

IRON AGE COMPLEX SOCIETIES, RADIOCARBON DATES AND EDOM: WORKING WITH THE DATA AND DEBATES

THOMAS E. LEVY
tlevy@ucsd.edu
University of California, San Diego
USA

MOHAMMAD NAJJAR
najjar_m@yahoo.com
Friends of Archaeology in Jordan
Jordan

THOMAS HIGHAM
thomas.higham@archaeology-research.oxford.ac.uk
Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit
Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art
University of Oxford
England

Summary: Iron Age Complex Societies, Radiocarbon Dates and Edom: Working with the Data and Debates.

This is a response to E. van der Steen and P. Bienkowski's *Antiguo Oriente* 4 article "How Old is the Kingdom of Edom? A Review of New Evidence and Recent Discussion."

Keywords: Edom – Khirbat en-Nahas – radiocarbon dates – Jordan – Iron Age

Resumen: Sociedades complejas de la Edad de Hierro, fechados de radiocarbono y Edom: trabajando con los datos y debates.

Esta es una respuesta al artículo de E. van der Steen y P. Bienkowski en *Antiguo Oriente* 4, "¿Cuán antiguo es el reino de Edom? Una revisión de la nueva evidencia y de la discusión reciente".

Palabras clave: Edom – Khirbat en-Nahas – fechados de radiocarbono – Jordania – Edad del Hierro

Scholarly criticism is one of the best catalysts for productive debate and from this perspective, we welcome Eveline van der Steen and Piotr Bienkowski's review.¹ It is unfortunate that the criticism of the *Antiquity* paper was stimulated by a premature press release. Many of van der Steen and Bienkowski's concerns about our work at Khirbat en-Nahas (and much more!) are answered in the papers in the volume, *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating—Archaeology, Text and Science*.² Further, we hope that a large-scale Highland–Lowland Iron Age Edom radiocarbon dating project can be initiated with all the researchers working in the area. To this end, Neil Smith and Thomas Levy recently carried out a dating project with a series of small scale excavations at four Iron Age sites in the Highlands of Edom in the general vicinity of Shawbak. Finally, it is our hope that we can continue the debate about the nature of the Iron Age polity in Edom in the near future.

As to the critique in *Antiguo Oriente*, we have to say we were expecting this kind of reaction and we see nothing wrong with that. We were aware that what we are suggesting goes against the dominant view that has pervaded over Iron Age archaeology in Jordan for the past three decades. There is one particularly observant point made in van der Steen and Bienkowski's review of the recent report in *Antiquity*³ concerning the University of California, San Diego – Department of Antiquities of Jordan sponsored excavations at the Iron Age site of Khirbat en-Nahas (KEN) that needs to be addressed first (Figure 1). Namely, that the work at KEN has attracted a great deal of attention due to the publication of the *Antiquity* article and a premature press release issued by McMaster University in *McMaster Daily News*.⁴ This press release was a total surprise to us. In September 2004 an international symposium on Radiocarbon Dating and the Iron Age of the southern Levant was organized by two of us (Levy and Higham) at the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, where a large number of specialists in Levantine archaeology, Biblical Studies, Egyptology and Radiocarbon dating gathered for three days of intense debate. The results of the conference are published.⁵ At the conference, opened with remarks from H.R.H. Prince Hassan Ibn Talal presented by Ghazi Bisheh,

¹ van der Steen and Bienkowski 2006.

² Levy and Higham 2005.

³ Levy *et al.* 2004.

⁴ *McMaster Daily News*, Dec. 20, 2004.

⁵ Levy and Higham 2005.

former director general of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, *Biblical Archaeology Review*'s editor asked for a popular article about the significance of KEN in light of the conference presentations about the site.⁶ At the time, the answer was simple –no, we are not ready to raise the issue in the popular press. Unfortunately, the proverbial “can of worms” has been opened and we are now living with it. We hope that the *Antiquity* paper will be read in the context in which it was published– the first research report on the 2002 excavations at Khirbat en-Nahas. Since then, we have conducted another major 10-week excavation season at the site in the fall of 2006. One of the main goals of that project was to acquire additional stratified sequences of organic material suitable for more high precision radiocarbon dating.

With regard to the current critique, we were unjustifiably accused by the authors of having a hidden agenda or “not-articulated chronological assumptions.” In this regard, we want to make it clear that our main interest in early Edomite history is the study of the impact of copper production on the formation of the Edomite state or complex society (however it may be defined) and its political and social institutions. This study is part of our broader research goal of a deep-time study of social complexity and the impact of mining and metallurgy on this process starting from the Neolithic period. Of course we are aware of the “chronological assumptions” mentioned by the authors of the critique and in this connection we want to say that it would be very unprofessional from our side to discard any of the available non-archaeological sources such as the Old Testament or Hebrew Bible. We work as researchers and we do our archaeological investigations accordingly; if any of the “established truths” from archaeology or historical texts will be proved or disproved in the course of these investigations, it is our duty to do the follow-up and to make the results available to the scholarly community.

THE CHRONOLOGICAL BIAS IN THE IRON AGE ARCHAEOLOGY OF EDMOM

Until quite recently, the Iron Age chronology of Edom rested on the discovery of a single clay seal impression found at the highland site of Umm el-Biyara during Mrs. Crystal Bennett's excavations in the 1960s.⁷ The seal contains the name of Qos-Gabr (the man of God Qos) known from the 7th

⁶Levy *et al.* 2005; Higham *et al.* 2005.

