

The Institute of ARCHAEOLOGY Siegfried H. Horn Museum



Table of Contents

	Page
<i>ASOR 2017</i>	1
<i>Hess Lecture</i>	2
<i>Random Survey</i>	4

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY
HORN ARCHAEOLOGICAL
MUSEUM
NEWSLETTER

Paul J. Ray, Jr.	Editor
Constance E. Gane	Assoc. Editor
Randall W. Younker	Assoc. Editor
Robert D. Bates	Assoc. Editor
Dorian Alexander	Asst. Editor

The Newsletter is published four times a year by the Institute of Archaeology, Andrews University. Annual subscription price is \$7.50. Museum membership, subscription, and editorial correspondence should be addressed to the Horn Archaeological Museum, Institute of Archaeology, Andrews University, 9047 US 31, Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0990, Telephone 269-471-3273, Fax 269-471-3619, e-mail hornmusm@andrews.edu.

Volume 39.2
Spring 2018
ISSN 1095-2837

ASOR 2017 Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting of the American Schools of Oriental Research (*ASOR*) was held in Boston from November 15-18, 2017. This year there were 120 sessions, in which over 650 papers and posters were presented. The plenary address was presented by William Boardman, Professor of Fine Arts at Harvard University, entitled "Archaeology, Object History, Art History: Questions of Definition and Discipline."

This year was the 50th anniversary of the Madaba Plains Project and its predecessor the Andrews University Heshbon Expedition. In connection with this celebration three separate Madaba Plains Project at 50 sections took place, one for each major excavation site: Heshbon, 'Umayri and Jalul. Those Madaba Plains Project Members and affiliates who presented papers in these sections included: Lawrence Geraty (Contextualizing the Quest for Biblical Heshbon at Tall Hisban); Bert deVries (Contextualizing the Quest for Early Christianity at Esbus); Bethany Walker (Contextualizing the Quest for Islamic Housban at Tall Hisban); Forde Jacobsen (Al Musallah: Local Ideas About Tal Hisban); Øystein LaBianca Contextualizing the Quest Theories of the *Longue Durée* at Tall Hisban); Timothy Harrison (Contextualizing MPP at Tall al-'Umayri: The Early Bronze Age); Kent Bramlett (Contextualizing MPP at Tall al-'Umayri: The Late Bronze Age); Douglass Clark (Contextualizing MPP at Tall al-'Umayri: The Early Iron Age); Larry Herr (Contextualizing MPP at Tall al-'Umayri: The Late Iron Age and Early Persian Period); Gary Christopherson (What Happened When the Tall al-'Umayri Regional Met Fernand Braduel's Temporal Hierarchy?); David Merling and Randall Younker (In the Trenches at Jalul: Struggles, Strategies, Discoveries); Constance Gane (Jalul and the Empires of the North); Paul Gregor (Tall Jalul: What Happened to Amorite Heshbon?); Paul Ray (Jalul and the Mesha Inscription: Was Jalul

(cont'd on p. 2)



Paul Ray, Randall Younker, Gerald Mattingly, William Dever and David Merling at ASOR.

Biblical Bezer?); and Randall Younker (Jalul and the Modified High Chronology for Iron Age IIA-B).

Other Madaba Plains Project Members and affiliates who presented papers this year that were not connected with the MPP 50th anniversary included: Michael Hasel (Socho of the Judean Shephelah: The 2010 Survey); Monique Vincent (Households, Communities, and Dimensions of Social Identity in the Early Iron Age at Tall al-‘Umayri, Jordan); S. Thomas Parker (Ceramic Imports to Petra: Domestic versus Funerary Contexts); Abelardo Rivas (Jalul as a Border City in Iron Age Transjordan), Michael Orellana (Building an Iron IIB-IIC Pottery Assemblage for Tall Jalul); Trisha Broy (Working Toward a Definition of the Collard-rim Pithos); Friedbert Ninow, Monique Vincent and Kent Bramlett (The 2017 Season at Khirbat al-Balu’a—In Search of Patterns of Settlement); Robert Bates and Paul Ray (Between the Roads: An Update on the Iron Age Roads at Tall Jalul 2016-2017); Helen Dixon (The “Look” and “Feel” of Levantine Phoenician Sacred Space); and Ralph Hawkins with David Ben-Shlomo (The Bedouin at Modern Ras el-Auja and the Early Iron Age Settlers at Khirbet el-Mastarah).

