CHAPTER ONE

Middle Bronze, Late Bronze?, Iron I? Iron II and later periods. Excavation from the 1989 and 1990 seasons penetrated Middle Bronze and substantial Iron II occupation levels (Flanagan and McCrery 1990; De Vries 1991: 165; Flanagan, McCrery and Yassine 1992). Excavations conducted during 1993 uncovered at least five phases of Iron Age occupation/activity, dating from the tenth century to the sixth century B.C. Remains from the Persian period were also found (Flanagan, McCrery and Yassine 1994). The 1995 seasons uncovered an additional Iron I phase (Iron IC) (Flanagan, McCrery and Yassine 1996). Nothing concerning the ethnic or political identity of the Iron Age occupants has yet been reported.

Khirbat Salameh Excavation

The first survey of the site appears to have been that of Mujahed Muheisin in 1976 (report on file with Department of Antiquities; see Lenzen and McQuitty 1987: 201, n. 4). The site was surveyed again in 1983 by Lenzen and McQuitty (1984: 295; 1987: 201). The survey noted simply a structure approximately 20 x 20 m with pottery dating from the Hellenistic to the Roman periods.

In 1984 limited excavations were conducted by Lenzen and McQuitty in two areas (I and II) (Lenzen and McQuitty 1987: 201). They reported a layer of debris was reached which contained a large number of animal bones and potsherds from the sixth/fifth centuries B.C.

This picture was modified in 1992 when more extensive excavations of Khirbat Salameh were initiated by Pierre Bikai, director of the American Center of Oriental Research. Some earlier walls were found which appear to date to the Iron II period, possibly toward the end of the Assyrian period (Bikai 1993: 521, 526).

Bikai interprets the Iron II Age structure as the central feature of an agricultural site whose fortunes ebbed and flowed with the larger regional economic picture. Bikai suggests that the increase of farmsteads around 'Amman during the latter part of the Iron II Age was the result of disruption of normal trade routes through the Persian Gulf and the use of alternate routes through Transjordan that led to temporary economic expansion in the region around 'Amman (ibid.).

Tall Jalul Excavation

In 1992 Randall Younker and David Merling initiated excavations at Tall Jalul in conjunction with the Madaba Plains Project (Younker et al. 1993; Younker et al. 1996; Younker et al. 1997). Additional seasons were undertaken in 1994 and 1996. To date, occupational and/or activity remains have been recovered from the tenth to fourth centuries (Iron I to Persian period). The most significant architectural remains include a stretch of Iron I wall (Field C), at least four phases of an approach ramp and outer gatehouse on the north side of the tell which date to Iron II (ninth–eighth centuries B.C.), several buildings from Iron II (seventh–sixth centuries B.C.) including parts of some domestic buildings, a pillared building, and a tripartite building. Some architectural remains date to the Persian period (Field C). Several typical Ammonite figurines (e.g., horse and rider figurines) and Ammonite seals dating from the seventh–sixth centuries have also been found, suggesting that the border of Ammon extended at least this far south during this period.

Wadi az-Zarqa/Wadi ad-Dulayl Excavations and Survey

The Wadi az-Zarqa/Wadi ad-Dulayl Project was inaugurated in October, 1993 (Palaumbo et al. 1996). Among the sites surveyed were at least nine Iron II sites, including Khirbat aj-Jamus and Tall al-Birah. The latter site is the only true tall in the region. Its size and prominent location overlooking the Zarqa River suggests that it must have played an important role in controlling activities and movements between the Jordan Valley and the eastern fringes of the Ammonite kingdom.

EXCURSUS

SALIENT FEATURES OF IRON AGE TRIBAL KINGDOMS

Öystein La Bianca

Much recent scholarship has been devoted to trying to grasp and describe the distinguishing characteristics of the social organization of the ancient Iron Age kingdoms of the Southern Levant such as the Israelites, the Ammonites, the Moabites and the Edomites (Frick 1985; Gottwald 1979; Herr 1998, others). Recently, we (La Bianca and Younker 1995; Younker 1997c) have argued that a fundamental
feature of their social organization was that they never ceased to be essentially kin-based or "tribal." Our point was to argue that despite the emergence of "kings" in these societies, and the reference to them as "kingdoms", these were fundamentally tribal societies or "tribal kingdoms."