⁷Bennett 1966a; 1966b.

century BC Assyrian annals of Esarhaddon (Prism B, ca. 673-2 BC)⁸ and the first campaign of Ashurbanipal (Cylinder C, ca. 667 BC).⁹ Scholars have taken the discovery of this extra-biblical text fragment to date the associated pottery found with the seal. As Bienkowski¹⁰ pointed out some years ago with regard to Iron Age ceramics in Edom, the seal impression of Qos-Gabr provides the date to which, or not later than, the ceramic assemblage can be attributed to (*terminus post quem*) and it does not indicate just how early that assemblage dated back to in time. In fact, Bienkowski¹¹ also alerted readers that the then unpublished radiocarbon dates from the German Mining Museum's soundings at Khirbat en-Nahas (KEN) indicated much earlier dates for the Iron Age in Edom. However, Bienkowski's caution and the later publication of the report on the soundings at KEN in German (which included radiocarbon dates¹² fell on deaf ears. Bennett's dating of the Iron Age in Edom to the 7th and 6th centuries BC became the accepted standard for the Iron Age archaeology of this part of Jordan. A host of studies concerning Iron Age Edom were produced based on the assumptions established by the relative dating of Umm al-Biyara¹³ (see Figure 2) and even more recent studies continue to work under the late 7th – 6th centuries BC assumption for the emergence of the Edomite kingdom.¹⁴

The enthusiasm that Bennett's late dating of Iron Age Edom received by scholars in the 1970s through the 1990s was in part against the views of the American archaeologist Nelson Glueck who pioneered archaeological surveys in Jordan and Iron Age research in Edom.¹⁵ Glueck took a more traditional view of Levantine archaeology and tended to accept most texts in the Hebrew Bible as historical fact in a way that many later researchers believed to be biased.¹⁶ Working in Edom, Glueck¹⁷ firmly believed that the majority of Iron

⁸ Pritchard 1969: 291.

⁹ Pritchard 1969: 297; Bienkowski 1992b.

¹⁰ Bienkowski 1992b: 99.

¹¹ Bienkowski 1992b: 110.

¹² Engel 1993; Fritz 1996.

¹³ Bennett and Bienkowski 1995; Hart 1989; Oakshott 1978; 1983; Pratico 1985; 1993.

¹⁴ Bienkowski 2002; and most recently, Crowell 2004; Porter 2004.

¹⁵ Glueck 1938; 1939; 1940.

¹⁶ Dever 2000.

¹⁷ Glueck 1940: 69, 86.

Age mining activities in the Faynan district that he documented could be dated to the 10th and 9th centuries BC.

In the early 1990s, working with published Iron Age ceramic drawings, Israel Finkelstein¹⁸ suggested that indeed, there was ceramic evidence (collared rim jars) for an early Iron Age occupation in Edom that pushed back this occupation considerably earlier than the view of Bienkowski¹⁹ and others. To help solve this chronological debate, which has profound implications for understanding the history and socio-economic processes that led to the rise of the Edomite “kingdom” – such as core-periphery relationships between Edom and the Assyrian empire²⁰ on the one hand and Edom and neighboring small polities such as Israel and Judah on the other, it was decided that as part of the UCSD – DOAJ Jabal Hamrat Fidan project, large scale stratigraphic excavations would be carried out at the Iron Age copper production site of Khirbat en-Nahas.

THE HIGHLAND – LOWLAND DICHOTOMY IN EDMOM

The excavations at Khirbat en-Nahas should be examined as part of the very significant “highland” vs. “lowland” contrast in the Iron Age settlement of Edom (Figure 3). The marked environmental differences between the semi-arid/Mediterranean zone on the high plateau of Edom where famous Iron Age excavated sites such as Busayra,²¹ Tawilan,²² and Umm al-Biyara²³ (see Figure 4 for example of this highland site) are located and the lowland sites of the Faynan district such as Khirbat en-Nahas are situated in the hyper arid Saharo-Arabian desert zone – also home to one of the Middle East’s largest sources of copper ore in antiquity. While this dichotomy must be compared and contrasted in the most objective way, it does not mean these two zones of Edom were independent of each other. However, to parse out historical and anthropological process they must be objectively compared. Besides comparative quantitative studies of Iron Age artifact assemblages (especially

¹⁸ Finkelstein 1992a; 1992b.

¹⁹ Bienkowski 1992b; 1992c.

²⁰ Tebes 2007.

²¹ Bienkowski 2002.

²² Bennett and Bienkowski 1995.

²³ Bennett 1966a; 1966b.

ceramics), and stylistic comparisons between artifacts and architecture, radiocarbon dating offers the most objective method for establishing a much needed chronological framework for comparing the highland and lowland of Edom that will ultimately lead us to explaining Iron Age culture processes such as the emergence of complex societies in the region known to us from ancient Near Eastern texts – including the Hebrew Bible.

What is missing from the critique of our work is an acknowledgement of the significance of the KEN excavation report in *Antiquity* for this being the first attempt to apply radiocarbon dating to stratified archaeological deposits from Iron Age architectural constructions and stratigraphic contexts in Edom. As such, we need radiocarbon determinations from stratified contexts from the highland sites of Busayra, Tawilan, Umm al-Biyara and others. We would suggest that a major collaborative international highland-lowland Iron Age radiocarbon dating project be established for Edom given the interest generated by the present discussion. The main problem of dating Iron Age sites in Edom has been, until the recent excavations at KEN and other sites in Faynan carried out by the UCSD – DOAJ team, what may be called a “highland-centric” view of the Iron Age archaeology of the region. As most of the stratified excavations in Edom have taken place up on the plateau, there has been more of a “bird’s eye view” of the region’s archaeology rather than a “worm’s eye” view - from the bottom of the region looking up. Standing at the bottom and looking up, we suggest that the Iron Age chronology on the plateau of Edom has been dominated by the discovery of a single artifact – the seal impression found at Umm al-Biyara that reads “Qos-Gabr, King of Edom” that according to Piotr Bienkowski²⁴

“Qos-Gabr (or Qaus-gabri) is probably the king who is mentioned twice in Assyrian inscriptions: on Prism B of Esarhaddon, which is dated 673-672 BC and in a description of the first campaign of Ashurbanipal, dated 667 BC, indicating a 7th century BC date for the associated pottery and small finds.”

