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Problem

An understanding of Israel's history is crucial to a Christian view of history, including its morals and values, and is a foundation stone of most conservative Christians including Seventh-day Adventists and their religious educational philosophy. There is a vital need for a curriculum that provides reasonable answers to the most frequently asked questions about Israel's early history and builds a solid base for the Christian/Adventist faith. The purpose of this study was to meet this need by empirically developing a curriculum for religion majors in Seventh-day Adventist colleges. Issues discussed include the Philosophical Background and Importance of History; the Role
Method

The instructional product development methods of Baker and Schutz and Naden were employed in this research. Instructional specifications were established through non-ambiguous behavioral objectives after the need for the product had been established. Criteria for the evaluation of these objectives were based on current literature related to the topic. Strategies for the positive modification of affect were included.

The curriculum was prepared in the form of ten, 50-minute class periods. Mastery was set at 80/80 which means that at least 80 percent of the participants would score at least 80 percent on each of the twenty-three behavioral objectives. Religion majors were the designated subjects through which the empirical development was conducted.

The product was first presented to small groups. The group size was increased as the product was modified and as the groups achieved higher levels of mastery. The curriculum was considered to be presentation ready when mastery was reached by a larger group (33), the results of which could be statistically analyzed. Modification of affect was measured by means of a Likert-scale instrument.
Results

After developing the curriculum, the instruction was presented to thirty-three subjects. Mastery at the predetermined level was achieved on all of the behavioral objectives. Modification of affect suggested that students were significantly motivated by the instruction to further study the archaeologically based issues on the history of ancient Israel.

Conclusion

In academic circles, conflict continues over the historicity of the Bible in general and of Israel in particular. These questions carry over into general society and congregational life.

Because SDA colleges lacked an empirically developed curriculum for teaching these issues related to the history of ancient Israel, this product could be utilized in a college instruction in religion/religious education classes.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

When scholars study documents from the past they attempt to establish the context from which the documents came. This means understanding the author, the period in which the document was written, and the social/economic cultures to which the author belonged or that made use of the document. In addition, they try to understand the meaning of the text for the audience to which the documents were addressed, and establish the purpose of its writing and its utilization.¹ However, these objectives have not always been achieved.

Prior to the eighteenth century, biblical events were generally accepted as historically accurate.² Nevertheless, this century brought radical new developments in the study of religious history. As a result, the Bible has been characterized by various liberal schools of thought as unrealistic, unhistorical, and incorporating

²Ibid., 113.
superstitious elements.1 This evaluative shift may have been the result of the influences of the enlightenment and rationalism in the late eighteenth century.2

This liberal approach looked at the Bible as a volume of documents from the past to be studied by the same principles and in the same critical manner as any other ancient document.3 Thus, principles of "analogy"4 "correlation"5 and "criticism"6 were the basic tools that


4According to Van A. Harvey, The Historian and the Believer (New York: Macmillan, 1956), 14, principle of analogy means "that we are able to make . . . judgments of probability only if we presuppose that our present experience is not radically dissimilar to the experience of past persons." This means that the past can be known through the present.

5Ibid., 29-30. Harvey argued, "On the basis of the principle of correlation . . . no event or text can be understood unless it is seen in terms of its historical context. This meant . . . (1) that no critical historian could make use of supernatural intervention as a principle of historical explanation because this shattered the continuity of the causal nexus, and (2) that no event could be regarded as a final revelation of the absolute spirit, since every manifestation of truth and value was relative and historically conditioned" (ibid.).

6Ibid., 14; he further explained, "Our judgments about the past cannot simply be classified as true or false but must be seen open as claiming only a greater or lesser degree of probability and as always open to revision" (ibid.).
were used to demonstrate textual accuracy and to distinguish between historically accurate and inaccurate texts. Following this principle, many scholars have assumed that history is cyclical.¹ For some, the miraculous acts of God are fiction, and His intervention in history as described in the Bible is not to be accepted literally.² Thus, any biblical event explained by believers as "miraculous" must be explained as a natural phenomenon without divine involvement.³ While some disagree among themselves on the interpretation of specific texts, the one issue about which virtually all liberal scholars agree is that events seldom, if ever, happened as the Bible describes them.⁴

One crucial area where such scholars differ greatly regards the beginning of Israelite history, or as scholars like to call it, the emergence of ancient Israel.⁵ Many scholars struggle with such questions as, Where did the people who became the nation of Israel come from?⁶ Three main models have been introduced by the scholarly world:

¹Miller, "Reflections on the Study," 64.
³Miller, "Reflections on the Study," 64.
⁴Hayes, 166, 167.
⁶Ibid.
the conquest or biblical model, the peaceful infiltration model, and the peasant revolt model.¹ There is no clear consensus as to when Israel's history began. For some, the recorded history of ancient Israel began at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (5th century B.C.).² Yet others support the idea that it started with David and Solomon (10th century B.C.),³ or even with the period of Judges.⁴ The differences of opinion are rooted in the different presuppositions accepted by the schools of thought to which each of these scholars belong.

These schools of thought can be divided into two basic groups: (1) those who adopt the Historical-Critical method towards the biblical text, and (2) those who view Scripture as a divinely inspired document.

The historical-critical school disallows the intervention of the supernatural in the affairs of humanity. In treating the history of ancient Israel, they exclude the miracles. Biblical events that confirm that God is in control and may choose to intrude in human affairs (e.g., water rolling back, burning bushes, axheads floating, God

¹Ibid., 14.


instructing Moses, disasters upon Egypt, handing down the laws on Mount Sinai, angels defending Jerusalem against Senacherib's army) are given natural explanations and are presented without any reference to God. Scholars in this group assume that the past is analogous with the present and these past events are interpreted accordingly.

The historical-critical school can, itself, be subdivided into two smaller schools of thought. There are those who assume the best way to reconstruct a "true" history of the ancient Israelites is by focusing mainly (if not exclusively) upon historical criticism of the biblical document; that is, by critically analyzing the text to choose the historical data that are reliable and those that are not, and then subjectively to reconstruct Israel's "history" based on the results of this exercise.¹

The other historical-critical school has suggested that the best way to acquire an accurate reconstruction of Israel's history is to focus more on the archaeological record rather than on the biblical text.² This new thinking grew out of frustration when many old questions had not been answered satisfactorily by textual critical analysis. This school believes that since the biblical text is corrupted by

¹For the representatives of this school, see above p. 2.

generations of editors and redactors, virtually no historically reliable data can now be extracted from the text. Archaeological artifacts, on the other hand, provide a contemporary record of the Israelites whose history scholars are attempting to reconstruct. By using theories and methodologies of anthropological archaeology, they believe enough information can be extracted from the material remains (artifacts) for a fairly accurate picture of Israelite society.¹ According to this view, a better "history" of Israel can be reconstructed; textual material is only secondary, and supplementary.

The second major group (the historical-literal school) views Scripture as a document with divine origin that, among other things, provides accurate information on how God has worked with humanity in the past.² Scholars in this group³ assume a certain level of divine supervision in the composition of Scripture that prompts them to accept the

¹Dever, "Archaeology, History and the Bible," 56.
²Miller, "Reflections on the Study," 62, 63.
historicity of biblical statements with a high degree of confidence. They generally accept the Bible "as is," that is as a basically accurate account of the history of ancient Israel. Thus, they presuppose that some contradictions in the biblical record are only apparent, not real; a harmony would be revealed if we were aware of all the relevant details including extra biblical evidence.¹

This historical-literal school is skeptical of the negative assessment of the historical-critical approach concerning the historical accuracy of Scripture, and scholars in this school prefer to begin their construction of Israel's history with the assumption that the biblical record is accurate. Based on this assumption, they analyze extra biblical literature and archaeological artifacts to improve their understanding of the biblical picture of Israel's history. In that case the Bible was used as an historical textbook to provide information for archaeological endeavors. Furthermore, where evidence was not present, it was provided by misinterpretation of archaeological data at their disposal.² Because of their presupposition that the Bible is the Word of God, they do


not allow externally derived interpretations from either historical criticism or archaeology to serve as a final authority in the construction of Israel's history. Rather, the biblical text, itself, is given priority.

Statement of the Problem

One of the major concerns of educators in Seventh-day Adventist institutions is religious education. Students can hardly avoid being influenced by the unbeliever's philosophy that is so dominant in today's world. Media (e.g., public television) produces documentaries continually that discount the biblical story. An understanding and acceptance of Israel's history is crucial to a Christian view of history including eternal morals and values. Israel's history is a foundation stone of Christian/Adventist philosophy. For example, between the Exodus and Conquest occurs the Sinai covenant which provides the historical foundation for several key Seventh-day Adventist doctrines, such as the Sabbath, Law, Sanctuary etc. There is a vital need for a curriculum that provides reasonable answers to the most common criticisms and builds a solid base for a Christian/Adventist faith.

Professors in Christian colleges occupy strategic vocations in God's vineyard, and when they fail as they have too often done in recent years, faulty fruit is

Miller, "Reflections on the Study," 63.
borne if any fruit matures at all.¹

This failure is partly the result of the lack of effective curricula. With so many trends within the world of biblical scholarship and the number of reconstructions of the history of the ancient people of Israel that contradict the biblical record, there is a great need for the study of the history of ancient Israel within a conservative (biblical) framework.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study has empirically developed ten 50-minute class periods based on specific behavioral objectives. The purpose of the study was to develop a pedagogical tool entitled "The Issues concerning the History of Ancient Israel."

This was pursued by following the curriculum development model of Baker and Schutz² and Naden³ so the curriculum yielded mastery on the part of the intended students of religion.

The study enabled students to: (1) review the history of the development of the major schools of thought

---


---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
concerning Israel's history; (2) analyze the presuppositions of each of these schools of thought; (3) examine the reconstructions of Israel's history that each of these schools propose; and (4) compare these reconstructions with both the extra biblical data (historical and archaeological) and the biblical text itself.

It should be noted that the purpose of this study was not to demonstrate that archaeological data can "prove" biblical events. However, the light that is given to biblical sources is an illumination that cannot be ignored. Furthermore, the customs, social structure, and political structure of ancient society can be better understood from archaeological discoveries, providing a context for the development of faith.

**Significance of the Study**

As indicated above, in general, there are two ways to interpret the biblical text regarding the history of ancient Israel. The scholars of both schools follow their own presuppositions, thus the significance of the study was in presenting a fair depiction of both the historical-critical method and the historical-literal method, as well as their weaknesses. In addition, established patterns for the historical events concerning the origin of Israel were provided by the biblical evidence supported by archaeological data. Further, the significance of this study may be seen in the fact that no such curriculum
currently is available.

Definition of Terms

**Behavioral objective:** A precise description of a learner's post-instructional behavior. There are four specific criteria for this description: (1) the specified learner; (2) a measurable verb, which describes a learner's post-instructional performance; (3) given conditions, the situations in which the behavior occurs; and (4) standards, the precise specification of the acceptable level of learner performance.

**Early Bronze Age:** The archaeological period from circa 3000 B.C. to 2000 B.C.

**Experimental group:** The ones receiving a specific curriculum treatment. Religion majors from Seventh-day Adventist college in Croatia and Andrews University students in the Theological Seminary participated in the final testing of the curriculum.

**Iron Age I:** The archaeological period from circa 1200 B.C. to 1000 B.C.

**Iron Age II:** The archaeological period from circa 1000 B.C. to 586 B.C.

**Late Bronze Age:** The archaeological period from circa 1550 B.C. to 1200 B.C.

**Mastery:** The level of post-instructional behavior. Mastery in this study has been established as 80 percent of the subjects mastering at least 80 percent of the criteria.
of the behavioral objective. This level of mastery was measured by a post-test instrument. 

**Middle Bronze Age**: The archaeological period from circa 2000 B.C. to 1550 B.C. 

**Pottery sherds**: Broken pottery excavated from a tell. 

**Product development**: The process in which instructional materials are prepared according to specific objectives. Because a curriculum is developed through the instructional testing with the target audience, it is empirical in nature. Each stage in this process involves the learner who is to master the curriculum. 

**Product revision**: The correction or improvement of the product (not the objectives) based on the results of empirical testing in field tryouts with a view to the learner's mastery of the objectives. 

**Target population**: Seventh-day Adventist college or university students. 

**Tell**: An artificial mound made by successive layers of occupation through the course of history. 

**Theological Seminary students**: Students enrolled in the course "The History of ancient Israel OTST 635."

**Delimitations of the Study**

Periods after the settlement of Israel (ca. 1400 B.C.) were not treated in this study, that is, material from the monarchial period (Iron Ages I and II) was excluded.
Outline of the Study

Chapter 2 reviews the literature related to the history of ancient Israel. Chapter 3 details the methodology to be employed by describing the population and sample, and the empirical method based on Baker and Schutz's and Naden's processes for product development. Chapter 4 contains the details of the curriculum development process. Chapter 5 presents the summary, implications, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature on the history of ancient Israel, which is the content of the instructional product. The reason for this literature review is twofold. First, it provides the reader with a fully footnoted review of the literature on which the product is built, a resource of importance to the academic community. Second, it attempts to demonstrate content mastery by the product developer. The review of literature on the methodology of product development is to be found in chapter 3. Chapter 2 examines topically the themes that are included in the instructional product, but does not profess to exhaust the subject. The themes are: Philosophical Background and Importance of History, The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History, Archaeology and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History, Archaeology and the Bible, Application of Archaeology in Biblical Hermeneutics, The Patriarchal Period, Abraham and Middle Bronze II Customs, The Time of Exodus, and The Israelite Conquest/Settlement.
Philosophical Study of Ancient Israel's History

The writing of history, a form of observation, reconstruction, and the representation of human choices, is an extraordinary enterprise. Some have compared it to detective work, to woodsmanship, to writing fiction, to psychoanalysis, and to various branches of the natural sciences.

There are two main approaches to the writing of history: a chronicle (a factual account) or an interpretative narrative. Often the interpretative narrative is of greater significance because "the historian is not content to tell us merely what happened; he wishes to make us see why it happened, too. In other words, he aims . . . at a reconstruction of the past which is both intelligent and intelligible."¹ Thus, the understanding of history involves the interpretation of textual accounts, "written toward a specific end, of selected developments."² Furthermore, a narrative is called "a history" on the basis of its author's perceived intentions in writing, the author's claim that the account is accurate in its particulars, and the author's sincerity.³


³Ibid., 8.
The writing of history as a narrative dates from antiquity. Its roots are anchored in the cultures of Israel and Greece. The main source for the history of ancient Israel is the Bible, thus its history is often understood from a theological perspective. Nevertheless, much of the material in the Bible is historiographical and scholars seek to interpret and understand its accounts.

In *Christian Faith and Historical Understanding*, Ronald Nash proposed the following definition of history: "the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience." W. W. Hallo in his "Biblical History in Its Near Eastern Setting: The Contextual Approach" indicated that history began with the craft of writing. Brotzman also concluded that "the availability of an alphabetic


script for the earliest writing of the Old Testament books must not be undervalued."

When Christian theologians discuss history, they often use two German words: Historie and Geschichte. Historie means the study of past events with a view to discovering in an objective detached manner what actually happened. Geschichte on the other hand means the study of past events in such a way that the discovery of what happened calls for [a] decision on our part."

This distinction is important in understanding the history of ancient Israel. Scholars may agree on the Historie of some biblical events, but for each of them the Geschichte, the existential significance of what happened, could be quite different.

For this reason, the reconstruction of Israelite history by modern scholars depends to a large degree on their presuppositions about the nature of the biblical texts, the reliability of the primary sources, and the relative value of supplementary sources such as extrabiblical texts, inscriptions, and material evidences.

---


2Nash, 14-16.


The three supplementary sources, according to some scholars, are "the biblical texts, other ancient Middle Eastern documents, and artifacts uncovered by archaeologists."

Nevertheless, the Bible provides the context for interpreting the nonbiblical or supplementary material. Furthermore, while one group of scholars takes biblical history seriously, there are those who do not. A disbelief in the supernatural affects their attitude toward the textual accounts. The Bible's account of the world is one in which God intrudes upon human affairs, a world where waters roll back, bushes burn, and axheads float.

Because modern historians perceive the world to be more orderly, they often use the principle of "analogy" to


5 "Analogy" principle is when historians or theologians offer different explanations for historical developments in the Bible which do not involve God and his actions. Miller, "Reflections on the Study of Israelite History," 64.
interpret Israelite history. According to this principle, it is assumed that the past is comparable to and interpreted by the present. They reject as myth the fundamental theistic conviction that a supernatural being can intervene in the world of space and time.¹ Thus, from this point of view, one must discount the miraculous elements in the Bible.² The reliability of any details where the supernatural has intervened in our physical reality is questioned. God's involvement with humanity has to be explained in other ways.

In addition, while some admit that there is some accurate historical information in the Bible,³ others conclude that it has very "little to offer the historian."⁴ Still others go even further and point out that there is no reliable history in "a holy book that tells stories."⁵ This view is the result of religious training based on

¹Rudolf Bultman, Jesus Christ and Mythology (New York: Scribner, 1958), 15.
theological presuppositions that further influence the interpretation of Israelite history.

But there are scholars who feel this negative perspective is inappropriate.¹ V. Philips Long commented that the Bible is "a library of books of diverse literary genres, so that no single description will suffice to characterize it, other than such very general labels as religious book or Word of God."² But, to say that the Bible is theology and not history, or that the Bible is literature but not history creates false dichotomies. For, as Long continued, "the Bible evinces an interest in all three."³

In spite of these divergent attitudes, Alan Cooper, in an essay entitled "On Reading the Bible Critically and Otherwise," stated: "The historicity of the events described in the Bible is irrelevant; indeed, the idea that either the meaning of the Bible or its truth depends on its historical accuracy is probably the silliest manifestation of historical criticism."⁴ However, G. E. Wright did not agree, for "in biblical faith everything depends upon


³Ibid.

whether the central events actually occurred."1 For him it is important "that there was an Exodus, that the nation [of Israel] was established at Mount Sinai, that it did obtain the land, that it did lose it subsequently."2 Furthermore, "were the narratives written or read as fiction, then God would turn from the Lord of history into a creature of the imagination, with the most disastrous results," commented Sternberg.3

Some shy away from the issue of biblical history and feel that in our modern era we should not regard biblical narrative as history:

We should not ask of it, therefore, did this actually happen to real people like this? but is this 'true-to-life,' is this artistically true? In the present crisis over biblical studies, this is proving a popular strategy in many quarters.4

While it may be said that the validity of the Christian faith does not depend on the verification of certain historical events, it seems reasonable to assume that the central salvific events must be historical for the Christian faith to be valid.5

---


2Ibid.


5Craig Blomberg, The Historical Reliability of the Gospels (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987), 57-
Given these realities, it is not surprising that the diversity of opinion regarding the origin and character of historical writing in Israel has created much debate.¹

The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History

Even though the nineteenth century marks the beginning of historical criticism of the Bible, it was eighteenth-century deistic philosophy that created an attitude of skepticism towards its historicity and the rejection of the supernatural. Prior to this movement, the Christian church had generally taken at face value the internal claims of the Pentateuch that it had been composed by the historical Moses in the fifteenth century BC.

The Early and Medieval Periods

The hermeneutical principles widely employed by the Medieval church allowed the interpreter to find several

meanings in any given text including historical, mystical, analytical, figurative, and allegorical.¹ But this situation did not last long. G. Ebeling, a scholar skilled in hermeneutics and methods of biblical and theological interpretation, proposed that the history of the Christian church is the history of the divergent interpretation of Scripture.²

Even in the first century of the Christian era, there were some who twisted the teachings of Scripture.³ They called into question the genuineness and authority of the sources. The second century witnessed the rise of Gnosticism⁴ with its destructive criticism of the Old Testament. Others, including the Nazarites, a Jewish-Christian sect, denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.⁵ Nevertheless, according to R. K. Harrison, to Celsus (who wrote The True Word, ca. A.D. 180) "belongs the dubious distinction of assembling most of the arguments which have been leveled against Christianity and the Bible

¹Hayes, "The History of the Study," 20.
⁵Harrison, 5.
by subsequent generations of rationalists, atheists, and agnostics."

A mystical philosophy known as Neoplatonism arose to challenge the Christian faith in the third century after Christ. During this period, Julius Africanus (ca. A.D. 225) criticized the Biblical text of Daniel. Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. A.D. 400) applied literary criticism to certain books of the Old Testament. In the following centuries individual authors raised questions about the authorship and dates of some Old Testament narratives.

The pre-Reformation period (2nd-15th centuries) marked the development of the two major schools of biblical interpretation: one in Alexandria, Egypt, the other in Antioch, Syria. The school of Alexandria was influenced by Philo of Alexandria, a Jewish contemporary of Paul, and by Hellenistic strands of thought. It developed under the

1Ibid.


3 Harrison, 5.

4 Ibid., 6.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., 7.

7 Hasel, Biblical Interpretation, 2.
guidance of Clement of Alexandria, a pagan converted to Christianity (ca. 150 to ca. A.D. 211) and Origen, born at Alexandria of Christian parents (ca. 185 to ca. A.D. 254).

Clement developed five senses of Scripture: the historical, the doctrinal, the prophetic, the philosophical, and the mystical.\(^1\) Origen assumed that the Bible has a threefold meaning, coinciding with body, soul, and spirit in man, which consisted of "literal" (material), "soulish" (psychical), and "spiritual" meanings.\(^2\) The spiritual, or allegorical/mystical, he considered the most important of the three.

