

EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 9

Volume 9 • Number 2 • April 1985

Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews, original and reprints,
from publications worldwide for an international
readership interpreting the Christian faith for
contemporary living.*

GENERAL EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

[15:8](#), [Galatians 1:1](#) is quite explicit on this matter, namely, ‘Paul an apostle by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead’. On the road to Damascus, the fact that Jesus Christ had ascended was immaterial; what was important and shattering was that He was no [p. 116](#) longer in the grave. He had triumphed and was Lord. As raised, He reigned among and for His people in converting Saul and calling him to be an apostle.

One other point is mentioned in the case argued for ‘apostles today’. It is based on the preposition ‘until’ in [Ephesians 4:13](#). In effect, it is a case built on the continuing need of churches to be brought up to ‘the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fulness of Christ’. This is termed an experiential foundation in distinction from that historical foundation laid by ‘the Twelve’. Such a foundation, it is argued, can only be supplied by present day apostles and these are the master builders ([1 Cor. 3:10](#)).

We have seen that the twelve and Paul constitute one group theologically on the basis of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, and that [Ephesians 4:11](#) can refer to this group. On this showing, what sense can be made of the preposition ‘until’? Though these apostles are no longer on earth, their teaching remains, preserved by the head of the church who gave it to them, for churches in every age and place. The church or churches today do, therefore, have apostolic ministry—Paul, Peter, John and Matthew—and by them, Christ speaks by His Spirit to the churches.

The condition of the churches is not, therefore, to be attributed to their lack of apostles, but to the failure of and want of pastors, teachers and elders, and the mutual encouraging of one another. All these are to edify, that is, build up others in the faith and in grace and the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The need for edification is not the proof for the need of apostles.

There are, therefore, no apostles today in the sense being argued for in the current charismatic scene. The twelve and Paul were Christ’s master-builders. All others seek to work according to their pattern, given by the Lord and recorded by His Spirit. However, there are other ‘apostles’, that is church-appointed men and women who devote themselves to the work of the gospel. These can be better described as pastors, teachers, preachers, evangelists, or missionaries.

In this category, from time to time, there have been those whose labours have been so significantly owned of God in raising churches from ruins, rubble, dust and nothing that their contemporaries or successors justly regard them as having something apostolic about them, for example, the Reformers, ‘the apostle of the North’, ‘the apostle of the Peak’, ‘the apostle of Pembrokeshire’. Their work has demanded the figurative use of this term because of its undisputed colossal nature. May many more of their calibre be raised up!

Rev. Hywel R. Jones MA, is minister of Wrexham Evangelical Church, Clwyd, Wales, and tutor in biblical studies at the London Theological Seminary. [p. 117](#)

The Proofs, Problems, and Promises of Biblical Archaeology

Edwin M. Yamauchi

Reprinted from the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 36, No. 3 September 1984 with permission

In some cases archaeology confirms biblical passages which were questioned, but in other cases it presents problems which are not easily resolved at present. This article seeks to show how far archaeology provides us with the data to reconstruct the setting of the events in biblical history. This amplified and annotated text of Dr. Yamauchi's presidential address to the American Scientific Affiliation was given on August 5, 1983 at George Fox College, Newberg, Oregon.

(Editor)

The first statement of faith we subscribe to as members of the American Scientific Affiliation declares 'The Holy Scriptures are the inspired Word of God, the only unerring guide of faith and conduct.' In a brief and selective way I would like to survey how archaeology has affected our understanding of the Bible and its backgrounds.

I would not wish to characterize archaeology as a 'science,' though in an increasing fashion—especially in New World archaeology—various scientific disciplines are being enlisted in excavations.¹ These p. 118 would include the use of radio carbon dating,² the neutron analysis of pottery,³ osteological analysis,⁴ and dendrochronological studies⁵—to name only a few examples.

But to an even greater degree than in the hard sciences, archaeological conclusions depend upon the subjective interpretations of various factors including one's disposition toward the Scriptures as a source of historical data. For example, scholars disagree as to whether the destruction of Lachish III was caused by the Assyrian king Sennacherib in 701 or by the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar in 597, a difference of over a century!⁶

Moreover archaeological interpretations are constantly changing. Every season unearths new data. This is not only what is exciting but also what is frustrating about the study of archaeology.

¹ D. P. Williams, 'As a Discipline Comes of Age: Reflections on Archaeology and the Scientific Method,' *Arch*, 29.4 (1976), 229–31; J. Pouilloux, 'Archaeology Today,' *AJA*, 84.3 (1980), 311–12; C. Renfrew, 'The Great Tradition versus the Great Divide: Archaeology as Anthropology?' *AJA*, 84.3 (1980), 287–98; J. A. Sabloff, 'When the Rhetoric Fades: A Brief Appraisal of Intellectual Trends in American Archaeology During the Past Two Decades,' *BASOR*, 242 (1981), 1–6.

² Problems of Radiocarbon Dating and of Cultural Diffusion in Pre-History,' *JASA*, 27.1 (1975), 25–31. Cf. M. G. L. Baillie, *Tree-Ring Dating and Archaeology* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982).

³ One of my former students, Professor Michal Artzy of the University of Haifa, has become one of the leading scholars in this field. See for example: M. Artzy, I. Perlman, and F. Asaro, 'Cypriote Pottery Imports at Ras Shamra,' *IEJ*, 31.1–2 (1981), 37–47.

⁴ J. K. Eakins, 'Human Osteology and Archaeology,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 89–96; K. A. R. Kennedy, 'Skeletal Biology: When Bones Tell Tales,' *Arch*, 34.1 (1981), 17–24.

⁵ N. Lipschitz and Y. Waisel, 'Dendroarchaeological Investigations in Israel (Taanach),' *IEJ*, 30.1–2 (1980), 132–36; N. Lipschitz, S. Lev-Yadun, and Y. Waisel, 'Dendroarchaeological Investigations in Israel (Masada),' *IEJ*, 31.3–4 (1981), 230–34. Cf. G. Edelstein and M. Kislev, 'Mevasseret Yerushatayim: Ancient Terrace Farming,' *BA*, 44.1 (1981), 53–56.

⁶ This problem will be addressed later in the article.

Subjective factors which have affected archaeological interpretations include: 1) patriotism, 2) personalities, and 3) pietism. The early pioneers in Mesopotamia and Egypt strove to outdo their competitors in acquiring works of art for the British Museum or for the Louvre.⁷ Recently the Syrian authorities have been understandably upset that the media have stressed the importance of the Ebla texts for the background of Israelite rather than Syrian history.⁸

The archaeology of the Holy Land has been dominated by towering figures such as Kathleen Kenyon,⁹ W. F. Albright, Nelson Glueck, G. p. 119 Ernest Wright, etc.—with all of their strengths and their foibles.¹⁰ In some cases rather bitter rivalries have produced conflicting interpretations as in the notorious case of Yigael Yadin versus Yohanan Aharoni, two Israeli archaeologists.¹¹

In recent years ultra-orthodox Jews have attempted to stop Yigael Shiloh's excavations in Jerusalem because they feared that the excavators were desecrating Jewish burials.¹² Native Americans have also protested such a 'violation of sepulture.'¹³

In spite of these distracting factors, no one can deny the extraordinary value of archaeology in illuminating ancient texts. Among the public at large the impression has been diffused that archaeology proves the Bible. That statement needs to be qualified. There have indeed been striking cases in which passages, questioned by higher critics such as J. Wellhausen, have been corroborated by excavations.¹⁴ This was already stressed in the late nineteenth century by A. H. Sayce.¹⁵

⁷ J. E. Barrett, 'Piety and Patriotism—Secularism and Scepticism,' *BAR*, 7.1 (1981), 54–55; N. A. Silberman, *Digging for God and Country* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).

⁸ A. Mikaya, 'The Politics of Ebla,' *BAR*, 4.3 (1978), 2–7; H. Shanks, 'Syria Tries to Influence Ebla Scholarship,' *BAR*, 5.2 (1979), 36–37; C. Bermant and M. Weitzman, *Ebla: An Archaeological Enigma* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1979).

⁹ Cf. P. R. S. Moorey, 'Prominent British Scholar Assesses Kathleen Kenyon,' *BAR*, 7.1 (1981), 46–48.