From our understanding, this single seal impression, which can apparently be dated absolutely based on Assyrian epigraphic data, served as the single chronological anchor for dating the Iron Age pottery of Edom in the ‘post-Glueck’ period of research. We would suggest that one anchor is not sufficient and that radiocarbon dating projects, like the one at KEN can provide a more

²⁴ Bienkowski 1995: 44-45.

objective framework for establishing the much needed chronological ladder to test theories about history and anthropology in Edom.

THE FORTRESS AT KHIRBAT EN-NAHAS

With regard to some of the specific archaeological criticisms made by van der Steen and Bienkowski, we will try to address some of them here.²⁵ They use the term “possible fortress” and consistently place the word fortress in quotation marks as if there is some doubt as to our identification of the function of the structure. Back at the turn of the last century scholars such as Alois Musil²⁶ and later, Nelson Glueck,²⁷ identified the large square structure located at the northern aspect at KEN as a fortress (see Figures 3 and 4). Our excavations confirm the identification of the structure as an Iron Age fortress with a typical Iron II four-room gate. Although a more comprehensive study of the fortress is presented in the volume mentioned above, in the spirit of transparency, we will present here two tables that summarize comparisons of the KEN gate with other Iron II gates from the southern Levant and a size comparison of the fortress at KEN with other Iron Age desert fortresses in Israel, Jordan and Egypt (Sinai).

Our critics say

“so far nothing else has been found in southern Transjordan to justify the incorporation of the Khirbet en-Nahas ‘fortress’ in a larger polity.”

In discussing the archaeology of Jordan, we can not separate it from the other side of the border – namely, Israel and Palestine. We suggest that there was a cluster of at least three 10th– 9th century BC fortresses involved in the movement of Iron Age copper produced in the Faynan district. These include

²⁵ Since our debate with van der Steen and Bienkowski began on the Wadi Arabah Web site (<http://www.wadiarabahproject.man.ac.uk>), Israel Finkelstein has joined the discussion, in particular about the KEN fortress (Finkelstein 2005). While he accepts the fortress for what it is – a fort, he mistakenly argues that it dates to the Assyrians during the 8th– 7th centuries BCE. Our evidence shows conclusively that it was built and used during the 10th and 9th centuries BCE (Levy and Najjar 2006).

²⁶ Musil 1907.

²⁷ Glueck 1935.

Khirbat en-Nahas, the lower levels at Tell el-Kheleifeh²⁸ and Hatzevah.²⁹ There are problems with the old excavations of Glueck and the lack of a final Hatzevah publication. However, given the assumptions in Iron Age ceramic dating for Edom outlined above, the jury may have to be brought back to examine Pratico's³⁰ re-dating of Tell el-Kheleifeh to only the late phases of the Iron Age. The similarity between the gates at KEN and Tell el-Kheleifeh are too comparable to be ignored and there are unpublished radiocarbon dates from Hatzevah³¹ that demonstrate a 10th – 9th century BC occupation there. Thus, there must have been a group of three major Iron Age fortresses in the 10th – 9th centuries in the Wadi Arabah that were intimately involved in the copper trade (and other items) at this time from the Faynan source area to the Mediterranean in the west (via Hatzevah) and in the south, perhaps along Red Sea trade routes and overland to Arabia, via Tell el-Kheleifeh. As seen in Table 2, after Hatzevah, KEN is the largest IA fortress in the south Levantine desert zone. We agree that “*one fortress does not make a kingdom.*” However, KEN is part of a network of IA sites in the Faynan district,³² and the triangle of major fortresses along the Wadi Arabah no doubt had links with the web of Iron Age settlements in both the lowland and highland of Edom –as well as to regions in the west. This is not the place to debate the nature of the IA complex society in Edom (i.e., kingdom, tribal state, conical clan, developed chiefdom, rank society, etc.)– however, we welcome this debate in the future.

There may be some merit in our critics suggestion there must be transparency in the presentation of the dates and “*other chronological data they have used.*” We did publish the two IA scarabs with all the necessary parallels. However, our critics do not discuss the significance of these important chronological data. For example, samples of the “Chariot, Archer,

²⁸ Glueck 1940.

²⁹ Cohen and Yisrael 1995.

³⁰ Pratico 1993.

³¹ Y. Yisrael, pers.com. The authors would also like to thank members of the new Hatzevah research team for recently sharing their insights concerning the Iron Age stratigraphy at that site. These include: Mark Shipp, Terrance Christian, and Craig Bowman.

³² Levy *et al.* 2003. More recently, during the summer of 2007 our UCSD – DOAJ team carried out surveys along the Wadi Jariyeh and the region north of the Wadi al-Guwayb and recorded 3 new Iron Age fortresses that can be added to other fortified sites in Edom recorded by other scholars such as Glueck (see references here), Burton MacDonald (MacDonald 1992; 2007; MacDonald, Bradshaw, Herr, Neeley, and Quaintance 2000) and others.

or Hunting Scene” scarab (KEN Basket: 6438, Locus: 316 see bottom scarab in Figure 5) have been found in Iron IB deposits at Gezer (Strata XIII-XI), at Beth Shean VI-V (Iron IA-IB), Tell el-Farah south and many other sites. The scarabs, metal arrowheads and radiocarbon dates push us into the 10th and earlier centuries. We could discuss the other scarab and other artifacts but this is only meant to be a short response.