This school practiced a radical application of the allegorical method of biblical interpretation, which claimed that "all scripture has a spiritual meaning; [but] not all has a literal meaning."\(^3\) In medieval times this method was expanded into the "literal," which spoke of acts, the "allegorical," which dealt with what one believes, the "topological" of what one does, and the "analogical" of what one hopes for.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\)Richard M. Davidson, "Principles," 120.
\(^2\)Hasel, Biblical Interpretation, 2.
\(^4\)W. A. Quanbeck, "Luther's Early Exegesis," in Luther Today (Decorah: Luther College Press, 1957), 62, as defined by Luther before he broke with this medieval method, the standard of his day.
The school of Antioch opposed the allegorical method and insisted on the literal meaning of Scripture.\textsuperscript{1} Its concern was to support the literal-historical sense of Scripture. The great supporters of this school were Theophilus of Antioch (late 2nd century), Theodore of Mospuestia (ca. 350-428), Diodores of Tarsus (d. before 394), and John Chrysostom (ca. 344-407). In order to stress the literal, historical meaning of the Bible, great emphasis was placed on grammatical studies.\textsuperscript{2} The Antiochene perspective is summarized by Kaiser:

\begin{quote}
God gave the prophets . . . a vision . . . of the future in which the recipient saw as intimate parts of one meaning the word for his own historical day with its needs (historia) and that word for the future. Both the literal historical sense and the fulfillment were conceived as one piece. Both were intimate parts of one total whole work of God.\textsuperscript{3}
\end{quote}

The Reformation Period

During the Reformation period, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and many of the Anabaptist radical reformers broke away from the medieval allegorical method of interpretation of the Bible. Thus, they revolted against the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. They developed the grammatical-historical (sometimes called historical-grammatical) method

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}W. Farrar, \textit{History of Interpretation} (Grand Rapids: Baker 1979), 210-119.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Hasel, \textit{Biblical Interpretation}, 3.
\end{itemize}
within the context of the *sola scriptura* principle.¹ This method was concerned with issues such as authorship, date of composition, historical background, and the language of the document. The conclusion of all these issues was that the Bible should serve as its own interpreter.

*Sola scriptura* became the foundation for interpreting Scripture for all Protestants, as well as for conservative scholars and denominations to the present day. In Martin Luther's *Table Talk²* of 1540, one can read about Luther's previous position on the Bible and his position as a reformer. But it must be pointed out, that according to Luther's standards, writings claiming to be canonical stood or fell according to the extent to which they promoted Christ.³ Thus, not all biblical books were of the same value in Luther's view. However, Protestant interpretation soon fossilized into a rigid Protestant orthodoxy. Thus, in the seventeenth century there was a shift to a more individual spiritual life or the abandonment of the church completely.⁴ Nevertheless, the grammatical-historical


²Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther* (London: H. G. Bohn, 1857).

³Luther affirmed that Christ was the "punctus mathematicus sacrae Scripturae," *Werke* II(Weimar: H. Bohlau, 1912), 439.

⁴Davidson, "Principles," 123.
method of the Reformation continues into the Post-Reformation period.

In spite of the attempts of the Reformation period, there were those like Andreas Rudolf Bodenstein (1480-1541), a contemporary of Luther, who negated Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch.¹ This same position was expressed by a Spanish Jew, Benedict Spinoza, who in 1670 in his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* raised doubts about whether Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. He came to the conclusion that since Moses is referred to in the book of the Pentateuch in the third person, he could not have been the author, nor could he have recorded his own death.² Spinoza's ideas were mostly ignored at that time.

The idea that the Pentateuch was a composition of different people living at different times and composed over a period of five centuries began with Jean Astruc (1634-1766) who studied medicine and was a professor in several French universities. He anonymously published a treatise on

¹Harrison, 8.

²Gleason L. Archer, Jr., in his *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 81, commented: "This argument based on the use of the third person is very weak. Many well known ancient authors, such as Xenophon and Julius Caesar, referred to themselves in their own historical narratives in the third person exclusively. As to the obituary notice in Deuteronomy 34, it does not even purport to have been written by Moses, and was undoubtedly added by Joshua or some other near contemporary. But this in no way renders doubtful the Mosaic authorship of the rest of Deuteronomy which does claim to have been his composition."
the book of Genesis, an event that marked the beginnings of Pentateuchal source-criticism. By adopting the divine names of Elohim and Jehovah (English, Yahweh) he formulated a criterion for source-analysis.¹

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

The eighteenth century, the age of the Enlightenment, was characterized by the rise of an exaltation of human reason that occasioned a revolt against external authority. Combined with rationalism, this era was marked as the critical period of the exegesis and interpretation of the Bible,² which led to a revolt against the authority of Scripture itself. The claim that the Old Testament should be studied by the same principles of careful scrutiny as applied to secular writings was an offshoot of this movement.

The feeling that such study of the Bible can be done independently of ecclesiastical authority, religious dogmas, or church traditions was seen in the work of J. G. Eichorn (1752-1827). His work earned him the title "Father of Old Testament criticism."³ Another adherent was W. M. L. De Wette, the first to identify Deuteronomy with the Book of

¹Harrison, 12.
²Krentz, 16-22.
the Law discovered during the reign of King Josiah.¹
Therefore, the period that followed, the nineteenth century,
became a time of a more liberal approach to Israelite
history.

These two centuries also witnessed major advances
in general historiography. Positivistic² historians, like
Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831), Leopold Ranke (1795-
1885), and Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903), believed and
attempted to reconstruct past history wie es eigentlich
gewesen ("as it had actually happened").³ But soon this
model was seen as too simple, and abandoned.⁴ In response
to the positivist view of history the existentialist belief

¹Harrison, 15.

²The positivists claimed that history could be made
scientific by assuming that there are universal laws that
govern social activity and that the regularity of human
conduct can be discovered by statistical means. Nash, 21.

³Leopold von Ranke, Histories of the Latin and
Germanic Nations from 1494 to 1514, trans. G. R. Dennis (New
York: AMS, 1909), preface.

⁴Alan Richardson, History, Sacred and Profane
arose, which held that "truth is subjective."

In order to understand better the scholarship of the nineteenth century, it is necessary to recognize the philosophical movements that were then influential. While the Reformation period was a time of revolt against church authority, the nineteenth century brought a revolt against the Bible itself.

The first critical work of that century on the history of ancient Israel was written by Henry Hart Milman (1791-1868). His work met with significant opposition. He was probably the first to treat Israelite and Judaean history from a secular orientation and in the same terms in which one would write a history of Greece, Rome, or any other country.

Even before Wellhausen, the critical thinkers of the Bible viewed Scripture as a compilation of several

---

1The existentialist view of history was a reaction to nineteenth-century positivistic historiography which searched the past for "brute facts," ordered them in causal sequence, and called that history. This history could be reconstructed only by an historical scientist who remained objective, impartial, and disinterested against his material. As a truly scientific man, the historian must have no ax to grind, no propaganda to make, and no philosophical presuppositions guiding his inquiry. Existentialism is the reverse side of positivism. Carl Braaten, History and Hermeneutics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, [1966]), 66-67, 38.


3Hayes, "The History of the Study," 58.
sources: documentary, supplementary, and fragmentary.¹ Nevertheless, Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) became one of the most noted, influential, and significant Old Testament scholars of his period. He accepted and supported the old documentary hypothesis.² For him, the Patriarchal stories could not be used for historical purposes.³ What led Wellhausen to his conclusions was his literary study of the Old Testament. Thus, the historical-critical method was born in the nineteenth century and dominated the scene of that period. It still divides the scholarly world today.

The historical-critical method looks at the Bible as a collection of documents⁴ from the past to be studied by the same principles as any other ancient national document, namely the principles: of correlation, analogy, and criticism.⁵

²This method argued that there were four sources in the Pentateuch which originated in the order J, E, D, and P. For fuller treatment see Victor P. Hamilton, The Book of Genesis (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 11-37; Skinner, xlii-lxv.
³J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1885), 318.
Wellhausen proposed that the Pentateuch is combined from the so-called four sources: J, E, D, and P (J stands for Yahwist [Jahwist in German], E for Elohist, D for the Deuteronomist, P for the Priestly code). This idea gradually came to dominate discussions after the mid-nineteenth century. However, source criticism is not the only method used by historical-criticism. Among the many proposed are: form, tradition and literary criticism.

The History of the Role of Archaeology in Understanding Ancient Israel's History

The Relationship of Archaeology to Israelite History

While the literary critical approach was disturbing to conservative scholars in the nineteenth century, an increase in archaeological knowledge in the present century has proved very helpful in the study of the Bible.¹ This new information has had an important bearing on an understanding of the history of ancient Israel. The decipherment of ancient Near Eastern languages, especially Egyptian hieroglyphics and Akkadian cuneiform, opened to study and interpretation the long-closed literary treasures of

Israel's neighbors.¹ The exploration of the Near East and Palestine² triggered the establishment of many foundations³ that later supported archaeological excavations of sites in that part of the world.⁴ With the development of the discipline of archaeology as a science, new resource information has helped scholars gain insights into the biblical world of which little had been known outside the Bible itself.

Biblical archaeology began with Edward Robinson⁵ who was the first to identify the numerous biblical sites. Stratigraphic excavation began with British scholar Sir William Flinders Petrie. Pearlman wrote:


²Edward Robinson (1794-1863), an American, who wrote a three-volume work, Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai and Arabia Petraea: A Journal of Travels in the Year 1838 (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1841), based his writing on his travels in 1838, reporting on sites, place-names, and customs, and used modern names to identify many places mentioned in the Bible.

³The Palestine Exploration Fund was established in 1865.

⁴The Conder-Kitchener expedition was sponsored in 1872-8 by the Palestine Exploration Fund.

⁵H. T. Frank, Bible Archaeology and Faith, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971), 337.
If Robinson showed the archaeologist in broad terms where to dig, Petrie showed them the historical significance of what they had dug up. Robinson had recovered the geographical location of those ancient sites which had a recorded history. Petrie had now discovered the key to the alphabet of archaeology, making it possible to evaluate the tangible history that lay buried beneath those biblical sites.¹

However, William Foxwell Albright is considered the father of biblical archaeology.²

At the turn of the twentieth century, archaeology resumed the task that nineteenth-century biblical criticism had essentially abandoned. It accepted responsibility for reconstructing the historical, social, and cultural life of the Israelites. Albright's From the Stone Age to Christianity published in 1940 was a synthesis of the archaeological finds to that time. Archaeology became a valuable tool capable of supporting the "true" biblical history of the Israelites, especially the Patriarchal period, which had posed the greatest dilemmas.

Nevertheless, since Albright's pioneering work, much has been written on the science of archaeology. The most concise works on archaeology as a tool are by Amihai Mazar, Archaeology of the Land of the Bible 10,000-586

¹Pearlman, 49.

²Edward Robinson, Later Biblical Research in Palestine and in the Adjacent Regions (New York: Arno Press, 1977); Pearlman, Digging up the Bible.

A new school known as the "German school" (whose major advocates were Alt, Noth, and von Rad) began with Alt in the 1930s. They opposed the "American school" (Albright, Wright, and Bright) in the fundamental historical positions.³ The crucial issue in the debate was the degree to which archaeology helped confirm the historicity of the Patriarchal period. The "German school" opposed the notion that archaeology could confirm the Patriarchal stories, and argued for a more literary approach. A spin-off of this debate was the approach to the emergence of Israel. These Germans proposed a migration/settlement model in contradistinction to a military conquest of the promised land by the Israelites.⁴

Throughout the 1960s there continued to be disagreement about the contribution of archaeology towards confirming the historicity of Israel. Many liberal scholars considered biblical archaeology the unreliable guide of neo-


³The debate is summarized in J. Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing: A Study in Method* (Chicago: A. R. Allenson, 1956).

orthodoxy, a thinly disguised fundamentalism pleading for external support.¹ Hence it seemed that archaeology did not make as great a contribution as had been hoped to confirm the biblical account. Jericho remained the greatest dilemma, as well as et-Tell Ai, because the findings of excavation did not appear to match the text.² Out of the tension between the two "Albright" and "Alt" schools grew George Mendenhall's "peasant revolt" theory.³ This hypothesis opposed both conquest and peaceful infiltration, suggesting that the Israelites emerged through an indigenous social revolt in Canaan.

By 1970 some biblical archaeologists had modified their views, and de Vaux suggested that "what the Bible records is 'sacred history;' it provides a religious interpretation of history. . . . Archaeology can assist us only in establishing the facts that have been so interpreted."⁴ Theologian/archaeologist G. E. Wright also


²The excavation of Jericho by Kathleen Kenyon disclosed no destruction by Joshua of what she thought should be Joshua's time period. Another site that was in question was Ai as it cannot be located in the area where the Bible suggests it was.


⁴R. de Vaux, "On Right and Wrong Uses of Archaeology," in Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century, ed. James Sanders (Garden City, NY: Doubleday,
concluded that archaeological evidence "does not extend to the validity of the religious claims that the Bible would place upon us." However, McRay still argued that the value of biblical archaeology is in its ability to locate the faith in the realities of ancient history.

In 1974 and 1975 major reassessments of the history of ancient Israel (particularly the patriarchal period) became the center of discussion in the works of Thompson and Van Seters. Thompson declared, "Surely, no historical knowledge can be attained about the patriarchs, but only of the time when the stories about them arose among the Israelite people." He also concluded that the history of ancient Israel before the Iron Age should no longer be seriously considered. Van Seters argued that "attempts to


3T. L. Thompson, The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); 133.


5Thompson, The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives, 7.

portray a "Patriarchal Age" as a historical context for the stories of Genesis in the second millennium B.C. must be viewed as failures."¹ He further concluded that the stories "were written from the historical and cultural perspective of a later day."²

In spite of Van Seter's and Thompson's view, John Bright still affirmed the basic historicity of the Exodus in his book *A History of Israel.*³ However, the momentum was clearly moving away from this in the mid seventies and eighties. For example, Coote's *Early Israel: A New Horizon* assumed that the writers of ancient Israel knew little or nothing about the origin of Israel. For him, the periods of the Patriarchs, Exodus, Conquest, or Judges, never existed.⁴ At the same time, Van Seters concluded: "The invasion of the land of Canaan by Israel under Joshua was an invention."⁵ Thus, Alan Cooper proposed that the historicity of the events described in the Bible was irrelevant.⁶

²Ibid., 121.
⁶Cooper, 65-66.
While disagreement continued among theologians and archaeologists on the question of a pre-monarchical period, the role of archaeology is better understood today. Archaeologist W. Dever acknowledged the role it should play in today's scholarship when he wrote:

Yet because the Bible is not history in the modern critical or scientific sense, archaeology is limited in the contribution it can make. Archaeology may clarify the historical context of events described in biblical history, but it cannot confirm the interpretation of these events by the biblical writers, much less the modern theological inferences to be drawn from them.¹

Then, too, because of the limited range of theological presuppositions, "most discussions of biblical archaeology remain inconclusive or controversial, and they tend furthermore to discredit the whole enterprise of relating archaeology to biblical studies."² As Glenn Rose concluded, not only are the "archaeological method and associated methods of interpreting the data . . . in flux," but "the relationship of this changing archaeology to the Bible is . . . also in flux."³ Thus, Dever felt that the two disciplines should divorce.⁴ Thompson agreed with Dever that there should be an ongoing quest for an independent

¹Dever and Clark, 79.
²Ibid., 73.
⁴Ibid., 72.
archaeology that plays "only a modest role" in questions of biblical criticism.1

Dever's conclusion was that biblical archaeology, now called Syro-Palestinian or new archaeology, can become an autonomous professional discipline. The only question that demands an answer is "whether there is room alongside it for biblical archaeology."2 It must be affirmed that archaeology cannot "prove" the Bible in any fundamental sense. The idea that historical evidences can confirm or enhance religious faith is a contradiction in terms.3 In addition, Philips Long stated: "The question that must be addressed is whether archaeology alone, independent of literary evidence, is an adequate basis for historical reconstruction."4 He concluded: "Observations suggest that it is not."5 Thus, he commented that "historians should seek a closer coordination of archaeological and literary studies, despite the difficulties and dangers that attend such an enterprise."6

1Thompson, "The Background," 5.
2Ibid., 76.
4P. Long, 44.
5Ibid.
6Ibid., 147.
G. W. Ahlstrom felt that "archaeology is a valuable tool for evaluating textual information: it can confirm the picture given by the biblical writers, correct it on many points, or give an entirely different scenario."\(^1\)

In the latter half of the 1980s, the publication of research on the emergence of early Israel in Palestine reached a climax. It seemed to have entered into a new period of assessment, critique, and reformulation.

The works of Halpern in 1983,\(^2\) Lemche in 1985,\(^3\) Ahlstrom in 1986,\(^4\) Coote and Whitelam in 1987,\(^5\) and Finkelstein in 1988\(^6\) marked the attainment of intensive study and dissatisfaction with previous research. Vigorous criticism of some earlier views had been raised by Miller in 1991,\(^7\) Bimson in 1989 and 1991,\(^8\) M. and H. Weippert in

\(^4\)Ahlstrom, *Who Were the Israelites?*
\(^6\)I. Finkelstein.
\(^7\)Miller, "Is It Possible?"
\(^8\)J. J. Bimson, "The Origins of Israel in Canaan: An Examination of Recent Theories," *Themelios* 15 (1989): 4-15; idem, "Merneptah's Israel and Recent Theories of Israelite
1991,¹ and Thompson in 1992.² Coote concluded that "recent research on early Israel has brought us to a new understanding," which he called "a new horizon."³

More recently, it has been generally acknowledged that the focus of so-called sociological approaches to the research of Israelite history and literary approaches to the study of the Hebrew Bible has resulted in a major paradigm shift in biblical studies.⁴ Whitelam felt that this shift had profound implications for historical studies because the study of the history of ancient Israel and, in particular, the so-called emergence of Israel is part of this larger regional history.⁵


³ Coote, viii.


⁵ Ibid., 58, 59.
Methodological Approaches to the Bible

In order to understand contemporary approaches to the history of ancient Israel, a brief comment on different methodological approaches to the Bible is important. Many have tried to discover the "correct method." "Much harm has been done in biblical studies by insisting that there is, somewhere, a 'correct' method which, if only we could find it, would unlock the mysteries of the text."¹ For centuries there were only two groups of individuals discussing the history of ancient Israel: believers and skeptics.

Today the history of ancient Israel is not as simple a topic as used to be believed. In his book, The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History, Baruch Halpern pointed out that the scholarly world is divided into three groups: the confessionalists,² the negative fundamentalists,³ and the Pyrrhonists.⁴ He further pointed out that these groups "have caught the study of Israelite

²Halpern explained that for this group Scripture is a sort of map, a single, synchronic system in which the part illuminates the whole, in which it does not matter that different parts of the map come from divergent perspectives and different periods. Halpern, The First Historians, 3, 4.
³Continuing with the same example of a map, Halpern indicated that this group dates the whole map by its latest elements. Ibid., 4.
⁴This group, according to the same author, denies all possibility of acquiring significant and reliable knowledge of the past. For him the literary critics of the New Critical variety are among the most vocal. Ibid., 4, 5.
antiquity in a cross fire."¹ However, Halpern believed that "confessional" scholars cannot be critical historians.² In Israelite & Judaean History, Hayes divided biblical scholarship into four groups:³ orthodox,⁴ archaeological,⁵ tradicio-historical,⁶ and socioeconomic.⁷ Norman L. Geisler's Decide for Yourself: How History Views the Bible grouped biblical scholarship into six different views:

¹Ibid., 5.
²Ibid., 3-4.
⁴Hayes divided this group into an orthodox or traditional approach, and a conservative, which is not so rigid as the orthodox. He labeled Lindsell as the proponent of the orthodox group and Beegle and Wood as proponents of the conservative group. H. Lindsell, The Battle for the Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976); D. M. Beegle, The Inspiration of Scripture (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963); L. T. Wood, A Survey of Israel's History, rev. by David O'Brien (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986).
⁵This group sought to illuminate the biblical data by external evidence found through archaeological excavations. William Foxwell Albright (1891-1971) was the founder of biblical archaeology, and was supported by Bright. W. F. Albright, "Archaeology Confronts Biblical Criticism," American Scholar 7 (1938): 176-188; and idem, "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel," Journal of Biblical Literature 59 (1940): 85-112; Bright, Early Israel.
⁶Old Testament traditions were first preserved orally and written down much later through a long process, by redactors or editors, not authors. The supporters of this idea are Albrecht Alt, Martin Noth, Gerhard von Rad, and Hermann Gunkel.
⁷The supporters of this approach are Max Weber, G. E. Mendenhall, J. Dus, N. K. Gottwald, and others. The basic belief these scholars shared is that Israel as a people originated in the land of Canaan.
modern orthodox, liberal, fundamental, neo-orthodox, liberal evangelical, and neoevangelical.¹

The representatives of the modern orthodox view, according to Geisler, are A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield. They claimed that every element of Scripture, whether doctrine or history, is infallible in its verbal expression.² Those who support this view believe that the Bible is without error in everything it affirms including history, science, authorship, and dates of biblical books, and any other matters.³

A representative of the second group that views Scripture from a liberal point of view is Methodist theologian Harold De Wolfe. He claimed that the Bible is a collection of intensely human documents, and that many passages contradict one another or well-established knowledge.⁴ Geisler summarized this belief in the following paragraph:

The liberal view of Scripture is that the Bible is not the Word of God as such but merely contains the Word of God. Along with the truths of God in the Bible are many errors of science and theology that must be weeded out by use of reason in accord with "the spirit of

¹For more detail on this issue see chapters 5-10 of Norman L. Geisler's Decide for Yourself How History Views the Bible (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982).


³Geisler, 55.

