type J7a) is also suggestive of this date (Fig. 25:13). Stratum IV, therefore, without doubt dates to Iron I.

A number of vessels and types worthy of particular mention are described below.

*Krater with Reed Impressions.*— Figure 25:5 is a small sherd, probably of Type K2 (with two loop handles). The circular impressions on its rim were made by a reed prior to firing. At Shillo V, a number of open vessels had similar impressions made in the pre-firing stage (Bunimovitz and Finkelstein 1993: Figs. 6.52:5; 6.59:1; 6.60:3).






Fig. 24. Area G, Stratum V: Room 113 (1, 2) and Room 120 (3, 4) pottery.

No.	Vessel	Locus	Basket	Type	Description
1	Storage jar	113	1033/1	Handle (SJ)	Light brown clay; red decoration
2	Storage jar	113	1039	Handle (SJ)	Brown clay; post-firing mark
3	Cooking pot	119	1032/1	CP1a	Dark brown clay
4	Storage jar	119	1028/1	Handle (SJ)	Light brown clay; post-firing mark

Fig. 25 ▶

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>i</sup>
1	Bowl	1015/3	BL1	Whitish clay	
2	Bowl	1023/5	BL3(?)	Grayish brown clay	
3	Bowl	1022	BL varia	Reddish brown clay; red decoration	
4	Krater	1026/3	K1	Whitish clay	
5	Krater	1023/4	K2	Brown clay; pre-firing reed impressions	
6	Krater	1016/4	K varia	Brown clay	
7	Chalice	1023/3	CH1	Light reddish brown clay	1
8	Chalice	1015/1	CH1(?)	Brown clay	1
9	Cooking pot	1014/1	CP1b	Dark gray clay	
10	Cooking pot	1026/7	CP1b	Dark brown clay	
11	Cooking pot	1014/2	CP1b	Dark brown clay	
12	Cooking jug	1023/2	CJ1	Dark grayish brown clay; many white inclusions	
13	Jug	1016/2	Basket handle (J7a)	Buff clay; red decoration	
14	Body sherd	1023/1	-	Yellowish clay; reddish brown decoration	4
15	Amphoriskos	1016/3	AM2	Light brown clay	1

<sup>i</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.

*Cooking Jug (CJ1).*— Figure 25:12 is the only type-identifiable cooking jug to be found in the excavations. The specific type of two additional cooking jug sherds from Stratum IV was not discernible. It appears, therefore, that during the early Iron Age at Sulam there was probably

a preference for cooking in pots as opposed to jugs.

*Storage Jars.*— It is worth noting the relative rim counts of ridged-rim (SJ1a; Fig. 26:1, 2) and thickened-rim (SJ1b; Fig. 26:4) jars (see




Fig. 25. Area G, Stratum IV: Room 114 pottery.

Table 4). In Stratum V, there are half as many storage jars of Type SJ1b as of Type SJ1a. In Stratum IV, there was a dramatic increase of SJ1a storage jars, and the SJ1b type almost disappeared. This phenomenon is well-documented in Megiddo Strata VII–VI (Arie 2013:516–517).

*Decorated Sherds.*— The ceramic assemblage of Stratum IV is similar to that of Stratum V in that most of the pottery is undecorated. The rare evidence for decoration is mostly restricted to red-painted bands. For example, one bowl of Type BL5 (not illustrated), three other bowls (e.g., Fig. 25:3), two jugs (types non-discernible) and two storage jars of Type SJ2 (e.g., Fig. 26:3). A decorated body sherd (Fig. 25:14) from a closed vessel was tested petrographically and was shown to be a product of the Bet She'an Valley (see below and Shapiro, this volume). Worthy of mention is a large body sherd of a storage jar (Fig. 26:5), fabricated from whitish clay and painted

with black bands. This vessel appears to be non-local and is atypical of the Jezreel Valley ceramic tradition in both its ware and black decoration; it is therefore probably an import.<sup>6</sup>

#### *Stratum III (Area G) (Fig. 27)*

The ceramic assemblage of Stratum III (see Table 4) is likewise diagnostic of Iron I, and includes such local types as bowls (Fig. 27:1), kraters (Fig. 27:2, 3), chalices (Fig. 27:5), cooking pots (Fig. 27:7, 8), jugs (Fig. 27:9), storage jars (Fig. 27:14, 15) and a collar rim pithos (Fig. 27:16).

