



BOOK OF MORMON CENTRAL

<http://bookofmormoncentral.org/>

Type: Newsletter

U.A.S. Newsletter, no. 56 (February 11, 1959)

Editors(s): Dee F. Green

Published by: University Archaeological Society, Brigham Young University

U. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Number 56

Editor: Dee F. Green

February 11, 1959

Published approximately every six weeks by THE UNIVERSITY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. The purpose of the Newsletter is to disseminate knowledge of recent archaeological discoveries bearing on the Latter-day Saint scriptures; also of the archaeological activities and viewpoints of the Society and its members. Subscription by membership in the Society: three dollars per year; or Life Membership, fifty dollars. (Membership also includes subscription to other publications of the Society and of the BYU Department of Archaeology.)

56.0 LABORATORY WORK ON 1958 EXPEDITION

MATERIALS; PROGRESS REPORT. By Carl Hugh Jones. Following is a brief report of what has been accomplished so far in the laboratory processing of the artifact material obtained at Aguacatal by the 1958 expedition of BYU (Newsletter, 48.0, 50.01).

On the arrival at BYU last May of the large shipment of specimens from Mexico, the many boxes were opened and such material as could be processed before the end of the school year was prepared for display purposes.

The writer was able to return to the campus last August and begin the work of washing and labeling the sherds and other artifacts. After the first week, Miss Dorothy DeWitt joined in this work, and later also Miss Kristine Hansen; both are student majors in archaeology at BYU. With this help it has since been possible to process all specimen material brought back from Mexico.



Miss Dorothy DeWitt and expedition member Carl Hugh Jones exhibit some of the artifacts processed in the archaeology laboratory.

The laboratory work consisted of the following: First, all the bags of specimens were sorted by location, after which the sherds from each provenience were washed and placed on screens to dry. When dry, the sherd material was sorted and all insignificant pieces discarded. Following this, a small patch of paint was placed on each sherd. On the painted area was written a label indicating the excavation unit and level from which the specimen came. Great care was taken to keep separate each group of sherds and to preserve the location tags on the bags. Finally, the artifacts were sorted by kind and counted.

Once the above steps were finished, it was possible to start the restoration of some of the vessels. Armed with glue and clothespins, we were able partly to restore many jars and bowls. (The largest and best examples may be seen in the accompanying photograph.) Some of the difficult mending jobs were the little "sacrament cups," which were so small that they were hard to hold while the glue dried; and the vessels in Fine Cinnamon-Buff ware, because of the large number of sherds that had to be gone over before the right piece was found.

Among the other specimens recovered are pieces of cement and adobe, which have imprints of the wooden framework against which they were plastered. Some interesting stone objects are several celts of polished flint and a number of obsidian knife blades.

On December 19, 1958, as the autumn quarter closed, we had completed the above processing of all the material brought back from Aguacatal, the totals of preserved and labeled specimens being as follows: sherds, 11,520; pieces of adobe, 224; bones, 721; pieces of cement, 130; shells, 369; and objects of stone, 126. Grand total, 13,090 specimens.

56.1 "THE FLOOD," "THE TOWER OF BABEL," AND OTHER STUDIES; AN IMPORTANT NEW SERIES IN THE FIELD OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY. Bibliographic note and partial review by M. Wells Jakeman.

The attention of UAS members is called to a new series of small and popularly written but scholarly

books in the field of biblical archaeology, i. e. one of the Society's fields of special interest. The author is the eminent French archaeologist André Parrot, long-time specialist in the field of Near Eastern and biblical archaeology, and Chief Curator of the French National Museums, Professor of Archaeology at the School of the Louvre, Paris, and Director of Excavations at the ancient Mesopotamian city of Mari since 1933. Consequently we do not hesitate to recommend the purchase and careful reading of these books by UAS members (some of whom doubtless already have them).

