Tell Abu Suwwan is the only Neolithic site excavated north of the Zarqa River in Jordan. Its architectural characteristics and the diagnostic lithic artifacts discovered at the site during the University of Jordan 2005 and 2006 field seasons, directed by the author, suggest that the site was occupied continually from the Middle Pre-Pottery Neolithic Phase B (MPPNB) to the Yarmoukian (Pottery Neolithic) period. The site was divided by the excavator into two areas—A and B. Area A yielded a few walls, plaster floors, and orange clay. Area B yielded a large square or rectangular building with three clear types of plaster floors and an orange clay area. Both Areas A and B include numerous lithics, bones, and some small finds. Based on a recent survey outward from the excavated area, the probable size of Abu Suwwan is 10.5 ha (26 acres), and it contains complex architecture with a long chronological sequence. These attributes suggest that Tell Abu Suwwan is one of the Jordanian Neolithic megasites.

INTRODUCTION

Tell Abu Suwwan is a large Neolithic site in north Jordan; it is on the east side of the old Jarash–Amman highway, immediately before the turn west to Ajlun (fig. 1).

Abu Suwwan was first recorded by Harding (1948) and subsequently tested in 1955 by Diana Kirkbride (1958). More recently, Alan Simmons, Deborah Olszewski, and Zeidan Kafafi (1988) reported a small surface collection from the site. Although the site has been known and visited by both archaeologists and non-archaeologists for several decades, it had not been intensively investigated until the recent University of Jordan excavations directed by the author. The results of the 2005 and 2006 field seasons are reported here.

The excavations confirm that Tell Abu Suwwan dates to the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B (PPNB) and Pottery Neolithic (Yarmoukian) periods (table 1). Although the site contains a distinctive architecture, it shares various similarities with several other Levantine Pre-Pottery Neolithic (PPN) sites, e.g., Jericho (Kenyon 1956: 69–77; 1969), Tell Ramad (de Constand 1971: 278–85), Tell Abu Hureyra (Moore, Hillman, and Legge 2000: 493), Tell Aswad (Cauvin 2000: 39), Abu Ghosh (Lechevallier 1978: 57), Tell el-Kowm (Dornemann 1986), Yiftahel (Garfinkel 1987: 199–212), Nahal Hemar (Bar-Yosef and Alon 1988), Nahal Oren (Stekelis 1951: 2–4), and Ashkelon (cited in Kuijt and Goring-Morris 2002: 415), as well as Yarmoukian sites such as Byblos (Moore 1973: 36–68; Cauvin 1968; Dunand 1973 cited in Garfinkel 1993: 115–34), Sabi Abyad (Akkermans 1993), Munhatta (Perrot 1968: 406–19; Garfinkel 1993: 117), Sha’ar Hagolan (Stekelis 1951: 1–19; Garfinkel 1993: 116–18), and Wadi Rabah (Kaplan 1958; Gopher 1995: 211). Moreover, within the area surveyed at Abu Suwwan, a few el-Khiam points were found, which suggests that the site may also
Table 1. Tell Abu Suwwan $^{14}$C Dates to Areas A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Cal. bc</th>
<th>Cal. BP</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASW.B.G6/7.7</td>
<td>Beta-230547</td>
<td>5360–5210</td>
<td>7310–7160</td>
<td>YARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.A.D4.7</td>
<td>Beta-230544</td>
<td>6580–6420</td>
<td>8530–8370</td>
<td>LPPNB /PPNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.B.J6.10/11 (1)</td>
<td>Beta-230548</td>
<td>6840–6620</td>
<td>8800–8570</td>
<td>LPPNB /PPNC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.A.D4.6 (1)</td>
<td>Beta-230543</td>
<td>6890–6830</td>
<td>8840–8780</td>
<td>LPPNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.B.J6.10/11 (2)</td>
<td>Beta-230548</td>
<td>6920–6880</td>
<td>8870–8830</td>
<td>LPPNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.B.J6.10/11 (3)</td>
<td>Beta-230548</td>
<td>7020–6930</td>
<td>8970–8880</td>
<td>LPPNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.B.F6.13</td>
<td>Beta-230545</td>
<td>7060–6580</td>
<td>9010–8530</td>
<td>LPPNB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW.A.D4.6 (2)</td>
<td>Beta-230543</td>
<td>7470–6900</td>
<td>9420–8850</td>
<td>M/LPPNB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 2-sigma calibration (numbers in parentheses indicate split samples)
contain PPNA layers, probably to the north of the excavated area.

