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Of Kinship and Gods in Ancient Egypt: An Interview with Marcelo Campagno
By Virginia Laporta

Argentinean Egyptologist Marcelo Campagno, Professor of the University of Buenos Aires and Researcher of the CONICET (Argentine National Research Council), has been one of those researchers that have focused attention on the origin of the Egyptian State and the role of the ideology of kinship in the development of the state institutions. This is an interview with Campagno, after his research residence in the prestigious Warburg Institute (London, United Kingdom), in which he tells us about his career in the Egyptology and current investigations.

How did you get involved with Egyptology? In which circumstances did you become a researcher?

Actually, one is not born being an Egyptologist: one makes himself an specialist in this area. There are people that are fascinated with Ancient Egypt since they were kids, but this was not my case at all. I did not have a particular interest in this area until I discovered the origins of the state problem, which I saw for the first time in the Ancient History I (Ancient Near East) course. How do societies turn from equality to inequality, from societies with little differentiation to others which are governed by god-kings? These were the facts which I was firstly interested in. After that, you can say that everything happened as it was meant to be. I approved the course and the people in charge of it called me. I suppose because I was an enthusiastic student. The people that had taught me the course was in charge of the Institute of Ancient Near Eastern History of the University of Buenos Aires, and they invited me in order to get involved with the activities of the institute as I was an advanced student; of course, the job was not paid.

So, I started going there rather often and after a while it came up an opportunity with research scholarships for undergraduate students. I presented to the interview and won it, which was totally unexpected because I thought that this opportunity would be for other students, who were more advanced in their studies or had better political contacts. That was how I began to systematically study while I still was an undergraduate student. As I started to deal with an economic income which let me manage my academic research, I suddenly found myself in a new situation. By this manner, my first academic research turned out to be afterwards my Licentiate Degree. After that, I presented myself to a new research scholarship project, but this time as a graduate student, which I fortunately won. In the meanwhile, a vacancy appeared in the course of Ancient History I at the university which I could get because I was a grant holder. From that time on, one thing led to another one. As Sinuhe says “one land took me to another land”, one scholarship took me to another scholarship. But it was rather difficult to me at
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that time, as the chaos that aroused for ancient Egyptians between one pharaoh’s period and the following one. At those days, every time that a scholarship ended I got desperate until I won a new one because I could not be sure if I was going to win it or not and my money finished too fast. But fortunately I was lucky enough to be a scholar for most part of the 1990s. The first one was in 1991, when I was still an undergraduate student; then I got my BA degree in 1994 and after that I won another scholarship being a graduate. By that time I finished my Licentiate Thesis, and a third scholarship allowed me to start my Doctorate studies, and I got a fourth one in order to finish this new Thesis. By that time, the Antorchas Foundation gave me another scholarship that allowed me to travel to Switzerland and stay in Basel to start post-doctoral studies.

Afterwards, what allowed me to be regular researcher was my admission into the CONICET. Firstly, I got a post-doctoral scholarship by the year 2003; and in 2004 I became an Assistant Researcher. So, in connection with your question, I would not say that I started my career with an specific interest in Egyptology, But certainly I would say that after a while I found a problem that is linked to this specific area of study, which is the origin of the state in Egypt. As far as I got involved in Egyptology from a theoretical problem, my position in the field was connected with the possibility of thinking other theoretical facts, from the initial theoretical problem that could be thought in the Ancient Egyptian scenario, in a kind of dialectic between theory and practice, so as to speak.

Most of the time, the word “Egyptologist” gives me the impression of being a bit artificial, because it seems that the person which is called in that way should know all about Egypt and nothing more than Egypt. In fact, I am interested in Ancient Egypt but I also found rather interesting the problems of other societies. The topic about the origin of the state in the Pre-Hispanic world, for example, is something that I have been working recently from a comparative perspective. Recently, I have being writing a book for Eudeba (University of Buenos Aires Press) that is called El origen de los primeros Estados (The Origin of the First States), which is basically centred in Pre-Hispanic America. However, it has also a chapter about the Old World with some space for theoretical reflection and possibilities of comparing different contexts in which primary states emerged.

Traditionally, as Egyptology is presented as something closed in its own state, in order that a specialist get familiarized with it he should have to know a lot exclusively about Egypt. However, I think there are other possibilities, such as those ones that are linked with working with topics that are recorded from different societies. Actually, I would say it is very difficult that an Egyptologist can manage 100% a topic of study such as “Ancient Egypt”, because this topic would be infinite. That is why I think that there are other ways from where you can get to the same topic but from other ways, which are not strictly related with the field but they have a theoretical problem as a communicant vase. I think this is something which can be done and that is not very frequently done nowadays.