Of special note is a large krater (Fig. 27:4), morphologically identical to the open cooking pots (Type CP2a). No such vessel has been found in contemporary Megiddo assemblages, but parallels are known from the rural site of 'Ein el-Ḥilu (Arie 2011: Fig. 9.2.6:16). Also worthy of mention is a base fragment of a goblet of Type G1 (Fig. 27:6), as it is the sole evidence for this vessel type at Sulam.




Fig. 26. Area G, Stratum IV: Room 114 pottery (cont.).

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>1</sup>
1	Storage jar	1026/2	SJ1a	Reddish brown clay	3
2	Storage jar	1015/4	SJ1a	Light brown clay	2
3	Storage jar	1016/5	SJ2	Reddish brown clay; red decoration	
4	Storage jar	1015/2	SJ1b	Reddish brown clay	
5	Storage jar	1016/1	SJ2	Whitish clay; black decoration	

<sup>1</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.

*Decorated Sherds.*— The base of a jug (Fig. 27:10), probably of Type J7b, has a red-painted decorative pattern, which is described by Gilboa (2009:82–84) as ‘overlapping multiple diagonal strokes’ (OMDS). The recovery at

Sulam of a vessel with such decoration attests to the distribution range of this decorative type, designated by one of the authors as ‘Late Canaanite Decorative Style’ (see Arie 2013:534–536 for full discussion).




Fig. 27. Area G, Stratum III: Room 103 (1–11, 13–16) and L109 (12) pottery.

The lower part of a small amphoriskos of the rounded-base type (Fig. 27:13) is decorated with a painted pattern of red and black lines. The upper part of such a closed vessel was found in Level H-9 (= Stratum VIA) at Megiddo (Arie 2013: Fig. 12.80:2). These vessels should be attributed to the aforementioned 'Late Canaanite Decorative Style'.

The small number of diagnostic decorated sherds in Stratum III follows the Strata V and IV pattern. Aside from the above-mentioned vessels, the only others decorated with monochrome red paint are two flasks of Type F1b (Fig. 27:11 and another not illustrated) and a pyxis of Type PX1 (Fig. 27:12).

A thin red slip was found on a Type K1 krater (not illustrated) and a Type SJ1a storage jar (Fig. 27:15), comparable to a slip applied to similar vessel types at Megiddo VI (Arie 2006:224).

#### *Stratum 3 (Area G1) (Fig. 28)*

The limited pottery assemblage from Stratum 3 in Area G1 includes only eight diagnostic

sherds. The types of kraters (K1; Fig. 28:2, 3), cooking pots (CP1b; Fig. 28:4), storage jars (SJ1a; Fig. 28:5, 6) and collared-rim pithoi (P1; Fig. 28:8) suggest that this installation is coeval with Stratum IV and/or Stratum III of Area G. A bar handle on a decorated open bowl of Type BL2 (Fig. 28:1) and the punctured handle of a storage jar (Fig. 28:7) are of special interest.