Gebel (2004: 6) was one of the first to suggest that Tell Abu Suwwan was the only Neolithic megasite north of ‘Ain Ghazal. Simmons (2007), based on his earlier survey information, estimated that the site could be as large as 12.1 ha (30 acres) (Simmons 2007: 178, table 7.1). Kuijt (2000: 81), Gebel (2004: 7), and Simmons (2007: 176–79) all discuss the Neolithic megasite phenomenon in Jordan. The attributes they use to describe megasites include (1) surface areas that exceed 20 acres; (2) a location near springs on a slope setting; (3) architectural complexity; (4) a thin layer of deposits commonly covering the site; (5) a Neolithic sequence that is continuous and uninterrupted; (6) architecture that seems to have been preplanned, is freestanding, and has agglutinated, often small, rooms; (7) structures seemingly made for public and ritual use; (8) abandonment by the end of the Neolithic period; (9) regional diversity in terms of social and political organization (as manifest in architecture), despite sharing of main components among other megasites. These descriptive criteria also appear to characterize Tell Abu Suwwan.

Tell Abu Suwwan is the only Neolithic site excavated north of the Zarqa River and, based on a recent survey around the excavated area, its probable size is 10.5 ha (26 acres). It has complex architecture with a long chronological sequence and contains an area that seems to have been used for ritual purposes. These attributes indicate that Tell Abu Suwwan should be considered one of the Jordanian Neolithic megasites.

The architectural characteristics and the diagnostic lithic artifacts discovered at Tell Abu Suwwan establish that the site was occupied continually from the MPPNB to the Yarmoukian period. Similar continuity of site occupation is known at only two other Neolithic sites in Jordan: ‘Ain Ghazal (Kafafi 2001b; Simmons 2007: 176) and Wadi Shu'ieb (Simmons et al. 2001; Kafafi 2004: 115; Simmons 2007: 129). Tell Abu Suwwan also resembles other major PPNB and PN sites in Jordan, in terms of architectural elements, lithic assemblages, and environmental settings, such as PPNB Bayda (Kirkbride 1966: 8–61), Basta (Gebel et al. 1988; Gebel et al. 2004), Ba’ja (Bienert and Gebel 2004), Ain Jammam (Fino 2004; Waheeb and Fino 1997), Ghwair I (Najjar 1994: 78–82, Simmons 2007: 169–74), es-Sifiya (Mahasneh 2004: 45–63), Khirbet Hammam (Peterson 2004: 334), and Ayn Abu Nukhayla (Henry et al. 2003); and Yarmoukian sites such as Abu Thawwab (Kafafi 1988), ‘Ain Ghazal (Rollefson 1993; Rollefson and Köhler-Rollefson 1993; Rollefson, Simmons, and Kafafi 1992), Wadi Shu’ieb (Simmons et al. 2001), Tabaqat al-Buma (Banning et al. 1992: 50–69; Banning et al. 1996: 31–43), and ‘Ain Rahub (Muheisen et al. 1988: 493, 499; Kafafi 1993: 101–2).

Results of the 2005 and 2006 excavations at Tell Abu Suwwan are described below. These are then discussed in light of comparisons with the other Jordanian Neolithic megasites.

**PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Kirkbride’s (1958) investigations in 1955 led her to date the site to the Lower Palaeolithic, Middle Palaeolithic, and the Pre-Pottery Neolithic, although she noted that most of the lithics appear to pertain to the Pre-Pottery Neolithic B. Additionally, she excavated a sounding to a maximum depth of 1.5 m. Numerous stone tools and a hearth were found in her test trench, although she did not encounter architecture (Simmons, Olszewski, and Kafafi 1988: 15).

In 1984, Abu Suwwan was mentioned in the Tell al-Husn survey conducted by Albert Leonard (Site 30). Leonard’s survey recovered lithic artifacts and pottery sherds, and he divided the site into upper and lower sections. The pottery sherds were dated to the Late Roman/Byzantine period, while the lithic tools were dated to the PPN (Leonard 1987: 359).

In the summer of 1987, Alan H. Simmons, Deborah I. Olszewski, and Zeidan Kafafi surveyed the site and collected some of the lithics found on the surface. Their study of the lithic collection indicated that the tools were very similar to those known from the PPNA and PPNB, with analogues to lithics in collections from ‘Ain Ghazal, Bayda, and Tell Abu Thawwab in Jordan, as well as from Jericho in Palestine and Tell Ramad in Syria. Moreover, Simmons, Olszewski, and Kafafi (1988: 15–20) suggested that the site was also occupied during the early Pottery Neolithic (PN) period and probably contained Neolithic architecture.