Is this a new approximation inside the field?

I would say that it is a new approximation, and actually it can be original but, most important, it is a serious and formal new vision. I said this because the risk of this kind of approximations is doing them in a improvised and superficial way, and most orthodox people does not like it when they see this kind of stuffs. It is true, there are people that can do it in such a way, inside or outside the field as well. However, there are not topics by themselves, but the way the research is done, which can be superficial. This kind of thing can be avoided when you work seriously, with rigor. For instance, the approximations to the Ancient Egypt from an anthropological perspective are not something usual in the Egyptology field. I am trying to work in that line and the repercussion outside my country –in Spain, Switzerland, and England- have been very enthusiastic. I think that this is because seriousness is not related with what thing you study, but with the attitude that you have with your work.

I think all the debates linked with the definition of the object of Egyptology are more connected with the academic environment than with what you can really do with those objects, which are shaped while your are working with them. I would say that if there is not space for new and different opinions, then we have a dead discipline; if the only thing you can do is reproducing what is already known, then what you are doing is a ritual practice, reproducing the facts in exactly the same way they already existed. That is to say, that you would end up writing the same things of already known topics. I think it is good if we cross topics with other disciplines and try to make them to dialogue between them, in order to cross different ways of looking to the object. There we will find the richness of Egyptology, History, Social Sciences and most of all the richness of thought. I cannot find another personal or social sense for practising this kind of disciplines. But the experience of crossing topics does not compare at all with elaborating extravagant hypothesis nor delirious ones. There is some kind of conservatism in this discipline that
would prefer not to innovate in order to avoid mistakes, because that seems to imply a definitive collapse for the researcher. I think that are different ways of being wrong and those connected to the initial moments of a thought can be even necessary in order to obtain new proposals. I think we do not have to be afraid of that.

Sometimes, one wonders if it is necessary for the CONICET – or any other public institution – to pay an Egyptologist taking into account that he is reproducing facts and values of a dead civilization. I affirm this because this is a common opinion, people that say that an Egyptologist is someone that locks up himself in order to discover the deep sense of a hieroglyph. But, actually there is a lot more than that, and the discipline can be an active one concerning the realm of thinking. Especially, because this kind of societies is very different from ours, so that they let us know other kinds of societies and that our society is not the only possible way of organization at all. People in general tend to consider the world where they live as a natural thing, but if we do not think about it surely we would suppose that there does not exist anything else. That is why studying so different societies – not only related to social or economical organizations, but also different ways of thinking – allow us to understand the diversity of possibilities that the human being has and the instituted and revocable character of every social order.

At this point, I think that Egyptology could be really active, just like any other discipline that thinks about the ancient world or other societies that are different from ours. It can be possible that people who are specialized in Natural Sciences or even historians that are specialized in Argentine or contemporary history think that their fields are more useful just because they are in or near the present. Nevertheless, I think that we can write about a few years’ period in some lost farm in Chascomús, but we will not learn anything new about the historical dynamics of that times. And, on the other hand, researches about ancient Egypt or Mesopotamia could turn out to be really interesting because the study’s object is not decisive by itself, but certainly is the way in which is worked by the author.

You focus attention on the role of kinship in ancient Egypt. What was the role that kinship had in this society and specially in relation with the origin of the State?

In my opinion this is a decisive topic to understand this kind of societies in particular, even though it has received little attention. In fact, there are works about this topic in ancient Egypt but, in general, these studies are more interested in the identification of kinship terms than in investigating its importance for the structure of the society. Theoretically, I’ve started analysing the origin of the state connected with kinship issues. This is because my perception is that kinship is a kind of practice that turns out to be dominant in non-state societies, which means that kinship gives structure to and provides with the society’s code. This kind of dominant practice does not allow other relations to appear, such as for instance, the ones connected with the state. I mean, the different kind of practices that are organized around the monopoly of coercion strongly diverge from those articulated through kinship. So that, wherever kinship is a dominant practice, the state does not appear. But the state actually appeared, so at this point we came up with a paradox, and the way of solving this paradox is what has led me to think about the problem of the origin of the state.

I think that the state appears specially outside environments where kinship is a dominant practice. Outside could mean “in between”, which means in between communities, where kinship do not provide the linking tissue. If we have, for instance, two village communities, kinship practices could articulate inside each one of the communities separately, but it could not articulate both at the same time. The same happens with the urban space, for example, where that space could have more than one kin group living in the same urban environment, but these group would not be part at the same time of the same social space. So, it could be another possible terrain where interactions between different kinship groups can occur. I think this is the way where we must start searching; I do not mean by that to look up inside kinship itself, but outside it. However, once the state appears, kinship does not disappear. That is because this is not about a replacement of one principle for another. The state subordinates the kinship but it does not eliminate its importance for the organization of society.