¹⁰ In the decade from 1970–80 many leading archaeologists passed away: in 1970: Paul Lapp; in 1971: W. F. Albright, N. Glueck, R. de Vaux; in 1974: G. Ernest Wright; in 1976: Y. Aharoni; in 1978: J. L. Kelso and M. Mallowan; in 1979: G. L. Harding; and in 1980: M. Burrows. See *SA*, pp. 1, 9.

¹¹ This rivalry has been brought out into the open in a series of articles in *BAR*. Even after Aharoni's death, the feud is continued by his wife and by his friend A. F. Rainey. See *BASOR*, 225 (1977), 67–68; *BAR* 3 (1977), 3–4; *BAR*, 6 (1980), 1.

¹² H. Shanks, 'Politics in the City of David,' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 40–44.

¹³ V. A. Talmage, 'The Violation of Sepulture: Is It Legal to Excavate Human Burials?' *Arch* 35.6 (1982), 44–49.

¹⁴ Likewise, the tendency of archaeology to confirm classical traditions against the criticisms of sceptical scholars may be seen in: *Composition and Corroboration in Classical and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., 1966); 'Homer, History and Archaeology,' *NEASB*, 3 (1973), 21–42; 'The Archaeological Confirmation of Suspect Elements in the Classical and the Biblical Traditions,' *The Law and the Prophets* (O.T. Allis Festschrift), ed. J. Skilton et. al. (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Pub., 1974), pp. 54–70.

¹⁵ A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments* (1883); idem, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments* (1893); idem, *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* (1904). Sayce began as a higher critic and was rejected for Pusey's chair at Oxford as deemed too liberal by Gladstone. It is an irony that, after the discovery of the Tell Amarna tablets in Egypt, Sayce became an opponent of higher criticism, whereas Pusey's successor, S. R. Diver, became a proponent of such criticism. See B. Z. MacHaffie, 'Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies,' *Church History*, 50.3 (1981), 316–28.

But we must also recognize that there are, in addition to *proofs*, certain *problems* which have been presented by archaeology in regard to the interpretation of the biblical texts. The communication (see [p. 120](#) pp.139–141) by Richard L. Atkins notes some of these cases.¹⁶ Atkins assumes that the type of ‘wishful-thinking’ interpretation of the archaeological data stems from the doctrine of inerrancy, which he deprecates.^{16a} Though this may be the case with some popularizers and preachers, his conclusions are unwarranted in the case of the members of the Near East Archaeological Society, who sign the same statement of faith as the members of the Evangelical Theological Society.¹⁷ I would affirm that Scriptures do not err, but that our interpretations often need correction.

As examples of unwarranted attempts to ‘prove’ the Bible Atkins cites: 1) the ark on Ararat, 2) Joshua’s conquests, 3) Jesus’ birth in a cave, 4) the site of Calvary—among others. William Dever of the University of Arizona has also been so embarrassed by such attempts to correlate the Bible and archaeology that he has urged the abandonment of the name ‘Biblical Archaeology’ as unprofessional and proposes the more neutral term ‘Syro-Palestinian Archaeology.’¹⁸ Dever was a student of G. Ernest Wright, whom he admires for his expertise in archaeology but whom he criticizes for his attempt to combine theology and archaeology.¹⁹ But even Dever agrees that archaeology can provide valuable background information.²⁰

THE ALLEGED ‘ARK’ ON ARARAT

Although some conservative Christians have sought to ‘prove’ the [P. 121](#) biblical account by a search for Noah’s ark on Mount Ararat in eastern Turkey, other evangelical scholars are quite aware of the pitfalls of such an enterprise.²¹ In the first place, the location of the singular Mt. Ararat appears to be a relatively late development (9th cent. B.C.); the biblical text itself ([Gen. 8:4](#)) speaks of the ‘mountains’ of Ararat. Ararat is cognate with ancient

¹⁶ R. L. Atkins, ‘Extravagant Claims in Bible Archaeology,’ (in this issue). For a book which stresses the disharmonies, see my review of M. Magnusson’s *Archaeology of the Bible* in *Fides et Historia*, 12.2 (1980), 150–52.

^{16a} For a work which advocates a doctrine of ‘infallibility’ rather than ‘inerrancy’, see J. Rogers and D. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979). For a response from an inerrantist position, see J. D. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982).

¹⁷ The NEAS includes such careful and competent scholars as Harold Mare of Covenant Theological Seminary, Bastiaan Van Elderen of Calvin Theological Seminary, Keith Schoville of the University of Wisconsin, Robert Cooley of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, etc. John D. Davis of Grace Theological Seminary in his article, ‘Archaeology and Apologetics,’ *Spire*, 11.4 (1983), 7–9, as an inerrantist deplores the abuse of archaeology in popular apologetics.

¹⁸ W. G. Dever, ‘Archaeological Method in Israel: A Continuing Revolution,’ *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 40–48; idem, ‘Should the Term “Biblical Archaeology” Be Abandoned?’ *BAR*, 7.3 (1981), 54–57.

¹⁹ W. G. Dever, ‘Biblical Theology and Biblical Archaeology: An Appreciation of G. Ernest Wright,’ *HTR*, 73.1–2 (1980), 1–15.

²⁰ W. G. Dever, ‘What Archaeology Can Contribute to an Understanding of the Bible,’ *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 40–41. Cf. J. M. Miller, ‘Approaches to the Bible through History and Archaeology,’ *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 211–16.

²¹ ‘Critical Comments on the Search for Noah’s Ark,’ *NEASB*, 10 (1977), 5–27; ‘Is That an Ark on Ararat?’ *Eternity*, 28 (Feb., 1978), 27–32.

Urartu, which was originally located farther south between Lake Van in eastern Turkey and Lake Urmia in northwest Iran.²²

In the second place the radio-carbon tests of the wood which has been recovered from the glacier on Mt. Ararat yield very late dates.^{22a} It is true that Berosos (3rd cent. B.C.) refers to a tradition that the ark was associated with Mt. Ararat,²³ but this does not carry us back far enough.

As is well known there are striking parallels to the biblical story in the Babylonian traditions.²⁴ An evangelical scholar, Alan Millard, now at the University of Liverpool, while rummaging through some drawers at the British Museum recently discovered a major new Babylonian work, the Atrahasis Epic, which has both a creation and a flood story.²⁵ As impressive as the similarities are, the contrasts are even starker—the Babylonian gods send the flood because mankind has become too numerous and too noisy. After the flood subsides they smell the sweet savour of the sacrifices and crowd around it like flies, as they have been deprived of sacrifices for a week.²⁶

THE PROBLEMS AND PROMISES OF EBLA

One of the most publicized of recent archaeological discoveries is the recovery of a palace and archives at Tell Mardikh—ancient Ebla—in P. 122 northern Syria by the Italian archaeologist P. Matthiae.²⁷ The excavations began in 1964 but the first of about 20,000 cuneiform tablets in a new Semitic language was not discovered until 1974.²⁸ The site flourished at the end of the Early Bronze period about 2350 to 2250 B.C. This is earlier than the usual date assigned to Abraham.

G. Pettinato, the original epigrapher of the expedition, aroused great excitement when he informed D. N. Freedman, then editor of the *Biblical Archaeologist*, that the Ebla texts contained the first reference to Sodom and Gomorrah and the three other cities of the Plain ([Gen. 14:1–2](#)) found outside the Bible.²⁹ If true, this would have required an earlier date for Abraham, inasmuch as Sodom and Gomorrah were never reoccupied. Indeed

²² See 'Urartu,' in *The New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology* (hereafter *IDBA*), ed. E. M. Blaiklock and R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) pp.463–65. *Foes from the Northern Frontier* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), ch.2.

^{22a} L. R. Bailey, 'Wood from "Mount Ararat": Noah's Ark?' *BA*, 40.4 (1977), 137–46; idem, *Where Is Noah's Ark?* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978).

²³ G. Komoroczy, 'Berosos and the Mesopotamian Literature,' *Acta Antiqua*, 21 (1973), 125–52.

²⁴ See A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1949).

²⁵ W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969).

²⁶ 'Anthropomorphism in Ancient Religions,' *BS*, 125 (1968), 29–44.