#### *Petrography of Late Bronze Age III and Iron Age I Wares*

Twenty samples from Sulam Strata V–III, primarily storage containers and decorated vessels, were examined for provenance (see Shapiro, this volume). The results indicate that these vessels were fabricated from five separate petrographic groups, most likely representing five separate potters' workshops. The provenance of three of these groups is the Jezreel Valley, together representing 85% of the examined vessels from Sulam.<sup>7</sup>

It is noteworthy that only two vessels produced in the Bet She'an (Central

◀ Fig. 27

No.	Vessel	Locus	Basket	Type	Description	Petrographic Group <sup>i</sup>
1	Bowl	103	1011/2	BL2	Brown clay	
2	Krater	103	1011/1	K1	Dark brown clay	
3	Krater	103	1007/21	K1	Brown clay	
4	Krater	103	1003/1	K varia	Grayish brown clay	
5	Chalice	103	1007/3	CH1 (?)	Reddish brown clay	
6	Goblet	103	1001/1	G1	Buff clay	1
7	Cooking pot	103	1007/2	CP2a	Dark brown clay	
8	Cooking pot	103	1007/1	CP2b	Dark brown clay	
9	Jug	103	1010/1	J1	Brown clay	
10	Jug	103	1003/2	J7b(?)	Brown clay; reddish brown decoration	1
11	Flask	103	1001/2	F1b	Yellowish clay; red decoration	5
12	Pyxis	109	1017	PX1	Brown clay; red decoration	
13	Amphoriskos	103	1009/1	AM1	Buff clay; red decoration	
14	Storage jar	103	1009/3	SJ1a	Buff clay	
15	Storage jar	103	1010/2	SJ1a	Brown clay; red slip	1
16	Pithos	103	1005/1	P1	Light brown clay	1

<sup>i</sup> See Shapiro, this volume.






Fig. 28. Area G1, Stratum 3 pottery.

No.	Vessel	Locus	Basket	Type	Description
1	Bowl	314	1019/4	BL2(?)	Brown clay; red decoration; bar handle
2	Krater	314	1021	K1	Buff clay
3	Krater	314	1024/2	K1	Brown clay
4	Cooking pot	314	1019/10	CP1b	Dark brown clay
5	Storage jar	311	1018/1	SJ1a	Brown clay
6	Storage jar	311	1017/7	SJ1a	Whitish clay
7	Storage jar	314	1024/1	Handle (SJ)	Light brown clay; pre-firing mark
8	Pithos	Surface	1009/2	P1	Whitish clay; pre-firing cane impression

Jordan) Valley (PG4) were found at Sulam, considering the short distance between the two areas. One of these vessels is the decorated flask dating to LB III (Fig. 22:2), during which time Bet She'an served as an Egyptian garrison (Dynasty XX). The second vessel is a decorated body sherd assigned to Stratum IV; considering its small size, it is possible that this sherd is a residual survival from the previous stratum (for discussion, see Arie 2011:364).

#### ROMAN AND BYZANTINE POTTERY

##### *Roman Period* (Fig. 29)

Architectural remains from the Roman period were unearthed only in Stratum 2 of Area G1 and were not fully excavated. The small pottery assemblage includes bowls, kraters, a cooking pot, storage jars and a jug. The diagnostic rim sherds presented in Fig. 29 were retrieved from Living Surface 309. Dominant in the assemblage are vessels that correspond

well with the Kefar Hananya (hereafter KH) typological sequence (Adan-Bayewitz 1993).

*Bowls.*— A number of ‘Galilean Bowls’ are of types classified by Adan-Bayewitz (1993) as forms KH1B (Fig. 29:1) and KH1E (Fig. 29:2, 3). Bowl KH1B, which bears two grooves on the exterior rim, spanned a long period of use: from the end of the first century/beginning of the second century CE until the beginning/mid-fourth century CE (Adan-Bayewitz 1993:91–92). The KH1E bowl has a rounded thickened rim. This type is the latest of the ‘Galilean Bowls’ produced at Kefar Hananya, dating from the mid-third century CE until the end of pottery production there in approximately 430 CE (Adan-Bayewitz 1993:103–109, 148–150).

*Cooking Pot.*— The cooking pot (Fig. 29:4) is typical of the KH4C form, i.e., a closed globular pot with a short neck, and a rim which is flattened and has two grooves in it. This type dates from the early second to mid-fourth centuries CE (Adan-Bayewitz 1993:128–130).

