

Prof. Newberry, is convinced of this fact. He described their fine workmanship and pointed out that they are actually rings and thus similar to the signet ring which he himself wears. I asked him about the alleged scarcity of scarabs from subsequent pharaohs elsewhere in Palestine and he said he could not speak definitely on this point. (2) Since it impressed me that the Mycenaean ware, as far as I have looked into it, seems to be in Garstang's favor. I did not question him further on this. I did mention, however, his argument regarding the absence of the distinctive material from Akhnaton, and he stated that this was very striking, particularly the absence of those blue and yellow pendants which are so characteristic of it.

(3) As to the third argument, about the common vases pictured in Fig. 7 of Wright's publication being found at a later date elsewhere in Palestine, he asserted that these vases are very common at Jericho. He showed me pictures of them in his third report on Plate 22, and a chart of the appearance of them and of other types on Plate 24. They are the type which he designates by the Greek letter kappa. They are commonly associated with a type which he designates as Theta. He pointed out that they occur during a long period, and that they are found also in the lower storerooms which would certainly fix their beginning as very early. Moreover he stated that only two pots of this type have been found elsewhere in Palestine. One of these is at Beisan in a 15th century context, thus agreeing with his date for the last days of Jericho. The other is at Lachish in the second temple. This is thus 13th century, but it is an unpainted specimen and is found among other archaic objects, thus proving nothing as to a late date.

(4) This is of course apart from Garstang's own words and I did not question him particularly about it.

(5) I stated certain doubts in my own mind as to the certainty of the argument regarding Transjordan. Dr. Garstang said that he was not at all sure that it is yet possible to establish synchronisms between the pottery of Transjordan and that of Palestine proper. He had himself examined a few places in that section, and was of the impression that rather primitive pottery persisted there until comparatively late. Glueck might be able to show that there was a long period of comparative unsettlement, and then a short period of wide settlement in that area, with many towns occupied at the same time, but he questioned whether the exact time of this settlement could be demonstrated as yet. I raised the argument about the requirements of the Biblical statements of conquest of Transjordan prior to the fall of Jericho, and he questioned whether the places conquered were actually cities or possibly more or less nomadic colonies.

I think this covers in a rather sketchy way my discussion with Dr. Garstang. It brings into relief the points at issue between the two views and gives a basis for further investigation of the evidence.