²⁷ See 'Unearthing Ebla's Ancient Secrets,' *CT*, 25 (May 8, 1981), 18–21; P. Matthiae, *An Empire Rediscovered* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1980). See also P. C. Maloney, 'Assessing Ebla,' *BAR*, 4.1 (1978), 4–11; idem, 'The Raw Material,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 57–59; R. Biggs, 'The Ebla Tablets: An Interim Perspective,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 76–88.

²⁸ G. Pettinato, *The Archives of Ebla* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), emphasizes Eblaite's western affinities. I. Gelb, *Thoughts about Ibla* (Malibu: Undena, 1977), stresses Eblaite's eastern affinities. Cf. C. H. Gordon, 'Eblaite and Its Affinities,' *Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1975), pp.297–301.

²⁹ D. N. Freedman, 'The Real Story of the Ebla Tablets, Ebla and the Cities of the Plain,' *BA*, 41.4 (1978), 143–64; H. Shanks, 'Interview with D. N. Freedman,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 51–54.

around the southeastern end of the Dead Sea five Early Bronze sites, which are being investigated by W. Rast and R. Schaub, have been suggested as candidates for these five cities of the Plain.³⁰

Professional and personal differences led eventually to the resignation of Pettinato, who was replaced by A. Archi. With rather bitter invective Pettinato has questioned Archi's competence in Eblaite as his earlier speciality was Hittite. Archi in turn has challenged almost every important reading of the texts by Pettinato.³¹ For example, Archi p. 123 does not believe that Eblaite *Si-da-ma*^{ki} and *i-ma-ar*^{ki} can represent Palestinian Sodom and Gomorrah because they appear in lists with Syrian cities.³² Another point of contention is whether the ending -ya has anything to do with the divine name *Yahweh*.³³ In any event, the thousands of texts in a Semitic language related to Hebrew promise a rich philological harvest.³⁴

THE PATRIARCHS

The positive evaluation of the patriarchal traditions by E. A. Speiser, C. H. Gordon, and W. F. Albright³⁵ has been challenged by the recent revisionism of T. L. Thompson³⁶ and J. Van Seters.³⁷ They have in effect revived the Wellhausenian view that these narratives were not accurate representations of the second millennium B.C. but were anachronistic creations of the first millennium.

Though Thompson and Van Seters have made some valid criticisms of some of the parallels cited between the fifteenth-century B.C. Nuzi texts and the Bible, their own reconstructions are too radical to command wide assent. Other scholars have pointed out

³⁰ W. E. Rast and R. T. Schaub, 'Preliminary Report of the 1979 Expedition to the Dead Sea Plain, Jordan,' *BASOR*, 240 (1980), 21–62; H. Shanks, 'Have Sodom and Gomorrah Been Found?' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 16–37; W. C. Hattem, 'Once Again: Sodom and Gomorrah,' *BA*, 44.2 (1981), 87–92. But note the scepticism of J. A. Sauer, 'Syro-Palestinian Archaeology, History, and Biblical Studies,' *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 201–209, especially 207.

³¹ G. Pettinato, "'Declaration' on Ebla," *BAR*, 5.2 (1979), 39–47; idem, 'Ebla and the Bible,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 203–16; idem, 'Ebla and the Bible—Observations on the New Epigrapher's Analysis,' *BAR*, 6.6 (1980), 38–41; H. Shanks, 'BAR Interviews Giovanni Pettinato,' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 46–53. For A. Archi's responses to Pettinato, see: A. Archi, 'The Epigraphic Evidence from Ebla and the Old Testament,' *Biblica*, 60 (1979), 556–66; idem, 'New Ebla Epigrapher Attacks Conclusions of Ousted Scholar,' *BAR*, 6.3 (1980), 55–56; idem, 'Archi Responds to Pettinato,' *BAR*, 6.6 (1980), 42–43; idem, 'Further Concerning Ebla and the Bible,' *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 145–54.

³² H. Shanks, 'Ebla Evidence Evaporates,' *BAR*, 5.6 (1979), 52–53; A. Archi, 'Are the "Cities of the Plain" Mentioned in the Ebla Tablets?' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 54–55; idem, 'Notes on Eblaite Geography II,' *Studi Eblaite*, 4 (1981), 1–18.

³³ M. Dahood, 'The God Ya at Ebla?' *JBL*, 100.4 (1981), 607–608; H.-P. Müller, 'Gab es in Ebla einen Gottesnamen Ja?' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 70.1 (1981), 70–92.

³⁴ See M. Dahood's Appendix in Pettinato's book (n.28); also M. Dahood, 'Ebla, Ugarit and the Old Testament,' *Bible and Spade*, 8.1 (1979), 1–15; idem, 'Are the Ebla Tablets Relevant to Biblical Research?' *BAR*, 6.5 (1980), 54–58, 60; D. N. Freedman, 'The Tell Mardikh Excavation, the Ebla Tablets, and Their Significance for Biblical Studies,' *NEASB*, 13 (1979), 5–35.

³⁵ See *SS*, pp.36–46; 'Patriarchal Age,' *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopaedia*, ed. C. F. Pfeiffer, H. E. Vos, and J. Rea (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), pp. 1287–91; *SA*, pp. 1–3.

³⁶ *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1974).

³⁷ *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1975).

their one-sided and selected use of the evidence and the impossibility of the view that Abrahamic traditions were created only in the first millennium.³⁸

Thompson cited for support of his view Y. Aharoni's interpretation of his excavations at Beersheba.³⁹ Since he found nothing earlier than p. 124 Iron Age materials associated with the site and its well, Aharoni concluded that the patriarchal narratives must date to the Iron Age (i.e. after 1200 B.C.).⁴⁰ But it is not certain that Iron Age Beersheba is necessarily the same as patriarchal Beersheba.⁴¹ There is no indication in the Old Testament that Beersheba in Abraham's time was a city.⁴²

MOSES AND MONOTHEISM

In his last book Sigmund Freud speculated that Hebrew monotheism really owed its genesis to an Egyptian named 'Moses,' influenced by the monotheism of Akhnaton (Amenhotep IV). Though such an Egyptian influence was also suggested by Albright, this is a most unlikely scenario.⁴³ For one thing the concept of the supreme god Yahweh was already maintained by the patriarchs.⁴⁴

The Hebrews were, with the exception of the abortive monotheism of Akhnaton and the later monotheism of the Greek philosopher Xenophanes,⁴⁵ unique in stressing the worship of a single god. The Hebrew language even lacks a word for 'goddess.'

New evidence has, however, now been found near a site identified with Kadesh-barnea in north-east Sinai,⁴⁶ which has raised some questions about the purity of Hebrew monotheism. The excavator found some cartoon-like figures of Yahweh and 'his Asherah.' Asherah was the name of a Canaanite goddess associated with the fertility cult,⁴⁷ and also of the wooden object which represented her.⁴⁸ But as p. 125 there is evidence that the traders at Kuntilet 'Ajrud came from Samaria about 800 B.C., their graffiti are no more than

³⁸ See SA, pp.3–6, 10. For a positive presentation of Abraham in a second millennium setting, see D. J. Wiseman, 'Abraham in History and Tradition,' BS, 134 (1977), 123–30, 228–37.

³⁹ Y. Aharoni, 'Nothing Early and Nothing Late,' BA, 39 (1976), 55–76.

⁴⁰ Z. Herzog, 'Beer-sheba of the Patriarchs,' BAR, 6.6 (1980), 12–28.

⁴¹ M. D. Fowler, 'The Excavation of Tell Beer-sheba and the Biblical Record,' PEQ, 113 (1981), 7–11.

⁴² N. Sama, 'Abraham in History,' BAR, 3 (1977), 9.

⁴³ SS, p. 165; SA, p. 13; S. Herrmann, *Israel in Egypt* (London: SCM Press, 1973), p.22.

⁴⁴ W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973).

⁴⁵ Whether or not Zoroaster preached the monotheistic worship of Ahura-Mazda is complicated by our late Zoroastrian sources. See the ch. on Iranian Evidences in *Pre-Christian Gnosticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973; Grand Rapids: Baker, rev. ed., 1983).