*Jug.*— This wide-mouthed jug (Fig. 29:5) has a simple rounded rim and a high neck with ridges.

Although the small pottery sample from Stratum 2 does not permit far-reaching conclusions regarding the Roman occupation at the site, it is important to note that only locally manufactured wares are present. This stands in contrast with the high percentage of imports during the Byzantine period (see below). Present in the assemblage are well-dated types of the Kefar Hananya typology that span the second to the third/fourth centuries CE. However, based on the Galilean Bowls, which are firmly tied in with a well-documented chrono-stratigraphy at many sites, we can fine-tune the dating of the Stratum 2 occupation to the mid-third century CE.

#### *Byzantine Period* (Fig. 30)

The ceramics from this period were not found in well-sealed contexts and, due to the limited excavation of this period, they derive from only a small number of loci. Figure 30 illustrates selected pottery from Area G, Stratum II, and Area G1, Stratum I. Parallels for the imported wares are taken from Hayes’ typology (1972) and the local wares from Ḥorbat ‘Aqav at Ramat Ha-Nadiv (Calderon 2000).

*Bowls.*— The assemblage includes imported wares only; absent are locally produced bowls.




Fig. 29. Area G1, Stratum 2: L309 pottery.

No.	Vessel	Basket	Type
1	Bowl	1015/9	BL KH1B
2	Bowl	1015/27	BL KH1E
3	Bowl	1015/2	BL KH1E
4	Cooking pot	1015/22	CP KH4C
5	Jug	1015/19	J

*Late Roman C/Phocaeen Red Slip Ware*: These vessels, manufactured at Phocaea in Asia Minor, are the most commonly found bowls in this limited assemblage. They are made from fine dark orange-red clay that is slipped and burnished. The Sulam bowls have parallels in Hayes' Forms 3 and 10.

Form 3 bowls (Fig. 30:1–3) usually have a vertical rim with an overhanging flange (Hayes 1972: Fig. 69: 17, 19). Of the three illustrated

bowls of this type, one (Fig. 30:1) bears a rouletted decoration below the rim.

Figure 30:4, a bowl with gently sloping walls, corresponds to Hayes' Form 10B (Hayes 1972:346, Fig. 71:7).

*Cypriot Red Slip Ware*: These vessels are imported from Cyprus and have a finish similar to the Late Roman C/Phocaeen Red Slip Ware bowls.

The Form 3.2 bowl (Fig. 30:5) has a thickened splayed rim with typical rouletted decoration




Fig. 30. Area G, Stratum II (1, 5, 11) and Area G1, Stratum I (2–4, 6–10) pottery.

No.	Vessel	Area	Locus	Basket	Description
1	Bowl	G	102	1008/3	LRC
2	Bowl	G1	304	1008/8	LRC
3	Bowl	G1	304	1008/6	LRC
4	Bowl	G1	304	1009/4	LRC
5	Bowl	G	102	1006	CRS
6	Krater	G1	304	1008/1	CRS
7	Cooking pot	G1	301	1010/1	
8	Cooking pot	G1	301	1004/11	
9	Cooking bowl	G1	301	1010/6	
10	Cooking pot lid	G1	304	1008/11	
11	Stopper	G	102	1008/1	

beneath (Hayes 1972: Fig. 80, Form 3.2). There is a slight groove on the rim exterior.

A krater (Fig. 30:6) corresponds well with Hayes' Form 11 (Hayes 1972: Fig. 83:1). The small size of the sherd does not permit a precise calculation of its diameter.

*Cooking Vessels.*— The Byzantine cooking vessels from Sulam are all local wares.

*Closed Cooking Pots:* These vessels (Fig. 30:7, 8) have a short neck, a square grooved rim and ribbing on the shoulder. They were deep and probably had two handles (cf. Ḥorbat 'Aqav, Calderon 2000: Pls. 7:31; 22:36–40).

*Cooking Bowl:* This coarse ware vessel is shallow with horizontal handles (Fig. 30:9).

