

ARCHAEOLOGY: THE IRON AGE IN PALESTINE

As I have mentioned before, there have been various explanations which I have given for the end of Late Bronze and Iron when I couldn't figure out what the real problem was because there are contradictions. I think now, for the first time, we are able to give a summary that represents the best explanation of all of the apparent problems which have come to our attention (as well as, of course, to the attention of the archaeologists).

Beware of Strong Claims!

Let me give you a little introductory background: For some time I labored under the illusion that the stronger the man makes a claim the more likely it is that he is right; otherwise he wouldn't make his statement so emphatic. Later one discovers that normally a scholar has to make big claims when there is no proof!--but if you have the proof you don't have to worry about the claims!

I will go back to history for an example of this. For years and years there was the problem of Dynasties 18 and 19. Velikovskiy is the one who broke through the problem for us finally. All the ancient historians say that Dynasty 18 of the Thutmoses and Dynasty 19 of the Ramessides is correctly dated, and before that there are problems. Well, I knew the problems before that and we solved those, but then I couldn't make sense out of this period although everybody claims to have it correctly chronologically placed out of within almost a year--that is the claim!--and you would take this for granted until you realized that the claim was based strictly on astronomy! On astronomy--not on history at all! That is, it was the astronomical sequence which was used to give the dates of those dynasties. They could have been any number of cycles later, or earlier for that matter, if you're going to go by astronomy. And the weak link they never discussed which is the period of Dynasties 21, 22, 23, 24; they simply gloss over those so you don't detect the problem!

Iron Age the Period of the Israelite Kings?

Now in the archaeology of Palestine we confront the same thing: There is the bold statement that the Iron Age is clearly the age of Israel because it is the period of Samaria, and the ware of the city of Samaria, capital of Israel. There can be no doubt about it, they say! (See Compendium, vol. one, page 484.)

If that's true then what are we going to do with Late Bronze, you see? So this puzzled me for a long time, and I had the Iron Period incorrectly dated to start with because I accepted Albright's statement. Later on we came to realize that something was wrong, but how to correctly place the Iron Age was yet a bit obscure--whether it should be parallel with the end of Late Bronze in Palestine or succeed it. Now I think we have basically resolved the problem.

We have clear material in many sources--the Cambridge Ancient History, archaeological evidence--it is absolutely clear that Dynasties 19 and 20 of Egypt pertain to the Late Bronze Age. Look into the Compendium for the correct dating of these two dynasties. The Nineteenth Dynasty parallels the end of Assyria and Nebuchadnezzar. Rameses the Great was a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar. The Twentieth Dynasty was Rameses III--not the Great but III (the Third). He is the contemporary of the Persian king during the time of Egyptian independence from Persia--this is in the fourth century B. C.--and he died shortly before Alexander's conquest. All this belongs to Late Bronze. The archaeological evidence for this is very clear.

This requires then, without a doubt, that Iron I A represents the period of Persian treading through Palestine and the reconquest of Egypt. And Iron I B is the so-called Philistine period, but could be none other than the admitted Greek pottery—they think it was merely that the Philistines came out of the Grecian area at this time, but actually it included the Greeks themselves; it also concludes the time of Alexander the Great and those who succeeded him. (Look at pages 483-4 in vol. one of the Compendium.)

Now the question is, How do we put the rest of the story together?

Palestinian Pottery Not a Guide in This Period

First of all we cannot—listen carefully to this so you understand—we cannot associate clearly the pottery evidence of Palestine with the Biblical record. This is because the Biblical record at this point, unlike the early period, doesn't tell us the same thing that it did before. In the early period you have a people coming in who weren't there before—Abraham, Jacob coming in with his wives and that culture; you had the destruction of a whole people by another people who invade the country; you have invasions over and over again in certain periods as in the Period of Judges which is applied to the sequence of Middle Bronze.

But when you come to the Late Bronze, you are dealing with a different situation. There may have been wars, but you will discover that the people still lived in the cities. And unless we can be sure that a war passed through a city, you don't know whether it was a war layer, a destruction by fire by accident or whatever it might have been. In other words, there is no displacement of population until the departure of Israel. Therefore we have to rely more on contemporary history; that is, do we have scarabs, do we have fragmentary names of foreigners who would then be parallel with this archaeological sequence, and so on.

