

Virtual Lecture Transcript

Egyptian Rule and Canaanite Resistance as Seen from Jaffa In Honor of Norma Kershaw By Aaron A. Burke Thursday, February 4, 2021

Louise Bertini:

Welcome to a special edition of our ARCE Public Lecture Series. I'm Dr. Louise Bertini, the Executive Director of ARCE. We are pleased to have you here with us today and, of course, our speaker, Dr. Aaron Burke. Dr. Burke is a Professor of Archaeology of Ancient Israel and the Levant and the Kershaw Chair in the Archaeology of the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures at the University of California, Los Angeles. We've asked Dr. Burke to be with us today for a special tribute to our dear friend and supporter, Norma Kershaw. Norma was a steadfast and generous supporter of ARCE for many years and played an integral role in both the ARCE Orange County chapter as well as ARCE National. I'm sure many of you watching right now knew Norma well, and we are grateful to have you with us. In that spirit, I'm pleased that we have some of Norma's friends and fellow ARCE Orange County chapter members here with us today who will share a few words about Norma before we dive into Dr. Burke's presentation. And I now would like to turn it over to Eva Kirsch, President of the ARCE Orange County chapter.

Eva Kirsch:

Thank you, Louise. Hello, everyone. Norma Kershaw was my dear friend for over 20 years. I loved, admired and respected her. I met Norma for the first time when she was curating an exhibition about the Exodus for her Mission Viejo temple, from which she borrowed some objects from the collection of Robert and Frances Fullerton Museum of Art. Since then, we stayed connected, and our friendship had grown. Norma kindly encouraged me when I called her my mom or my Jewish mom, and she stood up to it. When my mother passed, Norma spent time with me. She listened and consoled me. I loved Norma's stories. One of those I cherish very much is about Norma's decision to pursue her education at the age of 43 after raising her two daughters, Barbara and Janet. As you may know, Norma received degrees from first Queens College, City University of New York and then from Columbia University. Several years ago, when I was spending time with Norma in her house, she was sharing with me some of her memorabilia, and she showed me a note that her younger daughter, Janet, wrote. And it was really charming and quite cute. Janet wrote, after Norma finished her master's degree at Columbia, "Can I call you MA, capital M, capital A, now?" So I really found it interesting. Norma and I shared the joy of travels. Norma enjoyed travels so much, and I

witnessed how difficult it was for her when she had to give them up at certain point in her life. She told me about many of her trips, including the archaeological excavations in Israel, Cyprus and Egypt, as well as her trips to Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, for which I admired her very much. Norma and I shared the passion for ancient art and history, for ancient history and archaeology, for ancient Egypt and the Near East. Together, we attended numerous events, and we talked a lot about these topics. We also talked about politics. Norma's passion and knowledge were well supported by her wit and sense of humor, dry and often sarcastic. As a wonderfully entertaining speaker and prolific teacher, Norma was able to convey the importance of art historical and archaeological material, which brought her wide respect and recognition, including an invitation to serve as a lecturer for the United Nations Cultural Affairs Commission. She served in this capacity for more than a decade. Living in California for a very long time, Norma retained her strong New Yorker persona. I loved when she compared New York to California, particularly when she wondered why Californians had to confirm meetings after making them in the first place, something New Yorkers would never do. There's not enough time, even in a week, for the long list of my memories of Norma, but I need to emphasize one: Norma's relationships with the Orange County chapter of ARCE. In addition to her involvement with numerous other organizations, such as ASOR ... Norma was also long-time very loyal supporter of ARCE/OC, serving first on the chapter's Board of Directors, and then its advisory board. The ARCE/OC board members and I cherished Norma's wisdom, generosity, and commitment to ancient history and archaeology. Norma regularly sponsored and attended our lectures and events. And sometime around maybe 2006, she made it possible for the chapter to continue its monthly events in the newly built gorgeous Norma Kershaw Auditorium at the Bowers Museum. We did it until the pandemic started. Norma attended most of our chapter's events and almost always sat in the same seat in the second row. We all knew that she was there in spirit when she was no longer able to attend our events in person. For her strong, commanding personality and ability to touch lives, to influence and to connect people, Norma was loved and respected. Her passing left a huge void in our hearts. She's terribly missed. It feels like she left together the world that made her success and achievements possible. I miss her a lot. I miss her every day. And now, please let me introduce Dr. Benson Harer, Norma's very close friend, who's also a great benefactor of the California State University, San Bernardino, both its Egyptology program and museum. It was Ben who introduced me to Norma was curating an exhibition for her temple in Mission Viejo, sometime about 20 years ago. Thank you. Please welcome Dr. Benson Harer.

Benson Harer:

Thank you, all, very much. I first met Norma shortly after she came to southern California, and we had recently formed the ARCE chapter in Orange County. She came to hear me give a talk on ancient Egyptian medicine, and those of you who know Norma can understand that after the talk, she insisted that I and John Adams, who was the co-founder of the ARCE chapter with me, had come back to her home with a couple other

people because she wanted to talk about setting up an AIA chapter in Orange County. It was hard to say no to Norma, as many of you know, so we went, and I was a bit wary, to tell the truth. But Norma and I hit it off immediately. We ended up ... after the others left, I lingered on for another hour or so with her, and it was the first of many long conversations with Norma. Over the years, she was, I think, the most civic-minded and public-spirited person that I know. She was so anxious to do things to benefit the world and her community and the areas of interest to her, which were archaeology and, particularly, the Levant in Israel. And we talked at length about the many things that she wanted to do: a garden for the city, a library. She sponsored a conference room for ARCE in Cairo. The auditorium at the Bowers Museum. The contributions went on and on, and she even became a member of ARCE. And, subsequently, we put her on the board of ARCE for a number of years. I spent a lot of time talking with Norma as her health was declining and she was bedridden. I talked with her every week, and she talked about the things that she had done or things that were meaningful to her, and the various things that she did. I think the two that she took most pride in were the two professorships that she set up at UC San Diego. I think this gave her more gratification than any of the other things that she had done. And so I think it's particularly fitting that today we have one of those professors here to speak to us. Dr. Aaron Burke got his undergraduate degree at Wheaton College and then his Ph.D. at the Oriental Institution in Chicago. He has worked extensively through the Levant and particularly concentrated on the area of Jaffa. And today, he is going to talk with us about his work there. He currently is the Kershaw Chair of the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean in the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Culture at UCLA. And his talk today will be on the Egyptian rule and Canaanite resistance as seen from Jaffa. Thank you for being with us, Dr. Burke.