The volumes that have so far appeared in English, and their prices, are as follows: Discovering Buried Worlds (1st or French ed., 1952; present English trans. ed., 1955; \$3. 75); The Flood and Noah's Ark (1st or French ed., 1952; present English trans. ed., 1955; \$2. 75); The Tower of Babel (trans. ed., 1955; \$2. 75); Nineveh and the Old Testament (trans. ed., 1955; \$2. 75); The Temple of Jerusalem (trans. ed., c. 1957; \$2. 75); Samaria (description of the discoveries at one of the capital cities of ancient Israel; trans. ed., c. 1958; \$2. 75). The English translations are by Edwin Hudson, and the publisher (of these editions) is the Philosophical Library of New York (address orders to: The Philosophical Library, Inc., 15 E. 40th Street, New York 16, N. Y.).

Professor Parrot--who took his doctorate in the field of biblical studies and theology--writes with the conviction that the believer in the Bible "has nothing to fear and much to learn from the resurrection of the biblical past under the pick of the excavators," and that "every victory won by biblical archaeology for historical truth is a service rendered to religious truth."

In his first book of the series, Discovering Buried Worlds, he introduces the reader to the archaeologist at work, at the same time making clear the great privilege and responsibility that such work entails. Next is presented a resume of archaeological activity in the Near East to the present day; and a synoptic outline of five thousands years of ancient Near Eastern history, as so far reconstructed from the findings of archaeology. The last section summarizes in particular the discoveries bearing upon the Bible. Archaeology, it is pointed out, contributes to the picture of the biblical world by (1) confirming historical facts, (2) establishing the location of places mentioned in the Bible, and (3) restoring some of the life of the vanished peoples of the Bible through the recovery of their documents and artifacts.

The second volume (in its first part) is a rapid survey of the evidence to date concerning the Flood; first, the literary and epigraphic evidence (the Genesis story itself, the Mesopotamian cuneiform accounts, the Epic of Atrahasis, the Greek account of Berosus,

and the cuneiform king-lists that mention "the Flood"), and second, the archaeological evidence proper (layers of flood deposit that have been found in the excavation of various ancient cities of the Mesopotamian plain, namely Ur, Kish, Erech, Shuruppak, Lagash, and Nineveh). Parrot notes that the flood layers occur at different periods--i. e. there were several floods in the ancient history of Mesopotamia--but that one of these layers is undoubtedly the deposit left behind by the great flood referred to in Genesis and the cuneiform writings. He does not state which of these layers represents this "universal" flood of Genesis in Mesopotamia; but in Figure V he shows that the layer found at Shuruppak, dating to the end of the Jemdet Nasr or predynastic period, is the one occurring most widely throughout the lower plain of Mesopotamia (equates with one of the three found at Kish and also with the single flood strata found at Erech and Lagash).

Incidentally the correlation of these layers at the end of the Jemdet Nasr period--making this particular flood the most extensive and consequently the one to be identified as the great flood of Mesopotamian and biblical tradition--was first pointed out by the reviewer, several years ago in a prior study of the problem by him (reported in a paper presented at the Society's Fifth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures, December, 1951; see abstract of this paper in the UAS Newsletter of Jan. 20, 1952, 4. 1). It may be added that these several correlated flood layers at the end of the Jemdet Nasr or predynastic period can now be rather reliably dated to about 3100 B. C. (on the basis of recent reinterpretations of the cuneiform King-lists, placing the beginning of the first dynasty [namely the First Dynasty of Kish, when, according to these lists, "kingship came down from heaven" following "the Flood"] at about this date); which --if the extensive flood they represent was indeed the great flood of Mesopotamian and biblical tradition-- is therefore the true date of that flood, i. e. a correction backward, by several centuries, of the traditional dating of the event on the basis of our present Masoretic Hebrew text of the Old Testament. (This new dating of the Flood from archaeological evidence closely agrees, however, with the dating indicated by the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament.) It may also be mentioned that one of the cuneiform accounts indicates that Noah was living at Shuruppak when "the Flood" came, i. e. one of the cities destroyed by a flood at the end of the Jemdet Nasr period; which further identifies the flood layers at the end of this period as the deposit of the great Genesis flood. (For this, and an important final question raised by the archaeological evidence as to the extent of the Flood, see also the previously cited discussion in Newsletter No. 4.)