Christ." Hence, higher criticism of the Bible is not only welcome but essential to discovering what is true in the Bible. Along with the rejection of much of what the Bible teaches is an antisupernaturalism that rejects the miracles of the Bible.¹

The third group, the fundamentalists, is represented by John R. Rice who stated that the Bible is absolutely correct when it speaks on matters of history or geography.² This view holds that the Bible was dictated from God, written by humans, and is as perfect as God.

The neo-orthodox view, represented by Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, admitted the possibility of errors; however, they rejected the historic orthodox view that the Bible has formal authority. According to Brunner, literary critics of the Bible exposed many contradictions and human characteristics with which the Old and New Testaments abound.¹

The liberal-evangelical view is closely related to the liberals; however, they accept the historicity, teachings, and resurrection of Christ. It is understandable that C. S. Lewis declared he had no problem when scholars

¹Geisler, 67.


³Emil Bruner, God and Man (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930), 36.
said that the account of Creation in Genesis is derived from Semitic stories.¹

The last group, called by Geisler neo-evangelical, is represented by Dutch theologian G. C. Berkouwer and an American theologian Jack Rogers. The supporters of this view believe that the Bible is a human witness to divine revelation. Thus, like any other book, it is subject to mistakes and must be judged by biblical criticism.²

The above views reflect the complexity of modern scholarship regarding the Bible. It is very important what methodological approach to the Scripture one has, in that the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel will be reflected by this.

The Three Case Studies on Reconstruction of Ancient Israel's History

Case Study I

Patriarchal Period

The history of ancient Israel before the exodus from Egypt is referred to as the Patriarchal period. The biblical story of the patriarchs covers Abraham and his departure from Ur,³ his journey from Mesopotamia to Haran and on to the land of Canaan (Gen 11:31,32; 12:1-9). In

²Geisler, 114.
Canaan he has his own son Isaac who becomes the father of Jacob, the latter who is also called Israel. Jacob had twelve sons, the ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel. They all settled in Egypt where their descendants became slaves.

Scholarly views on the historicity of the Patriarchal Period

As Kyle McCarter, Jr., suggested, the biblical description of the Patriarchal period is concerned largely with private affairs, and there are only a few references to public events, none of which corresponds to a known event in general history.1 Consequently, in the absence of references to persons or events of general history, it is difficult to determine the historical context to which the Patriarchal account belongs.

In the middle decades of the twentieth century, archaeology was used by scholars to create a positive view of the historicity of the patriarchs. The leading figure in

this trend was William F. Albright.\textsuperscript{1} Other scholars including Ephraim A. Speiser promoted the same view.\textsuperscript{2}

By way of illustration, Albright argued that the finds on the plain of Bab-edh-Dhra east of the Dead Sea constituted archaeological proof of the destruction of cities mentioned in Gen 18-19.\textsuperscript{3} From this assertion, he claimed that "the date of Abraham cannot be placed earlier than the nineteenth century B.C." (Middle Bronze I 2000-1800 B.C.).\textsuperscript{5} Beginning in 1932, N. Glueck explored the southern Transjordan and confirmed that the area flourished in Middle Bronze I, but was deserted for many centuries after. Thus, he too identified Middle Bronze I as the time of Abraham and called it "the Abrahamitic period."\textsuperscript{6}

In 1961 Albright again discussed Abraham in an article, "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological..."
Interpretation," in which he supported his dating of Abraham to the Middle Bronze I by a re-examination of Glueck's Negeb pottery. He remained firm in his belief of the contemporaneity of Abraham and Middle Bronze I, even in his last works in 1966 and 1969.2

Other scholars have examined the relationship of Abraham to the cities he is associated with in the biblical text. For example, Bimson3 listed more than twenty such cities. However, Abraham had direct contact only with four: Sodom, Salem, Gerar, and Hebron.4


A large quantity of inscripational material is now available that also has an important bearing on the Patriarchal age. Albright associated certain details in the biblical Patriarchal stories, including names, social customs, legal practices, and aspects of lifestyle, as corresponding with features of the second millennium culture in some excavated cities of Mesopotamia including Mari and the Hurrian culture described in the Nuzi tablets.

Albright argued:

As a whole, the picture in Genesis is historical, and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the patriarchs come alive with a vividness

---

1Mari was a city on the upper Euphrates that attained a position of ascendancy in Syria and western Mesopotamia. The life and history of Mari in the early second-millennium society are recorded in a major cuneiform archive found at the site Tell Hariri on the Syrian side of the Syro-Iraqi frontier. The cuneiform tablets dating to 19-18th century B.C. revealed documents which mention names that are of the same type as those of the patriarchal narratives, like Jacob and Abram. See Kenneth A. Strand, Brief Introduction to the Ancient Near East: A Panorama of the Old Testament World (Ann Arbor, MI: Braun-Brumfield, 1969).

2The Nuzi tablets reflected the practices and customs of the Hurrians, a kingdom of Mitanni, people who flourished in the eastern Tigris region in the middle of the second millennium. According to these tablets, which date to 15th century BC, in a marriage contract, for example, a barren wife was required by law to provide a slave woman to her husband to bear his children. In spite of that, if a real wife bore a son, the slave woman's child could not be expelled. See Ignace J. Gelb, "Introduction," in Nuzi Personal Names, ed. Ignace J. Gelb, Pierre M. Purves, and Allan A. MacRae (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), 1-5.
unknown to a single extrabiblical character in the whole vast literature of the ancient Near East.¹

Albright's reconstruction of Israelite history proved to be very influential in his time, and continues to so even today. However, many of his interpretations concerning biblical events in connection with archaeology have been recently challenged. This, in turn, has created increasing doubt about many of his more general conclusions concerning the patriarchs. For example, De Vaux summarized his view on Abraham and MB II in The Early History of Israel. Scholars like Wright,² Speiser,³ Bright,⁴ and Cross⁵ agreed with De Vaux, and placed Abraham in the second millennium B.C., the Middle Bronze II period.⁶ Hence G. E. Wright wrote the off-quoted words:

³Speiser, xlv-liii.
⁴Bright, 81-85.
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We shall probably never be able to prove that Abraham really existed, that he did this or that, said thus and so, but what we can prove is that his life and times, as reflected in the stories about him, fit perfectly within the early second millennium, but imperfectly with any later period.1

Further, a small minority of scholars, including C. H. Gordon, reflected on the social customs of fifteenth-thirteenth-century texts found in Nuzi and Ugarit and argued that Abraham and Jacob should be placed in the fourteenth century B.C. or LB II.2 Eissfeldt also associated Late Bronze II with Abraham because of the biblical genealogies.3

D. N. Freedman, on the other hand, placed the Abraham narratives in the middle of the third millennium B.C. or EB III (2650-2350 B.C.).4 He argued his position on the basis of literary and archaeological evidence, mainly the Ebla tablets. He saw a correspondance between Ebla and the cities described in Gen 14.

1Wright, Biblical Archaeology, 40.
4Freedman, 143-164.
Archaeologist Rainey questioned Albright's "Amorite hypothesis." Albright, as well as De Vaux, associated Abraham's travel from Ur to Palestine with the migration of the Amorites, or West Semitic peoples. Thompson, however, stated that current scholarship does "not witness to a major West Semitic migration in Palestine in the early Second Millennium," and argued against any such migration from


2During the EBIII period people lived in large city centers. The end of this period saw the disruption of urban life throughout Syria and Palestine. The period that followed EBIV/MBI was non-urban. A revision of town life began again in MBII periods. Albright believed that the destruction of EBIII urban city-states was caused by Amorites. These people are called in Mesopotamian sources Amurrum which means "Westerners" or "Amorites." However, it is accepted by the majority of archaeologists, as well as historians, that the influx of Amorites into Palestine occurred at the end of EBIV/MBI (1950 B.C.) rather than at the end of EBIII (2250 B.C.). It is recognized that they were responsible for a new urban city-state era that exploded in Palestine during MBII periods. The term "Amorite hypothesis" does not refer to a possible connection between Amorite movements and Abraham, but only to Amorite westward expansions.

3Albright, The Biblical Period, 4-5. Albright associates Abraham with the movement of Amorites in MBI period.

4de Vaux, Early History, 1, 263-266. (De Vaux's MBI = MBII, p. 265.)

5Sir Leonard Wooley excavated Tell al Maqayyar, which he associated with the Ur that Abraham came from. C. Leonard Wooley, Ur of the Chaldees: A Record of Seven Years of Excavation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930); idem, The Excavations at Ur and the Hebrew Records (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1929); Unger, 109.
North Mesopotamia. He also argued against the view that associated the destruction of urban civilization at the end of Early Bronze III with an (Amorite) invasion from the north. Other reasonable suggestions include Egyptians, Indo-European people, and natural causes.

The association of the Amorite migration with Abraham is now doubted by many scholars and should probably be given a separate treatment from discussions of the patriarchs. Dever has pointed out that the whole dilemma of the biblical patriarchs "is a separate question and one that is likely to prejudice the discussion of Middle Bronze I." In spite of the present confusion, however, Sarna has remarked:

Thompson, *Historicity of the Patriarchal Narrative*, 96.

Ibid., 144-171.


Dever and Clark, 83-84, 94, 118.
If Abraham's migration can no longer be explained as part of a larger Amorite migratory stream from east to west, it should be noted that what has fallen by the wayside is a scholarly hypothesis, not the Biblical text. Genesis itself presents the movement from Haran to Canaan as an individual, unique act undertaken in response to a divine call, an event, not an incident, that inaugurates a new and decisive stage in God's plan of history. The factuality or otherwise of this Biblical evaluation lies beyond the scope of scholarly research.¹

In spite of the arguments each group presents, many scholars find difficulties in all of them.² Thus, Dever has argued that even though favorable evidence could provide the best model for future research, the Patriarchal traditions still may fit into the second millennium B.C.³ However, he added that his conclusion "could change overnight with new discoveries."⁴ Nevertheless, the current state of the field of archaeology has led Bimson to remark:

From the point of view of the Palestinian archaeological evidence, there is certainly no reason to reject an early setting for the events of the patriarchal narratives, and ideally those events should be placed within the twenty-first to nineteenth centuries BC.⁵

This chronological range is suggested by biblical sources: if one follows the LXX, Abraham lived in the Middle

³Dever and Clark, 117-118.
⁴Ibid., 120.
⁵Bimson, "Archaeological Data," 89.
Bronze Age (1950-1550 B.C.). However, if one uses MT, Abraham lived in the EB IV Age (2250-1950 B.C.).

The view that the biblical accounts of the patriarchs are only myths and not historical goes back to J. Wellhausen. This view influenced many German scholars including Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth. Noth's statement that "only little light falls from external evidence, especially on the patriarchs," testifies to his belief that archaeology provides little support for the historicity of the Patriarchal narratives.

This general view has been taken up by an American scholar, J. T. Luke, who has stated that the Patriarchal narratives are not "historical documents" in historiographical form. Rather, they are literary-theological constructs reworked and rewoven as literature throughout at least five hundred years of their own history. However, Luke further added that to acknowledge this does not deny them some archaic and historical significance, for they were not mere literary inventions.

---


Skinner also pointed out that "the narratives preserve a true memory of the time before the occupation of Palestine, and in this way possess great historical value."¹ Whybray admitted that even though "many of the patriarchal stories have the characteristics of the folktale, this alone is not sufficient to deny them all historical value."² If there is no proof for something, Durham pointed out, one can not say it is not historical,³ because "the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence," Millard asserted.⁴

Kitchen also wrote,

Absence of evidence is not, and should not be confused with evidence of absence. The same criticism is to be leveled at the abuse of this concept in archaeology: the syndrome: "we did not find it, so it never existed!" instead of the more proper formulation: "evidence is currently lacking; we may have missed it or it may have left no trace"; particularly when 5 percent or less of a mound is dug, leaving 95 percent or more untouched, unknown, and so, not in evidence.⁵

¹Skinner, xxix.
⁴Unpublished statement given by Millard at the Wheaten meeting of archaeologists, 1990. Allan Ralph Millard is archaeologist and professor of Hebrew and Ancient Semitic Languages at the University of Liverpool, England.
The Exodus

The narrative from the book of Exodus is not the story of an individual, but of a nation. Exodus 1-15 covers the topic of Jacob's family or the Israelites enslaved in Egypt to their liberation from slavery. According to the biblical narrative, a famine brought Jacob's sons to Egypt in search of food. Discovering that their brother Joseph had become a high official in Egypt, the whole family moved there. However, the biblical text further informs us that a new pharaoh "who did not know Joseph" came to the throne and the status of the Israelites in Egypt changed. Rather than enjoying a privileged state, they were eventually enslaved, working for the Egyptians in building pharaoh's cities.

The text further informs us that a baby was born to a Levi family during the time that pharaoh's decree was in effect, which ordered that all Israelite male babies should be killed. Because his life was in danger, his mother placed the baby in a basket and set him afloat in the Nile River. He was soon found by the pharaoh's daughter who adopted him and named him Moses. He subsequently grew up in the court of Egypt.

The Bible relates practically nothing about Moses as a young man. The New Testament does mention that he was educated to be someone of great importance in Egypt. From the Exodus account, he is portrayed as someone who hated
injustice. Because of his zeal, he eventually had to flee Egypt. However, God brought him back to become the deliverer of his people. After much persuasion and many plagues, the pharaoh finally released the Israelites from bondage. Pharaoh soon changed his mind, however, and attempted to recapture the Israelites. When the pharaoh and his army were halfway across the sea, the waters rolled back and the Egyptians drowned. Liberation from slavery has been celebrated among the Jews ever since in the Passover festival.

Scholarly views on historicity of Exodus

The Exodus narrative raises many historical problems because the events that the Bible describes do not fit into the framework of currently known Egyptian history. There are no extrabiblical sources, either literary or inscriptive, that refer to the experiences of Israel in Egypt as described in the book of Exodus. In spite of these limitations, however, some scholars have explored Egyptian history for a possible historical context in which the Exodus story could fit. Other scholars have asked if

---

there was a single, united Exodus as the Bible records, or is the present narrative simply a summary of many separate, unrelated events? Still others have wondered if Israel was ever enslaved in Egypt or did the Israelites always live in Canaan?

For those who accept the basic historicity of the Exodus, two methods have been utilized in attempting to solve the problem of the date of the Exodus: either working forward in time from the period of the patriarchs; or working backward from some established point in later history such as the time of the Israelite monarchy. For many, working forward is chronologically hazardous; however, others believe it is equally "unfruitful to calculate back from some recognized date in history." Nevertheless, despite the difficulties, or perhaps because of them, many have attempted to tackle this challenge. Generally, two different centuries have been proposed for the time of the Exodus: the fifteenth century B.C.; and the thirteenth century B.C.

The thirteenth-century Exodus. The thirteenth century Exodus theory has been "the oldest theory since the

1For a summary of the chronological problems, see Harrison, 164-176, 308-325.

rise of modern Egyptology,"¹ and identifies Ramesses II of the XIXth Dynasty as the pharaoh of the oppression. In this scenario, his successor, Merneptah, would be the pharaoh of the Exodus.² However, at the time this theory was proposed, the dating of the Egyptian dynasties was in a state of flux. The dates for the XIX Dynasty ranged between the sixteenth and the twelfth centuries B.C. Today the dates most widely accepted for Ramesses II are 1290-1224 B.C.³

The actual foundation for the thirteenth century Exodus was derived from the biblical text, which informs us that the Egyptians pressed the Hebrews into forced labor, forcing them to build for the pharaoh the store-cities of Pithom and Ramesses (Exod 1:11). Based on the presence of this latter name in the Bible, scholars have attempted to find in Egyptian history a pharaoh by the name of Ramesses. As, T. H. Robinson wrote in the 1930s: "The whole theory of a nineteenth dynasty date for the Exodus rests on the two names in that verse."⁴ According to Egyptologists, Ramesses II was famous for his extensive and massive building enterprises that he executed by conscripting large numbers

¹Bimson, Redating the Exodus, 18.
²Ibid.
of civilians, especially foreigners. This fact seems to match the biblical account.

Archaeological evidence has also been a major factor in establishing the Exodus in the thirteenth century.\(^1\) The biblical books of Joshua and Judges report that the Israelites destroyed, attacked, and conquered many cities in Palestine. Archaeology has indeed revealed that many sites were destroyed in the thirteenth century, and many scholars have associated this destruction with the Israelites' possession of the promised land. Hence Albright identified the thirteenth century destruction at Bethel "with Israelite conquest."\(^2\) Bright also interpreted the archaeological evidence as "impressive," and concluded that "it has served to support the widely held opinion that the Israelite conquest was a violent one and that it took place in the latter part of the thirteenth century."\(^3\) Scholars like Wright,\(^4\) Aharoni,\(^5\) and Kitchen\(^6\) wrote of destructions

\(^1\)Bimson, *Redating the Exodus*, 48.


\(^3\)Bright, *History of Israel*, 132.

\(^4\)Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, 81-84.


connected with Israel. For many years this interpretation was the reigning paradigm.

In addition, Stager has summarized some new features identified in the thirteenth century B.C. hill country. Villages were established at this time on hilltops accompanied by extensive deforestation. Terracing of slopes was undertaken to create areas for agriculture to meet the needs of the population living in the highlands. Cisterns, plastered by waterproof linings of lime, were constructed throughout the central highlands as well.

Callaway has indicated that the transition from Late Bronze to Iron Age I (ca. 1200) marked a dramatic increase in the number of permanent settlers of Palestine. Traditionally, this influx had been associated with the entry of Israel into Canaan. Most of the villages were established on the abandoned ruins of earlier sites, such as Ai, or on unoccupied hilltops that had never before supported settlements, such as Raddana. In either case, the Israelite settlement sites were distinguished mainly by the pattern of settlement and by the characteristic features


'Ibid.

'Ibid.
of their material culture, which were unprecedented in the Late Bronze Age.¹

Most of these sites were rather small villages of no more than one to two acres. However there were exceptions such as Shiloh (4 acres), Tel Masos (12 acres), and Dan (50 acres).² Fortifications were almost unknown, yet the positioning of the houses has suggested to some an attempt to create some sort of defense line for the settlement.³ The circular arrangement with the back walls of houses facing the periphery and a large open area in the middle, differed sharply from any known Canaanite town plan.⁴ Each house had an entrance facing inward towards the center of the town; this arrangement, thus, provided some protection.⁵

In most cases, private dwellings in the settlements were "pillared" houses usually consisting of four rooms; hence they are also called four-room houses.⁶ Many examples for this new type of architecture have been found in


²Ibid., 64.
³Ibid.
⁴Ibid., 66.
settlements in the Negev: about twenty units were found at Beer-Sheba and Tel Masos.2

The main characteristics of this house type have been described as following:

There are three rectangular spaces—one across the back and two along the wide walls at right to that at the rear. These three spaces are the interior dwelling units on the general floor, and they are always, in the domestic house, of approximately the same length and width. The central entrance to the house is in the center of the outer wall opposite the transverse rear sector. This entrance leads into what has been called the fourth "room", but which from its installations in certain examples . . . is the courtyard of the house.3

The feature that distinguished this new house type from a three-room-long building was the back room running the width of the building.4

Some scholars believe that these four-room houses were an "Israelite" development brought with them from outside,5 or an original Israelite innovation.6 However,  

1Y. Aharoni, Beer-Sheba I (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1973), 13-17.
4Ibid.
others disagree. Oren, for example, declared that the four-room house originally belonged to the Philistine architectural tradition and was eventually adopted by the Israelites. ¹ G. E. Wright suggested that this type of house was probably borrowed during the tenth century from Phonicia. ² On the other hand, Braemer grouped together the four-room houses with structures from Syrian and Lebanese sites. ³ In any case, it can safely be affirmed that the four-room house was the prominent Palestinian house type of the Iron Age, ⁴ and that it stood out characteristically because of both its plan and location in one clearly defined area: Palestine. ⁵

As mentioned above, most of the new villages were established either on the abandoned ruins of earlier sites or on unoccupied hilltops. Since many of these new sites lacked natural water sources, new ways of obtaining water were necessary.

The newcomers, therefore, dug cisterns to capture rainwater for use in the dry season. These plastered water cisterns have been regarded as one of the important features

⁴Ibid., 5.
⁵Ibid.
introduced by the Israelites. The construction of these cisterns has suggested to some that the constructors had considerable technological capabilities. For example, Callaway indicated that

an appreciable sophistication is evident in the construction of the cisterns. The houses were located only where the Senonian layers are found at Ai and at other Iron Age I sites . . . indicating that the settlers arrived with experience in cistern building.

Garsiel and Finkelstein assumed that settlers followed the dispersal of chalk rocks; indeed, few sites have been found in these regions in which the limestone is unsuitable for digging cisterns.

The cisterns were cut out of the chalk and limestone and shaped in the form of a pear. At some places it was not necessary to line the cistern with additional lime plaster because of the impermeable nature of the rock;

---

1Mazar, "The Israelite Settlement," 68.


nevertheless, this lime plaster was used at other places as "waterproofing cement."¹

Rainwater was directed from the roofs of the houses to flow into cisterns. Rocks that were placed at the bottom trapped larger impurities, while a hole was drilled in the side allowing water to travel from one cistern to another filtering it along the way as it flowed to the inside of the house.² There was a narrow opening at the top of the cistern that was closed with a flat, round capstone.³

Archaeologists have found an amazing number of Iron Age cisterns in the highlands. At Tell en-Nasbeh,⁴ for example, 53 were discovered. While the introduction of cisterns enabled the Israelites to live on the hilltops throughout central Canaan, some scholars believed that the revolutionary development of waterproof lime plaster was the actual key that enabled settlers to depend on rock-cut cisterns.⁵ However, others say that the Senonian chalk in which the cisterns were dug had a self-sealing quality and


²Ibid., 46.