Based on the above surveys, the University of Jordan started its first field school season at the site in the summer of 2005. Excavations began in early July and ended at the end of August. A similar schedule was followed during the summer of 2006.
During the 2005 season, the area in the northern part of the site was divided into two sections—Area A is in the northwest part of the site and Area B is in the northeast part of the site (fig. 2). A 5 x 5 m grid was established in each area. Prior to excavation, a systematic archaeological survey was conducted in each area, with survey materials recorded using the grid squares. In each area, 1 x 1 m test trenches were excavated. Test trenches were planned so that they intersected a corner of the 5 x 5 m grid. This allowed insight into materials, stratigraphy, and features that would possibly be encountered in each section of the site. These data influenced the choice of initial excavation squares within each 5 x 5 m grid (al-Nahar 2006). In Area A, seven squares were excavated (D2, D3, E2, E3, F2, F3, and part of D5). In Area B, nine squares were excavated (F2, H4, H5, I4, I5, I6, J5, J6, and G7, which was extended into G6 [for about 1.5 m]).

In the summer of 2006, the University of Jordan undertook its second field season at the site. Based on the results from the 2005 season, a number of new squares were opened and some squares from the 2005 season were reopened for continued excavation. Additionally, several baulks were systematically excavated to clarify some of the stratigraphy in
the interior walls. In Area A (fig. 3), eight new squares were excavated (A3, C4, D4, D5, V3, W3, Y3, and baulk [D3/C3] with part of C3). The re-opened squares from Area A were D3, D5, and E2. In Area B, eleven new squares were excavated (F5, F6, F7, G5, G6, H6, H7, I7, J5, J6, and K6). The re-opened squares from Area B were H5, I5, I6, J5, and J6 (fig. 4). The excavated baulks in Area B were I6/J6, I5/J5, I5/I4, and I5/H5.

AREA A

Structures and Features

During excavations in 2005 and 2006, three walls in good condition were uncovered in Square E2 (fig. 5). One of the walls extended east–west, with a length of about 2 m and a width of 0.5 m. This wall joins with a second one, part of which was uncovered in the 2005 season; excavations of this wall continued in the 2006 season. The second wall runs north–south and has a length of 1.5 m. It was made of medium-size stones, consisting of two courses in the northern section of the wall and one course near the wall’s termination. In the east part of the square, a third wall running from north toward the south was exposed during the 2006 season. It begins near the eastern end of the east–west wall but is not connected to it. The third wall’s length is 2 m and its width is 0.5 m. On the east side of this wall, three pits with small-size stones were found connected with the wall. The mortar used for the three walls was a mixture of mud and small stones. All the stone walls of this structure were built directly on top of sterile soil.

In Square D3, a mud floor with a distinct mud circular pit was found. The diameter of the pit is 40 cm and its depth is 20 cm. The mud floor yielded a large number of diagnostic lithic artifacts, including scrapers and burins. In the southeast side of the square, two large boulders were exposed; they appear to form a triangular (1.0 × 0.40 m) stair step. Therefore, it was decided to extend Square D3 toward the east and excavate both the D3 east baulk and Square C3. This extended unit (D3/C3) has dimensions of 1.5 × 4 m. By the end of the 2006 season, a 3-m, one-course, one single-leaf wall was uncovered in D3/C3; this wall connected to the stair step found in Square D3. Further excavations are planned to explore this feature and to follow the wall extension.

In Square C4, an irregular feature made of small stones mixed with white plaster chunks was exposed in the southwest part of the square. Although further excavations are needed to understand its function, it might be related to the wall found in D3/C3. In Square D4, lumps of mud brick were scattered in the eastern part of the square on one of the mud floors. A wall fragment found during the 2005 excavation in the south section seems to extend under the D4/D5
In the 2006 season, five hearths were found in the southern part of Square D5; three of them are on top of each other, which indicate several reuses of the area. In the northeast corner of Square D5, a small portion of a white plaster floor appeared in the section. It seems that the rest of the floor might be located under the olive trees north of Area A. In the west part of the square, what appears to be a large lime kiln was excavated in the 2005 season. This feature is stratified as follows. At the top, there is a thin layer of fine-powdered, compacted sediment. This layer overlies about 10 medium-size white chalky stones and some limestone cobbles. Six of the stones are laid out in a straight line, while the others are distributed randomly. Among these stones and under them, the hearth is filled with an ash layer mixed with very fine sediment.

