Zaben Studies Jalul Pottery

In the summer of 1993, Ms. Sabal es-Zaben came to the Institute as a visiting scholar to analyze the pottery from the 1992 season at Tell Jalul. This research will be the basis of her M.A. thesis at the University of Jordan where she is majoring in Archaeology.

Because the Jalul region is the home of her family, her interest in excavations at Tell Jalul and its surrounding area springs as much from her personal background as it does from her career choice. Sabal is from the Zaben branch of the influential Beni Sakhr tribe and her grandfather’s house can still be seen today in the village of Jalul not far from the tell. Her father, General Achaš es-Zaben (ret.) is the former Jordanian Defense Minister and owns an estate east of the site. He is also the major owner of the tell itself. The Zaben country estate, which is quite lush in contrast to much of the surrounding area, gives an indication of how productive the land probably was in antiquity.

The Zaben family has had a long-standing interest in archaeology. General Zaben, in his official capacity as representative of the Jordanian government, accompanied G. L. Harding and Roland deVaux in their work at Khirbet Qumran and the Dead Sea Scroll caves prior to 1967. Subsequently, he has shown much interest in the work at Tell Hesban and is a generous supporter of the work at Tell Jalul. It is through her father’s involvement that Ms. Zaben became interested in archaeology.

Ms. Zaben enjoyed her one month stay in Michigan. She was especially impressed with the greenness and amount of water here—both provide striking contrast to her homeland. Although she was able to visit the museums in Chicago, she spent most of her time working diligently on her project. Upon completion of her pottery analysis, Ms. Zaben returned to Jordan to complete the final year of her master’s program. She anticipates joining the Tell Jalul team for the 1994 season. (Paul J. Ray Jr.)

Administrative Cuts Hit Institute

When the Institute staff returns from the dig this summer, it will return to a leaner organization. Andrews University cutbacks have forced the reduction of the Institute administrative secretary to a halftime position.

Our single secretary has long provided assistance to the director and curator for their Seminary Old Testament/Archaeology class loads and routine Institute/Museum business. In addition, office tasks have greatly expanded over the past years as the Institute has accepted increased responsibilities over the stateside operation of the Madaba Plains Project. The Publications Department, while primarily responsible for its own office needs, has contributed to the secretarial load. Given such a workload, a cutback is ironic at best.

Needless to say, this reduction to a halftime administrative secretary will likely result in reduced services and increased response times. For example, it is probable that the Museum exhibit hours will be reduced to half-days when classes resume. We hope to reorganize secretarial tasks as efficiently as possible, but under the circumstances, certain inconveniences are doubtless unavoidable. We ask your indulgence as we move ahead into this new situation. (Ralph E. Hendrix)
ARCHAEOLOGY OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

On Monday May 9, Nancy Lapp, curator of the James L. Kelso Bible Lands Museum at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, gave an illustrated lecture entitled "Excavations on the Dead Sea Plain, 1990" for the Horn Museum Lecture Series. A history of her involvement with the Early Bronze sites and cemeteries of the Dead Sea Plain and northern Arabia prefaced an in-depth report on recent work in this area. Particular attention was given to the Iron Age town of Feifeh and the Early Bronze Age cemeteries at that site and at Khanazir.

In 1924, Almond, Albright and Kyle discovered the town of Bab edh-Dhra. Paul Lapp made soundings at the site in 1965 and excavated the cemetery to its south in 1965-67. Bab edh-Dhra (1979-81) and Numeira (1977-83) were dug by Walter Rast and Thomas Schaub. The 1989-90 season at Feifeh (Rast and Schaub) concentrated on the town site (an Iron II fortress) and the cemetery with the cit tombs. At Khanazir, (also 1989-90), work concentrated mainly on the southwest cemetery slope, which consisted of oval, stone-lined cit tombs dated to the Early Bronze Age IV period. One intrusive burial in an EB IV tomb contained a scarab with hieroglyphics and a seal with a carving of Anubis from the time of Ramses II in the Late Bronze Age II period.