Heirlooms as a Factor in Archaeology

Now you should be aware that if you have an archaeological sequence in which you will find a scarab of Ramesses the Great we can draw one of two conclusions. If this has not been altered by later digging so that the record was buried accidentally below the actual period of time, if you can see that the horizon has not been effected by later building of trenches for walls and that it is just as the original stratigraphy demanded, then one could conclude that any material pertaining to Ramesses belongs to the time of Ramesses, or that it could be later, but it clearly couldn't be before Ramesses and have Ramesses' remains in it.

In other words, you can always have heirlooms! This is always a possibility, although I think it is often greatly overplayed by archaeologists; nevertheless, you should be aware of it as a possibility. There is always a possibility that archaeological remains of a ruler or a king of a certain period may indeed be found later in terms of documents which in no way serve to date the archaeological horizon in which they are found but merely show that these objects were in circulation later.

Normally this is not the case, though archaeologists put more stress on it by far than they should. However, in a few instances this will be the case—so bear that in mind. This can always happen. I have some material in my home—maybe some books or some pieces of pottery—that might be one or two hundred years old. These objects do not date the house or the other things in it. This kind of thing can happen.

Dating Iron I A

Now, we come normally in Late Bronze all the way down to the material clearly associated with the building of Ramesses III of the Twentieth Dynasty whose dates are 381 to 350 B.C. (vol. one of Compendium, page 230). We have no basic Late Bronze material after this point. His material seems to be mostly associated with the close of Late Bronze. (There might be variations in some areas where the old culture continued somewhat.)

But suddenly we have an incursion of a people that are associated with the minor remains called Iron I A, though this will normally be parallel with Late Bronze in other cases. This could hardly be other, now, than the Persian devastation of the country. Iron I A deposits are normally insignificant—very short in duration.

Iron I A is usually assigned to the whole Period of Judges!

Modern-day scholars shorten the Period of Judges to about a century when it was actually $3\frac{1}{2}$ centuries (prior to the Philistine domination)! And anybody who has made a study recognizes the following: If Iron I A is of the Judges, as Albright and all the others would conclude, then it is impossible to have the Period of Judges as long as the Bible says it is—there aren't that many remains!

In the first place, Iron I A does not replace Late Bronze like the Children of Israel replaced the Canaanites! It doesn't represent that kind of devastation of a culture! It is a transition made by a power that comes from the north and devastates many of the coastal cities and not the hill cities. There is no way to reconcile Iron I A with the Biblical record! There just isn't! The amount of remains are so small we would have to conclude that the archaeologists have made a major error; but the evidence would be in perfect agreement with the status of material in Palestine during this brief period of activity at the close of the Persian Empire when the Persians were marching through Palestine to put down revolts in Egypt (Compendium, vol. one, chapter 9). [Although there are parallels with Late Bronze, we may say that the transitional period of Iron I A may be dated 350-330 B.C. Ed.]

Identifying Iron I B

And then suddenly we have the conquest of Alexander the Great! And Alexander's conquest brings a host of people out of the Aegean world who spread all over the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean and into Palestine. For example, the city of Decapolis mentioned in the New Testament—Decapolis meaning "the Ten City"—was a Greek city. Many Greek cities were established, many Greeks settled all through the Middle East!

Here suddenly is this "Philistine" invasion. That's what it's called—but it's not Philistine, it's Greek!

The associated ware is admittedly Greek pottery derived from sub-Mycenean III C ware (vol one, page 483). This is Greek ware. There isn't any question! So there is no reason not to associate it with the time of Alexander the Great if we have the whole previous archaeological pattern correctly laid out.

It is impossible to associate this pottery with the Philistines for two reasons: One, the Biblical record shows clearly that the Philistines were there long before the ware suddenly makes its appearance (which was in the days of Abraham); and two, we're already down to the days of Alexander anyway.

Further, many of the Philistine cities dominated by the Philistines in Israel in the days of Saul (like Beth-shan—also spelled Beth-sheg) shows no Philistine ware. wasn't a Greek city, but it was a Philistine city—but it was a Philistine city at the end of Middle Bronze, that's the difference. In other words, the archaeologist is confronted with the fact that even though Philistine ware is heavily associated with the Philistine culture because that's where the Greeks settled, he cannot explain why Philistine ware—so-called, which is really Greek—does not occur in cities known to belong to the Philistines in the days of Saul! Therefore, either the Biblical record is wrong or the archaeological record is incorrectly associated.