Part Two of this second volume deals with the Ark -- what has been said about it, how it has been illustrated (often fancifully), and what is actually known archaeologically about boats of Noah's time. There is also a brief and amusing account of the several "scientific" expeditions that have gone to Mt. Ararat in search of the Ark: "People do look for the Ark, and from time to time they find it," despite the fact that "after five thousand years the wood of the Ark, even coated with pitch, has [surely] long since returned to dust" (to which the reviewer may add that these searches for the Ark on Mt. Ararat, far to the north of Mesopotamia, are misdirected in the first place, since Genesis actually says that the Ark landed on the "mountains of Ararat," which in light of evidence from the cuneiform tablets were a range of mountains immediately bordering the Mesopotamian plain on the east--i. e. among or to be identified with the Zagros Mountains of western Iran, and nowhere near the high mountain in Armenia now called Ararat; cf. Newsletter 43. 1).

In his third book, Dr. Parrot discusses the origin and significance of the biblical "Tower of Babel" as shown by archaeology. Students of biblical archaeology agree that the building of the great "tower" spoken of in Genesis 11 was the construction of a Mesopotamian ziggurat or brick stepped temple tower (of which some 35 are now known at 27 different cities. If such be the case, Parrot argues, the building of this great "tower" or ziggurat of the Genesis account should be understood in Mesopotamian terms. That is, since the ziggurats or stepped temple towers of ancient Mesopotamia were build primarily for the worship of God, or the gods, this would seem to require a correction of the implication in Genesis that the building of the high tower or ziggurat it tells about--"a tower" that would "reach unto heaven"--was a sin against God. In other words, as Parrot puts it, instead of being "a clenched fist raised [high] in defiance towards Heaven," it was in reality "a cry to Heaven for help." Parrot then documents this interpretation by reviewing the archaeological evidence on the history and purposes of the ziggurat in ancient Mesopotamia.

This interpretation, it will be noted, would seem at first thought to make meaningless the further account in Genesis of God's stopping the building of the tower and scattering its builders. But this does not necessarily follow. Although the building of the great tower or ziggurat of the Bible must have been primarily for the purpose of worship, in light of the archaeological evidence marshaled by Parrot, it could still have been that the builders in this instance--evidently King Nimrod and his people--undertook the project without the proper humility, i. e. that they sinned--as implied in Genesis--in also having the ambition of

making their temple-tower "reach unto heaven" or be the highest in the land, in order to "make [them] a name," i. e. to bring them fame; and that, of course, it was this that offended God, not the building of a temple-tower or ziggurat as such.

Incidentally, there is evidence that the statement in Gen. 11:9 is a late gloss, mistakenly incorporated into the text of Genesis and giving an erroneous identification of the city where the great tower or ziggurat was built. For the name Babel given this city (Babilu or Babylon) does not mean--as implied in that passage--'confounding of language' (from which of course our word babel or confusion of many voices or languages), but rather 'Gate of God.' Moreover, a recent study of the cuneiform records has adduced evidence that the "land of Shinar" where (after coming from the east [Gen. 11:2], i. e. from the direction of the Zagros Mountains or "mountains of Ararat;" cf. above) Nimrod and his people began the building of their city and tower as related in Gen. 11:2-4, was originally--i. e. in the time of Nimrod--the land of the city of Nippur located about 55 miles southeast of Babel or Babylon (only later including Babel and other neighboring cities as listed in Gen. 10:10), which tends to identify that city and not Babylon as the city where the great tower was built; see Newsletter, 16. 01. In other words, the ziggurat whose ruins have been discovered at Nippur--a high ziggurat that was, in fact, more famous in pre-Chaldean times than the one at Babylon--now appears to have been the actual tower spoken of in Genesis.

Lack of space prevents a discussion of the remaining volumes that have so far appeared in this new archaeological series. It may be stated, however, that although all these books are written in a popular style, they are fully informative, giving clearly and concisely the pertinent facts about each subject. Technical language is largely avoided, as they are written for the general reader rather than the specialist. References are provided, however, for those wishing to delve more deeply into any one of the important questions that the author opens up.

56.2 A QUESTION FOR THE EDITOR. As a regular feature of the Newsletter, a selected question on an archaeological subject is answered either by the editor or a guest contributor. Questions should be sent to: Editor, UAS Newsletter, Department of Archaeology, BYU, Provo, Utah.