Part of this lecture also focused on Lapp's work on a number of cylinder seals and cylinder seal impressions found at the Dead Sea Plain sites. The following day Professor Lapp lectured in the Bible Lands and their Exploration class in the Seminary. (Paul Ray Jr.)

A. Kempinski's and R. Gonen's classically formulated explanations of the Middle Bronze Ages contain detailed explanations of pottery plates and a discussion of the cultural changes exhibited in those plates.

On the basis of his pottery descriptions, Kempinski argues well (but not convincingly) for an early date for the beginning of the Late Bronze Age (p. 179), while Gonen responds indirectly to Kempinski's conclusions (p. 216).

The chapters by A. Mazar (Iron I) and G. Barkay (Iron II-III) are the best in the book. Pottery plates would have been helpful. Longer descriptions of the ceramic issues would have been welcomed. (For example, Barkay assumes E. Wright's position interpreting Samaria with which I agree), without acknowledging that there those who follow K. Kenyon's interpretation (pp. 319-320.). Mazar's information on the Philistines as well as Barkay's explanation of the "four-room house" and water systems was especially useful.

Since The Archaeology of Ancient Israel grew from lectures to an introductory class in biblical archaeology, it would seem that the target readership would therefore be students at an introductory level. However, the book is composed of essays by eight authors who approach their complex subjects from different points of view and with different emphases. On the whole their contributions are solid and make a positive contribution to the library of archaeological literature, but because the authors have approached their topics from different perspectives (and perhaps because the lectures were so heavily edited), new students to archaeology will probably not find this book as helpful as others (e.g. Biblical Archaeology in Focus by K. Schoville, Baker Book House, 1978; or Archaeology of the Land of the Bible by A. Mazar, Doubleday, 1990).

Whatever its limitations, The Archaeology of Ancient Israel contains well-written chapters by influential Israeli archaeologists. It is well worth acquiring. (David Merling)
On April 17, 1994, a brief archaeological survey was conducted at the Hiram Edson farm site in western New York by Randall Younker, Ralph Hendrix, Zeljko Gregor, and Michael Younker. Craig Hadley served as field historian and James Nix represented Adventist Historic Ministries (AHM), owner of the property which is located about 2.5 miles south of Port Gibson.

From documentary evidence, it is known that between 1832 and 1844, a house and barn belonging to Hiram Edson were built on the property. It was upon leaving this barn that Edson reported receiving his Sanctuary vision—central to SDA theology. The Edson house and barn stood on the property from at least 1844 to 1848 when the third sabbath conference was held there.

The parcel surveyed by the Institute team is probably the actual property Edson’s house and barn were located upon since it is almost exactly 2 miles from the north boundary of the property to Port Gibson, a measurement mentioned in historical records. However, the actual location of the barn has been lost. The purpose of the survey was to archaeologically determine the occupation history of the site and locate the presence of architectural remains dating to the Edson era in order that they may be avoided by AHM construction activities. AHM purchased the western portion of the original Hiram Edson farm in 1989, and it was this portion of the farm which was surveyed. Survey methods included visual surveys, 1 x 1 meter probes, shovel tests, and a metal detector.

An abandoned house stands in the southwest corner of the property. Visual survey of the meadow northwest of the house indicated no obscured architectural remains. A swampy woodland contained a modern shack and barbed-wire from the 1860s to the 1890s. No attempt was made to locate possible building sites to the extreme east of the AHM property as that parcel is privately owned.

The house in the southwest corner of the property was probably built between 1864 and 1874, with additions prior to 1937 (based on architectural analysis done by Crawford and Stearns in 1991). Two 1 x 1 meter probes were opened on the north side of the house. Excavation to the base of the stone foundation produced only one sherd of tan stoneware which might date earlier than the 1860s, but could date to later in the century. Also found were whiteware sherds and square nails which date to the second half of the 19th century. Shovel tests near the house produced artifacts dated from the second half of the 19th century down to the present. No significant artifacts were found in the meadow, neither from shovel tests nor from the metal detector.