⁵Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 113.
that the revolutionary development in the Iron Age was the introduction of cistern technology itself.¹

In spite of differing opinions, one thing is obvious: Iron Age villagers were able to live in inhospitable areas because of cistern construction.

Coerced to live in the hill country, it was necessary² for the Israelites to adapt to the unique environment there, and to develop the land to produce food. After building a tiny village, the remaining nine-tenths of the city ruins was often put into cultivation.³ Coote and Whitelam pointed out that one of the major technological achievements of the hill-country sites was the development of terracing to expand available agricultural land.⁴

This development required everyone's involvement, as it provided farmable strips of land that supported their agricultural needs.⁵ While Coote and Whitelam have suggested that terracing was designed to prevent erosion,⁶ Matthews has argued that it was not really designed for that purpose because the hills had little soil to lose due to previous deforestation (Josh 17:18) and the pasturing of

¹Callaway, "Village," 56.
²Hopkins, 23.
³Callaway, "Village," 56.
⁴Coote and Whitelam, 123.
⁵Matthews, 49.
⁶Coote and Whitelam, 123.
animals. Thus, much of the soil found in the terraces, says Matthews, was brought from elsewhere and was a mixture of different soil types.

At any rate, canals were often dug to direct rainwater down into the terraces. These terraces were constructed down the slope of the hill to ensure natural filtration of the water and a better distribution of moisture to all of the farming strips.

These terraces were best suited for growing grapes, olives, and nuts. However, the terraces at Ai and Raddana were also apparently used for growing cereals. Coote and Whitelam have suggested that the occupants of these villages were more interested in the short-term production of food rather than a long-term investment in commercial crops.

Nevertheless, by bringing with them the technology of agricultural terracing, the Israelites pioneered a subsistence strategy based on agriculture and animal husbandry that helped them succeed in a marginal

---

1Matthews, 50.
2Ibid.
3Ibid.
4Ibid.
5Coote and Whitelam, 123.
7Coote and Whitelam, 123.
environment. Stager has pointed out that the process of building terraces continued for many centuries and culminated in the stepped landscape of the hill country that is visible in Palestine today.

While many changes thought to have been brought about in Canaan by the settlement of Israelites have been discussed above, the most obvious change that scholars tend to consider is the pottery. "There is no doubt that the pottery of the 12th-11th centuries (Iron I), although the Canaanite legacy is well in evidence, is already a different entity," commented Ruth Amiran.

The continuity between the Canaanite pottery culture of the Late Bronze and Iron Age pottery culture, including both Israelite and other pottery, is clearly apparent. . . . On the other hand, the profound changes brought about in Canaan by the settlement of the Israelite tribes are easily discernable in various material phenomena, first and foremost in the pottery.

Mazar has observed that the pottery found at various sites, like Giloh, revealed that 79 percent of the total pottery repertoire was composed of so-called "collared-rim" pithoi, cooking pots, and storage jars.

1Ibid., 63.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
However, other sites like Tel Harushim and Kibbutz Sasa in Upper Galilee have revealed some imported pottery as well. Aharoni believed that this imported pottery was acquired through trade.¹ In spite of the trade, the collared-rim jars have been designated by many as specifically "Israelite" ever since the time of Albright.² Aharoni also labelled it as "conquest ware."³ These collared-rim jars were characteristic of many hill-country sites and appear to be marked by a distinct geographical boundary that coincided with the traditional territory of the Israelites as described in the Bible.⁴

Coote and Whitelam, however, have opposed such a suggestion and have argued that collared-rim jars were not restricted to the hill-country sites, but have been found at a number of lowland settlements as well, and, therefore, should not be used to identify "Israelite" settlements.⁵ Weippert, moreover, has questioned whether the changes in pottery styles should be taken as indicative of changes in population.⁶

²Coote and Whitelam, 126.
⁵Coote and Whitelam, 126.
Nevertheless, collared-rim pithos are characteristic of the early Iron Age expansion of settlement in the highlands,¹ and they have been used to explain the social, historical, and economic situations of those who settled in that region.² For example, Mazar has remarked that the pithoi could be used as containers for grain and water, and would be an essential item in the early Israelite house, together with the cooking pots. Indeed, these two items make up the bulk of pottery inventory.³ Even though Weippert denied that the collared-rim jars could have been used to identify a certain ethnic group,⁴ and stressed more its use than its origin, Coote and Whitelam agreed that it was a development that reflected the shift in settlement pattern at the end of the LB Age and the beginning of the early Iron Age.⁵

Another relevant item to the thirteenth century Exodus date is the famous Merneptah Stele, also known as the Israel Stele,⁶ discovered by Petrie in 1895. Pharaoh

¹Hopkins, 149.
³Mazar, "Giloh," 36.
⁴Weippert, 134-135.
⁵Coote and Whitelam, 127.
Merneptah (ca. 1212-1200 B.C.) led an expedition to Canaan where he clashed with the Israelites. The monument dates to about 1207 B.C. and, among those who were defeated, "Israel" is specifically mentioned. Merneptah's victory ode states in part:

The princes are prostrate, saying "Peace!"
Not one is raising his head among the Nine Bows.
Now that Tehenu [Libya] has come to ruin, Hatti is pacified;
The Canaan has been plundered into every sort of woe:
Ashkelon has been overcome;
Gezer has been captured;
Yano'am is made non-existent.
Israel is laid waste and his seed is not;
Hurru is become a widow because of Egypt.

This discovery has caused some confusion among scholars in regard to the thirteenth century Exodus. Was Israel already established in Canaan by 1207 B.C.? If yes, then the Exodus must have occurred earlier.

While writers like Petrie, Mercer, Rowley, and de Wit placed the Exodus in Merneptah's reign, Montet and

2W. M. F. Petrie, Egypt and Israel (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1911), 55.
5De Wit, 9-10.
North went even further and viewed the stele as part of the Exodus enterprise. Others, including Muller, concluded that Merneptah was not the pharaoh of the Exodus. What this stele does demonstrate is that the Israelites were in Palestine by ca. 1220 B.C. Furthermore, Hasel noted that the phrase "his seed is not" indicated that Israel's food supply was no longer in existence. On the other hand, some have said that the stele suggests that Israel as a nation did not come out of Egypt, or that what came out was only partial.

The names of Ramesses and Pithom mentioned in Exodus 1:11 have also raised much discussion among scholars. Redford has questioned whether the name Ramesses, mentioned in Exodus, refers to the royal residence of Ramesses II, as


2 W. M. Muller, "Egypt," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1901), 2:1242.


has been traditionally supposed.¹ There has also been much discussion on the location of the cities of Ramesses and Pithom.² On the other hand, S. Yeivin has argued that the name Ramesses is anachronistic,³ just as it is in Gene 47:11.⁴

Scholars Franken and De Vaux have argued against the association of Israel with the new features in Palestine during the Iron Age.⁵ Bimson has also commented that the archaeology of Palestine "provides no convincing evidence for a conquest or settlement of the land by incoming Israelites during that period."⁶

Although it is difficult to determine how these innovations came into existence, it is obvious that the innovation was typical of thirteenth-century Palestine. Many supporters of the thirteenth-century Exodus date assume

²See chapter 1 in Bimson's Redating the Exodus, 35-65.
³Yeivin, The Israelite, 36.
⁴Rowley, 31-32. The author commented that this is clearly retrospective usage since the descent into Egypt must have preceded the reign of the first Ramses.
⁶Bimson, Redating the Exodus, 65.
that these innovations are related to the new ethnic group that emerged in Palestine that is, Israel.

The fifteenth-century Exodus. "The second oldest theory since the rise of modern Egyptology",¹ according to Bimson, is the theory of a fifteenth-century Exodus. It originated with E. Lefebure in 1896.² This theory suggested that the XVIIIth Dynasty and pharaoh Thutmosis III was the pharaoh of oppression, and Amenhotep II was the pharaoh of the Exodus. Bimson noted that when establishing the time of the Exodus by using the biblical text of 1 Kgs 6:1, "this view was more in keeping than the older one . . . which places the event roughly in the middle of the fifteenth-century BC."³ Hence, the Exodus would be ca. 1445-1450 B.C. according to Bimson.

The acceptance of this theory was the result of the conformity with biblical chronology and the uncertainty occasioned by the Israelite stele. Scholars including Mallon,⁴ J. Orr,⁵ and Peet⁶ favored this earlier date of the

¹Ibid., 19.
²De Wit, 4.
³Bimson, Redating the Exodus, 20.
Exodus. The positive assertion "that further archaeological and documentary discoveries will only confirm the argument" demonstrated the confidence and support of these scholars for this theory.

Further support (which later turned out to be false) for this earlier date of the Exodus was seen by some scholars working with the Amarna letters from Egypt. Some have argued that the Habiru against whom some Canaanite kings were writing about in the Amarna letters were the Hebrews or Israelites. This connection began to be weakened however, when the term Habiru began to occur in many more texts from widely separated times and places. In addition, studies of the Amarna letters have indicated an

---

1Jack, 257.

2Bimson mentions Jack and others in his Redating the Exodus, 20.

3During the Amarna period (14th century B.C.) the city-states in Canaan were ruled by Canaanite vassals of Egypt. Although the Canaanite princes were under Egyptian administration, some of them wanted independence from Egypt. Thus, they hired troops of mercenaries to do the job. However, some were loyal to Egypt and wrote letters to the city of Amarna, regarding these bands of Habiru or SA.GAZ. This correspondence, "Amarna letters," got its name according to the Egyptian city to which they were sent, Amarna. The term Habiru seems to have meant "stateless, landless," and it points to a social status, not an ethnic group such as Israel. For further discussion of the meaning see M. Greenber, The Hab/piru (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1955), 87; Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest," 66-87; idem, The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 122.

4Rowley, 39, 56.
internal rebellion in Canaan showing that groups within the area became Habiru. Nevertheless, Bimson saw a connection between the Israelites and the Habiru groups:

The role of the Israelites in the Amarna period was probably mixed. After the Conquest, while many Israelites were attempting to settle in areas away from the Canaanites which they had failed to dislodge, others were settling among those Canaanites, as we gather from Jdg 1:29, 32 and 33. Similarly, while some Israelite groups probably preferred non-involvement in the disturbances of the Amarna period, others, especially those who had begun to merge into Canaanite society, could well have been involved as members of the Habiru bands. . . . Sometimes the Israelites may have suffered at the hands of Habiry-type groups.2

Even though Bimson did not use the appearance of Habiru in the Amarna letters as evidence for an early date of the Exodus, he did indicate that the letters portray an accurate view of the land of Canaan after the conquest.3

Another bit of evidence that has been used for the fifteenth-century Exodus was the dating by Garstang of Jericho's fall.4 Garstang connected Early Bronze walls with the destruction of Joshua in the Late Bronze period.5

---


2 Bimson, Redating the Exodus, 245, 246.

3 Ibid., 247.


5 Two sets of walls were found at Jericho. One dates to the Early Bronze, and the other to the Middle Bronze period. Garstang dated the Early Bronze wall to the time of Joshua, which according to the biblical text should have been dated to the Late Bronze age.
Nevertheless, these errors did not weaken the connection of conservative scholars including Rea, Hoehner, Wood, and Waltke, who continued to support the fifteenth-century Exodus. John Bimson, in his work *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*, pointed out that since the evidence for the thirteenth-century Exodus is insubstantial, there is no reason "for dismissing the *prima facie* evidence of the biblical information, which indicates a date in the first half of the 15th century BC."^5

Case Study III

**Israelite Settlement of the Promised Land**

A discussion of how Israel as a nation came to be present in Canaan has occupied many scholars for a considerable period of time. The period of the Conquest of Canaan has been called "the most difficult problem in the whole history of Israel."^6 The main source of information

---


^3 Wood, "The Date of the Exodus," 67-86.

^4 Waltke, 33-47.

^5 Bimson, *Redating the Exodus*, 236.

regarding the Israelite occupation of Palestine is the biblical account from Num 13 to Judg 1. The impression one receives when reading the conquest account is that after an initial delay of forty years, the whole of the promised land was conquered systematically and in a relatively short period of time by a unified Israel under the leadership of Joshua.

Some scholars believe that the narrative in Josh 1-12 is not as simple and cohesive as the text appears.¹ For example, the statements that Israel annihilated the inhabitants of the land seem to be contradicted in Judg 1,² which concludes with a list of twenty cities in which the people were not driven out by the newcomers (Judg 1:21, 27-33). Merling explained: "The Book of Joshua does not project universal conquest or settlement. The battles that it does describe are selected to demonstrate the purposes of the biblical writers."²


²Merling pointed out in his research that the book of Joshua is a combination of selected historical accounts, to show confirmation that God was with Israel. But it is not a complete story. P. David Merling, "The Book of Joshua: Its Theme and Use in Discussions of the Israelite Conquest and Settlement and the Relationship of Archaeology and the Bible," (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 1996), 255.
Others regard the conquest narrative as legendary, projecting later ideas into the past. Thus, perhaps the Israelites were not the destroyers of Canaanite cities. Rather, the destruction could have been the work of the impoverished original inhabitants of Canaan.

G. W. Åhlstrom felt that "archaeology does not support the Bible's claim that a conquest led to the emergence of an Israelite society and kingdom in Canaan." Furthermore, the conquest story should be understood from an ideological point of view. The Joshua narrative advocates the people's right to the land at a time when their claim to the land was disputed. Therefore, both the promise of the land and the conquest were set back into antiquity to serve as a precedent.

Thus, for Åhlstrom, Israelite society and its culture "should be seen as a continuation of the Late Bronze

---

1 J. Marquet-Krause, "La Deuxième Campagne de fouilles a Ay (1934)," Syria 16 (1935): 325.


3 Ibid., 256.


traditions rather than as intrusive" or those that came and conquered the land.¹

Accordingly, many scholars have advocated different explanations regarding how the land of Canaan was taken into the possession of the Israelites. Three main hypotheses are currently debated by the scholarly world.

The conquest model

The traditional approach taken by many Jewish and Christian commentators is the biblical description of invasion and conquest. According to this model, the twelve tribes of Israel escaped from Egypt, wandered in the wilderness for forty years, then undertook a series of military actions within a short time span, which resulted in their conquest of central and northern Transjordan as well as virtually all the territory west of the Jordan. This model was advocated by the Albright school, which took its inspiration from William F. Albright.² G. Ernest Wright and John Bright essentially followed this model.

The advocates of this view have argued that Judg 1 (individual tribes struggling to gain a foothold in the land) is not inconsistent with the Joshua account. They claim that Joshua had, in fact, conquered the whole land, but it remained for individual tribes to complete the

¹Ibid., 118.

²Bright, A History of Israel, 106-140., and Wright, Biblical Archaeology, 34-53.
conquest by clearing from their respective territorial
allotments remaining enclaves of indigenous peoples. They
believed that archaeological finds confirmed the biblical
stories of conquest under Joshua's command.

Others however, have disputed that the findings of
archaeology provide clear and compelling support for the
biblical stories. For example, the fall of Jericho's walls (Josh 6:20-26), the attack on the city of Ai, the
destruction of Hormah (Num 21:3; Judg 1:17), and Hazor (Josh 11:1-15) have all been questioned. These expressions of
doubt have been raised by opponents of the conquest model,

---


5Ramsey, 70.
thus forming the ground for other hypotheses for the occupation of the land of Canaan.

**Peaceful infiltration model**

The second model was developed in the 1920s by the so-called Alt-Noth school and has received support by scholars such as Weippert. The apparent lack of archaeological evidence at Jericho and Ai was one factor that has prompted this model among some scholars. In 1925 Alt's groundbreaking study, originally published (in German)


2. Weippert, 135.

3. Jericho and Ai are the two sites that are questionable when settlement or conquest is discussed. Today, scholars do not agree on the location of Ai. Archaeologists have long debated whether the Israelites in fact conquered Jericho. Dame Kathleen Kenyon, who excavated Jericho in the 1950s, claimed that Jericho was destroyed in the 16th century B.C. and there was no walled city at Tell es-Sultan (ancient Jericho) for Joshua to conquer. A comprehensive new survey of Kenyon's evidence at Jericho, however, has led Bryant Wood to conclude that a walled city existed at Jericho until about 1400 B.C. when it was destroyed in a conquest strikingly similar to the biblical account. The 1400 B.C. conquest would match the chronology derived from the Bible. However, it is about 150 to 200 years earlier than the time most scholars believe the Israelites were to be found as a people living in Canaan. For more information, see Wood, "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho: A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence," 44-59.

under the title *Die Landnahme der Israeliten in Palestina. Territorialgeschichtliche Studien*¹ (*The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine*), proposed that the occupation of Palestine began with gradual and generally peaceful movements of individual tribes from the eastern deserts. Alt suggested that "the tribal confederacy did not exist at the time when those who later became the Israelites entered Palestine."² Therefore, the Israelites, upon entering Palestine, settled first in thinly populated areas between the belts of Canaanite city-states³ that were situated in the central highlands. When the vegetation in that area ceased in the summer, they travelled into cultivated low-lands. They came to an understanding with owners of the low-lands about summer pasturage in the harvested fields and in the woods.⁴ In other words, settlement resulted "out of regular change of pasture on the part of nomads with small cattle."⁵ These nomads "began to practice agriculture once they had turned these wooded areas into arable land. This peaceful process of transition . . . to a sedentary life was


²Yadin, 17-18.

³Ramsey, 77.

⁴Callaway, "The Settlement," 70, 71.

the real process of settlement and it was a peaceful development."¹

By using texts such as Josh 15:63; 16:10; 17:12; and Judg 1:21-36, which seem to indicate that the Israelites were unable to capture some cities, Alt concluded that they initially claimed the territory in areas where resistance was the least.² Thus, the initial settlement was not a military conquest as Josh 1-12 indicates.³

However, this peaceful infiltration model does not deny some military engagements by individual tribes. And this is what the people remembered not the peaceful infiltration.⁴ Consequently, the military encounters were part of a second stage of Israelite settlement during the period of the Judges when Israel wanted to expand its territory.⁵ Noth further developed this model by distinguishing two phases of tribal settlement prior to the military expansion from the hill country to the low-lands.

Nevertheless, the Alt-Noth school has had its critics⁶ because these two scholars fictionized the character of the biblical conquest narratives through their

²Ramsey, 77.
⁴Weippert, 41-146.
⁶Ibid., 71.
literary analysis. One of the most serious problems in this model was the characterization of Israelites as nomads.

They reflected on the widespread view that throughout history the desert has been a constant source of nomads who spilled over into the surrounding fertile areas from time to time, temporarily disrupted the village and city life which they found there, but eventually were absorbed themselves into the sedentary population.

This assumption, however, lacks convincing evidence, and recently has encountered serious opposition.

Peasant revolt model

The third model has been expounded by George E. Mendenhall and subsequently expanded and promoted by Norman Gottwald and Cornelis de Geus. In 1962 Mendenhall published a provocative paper stating that the conquest was actually a sociopolitical upheaval from within Canaanite society rather than an invasion from outside. According to this view, "Israel emerged from the melting pot of Canaanite

"Miller, "The Israelite Occupation," 270.
"Miller, "The Israelite Occupation," 270.
culture in a revolutionary social movement among the peoples already in Canaan."¹ In Mendenhall's words:

"There was no real conquest of Palestine in the sense that has usually been understood; what happened instead may be termed, from the point of view of the secular historian interested only in socio-political processes, a peasant's revolt against the network of interlocking Canaanite city-states."²

Mendenhall developed his theory by reflecting on the revolts that apparently occurred in Canaan during the Amarna period. He identified the biblical Hebrews with the later apiru,³ or hapiru (mentioned in the Amarna tablets), who were described as "uprooted individuals of varied origins, without tribal or family ties, who joined in bands which could be hired as soldiers by organized states, or acted on their own."⁴ For Mendenhall, early Israel would have been truly "Hebrew"/hApiru, in that it emerged from an open rebellion against the existing social system.⁵ The end result was that Canaanite overlords were overthrown and a tribal confederacy known as "Israel" emerged.

Consequently, a social reorganization took place inside the land among the people of the Canaanite city-states. Israel as a nation, or one distinctive group of


³Ibid., 66-87.


⁵Miller, "The Israelite Occupation," 278.
people, emerged from peoples already in Canaan, peasants who revolted against their overlords.¹ The Israelites associated with peasants, farmers, pastoralists, outlaws, mercenaries, and adventurers.² Nevertheless, an important group that had escaped from bondage in Egypt led out, and this caused a decisive transformation of the Canaanite settlement structures.³

The religion of these fugitives who had escaped from Egypt was a key factor in the economically oriented struggle in Palestine during the conquest period.⁴ The Canaanite rebels embraced the new religion of Yahweh, because Yahweh was the Lord and Giver of the land, God of freedom, and the God who will fight for them and lead them to freedom from power under which they suffered.⁵ It was the covenant made at Sinai between Yahweh and this small group of fugitives from Egypt that triggered the revolution.

Gottwald, who advocated Mendenhall's model, wrote:

We should view Israelite tribalism as a form chosen by people who consciously rejected Canaanite centralization of power and deliberately aimed to defend their own uncentralized system against the effort of Canaanite society to crush their movement.


³Volkmar, 84.

⁴Hauser, 7.

⁵Mendenhall, "The Hebrew Conquest," 76-79.
Israel's tribalism was an autonomous project which tried to roll back the zone of political centralization in Canaan, to claim territories and peoples for an egalitarian mode of agricultural and pastoral life.¹

Objections have been raised against this model also. Many scholars doubt the power attributed to Canaanite rulers at the time of revolt, believing it was overestimated. The presumption that 'Apiru, and "Hebrew" were virtually synonymous terms is probably an over simplification.² The Yahweh concept and Canaanite peasants are also without evidence.³ Nevertheless, the most obvious criticism is the origin of the Israelite nation, for the Bible states that they were not indigenous to the land of Canaan.⁴ There is no hint in the Bible regarding the conquest of Palestine by Israelites through revolution.

