APPENDIX: THE POTTERY FROM KHIRBAT MADD ED-DEIR (KIBBUTZ MA‘ABAROT)

EDNA J. STERN

The excavation of the plastered cistern (L105) at Kibbutz Ma‘abarot, within the boundaries of the site of Khirbat Madd ed-Deir, yielded a small assemblage of ceramic fragments (Figs. 1–3). The pottery was retrieved from two contexts. The first is the cistern’s plaster, into which pottery sherds were embedded; the majority are ribbed body sherds, and one is a diagnostic rim (Fig. 1; see Fig. 4 in the main article). The rim, although a very small fragment, seems to belong to a ‘Bag-Shaped’ Jar made of reddish fabric with some white grits, which dates from the Byzantine period (e.g., Calderon 2000:127, Pl. XVII:12, 14, Fig. 17). The presence of ribbed body sherds along with this rim clearly dates the pottery sherds embedded in the plaster to the Byzantine period.

The second context is the accumulation within the cistern (Figs. 2, 3). The pottery types that were found in this accumulation can be dated roughly to the thirteenth–sixteenth centuries CE. They include handmade wares, unglazed wheel-made wares and imported glazed tablewares.

HANDMADE WARES (Fig. 2:1–4)

The handmade wares include a basin (Fig. 2:1), a geometric-painted body fragment (Fig. 2:2) and two cooking-pot fragments (Fig. 2:3, 4). The basin has slightly curved sides, a flattened rim and ledge handles. It is covered with red slip on the interior and is burnished. The body fragment of the geometric-painted ware is small, but it seems to belong to a jug or a jar. It is adorned with a design painted in blue-black paint. One cooking-pot fragment belongs to a globular cooking pot with a short, everted rim.

Fig. 1. Byzantine Jar from the plaster coating the cistern (L105, B1022/1, 2).

---

1 My thanks go to Yossi Elisha, for inviting me to study the pottery from his excavation, to Marina Shuiskaya, who drew the pottery, and to Edna Dalili-Amos, who took photographs of the sherds. Pringle (1986) uses the transliteration ‘Maad ad-Dair’.
and no neck (Fig. 2:3); the other fragment is of a horizontal ledge handle (Fig. 2:4). Both fragments are made of coarse fabric, which includes calcite particles, and are burnished on the exterior. Soot marks cover the lower part of the exterior of Fragment 4, below the handle, indicating that the pot was used
on an open fire. External soot marks were recorded on a similar vessel found at Khirbat Yamma (Stern 2017:3, Fig. 2:3–4), indicating that these vessels were indeed used for cooking.

A petrographic analysis conducted by Gabrielli, Ben Shlomo and Walker (2014) on a wide range of contemporaneous handmade vessels from various sites demonstrated that several major workshops marketed these products across long distances. This finding refuted earlier suggestions that the handmade wares were locally manufactured in the various villages (Avissar and Stern 2005:88; Milwright 2010:155–156). The four handmade vessels found in the cistern represent the three groups that Gabrielli, Ben Shlomo and Walker identified as the products of three separate industries. These industries differed from each other, as they specialized in producing vessels intended for different functions: the undecorated vessels (represented by Fig. 2:1) served mainly for the preparation and storage of food; the geometric-painted vessels (represented by Fig. 2:2) were used as tableware for serving food, and were therefore decorated; and the third group of vessels (represented by Fig. 2:3, 4) was designated for cooking and baking. The products of all three industries are found abundantly in excavations of Mamluk-period sites in the Sharon plain (for a discussion, see Stern 2017:3–5). As for chronology, following Gabrielli Gabrielli, Ben Shlomo and Walker (2014:221), who suggest that the geometric-painted vessels decorated with blue-black paint did not appear before the late thirteenth or the fourteenth century CE, the sherd in Fig. 2:2 should be dated to the Mamluk period.