In other words, what the men do who write these things is to draw conclusions, to smooth it all over, and never to mention these things unless it's a little side point but, "We don't draw the attention of the reader to this lest he begin to question us!"

Now, if we're going to prove whether the Philistine ware is Philistine, we need to find whether it is found essentially in those cities known to be associated with Philistine control in Palestine listed in the Bible. If they don't agree then that just isn't the answer. And, of course, chronologically it already couldn't be the answer.

So we have Iron I B representing the time of Alexander. And, since it has some significant duration of deposit, there is every evidence to conclude that Iron I B is the period of Alexander and the Ptolemies from around 330 to around 200 or the 190's—maybe 198-195. In other words, it represents something like a period of a century and a quarter to a century and a third in duration. There is no problem in concluding that Iron I B should represent this length of time.

Culture Described as "Miserable"

The culture and the ware of the time is said to reflect "miserable" living conditions. To what period in the Bible do the archaeologists assign it? You might well guess it—the TIME OF SOLOMON!! Yes, this is assigned to the period of the United Monarchy in Israel! This is something to think about--the time of David and Solomon! It is called "miserable."

There is destruction; Shechem is destroyed. I won't go into all the notes I have here for the moment, but there is significant destruction throughout the country to more than one place. Obviously this is the story of the Syrian Wars waged between the Syrians and the Ptolemies (see pages 96-97 in the new edition of Langer). The Ptolemaic Period represents the Greeks in Egypt who dominated Palestine after Alexander down to the middle of the first decade of the second century B.C.—198 or 195 B.C., something like that. And, after all, the archaeology doesn't change all of a sudden.

The Biblical record describes Palestine as rich, prosperous and full of trade in the days of Solomon—anything but "miserable!" They were able to build a temple the like of which has never been erected since, at least in terms of its gold and its woods. And yet the culture associated with it is said to be miserable! It is often said that king's horses lived better than his servants. This merely means that the people who lived in Palestine were living poorer than the stables which the Ptolemies built in the country to hold it under military control. That's all this is telling us.

But the archaeologists are trying to make us believe that the people of Israel were so miserable when the Queen of Sheba visited Solomon and the people were eating and drinking and making merry—just the opposite of being miserable! It is true that Solomon did tax them later in his reign, but you only tax people who can afford to pay it. You don't get any taxes if the people are miserable. They may be miserable paying it! —but there are no taxes to be gotten from people who are paupers and have nothing to offer!

Associating Iron I C

We come next to Iron I C which I would associate with the Syrians. It starts out "miserable" and continues to be "more miserable." These are expressions used by Kathleen Kenyon and others to describe this period—"miserable" and "more miserable." These are the archaeologists' words, not my own description!

Iron I C is said to be due to a new people dominating Palestine in the city of Megiddo—which wouldn't make any sense if this is already securely under the control of Israel in the time of Solomon. Israel never lost Megiddo after Solomon was in control; the House of Israel retained it, had been living there before. Actually, these new people who now dominate the country are the Syrians, you see, and the people who live there are very poor. There is no prosperity! There are no imports in the cities where the Jews and the native Asians lived! That's important: No prosperity, no imports—also hand-burnished ware. As for the walls of the time: Strongest possible with the least amount of money and effort invested. We find temples being erected—the story of the Syrians imposing their religion on the country.

So we may date Iron I C as approximately the period 195 to 165 B.C.

Iron II A — the Maccabean Period

Then we come to a change: Violent destruction takes place in the land. We have come now to Iron II A.

Following the violent destruction we have the appearance, in archaeological horizons, of the Star of David, the Tree of Life, and an increase in town life, as well as more wars. This could be none other than the time of the Maccabees who overthrew the Syrians!

We have the Syrian Period, then, from around 195 or 190 to 165—a much shorter period for Iron I C than Iron I B (but the population would be increasing).

The indication is that Iron II A continued down to the Roman conquest of the country around 63 B.C. I'm not going to say that this is absolutely certain about this; however, it seems to end in a certain destruction layer here and there when the Romans very possibly took it over. In other words, Iron II A probably lasted from 165 to 63 B.C. I would assume here that the probability is that Iron II A is from the beginning of the Maccabean Period to the finalization of Roman control (remembering that the Maccabees were at first allies).