*Cooking Pot Lid:* This (Fig. 30:10) has a flat rim, ribbing on the exterior and has lost its upper part; therefore, it is not known what type of handle was incorporated. This lid was probably paired with an open cooking bowl (see Calderon 2000:140–142; Pls. 8:46; 23:53–56).

*Stopper.*— A complete pottery jar stopper (Fig. 30:11) has a narrow plug, and widens at the top for grasping (see Calderon 2000: Pl. XII:97, 98).

The Byzantine pottery assemblage is very limited and only small quantities of chronologically diagnostic sherds were found. The presence of imported serving ware is noted by the presence of the Late Roman C/Phocaeen Red Slip Ware and Cypriot Red Slip Ware bowls. It is possible to date these domestic assemblages to the fifth–sixth centuries CE.

#### STONE FINDS

##### *Flint* (Fig. 31)

The two flint artifacts found in Area G (Strata V and III) fit the LB III–Iron I chronological range of their context. Both are large geometric sickle segments and exhibit sickle gloss on the working edges, from reaping.




Fig. 31. Area G, large geometric sickle segments from Stratum III, L103, B1007/1 (1); Stratum V, L113, B1021/2 (2).

*Ground Stone Tools* (Fig. 32)

A small number of basalt artifacts were found in both Areas G and G1, in well-dated contexts. All of the stone implements are reflective of domestic use and the grinding and crushing of grains and pulses.

*Late Bronze Age III–Iron Age I.*— Two objects can be attributed to this time range.

*Lower Grinding Stone:* The complete lower grinding stone in Fig. 32:1 is thick and rectangular, with a long concave working surface and a plano-convex section. The re-use of this stone in the construction of W122 (LB III, Stratum V) is understandable, considering its length (35 cm) and thickness (12–15 cm).

*Rubbing Stone:* The small fragment of a rectangular rubbing stone in Fig. 32:2, with a plano-convex section, was retrieved from Floor 103 (Iron I, Stratum III) in Area G.

*Byzantine Period.*— Three ground stone tools were found together below Stone Collapse 301 in Area G1, Stratum 1.

*Pestle/Hammerstone:* The complete handstone (Fig. 32:3) exhibits traces of both pecking and polishing, indicating that it was used for pounding, crushing and grinding.

*Polisher:* The near-complete triangular-sectioned tool (Fig. 32:4), produced from compacted basalt, has a highly polished surface with well-worn edges.

*Grinding Bowl:* This fragment of a fine-grained basalt bowl (Fig. 32:5) has rounded walls (2.2 cm thick), a highly polished interior and a fine disc base.

## CHRONOLOGY AND DISCUSSION

*Late Bronze Age III*

There is no doubt that the rich ceramic assemblage retrieved from Sulam Stratum V culturally and chronologically dates this stratum to LB III, the end of Egyptian rule in Canaan during Dynasty XX. This assemblage is an important addition to our knowledge of LB III pottery in the northern valleys.

We thus suggest that the destruction of Stratum V in Area G corresponds to the upper stratum in Area E of Gal and Hana's excavations (2002:88). These two excavation areas provide evidence of catastrophic events or upheavals at this Canaanite site in the second half of the twelfth century BCE. The destruction was contemporaneous with that of Megiddo VIIA and Bet She'an S-3, and can be seen as part of the chain of events that led to the collapse of Egyptian rule in Canaan. In addition, it would be reasonable for us to ascribe to this period (or to LB IIb) an Egyptian plaque found near the site (Giveon 1984; Tepper and Shahar 1984).