Kinship is very important at different levels of the state society, especially in the level of rural communities, where I think this still keeps working as the internal way of articulation. In connection with the elite, kinship is important because it determines the articulation of the relationships of its members. The best example is the idea of Dynasty, which is but a sequence of relatives that possesses the monopoly of coercion outside the group of relatives, a practice that is no related to kinship. From coercion this group can obtain, for instance, the tribute that comes from the wider sector of population that are not relatives of the elite group. At that point is where I see the central space for the state practice in this kind of societies, although kinship is very important at its base as well as in the elite group itself. In the field of symbolic representations is also important. Especially, I am thinking about the world of gods where kinship has a fundamental role as the mode of expression of the links between the gods themselves. For instance, the cycle of the gods Osiris, Horus and Seth, where they fight for royalty, a state purpose, the key is the use of kinship. There is a father, a son and a father’s brother, the latter fighting with his nephew to gain royalty. There is a proper kinship profile inside an elaborated tale made inside a state context.

You have recently had a fellowship residence at the Warburg Institute where you studied the terms of kinship in the Pyramid Texts. What are your expectations after that experience?

I went there with a proposal on the importance of kinship, particularly linked to the Pyramid Texts, which were the first important Egyptian corpus of texts from the last part of the Old Kingdom. I was interested in learning the way the terms of kinship were expressed in them, which are related to that world where the king is linked with the gods. What is the role of a father or a mother in the Pyramid Texts? Which are the predicates connected with different kinds of kinship links? So, having that information related to this kind of questions I am interested in defining the ideal representations of kinship that the elite had during the Old Kingdom times. In fact, if we say that once the state appears kinship keeps being decisive at the level of the social base as well as at the elite level, it is precisely at his last context where the Pyramid Texts were written. There it is possible to observe how kinship links goes through the world of kings and gods. Usually the king appears as the son of the gods from the moment he access to the throne. But, there also is an “earthly” son -a prince- who does the rituals for his dead father. In the texts, there appear those duties the son has with his parents as well as those his parents have with him. Also, we can see some difference, for example, between those ones connected with the kind of obligations that a mother and a father have with their son.
And the average social expectatives of the elite begin crossing in this way, those concerned with what a father or a mother is. For instance, the goddess Nut has to protect the king that ascends to heaven because this is her primordial function as a mother. It is possible to notice that Egyptians associated motherhood with protection. For instance, the main references in these texts are those in which the mother is giving birth, feeding and protecting her son. It is understandable that a father cannot give birth or feed a child but he does protect him; however, this fatherhood protection seems to be smaller than the one the mother possess. Either with Atum, Shu or Geb, in the condition of the king’s father that ascends, there are certain references that confirm his condition of responsible for the legitimacy of he who ascends. These are some of the ideas that arouse from the research I started in the Warburg Institute, with the aim of seeing how an ideal system of kinship is built in the Pyramid Texts and in some way extract the expectatives that Egyptians had about each one of these roles. Also, I would like to see if kinship works beyond its “own” context, to see other contexts which are not related to kinship at first sight but where it is possible to identify terms of kinship. For instance, the food offering treated as Osiris’ daughter: it is interesting to see that food is here considered in kinship terms related to the god. You can imagine that gods and the king be related each other through terms of kinship because gods are fashioned from human models and so two gods can be kin of each other like humans can do. But a piece of food does not seem to be reasonably linked in terms of kinship with other thing. Of course, this can be thought as a metaphor, but it is also interesting that metaphors were elaborated through kinship terms. So, I think there are elements that allow me to think about the wider function of kinship in Egyptian society.

Taking into account your experience as a conferencist and professor in European universities, what is your opinion about the actual academic level of Egyptology in our country? Is it possible for us to have an inter-university dialogue with specialists of the highest academic profile?