Iron II B — the Roman Period

Iron II B would then represent the rest of the Roman Period in Palestine.

That would be a shocker for the scholarly world because, normally, after Iron II B you come, in the normal archaeological scheme, to the Persian Period, then you come to the Hellenistic Period (the Greek), and then you finally reach the Roman!

How are we going to reconcile the overall story here--that you come from Early to Middle to Late Bronze to Iron I and II and II A and II B; and then how can you have Iron II B as the Roman Period, starting the Iron with the Persian conquest just before the coming of Alexander—how then can you have, on top of all this (which is thought to be the time of the Babylonian Captivity—they think that Iron II B ends with the fall of

Jerusalem in 585 B.C.!) all the rest of the archaeological sequence? Well, I think we can answer this problem very simply and logically. When you see the story, you will realize that the archaeologists have completely misunderstood the difference between Persian ware in the Persian-dominated sites, the Greek cities settled by Greeks after the overthrow of the Persians, and the native areas.

Remember that Late Bronze for the Nineteenth Dynasty takes us to the Babylonian Period; the Late Bronze continues to the Persian Period all the way to Dynasty 20; and then Iron I A begins the Persian reconquest in the 340's B.C.; then Alexander and the Ptolemies are represented by Iron I B; the Syrians by I C; and the Maccabees by II A; and finally down to the Roman Period of II B. That is our picture in summary.

What Event Occurred at the End of Iron II B?

I want you to notice a statement in The Bible and the Ancient Near East, page 117 in the paperback edition and page 96 in the hardback, the very beginning of Section VII: "The second Iron Age is now generally extended to cover the periods of the divided monarchy of Israel (II A), and the kingdom of Judah (II B) after the destruction of the northern kingdom [by Assyria]...and the exilic period (II C).... We shall bring this survey [in this book] and our charts to a close, however, with Iron II B, ending in Judah in 587 B.C."—instead of 70 A.D. as I would say—"because at that point the series of coherent and interlacing stratifications of the various excavated sites comes to a close."

Now, if the "coherent" sequence and stratification comes to a close, except for Samaria, how are you going to impose on top of what is ended the Persian, the Hellenistic, and the Roman cultures? Answer: The Iron Age remains represent the Jewish cities—they contain the culture of the native Jews! The non-Jewish cultural sequence and artifacts—the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman—are found in the other non-Jewish towns and cities! The native and non-native cultural sequences run parallel instead of consecutively!

At a certain point in Palestine, which we have established as 70 A.D., city after city ends (except one that goes to the later period of 135 A.D. when the Jews were again overthrown by the Romans). These were the sites that were settled by the natives from ancient times—Canaanite through Israelite through Persian (that is, the Jewish period), to Roman (Hellenistic Roman, the Jewish period—during all that time), till the Jews were expelled! We are dealing here—listen carefully—with the following names, Biblical names: Ashkelon, Beth-shemesh, Beth-shan, Megiddo, Mirsim, Bethel. Not one of these cities is Greek! These are all cities inhabited by the natives—the Jews!

When they are explaining the pottery in these sites—and we have clear evidence of the time-element because we have the chronology absolutely proved! There is no question about that! We have the dates correct so there is no other conclusion but that the Iron Age goes to 70 A.D. Now Albright saw that Iron II B stopped at a certain point. As he said, he knows almost no place—almost no place—in Palestine where the area was not devastated. That's why he thought the end of Iron II B marked Nebuchadnezzar's captivity of the Jews! When he first wrote, he said it was all obliterated. [We find this statement on page 142 of Albright's The Archaeology of Palestine, the Pelican paperback now out of print: "There is not a single known case where a town of Judah proper was continuously occupied through the exilic period."/] Since then I have heard other archaeologists say that they have found a few areas where the culture did indeed continue.

From this they draw the erroneous conclusion that there was not a true 70-years' captivity. There really was—they don't realize that it was much earlier during the Late Bronze period; but there was no change in culture and that's why it has not been

taken note of. I should dwell on this point a little more: There are clear indications of the demise of culture at a certain point in Late Bronze, and its degeneration right at the close during the period of the restoration of the Jews under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah.