⁴⁶ R. Cohen, 'The Excavations at Kadesh-barnea (1976–78),' BA, 44.2 (1981), 93–107; idem, 'Did I Excavate Kadesh-Barnea?' BAR, 7.3 (1981), 20–33; Z. Meshel, 'An Explanation of the Journeys of the Israelites in the Wilderness,' BA, 45.1 (1982), 19–20.

⁴⁷ 'Cultic Prostitution—A Case Study in Cultural Diffusion,' *Orient and Occident*, ed. H. A. Hoffner (Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1973), pp.213–22.

⁴⁸ Z. Meshel, 'Did Yahweh Have a Consort?' BAR, 5.2 (1979), 24–36; J. A. Emerton, 'New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntilet "Ajrud,"' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 94 (1982), 2–20. Such syncretism was also found among the Jews at Elephantine in the fifth cent. B.C. See B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley: University of California, 1968).

evidence of the striking syncretism which the Old Testament itself ascribes to the area of the Northern Kingdom.

THE EXODUS

H. Goedicke, a distinguished Egyptologist with the Johns Hopkins University, made the front page of the *New York Times* by setting forth arguments for an early date of the Exodus in the reign of Hatshepsut, and by linking the phenomena of the parting of the Red Sea and the fiery pillar with the cataclysmic eruption of the volcanic island of Thera (Santorini) in the Aegean in the 15th cent. B.C.⁴⁹ His views have been sharply contested and do seem to be highly speculative.⁵⁰

A more substantial contribution to the question of the Exodus is the important monograph by J. H. Bimson, *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*, which has called forth a flurry of reviews.⁵¹ In general, critics have responded favourably to his criticisms of the archaeological evidence used, for example, by Y. Yadin⁵² to support the late date of the Exodus and the Conquest.⁵³ But they have also reacted unfavourably to Bimson's own attempt to correlate Middle Bronze (MB) sites with an early Conquest by Joshua.⁵⁴ p. 126

As I have pointed out elsewhere the view which places Joshua's conquest in the thirteenth century faces problems with the sites of Gibeon, Jericho, and Ai. As the modern village of El-Jib still rests on the tell of Gibeon and as J. Pritchard did find Late Bronze (LB) tombs there, the possibility remains that the LB settlement there is yet to be discovered. Because of massive erosion, K. Kenyon found very little LB remains at Jericho.⁵⁵ Yadin suggests that MB walls were still being used in Joshua's day.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ H. Shanks, 'The Exodus and the Crossing of the Red Sea according to Hans Goedicke,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 42–50; C. R. Krahmalkov, 'A Critique of Professor Goedicke's Exodus Theories,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 51–54; H. Shanks, 'In Defence of Hans Goedicke,' *BAR*, 8.3 (1982), 48–53; Y. T. Radday, 'A Bible Scholar Looks at *BAR*'s Coverage of the Exodus,' *BAR*, 8.6 (1982), 68–71.

⁵⁰ For one thing Goedicke's reconstruction requires a northern route. Though some Israeli scholars, e.g. B. Rothenberg, 'An Archaeological Survey of South Sinai,' *PEQ*, 101 (1970), 4–29, have come to favour a central route, most scholars still favour a southern route: see D. M. Beagle, *Moses, The Servant of Yahweh* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972; Ann Arbor: Pryor Pettengill, 1979 repr.) pp.170–173; S. H. Horn, 'What We Don't Know about Moses and the Exodus,' *BAR*, 3 (1977), 29; G. I. Davies, 'The Significance of Deuteronomy 1.2 for the Location of Mount Horeb,' *PEQ*, 111 (1979), 87–101.

⁵¹ Bimson's monograph, which was part of his dissertation, was published by the *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* at Sheffield in 1978. Cf. E. H. Merrill, 'Palestinian Archaeology and the Date of the Conquest,' *Grace Theological J.*, 3.1 (1982), 107–21.

⁵² Y. Yadin, *Hazor* (New York: Random House, 1975); idem, 'The Transition from a Semi-Nomadic to a Sedentary Society,' *Symposia ...*, ed. F. M. Cross (Cambridge: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1979), pp.57–68; idem, 'Is the Biblical Account of the Israelite Conquest of Canaan Historically Reliable?' *BAR*, 8.2 (1982), 16–23.

⁵³ *SS*, pp.46–64; *SA*, pp. 15.–17, 22.

⁵⁴ See for example reviews by H. Engel in *Biblica*, 61.3 (1980), 437–40; by A. F. Rainey in *IEJ*, 30.3–4 (1980), 249–51; by J. A. Soggin in *Vetus Testamentum*, 31 (1981), 98–99.

⁵⁵ *SS*, pp.57–58; *SA*, pp.16, 22.

⁵⁶ H. Shanks, 'BAR Interviews Yigael Yadin,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 16–23.

As for the great mound of Et-Tell, usually identified with Ai, it is possible that some LB remains may yet lie within the 28-acre site.⁵⁷ Others have found another site with LB materials called Nisyah, two kilometres east of Bireh, which they would identify with Ai.⁵⁸ This would require the identification of Bireh as ancient Bethel rather than Beitin.

One of the complicating uncertainties is the attempt to correlate the excavated sites with those named in the Old Testament. For example, though some scholars have identified Tell Deir ‘Alī in Jordan with biblical Succoth, H. Franken, the excavator, rejects this identification.⁵⁹ Albright persisted in identifying Tell Beit Mirsim, which he excavated, as the site of Debir taken by Caleb, though the tell called Khirbet Rabud, excavated by M. Kochavi now seems to be a better candidate.⁶⁰

THE JUDGES

The Philistines were the most formidable foes of the Israelites during the days of the Judges and the early part of the United Monarchy.⁶¹ The most dramatic archaeological discovery to illuminate Philistine culture is the excavation of a unique Philistine temple at Tel Qasile just north of Tel Aviv by Ami Mazar.⁶² Though very small, the temple with its two **P. 127** column bases corresponds to the plan of the Philistine temple pulled down by Samson at Gaza ([Judges 16:29](#)).⁶³

An important ostrakon dated to the 12th century B.C. was found in 1976 at Izbet Sartah near Tel Aviv. Though the 83 letters in five lines are faint and defy attempts at decipherment, what is clear is that in the last line we have an Abecedary, written from left to right.⁶⁴ A. Demsky believes that the writer was an Israelite, and that this text lends strong support to the evidence for literacy attested in [Judges 8:14](#). Some critics had contended that the Israelites did not use writing for ‘formal literature’ as early as the Judges, in spite of strong inscriptional evidence to the contrary.⁶⁵ Commenting on the Izbet Sartah ostrakon, S. H. Horn notes: ‘there can be no longer any doubt that fully

⁵⁷ SS, pp.57, 60. Cf. L. Allen, ‘Archaeology of Ai and the Accuracy of Joshua 7:1–8:29,’ *Restoration Quarterly*, 20 (1977), 41–52.

⁵⁸ W. Fields, ‘Have We Found Ai?’ offprint published by the author, Joplin, MO: Ozark Bible College, 1981.

⁵⁹ H. Franken, ‘The Identity of Tell Deir ‘Alī, Jordan,’ *Akkadica*, 14 (1979), 11–15.

⁶⁰ M. Kochavi’s excavations of the site in 1968–69 are reported in *Tel Aviv*, 1 (1974), 2–33.

⁶¹ See *Greece and Babylon, hereafter GB* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967); ‘Archaeological Evidence for the Philistines,’ *WTJ*, 35.3 (1973), 315–23.

⁶² A. Mazar, ‘A Philistine Temple at Tell Qasile,’ *BA*, 36 (1973), 42–48.

⁶³ Timnah, where Samson obtained his first Philistine wife ([Judges 14:1](#)), has been identified with Tel Batash, which is being excavated under the direction of George Kelm and A. Mazar. A clay bulla is the first evidence that the Philistines wrote on papyri. R. D. Kaplan, ‘Looking at Some Recent Excavations’ *Christian News from Israel*, 27 (1979), 19–20.

⁶⁴ M. Kochavi, ‘An Ostrakon of the Period of the Judges from “Izbet Sartah,”’ *Tel Aviv*, 4 (1977), 1–14; M. Kochavi and A. Demsky, ‘An Israelite Village from Days of the Judges,’ *BAR*, 4 (1978), 19–31.