In the 2005 season, two well-made plaster floors stratified immediately on top of each other were found in the northwest part of Square F3. The double plaster floors have a yellowish color; they were both made of fine plaster clay mixed with gravel. Unfortunately, they were cracked and fractured into about three pieces. This floor damage may have resulted from agriculture and cultivation practiced at the site over a lengthy period of time. This double plaster floor must have been surrounded by walls, and it seems either that local farmers removed these walls or that they are still present in the surrounding unexcavated squares. Additionally, the double floor indicates that this structure was reused at least once.

In the west part of Area A, orange clay was found associated with a white plaster floor. The orange clay has the shape of a ring laid on the white plaster floor. It looks like a rim of a plate made of clay, probably sun-dried, and later exposed to heat. Unfortunately, the area suffered considerable damage due to its proximity to the surface—the floor is about 15 cm below the modern ground surface.

**Area B**

Area B yielded a large square or rectangular structure. Its north corner was uncovered during the 2005
season. The north corner points to true north in Square I4 (figs. 5–6).

**Exterior Walls**

The walls forming the north corner are the exterior walls of a large building. The west exterior wall of the structure is present in Squares I4, J5, and J6, and the north exterior wall is present in Squares I4, H5, and G5.

Most of the structure’s walls are intact and have a well-laid foundation. The walls were constructed with the same material and in the same way. Various kinds of limestone and sandstone cobbles, pebbles, and gravels were used. For the exterior and the interior sides of the walls, large, medium, and small stone sizes were used, chinked with a mud-gravel mortar. The mortar was composed of mud mixed with plaster chunks, gravels, and pebbles.

The north corner of the structure is formed by the northwest wall and the northeast wall; the northwest wall extends from the north corner toward the east corner and its length is 12.5 m. The northeast wall extends from the north corner to the east and its length is 11 m. The thickness of the exterior walls ranges between 1.2 and 1.5 m. The northeast and northwest walls are preserved to a height of one or two courses and ranged from 25 to 60 cm.
The west corner is not clear yet; however, the walls forming it were exposed during the 2005 and 2006 seasons. The west corner of the structure was formed by the northwest and southwest walls. The southwest wall extends from the west corner toward the south corner and its exposed length is 8.5 m. The south corner is not clear yet and awaits further excavation in the future.

The exterior angle of the structure’s west corner lies under the baulk; however, the interior angle was uncovered during the 2005 season. The interior part of the west corner was full of fallen stones and is therefore difficult to recognize in all of its dimensions. In the 2006 season, some of the fallen stones were removed, and this exposed yet more of them. The west corner interior still needs further work to resolve the confusion caused by the fallen walls.

Some of the wall dimensions of the southwest wall were revealed. The exposed length of the exterior part of the southwest wall is about 8.5 m, but the thickness has not yet been determined. From the exterior part of the southwest wall, one to four courses were preserved. Therefore, the height of the southwest wall ranged from 50 to 85 cm.

**Interior Walls**

Five interior walls were excavated during the 2006 excavation, all oriented northwest and all parallel to one another (fig. 5). Four angles within the interior walls appeared. Three of them are exposed in Square I6, where two of them parallel each other, and both of these are formed of two northwest and southwest walls running toward the west. The third
corner is formed by the northwest wall and southwest wall running toward the south. The interior walls are intact, have a well-made foundation, and differ in construction from the exterior wall. The interior wall consists of large, medium, and small stones, chinked with gravel. Limestone and sandstone were used to construct the building. For the exterior and the interior sides of the walls, boulders and large, medium, and small-size stones were used, while between the courses, small-size stones and gravel were used. The walls’ mortar composition is mud mixed with plaster chunks, gravels, and pebbles. The thicknesses of the interior walls range between 0.6 and 1.35 m. Why there are differences in the thicknesses of the interior walls must await further excavation.

Structure Floors

Three types of plaster floors were found. The topmost is made of a powdery white plaster (huwwar) mixed with small-sized stones and plaster chunks. Patches of this floor appear in most of the structure between the interior walls. Most of this white plaster (huwwar) floor seems to be damaged due to modern agricultural activities in the area.