Aaron Burke:

Thank you, Ben. I'd like to thank Eva, Ben and Louise and ESLSCA for the invitation and for setting up this opportunity. Before I begin, I too want to pay my tribute to Norma Kershaw and her contributions and support of ... I hope I'm sharing the right screen ... contribution and support of myself and archaeology, both in Egypt as well as in the Levant. I know her from having a foot in both areas and being a member of both ARCE and ASOR. I have spoken in the Bowers Auditorium at the ... or the Kershaw Auditorium at the Bowers Museum and stood in the garden honoring Norma Kershaw at the Albright Institute in Jerusalem. And it's a great honor to have known her. She was, likewise, I would say, to echo Eva's comments, a mother to myself as an academic here. I got to know her over the 15 years that she and I overlapped here in LA, and I hope that this lecture is a grand tribute to her. She took great pride in giving comments and suggestions for which most of us will be grateful to receive those kind of remarks about how to improve our presentations and to reach a greater and greater audience beyond even academics. So I hope today what I can share with you from Jaffa is a tribute to her. She was responsible, even before I held the Kershaw Chair in Eastern Mediterranean Studies at UCLA, for supporting the project through my colleague, William

Schniedewind, and he [indistinct] the first holder of the Kershaw Chair for 11 years from about 2006, I think it was. And he supported the project by sending students there and providing direct support. And we dedicated our first volume, *History and Archaeology of Jaffa 1*, to her, and I'm glad she was able to see that during her time in the last decade. What I would like to speak to you today about is a somewhat shortened version of a talk that I have given in recent months, including to the north and south California chapters of ARCE. This will be a shorter version of it, echoing and reflecting work supported by the National Endowment for Humanities in Jaffa that has been carried out since about 2001 with NEH support from 2013, but also graphs in a great deal of earlier excavation research going back to 1955, and Jaffa, the earliest excavations carried out by the municipality of Tel Aviv that were never published. Much of what you'll see today is included within our first major excavation report within the *American Journal of Archaeology* by the AIA that was published in 2017. It's open access, so I hope that if you're looking for more details from an academic side of things, you can look there. There are also some public articles that feature digital modeling of the site, some of which I will feature today. And I'd be glad to answer some questions afterwards about the results of this work. I titled this talk "Egyptian Rule and Canaanite Resistance as Seen from Jaffa" because one of the leading things that we were able to conclude from our excavations and study of the old results from excavations in Jaffa is that it, as an Egyptian fortress, faced, over the course of 350 years or more, periodic resistance, and it sort of becomes a witness to periodic witness to Egyptian New Kingdom rule in Canaan. And so that's sort of the leading narrative that one can take away, and one of the points that can be interrogated from the archaeological context in Jaffa. And what we'll look at today, principally, is not the hallmark of that 350 years, which takes quite a bit to digest and is more like an hour-long lecture, but we'll look at the post-Amarna Period from about 1300 almost to 1100 BC, that features episodic resistance that I think can be pointed to coming principally from the coastal plain of Canaan. That is the coastal territory of what is today Israel, and perhaps even into the Gaza Strip. Okay. Without further ado, let's situation you a bit. I presume that everyone knows where Tel Aviv is at the eastern Mediterranean in the central coast of Israel. And Jaffa is one of those classic settlements or communities located on the south side of a modern city that was neglected. And it was in the 1990s when sort of an effort to revive it gave it greater and greater attention. Now, there was earlier archaeological work, but it was really since the 1990s that excavations in and around Jaffa itself and the lower city that's all boxed in in red here really gave it an opportunity to shine as an archaeological site. There's a glaring omission in studies of the region for the Bronze and the Iron Age for before 2000 in most of the bibliography, and Jaffa has something to say about all of that. And today we're going to focus on that period in the New Kingdom. Now, Jaffa first enters into this story of Egyptian New Kingdom not in the earliest moments before Thutmose III, but really from the reign of Thutmose III on. And that is in year 23 following his defeat of this large Canaanite coalition and what is commonly referred to as the battle of Megiddo where he kept his unawares, this large coalition around 1456 BC. And it's in the wake of that that we received through the documentation of the Bark Shrine of Amun at Karnak

that belongs to Thutmose III, a long list of I think what is most fairly characterized as conquered towns. Number 62 on this list is a place that had been historically or epigraphically omitted up to this point, and that is a Canaanite town known as Yapu in Egyptian, probably something like Yafo or Yafe in Canaanite, and ostensibly meaning beautiful, fair, nice place. Colleague of mine working on the Harvard question has suggested that it probably referred to a fair anchorage, and that's not something I'll be able to get into today, but we've done some studies and are working on a large journal article that documents to the east of the site, the location of what we think is now a silted-up harbor that would've provided a protection for ships from the Bronze Age, Canaanite period, until the New Kingdom when it became a logistical and maritime center for the Egyptian empire. So it's really from this moment that we can expect to see an Egyptian presence here, and, indeed, the archaeological report not only confirms that there's no destruction of the site that we can attribute to the Egyptians, suggesting that, indeed, through the conquering of this coalition and Jaffa in particular, Jaffa enters into Egyptian control. But it is also something that I'm going to neglect to talk about now, is the earliest evidence that is present that we've published that includes Egyptian ceramics in the 15th century right after Thutmose III's conquest of the site. It seems that they took over the Egyptian architecture, didn't build in particular any Egyptian fortress in that earliest period. And it's not until about 1400 BC that we start to see some architecture of that, and that's what we'll look at today, especially about 100 years later from 1300 BC in the Ramesside Period. So the site is taken over by the Egyptians and becomes a maritime logistical center. Sadly, there's not a great deal of documentation of that whole transition in the Egyptian record, and it really is left up to us to piece together why it should be so important. But here's an aerial view of the site of Jaffa. The green areas and almost everywhere you see trees are probably fairly the confines of the ancient site, or Tel. It wasn't until 1936 that what you see now was even what you could properly call a Tel because it was a living city. It wasn't a destroyed city. But in a counterinsurgency the British carried out against locals in 1936 during the Mandate period, much of the site was destroyed. We have documentation of that. And by the 1950s, the rubble of these destructions were still there, pushed aside up towards this auditorium you see in this green space. That mound of rubble made possible excavations beginning from Classical periods down here in what is today a park area. This we call Area A, and it features two primary areas. I'll only be talking about one today. That is the so called Ramesses Gate area named after the chief monument found there that's appended to the large, fortified gate, and the Lion Temple, a particular building just inside the gateway. So the exposures are not enormous. They're not ideal, but we're probably looking at a fortress of something by ... something on the order of maybe 200 by 100 meters, something on that order, rectangular structure here that we can look at parallels from the cataract forts four. Now, our focus was excavating in the Ramesses Gate area and began with a structure that had been partially exposed of it ... you might even be able to see that at one end of the gate complex here ... in the 1950s. That was re-exposed in the 1990s and made this whole area a possibility for excavations. Indeed, as you'll see later on, Tel Aviv University gave its hand at trying to excavate here in '97 and