UNGLOZED WHEEL-MADE WARES (Fig. 2:5–8)

This group includes simple bowls (Fig. 2:5–7) and a jar with a thickened rim (Fig. 2:8); they share the same local, reddish-brown fabric.

Whereas Bowls 5 and 6 are of a commonly found form, having a carintated shoulder, the form of Bowl 7 is less common. It has a rounded profile, and its fabric is very coarse, with numerous air bubbles and large white inclusions. In addition, its interior was left unsmoothed, suggesting that it served as a lid. Similar carinated bowls are usually found in large quantities in urban sites, such as Ramla (e.g., Cytryn-Silverman 2010:121–122, Pls. 9.28, 9.34:4, Photos 9.26–9.29; Toueg and Stern 2016: Fig. 3:4; Stern, Toueg and Shapiro 2019:137–139) and Jerusalem (Tushingham 1985:148, Fig. 41:1–6; Avissar and Stern 2005:82, Fig. 35:7–10, Type II.1.1.3), as well as in several rural sites, albeit in smaller numbers, such as at Giv’at Dani (Lazar 1999:130*, Fig. 4:1–6) and Khirbat Burin (Kletter and Stern 2006:184–185, Fig. 15:1).

The jar (Fig. 2:8) is of a common type found at Mamluk-period settlements in the Sharon plain, such as Khirbat Burin (Kletter and Stern 2006:186, Fig. 16:8) and Khirbat Yamma (Stern 2017:5, Fig. 2:8).

GLAZED TABLE WARES (Fig. 3)

The glazed table ware found at the site includes only imports, both from nearby lands, as the Soft-Paste Wares from Syria (Fig. 3:1, 2), and from afar, as the monochrome green-glazed vessels from Italy (Fig. 3:3–5).
The forms of the Soft-Paste Wares found here include a bowl with a high ring base (Fig. 3:1) and a closed vessel—a jug or a jar (Fig. 3:2). Their fabric is fritty and white, made of a soft paste: a mixture of crushed quartz, white clay and glass-frit. The glaze is alkaline-based and is painted either
in black and turquoise under a transparent glaze, as in the case of the bowl, or in dark blue under a turquoise glaze, as in the case of the closed vessel. Whereas the first decoration scheme dates from the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries CE, with a floruit in the fourteenth century CE (Avissar and Stern 2005:28–29, Type I.2.3.3), the second dates from the second half of the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries CE (Avissar and Stern 2005:26, Type I.2.3.1). Found throughout the Levant, Soft-Paste Wares are very common in Mamluk-period assemblages at other sites in the Sharon plain, such as el-Burj el-Āḥmar, Khirbat Ibreika, Tell Jatt, Khirbat Burin and Khirbat Yamma (Stern 2017:10–11, Fig. 4:9, 10, and see additional citations therein).

The monochrome green-glazed vessels include two bowls, of which only the bases were preserved—a high, narrow, outward-turned base (Fig. 3:3) and a wide, low ring base (Fig. 3:4)—and a rounded jug with the beginning of a handle (Fig. 3:5); all have a bright green glaze over a white slip. The fabric of the three vessels is reddish yellow in color, and it contains small white grits and mica. The general makeup of the fabric and the mica associate these vessels with well-known northern Italian products, mainly sgraffito wares (Avissar and Stern 2005:73, Type I.9.5). As sgraffito-ware bowls usually bear a distinct incised decoration, it seems to be a coincidence that none of the examples here have that decoration. Italian sgraffito wares have been identified at a growing number of rural sites, in addition to those already known from urban sites; they date from the late fourteenth century to the early sixteenth century CE (Stern 2017:11, Fig. 4:12–14, and see a list and citations therein).