*Iron Age I*

The dating of Sulam IV–III corresponds well with Megiddo VI. The question remains whether the *fossiles directeurs* defined at Megiddo for differentiating between the pottery assemblages of Strata VIB and VIA are present in the Sulam repertoire. Unfortunately, the Sulam IV and III pottery assemblages did not include outstanding examples that would enable us to answer this question. Considering the limited size of the Sulam assemblages, the two decorated storage jars (Type SJ2; Fig. 26:3, 5) in Stratum IV and the absence of Phoenician Bichrome Ware in Stratum III are not enough to justify a definite attribution of either level to a particular phase of Iron I. Nonetheless, the location of Sulam, its size, and the significant references to it in the historical texts do hint at successive occupation of the site from LB II through Iron IIA. Accordingly, we can tentatively suggest that Sulam IV is contemporary with Megiddo VIB (early Iron I) and Sulam III with Megiddo VIA (late Iron I).

The exposure of settlement remains dating to Iron I on the northern slope of the site, north of the MB II fortification wall (Area C in Gal and Hana 2002:83), indicates that this area was part of the Iron I settlement.

*Roman Period*

The scant remains dating to the Middle Roman period do not allow for far-reaching conclusions






Fig. 32. Ground stone tools from Areas G (1–2) and G1 (3–5).

No.	Type	Stratum	Locus	Basket	Material
1	Lower grinding stone	V	W122	1055	Basalt
2	Rubbing stone	III	103	1007/2	Basalt
3	Rubbing/hammerstone	1	301	1002/4	Basalt
4	Polisher	1	301	1003/2	Basalt
5	Bowl	1	301	1010/5	Fine grained basalt

regarding the settlement at Sulam during this period. In light of the small area excavated, the high percentage of Kefar Hananiya pottery vessels is not conclusive. Additional fragmentary remains from the Middle Roman period were also found at excavations 100 m southeast of Area G1, also along the northern perimeter of the site (Covello-Paran 2010), as well as in the modern village center (Mitler 2010) and the southern foot of the tell (Cinamon 2010a). The information gleaned from these excavations indicates occasional architectural features (grinding installations, mosaic-paved installations, floors) during the mid-third century CE, with agricultural fields surrounding the site. It is suggested that these remains indicate dispersed farmsteads at Sulam during this period.

#### *Byzantine Period*

It seems that the exposed building in Area G was constructed in the fifth century CE and perhaps continued in use until the Early Islamic period. Although very fragmentary, the Byzantine architectural remains in Areas G and G1 shed light on the settlement at Sulam during this period. The extensive Byzantine leveling of earlier strata, noted in Area G, is a phenomenon also observed at the site from a salvage excavation near the spring (Amos 2011). There, the Byzantine builders dug deep into the Middle Bronze Age ramparts and in effect sank their structure into it. In recent excavations at Tel 'Afula,<sup>8</sup> this same phenomenon of Byzantine structures cutting into the side of a Bronze Age tell has also been identified.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The repeated mention of Shunem in both Biblical and other historical sources mark it out as a key site for study of the Jezreel Valley

in the Late Bronze and Iron Ages. Despite the limitations imposed by the small scale of our excavations in the northern part of Tel Shunem, when considered together with previous excavations at the site, they provide clear-cut evidence for continuous settlement from LB II (fourteenth–thirteenth centuries BCE) until the end of Iron IIA. However, only large-scale excavations will provide the data necessary for examining the wider social and historical processes at work in this settlement. That said, the information accrued from excavations to date enable us to suggest the following reconstruction of the sequence of events.

The LB II settlement did not cease at the end of that period, but rather continued into LB III. At the end of LB III the site was destroyed in a massive conflagration. After this destruction and an undeterminable period of time, the site was resettled during Iron I. Unlike other sites in the valley, the Iron I settlement was not subjected to destruction, but was instead abandoned, perhaps at the end of the period. During early Iron IIA there was some resettlement at Tel Shunem (see Alexandre 2007), which continued until the Aramaean destruction.