⁶⁵ ‘Documents from Old Testament Times,’ *WTJ*, 41.1 (1978), 1–32; A. R. Millard, ‘The Practice of Writing in Ancient Israel,’ *BA*, 35 (1972), 98–111; cf. idem, ‘In Praise of Ancient Scribes,’ *BA*, 45.3 (1982), 143–53; F. M. Cross, ‘Newly Found Inscriptions in Old Canaanite and Early Phoenician Scripts,’ *BASOR*, 238 (1980), 1–20. The Phoenician alphabet may have been transmitted to the Greeks at a much earlier date than the 8th cent. B.C. See N. Naveh, ‘The Greek Alphabet: New Evidence,’ *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 22–25; see *SA*, p.32, n.26.

developed alphabetic writing systems existed in the time of Moses, making it possible for him and his successors to write books in a script easy to learn.’⁶⁶

THE UNITED MONARCHY

According to [1 Sam. 13:19–22](#) the Philistines at first retained a military advantage over the Israelites by their mastery of iron until they were defeated by Saul. New studies are shedding light on the development of iron metallurgy in biblical lands.⁶⁷

David fled from the wrath of Saul to dwell among the Philistines at [p. 128](#) Ziklag, a site which is now being investigated.⁶⁸ During her excavations in Jerusalem in 1961–68, K. Kenyon discovered a corner of the so-called ‘Jebusite’ wall of the city which David captured.⁶⁹ She found almost nothing, however, of the structures of David and of Solomon. Current excavations in the same area under Yigal Shiloh now claim to have discovered structures dating from this early period.⁷⁰

The fabulous grandeur and wealth of Solomon seemed to be exaggerated to many critics.⁷¹ In recent studies A. Millard has pointed out that extra-biblical accounts of the wealth, especially evidence of gold-plated buildings and statues, lend credence to the biblical descriptions.⁷²

Solomon obtained much of his wealth in trading ventures with King Hiram of Tyre. Classical scholars have questioned the traditions of the early penetration of the western Mediterranean by the Phoenicians, but Semitists have been more sanguine. On the basis of the Nora Stone (9th cent. B.C.) from Sardinia, Albright had suggested that Solomon in partnership with Hiram was sending ships to far off Spain in the 10th century.⁷³ A recent article by F. M. Cross now dates a Nora fragment on the basis of comparative epigraphy to the 11th century.⁷⁴

When I was in Israel in 1968 I took the tourist bus to view the so-called ‘Pillars of Solomon’—impressive geological structures north of Eilat. I smiled within myself at the knowledge which the other tourists did not have that we were in an area of ancient copper mining activities as slag heaps were all around. Later I learned to my chagrin that Benno Rothenberg in 1969 discovered at the base of those pillars an Egyptian temple with

⁶⁶ S. H. Horn, *Biblical Archaeology after 30 Years* (1948–1978) (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1978), p.10.

⁶⁷ T. Stech-Wheeler, J. D. Muhly, K. R. Maxwell-Hyslop, & R. Maddin, ‘Iron at Taanach and Early Iron Metallurgy in the Eastern Mediterranean,’ *AJA*, 85.3 (1981), 245–68; cr. J. D. Muhly, ‘Bronze Figurines and Near Eastern Metalwork,’ *IEJ*, 30.3–4 (1980), 148–61.

⁶⁸ E. D. Oren, ‘Ziklag: A Biblical City on the Edge of the Negev,’ *BA*, 45.3 (1982), 155–67.

⁶⁹ ‘Jebusites,’ *IDBA* pp.256–57; K. Kenyon, Jerusalem, *Excavating 3,000 Years of History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1967).

⁷⁰ Y. Shiloh, ‘Excavating Jerusalem: The City of David,’ *Arch*, 33.6 (1980), 8–17; idem, ‘The City of David Archaeological Project: The Third Season, 1980,’ *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 161–70.

⁷¹ ‘Solomon,’ *IDBA* pp.419–22; *SS*, pp.67–71.

⁷² A. R. Millard, ‘Archaeology and Ancient Israel,’ *Faith and Thought*, 108.1–2 (1981), 58–59; idem, ‘Solomon in All His Glory,’ *Vox Evangelica*, 12 (1981), 5–18.

⁷³ W. F. Albright, ‘The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization,’ *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), pp.343–51.

⁷⁴ F. M. Cross, ‘Early Alphabetic Scripts,’ in Cross, *Symposia* (n.52), pp.103–19.

inscriptions of the XIXth–XXth Dynasties dating from the 14th to the 12th centuries B.C. Rothenberg therefore maintained that these were earlier Egyptian mines and not Solomon's.⁷⁵ In a p. 129 recent article Bimson argues that radio-carbon dates do indicate that the Timna mines were being utilized during Solomon's reign.⁷⁶

THE DIVIDED KINGDOMS

After Solomon's death ten of the northern tribes under Jeroboam I rebelled against Rehoboam, who was left with but Benjamin and Judah. According to [1 Kings 14:25–26](#) Shishak, the Egyptian pharaoh, took advantage of this dissension to attack Jerusalem and remove the treasures of the temple. Though this account has been questioned, a monumental stele of Shishak has been found at Megiddo. Furthermore we learn from Shishak's own reliefs and texts at Karnak in Egypt that he conquered not only Judah but areas in the Esdraelon Valley and Transjordan as well.⁷⁷

Jeroboam I set up golden calves at Dan in the north and at Bethel just above Jerusalem. Extensive excavations at Dan by Avraham Biran have uncovered a well preserved arch and gate from the Canaanite period, as well as a sacred precinct, and an Israelite horned altar.⁷⁸

The independence of the northern kingdom was gradually undermined by the expansion of the aggressive Assyrian Empire. Our earliest known synchronism falls in the reign of Ahab, the son of Omri,⁷⁹ and of Shalmaneser III of Assyria. Ahab was part of an anti-Assyrian coalition which fought the Assyrians in the famous battle of Qarqar⁸⁰ in Syria in 853 B.C., a battle which is not mentioned in the Old Testament. The famous Black Obelisk, which depicts the Israelite king Jehu,⁸¹ comes from the end of the king's reign and is a poor historical source for the battle. Assyrian accounts of the battle progressively inflate the number p. 130 of enemy casualties from 14,000 to 29,000; Assyrian casualties are hardly ever mentioned.

A text found at Tell er-Rimah in 1967 contains evidence that Adadnirari III (810–783 B.C.) exacted tribute from Joash of Samaria (802–787 B.C.): *Ya'a-su Sa-me-ri-na-a-a*.⁸² Shortly after this the Assyrians were ruled by weak kings, a circumstance which allowed

⁷⁵ B. Rothenberg, *Timna* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972).

⁷⁶ J.J. Bimson, 'King Solomon's Mines?: A Re-assessment of Finds in the Arabah,' *TB*, 32 (1981), 145–46.

⁷⁷ 'Shishak,' *IDBA* pp.412–13; *SS*, p.71; K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period* (Westminster: Aris 8, Phillips, 1973).

⁷⁸ A. Biran, 'An Israelite Horned Altar at Dan,' *BA*, 37.4 (1974), 106–107; idem, 'Tell Dan—Five Years Later,' *BA*, 43.3 (1980), 168–82; idem, 'Two Discoveries at Tel Dan,' *IEJ*, 30.1–2 (1980), 89–98; J. C. H. Laughlin, 'The Remarkable Discoveries at Tel Dan,' *BAR*, 7.5 (1981), 20–37; L. E. Stager and S. R. Wolff, 'Production and Commerce in Temple Courtyards: An Olive Press in the Sacred Precinct at Tel Dan,' *BASOR*, 243 (1981), 95–102.

⁷⁹ It was Omri who moved his capital to Samaria from Tirzah. For a re-examination of R. de Vaux's interpretations of his excavations at Tirzah, see M. D. Fowler, 'Cultic Continuity at Tirzah?: A Re-examination of the Archaeological Evidence,' *PEQ*, 113 (1981), 27–32.

⁸⁰ 'Qarqar,' *IDBA* pp.375–77; *SS*, p.72; *SA*, pp.36–37.

⁸¹ See *SS*, fig.6 on p.53.