In summary, the complexity of "researching the beginnings of Israel"⁵ in the promised land are evident. In the light of the above discussion, and the review of the three main approaches that leading scholars have taken in Israel's historical reconstruction, which model is the


²Weippert, 63-102.

³Hauser, 14.

⁴Miller, "Israelite Occupation," 279.
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correct one? Which should be accepted as true, or the most probably true?

The peaceful infiltration model has weak foundations, based on archaeological excavations. The peasant rebellion model lacks convincing evidence that the main constituency of Israel derived from former Canaanite peasants who, by accepting Yahweh, overthrew their oppressors. Nevertheless, the conquest model must be re-examined as well. Is it reasonable to suppose that it was really a swift campaign, and that all the land was acquired through military campaigns (Josh 9:15, 17)? Did it take Israel a short period of time to become the sole rulers of the land?
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

While schools are facing many difficult issues, the "justification for the existence of the school lies in its curriculum."¹ John D. McNeil has pointed out that in the 1890s there was little professional preparation for curriculum development, and probably no curriculum experts in the United States.² The beginnings of the notion of curriculum development as a specialization within education are to be found in the early decades of the twentieth century, when an attempt was made to apply industrial "scientific management" to education.³ In the years since then the study of curriculum and instruction has undergone radical transformation.⁴

⁴Pratt, v.
What is curriculum? MacDonald, Wolfson, and Zaret offered this definition: "'Curriculum' is the cultural environment which has been purposely selected as a set of possibilities for facilitating educative transactions."¹ Egan saw curriculum as "the study of any and all educational phenomena."² However, the more traditional concept of curriculum as content and instruction as process has been adopted by educators for some years. This view was held by Broudy, Smith, and Burnett, who declared that "curriculum consists primarily of certain content organized into categories of instruction. . . . Modes of teaching are not, strictly speaking, a part of curriculum."³ Still, Tanner and Tanner suggested the following definition of curriculum: "That reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enables the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience."⁴

When discussing religious education, Pamela Mitchell suggested that the definition of curriculum faced many


questions and issues. She observed changes in curriculum definitions in the past centuries.\(^1\) It has been defined variously as a life experience, a body of knowledge, and plan or blueprint for learning.

L. F. Carter suggested an eight-step system of curriculum development:

1. State the real NEED you are trying to satisfy.
2. Define the educational OBJECTIVES which will contribute to satisfy the real need.
3. Define those real world-limiting CONSTRAINTS which any proposed system must satisfy.
4. Generate many different ALTERNATIVE systems.
5. Select the best alternative(s) by careful analysis.
6. IMPLEMENT the selected alternative(s) for testing.
7. Perform a thorough EVALUATION of the experimental system.
8. Based on experimental and real world results, FEEDBACK the required MODIFICATIONS and continue this cycle until the objectives have been attained.\(^2\)

Soon after, in 1971, Baker and Schutz\(^3\) developed the "Instructional Product Development" method as an extension of the "technological production model" that became a form for curriculum development.\(^4\) They introduced the product


\(^{4}\)Tanner and Tanner, 158-165.
development cycle of seven steps:¹ (1) product formulation, (2) instructional specification, (3) prototype test-item tryout, (4) product development, (5) product tryout, (6) product revision, and (7) operation analysis.²

Naden³ proposed a ten-step sequence for product development based on Baker and Schutz, and the experience of his students over a period of fifteen years in developing curricula. Those steps as he defined them are: (1) define the learners, (2) decide the topic, (3) write behavioral objectives, (4) develop pre- and post-tests, (5) establish criteria, (6) develop lecture outlines, (7) test the product, (8) complete revision based on trial results, (9) complete the trial and revision process, and (10) complete final trial and analysis.

The Empirical Product Development Methodology

This study followed the ten steps of R. Naden for the empirical development of an instructional product. These ten steps were deemed adequate to meet the objectives of this study, namely the development of a curriculum for

¹Baker and Schutz acknowledge generous contribution of James Pophan and Eva L. Baker during the final preparation of the instructional sequence of the rules for the development of instructional products (see vii and 128).

²Baker and Schutz, 131-134.

³Roy Naden, "The Empirical Development of Instructional Product Materials."
SDA college students entitled "Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel."

Step 1. The Learners

The first step in the product development is to identify the learners. This step is foundational since it provides focus for all steps that follow. It produces constant awareness of the target audience, which helps in preparation of both content and methodology that is appropriate for their background and experience. The learners for this study were religion/theology majors.

Step 2. The Topic

The second step, according to Naden, for the empirical development of an instructional product addresses the question: "Is the new or improved product justifiable in terms of a need?" In other words, is this product necessary? Further, are there already competing products of high quality? And if it is needed, is it of sufficient importance to justify the time and expense of development?

Another criteria for choosing the topic is expertise in the content. The topic for this study was chosen and developed within the context of the researcher's religion/archaeology and education background, the review of the related literature, and personal experience.
Step 3. Behavioral Objectives

The third step is the establishment of behavioral objectives and methods that promote positive outcomes stated in measurable terms. The major responsibility of this step is first to develop objectives that are non-ambiguous, that can be evaluated and stated in terms of the learner's post-instructional behavior; second, the entry level of the learner's proficiency must be evaluated; third, specification of the criteria by which the learner's response will be evaluated must be stated; and fourth, a method for determining learner affect toward the completed instructional product must be developed. Minimum acceptable achievement was set at 80/80; that is, mastery of the behavioral objectives would be satisfied when 80 percent of the learners mastered at least 80 percent of the criteria on each objective.

Validation of the behavioral objectives was sought in two ways in terms of content, and in terms of methodology. The members of the dissertation guidance committee together provided expertise in the above and validation of the objectives.

The twenty-three behavioral objectives corresponded to one of the following ten learning units: (1) Philosophical Background and Importance of History; (2) The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History (Part 1); (3) The Role of Biblical
Hermeneutics and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History (Part 2); (4) Archaeology and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History; (5) Archaeology and the Bible; (6) Application of Archaeology in Biblical Hermeneutics; Case Study I, The Patriarchal Period; (7) Continuation of the Patriarchal Period, Abraham and Middle Bronze II Customs; (8) Case Study II, Time of Exodus; (9) Continuation of Case Study II, The Fifteenth-Century Exodus Theory; and (10) Case Study III, Israelite Conquest/Settlement. The behavioral objectives, in harmony with the specifications of Baker and Schutz, were stated as follows:

1. The learner will, in his or her own words, define the term "history," using no more than thirty words.

2. The learner will identify the importance of biblical history, with 80 percent accuracy.

3. The learner will identify the two problematical issues of biblical history, as presented in the lecture, with 80 percent accuracy.

4. The learner will name the locations of the two schools that interpreted Scripture in the early Christian period, and describe in no more than five words the method of interpretation each used, with 80 percent accuracy.

5. The learner will identify the method of interpretation of Scripture used by Martin Luther in the context of his principle of "sola scriptura," with 80 percent accuracy.
6. The learner will identify a conceptual understanding of the "Historical Critical Method" and the three sources of the Pentateuch created before Wellhausen that were used to explain how the Pentateuch came into its present state, with 80 percent accuracy.

7. The learner will describe in no more than forty words the assumption and goal of the historical-critical method regarding the history of ancient Israel, with 80 percent accuracy.

8. The learner will name three of the four critical literary methods or hypotheses that the liberal theologians use to interpret the Pentateuch.

9. The learner will identify Wellhausen's classical four sources or documents that scholars use to separate the five books of the Pentateuch, with 80 percent accuracy.

10. The learner will, as presented in class lecture, define the word archaeology, in no more than ten words, with 80 percent accuracy.

11. The learner will name the founder of the American School of Archaeology, with 80 percent accuracy.

12. The learner will identify the relationship between archaeology and the Bible, with 80 percent accuracy.

13. The learner will describe in no more than thirty words the contributions of archaeology in every day life and will identify what the Bible and archaeology are, and what they are not, with 80 percent accuracy.
14. The learner will identify the time of the Patriarchal period, as presented in class, with 80 percent accuracy.

15. The learner will name a verse in the Bible that helps in calculating the time of the Patriarchs, with 80 percent accuracy.

16. The learner will identify Abraham and the time he lived in, with 80 percent accuracy.

17. The learner will describe, in no more than thirty words, two of the laws written on the Nuzi tablets that correspond to the laws found in the Old Testament, with 80 percent accuracy.

18. The learner will name a group or party responsible for the destruction of the EB III urban centers, with 80 percent accuracy.

19. The learner will write in no more than forty words why Abraham fits best in the Early Bronze IV/Middle Bronze I period, with 80 percent accuracy.

20. The learner will identify the two centuries in which the Exodus could have taken place, with 80 percent accuracy.

21. The learner will identify two biblical, one historical, and three (out of six) archaeological evidences for the support of the later date of the Exodus, as presented in class.
22. The learner will identify archaeological assumptions that are used for supporting the earlier date of the Exodus, with 80 percent accuracy.

23. The learner will name the three theories of Israelite conquest/settlement and in no more than sixty words describe each theory, with 80 percent accuracy.

Step 4. Pre- and Post-test Questions

The fourth step of Naden's stages is the preparation of pre/post-test items. This is accomplished by formulating a cognitive instrument, composed of questions that are based upon the stated behavioral objectives and the information obtained from the literature review. The same set of questions in the cognitive instrument are used as both pre-test and post-test (appendix A). In order to ensure higher levels of cognition, the instrument was developed and evaluated in accordance with Benjamin S. Bloom's Taxonomy.¹

Bloom and his associates, in the early 1950s, developed a taxonomy of cognitive educational objectives designed "to be a classification of the student behaviors which represent the intended outcomes or the educational process."² Bloom identified six major categories, arranged


²Benjamin S. Bloom and his co-workers developed taxonomy in the three domains: the cognitive, the affective, and the psychomotor. This study deals only with the taxonomy of the cognitive domain. Bloom et al., 12.
in a hierarchy in which each operation requires abilities and skills that are lower in the classification order.¹

The six categories should be considered in curriculum development. They are: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation,² with 1.00 being the lowest and 6.00 being the highest; thus, knowledge would be the lowest and evaluation the highest order. Subcategories are also utilized in conjunction with these categories of objective classification.³

   Behavioral objectives 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 21 and 23 are on the level of knowledge. Behavioral objectives 2, 7, 10, 15, 16, and 19 are on the level of comprehension. Behavioral objectives 13, 17 and 22 are on the level of analysis. Behavioral objectives 1, 6, 12, 17, 21 and 23 are on the level of synthesis. Behavioral objectives 3, is on the level of evaluation.

In the fourth step of the instrumental product development, it is important to establish that the target population had not already mastered the behavioral objectives. Second, the product is presented to a small group of two to four individuals of the target population. The trial and revision continue with other members of the target audience until defined performance criteria is

¹Ibid., 120.
²Ibid., 18.
³Ibid., 201-207.
attained. Furthermore, it is crucial that there be an unvarying correspondence between the behavioral objectives and the cognitive post-instruction test.¹

Step 5. Criteria for Evaluation

Every pre- and post-test has criteria for evaluation (appendix B). The criteria determine the precise content and how the learner is expected to respond to the questions. It is prepared prior to the instructional product as it reflects an aspect of the learners' post-instructional behavior. It specifies all applicable and testable details of the curriculum product. The criteria is used to compare in an objective manner pre-test knowledge of the subjects and the post-test outcomes of the learning process.

Step 6. Lecture Outlines

The outline of each lecture is based on the objectives and their criteria. Main headings correspond to the main material of each test item, while the subheadings conform to the criteria on which the learner is to be evaluated. In this study the lecture outlines are found in appendix E.

¹The Cognitive post-test serves simultaneously as a pre-test which evaluates cognitive behavior prior to the learning experience.
Step 7. Item Tryout

In the process of product development, an opportunity is given for the modification of the product, based on learners' response. The instructor has the advantage of receiving immediate feedback from the subjects. Throughout this process high levels of flexibility must be exercised; but if the desired mastery is not accomplished, the product developer must discover a curricular approach that will produce mastery.

Step 8. Revision

This process is based on learners' responses. It is repeated as often as necessary in order to obtain mastery. Often verbal feedback combined with the results of the cognitive post-test help in revision of the instructional product.

Step 9. Product Retesting

At this point the product is ready for its first full presentation with a larger group (5-7 individuals) of the target population. A word-for-word presentation is developed during this phase of the development (see Instructor's Manual). Special concern is given to the content, clarity, and ability to communicate the intended instructional information. Evaluative comments from the group are encouraged. Alterations and modifications are made for the improvement of the product.
Step 10. Final Trial and Analysis

This step is the final stage of the empirical development of the instructional product. It is conducted with the final version of all materials. It is performed at the conclusion of the developmental process. The product is field tested on a larger group of the specified target population sufficient to allow statistical evaluation. When mastery is achieved, as indicated by achieving at least 80/80\(^1\) on each behavioral objective, the product is considered ready for use and the development process considered complete.

The Empirical Product Development Model

Baker and Schutz emphasized management strategies that control some circumstances and produce positive affect in an attempt to promote mastery of the behavioral objectives.\(^2\) These strategies provided a favorable environment for integrating the solemn responsibility of reaching the student with the Word of God. Therefore, this study followed the following strategies:

1. A participant's manual, which consists of material directly related to the lectures and other

\(^1\)This means that at least 80 percent of subjects achieve at least 80 percent of the material.

\(^2\)Baker and Schutz, 211-214.
documents, will be given to each learner according to the order of the lectures to promote note taking and learning.

2. The researcher will use overhead transparencies that correspond with the lectures and the student handout material. The chalkboard will also be used for better understanding of the material presented.

3. The lectures will be conducted in a comfortable climate-controlled classroom.

4. Desks for writing will be provided.

5. The sessions will begin with prayer, preferably by a student.

6. Following the prayer, the session will usually begin with the administration of the pre-test, before any information is revealed. After the lecture presentation and a few minutes of review, the post-test is administered. The learning sessions will be governed by the time allotted for the course, which will be fifty minutes.

7. Time will be taken after each session to answer students' questions related to the lecture.

Modification of Affect

Modification of affect should be examined through the affective instrument (see appendix D). The instrument is to be administered at the beginning and at the conclusion of the lecture presentations. The items of the questionnaire should be related to the lecture material and
randomly ordered with Likert-scale questions ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree).

The data were analyzed statistically by the $t$-test, which compared the pre- and post-test scores. The scores were tested for significance at the 0.05 level rejection criterion to determine modification of affect. The computation formula for the $t$-test statistics was:

$$ t = \frac{\Sigma D}{\sqrt{\frac{N \Sigma D^2 - (\Sigma D)^2}{N-1}}} $$

$\Sigma D$ represents the sum of the difference between pre- and post-test scores, $\Sigma D^2$ represents the sum of the squared differences between pre- and post-test scores, and $N$ represents the number of participants.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The instructional product in this research was empirically developed according to the method of Robert L. Baker and Richard E. Schutz (developed in 1971) and Roy Naden (developed in 1993). The target population for this research was Seventh-day Adventist college/seminary religion students in both North America and Croatia. The subjects in the first two experimental groups used in the development of the product were students enrolled in their first year at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. The final sample of thirty-three subjects consisted of fifteen students of religion from Adventisticki seminar Maruševec in Croatia, and eighteen religion majors enrolled in class OTST635 History of Ancient Israel at Andrews University. All subjects in this study had received some theological training but had not taken a class in Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel. Thus they represented the target population.

The development of the instructional product is discussed below.

1See appendix C for a description of these subjects.
The Empirical Product Development Methodology

Step 1. The Learners

Seventh-day Adventist college and graduate students in religion and theology were the target population for this study. This population is found both inside and outside North-America.

The final sample group consisted of students of religion from Adventisticki Seminar Marusevec in the Croat Conference (December 1994) (formerly part of the Yugoslavian Union before the 1991 war) and Andrews University students enrolled in class OTST635 History of Ancient Israel, taught during the winter quarter of 1994.

Step 2. The Topic

The development of the product began with the assessment of the need for an empirically developed SDA seminary curriculum for the study of issues in the history of ancient Israel. There is a wealth of excellent material available on biblical hermeneutics, history of ancient Israel and archaeology in literature, syllabi on biblical interpretation and archaeology textbooks, but no

1. See chapter 2, "Review of related Literature."
2. Davidson, "Principles of Biblical Interpretation."
3. J. A. Thompson, The Bible and Archaeology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); Mazar, Archaeology of the Land of the Bible 10,000-586 B.C.E.; Schoville, Biblical Archaeology in Focus.
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empirically developed curriculum has ever been available for college students on the issues in the history of ancient Israel. In 1993, lecturers of the Andrews Theological Seminary, Old Testament Department and Institute of Archaeology, saw a need for a curriculum that would address the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel in relation to archaeology. Thus, it was affirmed that this instructional product was needed because such a curriculum did not exist. The topic for this study was chosen and developed within the context of the researcher's religion/archaeology and education background, the review of the related literature, and personal experience.

Step 3. Behavioral Objectives

Twenty-three behavioral objectives were developed. Then, cognitive pre- and post-test items were formulated and criteria developed by which they would be evaluated. The criteria were established by the curriculum developer and included consideration of the amount of available time, the specific needs of the learners, and the appropriate importance of each objective.

In order to accomplish a cumulative effect in the process of learning, special attention was given to construct a sequence for the objectives. Moreover, behavioral objectives were chosen and constructed to

---

'See appendix A.'
facilitate modification in the cognitive and affective domains of learning. It was the intent to motivate a change in feelings and attitudes towards the Bible in general and history of ancient Israel in particular.

General mastery was established at 80/80; that is, at least 80 percent of the learners would need to demonstrate mastery of at least 80 percent of the criteria established for each of twenty-three objectives in the cognitive post-test. The list of behavioral objectives is found in the "Methodology" section, chapter 3.

Step 4. Pre- and Post-Test Questions

To measure mastery of the twenty-three behavioral objectives cognitive pre- and post-test questions on the ten lectures were prepared and administered. They were used to measure the degree of mastery on the pre-test and the modification produced by the instruction on the post-test. A variety of test items were prepared multiple-choice, short answer, true-or-false, fill-in-the blanks, and essay questions. These items were targeted to match the precise behaviors described in the objectives. Emphasis was also placed on a variety of cognitive educational objectives as described in Bloom's taxonomy in the cognitive domain (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis,

1For more details, see appendix A. Each behavioral objective has its own standard.
Step 5. Criteria for Evaluation

For each of the cognitive instrument items, precise criteria were identified that guided in the making of the instructional product and provided a specific evaluation guide as to how the subject was expected to respond for each question. The criteria were used to compare in an objective manner pre-test knowledge of the subjects and the post-test outcomes of the learning experience. It specified all applicable and testable details of the curriculum, and thus gave focus to the content. See appendix B for the criteria for each objective in this study.

Step 6. Lecture Outlines

The outline of each lesson was defined by the objectives, the cognitive pre-post-test items, and their criteria. At the beginning of each lesson, an outline was constructed in title format. Main headings corresponded to the main material of each test item, while the subheadings conformed to the criteria on which the learner was to be evaluated. The lesson outlines are found in the Instructor's Manual (appendix E).

Step 7. Item Tryout

At this point, the ten lectures, basically in outline form, were presented to a small sample of
representatives of the target population. The results on the cognitive pre-test are shown in Table 1. As expected, all three participants scored poorly because the content was new to them. Nonetheless, it appears that a few mean percentage scores of behavioral objectives were high (1, 10, and 18). The reason is because the answers subjects gave were very close to the criteria, and probably may be due to the guessing approach of the learners to multiple-choice questions.

The cognitive post-test scores were superior to pre-test scores. In Table 1, the last four lines in the table are: (1) the percentage of subjects who scored 80 percent or above on each objective; (2) the mean scores' percentage for the pre-test for each objective; (3) the mean scores' percentage for the post-test for each objective; and (4) the difference between mean pre- and post-test scores. The mean scores for the post-test ranged between 67 percent and 100 percent. All three participants scored at least 80 percent on twenty-two of the behavioral objectives. Nevertheless, more focused instruction was needed. This was also true for objective 11, which had post-test mean scores of 67 percent. However, overall scores indicated encouraging progress in presenting the instructional content. The differences in percentage from the means of pre- and post-test scores range from 0 to 100 percent.
**TABLE 1**

**COGNITIVE PRE-/POST-TEST SCORES OF THREE PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Objectives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum score</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum score 80%</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjects' Pre-/Post-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>10 10 0 0 0 5 15 0 0 0 5 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 5 0 5 20 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>10 0 15 20 10 15 15 20 10 10 50 20 20 30 10 5 5 10 35 40 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 10 15 20 0 0 0 5 0 5 10 30 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>10 15 15 15 15 20 10 0 30 45 30 20 30 10 5 5 10 40 50 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 0 0 0 12 0 0 0 10 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>10 10 10 10 15 20 10 10 30 50 23 20 30 10 5 5 10 35 40 45 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent reading of 80%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>66 66 100 100 66 100 100 66 100 33 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17 0 17 0 17 11 0 8 100 0 0 27 17 33 40 0 100 0 33 8 40 0 0 33 8 40 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>83 92 100 100 92 100 100 100 100 67 89 97 84 100 100 100 100 100 100 92 90 90 84 50 90 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td>66 92 83 100 75 89 100 92 67 89 70 67 87 60 100 0 100 67 84 50 90 84 50 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Pre-test scores; B = Post-test scores.
Step 8. Revision

Based on learner responses, the first modification process began. Objectivity was of crucial importance.