56.20 Why a Department of "Archaeology"? Sir: Why is it that Brigham Young University has a Department of "Archaeology," while most other universities have departments of "anthropology"? What is the distinction between the two fields of study?

Why should BYU want to be so "different"? --- RTM

You are correct in understanding that most North American universities have departments of anthropology. Brigham Young University, in fact, is the only one of them, so far as I know, that possesses a Department of Archaeology, although it is also true that a number of schools have departments of "archaeology and anthropology." The reasons for the unusual arrangement at BYU have nothing to do with happenstance or the desire to be different. The role of the Department of Archaeology was clearly envisioned when it was founded in 1946 and has thus far been worked out on the principles then laid down.

"Anthropology" is a discipline of comparatively recent origin, generally classified in American universities as one of the "social sciences." It is a composite study, comprising such diverse fields as physical anthropology (the study of man as a biological species), linguistics, and prehistoric archaeology. The main interest, however, is that of "culture"--i. e. the totality of man's customary behavior--and an elucidation of the principles upon which culture can be understood; also, an examination of the relationship between that which is culture and that which biological in man.

"Archaeology" is a more unified discipline. All branches of the subject possess a common set of objectives and a common methodology: In every case the aim is to construct a developmental picture of what happened in man's past--i. e. history, as manifested in the material remains of human workmanship; and in every case this is accomplished by means of similar techniques of reconnaissance, excavation, and interpretation of discovered data. Archaeology is therefore a kind of history, and in fact mainly differs from conventional history only in the fact that it studies artifacts, whereas conventional history studies documents.

Although archaeology impinges upon many different related disciplines, it should be regarded essentially as one of the humanities. The "humanities" are a group of scholarly disciplines which have come into existence in western civilization centered about the concept of man's past achievements and emphasizing the creative and noble nature of man as a being of mind and imagination. Such studies as literature, art, music, and history--and, in Europe, archaeology--are regularly included under the "humanities."

In fact, archaeology is classified in a curiously contradictory manner as between European and North American scholars: In Europe it is regarded as one of the humanities, as indicated above; but in America it is held to be a dependent subdivision of anthropology, hence within the scope of the social sciences.

But what kinds of archaeology are referred to?

In Europe archaeology as we now know it has been produced from a fusion of three originally-independent antiquarian interests: the ancient historic biblical-Near Eastern civilizations, the historic Graeco-Roman or classical civilization, and the prehistoric Stone Age cultures of northern Europe,, all considered from the historical standpoint. The result has been a well-rounded and comprehensive historical discipline, unified by common objectives and methodology.

In North America, on the other hand, parts of archaeology (the fields of prehistoric archaeology) have been adopted by anthropology, and other parts (the fields of historic archaeology) have been hidden away in obscure corners of such disciplines as Near Eastern and biblical studies, and classical studies. I know of no university other than BYU where it is possible to get a comprehensive training in all the major branches of archaeology in a single department.

Anthropology has traditionally focused its attention on "primitive" or non-literate peoples of the contemporary world and on pre-literate (i. e. "prehistoric") peoples of the ancient world. In other words, in tracing the culture-history of ancient man, anthropology loses interest in him precisely at the point where he acquired writing, and the study from that point on is left to specialists in historic archaeology and documentary history (Near Eastern and biblical, classical, etc.).

In the American field, scholars were confronted with the study of wide-spread native populations, some non-literate and possessing very simple cultures and others being the heirs of ancient and highly advanced civilizations, which knew the use of developed forms of writing. But since these writings could not be read, the entirety of New World archaeological history prior to the coming of the Europeans--writing or no-- was arbitrarily lumped together as "prehistoric."

Now since conventional history has been limited to "documentary" sources, and since it has been concerned only with "western" (i. e. European and European-derived) civilization anyway, conventional historians could not involve themselves in New World archaeology. (This despite the fact that some of the ancient New World peoples were just as civilized and literate as some of those of the Old World studied in "history.") On the other hand, anthropologists with their traditional concern for primitive and pre-literate peoples, and an original assumption--long since disproved--that all the native peoples of the New World were essentially on the prehistoric or pre-literate level of culture development, adopted the study of New World archaeology for their own. And that adoption has remained firm until the present day. Whatever logic or illogic attaches to the inclusion of New World

archaeological history with anthropology, the fact is that in practically all North American universities it is so classified.