Certainly, we can dialogue with them. My personal experience -such as Barcelona, Basel and London- it is extremely positive. People listen, and do not have negative reactions when someone has something to say. I must recognize that in some places there is certain precondition a priori of the way Egyptology is studied in distant countries such as Argentina. But, until now, as far as I am concerned, this prejudice collapses easily. Once they see your proposals have nothing to do with a low level Egyptology, that you have a serious product, that is organized, updated and, in some way, original, the prejudice collapses and they keep interested. In just a few months -in September- Antonio Loprieno (Basel), John Baines (Oxford) and Josep Cervelló Autuori (Barcelona) are coming to Argentina, people who are examples of high profile specialists. I met them all during my longest stays outside my country. They would not bother to come here if it would not be worthy to do it because, actually, we cannot pay them too much money. They come because they believe that here there are suitable speakers. So, my answer to your question is affirmative because as soon as you propose serious products suitable speakers show up.

Firstly, if we talk about training and geography there exists some distance. But I think that distance turns out to be shortened in some cases. You have something serious to offer. At this point I think it is very important to offer new perspectives because we will not be the best archaeologists in Egypt nor the hieroglyph decipherers. This is because in Europe as well as in USA there is a very old tradition about that sort of things, to which we would never reach. But as soon as we have an original product to offer, that can be linked with watching from other outlooks such as the Anthropology, Philosophy, with seriousness and rigor, I think we can obtain a valuable product that can give the Egyptology made in our country a good level reference. In this sense, I would say that the lack of tradition in our country is an advantageous fact for us because tradition is very important for the existence of a discipline, but also it can be constrictive with what can be studied and what cannot be studied. With this kind of established canons Egyptology students from a central country do more or less the same things that are already in activity. However, where that tradition does not exist there can possibly be more openness and freedom to do things that may not be seen at the centre.

In connection with our general level of Egyptology in Argentina, I would say that it is very varied, you can find everything. This has to do with academic dynamics in which some people remain because they have entered in the Academia under circumstances rather different from now. For other people, however, it is rather difficult to get to those same positions that are already taken; there are lots of different cases. Regarding the Egyptology in Argentina, there was a pioneer initiative with Rosenvasser decades ago, that unfortunately was not continued in the way it should be for many reasons, some academic, other non-academic and also economic ones. In my opinion, there has been a special failure with the training of disciples, because they could not get a systematic continuity. There had been lots of crisis inside research groups which took the field to a rather different situation that what could have been from those first years. However, I am not a pessimist since I think that there are some interesting signs -such us the visit of specialists that I mentioned above-. I also think that if some tendencies can go on, I undoubtly think that it is possible to make international and competitive groups of work.

I do not agree with the idea that distance –like that which separates Buenos Aires from Europe– can be an insuperable obstacle. Of course it is not an easy task; it is not the same studying Egyptology in Paris than in Buenos Aires. There you have all kind of information, all the books located in the same place. And here you have to travel across lots of libraries and depend on traveling abroad or on internet searching, among other options, that is why it always turns out to be more complex. However, it is not impossible to do it correctly. There have been some people that had protected themselves under these difficulties in order to justify their cases. They say something like this: “we are so far away that we can manage with an Egyptology of lower level”. I have listen to this kind of arguments used to justify mediocrity, but this is not acceptable at all. Certainly, someone who works for this discipline knows what kind of effort does take because it is much more difficult than studying Argentine History. This is easier because the access to sources is rather simple, there is no need to study ancient languages or reading four or five languages in order to get to the bibliography. Even though, this kind of work can be properly done. I think brain substance in Buenos Aires is as good as the brain substance in Paris or New York. There is also an advantage, which is that lack of tradition that can be a positive aspect connected with open minded attitudes among the discipline.

What do you think about our national university careers’ organization? Is the study of History in general a disadvantage for graduates who want to specialize in one area?
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ANCIENT ISRAEL: ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF THE BIBLICAL PERIOD
A Study Program for Overseas M.A. and Ph.D. Students
in the Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations
at Tel Aviv University, Israel

The Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations at Tel Aviv University in cooperation with TAU’s School for Overseas Students (OSP) announces the initiation of a new credit program for overseas M.A. and Ph.D. students.

The program, which offers academic credit transferable to most American universities, is for students from various fields related to the Hebrew Bible who wish to broaden their knowledge in Biblical and Modern Hebrew, Biblical Archaeology and the history of the Land of Israel during the biblical period (Iron Age to Persian period, 12th-4th centuries BCE). It introduces students to issues of theory and methodology, and also offers the opportunity to gain fieldwork experience.

The program extends over the Spring Semester (starting February 2008) and includes seminars, field tours, study of Modern Hebrew, and an option of participation in excavations (during the summer months of June-July).

The Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations in Tel Aviv University is renowned for its strong involvement in study and research of the biblical period through important excavation projects in Israel (from Tel Beer-sheba, Arad, and Lachish to the recent excavations at Megiddo, Tel Beth-Shemesh and Ramat Rahel). Its senior staff members play a leading role in the major debates that have shaped the discipline (most recently the issues of Iron Age chronology, the rise of ancient Israel, state formation in Israel and Judah, and a variety of subjects related to the post-exilic period). Participants in the program will have the opportunity to be part of the vibrant academic life of the department and will attend courses taught by scholars on the cutting edge of research in the fields of archaeology and history of Ancient Israel.

Are you a graduate student who has completed or is about to complete an advanced degree (M.A. or Ph.D.) in Hebrew bible studies, ancient Near Eastern cultures and languages, Egyptology or in related fields such as biblical history, theology and religious studies or is currently enrolled in a M.A. or Ph.D. program and would like to spend a semester of studies in Israel and gain archaeological field experience? Then this program is for you.

CURRICULUM
Courses are taught in English.
The program is for a period of one-semester (Spring Semester) of study in Israel plus an option of participation in summer excavations. The program starts with one month of Intensive Hebrew Language Program (Uplan).

Seminars (for the spring semester)
Text and Archaeology –Selected Problems. (Prof. Israel Finkelstein)
The seminar will deal with Iron Age archaeology, the biblical text and ancient Near Eastern records. Among the topics which will be dealt with are: the rise of Early Israel in the Iron I; Philistine archaeology; Iron Age chronology; state formation in the Levant; the Northern Kingdom; the archaeology of Jerusalem; Judah in the late 8th century; Judah in the 7th century BCE: the days of Manasseh and Josiah.

The Babylonian and Persian Periods in Judah: Between Bible and Archaeology (Dr. Oded Lipschits) The seminar will deal with the historical sources to the Babylonian and Persian periods in the Levant, and will compare the historical picture with data from archaeological excavations and surveys, especially in Judah and Jerusalem. All this will be compared to the biblical sources, especially Ezra - Nehemiah, in order to learn about the value of this book for historical research as well as its ideological intentions, the stages of its composition and the different additions and editions.

How did it all begin? The Land of Israel during the Bronze Age (Dr. Yuval Gadot)
The rise of Early Israel is currently viewed as a process within the wider framework of the history of the Land of Israel. A meaningful understanding of Iron Age Israel demands, therefore, familiarity with the history of the land in earlier periods. The seminar will deal with the archaeology of Canaan during the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. This period saw the flourishing and decline of Canaanite culture as well as the growth and collapse of the Egyptian empire that ruled the country - the very processes that led to the birth of ancient Israel.

Each seminar meets for four hours per week, for a total of 8 credits. Participants will present one long research paper for each seminar. Other graduate seminars in the Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations that are outside the program are open to the students but as they are given in Hebrew, a knowledge of the language is required.

Field Tours
Four one-day field tours to main archaeological sites from the biblical period all over Israel, for a total of 3 credits (the tours will be guided by Dr. Yuval Gadot)
Royal cities of the Israelite kingdom: Megiddo, Hazor and Dan.
A thorough study of three main centers of the Northern Kingdom and the implications of their finds for biblical history.
The capital of Judah: new discoveries in Jerusalem
What can archaeology teach us about the City of David, the expansion of Jerusalem in late-monarchic times, and the history of the kingdom of Judah?
On the Philistine border: Tel Beth-Shemesh, Ekron-Tel Miqne and Gath-Tell es-Safi
A visit to the border between Philistines and Israelites – an intriguing archaeological picture of cultural and political processes at a confrontation line.
Fortresses and temples in the Negev of Judah: Tel Beer-Sheba and Arad.
The story of Beer-sheba valley – settlers, nomads, and foreign powers at the periphery of the kingdom of Judah.
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Participants will have to present one short paper for each tour.

**Summer Excavations**
The program offers the unique experience of taking active part in one of the excavation projects conducted at major archaeological sites by the Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University, for 3 credits.

Participants in the program will be permitted to take part in the excavations at:
- Megiddo (directed by Prof. Israel Finkelstein and Prof. David Ussishkin).
- Tel Beth-Shemesh (directed by Dr. Shlomo Bunimovitz and Dr. Zvi Lederman)
- Ramat Rahel (directed by Dr. Oded Lipschits)

There is an option to take part in the credit program conducted in each of the excavations and get up to 6 more credits. For more details see the web site of the Institute of Archaeology: [http://www.tau.ac.il/ humanities/archaeology/](http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/archaeology/)

**Modern Hebrew Studies**
The program gives the opportunity to acquire a sound knowledge of the Hebrew language. An Intensive Hebrew Language Program (Ulpan) by the School for Overseas Students at Tel Aviv University is offered prior to the Spring Semester, taught at all levels.