Those MPP members who chaired sessions of the program this year include: Øystein LaBianca and Lawrence Geraty (Madaba Plains Project 50: Hisban); Douglas Clark and Larry Herr (Madaba Plains Project 50: Tall al-‘Umayri, Randall Younker (Madaba Plains Project 50: Jalul); Timothy Harrison (The CRANE Project I and II); and Owen Chesnut (Archaeology of the Southern Levant I, II, and III). In addition Bethany Walker presided over the Consultation of Dig Directors in Jordan.

In a workshop on gender-related situations in the workplace, dealing with broadly-based gender-related issues in the field, in grad school, in the academy and other work places, Stefanie Elkins-Bates presented a paper entitled “A Professional Woman Working in Jordan.” In addition, Douglas Clark and Kent Bramlett

presided over the Madaba Plains Project and Khirbat Balu’a Workshop; with Clark also presiding over the Madaba Regional Museum Project Workshop.

The Poster session included entries by Jeff Hudon (Refreshing an Archaeological Site: The Example of Tall Hisban, Jordan); Kristina Reed, Sarah Burton, Lawrence Geraty, Øystein LaBianca, Randall Younker and Douglas Clark (Golden Excavations: Fifty Years of the Madaba Plains Project); Kristina Reed (Tall al-‘Umayri: 32 Years of Excavations and Discoveries); and Randall Younker (Highlights from the Heights of Jalul).

Concurrent Annual Meetings of the *Society of Biblical Literature (SBL)* and the *Near East Archaeological Society (NEASB)* were held from November 18-21, and 15-17, 2017 respectively. (Paul J. Ray, Jr).



Hess Lecture

On Oct. 23, 2016 Richard Hess, professor of Old Testament studies at Denver Seminary, presented a lecture entitled “King Lists, Names, and the Line from Adam to Abram in Genesis 1-11” as part of the Horn Museum Lecture Series.

Hess opened his lecture by explaining that his goal was to use ancient Near Eastern materials to study the Genesis genealogies, and to suggest how comparative material enlightens the questions connected with them. To achieve this, he analyzed literary comparisons, especially the king lists and what such observations might say about the origins and contributions of comparative material.

When looking at the genealogies in Gen 5 and 11, ancient Near Eastern comparisons have focused on king lists, e.g., King, who argued that names from the *Sumerian Kings List (SKL)* are found in Gen 5 and 11; Jacobsen, who suggested that the purpose of the *SKL* was to promote national feeling; Hallo, who further suggested its purpose was to promote unity under a single king, and that there always be only one king who

ruled. Lambert suggested that before 1600 BC the term “x son of y” referred to a biological or adopted son, with no generations between them, but after this time it could refer to missing generations. But “son of” does not occur in Gen 5 or 11. In the 1960s Reiner and Landsberger reconstructed a tradition about the seven *apkallu* as the pre-Flood fish (monsters) that brought about the collapse of civilization. Each *apkallu* correspond to a king and brings some new aspect of civilization. In this sense, they were comparable to the line of Cain in Gen 4.