'99 and sort of threw in the towel on those efforts, and we picked them up from the start of our project, the Jaffa Cultural Heritage Project in 2007 with first excavations in this area in 2011. Now, there's not a lot we can say about the Amarna Period here in the 14th century, but as you can see from my remarks here after the initial construction of a fortress here after 1400 BC, we think that we can determine that there is a destruction line and a rebuilding of that fortress that took place sometime after 1400 BC. Now whether we can connect it directly to the Amarna Period or just generally to the 14th century is a more difficult question, and it remains an open problem. But it's really from about 1300 BC when this gate complex is rebuilt that we can begin to talk about, in detail, from the Ramesside Period, what Jaffa was like and what this fortress complex was like and how it might have functioned within the Egyptian Imperial apparatus. So here you see what we'll be talking about principally, a phase we call RG-4a, the Ramesses Gate 4a phase, a rebuilding that takes place that we can detect on this original foundation. Now, those of you who know Egyptian archaeology will find it peculiar that we have a stone foundation here. We often remark Egyptian architecture doesn't use stone foundations. Well, there's a rider to that, is if you're an Egyptian building in a place that gets as much rainfall as coastal Levant, you build with stone foundations because your sandy bricks and your traditional brick architecture is not going to survive the erosion and the rot, basically, that will be incurred in a coastal environment. So they did adapt to local circumstances, even though very early on their bricks do emulate Egyptian practices, or persist in carrying that on. So let's look in more detail here from about 1300 BC, what we call the gate's rebuilding phase. So we had that initial construction around 1400. We're reacting to they're going to Jaffa needed to be sort of bulwarked against Canaanite resistance. At some point in the 14th century, I'm suggesting by my reconstruction lines there that something happened that required some rebuilding. I think you can see it here pretty distinctly in the distinguished steps to the construction that the structure had to be rebuilt around 1300 BC. So we're pointing to, already, a couple episodes of Canaanite resistance to Egyptian rule. If I give you some lines around the structure as we see it, and I apologize if this photograph is a little fisheye-like as we took it with a GoPro camera from a quadcopter. But trust me that these are the general lines of these towers that were constructed from their original construction and into their rebuilding at 1300 BC. There are about 22 meters in length, almost 6 meters in width, and if we can reconstruct them at least almost 4 meters tall in their solid brick construction before the second story, which I think arguably did exist. And we have reconstructed along the lines of other Egyptian fortresses. Now, the passageway here is at least 4 meters wide, so that's a very substantial passageway. And as you'll see today, it could not only function to allow easy traffic through, but you could even stuff things in there and carry out activity in the passageway and still manage to consider it a viable passageway. There are ways in which, as I'll point out, this operation of the gate is very analogous to Canaanite and later Israelite practices, namely, that gates seem to have a commercial function. They are kind of the eastern agora, if you will, in the Bronze and the Iron Age. So this is the reconstruction of the gate after the Amarna Period. This Neo-Marxist structure, as I like to refer to it, at the eastern end of the gate

complex here is a modern feature commemorating the location of the Ramesses II portal that I'll talk about here in a moment. And just to call your attention to it, you see the sort of episodes of excavation here. In the 1950s, Jacob Kaplan already hit in his earliest seasons, 1956, the upper portions and latest stages of this gate complex. So he knew that you could get to Egyptian material pretty quickly in Jaffa, which was unusual. He, like many others, would've anticipated lots of a classical material atop it, but he got right to it. Then Tel Aviv University came back in '97 and '99, and in '99, excavated much of the western end of the gate here beyond the left line at the end here. But between both of these, they seemed to have missed some of the best goodies that allows us to really reconstruct how this gate functioned. And I'll point out those now. One of the first things we encountered in excavating about the second season ... well, this was in 2013 already as we went through later phases of the gate ... were the timbers that enclosed the gate passageway. I want you to imagine ... and, for those of you who have done some landscaping, you have some sense of this ... these are the size of railroad ties in terms of section. And all of the sections we had were preserved to at least 2 meters, meaning that most of them fractured in half because they had to be about 4 meters across, more than that, to go into both sides of the superstructure of the gate. And when we found them, you can see this kind of mess. It's like what's left of your fireplace after you're done burning the wood, and we had to recover these. And we were quite successful in this process, I'm happy to say. Among the things that we discovered was olive wood, cedar, and oak. And much to our surprise, despite the fact that cedar would be the ideal timber to run the longer board across, we're finding that, actually, olive wood dominated. And my suggestion would be that this is repair work that was done over the life of the gate, probably just over the course of the 13th and first half of the 12th century. But we do have evidence of cedar of Lebanon that was shipped down the coast. And, as I mentioned, we expended great effort to try to recover these intact and to bring them out so that we could analyze them. We are working through and are going to be conducting a dendrochronology project with Cornell University and Sturt Manning there, and Brita Lorentzen, one of his Ph.D. students who has now graduated. And we will be analyzing these for the kind of environmental information that they can provide and the complete sequence that it permits, sequencing of the growth of sort of cedar and other species. So this holds some great promise, but we'll get to more accurate information about the destruction date here in a few minutes. Now, once we had cleared the base of the passageway, this is what it looks like. And you can see it's got curbs on both sides to protect the walls. We found, in many places, that plaster facing, mud plaster was still preserved. So you can imagine these are mud brick superstructures with mud plaster, benches or curbs at the base to protect the foundations of the wall, and some kind of early drainage system that might've gone out of use at one point here running down the middle of it. We imagine this whole structure is enclosed, as you can probably guess based upon the timbers that we recovered. And I do want to say that with those timbers, we not only recovered the beams that ran across. We recovered portions of the planks that run across the beams. And Brita Lorentzen was able to identify the pegs driven through the planks that connected the planks to the beams, so the green wood pegs. And