⁸² *SA*, p.37; W. H. Shea, 'Adad-Nirari III and Jehoash of Israel,' *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 30.2 (1978), 101–13.

Jeroboam II (786–746 B.C.) of Israel to expand at the expense of Syria—a development which was prophesied by Jonah ([2 Kings 14:25](#)).

The book of Jonah has troubled many commentators. Even a recent evangelical commentary by Leslie C. Allen has concluded that it is best to regard Jonah as a parable rather than as a historical narrative.⁸³ On the other hand, Donald J. Wiseman, Professor of Assyriology at the University of London, has recently examined the book of Jonah in the light of cuneiform sources and concludes:

It is submitted that this survey of some of the events which might lie behind the account of Jonah's visit to Nineveh supports the tradition that many features in the narrative exhibit an intimate and accurate knowledge of Assyria which could stem from an historical event as early as the eighth century B.C.⁸⁴

Tiglath-pileser III (745–727 B.C.) was one of the greatest of all the Assyrian kings.⁸⁵ He was also known as Pul ([2 Kings 15:19](#); [1 Chron. 5:26](#)), the name under which he ruled as king in Babylon. It was this king who devastated not only Damascus in 732 B.C. but also parts of Gilead and Galilee as well, deporting some of his prisoners to Mesopotamia. His campaigns are fully detailed in his inscriptions and can also be correlated with evidences of devastated Israelite cities from this time. He boasted that he placed Hoshea on the throne of Israel after the assassination of Pekah. The latter's name was found on a jar from the level at Hazor destroyed by the Assyrians.

In 722 the great city of Samaria fell to the Assyrians ([2 Kings 17:6, 18:10](#)). Samaria had been the splendid capital of Ahab which had been adorned by Phoenician craftsmen brought south by his wife Jezebel. In the debris, excavators found richly decorated ivory fragments, [p. 131](#) which illustrate the ostentatious luxury denounced by the prophets.⁸⁶

The Bible is correct in crediting the siege to Shalmaneser V, though his successor Sargon II claimed credit for the capture of the city.⁸⁷ Sargon boasted that he carried off 27,290 (or 27,280) persons from Israel, replacing them with various other peoples from Mesopotamia and Syria, who eventually intermarried with the natives to form the hybrid Samaritan population.

Sargon's armies conducted four campaigns in 720, 716, 713, and 712 to secure the Philistine coast. The invasion of 712 led by Sargon's general, mentioned in [Isaiah 20:1](#), is confirmed by a fragment of an Assyrian stele discovered in 1963 at Ashdod.⁸⁸

In 701 Sennacherib attacked Judah, capturing the southern city of Lachish though failing to take Jerusalem. This can be co-ordinated with the biblical account of the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem under the courageous defiance of Hezekiah ([2 Kings 18-19](#); [Isaiah 36-37](#)). As I mentioned earlier one of the most controversial issues dividing archaeologists is the dating of the destruction of Lachish III. Was it the work of

⁸³ L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), pp.77–81.

⁸⁴ D. J. Wiseman, 'Jonah's Nineveh,' *TB*, 30 (1979), 38–39.

⁸⁵ 'Tiglath-pileser III,' *IDBA* pp.451–53; *SA*, pp.37–38.

⁸⁶ 'Palaces,' *ISBE* (forthcoming); *SS*, fig.5., p.51. Numerous ostraca were also found at Samaria, whose interpretation has been the subject of controversy. See A. F. Rainey, 'The Sitz im Leben of the Samaria Ostraca,' *Tel Aviv*, 6.1–2 (1979), 91–94; idem, 'Wine from the Royal Vineyards,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 57–62; I. T. Kaufman, 'The Samaria Ostraca,' *BA*, 45.4 (1982), 229–39.

⁸⁷ *SS*, pp.74–75, *SA*, pp.38–39.

⁸⁸ G. L. Mattingly, 'An Archaeological Analysis of Sargon's 712 Campaign against Ashdod,' *NEASB*, 17 (1981), 47–64; cf. idem, 'Neo-Assyrian Influence at Tell Jemmeh,' *NEASB*, 15–16 (1980), 33–49.

Sennacherib in 701 or of Nebuchadnezzar a century later? Recent excavations at Lachish under D. Ussishkin seem to have shifted the balance in favour of the Assyrian date.⁸⁹

In spite of some doubts which have been raised as to the identification of Tell ed-Duweir with Lachish,⁹⁰ the Assyrian texts and reliefs can aid us in a clear understanding of this siege.⁹¹ A new inscription of a letter of Sennacherib to his god Anshar was published in 1974 by N. Na'aman. This reveals that Sennacherib captured Azekah and Gath [p.132](#) and then took Lachish (cf. [Micah 1:10–17](#)), before advancing upon Jerusalem.⁹²

The Assyrians were to be overthrown at the end of the 7th century by a coalition of Medes⁹³ and Chaldeans.⁹⁴ The latter were led by Nabopolassar,⁹⁵ the father of the great king Nebuchadnezzar, who is mentioned almost a hundred times in the Old Testament.⁹⁶ *The Chaldean Chronicles* published by D. J. Wiseman in 1956 have shed welcome light on the early years of Nebuchadnezzar. It was in his first year that Nebuchadnezzar's forces took away such captives as Daniel.⁹⁷

As to the Greek words in the book of Daniel, which have been used to date Daniel in the Maccabean era c. 165 B.C., it is essential to note that the Greeks penetrated the Near East long before Alexander.⁹⁸ Greek mercenaries fought both for and against Nebuchadnezzar. The argument from the close correspondence of [Daniel 11](#) with events of the Maccabean era to sustain a late date is a highly subjective one.⁹⁹ Those who do not believe in predictive prophecy of such precision will regard Daniel as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, 'a prophecy after the event.'

⁸⁹ SA, pp.40, 46; D. Ussishkin, 'Answers at Lachish,' *BAR*, 5.6 (1979), 16–39; W. H. Shea, 'Nebuchadnezzar's Chronicle and the Date of the Destruction of Lachish III,' *PEQ*, 111 (1979), 113–16.

⁹⁰ G. W. Ahlström, 'Is Tell Ed-Duweir Ancient Lachish?' *PEQ*, 112 (1980), 7–9.

⁹¹ D. Ussishkin, 'The "Lachish Reliefs" and the City of Lachish,' *IEJ*, 30.3–4 (1980), 174–95; cf. P. Albenda, 'Syrian-Palestinian Cities on Stone,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 222–29.

⁹² N. Na'aman, 'Sennacherib's "Letter to God" on His Campaign to Judah,' *BASOR*, 214 (1974), 25–39; idem, 'Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah and the Date of the LMLK Stamps,' *Vetus Testamentum*, 29 (1979), 61–86. Professor W. H. Shea informs me that on the basis of the reference to the god 'Anshar,' he will argue for two invasions of Sennacherib in a forthcoming article.

⁹³ 'Media, Medes,' *IDBA*, pp.304–06; Persia and the Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming).

⁹⁴ 'Chaldea, Chaldeans,' *IDBA*, pp.123–25.

⁹⁵ 'Nabopolassar,' *IDBA*, pp.326–27.

⁹⁶ 'Nebuchadnezzar,' *IDBA*, pp.332–34.

⁹⁷ D. J. Wiseman, et. al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965). On various problems related to Daniel see: *GB*; 'The Archaeological Background of Daniel,' *BS*, 137.1 (1980), 3–16; 'Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel,' *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 23 (1980), 13–21; 'Nabonidus,' *ISBE* (forthcoming).

⁹⁸ *GB*; 'Daniel and Contacts between the Aegean and the Near East before Alexander,' *Evangelical Quarterly*, 53.1 (1981), 37–47.

⁹⁹ D. W. Gooding, 'The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and Its Implications,' *TB*, 32 (1981), 43–80.

Space does not permit me in this article to discuss the numerous archaeological finds which have illuminated for us the books of Esther,¹⁰⁰ of Ezra,¹⁰¹ and of Nehemiah¹⁰² from the Post-Exilic era. p. 133

QUMRAN

Let me discuss some recent developments with respect to the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Qumran since 1947.¹⁰³ With the Israeli seizure of the West Bank in 1967, Yigael Yadin was able to acquire the 'Temple Scroll,' which had been kept under abominable conditions. Its length of some eight metres surpasses even the great Isaiah scroll.