Verbal feedback combined with the results of the cognitive post-test led to important modification in the instructional product. Some parts of the second lesson in the Instructor's Manual were rewritten. The need for a simple outline at the beginning and a comprehensive summary at the end of each lesson became obvious. Two overhead transparencies (28 and 29) were added to lesson 9. After these modifications, the product was ready for the next tryout.

Step 9. Product Retesting

The second group of subjects in this product development consisted of five religion majors from Andrews University. The cognitive pre-test results of the five learners, as in the first tryout, indicated that they were not familiar with the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel (see table 2). Furthermore, the scores on all behavioral objectives were below 80 percent (the lowest was 0 percent, and the highest 67 percent).

On the cognitive post-test, mastery of at least 80 percent was achieved on all behavioral objectives by all students. The mean scores for the post-test ranged between 80 percent and 100 percent. The subjects increased their
TABLE 2

COGNITIVE PRE-/POST-TEST SCORES OF FIVE PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Pre-/Post-Test</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>1B</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>3A</th>
<th>3B</th>
<th>4A</th>
<th>4B</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 10 5 0 5 0 10 0 0 20 8 0 9 0 5 0 0 0 25 0</td>
<td>0 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 20 50 30 20 27 10 5 5 10 40 50 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>0 5 5 5 5 0 10 0 10 0 0 0 10 15 0 9 0 0 0 5 0 20 0</td>
<td>10 10 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 50 30 20 30 10 5 5 10 35 50 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 50 23 20 30 10 5 0 10 30 50 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>0 5 5 5 5 0 10 0 10 0 0 0 10 15 0 9 0 0 0 5 0 20 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>0 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 10 0 0 0 15 8 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 0</td>
<td>10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 45 30 20 24 10 5 5 10 40 45 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent reading of 90%

Mean Percent Pre-Test

Mean Percent Post-Test

Difference in Percent

A = Pre-test scores; B = Post-test scores.
scores from 33 percent to 100 percent respectively (see table 2).

However, some difficulties remained, which led to further modification of the instructional product.

Subjects' responses indicated that the title of the subject "History of ancient Israel" needed revision. Since the curriculum deals with biblical and archaeological issues in the history of ancient Israel, the product was renamed "Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel."

There were also some changes in lesson 3. For a better understanding of the historical-critical approach, "The New Literary Criticism" was moved from lesson 4 to lesson 3. Thus, lesson 3 dealt with critical literary methods, and lesson 4 only with archaeology. For a better understanding of this very complicated issue (the critical-literary method), the section that deals with a comparison between the historical-critical method and the historical-biblical method (in lesson 3) was supported with Bible verses.

Several overhead transparencies (7 and 8)\(^1\) were added to lesson 4 so that subjects could better understand the importance of archaeology in history. Thus, they were able to see some of the discoveries that have affected an understanding of the Bible, particularly in the Old Testament.

\(^1\)See appendix G.
Subjects' responses made clear the need for a better understanding of the relationship of archaeology and the Bible. Many came to the class with the view that archaeology "proves" the Bible. Extended attention was given to the relationship between archaeology and the Bible in lesson 5. By pointing out the usefulness of archaeology in biblical studies today, and clarifying the substantial limits of its contribution to the understanding of Scripture, erroneous expectations were modified.

For a better understanding of the suggested fifteenth-century Exodus and the pharaohs of the eighteenth dynasty, a chart of the "New Kingdom and the Exodus" was given to each subject.

These revisions took place after the second exposure of the developing curriculum, and were based on the feedback and the cognitive post-test results. The most comprehensive revision was done in the instruction itself. As indicated above, in many instances there was too much material on one objective and too little for another. Some material was either removed, relocated, or substituted. Because the results of the second tryout had been largely effective, it was thought a final tryout could be attempted with a larger sample with results that could be submitted to statistical analysis.
Step 10. Final Trial and Analysis

The final trial must be conducted with the final version of all materials, a sufficient number of learners to allow statistical analysis of results, and with the mastery of the learners at the 80/80 level.

For this final tryout, the final version of the Instructor's Manual, the Participant's Manual, the cognitive tests, and other related material were ready to be administered. From December 12-22, 1994, and in March 1995, two groups of subjects completed the ten hours of instruction utilizing the instructional product. The lectures were first presented at the Adventisticki seminar Maruševec and then at Andrews University. Both of the groups were instructed in their classrooms (the setting familiar to them). Both classrooms were equipped with blackboard and overhead projector. The learning materials were identical, although in different languages, and were presented and taught by the same instructor. The major difference in these two presentations was the time span of the instruction. The first group did one lesson per weekday. The second group was given the instruction in fifty-minute sessions over a period of ten weeks.

Cognitive Behavior

The cognitive pre-test was given to the participants at the beginning of each lesson in order to determine the degree of their mastery of the material to be
presented. The results are shown in table 3. The pre-test scores show that the subjects had, as in earlier trials, a relatively low knowledge of the topic. All of the participants were far short of the 80 percent mastery on all twenty-three objectives (with the exception of objective 1). The mean percentage of pre-test scores varied from 0 to 58 percent.

The cognitive post-test scores for the final group of thirty-three subjects demonstrate that all subjects did achieve mastery of 80 percent or above of the criteria on each of the twenty-three behavioral objectives. The mean percentage of the post-test ranges between 82 percent to 100 percent. The difference between the mean of the pre- and post-test scores ranges from 6 to 95 percent.

The results of each behavioral objective, are as follows.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 1 was 94 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 100 percent, an increase of 6 percent. The reason why the mean of the pre-test score is high on this objective is because the answers subjects gave were very close to the criteria. Nevertheless, post-test scores show that subjects were more precise to what criteria were supposed to be as the lecture was presented, and 100 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.
<p>| Session | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Maximum Score | 10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 50 30 20 30 10 5 5 10 40 50 50 |
| Minimum Score | 8 16 16 16 8 16 12 12 16 8 8 24 40 24 16 24 8 4 4 8 32 40 40 |
| Subjects' Pre-/Post-test | 1A | 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 18 0 5 0 5 0 25 0 |
| 2A | 10 10 0 0 10 5 0 5 0 0 0 0 25 7 0 21 0 5 0 5 10 20 0 |
| 3A | 10 10 0 10 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 0 25 15 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 30 0 |
| 4A | 10 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 30 0 20 24 0 0 0 0 0 20 0 |
| 5A | 10 20 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 0 30 45 30 20 27 10 0 5 10 40 35 50 |
| 6A | 0 10 0 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 0 15 0 6 0 5 0 5 0 30 0 |
| 7A | 10 20 20 10 15 15 15 15 20 10 10 30 40 30 20 30 5 5 0 10 35 45 50 |
| 8A | 0 10 0 0 10 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 20 15 15 0 12 5 5 0 0 40 0 |
| 9A | 0 10 20 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 0 30 40 30 0 30 10 5 5 10 40 40 50 |
| 10A | 0 0 0 0 10 15 0 0 10 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 7 0 0 0 0 5 0 20 0 |
| 11A | 10 20 15 20 10 20 15 15 20 10 10 30 40 30 20 30 10 0 5 10 40 40 50 |
| 12A | 10 0 0 10 0 10 0 0 0 10 0 10 0 0 0 15 7 20 0 0 5 0 0 30 0 |
| 13A | 10 20 20 20 10 10 15 15 20 10 10 30 50 30 20 30 10 5 5 10 40 50 45 |
| 14A | 10 10 0 0 10 5 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 15 0 5 0 5 0 10 0 0 |
| 15A | 10 20 20 20 10 20 15 0 20 10 10 30 50 30 20 30 10 5 5 10 40 45 50 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre/Post Test</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27A</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27B</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects' Pre-Post-test</td>
<td>Behavioral Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent reading of 80%

Mean Percent Pre-Test

Mean Percent Post-Test

Difference in Percent

A = Pre-test scores; B = Post-test scores.
The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 2 was 26 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 89 percent, an increase of 63 percent, and 82 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 3 was 0 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 92 percent, an increase of 92 percent, and 85 percent of the learners achieved at least 92 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 4 was 17 percent. This low score indicated that not many subjects were familiar with the history of biblical interpretation. The mean of the post-test score was 93 percent, an increase of 76 percent, and 91 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 5 was 55 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 96 percent, an increase of 41 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 6 was 23 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 82 percent, a difference of 59 percent, and 82 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 7 was 7 percent. The low score indicated that subjects were unfamiliar with the assumptions of the historical-critical approach regarding the history of ancient Israel. The mean
of the post-test score was 97 percent, a difference of 90 percent, and 85 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 8 was 2 percent. The mean of the post-test score was 97 percent, a difference of 95 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 9 was 12 percent. The mean post-test score was 95 percent, a difference of 83 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 10 was 58 percent. The reason why the mean of the pre-test score is high on this objective is because the answers subjects gave were very close to the criteria. Nevertheless, the mean post-test score was 97 percent, a difference of 39 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test. The higher post-test score indicated that subjects were more aware of what the criteria was as the lecture was presented.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 11 was 9 percent. Such a low score indicated that subjects were not familiar with the American School of Archaeology movement and its leadership. The mean post-test score was 93 percent, a difference of 84 percent, and 94 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.
The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 12 was 11 percent. The mean post-test score was 99 percent, a difference of 88 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 13 was 25 percent. This objective was examined by true and false questions. Thus, the pre-test score could have been the result of guessing. The mean post-test score was 92 percent, a difference of 67 percent, and 97 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 14 was 22 percent. This objective was examined by multiple-choice questions, thus this score may have come in part from guessing. The mean post-test score was 96 percent, a difference of 74 percent, and 85 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 15 was 30 percent. The mean post-test score was 94 percent, a difference of 64 percent, and 94 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 16 was 30 percent. This objective was examined by true or false questions. Thus this score also could have included some guessing. The mean post-test score was 92 percent, a difference of 62 percent, and 82 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.
The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 17 was 6 percent. This score indicated that subjects were not at all familiar with archaeological discoveries at Nuzi. The mean post-test score was 92 percent, a difference of 86 percent, and 85 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 18 was 55 percent. This objective was examined by multiple-choice questions, and a higher pre-test score may have been based in part on guessing. The mean post-test score was 88 percent, a difference of 33 percent, and 88 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 19 was 18 percent. The mean post-test score was 91 percent, a difference of 73 percent, and 91 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 20 was 21 percent. The mean post-test score was 100 percent, a difference of 79 percent, and 100 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 21 was 2 percent. The low score indicated that subjects were not acquainted with the theory of a thirteenth-century Exodus. The mean post-test score was 93 percent, a difference of 91 percent, and 82 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.
The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 22 was 39 percent. This objective was examined by multiple-choice and true-and-false questions. Thus the higher pre-test score could have been the result of guessing. The mean post-test score was 87 percent, a difference of 48 percent, and 85 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test.

The mean pre-test score on behavioral objective 23 was 0 percent. The reason for this low percentage was that subjects were not at all acquainted with various settlement theories. The mean post-test score was 95 percent, a difference of 95 percent, and 100 percent of the learners achieved at least 80 percent on the post-test. The high percentage in the post-test indicated that even though the information was new it was mastered.

Affective Behavior

In the learning process, positive affect is an important factor in which the instructor and the topic portray an important function. The topic and the instructor can initiate either positive or negative factors. There are several ways that a learner can be motivated to learn, such as passing or failing the course, feeling the need for more knowledge, learning because it is important for devotional purposes, self-affirmation and improved social standing, and simply for the joy of learning. The learning process that
takes place in a group of more than thirty people, it is hoped, would incorporate all these motivations.

It is assumed that the sample group of thirty-three was religiously motivated to learn more about the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel. The atmosphere of the classroom was calm, and the subjects seemed to enjoy the lectures. It was observed that the subjects were not excited about the discussion of the historical-critical method in lesson 3.

Old Testament textual criticism is regarded by most students as a very complicated subject. Some antipathy may go back to the study of the Hebrew language. If so, the dislike is only magnified when students are introduced to the historical-critical method. However, the topic, even though not attractive to many, is very important to a theology/religion major. In academic circles, conflict continues over the historicity of the Bible in general and of Israel in particular. These questions carry over into general society and congregational life. Nevertheless, when discussion moved more to archaeology and the three case studies, interest increased.

The presentations were formulated for college students with sentences that were concise. In working with experimental groups, it had been observed that the use of speech in the first person best retained the attention of
the learners. The positive results of a clear, simple pattern of instruction were also noted.

Besides these observations, an instrument for the evaluation of the modification of affect was used to evaluate a change of attitude towards the instructional content (see appendix D). The test was developed and introduced after much discussion with the expert in the empirical development of the curriculum. It was administered before session 2 and after session 10. The students were asked to respond to fifteen questions on a five-point Likert scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." The questions covered aspects of their feelings about disclosing what they learned, readiness to address further study of the subject by discussing it with the professor, by purchasing more books on the subject, and by personal spiritual experiences with God.

The difference between the pre- and post-test scores (see appendix D) was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance ($t_{12}=8.894$). The mean difference was 9.333 points higher on the post test than on the pre-test.

Therefore, it is an assumption of this study that the modification of affect contributed to the participants' cognitive mastery of the curriculum as shown on the cognitive post-test and probably made a contribution to
their desire to continue their further study of the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel.

Summary

The empirical development of a college curriculum entitled "Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel" required systematic development, testing, and revisions through the input of three groups of subjects. Post-test scores, written feedback, and verbal suggestions led to modification of the instructional product during the process of its development. The third group of thirty-three supplied the primary evidence of the effectiveness of this instructional product. Mastery of the twenty-three behavioral objectives was achieved at the pre-determined level of 80/80, while the positive modification of affect was also demonstrated. Mastery was measured through a cognitive instrument, and the modification of affect through an affective instrument. The results are shown in tables 1-4.

\[1^{\text{See appendices A and D.}}\]
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus of this study was the empirical development of a college curriculum called "Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel." This chapter summarizes the statement of the problem, review of literature, methodology, findings of the study, and offers recommendations and suggestions.

Statement of the Problem

An understanding and acceptance of Israel's history are crucial to a Christian view of history, including eternal morals and values. Israel's history is a foundation stone of Christian/Adventist philosophy. There is a vital need for a curriculum that provides reasonable answers to the most common criticisms and builds a solid base for a Christian/Adventist faith. With so many trends within the world of biblical scholarship and the number of reconstructions of the history of the ancient people of Israel that contradict the biblical record, there is a great need for the study of the people of ancient Israel.
Issues

During the past decade or so, numerous biblical scholars and archaeologists have addressed the question of the authenticity of the Old Testament in general and origins of early Israel in particular.1 Two extreme views exist regarding these issues.2 The first holds that the Hebrew text has been so carefully transmitted that there are no errors in it. The second maintains that the text of the Old Testament is so uncertain that it is impossible to recognize the original form of the Hebrew Scriptures.3 Holding neither position, Brotzman remarked:

It would be naive to dismiss any textual corruption out of hand. . . . But the Old Testament student must also realize that the Hebrew text has been transmitted with great care. Errors will be found in the study of the text, but they are not so numerous or so crucial that they destroy its basic credibility.4

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that we are no nearer to certainty than when critical study of the Pentateuch began.5 Jean Astruc was one of the pioneers who came up with the so-called source or documentary hypothesis. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn further developed Astruc's approach. Critics like Julius Wellhausen developed with the

---

1Dever, "Ceramics," 200.
2Brotzman, 17.
3Ibid.
4Ibid., 19.
5Whybray, 12.

For three centuries, liberal scholars regarded the Pentateuch books as myth based on fiction and the imagination of later writers. This group looked at the Bible as a volume of documents from the past to be studied by the same principles (analogy, correlation, and criticism) and in the same critical manner as any other ancient document. For some, the miraculous acts of God are fiction and his intervention in history as described in the Bible is not to be accepted literally.

Hasel pointed out that the uniqueness of the Scripture rests in the union of divine and human. He noted: "We believe that the historical-critical method is not an adequate method of Bible study for a person who accepts the Bible as the Word of God."}

Liberal scholars asserted that the books of the Old Testament have little historical value and the majority of its content was to be regarded as purely idealistic and unhistorical. The stories are merely poetic, based on tribal tradition, with very "little to offer the historian." Nevertheless, although critical scholars have

2 Ibid., 98.
3 Eisfeldt, "Genesis," 378.
followed the historical-critical method in the study of the biblical text, many have admitted that there is some historical information to be gleaned.\(^1\) Whybray admitted that even though "many of the patriarchal stories have the characteristics of the folktale, this alone is not sufficient to deny them all historical value."\(^2\)

Considering the history of ancient Israel, there is no clear consensus among scholars as to when it began. The differences of opinion are rooted in two main schools of thought.

One adopts the historical-critical method for the biblical text, but is subdivided into two groups. The first group believes in the critical analysis of the text, the second focuses more on the archaeological record rather than on the biblical text. The other main school of thought is known as the historical-literal school and views the Scripture as a divinely inspired document. Thus, they presuppose that the biblical record is accurate, and that with an analysis of the extra biblical literature and archaeological artifacts, Israel's history can be understood and accurately determined.

The authenticity of the theories of liberal scholars on the history of ancient Israel has been questioned not only by conservative scholars but by some liberal scholars.

\(^1\)Dentan, 570, 571.
\(^2\)Whybray, 142.
as well. Skinner stated, "Now in the opinion of an influential school of writers this period of history has been so illuminated by recent discoveries that it is no longer possible to doubt the essential historicity of the Patriarchal tradition."¹ Later he added that "the narratives preserve a true memory of the time before the occupation of Palestine, and in this way possess great historical value."²

The discoveries that Skinner referred to are attributed to archaeology. Background information that this discipline has produced during the last century and a half has been important for the interpretation of Scripture. Peoples, customs, history, geography, chronology, authorship, and the date of composition can be evaluated in the interpretation of the biblical text. However, archaeological evidence should be interpreted in ways that do not compromise the Scripture.

Due to archaeological evidence, some scholars are confident that the narratives do not reflect the circumstances of a later date, but rather they fit precisely into the age of which they speak.³ Therefore, there is confidence that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were historical

¹Skinner, xxvi.
²Ibid., xxix.
³Bright, History of Israel, 70.
characters,¹ and not representatives of certain groups as Eisfeldt suggested.²

Patriarchal narratives reflect accurately and authentically social customs of the late third and early second millennium B.C. rather than any later time.³ Furthermore, it is pointed out that "the availability of an alphabetic script for the earliest writing of the Old Testament books must not be undervalued."⁴ Mitchell suggested that Moses knew how to read and write not only his Hebrew language but also Egyptian hieroglyphics.⁵ It is also assumed that he knew Akkadian.⁶

Akkadian was the lingua franca throughout the ancient Near East during the so-called Amarna Age. Local officials in Syria and Palestine wrote to the Egyptian rulers in Akkadian during the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries BC.⁷

The time period in which the patriarchs lived could be diversely determined by examining biblical chronology. If one follows the LXX, Abraham lived in the Middle Bronze Age (1950-1550 B.C.). If one uses MT, Abraham lived in the EB IV Age (2250-1950 B.C.). In spite of the different

¹Ibid., 91.
²Eisfeldt, "Genesis," 378.
³Bright, A History, 79.
⁴Brotzman, 33.
⁵T. C. Mitchell, 31.
⁶Brotzman, 33.
⁷Ibid., 33.
opinions it can be concluded that even though patriarchal narratives are not "historical documents" in the modern sense, they are historically significant, and point to a specific time span.

The date of Exodus, as an event, has also been disputed by scholars. One group suggested that the Exodus took place in the thirteenth century; others proposed the fifteenth century. The actual foundation for the thirteenth-century Exodus was derived from the biblical text (Exod 1:11). The acceptance of the fifteenth-century theory was the result of conformity with biblical chronology and the uncertainty occasioned by the Israelite Stele.

Additionally, there are those who advocate that the Exodus did not take place at all because the biblical account is based on details unconfirmed in any historical/archaeological record. In addition, some have proposed that the Exodus took place, but not in the proportions the Bible suggests.

The issue of the settlement/conquest of Palestine has also been questioned by many. Basically, three main hypotheses or models divide the scholarly world.

One group of scholars bases its ideas on the work of A. Alt and M. Noth. They interpret the entry of Israel into Canaan as a peaceful infiltration of semi-nomad groups. Alt suggested that the tribal confederacy did not exist at the time when those who later became the Israelites entered
Palestine. According to this theory, the central hill country of Canaan, where the Bible says the Israelites settled, was almost empty at the time the Israelites entered Canaan. Thus, they could gradually infiltrate peaceably.

Other scholars follow G. E. Mendenhall, who saw the rise of Israel as indigenous peasants revolting against their ruling towns and their feudal aristocracy. Consequently, a social reorganization took place inside the land among the people of the Canaanite city-states. Thus, Israelites are associated with peasants, farmers, pastoralists, outlaws, mercenaries, and adventurers.

Yet others follow the biblical tradition of invasion and conquest, supported by W. F. Albright and his followers. These scholars propagate the total destruction of most Canaanite cities and their immediate occupation in corroboration of the biblical story of Joshua. They believe that the account of Josh 1-12 is correct in every sense. Thus, the Israelites took Canaanite cities by force in a swift campaign. They destroyed most of the cities in this new land and immediately occupied them. So God's promise was fulfilled and they inherited the land that was promised to them through their ancestors.

The peaceful infiltration model has weak foundations, based on archaeological excavations. The peasant revolt model lacks convincing evidence that the main constituency of Israel derived from former Canaanite
peasants who, by accepting Yahweh, overthrew their oppressors. Nevertheless, the conquest model must be reexamined as well. Was it really a swift campaign and was all the land acquired through military campaigns?