In short, the survey recovered no archaeological evidence of occupation in the southwest corner or the meadow earlier than the latter part of the 19th century. This finding cleared the way for AHM to move ahead with improvements to the land. Future investigations on that portion of the original farm not owned by AHM may prove more fruitful in finding evidence from the 1830-1840 Hiram Edson era. (Randall W. Younker and Ralph E. Hendrix)
"House of David" Fragment*

The first archaeological reference to the "House of David" was discovered July 21, 1993 at Tel Dan in northern Israel. The basalt stone fragment, originally part of a larger monumental inscription, was found by surveyor Gila Cook who was part of the Hebrew Union College/Hebrew University of Jerusalem excavations at the site. The discovery of this extra-biblical reference to the kingdom of Judah is extremely important. In a larger sense, the discovery of this monumental inscription in Israel implies the presence of other ancient written evidences awaiting recovery.

"Taking a closer look at the stone while still in situ and helped by the direction of the early afternoon rays of the sun which illuminated the engraved lines on the stone, we could see the contours of the letters quite clearly. The stone was easily removed as only a small part of it was embedded in the ground. Turning the stone to face the sun, the letters became even more legible. The words, separated by dots, sprung (sic) to life," writes Biran and Naveh.

The fragment was reused as a building block in a gate structure. The destruction level directly above the gate dates to the time of Tiglath-pileser III's conquest of northern Israel ca. 733/2 BC. The fragment was already part of the gateway at the time of that destruction. Pottery directly below the fragment dates ca. 850 BC and earlier. Therefore, the stela was broken no later than ca. 850 BC.

The fragment, 32 cm × 22 cm (about 12.6 in × 8.7 in), was originally part of a stela estimated to be about 100 cm × 50 cm (about 39.4 in × 19.7 in). Thirteen lines of the original inscription are witnessed, starting from the right edge of the fragment (ancient semitic languages are read, right-to-left). The language is Early Aramaic or Phoenician and the form of the script dates to the mid-800s BC. Each word, separated by a dot, was inscribed on the smoothed basalt surface with a rounded iron stylus.

Translation of the inscription is:

1... my father went up ...
2... and my father died, he went to ... [Isr-]
3... and Hadad went in front of me ...
4... my king. And I slew of ... [cha-]
5... riots and two thousand horsemen ...
6... the king of Israel. And I slew ... [kin-]
7... of the House of David. And I put ...
8... their land ...
9... other ...
10... led over Is[r]ael ...
11... siege upon ...
12...and Ahab ...
13... of the divided kingdoms and the kingdom of Judah. This indicates the divided kingdoms must have been allies in the war. The fact that the stela was later smashed implies that Dan was recaptured and a stela commemorating the victories of an enemy was not appreciated by the new ruler.

Biran and Naveh suggest the events described on the fragment refer to the following scenario. Ben Hadad I captured Dan in 885 BC (1 Kings 15:16-22 // 2 Chronicles 16:1-6) only to have it recovered by Omri. The city was then recaptured by the writer of the stela, but was later returned by Ben Hadad II to Ahab, ca. 850 BC (1 Kings 20:34). This transferral of the city—four times in 35 years—fits the stratigraphic record as they interpret it. But they freely admit that other historical scenarios are possible.

Further study and, especially, the recovery of more of the stela, will help clarify the history.

(* Edited by Ralph E. Hendrix from "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan" in the Israel Exploration Journal vol 43.2-3 (1993): 81-98 by Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh)
Archaeology of the Coastal Plain


Bierling's well-illustrated, informal introduction to the archaeological study of the Philistines is presented in a non-technical style, but does presuppose a basic understanding of terminology and methodology. Following a review of Philistine history and the excavation of Tel Miqne (his site), he relates the current (1991) archaeological understanding of specific sites—primarily the "five" cities: Ashdod (Tell Ashdod), Ashkelon (Tell Ashkelon), Ekron (Tel Miqne), Gath (Tell es-Safi), and Gaza (Tell Harube), but also including Timnah (Tel Batash), Ziklag (either Tel Sera or Tel Halif) and Beth-Shan (Beth-Shean) as well as numerous peripheral sites. Conclusions, endnotes, bibliography, and two indices provide easy reference access.

