

החברה לחקירת ארץ-ישראל ועתיקותיה  
ISRAEL EXPLORATION SOCIETY

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים  
המכון לארכיאולוגיה  
HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM  
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

החפירות הארכיאולוגיות בירושלים  
JERUSALEM ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS

JERUSALEM P.O.B. 7041 ת.ד. ירושלים  
ישראל — ISRAEL  
טלפון 84669 TEL.

17 July

Dear Ken —

Thanks for the letter and information. Seems strange that you are no longer having those large Registrar duties. You're just like me — I was Registrar and Dean of Faculty for so long in Bricket Wood almost everyone thought I was a permanent fixture. But I am gone. So in Dr. Dorothy, now. Changes are taking place everywhere. I suppose (or at least I hope) for the best.

I checked the calculations for 5 B.C. and the printout (Korsey, Komaransky, et. al.) is correct. I am not sure how April 6 got in the article instead of April 8. I have always tried to be careful about calendar matters. What happened I don't know, but the printout (according to our present interpretation of intercalary years, which seems OK) makes it as Komaransky suggests. I'll write him a letter to that effect.

Glad to know the TRIO in Geology is at work. Excellent! Here is a problem which is partially geological but probably more in the archaeological field — yet it involves the Deluge. Jericho, clearly one of the oldest cities on earth, dated by Kenyon to about 8000 B.C., HAS NO EVIDENCE of a widespread Flood. That is, there is no alluvial deposits of any kind (except a few accountable rainfall deposits along the slopes) which would suggest a major Flood at all. Of course, I know the Flood occurred and WHEN God said it did. But all the tels in Palestine have no Flood deposits whatever — and I do mean NONE! yet many of them,

(over)



notably Jericho, are very ancient (seemingly pre-Flood) ~~yet~~ have no traces of such a Deluge. The problem with Jericho is exacerbated because the city, from its beginnings, was almost entirely of adobe construction (in the later stages some bricks were fired). Any water on sun-dried bricks would turn them right back into mud - goopy mud. and the millions of tons of water pressure on a Jericho (c. 900 feet below sea level) plus water currents which must have occurred for the period, <sup>while</sup> the universal deluge was in spate, surely must have left something of alluvial deposit - yet not a trace exists! When Lot looked down on the well-watered plains of Jordan (this was in the time of Abram - long after the deluge) he saw the cities of the Plain but Jericho was not mentioned as one of them. Maybe Jericho was former Sodom or Admah or one of the earlier cities? The first biblical reference to Jericho is in the time of Moses when it is described as the ONLY city of the Plain (with the possible exception of Zoar). Literary evidence puts Jericho as a post-Abram (or post-Lot) city, let alone a post-Deluge city. Yet all the evidence (with the exception of no alluvium to account for the Flood) puts Jericho's origin way before the Flood. Dr. Hoeh even suggests it was the city of Noe which Cain built. This looks reasonable on the surface, but I ask you geologists, WHERE IS THERE EVIDENCE OF THE FLOOD (which we all know happened) AT JERICHO? The answer: This is NONE! Not a trace! Do you have some ideas to help in this historical-archaeological-geological dilemma? Love to hear from you. Kind regards to everyone. Your friend & colleague. Ernest

This is no big problem - just a poser! Love.