A lower yellow floor was found in the south side of the structure. This floor is made of a coarse, yellow plaster mixed with small stones and gravel; it is 4 cm thick. A large number of diagnostic tools and a thick layer of carbonized organics were recovered from this surface.

A smooth polished white and red plaster floor was exposed over a large area in the 2006 season in Squares I6, I7, H5, and H6. This plaster floor was well made, with a well-made foundation. The foundation is stratified into five layers under the plaster floors. The lowermost layer consists of a medium-size (ca. 20 × 10 cm) stone pavement; above this layer is a coarse, white plaster mixed with small-size (ca. 5 × 7 cm) stones. Overlying it is a coarse plaster mixed with gravel, and above that, a thin layer of fine plaster mixed with ash. At the top of the sequence of foundation layers is a smooth white plaster which is colored in some places with red ocher. It is clear that the interior walls were built on top of the red floor, indicating that the red floor is earlier than the interior walls and that the site was occupied by later groups who reused the structure and remodeled its interior space.

Processing Area (Courtyard)

This area lies to the east of the structure and includes several spatial divisions. There is a processing area with several stratified floors made from very small-size stones, pebbles, and fine gravels. A large number of bones and lithic tools were found in association. To the east of the processing floor, a large hearth was found, and to the north, two bedrock mortars were uncovered. To the south of the processing area, a wall and a burned yellow plaster floor were found, probably associated with the processing area. To the southeast a wall and a floor were encountered. The floor includes large patches of burned orange clay, with a large bone surrounded by small stones sticking up vertically out of the floor (fig. 7). The wall has one course with eight large river cobbles. The clay area needs further delicate excavation to understand its function.

LITHIC AND BONE ARTIFACTS

Numerous lithics and many grinding stones were recovered from Tell Abu Suwwan. Analysis of the lithics is still incomplete, but all stages of lithic production appear to be represented, including a large
number of cores of different types such as naviform blade cores, flakes, blades, bladelets, and tools (fig. 8). The lithic types found at the site confirm that the site has PPNB and Yarmoukian components. Lithic diagnostics consist of different types of arrowheads (figs. 9–12), sickle blades, a bifacial knife (fig. 13), and several types of scrapers, including a large number of tanged circular scrapers of different sizes (fig. 14). Moreover, a new scraper type was recognized at Tell Abu Suwwan by Deborah Olszewski and the author, and designated the “Jarash Scraper.” These scrapers are generally made on blades and form an isosceles triangle in plan view. They are pointed at the proximal end (possibly to facilitate hafting) and are abruptly retouched at the distal end to form a straight line perpendicular to the axis of the blade.
The ventral surface of the blade is usually not retouched, although continuous, abrupt retouch is often found on the edges. The scrapers at Tell Abu Suwwan vary in size; lengths range from 3 to 6 cm, measured along the long axis of the piece (fig. 15).

Animal bones were recovered in some quantity from the site. Some of the bones are from large mammals, such as cattle and horse, while others include dog and gazelle. Many horns of sheep/goat were found within the Area B structure close to the plaster floors and usually next to the walls. In Square I5, a large, unidentified horn core was found adjacent to the west side of the northwest interior wall. Bone tools were also found; some of them were decorated and incised (fig. 16). Finally, various stone art pieces, such as figurine fragments and incised stones, were recovered.

**DISCUSSION**

Survey of the area surrounding the 2005 and 2006 excavations indicates that Tell Abu Suwwan extends over an area of about 10.5 ha (26 acres), an observation that is in good agreement with both Gebel’s contention that it is the only Neolithic megasite north of ‘Ain Ghazal (2004: 6) and Simmons’ estimate of the site’s area as ca. 12.1 ha (30 acres) (2007: 178). Both ‘Ain Ghazal and Tell Abu Suwwan are situated
near springs of the Zarqa River; the contemporaneity of these two sites may suggest that there was, at the very least, a relationship that afforded exchange of information and possibly goods.

Moreover, the architectural elements and the artifacts from Tell Abu Suwwan clearly indicate that the site was occupied continuously, beginning at the very least in the MPPNB—there are surface finds that suggest possible PPNA use of the site as well—until sometime during the Yarmoukian period. The megasites of ‘Ain Ghazal and Wadi Shu‘eib (Simmons 2007: 176–79) show a similar continuity of occupation. There also are clear parallels in the dates, lithic assemblages, and many of the architectural elements from Tell Abu Suwwan to materials recovered from both ‘Ain Ghazal and Wadi Shu‘eib. More broadly, Tell Abu Suwwan also shares many similar features in architectural elements and lithic assemblages with other Jordanian PPNB and PPNC sites (e.g., Bayda, Basta, Ba‘ja, Ain Jamman, Ghwair I, es-Sifiya) as well as with Yarmoukian sites (e.g., Abu Thawwab (Kafafi 2001a: 24–64; 2004: 115). Several examples are given below.