it's rather astounding that you can get to that level of architectural reconstruction from what we were able to recover here but, nonetheless, we could. When we excavated the floor, and I'll come back to this in a minute, the entire floor was as black as the black patch that you see here. That is burned, carbonized material across the entire surface of the floor to several centimeters in thickness. And I'll show you what we recovered from that context in a minute. Now, at the end here, you see this modern reconstruction of the Ramesses II portal that was added to the gate at some point after its construction, perhaps at the very moment of its building in the early 13th century. Now, what we do have of the gate portal was not recovered by us but was actually found in secondary context above this by Jacob Kaplan. So in the latest phase of the gate, and I'll end today's presentation I think with an image that illustrates one of those in situ, but about 30 percent maybe maximally of this gate facade has been recovered. This was appended to the outside of the gate and we literally have the passage from the gate descending down the tell and disappearing into the earth. And of course you would have walked up to this and seen this on both sides of the gateway. It is a traditional titulary of Ramesses II, not to be confused with any of the other Ramesside kings, that seems very clear, as Kenneth Kitchen and others corroborate. There are traces of plaster in the Kurkar local limestone. It is the worst material ever to build from, very sandy, it was from the ridges, the Kurkar ridges that are formed and constantly are forming actually, in this environment of water that drains out from the highlands and comes into the Mediterranean. This is the local building material. As I said, it's not very useful and you don't want to do a whole lot of heavy supporting with it. But this would have been appended to the facade of the gate, creating this facade and portal. And so far we've detected the colors, probably white is for certain, a little bit of red and a little bit of yellow in there in some of the hieroglyphs that are preserved. So fairly impressive, and the kind of thing that we know Ramesses the II did elsewhere in the Levante including at Byblos with his monuments. Now when we first began excavations of this destruction debris, as you can see here, we had almost 2 meters on top of the lowest floor. And in fact the lowest floor or the floor and the gate passageway here is not even visible in this slide. We had the south tower on the left side of the screen collapsing across, and we were able to recover the edges of 20 courses of bricks. So literally the whole facade fell in across the passageway and sealed the destruction debris. Now one of the more interesting things about this was that we have a fairly clean context here on the south side of the passageway in all this vitrified brick, from which we were able to recover this item, a 5 centimeter wide Amenhotep III scarab. Which at first, of course, before we had any dating on this suggested to us the actual date of this destruction which we were disabused of by radio carbon dates later on when we discovered that this is some sort of legacy item or a commemorative item that functioned, and maybe was even made later, as a commemorative item of Amenhotep III. Now Tel Aviv University, let's see, found in 1999 and published a Lion Hunt scarab of Amenhotep III. These are commemorative scarabs of his lion hunts. I think this one is commemorating the 102nd or something like that. And these are found throughout the eastern Mediterranean and different places. And that one probably came from roughly where my arrow is pointing here, in

the little bit of excavation that they did in this area. And it's a very interesting sort of collection. For the most part, Amenhotep III and his wife, Tiye, are the only pharaonic or only pharaohs attested in our scarab evidence to date. Now we know we're probably missing some scarabs that we haven't been able to recover from old excavations, but that's what we have. This scarab, as I mentioned, is about 5 centimeters across. There you have the reading by one of our former students, Dr. Krystal Pierce. The good god, The-lord-of-truth-is-Re, lord of appearances, this nomenclature attached to Amenhotep III. Now obviously with this 14th century date for his reign we would have assumed that we were looking at an Amarna period destruction possibly. But in the end, as I mentioned, we were disabused of that. Along with this scarab were found over 800 beads, just a fraction of which you see here from an early photo, other ones that are pierced, items that went on a necklace which is very interesting to us, as well as two smaller scarabs. One of which was found by Tel Aviv University in this area and this upper one and this smaller fragmentary one we discovered. Now that's very interesting that all of this stuff was found in that one crevice within this collapsed destruction. Our reconstruction is that this fell from a second story and into this crevice. I sometimes refer to this as our "Lord of the Rings" moment where something is falling out of the hands of this individual or fell from their office down into this spot. There's no ceramics. There's no other material in this particular spot to indicate that it came from a floor or the lower story which would have had to be in the passageway. This fell from above and this leads us to suggest that this upper story is an administrator's office. Now from the passageway itself we have a number of really fascinating discoveries including this one, only restored as of 2017, several years after its excavation. It is an ivory box inlay of the Egyptian vulture and it's perfectly flat so it very clearly seems to have been inlaid in a box. We recovered no other fragments of ivory to suggest that this box was exceedingly elaborately decorated. It seems to have had this one placard whether or not this fell from the upper story or was downstairs in the passageway when it collapsed is a little bit difficult to say. But I'm always tickled by the fact that one of the best parallels from this comes from the back of Tutankhamen's throne and you can see the rendering there of this vulture. Although to me this looks like the head of the horus falcon. But in any event, this is perhaps one way of envisioning this that this was part of either a furniture or the back of or the side of a box. Although I think a box makes more sense and it's a fairly small element. A lot of ceramics were recovered from the passageway including things like this large Cypriot store jar that was excavated by Jacob Kaplan in 1956. We found the actual depression out of which it came and that allowed us to re-contextualize it within the passageway. So you have to imagine that this 1.5 meter jar is off to the side of this 4 meter wide passageway. And consequently there was quite a bit of activity there along with Mycenaean imitation vessels like the one you see in the upper left here, lamps of what are mostly a Canaanite style, although made in Egyptian-style fabric. Don't have any reason to believe that the lamps here were produced were radically different. And the very ubiquitous Canaanite store jars, of which we have numerous examples that are smashed in the passageway as well as this ... many, many Egyptian-style bowls and local production. Now maybe more interesting than all of that ceramics,