We wanted very much to include a discussion of the Iron Age pottery assemblage from KEN but at the time, our ceramic specialist did not want to include it in the *Antiquity* paper. When that did not happen, we wanted to include summaries of the ceramic assemblage found in each strata at KEN for the volume on radiocarbon and the Iron Age – but it was not ready in time for inclusion in that book. We are currently preparing a comprehensive study of the KEN ceramics that will appear in a journal.

RADIOCARBON DATING AT KEN IN LIGHT OF THE CRITIQUE

The original draft of the *Antiquity* paper contained a “Methods” section, in which the Bayesian analysis was published. Unfortunately this was not included in the final paper solely for reasons of brevity. The basis of the Bayesian³³ calibration method is deceptively simple, yet mathematically complex. The reader is referred to any number of publications outlining the mathematical basis of the technique.³⁴ The methods are attractive because they allow associated archaeological information to be taken into account in the chronometric analysis, in an explicit, statistically-rigorous way. Archaeologists are familiar with the way in which stratigraphically constrained materials are submitted for radiocarbon dating and information of this kind is made explicit in the analysis.

Let us take as an example the context Stratum S4 from KEN and the building linked to slag processing discussed in the *Antiquity* paper. We know this is an archaeological event that can be dated by the selection of a suitable piece of organic material whose age-at-death (and hence cessation of uptake of ¹⁴C) is inferred as being close to the time of the archaeological

³³ Bayesian methods are named after the Reverend Thomas Bayes whose seminal work “An essay towards solving a problem in the doctrine of chances” was published posthumously in 1763 (Buck *et al.* 2003).

³⁴ E.g., Buck *et al.* 1996 (and references therein); Christen 1994; Christen and Buck 1998; Nicholls and Jones 1998; 2001; Zeidler *et al.* 1998.

event of the occupation and deposition of that stratum. Four variables assume importance in the dating and Bayesian modeling of the samples from this and other contexts. First, the *prior*. This represents the archaeological information available concerning the sample and its unknown calendar date (termed θ). In this case, we have no concrete information about the age of this specific context, but we do have information about its position relative to other samples within the excavated sequence. We know that it is earlier than the deposition of samples to be dated from strata 2 and 3, (i.e., for the series of samples that $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3$). This is important archaeological information, then, that can be included in the Bayesian chronometric analysis to come. Second, the *data*. This is the radiocarbon determination from stratum S4 obtained in Oxford (OxA-12169), which produced a radiocarbon age of 2899 ± 27 BP. The data acts through a distribution called, third, the *likelihood*. This refers to the unknown calendar date expressed when the radiocarbon age is converted into calendar years using the calibration curve, and the statistical uncertainty associated with it. Finally, the *posterior*. This gives the information obtained about θ as a probability function, based upon the prior and likelihood distributions. A larger posterior probability occurs when the grouped calibrated dates agree with the data and are plausible in the light of the prior input into the model. In the case of Area S, we had four stratum and four radiocarbon likelihoods from each, so an appropriate model for this archaeological sequence was constructed and is shown in Figure 6, alongside that from Area A. Bayesian analysis is mathematically intensive and analysis is only possible using computer programs, such as BCal,³⁵ which incorporate simulation-based statistical tools called MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo). For the user (the archaeologist), these tools are now widely available and utilized in chronometric analysis.

What is interesting and crucially important is the use of suitably structured analysis models because when utilizing the Bayesian approach we are forced to make our model assumptions explicit through the prior. This has drawn attention to the fact that there are no true neutral assumptions that can be made in statistical analysis, Bayesian or otherwise, and that any model assumptions will have a real influence on the result. Once again, this is discussed in much greater details in some chapters in the book *The Bible and*

³⁵ Buck *et al.* 2003.

Radiocarbon dating.³⁶ If our model assumptions are invalid or inappropriate then the resulting analysis can give misleading results.

METHODS

In the model developed for the *Antiquity* paper, certain mathematical symbols are used to describe the stratigraphic phases and boundaries at the site (Figure 6). α_n and β_n represent the beginning and ending dates of phase n . By analyzing the posterior probabilities for these parameters, we are able to consider the modeled distribution of ages corresponding with *termini post* and *ante quem*, and also to test issues of contemporaneity and span. α_8 therefore represents the probability distribution immediately prior to the deposition of S2a in Area A, while the late phase boundary of this level is represented by β_8 . The probability distribution α_5 — β_5 would represent the elapsed time span of Stratum 4 in Area S, and so on. In addition to this, we can use our prior knowledge, not just of the archaeological sequence but also of the dated materials, to ascribe a probability as to whether or not a dated sample is likely to be an outlier in the model. It could be, for example, that the variation in certain radiocarbon determinations might be due to sample constituent or contamination problems about which we had a prior hunch. Outlier analysis is described by Christen³⁷ in some detail. We ascribed a prior outlier probability of 10% to each radiocarbon determination³⁸ to assess whether or not there were potential outliers. The low prior probability was given because of our knowledge of the screening of the charcoal samples and our sampling of external tree rings where possible. Nevertheless, the possibility of there being outliers was entertained. The resulting posterior probabilities were not significant and therefore we conclude there are no outliers in the dataset.