Later Finkelstein argued that the *SKL* has kings reign between 6,000-72,000 years, which is much more than in Gen 5 or 11. He compared the *apkallu* and the pre-Flood kings with the lists in Gen 4 and 5, because both have dual lines (*SKL* the *apkallu* and pre-Flood kings; Genesis the lines of Cain and Seth). In both cases, the first line doesn’t continue after flood (the *apkallu* and Cain), but the second line (kingship and Seth) returns after flood. There are also similar names in both lines (e.g., En-men-gal-ana/An-men-gal-ana; Methushael/Methuselah). But, there is no convincing evidence between the names in the *SKL* and Gen. 5 and 11. Lambert then compared Gen 1-11 to the Atrahasis Epic, and noted that the creation and flood accounts in both occur in a larger literary narrative. Finkelstein also published Tablet BM80328, which contains rulers of the 1st Dynasty of Babylon. Some of the names correspond with known Amorite tribes, as well as to names at the beginning of the Assyrian King List (e.g., Tu-ub-ti-ya-mu-tu /Tudiya-Adamu). This is not a king list, but a ritual text with a religious purpose (like Gen 5 and 11), and thus part of a larger perspective.

Hallo also argued that there was a genealogical orientation by the Babylonians ca. 200 BC, a notion furthered Malamut, who also observed a similar numerical grouping of 10-12 names both in the king lists and Gen 5 and 11. However, Wilson, who compared ethnographical, oral, and tribal genealogies in order to gain an overview of their

functions in the ancient Near East, argued that it was incorrect to assume that names were arranged in groups of 10 or that the order of the names could be assumed; the genealogies could have originally been segmented and then redefined lineally. He further argued that fluidity was at work in the Genesis genealogies on the basis of tribal genealogies that are found elsewhere. Lambert criticized Wilson, stating that the *SKL* was not interested in establishing legitimacy by descent from one line, and that by the 2nd millennium BC king lists were built for Babylonian year-name lists and Assyrian *limmu* lists. Parentage is not crucial here, rather their sequence is essential to establish systems for reckoning time.

In 1989, Hess wrote an article on the differences between Gen 5 and 11 and ancient Near Eastern king lists, arguing that context must be the priority in comparisons. Genesis 5 and 11 uses “son” and notes about begetting in a different way than the king lists, and moves from the earliest to latest generation (opposite of a king lists). Genesis is concerned with kinship, whereas king lists are necessarily concerned with kingship. The Genesis genealogies move the reader forward into history, with the expectation of something better to come in the future. At Ugarit, two king lists have been discovered; the reverse side of the first (*KTU* 1.113) contains 13 lines which trace from the latest to the earliest king. Each name is labeled with a “god determinative,” referring either to the deification of these kings after death or to the “god of the king;” the context is religious, not genealogical. At the end of the second list (*KTU* 1.161), also religious in nature, the spirits of the Rephaim and Didanite kings are invoked to attend a *marzeah* feast.

With this background in mind, there comes the question of intention in Gen 4, 5, and 11. These genealogies use the *hiphil* form of the Hebrew word *yld* to communicate a patrilineal emphasis. One way to understand this form is as straightforward historical value: that with this information one can determine the age of the earth. The Jewish historian



Richard Hess.

Eupolemus in the 2nd cent. BC assumed this, as did all Judeo-Christian historians up until W. Henry Green, who wrote that Gen 5 and 11 have gaps. More recently, Sexton, suggests that there is allowance for such genealogical gaps by citing Gen 5:9-11, which requires that Cainan be born when Enosh was 90, and thus Enosh may be variously understood as Cainan’s father, grandfather, or great grandfather. Chronology doesn’t allow gaps, but genealogy does. Sexton further argues that Cainan’s position between Arphaxad and Shelah in the Septuagint is the more original source, contra Hasel, who maintained that the Hebrew text is original, with no retouch by editors. White suggests that the number of years for each of the members of genealogies demonstrates an intention to provide numerical values. But contrary to these arguments, the chronological information shows differences between them as the Gen 11 genealogy doesn’t give total ages. The use of the *hiphil yld* form in Lev 25:45 describes the begetting of a clan/family; thus the form doesn’t always refer to the next generation. There are only eight other occurrences of this use of the *hiphil yld* form outside of genealogies, and thus the form shouldn’t be restricted to linear chronology.