and I know archaeologists love to talk about ceramics. I might be one of the one who has a greater aversion to it than others, but I find quite fascinating that we have, from the passageway, more than, I think the latest count was more than 35,000 seeds recovered from all of that black organic material that was upwards of 3 to 10 centimeters deposited across the passageway. And again I remind you that this dark patch stain really of charcoal that we couldn't get off there really covered this entire passageway. And what you see on the left here is a little close-up of some of that, what I think is the barley in this case from the floor but here is the list of vegetal matter for which we have seeds that indicate something of the diet of those who were inhabiting the fortress and perhaps nearby: barley, wheat, olive, grape, chick peas, lentils, legumes, broad beans, vetch, pistachios, and that's what we're able to identify. And after extensive analysis by our botanists. I'll never forget the moment where at the end of the season, we were sifting through the seed material back the lab and one of our undergraduates with tongs picked up and said, "I think this is a chick pea." And indeed it was so carbonized and so clear it looked like it had been poured out of a can, it just happened to be black and you wouldn't want to eat it. But it looked exactly like a chick pea. So that was the first identification we got, and it didn't take a botanist to figure it out. So this impressive collection of seeds however, not only allows us to talk about the diet and the possibility that what is largely looks like a Canaanite diet was also the diet by the 12th century of those who were inhabiting the fortress. And that this passageway may have been functioning as a kind of open marketplace between the community inside the fortress and nearby communities. But what is fascinating about this collection that I'll get to in a moment, is the ability to date the destruction fairly accurately. Now along with those seeds in the passageway and those various vessels that indicate a degree of market activity, we had a pile of antlers. And I think the ultimate count was over 50 individual antler sets, some of which had been cut, others of which were largely broken in the piles that they were located here along the passageway. And from this we suggest that these were being marketed or sold or distributed in a way that they could be used as tools. I'm not actually sure of all the ways in which this might have been used but you could use them from burnishing things and maybe even in relationship to textile. I'd love any comments or suggestions about how those might have been used even if the parallels come from other contexts like European archeology. But you can see here just some of those fragments. So this is a fairly impressive collection which sort of is completely unexpected in this context. As I mentioned and alluded to, we interpret the context here of finding all of these things along the passageway floor as suggestive of a marketplace. While we have some items that have fallen from above like the necklace with the Amenhotep III elements, it seems pretty clear that most of this stuff sitting on the passageway was there when the destruction occurred and not brought into this context. And that what we're seeing here is the functioning of this Egyptian gate complex in a late stage of new kingdom empire as a marketplace where exchanges were occurring, not only between Egyptians and their agents, but also local populations like the Canaanites. So we have an interesting balance here between periodic resistance by certain factions in the coastal plain against Egyptian rule as evidenced in the destruction of Jaffa, foiled

against interaction in a peaceable way as a result of ... as reflected in the kinds of remains that suggest a marketplace in the passageway. And here you see the chick peas, piled chick peas. They didn't go right into this bowl, but the bowl was found nearby as were others. And we have elements that might suggest game boards or inlays and boxes. These in the lower right made of bone. A few fragments of foil and one of the notable things about those few pieces of foil was from the folds of one of them we actually have textile that's being analyzed by the Israel Museum that we suspect is linen which would point to the kinds of things that would be more common to Egyptian garb and dress perhaps than they would be to Canaanite. But that of course is entirely negotiable in the context of the 12th century. Now as I mentioned having all this seed material is very significant and it's principally important for one major reason. When you get short-lived samples of seeds that reflect a short duration from harvest to consumption, barley, wheat, olives, you don't want to keep them around too long. They might be good for seed, but you want to eat them when they're fresher. So most of this stuff, when it comes to short-lived samples, are assumed not to have been around very long. And in that case, if you test seed samples and you can tell, as we can, that our tens of thousands of seeds belonged to a sealed deposit and a moment in time, then ideally it's able to suggest to you the actual moment of destruction or very close. Given a margin of error of plus or minus 15 years which is something that is possible with the University of California's Irvine Keck AMS lab, as you can see, most of our dates were run with them, we were able to determine that this destruction of the Ramesside gate constructed around 1300 BC, first took place, or this phase of the gate took place in 1135 BC. So we have a fairly long-lived gate of about 150 years, evidencing maybe in one of the longer periods of peace or at least lack of resistance, I think is a fair expression, during the entire time that the Egyptians controlled the site. This is significant because up to this point in Levantine archeology we have bandied about mostly a date of 1130 BC for the end of Egyptian empire. And this mostly based upon one item, a pen case of Ramesses VI found at Megiddo probably in a secondary context. This is pretty lousy evidence for a precise date. And I'm happy to say that after all of our efforts and Kaplan's efforts we're able to suggest pretty clearly a date around 1135 BC. Now I will only trouble you with one more, one or two more slides to point out that this is not the end of story in the Egyptian fortress, that we actually have a very short-lived phase, perhaps upwards of about 10 years, and one of the reasons we can be pretty confident about the 1135 date that we're suggest here is that it's bracketed by yet another sealed context that provided short-lived carbonized samples dated to 1125. Now, before I get to that final moment, I just want to point out who do we think destroyed Jaffa because this is perhaps our greatest contribution in looking at Jaffa in the longue duree is to be able to look at this question and answer it and suggest that local resistance is largely the reason that Egyptian empire seems to be sort of devolving. Obviously there might be problems back in Egypt that led to the decline of Ramesside rule as we went from Ramesses III to the XI. But as it concerns material ability to resist Canaanite insurgency that declines over time. And 1135 becomes the first of a series of at least a couple destructions in Jaffa bringing about the end of Egyptian rule. We don't have any evidence to suggest the