We are thus confronted with a curious situation. Anthropology has adopted part of archaeology for its own, namely that of prehistoric peoples--and that is construed to include all New World peoples, primitive as well as highly civilized. But that science has never claimed the archaeological study of the ancient historic (i. e. biblical and classical) civilizations of the Old World--the very field, incidentally, to which most of the interest attaches at BYU, so far as the Eastern Hemisphere is concerned. Evidently, if the American student wishes to specialize in comparative studies involving the early high civilizations of both hemispheres he must perforce divide his university training among several academic departments. Now if Brigham Young University wishes to provide that combined training which is missing in most American schools it cannot accomplish its objective by merely imitating what has been done elsewhere. It must set up a framework which will embrace the whole science of archaeology. It must in a word follow the example of European rather than American universities.

The Department of Archaeology at Brigham Young University was founded in December, 1946, on the recommendation of the late Dr. John A. Widtsoe, then of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and under the presidency of Dr. Howard S. McDonald. Dr. M. Wells Jakeman was named department chairman and has occupied that position to the present time. One of the original purposes of the Department was to serve Brigham Young University and the LDS church as a center for research and publication in the archaeology of the scriptures. By "scriptures" are meant the four Standard Works, but especially the Bible and the Book of Mormon, because of the extensive historical content of these works. The focus of attention of the new department was therefore on the ancient high civilizations of both hemispheres--those of the Near East and those of Mesoamerica and Peru--and on comparative studies involving these areas.

With archaeology recognized as one of the humanities and including within its scope the two Old World divisions--historic and prehistoric--as well as the American division usually claimed by New World anthropologists, this comparative approach became possible. Whatever direction archaeological, anthropological, and historical studies may take at Brigham Young University in the future, for the first twelve years at least this comparative approach to the early high civilizations of both hemispheres has been greatly enhanced by the set-up as it was originally conceived.

Another advantage of the Department of Archaeology at BYU is that it has become especially strong as

to curriculum. So far as I am aware, BYU possesses the most comprehensive and well-balanced curriculum in archaeology as such to be found anywhere in America on the baccalaureate level. Any weaknesses inherent in the Department are those of limitations in staff, facilities, and funds for field research, and have little to do with the curriculum. (No claim is made to complete coverage of the related field of anthropology. However, a number of classes in that subject have been included from the first, as necessary supplements to the training in archaeology. In fact, there are strong reasons for an eventual expansion of the Department into a department of "archaeology and anthropology," as now found at some American as well as European universities.)

Because of the peculiar circumstances of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, Mormonism is the one religion which can be objectively tested by archaeological evidence. Here we have, it seems to me, the one great instance in the history of the world where it is possible to put a scientific test to the key foundation stone of a major religious system, and Brigham Young University is the one place where this test can be performed.

Every university has certain areas of specialization, certain foci of interest, in which it is likely to make its greatest contributions to the cause of truth. Dr. Widtsoe, once a BYU faculty member, recognized four such areas for this university; one of them was American archaeology, especially in its bearing upon the claims of the Book of Mormon as to the origin and early history of the ancient civilizations of the New World (In a Sunlit Land, 1953, pp. 95-96).

In my opinion, the founding of the Department of Archaeology in 1946 was a bold and imaginative stroke of leadership. Dr. Widtsoe, President McDonald, Dr. Jakeman, and their associates looked beyond the provincial viewpoint usually held by North American universities. There was a far-seeing and inspired act, taken with an ultimate view to assuming a position of leadership in relation to the broader world-concept, as exemplified by the departments of archaeology in European institutions of higher learning. . . . RTC.

