Corrigenda and Addendum to Postscript for the article:


Corrigenda

P. 34, col. 1, l. 31 – for “Shabago” read “Shabaqo”.
P. 34, col. 1, l. 33 – for “Depudyt” read “Depuydt”.
P. 37, col. 1, l. 29 – for “50 years” read “+50±50 years”.
P. 42, col. 1, l. 42 – for “urbat” read “Ḥurbat”.
P. 43, col. 2, l. 1 – for “Sörenson” read “Sörensen”.

Addendum to Postscript (Dec. 1998)

While this volume was in press debates on the chronological issues touched on in this paper have continued apace. We should at least mention here that Amihai Mazar (‘Iron Age chronology: A reply to I. Finkelstein’, Levant 29: 1997: 157-167) has responded to Israel Finkelstein’s low Palestinian chronology (mentioned in our Postscript). The latter replied promptly in ‘Bible archaeology or archaeology of Palestine in the Iron Age? A rejoinder’, Levant 30 (1998): 167-173. In the meantime the excavations at Tel Jezreel have revealed the same anomaly encountered by Kenyon at Samaria – i.e. “10th” century pottery types occur in an assemblage which historically belongs to the Omride dynasty of the mid-9th century, creating a discrepancy of “eighty years or more” according to the late Orna Zimhoni (‘Clues from the enclosure-fills: pre-Omride settlement at Tel Jezreel’, Tel Aviv 24: 1997: 83-109.) For the period around the end of the 7th century, a key study reviewing the controversy surrounding the contexts and dating of Archaic Greek pottery in Palestine has now been published with new material by Jane Waldbaum and Jodi Magness (‘The chronology of Early Greek Pottery: new evidence from seventh-century B.C. destruction levels in Israel’, American Journal of Archaeology: 101: 1997: 23-40. On the Egyptological front, we are pleased to note that Graham Hagens (‘A critical review of dead-reckoning from the 21st Dynasty’, Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt 33: 1996: 153-163), follows us in arguing for a substantial shortening of 21st-Dynasty chronology. At this point his reduction of 75 years is of the same order as ours. As a knock-on effect, Hagens then argues for a lowering of the absolute date for the Egyptian New Kingdom – and thus the Late Bronze Age – by the same amount. The logjam in Egyptology seems to be shifting at last.