Subsequently, there were minor attempts at resettlement which were not long-lived. Although sporadic potsherds dating to the Persian period have been retrieved from surface surveys, a settlement dating to this period has not been exposed in any of the 20 excavation areas at the site. It is suggested that only during the Middle Roman period was there significant resettlement of Sulam. However, the site was again abandoned for some 200 years until the substantial re-settlement of the entire site during the Byzantine period. Occupation then continued uninterrupted throughout the Early Islamic, Crusader and Mamluk periods.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The excavation (Permit No. A-3671), conducted on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority, was directed by Karen Covello-Paran, with the assistance of Vadim Essman and Viatcheslav Pirsky (surveying), Leea Porat (pottery restoration), Hagit Tahan-Rosen (drawing), Howard Smithline (photography) and Yossi Yaaqobi (administration). The excavation director thanks the family of Abed Abu Siam for their generous hospitality during the excavation.

<sup>2</sup> The skeletal material was reburied by the Department of Religious Affairs.

<sup>3</sup> This excavation (Permit No. A-5788) was also carried out on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority, under the direction of Karen Covello-Paran, with the assistance of Yosef Laban (administration), Mark Kunin (surveying), Yardenna Alexandre, Dina Avshalom-Gorni (pottery reading), Hagit Tahan-Rosen (drawing) and Yael Gorin-Rosen (glass). Once again, many thanks are extended to the family of Abed Abu Siam for their generous hospitality.

<sup>4</sup> The glass fragments were sorted by Yael Gorin-Rosen. They date to the Late Roman period, and will be published in a future analytical report on excavations at Sulam.

<sup>5</sup> Three storage jars of Type SJ1 were not restored or drawn and are only included in the quantitative analysis.

<sup>6</sup> This sherd was not subjected to petrographic analysis.

<sup>7</sup> See Arie 2011:348 for the inclusion of the petrographic groups (PG) identified by Shapiro (this volume) into his petrographic families (PF) of the Jezreel Valley (PG1 = PF M; PG2 = PF N; PG3 = PF P; PG4 = PFQ; PG5 = PF J).

<sup>8</sup> These excavations (Permit No. A-6311) were conducted in 2012, under the direction of Karen Covello-Paran on behalf of the Israel Antiquities Authority. The Byzantine architecture truncated a sloping tell accumulation dating to the Early Bronze and Middle Bronze Ages.

## REFERENCES

- Adan-Bayewitz D. 1993. *Common Pottery in Roman Galilee: A Study of Local Trade*. Ramat Gan.
- Adler W. 1996. Die spätbronzezeitlichen Pyxiden in Gestalt von Wasservögeln. In R. Hachmann ed. *Kāmid el-Lōz 16: 'Schatzhaus'—Studien* (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 59). Bonn. Pp. 27–117.
- Alexandre Y. 2007. Iron Age IIA Remains from a Salvage Excavation at Sulam. *'Atiqot* 56:23\*–32\*.
- Alexandre Y. 2008. Sulam. *HA–ESI* 120 (March 26). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=726&mag\\_id=114](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=726&mag_id=114) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Amos E. 2009a. Sulam. *HA–ESI* 121 (February 14). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1037&mag\\_id=115](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1037&mag_id=115) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Amos E. 2009b. Sulam. *HA–ESI* 121 (December 2). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1247&mag\\_id=115](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1247&mag_id=115) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Amos E. 2009c. Sulam. *HA–ESI* 121 (December 5). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1253&mag\\_id=115](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1253&mag_id=115) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Amos E. 2011. Sulam. *HA–ESI* 123 (December 4). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1855&mag\\_id=118](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1855&mag_id=118) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Arie E. 2006. The Iron Age I Pottery: Levels K-5 and K-4 and an Intra-Site Spatial Analysis of the Pottery from Stratum VIA. In I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin, and B. Halpern eds. *Megiddo IV: The 1998–2002 Seasons* (Tel Aviv University Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 24). Tel Aviv. Pp. 191–298.
- Arie E. 2011. *“In the Land of the Valley”: Settlement, Social and Cultural Processes in the Jezreel Valley from the End of the Late Bronze Age to the Formation of the Monarchy* (2 vols.). Ph.D diss. Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv (Hebrew; English summary, pp. 1\*–30\*).
- Arie E. 2013. The Late Bronze III and Iron I Pottery: Levels K-6, M-6, M-5, M-4 and H-9. In I. Finkelstein, D. Ussishkin and E.H. Cline eds. *Megiddo V: The 2004–2008 Seasons* (Tel Aviv