56.3 CLARIFICATION. Two items in the recent book by Thomas Stuart Ferguson, One Fold and One Shepherd, have come to the attention of the BYU Department of Archaeology, which it is felt require clarification for the benefit of UAS members:

56.30 The Lehi Stone. On page 228 (also in a brochure advertising this book) is printed a photograph labeled, "109. Stela 5 at ruins of Izapa, state of Chiapas, Mexico. Dates to about the time of Christ. The Stone is about 8 feet high and 6 feet wide. Photo by author." This, of course, is the sculpture now well

known to Society members as the Lehi Tree-of-Life Stone (UAS Bulletin, No. 4, 1953). However, the photograph was taken, not of the actual Stela 5 at Izapa, but very clearly of the plaster cast of that sculpture now in the Department of Archaeology at BYU, prepared from the latex mold of the original stone brought back from Izapa by the BYU-UAS Middle American expedition of 1958 (Newsletter, 48.00, 50.01, 51.3).

A careful check has revealed that no permission to photograph this cast for publication has at any time been given, either to Mr. Ferguson or to any other person. (It should be pointed out that a great deal of effort, time, and money were expended in its preparation and in obtaining the mold from which it was made, by both the staff and students of this department; and since the Society has its own plans for publishing this material, permission to photograph the cast is naturally required.) The unauthorized photograph published in Mr. Ferguson's book evidently was taken in June or July of 1958, soon after the cast had been finished and placed on display for the Society's Eleventh Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures (Newsletter, 50.0).

56.31. Book-of-Mormon Archaeology and New-World Origins. On pages 257-258 of his book, Mr. Ferguson also makes the following statement on the history of interest in the Book of Mormon from the standpoint of archaeology--i. e. on the history of Book of Mormon archaeology--up to the founding of his own organization in this field, the "New World Archaeological Foundation": "The Book of Mormon was first published in 1830. That was in a day before even ancient Maya cities were known to exist. Twelve years later Joseph Smith, the translator and publisher, rejoiced greatly when he read John Lloyd Stephens' books on his travels and discoveries among ancient Maya cities of Central America and southern Mexico. After reading Stephens' accounts, Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet, wrote some editorials expressing his delight that study of the ancient cities of the Book of Mormon lands had been so soon commenced following the first printing of the Book of Mormon. . . . Joseph Smith then went further and invited an all-out investigation of the authenticity and truthfulness of the Book of Mormon. . . . by a comparison of the ancient cities described by Stephens with those described in the Book of Mormon. . . . Neither Joseph Smith nor the newly-founded Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints had funds with which to undertake the comparisons during the lifetime of Joseph Smith. . . . Finally, after the lapse of one hundred twenty-five years, the tests are being made. After waiting in vain for others to initiate the work, I undertook to raise the needed funds and push the task forward."

The above concept of the history of Book of Mormon archaeology may surprise some of the readers of this newsletter; specifically, Mr. Ferguson's claim that no one since the time of Joseph Smith had undertaken the archaeological investigation of the Book of Mormon when, 125 years later (i. e. since the publication of the Book of Mormon, or in 1955?), he "undertook to raise the needed funds and push the task forward." In reality, quite a number of investigators in this field between these dates could be named, beginning with Benjamin Cluff, Jr. (who as president of BYU directed the first BYU archaeological expedition to Book of Mormon lands in 1900) and including the present staff and some former students of the BYU Department of Archaeology (in the case of one staff member, since 1934; see Newsletter, 37.1), as well as some present members of the UAS.

On the back inner flap of the jacket of Mr. Ferguson's book, an additional claim to priority is made that should also be commented upon. This is a statement that his organization, known as the "New World Archaeological Foundation," was first planned "in 1952 when it was noted that the major problem of New World archaeology was that of the origins of the early high civilizations and that no substantial organization was doing anything about it."

But the facts in the case are somewhat at variance with this claim. Brigham Young University--a substantial organization--clearly recognized that same major problem of New World archaeology in 1946 when it founded its Department of Archaeology, whose main field of investigation was to be Middle America and the origin of the ancient civilizations of that area. This was six years before Mr. Ferguson's organization got under way (compare above in this Newsletter, latter part of 56.2). Moreover, since its founding, the Department has done everything within its power in the way of investigating that problem, considering the resources placed at its disposal. (These facts, it should be added, were fully known to Mr. Ferguson from the beginning, for in 1948 he was a member of the Second Brigham Young University Archaeological Expedition to Middle America, which had as its purpose the gathering of new evidence on the origin of the ancient Middle American civilizations; see UAS Bulletin, No. 3, p. 19.)