Hittites on my list here on the left so we can pretty much remove them from candidacy for this. Sea peoples are usually seen as early 12th century culprits for destruction and disruption of sites. They don't really make any sense in this context. Israelites have almost no narrative that brings Jaffa into their conquests or their overall story from 1200 on, depending on when you set that tradition so they don't seem to be viable candidates, leaving us ultimately with local Canaanite resistance, a long and enduring story in the coastal plain, which we have tracked back all the way to the late 15th century. So I think that that's fairly easy to say although it may have had support from other quarters. I don't think it really needed it, what mostly occurred was sort of coalitions of resistance forming around different population centers. Now as I mentioned the gate is rebuilt and the plan is resurrect it on top of 2 meters of destruction debris to exactly the same dimensions and standards of the prior structure. The brick size changes a bit. It corresponds with a very late Ramesside episode of construction in Jaffa and in other sites with a really small brick. It's made of gray brick which indicates it's being ... They're using ashy material which is kind of a telltale sign that something has happened from which they're taking this material to make these bricks out of. But nonetheless, this is resurrected out of the ground in exactly the same dimensions. That had to be a staggering setback or frustration to Canaanites in this moment, when they thought that they could topple Egyptian rule. And we're not sure precisely which pharaohs we're talking about here between 1135 and this second phase of destruction in the second half of the 12th century that we date to 1125 BC, but they were able to resist one more time. And from these photos from 1956 Jacob Kaplan captured this moment. You see this Ottoman or British mandate period pipe that ran down a street that lined up directly with this Egyptian passageway, sitting directly on top of the threshold of the final gate here. You even see the doorstep that it's butted up against. This is the threshold on the outer part of the gate complex and here off to the left is one of what would have been two gate hinges. This thing weighs about 60 pounds of solid bronze. You can even see in the color photo, one of the few that we have from his excavations, a couple of the nails that held the beam or the boards of the door that must have been at least 15 centimeters in thickness, so these two panels of doors. And note please, that the door is in the closed position. So when this fortress was besieged and destroyed and burned in situ. And this was not rediscovered to be recycled, it was left there and it echoes that final moment of destruction by the Canaanites and around 1125 or in some moment thereafter. This final date can slide a little, it could go as late as 1100 BC. I'm not opposed to that idea. I doubt very much it goes all the way to the end of the new kingdom to 1075, but there is a more protracted and violent and sort of chaotic end to the Egyptian empire here than I think we had been playing with. And I'm hoping that in the years to come as many excavate other sites that we'll be able to tease out a more nuanced understanding of this unraveling of Egyptian empire. And what it meant, not only for Egypt, but also for the communities that then carry on afterwards. Because it's in the 11th century that we see the rise of the story of Israelite monarchy. And I think to my mind and reconstruction's, this as a sort of next phase of research is a fascinating connection to try to explore further. With that, I would like to thank you for your time.

And I'd be glad to answer any questions. I might even pull up some slides to illustrate other aspects of our work. Thank you very much.

Louise Bertini:

Thank you very much, that was absolutely fascinating. And I just want to direct, if anybody does have questions to please put them in the Q and A box. And we will address them. We have first two questions, from Francesco and Jackie that are related, asking about dating the gate to the Amarna period and if that date is correct, might it have possibly been earlier, dating to the reign of Amenhotep II or III?

Aaron A. Burke:

That's a great question. I have obviously neglected the discussion of the late 15th century. We have solid dating to Thutmoses III and Amenhotep II on the basis of ceramics dated to the end of the 15th century. And based upon the destruction of Jaffa or sorry, the counter insurgency that Amenhotep II references, I think it's year 7, against Afek, only 20 kilometers away, I would suggest that the destruction of Jaffa around ... in the late 15th century, which we have attested and I didn't talk about today, is solid evidence with that ceramic evidence that we have an Amenhotep II phase. What is problematic for us in Jaffa, and it's really a problem throughout all of Canaan, is identifying ceramic and material culture hallmarks of the 14th century. I'm now working a PhD student who's finishing his degree here at UCLA, Jacob Dom, and we cannot put our finger on clear ceramic markers in all of the material that we have from Jaffa for the 14th century. So consequently when I suggest the destruction there in that one slide of the gate complex at the ... in the 14th century, maybe the Amarna period, it is by proxy in sandwiching between the clear destruction attributable around the time of Thutmoses III, Amenhotep II, probably Amenhotep II, and the rebuilding in 1300 BC by Ramesses II. So it's a problem. It's a challenge, one that's going to take more than what we have in Jaffa to answer. So did I answer that?

Louise Bertini:

I think you did, yeah. By the way, just a comment, Cherien commented on the horns of animals, although from China and Indonesia, are used medicinally so another interesting context, as a zooarchaeologist, I find it fascinating. So we could go on for a while about that.

Aaron A. Burke:

Great suggestion.

Louise Bertini:

A question on the origin of the wood, where is it from?

Aaron A. Burke:

The cedar of Lebanon has to be from cedar, or from Lebanon, sorry, it is cedar. That has to have come from Lebanon because it only grows at an altitude of over 3,500 meters, I think it is. So it has to be quite high up. The olive trees and any kind of oak fragments could come from inland. They would have been hauled a distance but that's not too radical to suggest. There's always the possibility that some of these things, maybe the oak, might have been recycled from ships, I guess. But more than likely it just comes from inland. This was a swampy environment, kind of miserable, frankly. I can only imagine how humid and swampy and bug-infested and malarial the entire region was along the coast here. You had to go Inland a fair bit. And we think that swamps and this anchorage, enclosed anchorage, off to the east of the site were what made it a good harbor town.

Louise Bertini:

A question on if there are any estimates as to the number of people lived in the fortress.