The Hebrew text of Genesis is both reliable and old. There are variations in the total number of years between the

Septuagint and the Masoretic text however. Cainan in the Septuagint is placed between Arphaxad and Shelah. If this name is original, then there is a gap in the Masoretic text. There is also an irregularity in form between the two texts. The normal approach is “A lived x years and begat B,” and this phrase is introduced by *wayehi* (“and he lived”). Every part of the Masoretic text has this phrase except between Arphaxad and Shelah. Why? This is not clear, and there is no explanation for it.

Do the elements of these names occur at one or more times in the well-attested history of names in ancient Near East? The names in the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11, except for Adam and Sarah, are *not* attested among late Israelite or Jewish names, until the Roman period. Therefore, these names in Genesis come from before the 1st millennium BC. West Semitic etymologies pertain to these names except for Cainan and Lamech. Cainan comes from Kenan (*qyn*), meaning “metalsmith”; Lamech is completely unknown elsewhere in the ancient Near East. Selah, Enosh, Enoch and Noah do not occur as names from any known period, but other names are commonly attested (except for Adam and Methuselah, which occur only in the 2nd millennium BC and earlier). Peleg and several other names in Gen 11 are also place names, some dating back to the early 2nd millennium BC. There is no known etymology for Arphaxad and no known period in which the name occurs.

In conclusion, there a number of lines of evidence that question whether one can assert without doubt that there are no gaps anywhere in the genealogies of Gen 5 and 11. Gaps do occur in extra-biblical early West Semitic king lists. Although different from biblical genealogies in some important ways, these king lists remain closer and form a context for the biblical genealogies better than any other sequence of persons moving chronologically through time. (Dorian Alexander)



RANDOM SURVEY

Child Sacrifice at Carthage:

From ca. 800 until 146 BC Carthage was a Phoenician colony, located in North Africa. The city was destroyed by the Romans, who along with the Greeks, noted that the Carthaginians sacrificed their children. Recent archaeological, epigraphical, and historical evidence has been found that verifies the basis of claims made in classical-period times. Here, as well as in other Phoenician colonies in Sicily, Sardinia and Malta, both male and female children, many only a few weeks old, were sacrificed at locations known as *tophets*.

New Governor Found:

Following a storm, the base of a statue has recently been found in shallow water off the coast of the site of Dor, on which is inscribed the name of a previously-unknown governor of Judea, who ruled before the Bar-Kokhba revolt (AD 132-135). The inscription says: "the city of Dor honors Marcus Paccius...governor of the province of Judea."

To discover more about archaeology, the Institute, and the Museum, contact us at:

VOX: 269-471-3273

FAX: 269-471-3619

E-mail: hornmuseum@andrews.edu

or visit our website at:

www.andrewsarchaeology.org

New Archive Found:

In 2013 archaeologists found the Bronze Age site of Bassetki in the Kurdish region of northern Iraq. Located on trade routes from Mesopotamia to Anatolia, the site was an early urban center, being settled almost continuously from ca. 3000 to 600 BC. During part of the Late Bronze Age (1550-1300 BC) it was part of the kingdom of Mittani, after which it became a thriving Middle Assyrian town. In a building from this time, 93 cuneiform tablets have recently been found, 60 of them in a ceramic jar. One tablet mentions a temple to the goddess Gula.

Archaeological Evidence of Gruesome Practice:

Archaeologists have recently found 16 severed right hands, buried in four pits on the grounds of a Hyksos-period palace at Avaris, in Egypt. It is the first confirmation of a practice in which soldiers would cut off the hands of defeated enemies and present them as a way of keeping track of the number killed in battle, for which they were rewarded by a gold bounty. Hieroglyphic texts depicting this practice have long been known.

Domestication of the Dog:

Epipalaeolithic-period rock art from sites in NW Arabia depicts scenes with dogs on leashes, assisting humans in hunting wild animals. The leashing of dogs and their participation in various hunting strategies indicates their domestication at this time.

NEWSLETTER



The Institute of
ARCHAEOLOGY
Siegfried H. Horn Museum

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0990
Address Service Requested

Non-profit Organization

U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 5
Berrien Springs, MI 49103