At Tell Abu Suwwan, in Area A, a small rectangular building with white plaster floors and poorly fired orange clay was uncovered. Area B exposed a large rectangular structure (13.5 x 11 m). The components of the Area B building (at least three clear plaster floors and a poorly heated orange clay), the dimensions of the walls, the faunal assemblage, the lithic artifacts, and the pottery sherds all indicate that the site was occupied during the MPPNB, LPPNB, PPNC, and the Yarmoukian periods. Plaster (huwwar) floors are a common structural feature at
Fig. 11. Amuq arrowheads.

Fig. 12. Per-Sa and Helwan arrowheads.

Fig. 13. Bifacial knife.
many PPNB sites; examples in Jordan include ‘Ain Ghazal, Basta, and Ain Jammam (Telfah and Kafafi 2003: 56; Banning 2003: 11; Rollefson 1993: 93–94). The floors from these sites appear to be similar to the types of floors discovered in both Areas A and B at Tell Abu Suwwan.

In Area B, the size of the red, smooth plaster floors (6.0 × 6.6 m) found in the eastern part of the excavation suggests that the site was founded during the MPPNB and refloored during the MPPNB and LPPNB. It is possible that, during the LPPNB, the occupants of the site built the exterior wall of the structure and added more interior walls to the west of the red plaster floor area. During the PPNC, they probably thickened the width of the interior walls and continued using the building until the end of the Yarmoukian period. Rearrangement of interior space and reflooring seem to be common during the MPPNB, LPPNB, PPNC, and Yarmoukian periods (Kafafi 1993: 108; Rollefson 1993: 94; Simmons 2007: 136, 138; Rollefson, Simmons, and Kafafi 1992: 452).

MPPNB and LPPNB architectural characteristics, which have been summarized by several prehistorians (e.g., Simmons 2007: 136, 138; Rollefson 1998: 111; Banning 2003: 9–11; Kuijt and Goring-Morris 2002: 390–407; Banning and Byrd 1987: 309–25) correspond to the architectural elements found in Area B at Tell Abu Suwwan. The red plaster floor in Area B seems to be from a large family dwelling built during the MPPNB and consisting of a large room with an entrance at the north end. The entrance leads to a spacious open area (processing area) which contains a large hearth. The walls are made of large and medium-size limestone and sandstone and a mortar composed of mud and plaster chunks mixed with small stones and gravels. This dwelling seems to have been continuously used during the LPPNB. The floors and the interior divisions were remodeled.

The poor quality of the lime plaster, together with the wide walls (ranging in width from 1.0 to 1.5 m) found in the middle and west parts of the Area B structure, suggest occupation during the PPNC pe-

Fig. 14. Circular tanged scrapers.
Tell Abu Suwwan is ca. 20 km north of the site of Abu Thawwab (Kafafi 2001a: 1). The Yarmoukian phase at Abu Thawwab seems to be contemporary with the Yarmoukian stratum at Tell Abu Suwwan, for several reasons. The rectangular structure in Area A was built on virgin soil and seems to be associated mainly with a Yarmoukian lithic assemblage. Furthermore, this building seems to be comparable to the Yarmoukian structures found at Abu Thawwab and ‘Ain Ghazal (Kafafi 1998: 131; 1993: 108–10). Additionally, the Yarmoukian powdery plaster (huwar) floor in the eastern part of Area B at Tell Abu Suwwan resembles the Yarmoukian floors found at Abu Thawwab (Kafafi 2001a: 23–24), ‘Ain Ghazal, and Wadi Shu’eb (Kafafi 1993: 104).

These preliminary results from the 2005 and 2006 field seasons at Tell Abu Suwwan provide substantial evidence for its designation as one of the Jordanian Neolithic megasites. Further fieldwork will concentrate on clarifying the type of the architecture, studying its development from the MPPNB to the PN and linking the artifact assemblages with the functions of various structures. Future research also aims to put Tell Abu Suwwan into its regional context, to try to determine how it was related to other contemporary Jordanian Neolithic communities.
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