The radiocarbon likelihoods for each AMS measurement as simulated in BCal are shown in Table 3. The most likely calendar date range (or ranges) for each parameter is represented by highest posterior density (HPD) regions, given at 95% probability. In Figure 7, an example of a posterior probability density plot is given for one of the determinations (OxA-12342; represented by θ_6 in the model). The HPD region for this corresponds to 1055—915 BC

³⁶Higham *et al.* 2005, Bronk Ramsey 2005.

³⁷Christen 1994.

³⁸After Buck, Higham and Lowe 2003.

at 95% prob. Note that the distribution is multi-modal, but that the highest probability (as shown on the *y* axis) is associated with *c.* 960-980 BC.

We also analysed *termini post* and *ante quem* for KEN (Table 4). $\alpha 5$ effectively represents a *terminus post quem* for occupation at Area S, while $\alpha 1$ represents a *terminus post quem* for occupation at Area A. These suggest, therefore, that the highest probability is that Area S was occupied *after* 1190 BC and Area A *after* 1120 BC (in our paper, the former distribution was mistakenly stated as being *before* rather than *after*). A fuller methodological analysis would have made it obvious that this was not correct.

The discussion above is, we are afraid, rather moot in the light of more recent work, again in some chapters of *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating*. Further dating of many more samples from KEN has produced a rather fuller picture of the chronology of the site. We now have a total of 19 determinations from Area S and 15 determinations from Area A. In general, these results corroborate the chronometric story described here and in the *Antiquity* paper, improve significantly the precision of our analysis and increase our confidence in the chronology of the site. The reader is referred to this later work.

The difference between the Cal BC date ranges in Table 1 of our *Antiquity* article, and the calendar age ranges discussed in the text itself, then, is due solely to the application of the Bayesian modeling. Table 1 simply represents radiocarbon calibrations, with no modelling. In the *Antiquity* text, the ranges represent posterior probabilities, computed in the light of the priors and the result of the modeled simulation of the data. The reason for the two determinations from Stratum S4 and A4a respectively being older than would apparently be the case on the basis of the likelihoods alone is simply that the contexts are constrained in the model as being archaeologically “earlier” than the determinations above, which are not wholly different in terms of age.

It is important to remember that our model assumptions can often make a significant influence on the resultant posterior distributions. We made this point earlier in our response to van der Steen and Bienkowski (2006, *Antiquity*) by describing a hypothetical situation in which we treated two strata not as separate archaeological units, but as one. In an effort to test the sensitivity of our models, we also did the same thing in our more recent publication.³⁹ There, for the Area S model, we showed that changing the priors for the two lowest strata did have an effect on the posterior distributions for that earlier part of the sequence, whereas for later parts, there was no effect. It is important

³⁹ Higham *et al.* 2005.

to remember that there is no ‘right’ model, what we are doing is applying a realistic assessment of the archaeological sequence at the time. Further dating, or further excavation, or both, may cause us to revisit and modify our model. It is important to note, however, that this is a better approach than simply looking at the radiocarbon dates in isolation.

van der Steen and Bienkowski state that our analysis is an attempt to “push the dates as early as possible,” which misunderstands the methodology we have employed. They state that their attempts to replicate our results failed, but did not include the results of their analysis or consider why, when identical data was used, the results varied. Again, it is likely that priors included within their model play a key role, and variation may be a result of this.

Further criticisms of our work by van der Steen and Bienkowski revolve around the choice of using 95% probability ranges supposedly, they suggest, in order to make our dates older. This is not the case. At 95% probability there is a one in 20 chance that the ‘true’ age lies outside the range ascribed, whilst at 68% there is a 32% chance that the ‘true’ age is outside the range. The use of the former then, increases ones confidence in the age ranges obtained. Note that one could just as easily argue that the use of a 95% ranges pulls the dates younger!

van der Steen and Bienkowski suggest that “*stratum A4a (...in Area A) is dated by two samples (GrA-25318... and... 25354),*” but this was never proposed by Levy *et al.* (2005). Levy *et al.* (2005) suggested that, because of their greater age and the lack of agreement with other dates from the same strata, they *could* represent earlier metalworking activities, prior to the construction of the Area A gate. The Bayesian analysis of Higham *et al.* (2005) serves to confirm the lack of agreement of the A3 ages and supports Levy *et al.*’s skepticism about the coherence of the dates from these two strata. Any confusion here seems to us only due to problems with van der Steen and Bienkowski’s reading and comprehension. van der Steen and Bienkowski go on to suggest that two other dates from phase A3 are “pushed into the next stratum.” This is not true either. Levy *et al.* suggest that, on the basis of the range in ages for this stratum, these samples seem to be from the basal portions of the A2b industrial layer, whilst acknowledging the difficulties of effectively cross-correlating the strata inside and outside the structure itself. Alternative scenarios are presented in Levy *et al.*’s discussion. They state that, “*clearly more stratigraphic excavations are needed in and around the Area A gate to clarify the construction date of this structure on a more definitive basis.*” van der Steen and Bienkowski ought to read more carefully the caveats that are given in both chapters with regard

to stratigraphic interpretation and sample composition.⁴⁰ Throughout both chapters it is clear that Levy *et al.* examine the general fit of the radiocarbon determinations within the site stratigraphy, while Higham *et al.* present a more detailed Bayesian analysis of the overall chronology. There is no difference between either chapter's conclusions regarding the chronometric picture of Khirbat en-Nahas. Even without statistical modeling, all of the radiocarbon dates from KEN (including the dates obtained by Andreas Hauptmann's⁴¹ German Mining Museum team, show major periods of metal production during the 11th – 9th centuries BC and no dates for the 8th and 7th centuries that correspond with the traditional (late) Iron Age chronology advocated by van der Steen and Bienkowski. All the available radiocarbon dates from the industrial site of KEN point to the importance of examining Iron Age culture change and its relationship to metallurgy and trade during its full sequence in the Southern Levant – from the 12th through 6th centuries BC.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We hope that our response to the response to our recent *Antiquity* paper will promote more scholarly discourse that will ultimately help researchers solve many problems concerning the emergence, maintenance and collapse of one of the southern Levant's most fascinating ancient polities – Iron Age Edom. Perhaps sometime down the line, all researchers interested in the Wadi Arabah will join together in a major research project that focuses on radiocarbon dating and the Iron Age of this important border zone.