- University Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 31). Tel Aviv. Pp. 475–667.
- Bunimovitz S. and Finkelstein I. 1993. Pottery. In I. Finkelstein ed. *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site* (Tel Aviv University Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series 10). Tel Aviv. Pp. 81–196.
- Calderon R. 2000. Horvat 'Aqav: Roman and Byzantine Pottery. In Y. Hirschfeld. *Ramat HaNadiv Excavations: Final Report of the 1984–1998 Seasons*. Jerusalem. Pp. 91–165.
- Cinamon G. 2010a. Sulam. *HA-ESI* 122 (July 15). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1433&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1433&mag_id=117) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Cinamon G. 2010b. Sulam. *HA-ESI* 122 (December 16). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1595&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1595&mag_id=117) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Conder C.R. and Kitchen H.H. 1882. *The Survey of Western Palestine* II. London.
- Covello-Paran K. 2010. Sulam. *HA-ESI* 122 (February 7). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1339&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1339&mag_id=117) (accessed June 26, 2014).
- Gal Z. 1998. *Map of Har Tavor (41) Map of 'En Dor (45)* (Archaeological Survey of Israel). Jerusalem.
- Gal Z. and Hana B. 2002. Excavations at Kafr Sulam. In Z. Gal ed. *Eretz Zafon: Studies in Galilean Archaeology*. Jerusalem. Pp. 83–88 (Hebrew; English summary, p. 179\*).
- Gilboa A. 2009. Stratum VI at Megiddo and the “Northern Sea People Phenomenon”. *Eretz-Israel* 29:82–91 (Hebrew; English summary, p. 285\*).
- Giveon R. 1984. An Egyptian Tablet from Shunam. In E. Schiller ed. *Zev Vilnay's Jubilee Volume: Essays on the History, Archaeology and Lore of the Holy Land, Presented to Zev Vilnay* I. Jerusalem. Pp. 228–230 (Hebrew).
- Guérin V. 1874–5. *Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine: Galilee I–II*. Paris.
- Hana B. 2008. Sulam. *HA-ESI* 120 (January 8). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=623&mag\\_id=114](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=623&mag_id=114) (accessed January 8, 2008).
- Hayes J.W. 1972. *Late Roman Pottery*. London.
- Martin M.A.S. 2005. *Aspects of the Egyptian Involvement in Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Canaan: The Egyptian and Egyptian-Style Pottery, A Case Study* (2 vols.). Ph.D. diss. University of Vienna. Vienna.
- Martin M.A.S. 2009. The Egyptian Assemblage. In N. Panitz-Cohen and A. Mazar eds. *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989–1996 III: The 13th–11th Century BCE Strata in Areas N and S*. Jerusalem. Pp. 434–477.
- Mitler I. 2010. Sulam. *HA-ESI* 122 (August 29). [http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report\\_detail\\_eng.asp?id=1468&mag\\_id=117](http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=1468&mag_id=117) (accessed August 29, 2010).
- Oren E.D. 1973. *The Northern Cemetery of Beth Shan*. Leiden.
- Shapiro A. This volume. Petrographic Examination of the Ceramic Vessels from Tel Shunem (Sulam).
- Tepper Y. and Shahar Y. 1984. The Underground Caves near Shunam. In E. Schiller ed. *Zev Vilnay's Jubilee Volume: Essays on the History, Archaeology and Lore of the Holy Land, Presented to Zev Vilnay* I. Jerusalem. Pp. 228–230 (Hebrew).
- Zori N. 1977. *The Land of Issachar*. Jerusalem (Hebrew).