Hebrew examination 15.1.2008

Intensive Hebrew studies (6 credits) 20.1 – 14.2.2008

Hebrew studies (during the semester, 3 credits) 17.2-6.6.2008

Summer studies (6 credits) 3.8-19.9.2008

**Overseas Student Program Courses**
Participants in the program will be permitted to attend 2 additional courses in the Overseas Student Program. For course description see the web site of The School of Overseas Students, Tel Aviv University: [http://www.tau.ac.il/overseas/](http://www.tau.ac.il/overseas/)

**Schedule**
The program starts at 14.1.08

**Admission Procedures and Fees**
For application and admission requirements, admission procedures and fees see details at the web site of The School of Overseas Students, Tel Aviv University: [http://www.tau.ac.il/overseas/](http://www.tau.ac.il/overseas/)
For administrative inquiries please contact the School of Overseas Students, Tel Aviv University.
For academic issues please contact Dr. Shlomo Bunimovitz, Chair, Department of Archaeology and Ancient Near Eastern Cultures, Tel Aviv University, e-mail address: lipick@post.tau.ac.il

---

**New Distinction for Antiguo Oriente**
The flagship journal of the CEHAO, *Antiguo Oriente*, has been recently indexed by the LATINDEX catalog and the Basic Nucleus of Argentine Scientific and Technological Journals (Nacional Scientific and Technical Research Council)

---

**New Issue of the Revista del Instituto de Historia Antigua Oriental**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS RIHAO 12-13 (2005-2006)**
- MANFRED KORFMANN †, Troya a la luz de las nuevas investigaciones
- ALICIA DANERI RODRIGO, Interrelaciones en el Mediterráneo Oriental durante el Bronce Tardío
- PABLO A. CAVALLERO, La Troya de Homero
- MARCELO CAMPAGNO, El mundo antiguo: El pasado, el mito, la historia (A propósito de la conferencia “Troya: leyenda y realidad” de M. Korfmann)
- JOHN BAINES, Definiciones tempranas del mundo egipcio y sus alrededores
- ALEJANDRO F. BOTTA, Scribal Traditions and the Transmission of Legal Formulae in the Aramaic Papryri from Elephantine
- MERCEDES GARCÍA BACHMANN, A la búsqueda de trabajadoras en la biblia hebraica. Algunos problemas metodológicos
- FRANK STARKE, Los hititas y su imperio

**Address IHAO**

Instituto de Historia Antigua Oriental “Dr. Abraham Rosenvassser”, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires. 25 de Mayo 217, 3º piso. C1002ABD. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires. Argentina.

Email: ihaoo@filo.uba.ar

Tel.: (54-11) 4343-1196 ext. 107
Roxana Flammini receives her PhD Degree

CEHAO Director, Roxana Flammini, successfully defended her PhD Dissertation “From Kerma to Biblos. The Relationships Between the Egyptian State with his Linking Areas and Peripheries During the Middle Kingdom” in the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires, approving it with a 10 (ten).

In the following there is the abstract of the PhD Dissertation.

From Kerma to Biblos. The Relationships Between the Egyptian State with his Linking Areas and Peripheries During the Middle Kingdom

The starting point of this dissertation was the consideration of two main premises: a) the long-distance exchange networks in the Ancient Near East began due to the need of the local elites to obtain prestige goods, and b) the main axis of exchange of northeast Africa was the Nile river (from beyond the Third Cataract to the Eastern Delta, and from this point to the Levant following two routes. One of this routes was by sea and the other by land – the Ways of Horus). From these two premises on, it was detected that the Middle Kingdom Egyptian centralized State acted on different ambits which were established on this axis. From the re-elaboration of the concepts of core, semi-periphery and periphery, proposed by Wallerstein in his world-system approach, we delineated a core area where the practices to obtain prestige goods were originated; two peripheries (not politically controlled by Egypt during this time but reached for practices originated in the core) and two "linking" areas. In fact, these "linking" areas were part of the core, although we could observe the core carried out different practices over them (different from the practices carried out on the core itself and different in each linking area). During the Middle Kingdom these linking areas were characterized by 1) the establishment of a fortresses system in Lower Nubia and a hwt at Rushdi (possibly with defensive structures) and 2) the establishment of Egyptian colonists in the Lower Nubia fortresses and an Asiatic colony in the Eastern Delta (Tell el Dab’a) at the very end of the 12th Dynasty. We suggested that this change at both linking areas was originated by the core itself (the Egyptian colonists established at Askut, Buhen and Mirgissa and the Asiatic colony at Dab’a) to sustain exchange activities. In fact, the "linking areas" mediated between the core and the two peripheries (Upper Nubia - mainly Kerma; Palestine (Ashkelon and Tell Ifshar) and Syria (Byblos). Therefore, we concluded that the relationship between the core and the peripheries was asymmetrical and also the relationship between the core and the linking areas. This is the conclusion that allowed us to define the core as "core", since the practices originated there reached the linking areas and the peripheries in a higher level than the practices originated in those other ambits reached the core (at least during the Middle Kingdom).