REFERENCES

- BENNETT, C.-M. 1966a. "Fouilles d'Umm el-Biyara: Rapport Preliminaire." In: *Revue Biblique* 73, pp. 372-403.
- BENNETT, C.-M. 1966b. "Umm el-Biyara." In: *Revue Biblique* LXXIII, pp. 400-401, pl. XXIIb.
- BENNETT, C.-M., and P. BIENKOWSKI (eds.) 1995. *Excavations at Tawilan in Southern Jordan*. Oxford, British Institute at Amman for Archaeology and History - Oxford University Press.

⁴⁰ E.g. Higham *et al.* 2005: 168-169 and Levy *et al.* 2005: 138-139.

⁴¹ Hauptmann 2007.

- BEIT-ARIEH, I. (ed.) 1999. *Tel 'Ira - A Stronghold in the Biblical Negev*. Tel Aviv University Monograph Series Vol. 15. Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv University Institute of Archaeology.
- BIENKOWSKI, P. (ed.) 1992a. *Early Edom and Moab - The Beginning of the Iron Age in Southern Jordan*. Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 7. Sheffield, J.R. Collis Publications.
- BIENKOWSKI, P. 1992b. "The Date of Sedentary Occupation in Edom: Evidence from Umm el-Biyara, Tawilan and Buseirah." In: P. BIENKOWSKI (ed.), *Early Edom and Moab - The Beginning of the Iron Age in Southern Jordan*. Sheffield Archaeological Monographs 7. Sheffield, J.R. Collis Publications, pp. 99-112
- BIENKOWSKI, P. 1992c. "The Beginning of the Iron Age in Edom: A Reply to Finkelstein." In: *Levant* 24, pp. 167-169.
- BIENKOWSKI, P. 1995. "The Edomites: The Archaeological Evidence from Transjordan." In: D.V. EDELMAN (ed.) *You Shall Not Abhor an Edomite for He is Your Brother: Edom and Seir in History and Tradition*. JBL and ASOR, Archaeological and Biblical Studies 3. Atlanta, Scholars Press, pp. 41-92.
- BIENKOWSKI, P. 2002. *Busayra - Excavations by Crystal-M. Bennett, 1971-1980*. British Academy Monographs in Archaeology No. 13. Oxford, Council for British Research in the Levant by Oxford University Press.
- BRONK RAMSEY, C. 2005. "Improving the Resolution of Radiocarbon Dating by Statistical Analysis." In: T.E. LEVY and T. HIGHAM (eds.), *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating - Archaeology, Text and Science*. London, Equinox, pp. 57-64.
- BUCK, C.E., CAVANAGH, W.G and C.D. LITTON. 1996. *Bayesian Approach to interpreting Archaeological Data*. Chichester, John Wiley and Sons.
- BUCK, C.E., HIGHAM, T.F.G. and D.J. LOWE. 2003. "Bayesian Tools for Tephrochronology." In: *The Holocene* 13, pp. 639-647.
- CHRISTEN, J. 1994b. "Summarizing a set of Radiocarbon Determinations: a Robust Approach." In: *Applied Statistics* 43, pp. 489-503.
- CHRISTEN, J.A. and C.E. BUCK. 1998. "Sample Selection in Radiocarbon Dating." In: *Applied Statistics* 47(4), pp. 543-557.

- COHEN, R., and R. COHEN-AMIN. 2004. *Ancient Settlement of the Negev Highlands*. Vol. II. Israel Antiquities Authority Report No. 20. Jerusalem, Israel Antiquities Authority.
- COHEN, R., and Y. YISRAEL. 1995. "The Iron Age Fortresses at En Ḥaṣeva." In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 58, pp. 223-235.
- CROWELL, B.L. 2004. *On the Margins of History: Social Change and Political Development in Iron Age Edom*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Harbour, University of Michigan.
- DEVER, W. G. 2000. "Nelson Glueck and the Other Half of the Holy Land." In: L.E. STAGER, J.A. GREENE, and M.D. COOGAN (eds.) *The Archaeology of Jordan and Beyond: Essays in Honor of James A. Sauer*. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, pp. 114-121.
- ENGEL, T. 1993. "Charcoal Remains from an Iron Age Copper Smelting Slag Heap at Feinan, Wadi Arabah (Jordan)." In: *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 2, pp 205-211.
- FINKELSTEIN, I. 1992a. "Edom in the Iron I." In: *Levant* 24, pp. 159-166.
- FINKELSTEIN, I. 1992b. "Stratigraphy, Pottery and Parallels: A Reply to Bienkowski." In: *Levant* 24, pp. 171-172.
- FINKELSTEIN, I. 2005. "Khirbet en-Nahas, Edom and Biblical History." In: *Tel Aviv* 32, pp. 119-125.
- FRITZ, V. 1996. "Ergebnisse einer Sondage in Ḥirbet en-Naḥās, Wādī el-‘Araba (Jordanien)." In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina Vereins* 112, pp. 1-9.
- GLUECK, N. 1935. "Explorations in Eastern Palestine, II." In: *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 15, pp. 1-288.
- GLUECK, N. 1938. "The First Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-Geber)." In: *Annual American Schools of Oriental Research* 71, pp. 3-17.
- GLUECK, N. 1939. "The Second Campaign at Tell el-Kheleifeh (Ezion-Geber: Elath)." In: *Bulletin American Schools of Oriental Research* 75, pp. 8-22.
- GLUECK, N. 1940. *The Other Side of the Jordan*. New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research.
- HART, S. 1989. *The Archaeology of the Land of Edom*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Sydney, Macquarie University.

