

This suggests that the city fell not later than the reign of this monarch, i.e., according to Garstang not later than 1385 B.C. This date Dr. Garstang thinks fits admirably with the statement in I Kings 6:1 which puts the exodus 480 years before the dedication of the temple of Solomon. Dr. Garstang asserts that Mycenaean pottery, which was imported into Palestine in great amounts between 1400 and 1300 B.C. is conspicuous at Jericho for its absence. Out of hundreds of sherds examined he says only one from the city proper proved to be Mycenaean, and 1385 would allow for the beginning of the importation of this ware. There were a few vessels of Mycenaean pottery found outside the city, but these he dates on what appeared to be excellent grounds, from small settlements after the destruction of the walled town. Dr. Garstang also points out that the art of Egypt underwent a profound change in the reign of Akhnaton, the so-called heretic king, who succeeded Amenophis III, and that not a trace of the very distinctive art of this king is found in Jericho. Moreover, the El Amarna letters, which represent the archives of this king, contain correspondence with kings of many Palestinian cities, but there is in them no mention of Jericho. This, he maintains, points rather definitely to Jericho having been already destroyed at the time of their writing.

The arguments of Prof. Garstang, as summarized above, present a strong case for the early date of the destruction of Jericho. Before leaving them I should mention one point in connection with them which impressed me as somewhat peculiar. Prof. Garstang stated that at sometime during the life of the fourth city, there was a great earthquake, and the royal palace shows dislocation at many parts of its structure. It was not re-built, but the king moved to a smaller building at a point on the mound east of it and somewhat lower. This structure Garstang calls the middle palace. He found it difficult to examine the material from this palace in any satisfactory way because the previous a fortification, or a hilani house, erected on the mound some centuries later had dug right into it from above and destroyed a good part of it. Moreover, the earlier excavators in carefully examining this hilani had intermingled material from it and the earlier palace so that it was quite difficult to disentangle what remained of the pottery from the two structures. With considerable effort this task was completed, and the material from it proved similar to that in a tomb outside the wall, designated as Tomb 5, which contained two signet scarabs of Amenophis III and evidently the burial place of the kings of Jericho. At this point it impressed me that there was somewhat of question regarding the firmness of the argument.