In 1977 Yadin published a three-volume work on the scroll.¹⁰⁴ Though as yet no English edition or translation of the entire work is available, a German translation has appeared,¹⁰⁵ and numerous articles on the text have appeared in English.¹⁰⁶ The text is presented as the words of Yahweh. The Temple Scroll sets forth numerous and detailed injunctions. It ordains strict monogamy for the king (col.56:12f.). It sets forth plans for the placement of the toilets outside the city and lays down a blueprint for the erection of a new temple. It forbids the entrance of any diseased or blind person into the Temple City.¹⁰⁷ What a striking contrast to the attitude of Jesus!¹⁰⁸

In 1972 a famed papyrologist, José O'Callaghan, identified certain Greek fragments from Cave 7 at Qumran as the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament. O'Callaghan is the founder of *Studia Papyrologica*, head of the department of papyrology at the theological seminary in Barcelona, and also professor of Greek papyrology at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. In the case of 7Q5, O'Callaghan identified this piece with [Mark 6:52-53](#) and dated it to A.D. 50. This sounded p. 134 almost too good to be

¹⁰⁰ 'The Archaeological Background of Esther,' *BS*, 137.2 (1980), 99-117; cf. also on Susa, 'The Achaemenid Capitals,' *NEASB*, 8 (1976), 5ff.

¹⁰¹ 'The Archaeological Background of Ezra,' *BS*, 137.3 (1980), 195-211; 'Ezra and Nehemiah,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, forthcoming).

¹⁰² 'The Archaeological Background of Nehemiah,' *BS*, 137.4 (1980), 291-309; 'Was Nehemiah the Cupbearer a Eunuch?' *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 92.1 (1980), 132-42; 'Two Reformers Compared: Solon of Athens and Nehemiah of Jerusalem,' *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*, ed. G. Rendsburg et. al. (New York: KTAV, 1980), pp. 269-92; 'Nehemiah, A Model Leader,' *A Spectrum of Thought: Essays in Honor of Dennis F. Kinlaw*, ed. M. L. Peterson (Wilmore, KY: Francis Asbury Pub., 1982), pp.171-80.

¹⁰³ *SS*, ch.3: 'The Dead Sea Scrolls,' *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopaedia*, ed. C. F. Pfeiffer, H. F. Vos, and J. Rea (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), pp.432-42.

¹⁰⁴ Y. Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll,' *BA*, 30 (1967), 135-39; Y. Yadin, *Megillat Hammiqdāš* ('The Temple Scroll') I-III (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

¹⁰⁵ J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1978).

¹⁰⁶ Especially by J. Milgrom, e.g. 'The Temple Scroll,' *BA*, 41.3 (1978), 105-20; 'Studies in the Temple Scroll,' *JBL*, 97.4 (1978), 501-23; '“Sabbath” and “Temple City” in the Temple Scroll,' *BASOR*, 232 (1978), 25-28; 'Further Studies in the Temple Scroll,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 71 (1980), 1-17.

¹⁰⁷ B. A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,' *BASOR*, 232 (1978), 5-24.

¹⁰⁸ 'The Teacher of Righteousness from Qumran and Jesus of Nazareth,' *CT*, 10 (May 13, 1966), 816-18; *SS*, pp.140-45.

true.¹⁰⁹ Since his initial studies made from photographs, O'Callaghan has studied the papyri themselves firsthand and also infra-red photos of the papyri, and has continued to maintain his identifications.

Unfortunately with few exceptions, almost all scholars who have examined his arguments, including some who have been able to study the fragments themselves, believe that O'Callaghan's arguments cannot be sustained. More plausible is their identification as parts of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament. In most cases the fragments are too tiny to warrant any degree of confident identification.¹¹⁰

Recently some Greek biblical manuscripts, which appear to be a part of the great Sinaiticus manuscript which Tischendorf discovered, have been found in a back room at the Monastery of St. Catherine's in the Sinai. Full details have as yet not been revealed, but the notices are tantalizing.¹¹¹

JESUS CHRIST

The tradition that Jesus was born in a cave is a relatively old one, going back to Justin Martyr of Samaria in the second century.¹¹² Helena, the mother of Constantine, built a basilica there. Investigations in the present Church of the Holy Nativity have revealed mosaics which may go **P. 135** back to this structure. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, was inspired to make his home next to the alleged Cave of the Nativity in 385.

At the time when a popular movie about the search for the lost ark (of the temple) was being shown, Eric and Carol Meyers received great media attention for their discovery of an 'ark' from a synagogue in Galilee.¹¹³ Their 'ark' is quite different, however. It is an architectural decoration from a late synagogue. Unfortunately, with the exception of the

¹⁰⁹ 'Qumran New Testament Fragments?' *IDBA*, pp.379-81; J. O'Callaghan, '¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumran?' *Biblica*, 53 (1972), 91-100; D. Estrada, 'The Fragments from Cave 7,' *Eternity*, 23 (1972), 25-26; idem, 'On the Latest Identification of New Testament Documents,' *WTJ*, 34 (1972), 109-17; W. White, 'O'Callaghan's Identifications: Confirmation and Its Consequences,' *WTJ*, 34 (1972), 15-20; idem, 'Notes on the Papyrus Fragments from Cave 7 at Qumran,' *WTJ*, 35 (1973), 221-26; D. Estrada and W. White, *The First New Testament* (Nashville: Nelson, 1978).

¹¹⁰ C. J. Hemer, 'New Testament Fragments at Qumran?' *TB*, 23 (1972), 125-28; idem, 'The 7Q Fragments Reconsidered,' *Themelios*, 9 (1973), 14-16; M. Baillet, 'Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament,' *Biblica*, 54 (1973), 340-50; P. Benoit, 'Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân,' *Revue Biblique*, 80 (1973), 5-12; G. D. Fee, 'Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5=Mark 6:52-53,' *JBL*, 92 (1973), 109-12; R. Lester, 'Does Qumran Cave 7 Contain New Testament Materials?' *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 2 (1975), 203-14. Inscriptions in Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek from New Testament times in Israel raise the possibility that Jesus may have been trilingual. See 'Aramaic,' *IDBA*, pp.38-41; P. Lapide, 'Insights from Qumran into the Languages of Jesus,' *Revue de Qumran*, 8.4 (1975), 483-501.

¹¹¹ J. H. Charlesworth, 'The Manuscripts of St. Catherine's Monastery,' *BA*, 43.1 (1980), 26-34.

¹¹² *SS*, p.100; see J. Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1964); C. Kopp, *The Holy Places of the Gospels* (Freiburg: Herder, 1963).

¹¹³ E. M. and C. L. Meyers, 'American Archaeologists Find Remains of Ancient Synagogue Ark in Galilee,' *BAR*, 7.6 (1981), 24-39; E. M. Meyers, J. F. Strange, and C. L. Meyers, 'The Ark of Nabratein—A First Glance,' *BA*, 44.4 (1981), 237-43.

synagogue at Masada¹¹⁴ and a few others, almost all of the remains of synagogues in Israel come from the Byzantine period and not from the New Testament era.¹¹⁵

This seems to be the case with the celebrated synagogue at Capernaum. The possibility remains that the synagogue of Jesus' day may lie covered under the present remains which have been left in situ. Under the octagonal structure between the synagogue and the Sea of Galilee exciting discoveries have been made by V. Corbo since 1968. He discovered that the octagon was a basilica of the fifth century. Beneath that he found evidence of a house church with graffiti which mention Peter. The first-century level was a fisherman's house, which was transformed into a church. Not only is this the earliest structure which can be identified as a church, but it is plausible to believe that this was Peter's own house!¹¹⁶

Recent excavations have clarified the numerous constructions of Herod the Great, including his work in Jerusalem.¹¹⁷ We now have a better idea of the walls and of the streets of Jerusalem in Jesus' day.¹¹⁸ Investigations by B. Mazar have succeeded in giving us a clear understanding of the temple platform and of some of the decorations which p. 136 came crashing down when Titus destroyed the temple in 70.¹¹⁹ Debate over the exact location of the temple on the platform continues, however.¹²⁰

The harsh reality of crucifixion's brutality¹²¹ has been brought home to us by the discovery in 1968 of ossuaries at Giv'at ha-Mivtar just north of Jerusalem.¹²² Among the bones of thirty-five individuals, there is evidence that nine died from violent causes,

¹¹⁴ Y. Yadin, *Masada* (New York: Random House, 1966).]

