

ANATI: PRE-FLOOD ARCHAEOLOGY

Palestine Before the Hebrews by Anati is recognized by scholars in the field of archaeology as one of the best. It represents a summary of the work done in Palestine up to 1963. Since that date one should read more recent books and journal articles to get the most up-to-date material.

There is so much here that we can only summarize some basic points to illustrate the problem.

Earliest Stone Cultures

We do not need to go into a detailed description of the archaeological terminology and so on. We want to get the principle of what is involved. It would help to look at the pictures in the book to see what has actually been found.

The earliest form of culture that is found anywhere in the world that is clearly attributable to man is called a "Pebble Culture"—this is a term that we should probably certainly change.

Page 77, bottom: "Traces of human artifacts became more abundant in later prehistory, while periods became shorter and the rhythm of cultural change accelerated. Significantly, from the 250,000-year period in which the Pebble culture must have persisted" Now when you read a book that says that "such-and-such must have happened" the emphasis must have is due to lack of evidence! Therefore one must use a strong verb! This is simply the way we have to read these books.

Pp. 77-78: Continuing: "...must have persisted (approximately between 600,000 and 350,000 years ago"—or 250,000 years for the duration of one culture, this Pebble culture. Note the picture on this page of the kind of tools used—comparatively primitive is probably what you could first conceive of if you had a stone and to whack away on the end of it so you could get some cutting edge to start with and hadn't really thought of any other method. This is one of the quickest methods—just keep striking stones till you come up with a sharp edge due to a proper break.

Page 78, top: Notice: "...We know of only two sites" of this culture "in Palestine." So they have found two sites of the Pebble Tool Culture. This culture also had its development in East Asia and East Africa. In other words, it represents the earliest type of culture when man is forced to migrate and utilize whatever simple material is around.

"Early Bifacial and Early Tabunian artifacts have been found so far at five sites." Now at the point of investigation, you see, we are dealing with archaeologists who have—up to a certain point in history—found a certain number of instances of one cultural pattern, a certain larger number of another.

The term "bifacial" is a specific definition of a method of chipping stone; it means "two faces." That is, there are two sides of the stone that have been chipped, whereas the pebble might have only one chipped side but enough to give it a sharp edge. Bifacial has to do with both sides. And there are variations depending upon whether they wanted a scraper or a chopper, or some kind of axe for cutting down small trees.

They define another related culture in Palestine in different terms—they used to use European terminology, but now it's called "Early Tabunian" which is named after a site in Palestine. You do not necessarily have to memorize these terms.

What we want to note is the concept of the advance of culture demonstrated by the increase in the number of sites discovered.

The Early Bifacial and Early Tabunian represent a period of about 130,000 years! That, of course, is a very accurate figure. They conceive of it as a very long time and then gradually the time is shortened—but this is based on concepts of how, when men arose, long it would take to make such an advance if man was really more like an ape to start with.

Still top of 78: "Middle Bifacial and Middle Tabunian are known from...eleven sites and they represent a period of about 100,000 years." Now labels like "Early" and "Middle" merely means that there is progress in cultural techniques.

"Late Bifacial and Late Tabunian are known from over forty different sites, and they represent a period of about 60,000 years."

Note the chart on page 76: Early, Middle and Late Tabunian are classified as coming in the Lower and Middle Paleolithic. In other words, we are still in the Paleolithic stage here. Then comes the Mesolithic, then the Neolithic, the Chalcolithic; and then the Early Bronze, Middle Bronze, Late Bronze; then the Iron Age; then the Classical cultures coming before the Middle Ages as we know them, and then Modern times—this gives you the sequence. These are not geological but archaeological terms.

Parallel with such archaeological terms, we would find the "Ice Ages"—that is, the Pluvial and Interpluvial (terms listed in parallel columns on page 76).

Progress and Population

We are dealing here, as we have said, with Lower and Middle Paleolithic—which means we still have part of Middle and all of Upper Paleolithic to go.

The point is that in this picture we have something peculiar: As progress is made in technical skill, the human population gives the impression of multiplying. This is the point: As progress is made in technology, there is also clearly a multiplication of sites. This implies that as the human family was multiplying and spreading out, there was a development of technique along with a growth in population numbers.

Dr. Hoeh calls brief attention to the middle paragraph on 78 about the numbers of tools associated with these earliest cultures of the Lower Paleolithic.

Mousterian

If we look at the chart on page 76, we proceed from the Pebble Tool to the Early and Middle Bifacial, then we come to the Late Bifacial. And then we discover that above the Late Bifacial we have what is commonly known—and, at the beginning, even parallel with it—the Mousterian.