Aaron A. Burke:

Yeah, if we use typical metrics for total hectares, meaning hectare being 100 meters by 100 meters, area and if we're conservative, we say 100 persons per hectare, then a fortress like this could have held 250 people. But of course it could be more dense than that because it's a fortress. There also might be a fair number of people who operated in the fortress or in relationship to it or lived in the immediate hinterland. But I'm not ... I'm guessing that the fortress at any given moment only had several hundred troops in it. That we don't have to envision a large garrison here. We have to think about this as a logistical center more than a stronghold intended to provide large resistance in the region to anything like Canaanite insurgency or resistance to the Egyptians. That was something that was levied on an annual basis through these episodes of Egyptian campaigning. And that's really important to the whole interpretation is, when you think about those moments of Egyptian campaigning, this was not something done just to be done. It was done because it was viewed as strategically necessary by the Egyptians. And many of the places to which they returned on more than one occasion evidence the level of resistance that they faced in the country side. The coastal plain was the most densely area... inhabited area of Canaan. The highlands much less densely so. And so the resistance made sense to come from places like Afek, 20 kilometers away, Gezer, on the road to Jerusalem, Ashkelon, down the coast.

Louise Bertini:

Another question from Danel, many thanks for the lecture and the baso article. How do you know that the Egyptians were still controlling Jaffa assign a task 1135? Couldn't the Egyptians abandon the town earlier before the destruction, especially if you have additional destructions in 1125. Finkelstein and others claim the Philistines entered the southern Levante later than common opinion. How do you regard his suggestion?

Aaron A. Burke:

Well I think we have to deal with what we're looking at on face value. In the context of the other, I don't think that the other context from south of here, for Philistia, have much to say about this context. Except for the fact that after all of the destruction of the site and what seems to be an abandonment after 1125 or maybe as late as 1100, we do have some pits. And there is some Philistine ceramic in them, not a lot, and nothing to suggest a robust phase of habitation. This looks to me like opportunistic settlement. We know that Telkasila just to north of us on the Yarkon River becomes the boundary of Philistine expansion in this period before 1000. So I would argue that the nexus of information we have from Jaffa itself, from architectural styles that are Egyptian, especially with the rebuilding of the fortress. This is not higgledy-piggledy, this is really built to Egyptian standards and conventions and with a high degree of care in each of the rebuilding episodes. I would suggest that it happens without hiccup in each of those cases. So this is isn't like somebody figuring out what to do, this is the survival of Egyptian resistance to Canaanite resistance. The architecture, the ceramics that are fitting comfortably into the assemblages of Egyptian sites, whether it's Deir el-Balah in Gaza or Tell el-Borg in the North Sinai, where I had the good fortune to work one season.

Louise Bertini:

Me too.

Aaron A. Burke:

Or else ... Yeah, okay. Or else, at any of these sites. So the fact that it looks a little hybrid is not surprising. It's certainly fascinating and it's not a suggestion that somehow we have lost, that these are not Egyptians in terms of political power. I do think it is particularly significant with respect to local interactions and it does suggest a very colorful, complex environment at the end of Egyptian empire. One that transitions in a very interesting way into what comes afterwards, albeit from the biblical side of things, almost mute with respect to Egyptian empire.

Louise Bertini:

I think on a similar note, there's a question about other Canaanite cities as far as destruction around the same date.

Aaron A. Burke:

Well, this is an interesting issue because many of these excavations that were conducted previously do not afford a very accurate dating of their actual destruction dates. In fact, the ceramic chronologies would have left many destructions either in the 13th century or early 12th century with little regard to their dating this late. In fact, you saw in my radiocarbon dates that there were some OX dates. Those were Oxford dates, intended to corroborate the dates that we got from the ... or the test, I should say, the UC Irvine dates ... because we were sort of smacking ourselves in the head, surprised that these

dates were as late as they were. And in the end, I think what it exposes is that we've done so little radiocarbon dating of late-Bronze-Age contexts. Outside of, say, recent excavations at Megiddo, there's been very few late-Bronze-Age sites that have been excavated, and very few within that that have provided radiocarbon dates, so it is a point that requires full reappraisal, and it is something to which I will be dedicating the next few years of my life to look at.

Louise Bertini:

Some other destruction-in-other- nearby-site questions: One is about the nearby site of Tel Gerisa, if there's any relation, and then on the destruction, asking if there was any evidence of weapons or military activity.

Aaron A. Burke:

Tel Gerisa had some earlier excavations. It has had some more recent ones that are now being published, and worked up by some students from Tel Aviv University. There you have what looks to be one of these sort of Egyptian estate-type buildings. We even have one, that I didn't get a chance to talk about, that we at least have what looks to be the footprint of it. No floors, living floors, to go with it that Kaplan was able to expose, but at Gerisa, which is only a few kilometers to the northeast ... In fact, Napoleon set up his cannons and shelled the Ottoman garrison at Jaffa from Gerisa to the northeast, so that gives you some idea that it's not very far away, even though it's hidden in the buildings of Tel Aviv. There just seems to have been a small sort of agricultural estate, maybe akin to what you see at Afek, so the fact that these small Egyptian enclaves can live at these sites suggests how strongly, most of the time, Egyptian control sort of dominated and administered this region. They didn't need big, big bulwarks at most of the sites at which they were inhabiting.

Louise Bertini:

There is a question about Ancient Egyptian accounts about their defeats.

Aaron A. Burke:

Yes.

Louise Bertini:

And they wrote about them.

Aaron A. Burke:

Yes, well, this is the sort of bigger challenge in dealing with imperial and military history in any period. Your primary records are those belonging to the empire that kept a record. It was more or less like a list of grudges and places to make sure that you went after and your successor guaranteed still fell within your control, so what is, of course, not mentioned ... And I think the best case in point, with regards to Jaffa, is what I didn't talk about, but I've written about elsewhere, is a famous story. Although it dates,

the actual manuscript, to the Ramesside period, called "The Tale of the Capture of Jaffa," and this is probably set at the end of the 15th century, in the reign maybe of Amenhotep II, Thutmose III. I actually think it is echoing the circumstances that led to the first loss of Jaffa by the Egyptians, that then led to a retaking of the fortress through a ruse that is by this Commander Djehuty, who, at least if it's the same person, seems to be a historical figure whose tomb was excavated in the 1800s, and now all the stuff is scattered all over European museums, even The Met. But I think it's a true story, illustrating this sort of periodic resistance that the Egyptians faced, and their reactions to it. Trying to remember, now, where this question started. Sorry. I got Zoom tunnel vision!

