

Another period represented at 'Umayri is the 11th to 9th centuries B.C., a time when the site was probably first occupied by the Ammonites. We have previously found thousands of pieces of pottery from this period, but never buildings and floors. This season we found a complete cobbled courtyard, perhaps a religious area because of several ceramic shrine models discovered here. Along with the shrine models were stone benches placed in a line and a wooden awning or shelter lining one side of the courtyard perhaps to cover a particularly holy place.

In fact, two courtyards existed, one on top of the other. The lower floor dates to the 11th century and the upper one comes from the 10th-9th centuries B.C. Only the lower one, however, contained the shrine models. These had been smashed and sealed beneath a renovated surface. Very few sites in Jordan have buildings from this time period that have been excavated.

The third time frame is the Hellenistic period, dating to ca. 300-100 B.C. At the southern edge of the site we have found the walls of a farmstead from this period. Although the walls, floors, and pottery from the building are crude, two nicely made coins minted by the Ptolemaic rulers in Egypt were found. A third coin was found in a previous season.

The floor of a storeroom contained many finds including several lamps, six or seven hand-made juglets, a few store jars, and other domestic objects, such as grinding stones, loom weights, and spindle whorls. These objects reflect daily life of the people.

Not many cities and towns appear to have existed during the early Hellenistic period in Jordan. However, several small rural sites were located in the 'Umayri region, some of which we have previously excavated. We can only hope that we will find more in future seasons. (Larry G. Herr, Douglas R. Clark and Lawrence T. Geraty)



Monson and Master answering question after their lecture.

## Monson and Master Lecture

John Monson and Daniel Master, Assistant Professors of Archaeology at Wheaton College, spoke for the Horn Museum Lectureship, April 15, 2002. Dr. Monson has excavated at several sites in Palestine including Ashkelon, Lachish, and Timnah. Dr. Master has excavated at Ashkelon and specializes in deep-water excavations and trade routes. Their joint lecture was entitled *Searching for Solomon in the Archaeological Record*.

Dr. Monson compared the Solomonic temple with other temples in the Ancient Near East. He found that the 'Ain Dara Temple in northern Syria has many features that are similar to the Solomonic Temple. Both temples have the same three-division, long-room plan. The 'Ain Dara temple has an entry portico, an antechamber and a main chamber with a screened-off shrine; whereas Solomon's Temple had an entry portico, the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies.

Monson demonstrated that the 'Ain Dara Temple shares 34 of the 65 architectural features found in biblical description of Solomon's Temple. Both temples are relatively the same size (98-120 ft x34-65

ft), built on a raised platform with a monumental staircase and courtyard in front. The stylized floral designs, lily patterns, palmettes, winged creatures and lions of 'Ain Dara are similar to the flower patterns, palm trees and cherubim of the Solomonic temple.

Dr. Monson concluded that the many similarities between the Solomonic Temple described in 2 Chron and the 'Ain Dara Temple provide new evidence that anchors the Temple of Solomon in the cultural traditions of the tenth century B.C. regardless of the date assigned to the composition of the biblical text.

Dr. Master discussed the various state-formation models of ancient Israel and compared them with major archaeological sites during the related periods.

Most state formation models are based on the presence of a strong authoritarian figure. However, Israelite society was based upon patrimonial relationships that only appointed strong temporary leaders in times of crisis.

By the Iron Age, Israel's patrimonial society faced new challenges. According to Masters, the tenth century B.C. "picture in Palestine is one of growth and urbanization." Within a very short time, Gezer, Hazor and Megiddo grew from small settlements to fortified cities with casemate walls and six-chambered gates.

The biblical stories of Saul and David demonstrate that a need arose for a more permanent solution to deal with the increasing threats associated with the growing urbanization. A monarch was installed to create a more coordinated defense against the Philistines and other nations.

Masters believes that when monarchs began to assume other more powerful roles it created conflict within the existing patrimonial tribal structures. Soon the kingdom divided over the issue of forced labor, but the resulting territories did not break into anarchy because the tribal authority structures remained intact. The kin-based authority relationship remained intact despite the shifting tribal allegiances. (Robert D. Bates)