The Mousterian is a type of culture associated with Neanderthal Man in Europe.

And the Mousterian is associated with a Late Bifacial and a kind of Tabunian that still continues (see in column "Yabrud, Syria"). So above this Late Bifacial we will say there is a Tabunian as well, and then a Mousterian Culture.

"Mousterian" is named after a site. Mousterian Culture is from a Neanderthal type man. Now, this brings us to the Middle Paleolithic and, basically, the close of the Middle Paleolithic represents the Mousterian.

We could say that normally the Tabunian and Bifacial represents the Early Paleolithic and then the Mousterian represents the Middle Paleolithic.

Three-way Organization

In other words, if you have a Paleolithic and a Mesolithic and a Neolithic, the Paleolithic is divided into Early, Middle and Late. The reason is that archaeologists can see that one phase is earlier than the last one and that there is something in the middle—that's the reason they do it! There is no sound way to be sure that there is always a three-fold division. When the people back then were preparing materials, they didn't think, "Well now, we'll go through these three stages"—obviously!

There is also an Early, Middle and Late Neolithic, Early, Middle and Late Bronze. And then each one of these is often subdivided—Early Bronze I, Early Bronze II, Early Bronze III; Middle Bronze I, Middle Bronze II, and so on—this kind of thing is what they do. That is, there is just a human tendency to think of it as first and last and something in between. And then they discover that there are many other subdivisions, you see. So as you read the material, you must conceive of this pattern of thinking by the archaeologists.

Miscellaneous Points

Now we may drop back a little in the book to pick up more of the background.

There will be some pictures showing that the climate during this period had variations and to what extent there are sites of fire-places--cave deposits.

Page 59, bottom: Here we find an interesting item. "The earliest anthropoid remains known so far in the Near East come from the Jordan Valley, from a site called Ubaidiya"—meaning "the little Negro," I believe, in the Arabic—"near Kibbutz Affiqim. There are two small fragments of a skull four times as thick as the skull of modern man, and one incisor tooth...found in the levels of clay and gravel."

Now, these remains are anthropoid—but whether we can be sure that they are human beyond any doubt would remain a question. We do not have time to investigate it further here. It is a possibility.

These remains "belong to the Grand Pluvial, the first and most conspicuous pluvial" period—this is the earliest. And the chart on page 76 reveals that the Grand Pluvial parallels the Pebble Tool Culture (very bottom of the chart).

Top of page 60: These anthropoid remains are in the same levels with "fossil bones of some forty different species of extinct animals...including elephants, rhinoceroses, hippopotamuses, wild bears, turtles, and large numbers of catfish" all in these various deposits—creatures that, of course, at a later time didn't even exist in Palestine!

Now, as we go through, the remarkable thing is the lack of human burials through all this early period. In fact, not until you come to this phase /I believe the reference is to Middle Paleolithic/ do we have any indication of burials other than some anthropoid fragment as just described.

Caves

Now, most of the sites are "open-air stations"—middle of page 63. By this we mean that man as a whole was not living in caves. In fact, caves as a place of habitation normally are associated with the Mousterian. In other words, only as time went on (into the Middle Paleolithic) do you have this. You rather have here what we would call merely

camping or open-air sites. This certainly could explain part of the reason for a loss of numbers. If they are living out in the open, the remains may well have been turned up agricultural development in later times; so that who knows how many have been lost if they were once in an open-air region. Mostly however, it is in what is today near-desert so that it would have been impossible to survive.

Mousterian and Levalloisian

Page 82-83: "Until a few years ago it was believed that the Middle Paleolithic was characterized by two cultures, the Mousterian and the Levalloisian (this name was taken from the site of Levallois, near Paris, in France)... Since then, however, French prehistorians have noticed that in Europe, also, Levalloisian flakes and cores are frequently found in Mousterian layers."

The idea formerly was that there were two separate cultures—that one had to do with the technique that is called "flaking" where they were using it for cutting hide and skin and meat, and the other was the Mousterian kind of "hand ax" culture. The obvious answer is that in some regions where there are forests the need will exist for axes; in other regions you might have no need for these but you will have the kind of stone that would be necessary for cutting up hide and the animal that might have been butchered.

So, in this particular case, they were thinking of these as two separate cultures whereas they are simply just two techniques that go hand in hand according to the individual area or tribe. And in some cases, obviously, family groups may well have specialized in making one or the other type of instrument (just as today).

Fauna Change in Relation to the Biblical Record

Page 97: "Up to the [time of the Mousterian], an archaic sort of fauna prevailed, among which were elephants, rhinoceroses, hippopotamuses, and other large animals which disappeared thereafter from Palestine."