Louise Bertini:

I think it's about Egyptian accounts of their defeats.

Aaron A. Burke:

So I think you have to work basically by inversion, and think about all those campaigns as reactions to resistance, and you have to create the shadow on the wall that was the original resistance that is now missing from any kind of historical documentation. Maybe it was never really recorded. So the concern is to put down resistance, and by proxy, we can detect resistance. I think we have to infer that it was present, in many cases. Not all of it, most.

Louise Bertini:

Have a question from Daniella about, "Ellen Morris has identified, for the mid-18th dynasty, Tell el-Ajjul and Megiddo as Egyptian bases in Canaan, pointing out the possibility of Gaza, Jaffa, Beit She'an and Acre also to be identified as such. Based on the destruction level that you have mentioned, dated from the reign of Amenhotep II, do you think we have enough evidence to suggest that Jaffa might have been an Egyptian center during that period?"

Aaron A. Burke:

Yes. During the period from when to when? Basically, for most of the same period, Jaffa has the earliest evidence. Again, it wasn't the focus of my emphasis today, but it has, along with Beit She'an, the earliest Egyptian ceramics that are detectable anywhere so far in Canaan for a firm, Egyptian administrative presence. Yes, Ellen ... I'd like to give a shout out to Ellen. As of a couple of years ago, Ellen and I are now trying to collaborate on sort of Jaffa 2.0, as perhaps we could call it, which is what happens after Jaffa with respect to Egyptian and Canaanite interactions because I think one of the more fascinating things is to imagine that not everybody went home with the Egyptian Empire. There were Egyptians that we are very well aware married locally. We see hybrid burials in anthropoid sarcophagi of Egyptian officers or administrative officials married to, I think, for lack of a better term: Canaanite gals, and had children together, so these individuals don't necessarily pick up and go home, but rather, they're a part of

this, what you might call in the Bible, "mixed multitude" that make up the population of Canaan after the demise of Egyptian rule. But by far, Jaffa, I list it among the htm-fortresses that Ellen identifies. I think she explicitly suggested that it could be so in her earlier work, and for sure, it's got the same assemblage that Beit She'an has, that might permit it to be labeled as such, from an early date, from the 15th century, right after Thutmose III.

Louise Bertini:

And actually, there is a question from Ellen that came through on the chat ...

Aaron A. Burke:

Uh-oh!

Louise Bertini:

... in reference to your 11/25 discussion. How have you distinguished an Egyptian rebuilding from a possible rebuilding by those who could have conquered the fort?

Aaron A. Burke:

Okay, I dropped out a couple of slides here for the sake of brevity and respect for all of your time, but there in the 2011 season, 2011/2012, we're able to get to that last Egyptian gate that connected with Kaplan's threshold, and the gate hinge that he had recovered, and we excavated further in and picked up the subfloor of that. We've got bricks of a gray type and dimension that are classically the latest period of Egyptian construction, as attested in other sites, so there's not much question to my mind that this should be connected with Egypt, as well as a scarab, a sort of decorative scarab found from the floor, and continuation of the Egyptian assemblage, including an Egyptian cup, and so I don't see any reason here to suggest that this was taken over and redeployed. I guess there's nothing that proves that it can't be, but to my mind, the long and enduring continuation of this tradition, with no evidence, at least in Canaan, that these fortresses are being, for any great duration, inhabited by Canaanites. Although I guess you could say the "Tale of the Capture of Jaffa" illustrates that they took over sites, and then Egyptians had to recover them from them, so it's totally within the realm of possibility, and it might be part of the messy end of Egyptian control, but as far as we can tell, the architectural styles look like they adhere to Egyptian conventions.

Louise Bertini:

I think we'll take one more question for our time. Question from Cynthia, that, "Is this picture really one more of colonization than conquest?"

Aaron A. Burke:

Well, our terminologies don't always fit well real-world environments, right? We think of colonization, and we have a very formal approach to what that means: imperialism and colonialism and military expansion like this. Was Russia's takeover the Crimean a

colonization? We don't often use that word, but in some sense you could say it's sort of that, so I think we have to think of these things in a sort of fluid way. I often think about Egyptian Empire as a net being thrown over Canaan, rather than an inkblot on a map, and a lot of stuff gets through a net, the finer, smaller things do. It gets very difficult to have total control over things, and what you find yourself having to do, if you're the Egyptians, is to constantly come back and rethink your strategy. One thing that's very clear with the duration of the Egyptian empire is that by the time we get to the 13th and 12th centuries, the Egyptians have a strong foothold. They are creating sites like Gerisa and Afek, with ruled agricultural estates and "administrative centers" that clearly mean they have eyes, ears and a hand in many, many places, where previously they might have gone with a more loose administrative structure, so there's an evolution to empire that doesn't allow it to be easily explained by a single label. In fact, I think that they're ... Although Ellen did a lot of that early work with respect to the historical questions, I think we constantly have to work back and recall that it's not even clear that there was a footprint for empire before Thutmose III, and it's questionable, after Thutmose III, what anyone had in mind about what it was they were trying to accomplish, or what they would have said is acceptable versus unacceptable, except when someone threw off Egyptian rule and said, "We're not going to pay tribute anymore, and we're not going to abide by this." That was something that had to be met with resistance by the Egyptians, if indeed empire was going to mean anything. So I think it's one of those things that's fluid, I think it's fair to say, over the course of many centuries.

Louise Bertini:

Well, thank you so much for this wonderful lecture. I also want to thank Eva Kirsch and Ben Harer for also joining us today for this lecture in honor of Norma, and I'm sure she also would have loved to ... I'm sure she's heard you many times, and I hope that this is a fitting tribute to her. So thank you all for joining us, and have a good day.

Aaron A. Burke:

Yes, thank you very much, and a tribute to Norma. Thank you.

Louise Bertini:

Bye.