Based on Egyptian inscriptions, as well as excavations at Ashdod and Ashkelon, Bierling indicates the Philistines were: (1) from the general Aegean area, and (2) part of the second of two waves of "Sea Peoples" who began entering the Levant during the reign of Rameses III, ca. 1175 BC (p. 126). However, Bierling rightly cautions that there is no absolute link between the people mentioned in the inscriptions and implied in the excavations, and the biblical "Philistines" (p. 23). It is only by implication and general scholarly agreement that the people whose cultural remains are found on the coast of the Levant are identified as the biblical "Philistines."

It is not surprising, therefore, that a textual source (the Bible), provides Bierling's historical framework in which, he argues, the name "Philistine" is used as a sociopolitical category, rather than ethnically or linguistically (p. 23).

In standard fashion, he attributes the Gen 10:13-14 reference to Philistines either to "an early wave of raiders" or to "a copyist" (p. 24, cf. 66, 92). He defends the text in his treatment of Israel's reliance on Philistines for metal-working (1 Sam 13:19-22). However, he argues that the predicted destruction in Zech 9:5-7 must have originated before the prophet's ministry since the cities of Ashdod and Ekron were destroyed well before his *floruit*, c. 520 BC (p. 244).

Bierling promised to "give Goliath his due" by providing "new archaeological light" (p. 245). His historical scenario is derived directly from the biblical text and is therefore not "archaeological." Neither his explanation of international conflicts, nor his analyses of biblical issues are "new." His sketch of the formation of the Sea Peoples and their migrations is a popularization of current archaeological thought, but is not innovative.

What Bierling has done is recount the well-known biblical history of the Philistines and insert an archaeological discussion of sites (including a few specifics like the Mycenaean III.C.1b pottery, horned incense altars, and olive oil installations).

What is missing? The whole subject of Philistine religion is touched only briefly and tangentially. There lacks a treatment of Philistine city-planning, military fortifications, food-gathering, domestic life, etc. Bierling has de-emphasized or left untouched major segments of Philistine culture.

On balance, *Giving Goliath His Due* may not be ground-breaking, but it remains a very enjoyable up-to-date summary and synthesis. It definitely has its place as an general introduction to the archaeology of the coastal plain. (Ralph E. Hendrix)
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**AL-MAKTÁBA**
THE BOOKSTORE

**Slides! Slides! Slides!**
- Tell Hesban Slide set recounts the Tell Hesban Expedition—1968-1976. $49.95 per set (+ $2.50 shipping)
- Mural Slide Set (57 slides) tells the Bible story with HAM objects in the paintings! Includes booklet. Just $49.95 per set (+ shipping).

**Order Now!**
- I want to subscribe to the *Newsletter* at just $7.50 per year.

Here is my address:

---
HISTORICAL TRIVIA

About 1488 BC, Thothmes III, the pharaoh who first extended the Egyptian Empire north into Palestine, used a narrow pass through the Carmel Range to sneak-up on Megiddo.

In 1918, towards the end of World War 1 (some 3400 years after Thothmes III), British general Allenby used the same mountain pass to sneak-up behind the Turks and defeat them!

To keep abreast of what others are doing in the region of Jordan, subscribe to Central Jordan Network by sending $3.00 to: Gerald Mattingly 7900 Johnson Dr. Knoxville, TN 37998

Middle East Tour

During April, David Merling, the Museum Curator, led 30 seminary students on a study tour of Israel, Jordan and Egypt. The group was an eclectic gathering of students from many parts of the world. In addition to the tour, students completed two study courses.

We apologize for the lateness of this Winter-Spring issue. News of this past summer's exhilarating six-week dig in Jordan will appear in our upcoming Fall issue.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERENDIPITY?

A white marble statue base of the Egyptian 18th Dynasty (female) Pharaoh Hatshepsut which was discovered by R. Lepsius in 1843, matched the upper half discovered by H. E. Winlock in 1926.

Conversely, a body and base found by Winlock matched a sphinx head of Hatshepsut found by Lepsius. Because of this fortuitous matching, and because the older pieces were in two different museums, both statues were rejoined, each museum getting a complete statue!