

as previously thought, but rather after 1300 B.C. Dr. Garstang says that he himself had been puzzled about this pottery, but had accepted the conclusions regarding it of the experts at Beisan. He showed me pictures of it, which he had published in the "Liverpool Annals of Archeology" Vol. XXI, giving the report of his 1933 excavations at Jericho, on plates 31 - 39. He gladly accepts this amended dating. However, he examines his records and find that this pottery occurs only in the middle palace (where hundreds of samples of it are found), and also near the north wall of the third city, and thus quite outside the walls of the fourth city. None of it at all is found in other buildings of the fourth city or in any association with the walls which fell when that city was destroyed. He says that he had had certain misgivings about this palace, and now sees from this pottery that this is not really a palace at all, but a later building built on the mound some time after the actual destruction. It has its own strong wall, and thus is doubtless to be equated with the mention in Judges of Eglon, King of Moab, who oppressed Israel for many years and who settled the city of Palm Trees, which doubtless refers to the site of Jericho. It impressed me as a very neat way of avoiding what were at first sight the implications of this revision of dating of this type of pottery as far as the date of the fall of the city was concerned. I said that this would then mean that the earthquake same palace as formerly was used until the end. I asked what about the earthquake and he stated that this would doubtless mean that the earthquake which destroyed that palace occurred at the same time as the falling of the city. It thus simplifies the reconstruction of the history quite materially. I pointed out the section in the book to which I have alluded above which spoke of the pottery in the middle palace as being the same as that in Tomb 5. He stated that this sentence correctly understood is true, but yet is misleading in the light of this new evidence and he regrets that it is so stated in the book. He told me that when Watzinger, who excavated the site 25 years earlier, examined the Hálani, he dug deep down to its foundations which reached to the very foot of the middle palace

and even to the underlying Hyksos stratum. Thus pottery from all three buildings became hopelessly mixed, and it required a great deal of effort to separate it at all. As proof of this he showed me from his publication of several years ago pictures of pots which he had constructed from shirds which fit perfectly together, altho the shirds were in some cases actually found in several different rooms of the building. As a result the finding of earlier material in this building proves nothing as to its age, but the finding of the later fabrics, which are found nowhere else within the fourth city proved definitely that this building comes from a period later than the rest of the city.

I presented to Prof. Garstang the argument which Wright gives, and I shall briefly state parts of his answer to them: (1) He says that the series of scarabs is continuous for a long time and then suddenly stops. I asked whether he was sure that these were actually signs, and he asserted that a great expert on scarabs, namely