Dr. Christophe Rico (Hebrew University of Jerusalem – École Biblique et Arqueologique Francaise de Jerusalem) visits UCA and offers Doctorate Seminar and Extracurricular Course

Doctorate Seminar: Nacimiento de la escritura y desarrollo del alfabeto: una perspectiva interdisciplinar
From September 4 to September 13, 17.30-21.00 hs; 14/09 until 21.30 hs

Extracurricular Course: Génesis y desarrollo del libro en la cultura occidental
September 18 and September 19, 16.00-20.30 hs

Information and Inscription
Oficina de Extensión y Posgrado
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Av. Alicia Moreau de Justo 1500, 1er. Piso
Tel: (54- 11) 4338-0789,
filosofia_eyp@uca.edu.ar
Monday to Friday 10.00 -13.00 hs / 16.00-19.00 hs

Juan Manuel Tebes gets Universidad Católica Argentina – Fulbright Fellowship

Lic. Tebes received the Universidad Católica Argentina – Fulbright Fellowship, which will cover his graduate studies in USA. Tebes will reside two years in the College of The Liberal Arts, Pennsylvania State University (2007/2009).
Dig Biblical “Gath of the Philistines”
*Follow in the Footsteps of David and Goliath*

Take part in discovering the Holy Land’s exciting past. Excavate at Tell es-Safi, biblical Gath of the Philistines (home of Goliath). Located in central Israel, it is one of the largest archaeological sites in the region. Rich finds include Bronze and Iron Age (Biblical Period) remains, such as well-preserved destruction levels, a monumental siege system, various ancient inscriptions (including the “Goliath” inscription), and impressive evidence of the Canaanite, Philistine and Israelite cultures. Come learn about, and “touch,” biblical times and history.

**Join us this summer!**
**July 8 – August 3, 2007**
Volunteer and academic programs are offered through Bar-Ilan University, Israel’s largest academic community

For information, surf to:
www.dig-gath.org
or our blog:
gath.wordpress.com,
or contact the project director,
Prof. Aren Maeir, at
maeira@mail.biu.ac.il
Encyclopedism is useless, but I agree with starting from a general subject as History, which means the possibility to learn about different things beyond a specific knowledge. If there would be a chance of studying specific Ancient Near Eastern History, I would not like that it would be reduced to pure Orientalism because in that way you can get a path with less possibilities. For instance, you may have the chance to know a lot about Neo-Egyptian language or Paleo-Babylonian times but you would not know anything about Pre-Hispanic times or the Middle Ages, which I do not think would be a reasonable decision. We can argue about ideal programs of History careers, and it should not be as many obligatory courses as there are in current History programs, where a student could choose freely among courses related to his own interests. However, I agree with studying general History in this way, so that you can manage to specialize in graduate studies. A general undergraduate career avoids a student to pass from high school right up to the field, giving him the chance to form him as an intellectual. For this purpose it would be necessary to articulate study programs with subjects like anthropology, philosophy, sociology, economics, literature, etc., more than happens nowadays, in order to make it wider and richer.

Of course, it should not be necessary for a student who is interested in ancient societies to study several courses of Argentinean or American history. That does not seem to be very reasonable, even though I do think Argentine History has to be included in every national program of general History, because this is very important for an Argentinean intellectual. I personally think that the key is not to train specialists but to educate intellectual people. This should be a central objective of universities: to educate in every field people that may be able to understand the world from different possibilities, in order to change it or for whatever reason. In this way not only the student that focused in Contemporary History can be prepared to understand present times, but also he who studied Ancient History can do it because he has the ability of knowing differences, contrasts, influences, changes, variants. And he can also add his specific knowledge about other societies. In this way, each one would have his own specialization inside an intellectual frame, but not in terms of specialization in itself, which in the end turns out to be rather difficult to justify in its own purpose. Certainly, the “hyper-specialization” finally produces a kind of researchers only connected with one dimension of History, and the unwanted effect uses to be that this persons fall into some wrong narcissism such us supposing that everything he or she investigates is important only because he or she does it. This is the moment when the researcher cannot get out of his ghetto, because he or she is comfortable in his own “hole”.