Persian, Greek and Roman Cities

So here in cities such as Ashkelon, Megiddo and Bethel are clear indications of the pottery sequence of the native people of Palestine, the Jews, all during the so-called "Iron Age" period. What are we going to do, then, with what we would call the Persian, Greek and Roman cities?

Let me go back for a moment: Early, Middle and Late Bronze and Iron take us to the Jewish captivity of 70 A.D. And, in a few cases, Iron II B goes all the way to 135 A.D. when the Jewish revolt against the Romans called the Barcocheba occurred. The cities with this sequence are those that we find associated with the Biblical record--like Hazor which continued to 135 (and maybe even afterward where there is a Roman vault on the top of Phase I).

Now the cities which have another sequence called "Iron" and labeled Persian, Greek and Roman--which is truly Persian, Greek and Roman!--are these: Ramat-rahale (check spelling), Tell Abu Hawan, Tell el Far'ah at Joppa, Tell Jammeh, and Samaria. All of these are essentially non-Jewish cities! They are cities of either the Philistines (possibly in that area--probably not, in most cases) or the Phoenicians, cities that the Persians colonized, cities that the Greeks and Romans lived in!

The pottery of these non-Jewish sites will be correctly dated. Why? Because it is associated with known Greek culture, known Roman, known Persian culture. These cities are basically never mentioned in the Bible (the cities that, normally, G. Ernest Wright doesn't even mention). These are the cities that archaeologists are now using to fill the chronological void they have created--which was created by pushing back the destruction of the Jewish community of 70 A.D. back to 585 B.C. In other words, it's a 650-year gap--this is what has happened! In short, if the archaeology of Jewish remains has been pushed back $6\frac{1}{2}$ centuries, you are going to have to fill it up with the rest of the story! This they have done by putting the parallel remains of the non-Jewish areas, as a whole, into these many intervening years! Remember, in these other areas the natives lived--they didn't trade, they were so poor they couldn't afford to; and when they could afford to they didn't want to, as a whole, because they did not want to be Hellenized anymore (under the Maccabees).

It took me a long time to isolate this problem. In the case of one site which I would be reading about, there would be absolutely no doubt that their sequence was correct all the way back to the Persian period. They would find Persian wares in Palestine directly related to wares in Persia; Assyrian wares the same way. But listen: Always, the sites which have the Assyrian, Persian and Hellenistic wares are sites which do not have, below these periods, the Iron I and II which follows Late Bronze in these other cities (the native Jewish sites). (They may call the Persian material "Iron III" but that's just their definition--it doesn't appear anywhere on any of the other sites, it stops at Iron II B.)

They have created a problem! This is why Wm. F. Albright says, in The Archaeology of Palestine, that when we push back the Iron ware as early as we did we were left with a blank because all these [Jewish] cities end up empty! [The exact quote from page 142 is: "When this pottery was transferred to its proper date (!!!???) before 587 B.C. (!!!), it left something (???) of a void behind." I should say so!]

Note: This page contains additional statements on the Iron Period taken from the discussion class of 11-7-68. These points will place emphasis on certain important topics covered in the preceding lecture.

You should be definitely aware of this: There is no known site in Palestine that continues to the end of Iron II B that is succeeded by anything Persian!

...A lot of their confusion has arisen because some of Iron I and Iron II ware is the same as Iron III. After all, it's contemporary! And they have found no place where Early Persian succeeds Late Iron II B. There is no place in Palestine because the sequence is completed.

A student asks, "Is Iron III to be dated 70-135 A.D. or is it after that?"

Dr. Hoeh's answer: Well, Iron III, by their definition, is Persian material. Therefore it precedes Iron I and II (if I limit it to Albright's new definition rather than the broader definition that I was using based on some of the earlier work). Therefore Iron III, in fact, would precede all of Iron II and also precede Iron I B and C. It would be parallel with the end of Late Bronze and parallel with Iron I A. Wouldn't it? That's the Persian Period, right?

There is no known place in Palestine—this is the point—no known Palestine (in fact, therefore, no place) where you will actually discover—it would be an impossibility!—true Persian ware on top of the end of Iron II. It would be impossible because one's Persian and the other is Judaeo-Roman in its time-setting!

Another interesting point is that Dothan, an archaeologist writing in the journal Atiqot, mentions how often Hellenistic deposits are found in the early Iron II material—which is exactly what one would expect because Iron II is still in this Hellenistic setting. Remember, Hellenism goes all the way down to the Roman conquest of Palestine which occurred in 63 B.C. Therefore Iron II during the Maccabean Period is still Hellenistic—you see, in this period, it's Late Hellenistic.