What, specifically, do we mean by this? In our previous article we emphasized the capacity of tribal ideology to accommodate both sedentary and nomadic types of livelihoods. We also showed how tribal ideology could operate at the super-tribal level of "kings" and "kingdoms." In the following few paragraphs, I would like to take the argument a bit further by positing ten hypotheses summarizing the salient features of such "tribal kingdoms."

One, their tribal social structure was intimately linked to their way of obtaining food. The peoples who founded the kingdoms of Israel, Ammon, Moab and Edom were, by and large, range-tied shepherds and land-tied farmers. Throughout their histories, the extent to which one or the other of these two pursuits were emphasized by a given household or cluster of families was determined by local climatic and landscape conditions and by changing opportunities for involvement in local and regional trade. The organizational principle that facilitated adaptive shifts in either the direction of pastoral or agricultural pursuits was tribalism—an ideology based on the idea of claimed descent from a common ancestor with possibilities for manipulation to accommodate shifts back and forth between land-tied and range-tied pursuits at the level of either individual households, groups of households, or whole communities.

Two, is the presence co-existence of land-tied and range-tied agricultural regimes. The economic pursuits of most people were either centered on land-tied production of cereals and tree fruits, or on the production of meat and milk on the hoof by means of range-tied husbandry of sheep and goats. While households specializing more in one or the other of these pursuits co-existed in the same villages and hamlets, the proportion represented by one or the other pursuit would vary considerably from one village to the next. This proportion might also vary considerably over time within a particular household, hamlet, village or region.

Three, their tribal affiliations were based on generative genealogies. By means of manipulation of claimed ancestors, individuals and households were able to affiliate with named groups and sections within the larger tribes. Such generative genealogy permitted individu-
from the study of instruments of delegated power, such as stamp seals and related artifacts.

Seven, most people lived in the rural hinterland beyond the towns. As the daily lives of most members of these ancient kingdoms were caught up in activities related to the quest for food, people lived in small villages and hamlets surrounded by agricultural lands and pastures. Villages and hamlets consisted of various configurations of houses, caves, and tents, depending on the conditions of production in various geographical regions. As a general rule, the more "risky" these food production conditions were, whether due to the vicissitudes of climate, trade, or politics—the greater the fluidity of rural settlement patterns. Cycles of sedentarization and nomadization appear generally to have been more pronounced in Transjordan than in Cisjordan. In Transjordan, such cycles become more pronounced as one moves southward from Ammon, to Moab, into Edom.

Eight, is the presence of heterarchical power structures. Power relations within each of these Iron Age tribal kingdoms are best described as being counterpoised rather than ranked within some scalar hierarchy. Thus it was possible for there to be several political centers of gravity within each kingdom, each center basing its power on a different political resource. For example, one center may be politically powerful because of its location on the junction of two or more intersecting highways. Another may base its power on being a processing and distribution center for certain agricultural products. And a third may base its power on its being the home of an important religious service or shrine. Such structures stand in sharp contrast to the scalar hierarchies associated with the hydraulic societies of Egypt and Mesopotamia. They also are more consonant with the egalitarian ideals of tribal societies.

Nine, is the presence of overlapping territorial units. Consistent with the existence of heterarchical power structures would be overlapping territorial units. The boundaries separating different local level political units would best be described as fuzzy and fluid rather than clear and fixed. The reason for this is that the economic activities engaged in by one group may be such that they can easily co-occur with those carried out by another. For example, one clan may be primarily pastoral, another primarily agricultural, thus both would stand to benefit from the one overlapping the other as pasture animals belonging to one group would be allowed to graze on the stubble fields claimed by another.

Ten, is the maintenance of militias. A cadre of trained soldiers was maintained in order to protect the interests of each tribal kingdom. These soldiers relied on herds of camels or horses and on arms made of iron as instruments of warfare.

**Conclusion**

To these salient features, others will no doubt soon be added. The intent, of course, is to stimulate discussion and field research to either confirm or reject any or all of them, hopefully in order to replace each hypothesis with a better one.
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