Pages 97-8: Then later, in the period of the Mousterian, the fauna changes to "wild oxen, wild horses, gazelle, and deer." In other words, there is definitely a change in climate and, in fact, an indication that animals that once were in the region were migrating—either killed off in this area—or didn't any longer find it hospitable.

Now the interesting is that if the Biblical record is true, the implication is that all animals as a whole were found centered in Palestine originally. Now we say, logically, that there is a necessity of having certain types of plant and insect life scattered over the earth for a balance. But there is no reason that the larger animals or man had to be. After all, after the Flood they spread from a single, central area. And the implication of the Biblical record is that both instances are the same.

Now if you have these strange creatures that are no longer extant, but are found scattered in Southeast Asia and India and especially Africa one would be led to the conclusion that when we are at this point in history we are at the earliest point in human life where animals existed, as they might well have, after the Flood within a few years after the ark landed—that is, in a central location. In the same way here, we would be dealing with a period, maybe the first few decades when human life is on earth, when human and animal life is multiplying before many of these types of animals disappear [that is, migrate from the original central area of Palestine].

So "the predominant animal"—as we move up (page 98)—"was the fallow deer." Now you don't need to remember these terms in detail. You can simply think of them as the

large, tropical animals and then notice the contrasting smaller animals that make their appearance later. "New species of wolf and hyena made their appearance." The word "species" merely means that some other variety cropped up as a result of breeding over a period of time.

Continuing at the top of 98: "On the whole, the fauna was less varied" at this particular period "than both earlier and later fauna. It persisted until the beginning of the Upper Paleolithic, and then...a whole new series of forest animals suddenly made its appearance. Foxes, hares, bears, wolves, wild boars, wildcats, and squirrels seem proof that the environment changed again and that forest came to cover large parts of Palestine." In other words, different types of animals represent different types of vegetation. Thus to start with there was a very pleasant tropical climate—that's what pictured by these large tropical animals. Then you have a drying climate in which you have a more temperate zone. Then you have forests spreading over much of the region where apparently there were none before, and forest animals now make their appearance. Of course we know that many of these animals were available right in the small forest represented by the Garden of Eden; but as far as noting the name, this is the sequence that men have found.

This material, then, gives you the idea of various changes of climate of rather great significance.

Burial Customs of Middle Paleolithic

Move on to page 100, middle: "Burial methods are quite similar throughout the Eurasian area of the Mousterian cultures."

We now have, by the time of the Middle Paleolithic, burial traditions—not at the earliest but as time moved along in the pre-Flood centuries.

Now in this case, whether we are dealing with mature men who died of old age is not altogether clear. In many instances there are cases of women and infant skeletons—female and infant skeletons—which imply problems with childbirth rather than of people reaching an age of many centuries. I think that is the stronger evidence.

This book does not emphasize it, but other books constantly refer to Neanderthal children as the most common type of skeleton in the early period. This certainly implies that something was going wrong with the human family in terms of disease. Whether this also indicates other practices such as offering the firstborn as a sacrifice is another question.

There seem to be no special signs that care was given after death. Human skeletons just appear on the floor of caves in this particular culture (pp. 100-101). And remember that this is what is known as the Neanderthal Man which we equate with the "giants" of Genesis 6:4 or Nephilim. We are not here speaking of men of gigantic stature but with unusually large muscular development.

"THE OLDEST HUMAN REMAINS found in a Mousterian complex are those of the Galilee manIts dating has been much discussed, but it seems to belong to the very end of the last interpluvial. It was found in the earliest Mousterian level of its site, immediately beneath the Bifacial culture." I point this out here because it becomes important in our later discussion. This is on page 105.

Page 106, top: They found "the skeleton of a small woman and a male jaw"—just tiny fragments like this, that's all we have.

Large Middle Paleolithic Population

Page 109, bottom: "In the Near East, from Middle Paleolithic times on, the population became quite large. Palestine alone has provided several hundred sites with Mousterian industries, and the far fewer sites of the much longer Lower Paleolithic suggest that the population increased greatly in the meanwhile. Between thirty and thirty-five thousand years ago, groups of new people more numerous than the groups which had brought in the very early blade culture, arrived in the area...."

What they are saying is that it is very possible that other nearby areas of the world had other branches of the human family who have different cultural techniques which they brought into Palestine just as you would have had multiplication within the area. But notice now: Here we are dealing in hundreds of sites. Remember that back on page 78 we had two and five and eleven and forty sites—but now it's hundreds! Anati uses the phrase "several hundred sites!" I have no idea of what this means specifically—I would think it probably means 500 to 700—that could be what the term "several" might mean.