- HAUPTMANN, A. 2007. *The Archaeo-metallurgy of Copper - Evidence from Faynan, Jordan*. New York, Springer.
- HERZOG, Z. 1992. "Settlement and Fortification Planning in the Iron Age." In: A. KEMPINSKI and R. REICH (eds.), *The Architecture of Ancient Israel - From the Prehistoric to the Persian Periods*. Jerusalem, Israel Exploration Society, pp. 231-274.
- HIGHAM, T., J. VAN DER PLICHT, C. BRONK RAMSEY, H. J. BRUINS, M. ROBINSON, and T.E. LEVY. 2005. "Radiocarbon Dating of the Khirbat-en Nahas site (Jordan) and Bayesian Modeling of the Results." In: T.E. LEVY and T. HIGHAM (eds.), *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating - Archaeology, Text and Science*. London, Equinox, pp. 164-178.
- LEVY, T.E., R.B. ADAMS, J.D. ANDERSON, N. NAJJAR, N. SMITH, Y. ARBEL, L. SODERBAUM, and M. MUNIZ. 2003. "An Iron Age Landscape in the Edomite Lowlands: Archaeological Surveys along the Wadi al-Guwayb and Wadi al-Jariyeh, Jabal Hamrat Fidan, Jordan, 2002." In: *Annual of the Department of Antiquities Jordan* 47, pp. 247-277.
- LEVY, T.E., R.B. ADAMS, M. NAJJAR, A. HAUPTMANN, J.A. ANDERSON, B. BRANDL, M. ROBINSON, and T. HIGHAM. 2004. "Reassessing the Chronology of Biblical Edom: New Excavations and 14C Dates from Khirbat en-Nahas (Jordan)." In: *Antiquity* 78, pp. 863-876.
- LEVY, T.E. and T. HIGHAM (eds.) 2005. *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating - Archaeology, Text and Science*. London, Equinox.
- LEVY, T.E., and M. NAJJAR. 2006. "Some Thoughts on Khirbat en-Nahas, Edom, Biblical History and Anthropology - A Response to Israel Finkelstein." In: *Tel Aviv* 33, pp. 107-122.
- LEVY, T.E., M. NAJJAR, J. VAN DER PLICHT, N.G. SMITH, H.J. BRUINS, and T. HIGHAM. 2005. "Lowland Edom and the High and Low Chronologies: Edomite State Formation, the Bible and Recent Archaeological Research in Southern Jordan." In: T.E. LEVY and T. HIGHAM (eds.), *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating - Archaeology, Text and Science*. London, Equinox, pp. 129-163.
- MACDONALD, B. 1992. *The Southern Ghors and Northeast 'Arabah Archaeological Survey*. Sheffield Archaeological Monographs Vol. 5. Sheffield, J.R. Collis Publications.

- MACDONALD, B. 2007. "Site Surveying in Jordan: The North American Contribution." In: T. LEVY, P.M.M. DAVIAU, R.W.YOUNKER, and M. SHAER (eds.), *Crossing Jordan - North American Contributions to the Archaeology of Jordan*. London, Equinox, pp. 27-35.
- MACDONALD, B., A. BRADSHAW, L. HERR, M. NEELEY, and S. QUAINANCE. 2000. In: "The Tafila-Busayra Archaeological Survey: Phase 1 (1999)." *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 44, pp. 507-522.
- MUSIL, A. 1907. *Arabia Petraea. I. Moab; II. Edom: Topographische Reisebericht*. Wien, Alfred Holder.
- NICHOLLS, G.K., and M.D. JONES. 1998. "Radiocarbon Dating with Temporal Order Constraints. Technical Report #407." Auckland, New Zealand, Department of Mathematics, University of Auckland.
- NICHOLLS, G. and M.D. JONES. 2001. "Radiocarbon Dating with Temporal Order Constraints." In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 50(4), pp. 503-521.
- OAKSHOTT, M.F. 1978. *A Study of the Iron Age II Pottery of East Jordan with special Reference to Unpublished Material from Edom*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. London, University of London.
- OAKSHOTT, M.F. 1983. "The Edomite Pottery." In: J.F.A. SAWYER and D.J.A. CLINES (eds.) *Midian, Moab and Edom: The History and Archaeology of Late Bronze and Iron Age Jordan and North-West Arabia*. Sheffield, JSOT Press.
- PORTER, B.W. 2004. "Authority, Polity, and Tenuous Elites in Iron Age Edom (Jordan)." In: *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 23, pp. 373-395.
- PRATICO, G.D. 1985. "Nelson Glueck's 1938-1940 Excavations at Tell el-Kheleifeh: A Reappraisal." In: *Bulletin American Schools of Oriental Research* 259, pp. 1-32.
- PRATICO, G.D. 1993. *Nelson Glueck's 1938 - 1940 Excavations at Tell el-Kheleifeh - A Reappraisal*. ASOR Archaeological Reports Vol. 3. Atlanta, Scholars Press.
- PRITCHARD, J.B. 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.
- TEBES, J.M. 2007. "Assyrians, Judeans, Pastoral Groups, and Trade Patterns in the Late Iron Age Negev." In: *History Compass* 5, pp. 619-631.