In spite of the archaeological discoveries, many places mentioned in connection with the Exodus and the conquest/settlement cannot be positively identified. "This is not of course to say that the events and persons referred to by Exodus, are not historical, only that we have no historical proof of them."¹ In regard to this, the observation of a dominant British scholar and archaeologist (Millard) "the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence," may be applied.² Whybray correctly concluded that "we are dealing entirely with hypotheses and not with facts. Proof either in the mathematical or in the logical meaning of that word, will never be attainable."³

Thus, it may be concluded that "were the narratives written or read as fiction, then God would turn from the Lord of history into a creature of the imagination, with the most disastrous results."⁴

The Bible is more than [a] source of Christian insight or a mere textbook of models of theology and behavior in an ancient sociocultural setting. . . . The Bible's

¹Durham, xxv.
²Millard, "Israelite and Aramean."
³Whybray, 26, 27.
⁴Sternberg, 32.
picture of humankind and its dilemma is not different from that of human beings in the modern world. The biblical diagnosis of the problems and its solutions remain true and vitally relevant today.¹

Summary of Methodology

In order to adequately meet the objectives of this study, the empirical development of an instructional product according to the method of Naden, derived from the seven steps of Baker and Schutz, was chosen. The first step was the identification of the learners. Then the topic was selected, followed by formulation of nonambiguous behavioral objectives. The development of pre- and post-test questions for every lecture followed, with the definition of criteria for evaluating items. Then I prepared the lecture outlines based on the established criteria. The product was exposed progressively to three groups of representatives of the target audience. First it was tested with a small sample of three from the target population. The product was then revised, based on input and experience. The product was tested with a larger group of five people from the target audience. The revision process followed, and at the end, there was a final trial and analysis with a group of thirty-three, a sufficient number to allow statistical analysis of the results.

¹Hasel, Biblical Interpretation Today, 111.
Summary of Findings

The participants in all the experimental groups (three, five, and thirty-three) lacked mastery of each of the twenty-three objectives on the cognitive pre-test.¹ Such would be expected because the students had had no class on this subject and the instruction that followed provided specific information about the issues concerning the history of ancient Israel. However, the instruction that followed the pre-test provided the subjects with the information identified in the behavioral objectives, the test items, and their criteria. The development of the Participants' Manual and the Instructor's Manual was based on the verbal and written feedback in the cognitive post-test.² This in turn led to significant modification of the instructional product. Some parts of the manuals were rewritten and learning aids were added, including several overhead transparencies. The cognitive tests were also revised.

Through ten systematic steps of empirical development, this instructional product brought cognitive modification for a group of thirty-three students. Mastery was achieved by students at Adventisticki Seminar Maruševec, and by Andrews University religion students during the regular class periods in the class of OTST635 History of

¹See tables 1, 2, 3.
²See tables 1, 2, 3.
Ancient Israel. The cognitive post-test scores show that the achievement of the subjects after the instruction scored 80 percent or more on each of the objectives.

An instrument for the evaluation of the modification of affect was also used to evaluate a change of attitude towards the instructional content. It is an assumption of this study that the modification of affect contributed to the participants' cognitive mastery of the curriculum as shown on the cognitive post-test and made a contribution to their desire to increase their knowledge in this topic.

The primary purpose of this study was to produce a comprehensive, pedagogical tool for teaching issues concerning the history of ancient Israel to Seventh-day Adventist seminary/college students in religion. This curriculum was designed to clarify some of the critical issues of the Old Testament and to create a favorable ground for the reception of the Bible into the Christian lives and practice of the students.

Recommendations

1. It is suggested that this empirically developed college curriculum called "Issues Concerning the History of ancient Israel" be made available for consideration by the

'See results in table 3.'
Old Testament teachers in colleges in North America and other English-speaking areas.

2. It is suggested that this empirically developed college curriculum be made available for consideration by the Old Testament teachers in non-speaking English areas.

3. It is recommended that more teaching aids, such as transparencies, maps, and drawings be used in archaeology class lectures.

4. It is recommended that this instructional product be considered for presentation in seminar format to SDA lay preachers in local churches.

5. It is recommended that when this curriculum is used in a general college/seminary setting, that more typical final examination style questions be developed to test mastery.

It is believed that the implementations of these recommendations could significantly contribute to

1. Better understanding of the Bible
2. Developing more confidence in the Word of God and the promises revealed in it
3. Improving understanding of the role of history in Christian faith
4. The understanding of different views on the history of ancient Israel.
Further Study

This study was primarily concerned with teaching a curriculum called "Issues Concerning the History of ancient Israel" to college students. However, a need for such a curriculum transcends these limitations. In academic circles today, debate continues over the issue of the history of ancient Israel and the authenticity of the Bible at large. Unhappily, the negative view seems to prevail. This carries over into both society in general and congregational life. It is particularly true in institutions of higher learning and in the media. Biblical faith is waning. Therefore, the following areas are suggested for further study:

1. A study that would expand the history of ancient Israel to the time of exile

2. A study that would give more time for class discussion of certain issues of the Bible

3. A separate study (of the hermeneutics) that would precede "Issues Concerning the History of ancient Israel," and that would help students to become aware of the problems being debated in the scholarly world

4. Research that establishes the relationship between affective behavior and cognitive achievement in SDA college religion classes in the interest of stemming the tide of large numbers that presently leave their faith in God and the Bible.
COGNITIVE INSTRUMENT

PRE- POST-TEST

LESSON I

Name: _______________________________ No. of points:_____/50
Date: ____________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS:

1) Define "history" in no more than 30 words? (10 points)

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

2) Give two reasons why biblical history is important to a Christian? (20 points)
a) ____________________________________________________________
b) ____________________________________________________________

3) When do you think Israelite history began? (10 points)

_________________________________________________________________
4) Fill in the blanks (10 points)

The whole problem of the history of Israel depends to a large degree on scholars' presuppositions about ____________________________

portrayed in the biblical text, and the value of ____________________________.
PRE- POST-TEST
LESSON II

Name: ___________________________ No. of points: ____/50

Date: ___________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS:

5) Name the locations of the first two schools of biblical interpretation in the 2nd-5th centuries, and describe in no more than 5 words which method of interpretation did each use? (20 points)

1) Method: ________________________________
   Interpretation: __________________________

2) Method: ________________________________
   Interpretation: __________________________

6) Which method of interpretation did Martin Luther develop in the context of "Sola Scriptura"? (10 points)

   _________________________________________

7) True or False (20 points)

   ___ The historical critical method did not begin before the time of the enlightenment.
   ___ Historical critics saw inconsistencies in the Pentateuch before the 18th century.
   ___ Some scholars saw Scripture as a compilation from several sources, which could be identified as: Old documentary, supplementary, and fragmentary.
   ___ The historical critical method raised doubts about Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch.
PRE- POST-TEST
LESSON III

Name: ___________________________ No. of points: ____/50

Date: ___________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS

8) Describe in no more than 40 words the assumption and goal of the Historical Critical Approach regarding the history of Israel? (15 points)

9) Name three out of four Critical Literary tools or methods of interpretation of the Pentateuch. (15 points)

10) Write in the space provided the letter that represents a source beside the correct century (20 points)

____ 8th century "P"
____ 7th century "J"
____ 9th century "D"
____ 5th century "E"
QUESTIONS:

11) In no more than 10 words define the term "archaeology"? (10 points)


12) Name the founder of the American School of Archaeology? (10 points)


13) Circle the one correct answer: (10 points)

Archaeology

a) cannot prove the Bible
b) is not related to biblical study
c) is not limited in its contribution to the Bible
d) can confirm the interpretation of biblical events

14) Fill in the blank spaces (20 points)

Without archaeology the significance of much of the

would be missed, so without the

much archaeological material would go unexplained.
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PRE- POST-TEST

LESSON V

Name: ______________________________ No. of points: ____/50

Date: ___________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS:

15) The Bible tells us much about political history, but archaeology provides us with details of

(5 points).

16) True or False (45 points)

____ The Bible is not an historical book

____ The Bible tells exactly why things happened

____ The Bible is a book that tells us only how we can be saved

____ archaeology is the study of ancient peoples

____ archaeology is a complete science

____ Biblical archaeology started with Edward Robinson

____ Albright's main goal was to prove the historicity of the Patriarchs, the Exodus and the Conquest.

____ archaeology cannot contribute much to the historical study of the Bible.

____ archaeology can supplement the Bible's record of history.
QUESTIONS:

17) Circle the correct answer: (30 points)

The Short chronology is based on

a) MT
b) LXX
c) Sumerian Pentateuch

The Long chronology is based on

a) MT
b) LXX
c) Sumerian Pentateuch

The Masoratic Text suggests the Israelites spent how many years in Egypt?

a) 215
b) 430
c) 400
d) 350

The LXX suggests the Israelites spent how many years in Egypt?

a) 215
b) 430
c) 400
d) 350

Fill in the blank: (20 points)

18) The verse that helps determine the time of the patriarchs is

__________________________.
PRE- POST-TEST
LESSON VII

Name: _____________________________ No. of points: _____/50

Date: __________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS:

19) True or False (30 points)

___ Scholars know exactly what caused the EB III urban destruction.

___ Abraham had direct contact with the cities of Sodom, Salem, Gerar and Hebron.

___ Sodom, Salem, Gerar and Hebron did not exist in EB IV/MB I age.

___ The Nuzi tablets date from the 15th century B.C.

___ According to the law of adoption recorded on the Nuzi tablets, the son-in-law as an adopted heir could marry a second wife.

___ The possession of household gods (teraphim) was legitimate proof of the ownership of property.

___ The exact location of ancient Sodom is known today.

___ Customs recorded on Nuzi and Mari tablets are similar to those practiced by the patriarchs.

___ The Mari tablets mention the name Benjamin.

___ Nuzi childless couples did not practice the adoption of a slave person.
Fill in the right answer: (10 points)

20) Describe in no more than 30 words the two laws found on the Nuzi tablets that correspond to the customs found in the Old Testament.

a) 

b) 

21) Circle the correct answer:

What was responsible for the destruction of strong centers in the Early Bronze III period? (5 points)

a) Egyptians  

b) Amorites  

c) Kurgan people  

d) Natural causes  

e) Scholars are not certain  

22) Explain in no more than 40 words why Abraham best fits in the Early Bronze IV/Middle Bronze I period? (5 points)
PRE- POST-TEST

LESSON VIII

Name: _____________________________  No. of points: _____/50

Date: _____________________________  1995

QUESTIONS:

23) Fill in the blanks: (10 points)

According to some theologians, the Israelites came out of Egypt in the

__________________________

century at the time of 19th dynasty; however others believe that this happened in the

__________________________

century at the time of 18th dynasty.

24) List two biblical points that theologians use to support the exodus during the time of the 19th dynasty. (20 points)

a) ______________________________________________________

b) ______________________________________________________

25) Which historical evidence is used to support the exodus during the time of the 19th dynasty? (5 points)

________________________________________________________________________

26) Describe three archaeological evidences that scholars use to support the exodus during the 19th (15 points)

a) ______________________________________________________

b) ______________________________________________________

c) ______________________________________________________
PRE- POST-TEST
LESSON IX

Name: _____________________________  No. of points:_____/50

Date: ___________________________1995

QUESTIONS:

27) Circle the correct answer:

According to the theory of a 15th century exodus, the pharaoh of the exodus (who died in the Red Sea) was (10 points)

a) Ramesses II  
b) Hatshepsut  
c) Thutmose III  
d) Amenhotep II

Thutmose III was the (10 points)

a) husband of Hatshepsut  
b) co-regent with Hatshepsut  
c) son of Hatshepsut  
d) father of Hatshepsut

28) True or False (30 points)

____ The kings of the 18th dynasty ruled during the 15th century.

____ The princess that adopted Moses, believed by most scholars to have been Nefertiti.

____ Amenhotep II probably killed the captive high officials from Palestine because of his father's death.

____ During his reign Thutmose III went to campaign in Palestine almost annually.

____ "Apiru" means "Hebrews."

____ The Amarna tablets report about cities in Palestine that were attacked.
PRE- POST-TEST
LESSON X

Name: ________________________________  No. of points: ____/50

Date: ________________________________ 1995

QUESTIONS:

Fill in the blanks (15 points)

29) Name three theories for the settlement of the Israelites in Palestine.
   a) _______________________________________________________
   b) _______________________________________________________
   c)  ___________________________________________________

30) In no more than 60 words describe each of the three theories: (15 points)
   1) ______________________________________________________
   2) ______________________________________________________
   3) ______________________________________________________

31) Alt supported the
   ________________________________ settlement theory. (5 points)

32) Mendenhall and Gottwald suggested that the Israelites who entered Palestine were actually (5 points)
   ______________________________________________________

33) Albright suggested the
   ________________________________ model for the settlement of the Israelites in the promised land. (10 points)
APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR COGNITIVE INSTRUMENT
CRITERIA FOR COGNITIVE INSTRUMENT

The following are the criteria for the tests in the cognitive domain.

SESSION 1

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 1

1) Variety of responses are expected. Example: History is an attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 2

2) God has revealed himself through history, or Jesus Christ entered human history, or Christianity is an historical religion, or Historical events are part of Christian religion, or Historical events prove the truth of Christian beliefs.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 3

3) Israelite history begins with Abraham, or if a person is a skeptic or unbeliever Period of Judges, or David and Solomon, or the so-called Deuteronomist (6th century), or Persian period.

4) The whole problem of the history of Israel depends to a large degree on scholars' presuppositions about supernatural intervention portrayed in the biblical text, and the value of extra biblical texts.

SESSION 2

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 4

5) Alexandria, Egypt - allegorical method Antioch, Syria - grammatical method

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 5

6) Grammatical-historical method
BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 6

7) F, T, T, T.

SESSION 3

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 7

8) The Historical-Critical approach assumes that the Bible does not provide an accurate view of Israel's early history; thus its goal has been to reconstruct early Israel's "true" history, using a variety of methodologies or "tools".

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 8

9) Source Criticism. or Form Criticism. or Tradition Criticism. or New Literary Criticism.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 9

10) E - 8th century
    D - 7th century,
    J - 9th century,
    P - 5th century.

SESSION 4

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 10

11) Study of the beginnings.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 11

12) William F. Albright

13) a

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 12

14) Without archaeology the significance of much of the Bible would be missed, so without the Bible much archaeological material would go unexplained.

SESSION 5

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 13

15) daily life
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SESSION 6

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 14

17) b, a, b, a.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 15

18) 1 Kings 6:1

SESSION 7

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 16


BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 17

20) Adoption law - Abraham wanted to adopt Eleazar as his legal heir. or
    Marriage laws - Sarah gave her maid to Abraham to get offspring. or
    Right of primogeniture - Esau sold his birthright to Jacob his brother. or
    Teraphim - Rachel stole her father's household gods.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 18

21) e.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 19

22) Because in that period the cities were destroyed and abandoned, and this situation provided easy travel for Abraham through Palestine. or
    There were only a few settlements, no walled cities. or
    Most of the population at that time lived a new lifestyle, a semi-nomadic life.

SESSION 8

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 20

23) 13th century B.C. and 15th century B.C.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 21

24) a) Easy access of Moses to pharaoh, the capital of Egypt must have been in the Delta.
b) Israelites built cities for the pharaoh called Pithom and Ra'amses.

25) Merneptah stele or Israelite stele.

26) Palestine went through noticeable changes at the end of the 13th century B.C. or New settlements are established on new locations. or Cultural changes. or Terraces. or Cisterns. or New pottery. or New system of architecture. or Ground silos.

SESSION 9

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 22

27) c, b.

28) T, F, T, T, F, T.

SESSION 10

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE 23

29) a) Peaceful infiltration theory 
b) Peasant revolution or revolt theory 
c) Conquest theory

30) 1) Peaceful infiltration - Israelites peacefully settled in the hill country of Palestine.  
2) Peasant revolt - Israelites were indigenous peasants who revolted against their overlords.  
3) Israelites came and conquered the promised land through military means as the Bible reveals.

31) Peaceful infiltration

32) Peasant revolt

33) Conquest
DIARY OF THE PROCESS

General Observations

Because the focus of this research is the development of an instructional product, not only results of the empirical process are important, but also personal perceptions related to this process. Therefore, these subjective factors, which influenced the development of the curriculum, are described in this appendix.

It was evident in the first lecture that the teacher's expectations were greater than the learners were able to produce in the designated time. Sometimes the teacher's standards for learning are too low, sometimes too high. It is not easy to find the right balance.

Expectations for lesson three also were too high. Some students had never heard of "Historical Criticism." By further simplifying this topic, students were able to get a much clearer picture of the whole problem concerning sources.

It was necessary to rearrange lesson three also, so subjects could better understand the material. A section from lesson four was moved to lesson three. Therefore, lesson three dealt only with the Historical Critical Method. Discovering students' attitudes to this question, I felt
somewhat disappointed because I had thought that I would be able to strike an even balance in expectancy and that I would be able to go through that material in 35 minutes without much problem. But it was not so with these students, many of whom were hearing the information for the first time. It must be admitted that this theme is a difficult one and sometimes controversial, and not always so exciting. Because of this, some students had a difficult time seeing it as an important issue. However, at the end of the lecture-series, one student apologized for his ignorance, and thanked me especially for the lessons on Historical Criticism.

Besides measuring cognitive behavior, it is consequential to detect the viewpoints of the students on how they feel. Do they find the content relevant, interesting and useful? Because of the complexity of human emotions, this task was not easy. Some modification of affect could be measured by an instrument which was administered before lesson two and after lesson ten. However, it appears that the instructor's feelings about the learning and accepting atmosphere in the class was also an important indicator.

When I came to the classroom for the first lesson at the Andrews University Theological Seminary, I did not feel overly welcome. I do not know why, but perhaps it had to do with my being a woman. However, some students were eager to
learn, regardless of who was lecturing. Because of differing cultural backgrounds, some students seemed to have a difficult time accepting a woman presenting lectures in the theological Seminary. Another difficulty for some were the pre-tests. Many religion majors seem to live with the attitude that they must know everything, and if they do not, it is a catastrophe. Then too, some came to the class with a traditional view of archaeology, believing that it would "prove the Bible." Some had spent an academic quarter in Israel and thought that because of their extensive travel they had learned what needs to be learned about archaeology. However, as we moved from one lesson to another their interest increased, and they learned to trust and respect me. When my teaching experience was over, and all the testing was done, two students apologized for their biased behavior. This experience taught me that the performance of both the instructor and the learners is improved when there is a positive attitude in the classroom.

October 10 - 31, 1994

An item tryout was attempted with three representatives of the target population. These students were my friends and we had nice time together. They attended my lectures regularly. They had no previous knowledge of the topic. However, they were all Religion majors. Because of that, they represented the target population. For every class period a blackboard and an
overhead projector were available. Following prayer, the class would begin with a cognitive pre-test. The lecture was presented and a post-test administered at the end.

Students were encouraged to ask questions on the subject studied. Their enthusiasm grew as we moved on to what they considered the interesting material—the case studies.

This was the first feedback from field work. The following points indicate the major problem areas identified.

1. Some of the lessons contained too much material.

2. A simple short outline at the beginning and a summary at the end of the lessons was needed.

My outlines were too long. This modification was especially necessary for lessons six and eight. In lesson six it is important to clearly and simply calculate the time of Abraham's life, according to MT and LXX. In lesson eight many kings are mentioned, thus different themes could easily be confused. It was necessary to simplify the relationships, and form a chart of who was married to whom.

Having modified the lessons, the next instructional product tryout could begin. A different group of students, drawn from the target population, were involved in the second tryout.
November 7 - 25, 1994

This group consisted of five Religion majors. None of them had any knowledge of archaeology prior to their coming to the Seminary, so this study was new to them. I also knew this group well and there was no need for the development of a relationship and it was easy for me to gain frank feedback.

On the cognitive post-test, mastery of all behavioral objectives at the 80% level was achieved by all the students. However, there was a particular difficulty that was considered and applied in the development of instructional product. It is not advisable to have these sessions right after lunch. Students were tired and some felt sleepy, and did not appreciate the afternoon sessions. This seems to be a negative factor in the learning process. The problem was corrected by moving the lectures to an earlier period. However, I met with the same problem when I tested the curriculum with a larger group in the class, OTST636 History of Israel. There is nothing I could do when the time had been assigned for that particular class by the Dean and students had to come at the assigned time.

Nevertheless, despite this difficulty, the students mastered the concepts presented. They were able to discuss the issues intelligently and make connections with previous understandings of the Issues Concerning the History of Israel. Enthusiasm seemed to be highest from lessons 4
through 10. The class discussion increased considerably during these lectures. All these insights helped in the preparation and presentation of the ten lectures.

With encouraging cognitive results, and affective feedback from this series of lectures, I felt ready to make the presentations to a larger group, thus acquiring the data for analysis from the target population.

December 12, 1994 - March 9, 1995

This group consisted of 15 students from an SDA college campus in Croatia and 18 students from Andrews University campus. The curriculum was presented and tested virtually identically on those two campuses with the exception of language. The first group were college-level students from Adventisticki Seminar of Croatia. The campus is situated ten miles from the city of Varaždin in Croatia.

The lectures for this group were presented at the Adventisticki Seminar of Croatia from December 12 - December 21 1994, one lecture per day. There were five female students and ten male students. The class was held at 11:30 a.m. The classroom where the lectures were presented was a familiar place to these students because this was their regular classroom where most of their classes were taught. An overhead projector was available.