Continuing page 109, bottom: "We do not know what happened then to the makers of the Mousterian culture. Their tradition continued into the early phases of the Upper Paleolithic, but very quickly decreased in importance, and after a short while the blade industries totally dominated the caves"—where the Mousterian types previously had been. "In all the archaeological sites of the period, Mousterian culture was covered by the levels of this new cultural tradition" which we call a blade industry—in other words, this is the beginning of the Upper Paleolithic—blade industry as opposed to the cruder hand ax.

So this gives just a generalized picture, and then the next chapter takes up the Upper Paleolithic.

Upper Paleolithic People

This is Chapter IV of Part Two of Palestine Before the Hebrews; the entire book is divided into five major parts with several chapters in each. For this class you would do well to read the first four parts.

Now, in the Upper Paleolithic, page 12: "Though most prehistorians agree today that the blade industries originated in Asia, the exact area is not yet known. In the Near East, from their first occurrence they indicate the sudden start of traditions unknown to the Mousterian cultures....The people of the new tradition are of a new physical type, with more refined features and with skeletons very similar to those of modern man."

Now the Mousterian culture previous to this was a type in which the Neanderthal Man existed. The skeletal pattern of Upper Paleolithic man is clear while that of Lower and Middle Paleolithic man is not. We only know that in the end Mousterian and Tabunian are about the same, but we just don't know much about the skeletal pattern at all because there aren't any skeletons available. At any rate we have the indication that, at least in much of Palestine, this nephilim type of people were extant and multiplying.

But now we come to a new physical type of human being "with more refined features and with skeletons very similar to those of modern men." So we discover, in other words, at this point a new cultural technique that overlaid the Mousterian. So that whatever happened, we have the implication of a spreading out of a population that may well have been centered elsewhere—a population that is assumed to have been centered somewhere farther east in Asia and spread into Palestine.

Now we must understand that in Israel they have done far more archaeological work than anywhere else. Therefore it would be very difficult to discern the picture elsewhere and we have to limit ourselves to the Biblical record and to some phase of the world where the emphasis is best given.

Like American Indians

The blade tools of this people, who were much more like modern man in their skeletal structure, "were still made less than one hundred years ago by American Indians" —the same technique (p. 113).

Drop to the middle of the page: "These people have also left traces of the earliest man-built habitations"—that is, in the area. "These were huts or tents set over an excavated floor or banked in by stones or small mounds of soil, and they seem to have been roofed over with animal skins supported by slanting poles, in the manner of American Indian wigwams." Now this clearly indicates a type of life.

"They had a marked aesthetic sense and used to perforate shells and carve ivory, and make of these materials beads, pendants, bracelets, and other personal ornaments. Coloring materials such as ocher were extensively used" which indicates "an acute self-awareness"—just exactly the pattern of thinking of American Indians! (And we shall see later that many of the cultures that we now will note developing on this side of the Flood were also developing on the other side.)

Concluding Summary

You would do well to outline the cultures of the Lower, Middle, and Upper Paleolithic, and succeeding ones, on a single sheet of paper so you can get the overall picture. It will take us a day or two of class yet to complete the story. We are still talking about a non-urban, non-civilized area. We have not yet defined a particular kind of population; we want to see, when we go on from here, how the urban life did ultimately develop. We have a relative indication in the Bible of how long certain men lived, and from this we can lay out the expected cultural pattern.

At least this is a picture of what we would call a culture of vagabonds and wanderers! That's quite clear—like the American Indian over the plains. I think this is strongly indicated.

In relation to the Mousterian: The Bible doesn't say anything more than that there were nephilim in those days. It doesn't say from what stock they came. Cain was driven east—Adam originally was driven east, then Cain further east; and he wandered east and then returned west. This is the implication from Josephus. I would draw the conclusion that that represents [I think Dr. Hoeh is referring to the Indian-like culture discussed above. Ed.], in greater likelihood, the culture of the branch of Cain's family as it returned. And we have, of course, no Biblical basis for knowing the source of the Mousterian, whether it was from another branch of Adam in Cain's line we cannot say. And there is no reason, all we are doing is merely finding archaeological confirmation of types of people.

In fact, the possibility is that various sons of Adam gave rise to stocks similar to that and it wasn't just one alone. That's why the Bible spends no time in defining those things which are not needed [implying that a detailed discussion would become too involved and complex to be included in Moses' brief pre-Flood summary. Ed.].