- VAN DER STEEN, E. and P. BIENKOWSKI. 2006. "How Old is the Kingdom of Edom? A Review of New Evidence and Recent Discussion." In: *Antiguo Oriente* 4, pp. 11-20.
- ZEIDLER, J.A., C.E. BUCK, and C.D. LITTON. 1998. "The Integration of Archaeological Phase Information and Radiocarbon Results from the Jama River Valley, Ecuador: A Bayesian Approach." In: *Latin American Antiquity* 9, pp. 160-179.

Site	Façade (m)	Depth/Width (m)	Passage width (m)	Depth of Chambers (m)	Width of Chambers (m)	Date of Construction
Megiddo IVA	25	15.5	4.2	3	8.2	Late 9 th – 8 th C. BCE
Beersheva V	20.8	12.6	4.2	3	6	End 10 th or 9 th C. BCE
Beersheva III	16.6	13.6	3.6	3	5	Early 8 th C. BCE
Tel Dan	29.5	17.8	3.7	4.5	9	9 th C. BCE foundation?
Ashdod 10	16.5	13.75	4.2	2.4	3.8	End of 11 th or Early 10 th C. BCE
Tell en-Nasbeh (Early)	15	12	4	1.8	4.4	No hard data
Khirbat en-Nahas	16.8	10.6	3.63	2.9	3	10 th C. BCE

Table 1.

Characteristics of Selected South Levantine Iron Age Four-Chamber Gates. Sources: Herzog 1992; Levy *et al.* 2004; A. Mazar, pers. comm.

Fortress	Shape	Size (in meters)
Northern Negev		
Arad	Square	50 x 50
Uza	Rectangular	42 x 51
Horvat Tov	Square	30 x 40
Tel Ira VII	Irregular shape	100 x 320
Negev Highlands		
Horbat Rachava (Site 1)	Oval	60 x 70
Horbat Ha-Ru'ah (Site 8)	Oval	42 x 50
Mezudat Nahal 'Aqrav (Site 35)	Oval	40.25 x 45.5
'Ein Qadeis (Site 44)	Oval	37.5 x 52.5
Tira (Site 4)	Irregular shape	32 x 78
Refed (Site 3)	Irregular shape	42 x 57
Horvat Haro'ah (Site 8)	Fortlet w/ mudbrick towers	8 x 12
Beerotiyim (Site 19)	Fortlet w/ mudbrick towers	11.31 x 16.13
Har Gizron (Site 45)	Fortlet w/ mudbrick towers	3.76 x 4
Sinai		
Quseima 'Aharoni' fortress	Oval	26 x 28
Kadesh Barnea (earliest)	Oval	26 x 28
Kadesh Barnea	Rectangular	34 x 52
Wadi Arabah		
Yotvata	Trapezoid	40 x 64
Hatzevah	Square	100 x 100
Tell el-Kheleifeh	Square	45 x 45
Khirbat en-Nahas	Square	73 x 73

Table 2.

Selected Desert Fortresses in the Negev, Sinai and Wadi Arabah. Sources: Cohen and Cohen-Amin 2004; Herzog 1992; Beit-Arieh 1999; Herzog 1992.

Model parameter	OxA number	HPD region (BC/AD) (95% prob.)
θ_1	OxA-12365	1215 to 1180 BC, 1160 to 940BC (multi-modal distribution)
θ_2	OxA-12366	1005 to 870 BC (960, 925 BC)
θ_3	OxA-12637	920 to 815 BC (885 BC)
θ_4	OxA-12368	890 to 790 BC (835 BC)
θ_5	OxA-12169	1260 to 1240 BC, 1215 to 1200BC, 1195 to 1020 BC (multi-modal distribution)
θ_6	OxA-12342	1055 to 915BC (multi-modal distribution)
θ_7	OxA-12168	970 to 830 BC (895 BC)
θ_8	OxA-12274	900 to 765BC (815 BC)

Table 3.

Individual HPD regions for each determination given at 95% probability and rounded to five years. The figure in brackets represents the modal value, the year(s) associated with the highest probability, except in cases where the distribution is multi-modal as in Figure 7.

Parameter	HPD intervals (BC/AD) (95% prob.)
β_4	885 BC to 415AD (mode 810 BC)
β_8	890BC to 560AD (mode 806 BC)
α_1	4040 BC to 935BC (mode 1122 BC)
α_5	3115 to 1015BC (mode 1193 BC)

Table 4.

HPD regions for the parameters associated with the periods immediately post- and pre-dating settlement at Khirbat en-Nahas (see model in Figure 6 for parameters). The attention of the reader is drawn to the modal values which represent the value associated with the highest probability within the distribution.



Figure 1.

Lowland Edom: Aerial view of Khirbat en-Nahas, view southeast. Note the large square fortress (ca. 73 x 73 meters), black copper slag deposits and the numerous remains of collapsed buildings on the site surface. Photo: JHF Project (1999), UCSD Levantine Archaeology Laboratory.



Figure 2.

Seal impression from Umm el-Biyara reading “Qos-Gabr, King of Edom”. Source: Bienkowski 1992a: Fig 11.2.




Figure 3.
Map of Khirbat en Nahas. Source: Levy *et al.* 2004: 869.



Figure 4.

Highland Edom: View of Iron Age excavations at Umm al-Biyara in the Petra district. Photo: T.E. Levy.



Figure 5.

Scarabs from Khirbat en-Nahas. Source: Levy *et al.* 2004: 875.




Figure 6.
Calibration model for Areas A and S at Khirbat en-Nahas.




Figure 7.
Posterior probability density plot for θ_6 in the model (OxA-12342) (Table 3).