There is nothing more important than opposing to such embarrassing perceptions. I am not denying to specialization its own importance by saying this. What I am trying to say is that there are other ways of facing specialization, avoiding “hyper-specialization” just like Hobbsawm said in a recent interview, and also letting intellectual dimension to play its own game. Let us leave central countries to carry on with the traditional way of the discipline while we give it a new dimension in order to be socially useful, as well as it could turn out to be a competitive one if it has something new to propose, that makes people think. I believe the key is just there.

CEHAO MONOGRAPH SERIES

The Co-Editors of the Monograph Series desire to publish monographs, traditional Licentiate and MA Thesis, and PhD Dissertations that employ original research, critical review, and innovative methodology in the study of the Ancient Near East. We consider for publication monographs related to the history of the societies of the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean from the Paleolithic through the Roman-Hellenistic period. Submissions that make use of digital technology are encouraged, as are those using traditional print styles. All submissions accepted for inclusion in the Monograph Series will be published electronically. They must be written in one of the following languages: Spanish, English or French. Submissions are peer-reviewed and should be in an anonymous format with an accompanying cover letter (printed or electronic) providing the author’s name and the title of the submission. For more detailed information, please refer to the submission guidelines posted to the website above, or contact us at cehao_uca@yahoo.com.ar

Co-Editors:
-Roxana Flammini, Universidad Católica Argentina
-Juan Manuel Tebes, Universidad Católica Argentina, Universidad de Buenos Aires, CONICET
-Santiago Rostom Maderna, Universidad Católica Argentina
-Marcelo Campagno, Universidad de Buenos Aires, CONICET
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Free access: www.uca.edu.ar/cehao
Sunday, June 24, 2007
Revealing the Dead: Chalcolithic Burial Practices on the Coastal Plain of Israel
presented in Spanish by Amir Gorzalczy

Lecture 3:00-4:30 p.m., Gill Auditorium
In Spanish with English translation by Gabriela Hussong
Tour of the Journey to the Copper Age exhibit with Mr. Gorzalczy follows the lecture

$25 general public; $15 Museum of Man members, seniors, children, and military
Limited to 60 people. Call 619-239-2001 to reserve space.

Join Amir Gorzalczy, research archaeologist with the Israel Antiquities Authority, to learn how the people of the Chalcolithic Age in the Holy Land 6000 years ago buried their dead, and how the practices reveal the profound changes in social structure that the people were experiencing at the time.

Mr. Gorzalczy received his M.A. in Archaeology from Tel Aviv University and is on the editorial board of Antiguo Oriente, the Journal of the Center of Historical Research of the Ancient Near East at Catholic University in Buenos Aires. He has extensive field and excavation experience and is widely published on excavations of burial caves. Mr. Gorzalczy was Director of the Palmahim Chalcolithic cemetery excavation in 2005.

Domingo 24 de junio de 2007
Conferencia Revelando a los muertos: Prácticas funerarias calcolíticas en la planicie costera de Israel
(Presentada en español) Por Amir Gorzalczy

Conferencia de 3:00 a 4:30 PM en el Auditorio Gill del Museo del Hombre de San Diego,
Parque Balboa. Presentada en español con interpretación simultánea al inglés por Gabriela Hussong. Recorrido de la exhibición Un viaje a la Edad del Cobre con el arqueólogo Gorzalczy después de la conferencia.


Disfrute de la conferencia impartida por Amir Gorzalczy, arqueólogo investigador de la Autoridad de Reliquias de Israel, para conocer cómo es que hace 6000 años la gente de la Edad del Cobre (período Calcolítico) en la Tierra Santa enterraba a sus muertos y cómo las prácticas revelan los profundos cambios en la estructura social que vivía la gente de aquel tiempo.

El Arq. Gorzalczy recibió su Maestría en Humanidades en Arqueología de la Universidad de Tel Aviv y es parte de la junta editorial de Antiguo Oriente, la publicación del Centro de Estudios de Historia del Antiguo Oriente de la Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina en Buenos Aires; cuenta con vasta experiencia en campo y excavaciones y ha publicado ampliamente en el tema de excavaciones de cuevas de entierro. En 2005, el Arq. Gorzalczy fue director de la excavación del cementerio calcolítico Palmahim.

Congratulations to Amir Gorzalczy, archaeologist of the Israel Antiquities Authority (Israel) and member of the Editorial Board of Antiguo Oriente, for his Conference “Revealing the Dead”, in San Diego, California, USA!