¹¹⁵ E. M. Meyers, 'Ancient Synagogues in Galilee,' *BA*, 43.2 (1980), 97–108; idem, 'Synagogues of Galilee,' *Arch*, 35.3 (1982), 51–59; E. M. Meyers and J. F. Strange, *Archaeology, the Rabbis and Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981).

¹¹⁶ *SS*, p.102; V. Corbo, *The House of Saint Peter at Capharnaum* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1969); J. F. Strange and H. Shanks, 'Has the House Where Jesus Stayed in Capernaum Been Found?' *BAR*, 8.6 (1982), 26–37.

¹¹⁷ 'Archaeology and the New Testament,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), I, pp.645ff.; reprinted in *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979),

¹¹⁸ J. Wilkinson, 'The Streets of Jerusalem,' *Levant*, 7 (1975), 118–36; idem, *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978); B. E. Schein, 'The Second Wall of Jerusalem,' *BA*, 44.1 (1981), 21–26.

¹¹⁹ It was my privilege to participate in the 1968 season directed by Professor B. Mazar just south of the temple mount. See B. Mazar, *The Mountain of the Lord* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1975); idem, 'Excavations near Temple Mount Reveal Splendors of Herodian Jerusalem,' *BAR*, 6.4 (1980), 44–59; M. A. Zimmerman, 'Tunnel Exposes New Areas of Temple Mount,' *BAR*, 7.3 (1981), 34–41; 34–41; J. Fleming, 'The Undiscovered Gate beneath Jerusalem's Golden Gate,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 24–37.

¹²⁰ D. M. Jacobson, 'Ideas Concerning the Plan of Herod's Temple,' *PEQ*, 112 (1980), 33–40; C. L. Meyers, 'The Elusive Temple,' *BA*, 45.1 (1982), 33–42; A. Kaufman, 'Where the Ancient Temple of Jerusalem Stood,' *BAR*, 9.2 (1983), 40–59.

¹²¹ 'The Crucifixion and Docetic Christology,' *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, 46.1 (1982), 1–20.

¹²² V. Tzaferis, 'Jewish Tombs at and near Giv'at ha-Mivtar,' *IEJ*, 20 (1970), 18–32; N. Haas, 'Anthropological Observations on the Skeletal Remains from Giv'at ha-Mivtar,' *IEJ*, 20 (1970), 58ff. On the dispute over the location of Calvary, see *SS*, pp. 108–11, and Wilkinson, *Jerusalem*, pp.180ff., 194ff. The site of Gordon's Calvary has no archaeological or traditional evidence for it, whereas the Church of the Holy Sepulchre does. See Charles Couasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem* (New York: Oxford University, 1974); I. Grego, 'Il Golgota Monte Santo dei Cristiani,' *Bibbia e Oriente*, 23 (1981), 221–33; J. F. Strange, 'Archaeology and Pilgrims in the Holy Land and Jerusalem,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 75–78.

including a child who was shot with an arrow, a young man who was burned upon a rack, and an old woman whose skull was bashed in. Of the greatest interest is one ossuary which provides us for the first time with physical evidence of crucifixion. It is the ossuary of a Yehohanan, who was a young man between the ages of twenty-four and twenty-eight. He was crucified at some time early in the first century A.D..

Yehohanan's *calcanei* (heel bones) were still transfixed by a four and a half inch iron nail, which had been bent as it was pounded into a cross of olive wood. The right *tibia* (shin bone) had been fractured into slivers by a blow, the 'coup de grace' which was administered to hasten death (cf. [John 19:32](#)). The crease in the right radial bone indicates that the victim had been pinioned in the forearms rather than in the hands as in the traditional depictions of Christ's crucifixion. The Greek word *cheiras* in [Luke 24:39-40](#) and [John 20:20, 25, 27](#), usually translated 'hands,' can and should be translated 'arms' in these passages. [p. 137](#)

CONCLUSIONS¹²³

Numerous tombs in Jerusalem and elsewhere can illustrate for us the kind of tomb in which Jesus was buried.¹²⁴ But only faith can convince us of the reality of the resurrection!¹²⁵

Archaeology in some striking cases does present us with *proofs* of the validity of passages which have been questioned. In other cases it is not to be denied that there are still *problems* which cannot be currently resolved in reconciling the archaeological data with the biblical text. But here we need to be aware of the fallacy of arguing from silence.¹²⁶ There is no question but that we have but scratched the surface. There are almost limitless *promises* of new data and texts available to future generations.

When I think of the functions of archaeology, I am reminded of the three elements which make opera so enjoyable for me: 1) the lyrics, 2) the music, and 3) the sets and costumes. Scriptures correspond to the lyrics, faith creates the music, and archaeology provides the setting. We can understand the text by itself, or the music by itself, but how much richer is our enjoyment with the provision of the sets and costumes. Just so archaeology can provide us with the realia which help us recreate in our minds' eye the original settings of the Scriptures.

Notes

AJA

American Journal of Archaeology

¹²³ Space does not permit a discussion of how archaeology has illuminated the ministries of Paul and of John. See SS, pp.112-25; *The Archaeology of New Testament Cities in Western Asia Minor* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980); *Harper's World of the New Testament* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981); Jack Finegan, *The Archaeology of the New Testament: The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles* (Boulder: Westview, 1981).

¹²⁴ A. Kloner, 'A Tomb of the Second Temple Period at French Hill, Jerusalem,' *IEJ*, 30.1-2 (1980), 99-108; L. Y. Rahmani, 'Ancient Jerusalem's Funerary Customs and Tombs,' *BA*, 44.3 (1981), 171-77, and 44.4 (1981), 229-36; J. Zias, 'A Rock-Cut Tomb in Jerusalem,' *BASOR*, 245 (1982), 53-56; R. Hachlili, 'A Second Temple Period Jewish Necropolis in Jericho,' *BA*, 43.4 (1980), 235-40; R. Hachlili and A. Killebrew, 'The Saga of the Goliath Family,' *BAR*, 9.1 (1983), 44-53.

¹²⁵ Easter—Myth, Hallucination, or History?' *CT*, 18 (March 15, 1974), 4-7; (March 29, 1974), 12-14, 16.

¹²⁶ SS, ch. 4; SA, pp.17-20.

Arch	Archaeology
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BAR	Biblical Archaeology Review
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research p. 138
BS	Bibliotheca Sacra
CT	Christianity Today
GB	Greece and Babylon (1967)
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
IDBA	International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
ISBE	International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia (rev. ed)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JASA	Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
NEASB	Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
SA	The Scriptures and Archaeology (1980)
SS	The Stones and the Scriptures (1972; 1981 repr.)

Dr. Edwin M. Yamauchi is Professor of History at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, U.S.A.

This article refers especially to articles published in 1980–83, as I have earlier published the following expositions of archaeology between 1972–80: *The Stones and the Scriptures* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), hereafter SS; 'A Decade and a Half of Archaeology in Israel and in Jordan,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 42.4 (1974), 710–26; 'Documents from Old Testament Times: A Survey of Recent Discoveries,' *WTJ*, 41.1 (1978), 1–32; 'Archaeology and the New Testament,' *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), I, pp.645–69; with D. J. Wiseman, *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979); 'Archaeology and the Scriptures,' *The Seminary Review*, 25.4 (1979), 163–241; *The Scriptures and Archaeology* (Portland: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1980), hereafter SA. Where no author is listed the reference is to one of my own writings. [p. 139](#)

Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology

James Stamoolis

*Reprinted from International Bulletin of Missionary Research, Vol. 8.
No. 2, April 1984 with permission. Copyright © by Overseas Ministries
Study Center, Ventnor, New Jersey.*

It is very unfortunate that there is so little dialogue between Evangelicals and representatives of Eastern Orthodox Churches. This article gives illuminating insights into the Orthodox Church's understanding of mission, that are often missing in Protestant missions. On a recent visit to Egypt this Editor was challenged by evidences of renewal in mission in some of the local churches of the Coptic Orthodox Church.
(Editor)