I have a whole work on Bethshan where constantly Late Hellenistic and Early Iron II are found associated. This is the case—and they don't know why! In this book on Bethshan, the author tries desperately to discount the Late Hellenistic sherds that have confused the issue! And he literally discounts all the Hellenistic material that he has found associated with Iron II! He literally discounts it because, in his estimation, he is dealing here with Jews with Iron II ware who were adopting Hellenistic pottery styles, see? And since Iron II is supposed to be pre-exilic—before Nebuchadnezzar—he has to assume that the deposit has become mixed!

We must realize that this is their definition: Whenever two things that don't belong together, in their estimation, are found together by definition it has to be mixed! And therefore they merely separate out the Iron II ware—which was found in other cases with no Hellenistic sherds, see? (where they weren't importing it, that's it—where the Jews had nothing to do with the Hellenists)—and therefore separating in time what on the deposit was side-by-side!

You only find this kind of detailed description in the archaeological journals. And this is an excellent illustration of the kind of problem they create for themselves by misassociating the Bible and/or the true historical pattern with the archaeological sequence.

Supposed Events	Supposed Date	KK	W	A	Actual Events	True Date
					Roman	
					L Hellenistic	
					E really out of place! this level is <u>never found in sequence</u> .	
Persian				IA3	a map of population density would leave Judea empty & coast area full. Josephus records millions killed keeping PO!	135 AD
Fall of Jerusalem	587			IA2C		
	6--			IA2B	Roman destruction of Jerusalem	70 AD
				IA2A	Roman Conquest	63 BC
Division of Is & Ju	900			IA2A	Maccabees	168 BC
Monarchy	1000			IA1C	"more miserable" Syrian Greeks (Seleucids)	198/5
Judges	12--			IA1B	"miserable" Ptolemaic Greeks (called Philistines)	330/1
	1200			IA1A	Persian Re-conquest	350
Conquest Exodus	1300			LB1B	Neb. - 70 yr. captivity of Persians	650
	1400			LB1A	Amarna Period (Asa) Jehoshaphat end of Assyrian domination	650
	1550/1500			LB1	Solomon David Sennacherib Conquest by Tutmoses III (Shishak)	1000 468
	1650/1625			MB-LB MB1C	Philistine Harassment--end of Saul's reign	1050/12
Hyk Domination	1750/1700			MB1 MB1B	Saul Samson, Samuel (1107) Gideon Deborah, Barak, Shamgar Ehud Othniel	1272 - 1292 1177 - 1197 1234 - 1194 1234 - 1254 1342 - 1352
Ammerites strong	1,900			MB1 MB1A	Jud. 3:8 8yr. Occupation of Cushanrishathium	1400
	2,000			interm. MB1	Joshua & the elders	1425 - Joshua dies 1442 - begin settling 1447
	2,100			EB- (gap)	conquest: Jericho & Ai	EXODUS 1487
	2,200			MB EB1V EB1B EB1A	not known (Bible not in question)	
	2,400			EB1V EB1B EB1A	Great Walled Cities -- Canaanites	
	2,700			EB1B EB1A	Israel to Egypt	
	2,900			EB1B EB1A	burnished ware - Jacob	
	3,300			EB1B EB1A	Sodom & Gomorrah Well-watered plain	Abraham earliest postflood 1917
				Chalcolithic	Yarmuk	
	5,000			EARLY LATE	empty (flood) Tower of Babel	2254 2370
				Neolithic	Tahunian & Jerichoan	pot A, B (eroded chalcolithic) [350 yrs] pre-pot B - Lamech (Jericho) Tubalcain (Gatal Hüyük) [400 yrs] pre-pot A - Cain (Jericho) [200 yrs] empty - Cain wanders
	8,000			Mesolithic	Natufian	Adam dies 600 AM 400 AM
	10,000			Upper Paleolithic	[Gravettian, Aurignacian] blade	300 AM
	30,000			Middle Paleolithic	Mousterian, Levalloisian, Neanderthal	250 AM
	70,000			Lower Paleolithic	(1) Tayacian (Tabunian) (2) Bifacial (3) Pollic Culture	40 11 5 2 } SITES