**Discussion**

The sherds embedded in the plaster coating the walls of the cistern date clearly to the Byzantine period. The widespread supposition is that pottery sherds that are inserted into plaster date the plaster, as builders did not collect pottery sherds from earlier periods, but rather picked up contemporary sherds, possibly from waster dumps at nearby pottery workshops. Following this reasoning, it is indeed plausible that the cistern was built and plastered during the Byzantine period. It is also suggested that the cistern was reused during the Crusader and Mamluk periods, and was associated with the Crusader-period tower that was documented at the site in the past and identified as part of the Frankish village of *Casale Latinae* or *Montdidier* (Pringle 1986:37–39, Site 25, Fig. 9, Pl. VIII; 1997:67, Site 139).

The pottery types found in the accumulation inside the cistern can be dated from the thirteenth century CE (handmade wares, Soft-Paste Wares) to the sixteenth century CE (Italian imports). The

---

2 I would like to thank Anastasia Shapiro for examining the fabric of these vessels with a ×10 magnifying glass and for comparing them to Italian vessels found at the citadel at Safed (Ẓefat; unpublished material; for information on the excavation, see Barbé and Damati 2005).

3 I would like to thank Nimrod Getzov for a discussion on this topic.
chronological range of these ceramic finds is very broad, starting at the end of the Crusader period, through the Mamluk period and ending in the early Ottoman period. However, while the period of use for most of the types spanned over a hundred years, the various periods of use overlapped during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries CE. Thus, although some types can be dated to the Crusader period—and can thus reflect the Crusader settlement at the site—these make up a very small part of the assemblage. However, the absence of additional well-dated Crusader-period sherds seems to suggest that the assemblage, as a whole, dates from the Mamluk period.

Pringle (1986:37) suggested that the Frankish settlement at the site was dismantled and did not continue into the Mamluk period. He grounded this argument on the absence of any mention of the settlement in the Arabic lists of lands in the region that were divided by Baybars to the Amirs. However, as demonstrated above, the ceramic evidence points to some form of habitation at the site during the Mamluk period. This dating, it should be stressed, is offered here with great caution, due to the small number of sherds making up the assemblage. Furthermore, the nature of this habitation or a possible reuse of the nearby Crusader-period tower during the Mamluk period cannot be fully understood based on such merger ceramic remains.

That being said, the assemblage is nonetheless significant as it provides a glimpse into the life in yet another Mamluk and early-Ottoman rural settlement in the Sharon plain, along with the sites of el-Burj el-Aḥmar (Pringle 1986), Khirbat Burin (Kletter and Stern 2006), Khirbat Ibreika (Yannai 2006), Tell Jatt (Yannai 2010) and Khirbat Yamma (Stern 2017). The Khirbat Madd ed-Deir assemblage exhibits two interesting features. The first is exemplified by the simple, unglazed bowls. As noted above, these are usually found in large quantities in urban centers, although their presence has been recorded at a few rural settlements, albeit in smaller numbers. It has been suggested by the author that these bowls were probably considered disposable vessels, as they were used for purchased cooked food in the large cities, where the use of fire in the homes was banned due to the risk of conflagration (for a discussion, see Stern 2014:99–100). The second feature is the Green-glazed wares that were imported from Italy. These were identified at four of the abovementioned sites—Khirbat Burin, Khirbat Ibreika, Tell Jatt and Khirbat Yamma. It has been suggested that these glazed wares arrived with Italian merchants who came to trade cotton and other agricultural goods in Palestine, and are therefore found at these small countryside site (for a discussion of this phenomenon, see Stern 2017:14–15).

Although these two groups of vessels—the very simple bowls of local production and the imported glazed bowls and jug—are very different, they were both used for the same purpose: as receptacles for food. Thus, they hold tangible data that can shed light on issues such as food consumption and international maritime trade during the Mamluk and the beginning of the Ottoman periods.

---

4 It is important to emphasize that such an identification can be achieved only through a close examination of the fabric. This clearly underscores the importance of a close examination and a detailed description of the fabric of ceramic sherds (for further discussion, see Stern, Toueg and Shapiro 2019).
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