I explained to the students the reason for the lectures as part of my doctoral dissertation and they seemed cooperative and willing to learn. All materials were
Eighteen students were part of the second testing session. These students were Religion majors, enrolled in the class OTST635 History of Israel, which was taught during the Winter quarter at Andrews University. (Twenty four were enrolled, but the results of only 18 were used—that is, only those students that attended all the classes and did all the tests.) This was a 12:30 p.m. class held in room 350 of the Seminary building. Although the subjects were given only one lesson a day (Tuesday - Thursday) this was not a good time for instruction because the students tended to be sleepy and tired. Most of them had already several classes before coming to this class. But the 12:30 class was the "usual" time assigned for this class, and because there were so many students in the class there was no opportunity to change the schedule. In addition, the class was held in the same classroom where all archaeology classes are taught. An overhead projector was available.

It must be pointed out that the students at Andrews University found it difficult to cope with such frequent testing. They felt like guinea-pigs. The hardest thing for these students was not being able to give the correct answers on the pre-test. They have not been exposed to such rigorous testing procedures. However, with a positive attitude and assurance that these results would not effect their final grade, they overcame this barrier. The scores
of the affective test showed that their attitude changed significantly.

The cognitive pre-test scores of the thirty-three participants indicated varying degrees of acquaintance with the learning material (table 5). But, according to the post-test results, all of the participants achieved mastery, at the level established, of all twenty-three behavioral objectives after they were exposed to the instruction. The criteria for the empirical development of the college/Seminary curriculum were satisfied.
APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT FOR MODIFICATION OF AFFECT
AFFECTIVE TEST

Name: ________________________  
Date: ________________________  

Circle the number that best describes your response to the following statements.

Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  Strongly Agree

1) I believe there is a controversy on the issues concerning ancient Israelites.  
   1  2  3  4  5

2) I would like to enquire more about certain issues in the history of Israel.  
   1  2  3  4  5

3) I believe archaeology is a very important discipline in the field of the history of Israel.  
   1  2  3  4  5

4) I would like to buy a book or two on the history of ancient Israel in the next year.  
   1  2  3  4  5

5) I would like to buy at least two books on biblical archaeology in the next two years.  
   1  2  3  4  5

6) I will probably check out a book or two on the history of Israel from the library during the next few months.  
   1  2  3  4  5

7) I will probably check out a book or two on archaeology from the library during the next few months.  
   1  2  3  4  5

8) I would like to speak some time with an archaeologist concerning the history of Israel.  
   1  2  3  4  5

9) I believe the Bible provides important information regarding the history of Israel.  
   1  2  3  4  5
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10) I believe that Israelite history started with Abraham.

11) I would like to discuss the time of Israelite Exodus from Egypt.

12) I believe that Israelites escaped from Egyptian bondage and conquered the promised land.

13) I would like to see how archaeologists conduct their excavations.

14) I would like to participate in an archaeological dig in Palestine.

15) I will commit myself to read the Bible regularly.
### TABLE 4

**AFFECTIVE PRE-/POST-TEST RESULTS OF THIRTY-THREE PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Difference D</th>
<th>Diff. Squared D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum D = 308 \quad \sum D^2 = 4038 \]
LESSON I

PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND
IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY

The Instructor welcomes students as they arrive and select their seats among the classroom desks arranged in rows. The students are already introduced to the project and acquainted with the instructor. The instructor prays and the first lesson begins. At the beginning of each following lesson students will pray.

Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 1) The learner will, in his or her own words, define the term “history,” using no more than thirty words; 2) The learner will, identify the importance of biblical history, with 80% accuracy; 3) The learner will identify the two problematical issues of biblical history, as presented in the lecture, with 80% accuracy.

Lesson Outline

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

A) What is history?

B) Why is history important to a Christian?

C) When did Israelite history begin?

D) Biblical and other ancient histories

E) Does it really matter?
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What Is History?

When we think of the term history or discuss it, what does it imply? Of what does it remind us? What exactly is history? In the most basic sense, history is the written record of actual events, or history refers to events that happened in the past. Furthermore, history could be that which is studied (the past) or the study itself of what people have done, said, and thought in the past.

History is defined as the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience. This means that historical evidence in the form of earlier documents and artifacts cannot become a source for the historian until he knows it. Thus, the historian's access to the past must always proceed through the instrumentality of some records. That is why scholars like William Hallo said that history began with the craft of writing.¹

The earliest invented writing was cuneiform script used by the Sumerians five thousand years ago. Knowledge of writing was mainly the skill of the scribal class. Rulers tended not to be literate, but scribes and priests were, and usually they kept records for royalty. Not surprisingly, writing was first developed for the purposes of taxation.

¹Hallo, "Biblical History," 10.
The function of the scribes was to compose literary documents that reflected how the rulers understood themselves and their role in society. Rulers were those who defined what political, social, and religious issues were to be considered important. Hallow's study of the Sumerians shows that "they (letters) constitute impressive evidence that, already in Sumerian-speaking times, the great political, military and cultic events of the court were chronicled as they happened."¹ He believed that man was interested in recording the past from the very beginning of literate societies.

That is why, in the first place, we can say that history is concerned with the past of mankind. But is everything that happened in the past recorded in history? When we think of biblical events, we know that the Israelites marched around the city of Jericho each day once for seven days, but do we have a record of what they discussed when they returned to the camp? No, we do not, even though we would like to have more details of the events that interest us. The reason why we do not have everything recorded, is because writers or recorders of history made distinctions between significant events such as great public affairs, wars and conquests, the rise and fall of nations, the deeds of kings and statesmen, and such like.

Therefore, history is concerned with things that were important to the writer, to kings, and to the people in the past. Totally detailed, recorded history would be too long to read or study. Even if people in the past did try to record everything, human life is so relatively short that we would have insufficient time to know everything. Thus, the understanding of history involves the interpretation of textual accounts, written toward a specific end, of selected developments.

The main source of the history of Israel is the Bible. Much of the material in the Bible is historiographical and believers have longed to interpret and understand its accounts.

Why Is History Important to a Christian?

There are many people today who do not like history. Usually they have a hard time with dates, or there are other reasons behind their dislike. But should we as Christians be interested in history? Why is history important to a Christian? One reason is that God has revealed himself to us through history. Another reason is that Jesus Christ entered human history.

Read Galatians 4:4
Christianity is an historical religion. Historian Herbert Butterfield explained Christianity thus because it presents us with religious doctrines which are at the same time historical events or historical interpretations, including the creation of this world, creation of man, Abraham's journeys, Joseph's life in Egypt, Exodus from Egypt, conquest of the promised land, exile, crucifixion, resurrection, etc.

What do all these events mean? Why is it important for a Christian to know that all this actually happened in history. Why is it important that the events recorded in the Bible are not some sort of a tale, or made up story?

Read 1 Corinthians 15:14; Romans 1:20.

God has revealed his power through history, his plan of salvation, his will for us humans, "so that men are without excuse," says apostle Paul. The Bible says that biblical history is recorded for a purpose. Furthermore, historical events prove to many Christians the truth of their beliefs. "Were the narratives written or read as fiction, then God would turn from the Lord of history into a creature of the imagination, with the most disastrous results," points out one scholar.

1 Butterfield, 3.
2 Sternberg, 32.
In spite of that fact, should we believe that they are true historical events that actually happened at some point in time in biblical history?

For several decades, many Christian theologians have used two different German words when they discuss history. We should be acquainted with them because we will meet them in religious literature. The two words are: Historie, which means study of past events with a view to discovering in an objective detached manner what actually happened; and Geschichte, which means the study of the past events in such a way that the discovery of what happened calls for decision on our part.¹

Still others make the distinction between different kinds of records, a chronicle, (a simple narrative) events in chronological order without any important statement, and a significant narrative, tells us not only what happened but lets us see why it happened.²

Let us come back to the two words Historie and Geschichte and see how an orthodox Christian views the history of ancient Israel with these terms in mind. Such a Christian believes that Israel was God's chosen nation for a special mission. The meaning of biblical events (its Geschichte) will be different from what it is to the person who does not believe in ancient Israel's history.

¹Peter, 174.
²Nash, 13.
When Did Israelite History Begin?

As we discuss Israelite history, when do you think it began? Would you say that Israelite history began when God chose a single family, Abraham's family, to make a nation. God told Abraham to take his family and leave Ur. God gave Abraham a son by the name of Isaac. Isaac had two sons. One was named Jacob, who in turn had 12 sons, and their families together were known as Israel.

There are many today, however, who disagree with the idea that Israelite history began with the patriarchs. John Seters states: "History is the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past."¹ Thus, he does not believe that real historiography developed until the so-called Deuteronomist in the sixth century BC. It was then that scribes started to record real history. What was thought to have come before the 6th century BC is considered only a made-up story.

Yet others like Miller and Hayes began to reconstruct Israel's history with the period of the Judges.² They said that nothing before that era is true history, only fabrications.

¹Van Seters, In Search of History, 1.
²Miller and Hayes.
Some go even further and say that Israelite history began with David and Solomon (Soggin, Whitelam). Yet others said it was just a reflection from the Persian and Hellenistic eras.\textsuperscript{1} Thus, these advocates (e.g. Thompson) would say that there is no biblical history before the Persian period. We must not forget the group that rejected all of the Old Testament, believing that it also is just a collection of tales. Hence, everything recorded in the Old Testament regarding the Israelites, they say is untrue and unhistorical.

Biblical History and Other Ancient Histories

Israelite historiography has some elements in common with other ancient historiographies (Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Hittite, and early Greek) in that it includes the intervention of supernatural powers in human affairs. Consequently, when something bad happened, Israel believed it was the result of their disobedience to God. Similarly in antiquity, when something happened to a nation or group of people, they believed it was the result of their god's anger with them. One scholar explains: "According to the religious conceptions of all ancient Near Easterners, the affairs of the world in general and people in particular were subject to the will and the actions of the gods."

\textsuperscript{1}Yamauchi, 26.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 3.
Another parallel is seen in Israel's perception of the world and the views of her neighbors. They emphasized the superiority of their God. Similarly, other nations thought also that their gods were superior to others. There are numerous examples in the Bible. We might just mention David and Goliath, or other battles that Israel fought with the Philistines, Assyrians etc., where these nations praised their gods as being greater than Yahweh.

Even though there are parallels between Israel and other ancient nations, there are also elements which differentiate them from their neighbors.¹

1. The concept of a monotheistic god is seen only among the Hebrews. They were the only nation that believed in one god, Yahweh. (Even though often they went astray and adopted their neighbors' gods, they knew that there is only one God, the Creator of heaven and earth.) Thus, Israel's religious distinctiveness, the divine revelation to patriarchs, the promise of the land, the revelation of God to Moses, is not seen in the surrounding world.

2. Their God was not the projection of anthropomorphic features often seen in pagan gods. The Bible informs us that they did not make images of their God. For example, their God was not like an Egyptian idol made in the form of a human body but with a bird head.

¹Yamauchi, 4.
3. No other people claimed to have a divinely ordained history and revealed covenant, which helped Jews to sustain hope in times of trouble. Even though their purpose in this world seemed the same as that of their neighbors, to conquer and subdue, it was not.

4. Biblical writers were not reluctant to criticize the leaders and kings of their people. While it was forbidden to openly write down the faults of the Egyptian kings, for they were gods, Israelites were different. Many times the faults of their kings were recorded in history and open for all to see. There was no attempt to hide someone's errors and wrongdoing.

5. The parts of the Bible that are historical are selective and based on a sacred perspective. (e.g. Ahab's role at the battle of Qarqar (853) is not noted in the biblical texts, but rather the wickedness of his queen Jezebel. Thus, the things recorded in the Bible are based on a different perspective, not for the glorification of a certain king, but for education.

Does It Really Matter?

As mentioned previously, in academic circles today there is a conflict raging over the historicity of the ancient Israelites. Why are there so many different beliefs about the history of Israel? Why do some people believe in the Bible as the true history? Why do others say there is nothing true before the period of Judges? Why do some start
with David and Solomon when they discuss the history of Israel? Furthermore, why do others start with the so-called Deuteronomist of the sixth century BC? Then there are those who say that there is nothing credible before the Persian period. Sad to say, there are those who even reject the whole Old Testament.

Van Seters, for example, believed that there was no source prior to the Deuteronomistic. W. W. Hallo also remarked:

"And we may have to conclude that when the biblical authors appropriated Bronze Age sources for early Israelite history, they did so intelligently, purposefully and selectively. The surviving traditions were sifted and weighed. Their reflexes in biblical literature are neither free creations de novo, nor uncritical imitations of everything available."\(^1\)

Then there are those who take history very seriously. As Mark Noll remarked:

"Christians . . . affirm that their very existence is defined by the meaning of purportedly historical events—an omnipotent deity who from nothing created the heavens and earth, the same God who called Abraham to be the father of many nations, who threw the Egyptian horse and rider into the sea in order to preserve his purpose among a chosen people, and who showed himself and his loving intentions for humanity supremely in becoming a person himself."\(^2\)

The whole problem of the history of Israel, says Edwin Yamauchi,\(^3\) depends, to a large degree, on scholars' presuppositions about the nature of the biblical texts, and

\(^1\)Hallo, "Biblical History," 8.
\(^2\)Noll, 392.
\(^3\)Yamauchi, 5.
the relative value of supplementary sources such as extrabiblical texts, inscriptions, and material evidences. Furthermore, the belief or disbelief in the supernatural, also affects certain aspects of biblical history. Even though we do not see any miracles happen today, do we discount the miraculous element in the Bible?

Thus we must ask ourselves: Is the Bible the inspired word of God, and did everything really happen the way it has been recorded? Do we interpret Israel's history by using the principle of "analogy?" According to this principle, it is assumed that the past is comparable to, and understood by, the present. Or, does the Bible need to be "scrutinized like other historiographical traditions of the ancient Near East?"¹

Alan Millard concluded:

"Comparing the Aramaic monuments with the records of Israel's history seems to indicate that both describe the same sort of politics and similar attitudes to events. . . . With those, and other, ancient texts available, it is, surely, unscientific and very subjective to treat the Hebrew records from the start as if they are totally different creations."²

Does extrabiblical data from other ancient peoples broaden our view of the Israelites and help us to understand better their life and history? Or do we think that this extrabiblical data (mostly archaeology) proves the Bible?

¹Hallo, "The Limits of Skepticism," 193.
²Millard, 275.
One biblical scholar had said "in biblical faith everything depends upon whether the central events actually occurred." Is he right when he indicated that it is important that there was an Exodus, that the nation of Israel was established at Mount Sinai, that it did obtain the land, that it did lose it subsequently?

To say that the Bible is theology but not history creates a false dichotomy, points out Philips V. Long. He continues that the Bible evinces an interest in all.

While it may be said that the validity of the Christian faith does not depend on the verification of certain historical events, nevertheless, they must be historical for Christian faith to be valid.

We cannot escape the debate. Its results appear in our daily newspapers, in books on the paperback rack in the stores, and in the curricula of our high schools and colleges. Its presence raises the question of the nature of responsible and valid interpretation that reflects accurately the contents of biblical texts and tells us what happened in the past.

Briefly review the main points

Summary

What Is History?

History, in the most basic sense, is the written record of actual events, or it could refer to events that happened in the past. It could be that which is studied (the past) or the study itself (the subject).

History is defined as the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience.

The main source of the history of Israel is the Bible. Much of the material in the Bible is historiographical and its interpretation has brought much controversy.

Why Is History Important to a Christian?

God has revealed himself to us through history. Jesus Christ entered human history. Christianity is an historical religion, and it presents us with religious doctrines which are at the same time historical events or historical interpretations.

When Did Israelite History Begin?

There are different view on the beginning of Israelite history. While some believe that it started with the patriarchs, there are those who insist that it started in the sixth century BC. Then there are those who say it started with the period of the Judges. Some say it started with David and Solomon. Furthermore, there are those who say it started from the Persian and Hellenistic eras. There are even those who deny the Old Testament as historical.

Biblical History and Other Ancient Histories

Parallels

Intervention of supernatural powers in human affairs. Another parallel is seen in Israel's view of the world and the views of her neighbors.

Differences

The concept of a monotheistic god is seen only among the Israelites. Their god was not the projection of anthropomorphic features that is often seen in pagan gods. No other people claimed to have divinely ordained history and a revealed covenant, which helped Jews to sustain hope.
in the time of trouble. Biblical writers were not reluctant to criticize the leaders and kings of their people. Certain historical parts of the Bible are based on sacred perspective.

Does It Really Matter?

We cannot escape the debate. Its results appear in our daily life. Sad to say the negative view of the Scripture is prevailing, and it is not only popular in closed circles. This view carries over into society in general and into our churches as well. It is particularly true in institutions of higher learning and the media. Biblical faith is waning.

The whole problem depends, to a large degree, on scholars' presuppositions about the nature of the biblical texts, and the relative value of supplementary sources such as extrabiblical texts, inscriptions, and material evidences.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON II

THE ROLE OF BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS AND
THE UNDERSTANDING OF ANCIENT ISRAEL'S HISTORY

Briefly review the main points from the lesson I.
Administer affective pre-test. Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 4) The learner will name the locations of the two schools that interpreted Scripture in the early Christian period, and describe in no more than five words the method of interpretation each used, with 80 percent accuracy; 5) The learner will identify the method of interpretation of Scripture used by Martin Luther in the context of his principle of "sola scriptura," with 80 percent accuracy; 6) The learner will identify a conceptual understanding of the "Historical Critical Method: and the three sources of the Pentateuch created before Wellhausen that were used to explain how the Pentateuch came into its present state, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

1) Pre-Reformation Period
   A) The School of Alexandria
   B) The School of Antioch

2) Reformation Period
   Martin Luther

3) Post-Reformation Period
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4) The Age of Enlightenment

5) What Led to Historical Critical Thinking?

6) Critical Thinking Before Wellhausen
   
   A) The Documentary Hypothesis
   B) The Supplementary Hypothesis
   C) The Fragmentary Hypothesis

Pre-Reformation Period
2nd-15th century

Even though the 19th century marks the beginning of historical criticism of the Bible, it was the 18th century and its philosophy that created an attitude for historical skepticism and the rejection of the supernatural. Prior to the 18th century, the Christian church had always taken at face value the claims of the Pentateuch to have been composed by the historic Moses of the fifteenth century BC.

However, even in the first century of the Christian era, there were those who questioned the genuineness and authority of the Scripture. You have probably heard of
Gnosticism,¹ Neoplatonism,² and many other teachings that questioned the Old Testament.

The pre-Reformation period marks the development of two major schools of biblical interpretation. One was found in Alexandria, Egypt, and the other in Antioch, Syria.

A) School at Alexandria

The school of Alexandria was influenced by Philo of Alexandria, a Jewish writer and contemporary of the apostle Paul. The early Christian fathers like Clemont of Alexandria, who was of pagan origin but converted to Christianity, and Origin, born at Alexandria of Christian parents, who also helped guide its teachings. Their teachings were influenced by Hellenistic strands of thought.

This school used radical application of the allegorical method of biblical interpretation, which claims that "all scripture has a spiritual meaning; not all has a literal meaning." Whenever Philo found difficulties in the biblical text, or if it made no sense to him, or seemed

¹Gnosticism: a religious and philosophical movement which was popular in the Greco-Roman world and found expression in many different sects and settings. Gnostic groups were characterized by their claim to possess secret knowledge "gnosis," about the nature of the universe and human existence. Hexham, 92.

²Neoplatonism: a religious and philosophical movement which emerged in Greco-Roman society as a blend of essentially Platonic, Pythagorean, Stoic and Aristotelian elements, its chief exponent was Plotinus. The philosophy had a strong mystical inclination and was easily adopted to the needs of Christian thinkers seeking to reconcile Christian and pagan thought. Hexham, 157.
unworthy of Scripture, he substituted the literal meaning for allegorical interpretation. The literal sense was the historical core which needed to be stripped away in order to arrive at the center, the hidden spiritual meaning.

The similarities of this thought can be seen in the parables of Jesus. Often Jesus told stories with an intent or meaning. Thus, according to the teaching of this school, Scripture had to be interpreted in an allegorical sense. To know the true meaning, the Scripture had to be interpreted allegorically. However, final authority on the meaning of the text was not the Bible itself, but the one who was the interpreter.

This kind of teaching led to the interpretation of the Bible in a way that based Christian faith largely on Greek philosophical systems. Therefore, the Bible was not its own interpreter. It could be understood only through church tradition and philosophy.

For example, according to this allegorical method of interpretation of the school of Alexandria, the writer of the Bible did not write or describe the events as they actually happened, but rather wanted the reader to see the spiritual message. This means that the events recorded in the Bible have little or no historical value.

B) The School of Antioch

This school was influence by the teachings of Theophilus of Antioch (late 2nd century); Theodore of
Mopsuestia (ca 350-428); Diodores of Tarsus (d. before 394); and John Chrysostom (ca 344-407). This school opposed the allegorical method of Alexandria. They were concerned with upholding the plain, literal-historical meaning of Scripture.

They believed that the events recorded in the Bible are historically accurate. Thus, in order to stress the literal meaning of the Bible, they greatly emphasized grammatical studies.

The Bible was written in different languages such as Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Biblical Greek. These languages require translation and interpretation. We meet different social customs, different civil, military, and political institutions; different economic and technological conditions, different patterns of thought from our modern ones. All of these aspects and many others demand hermeneutical study of the Scriptures.

This meant that the school of Antioch by emphasizing grammatical studies tried to understand what the human writers of Scripture intended to convey to their hearers or readers. Furthermore, they tried to grasp what God, the divine Author, intended to communicate through the words of Scripture.

The Antiochen perspective is summarized by Kaiser:

"God gave the prophets... a vision... of the future in which the recipient saw as intimate parts of one meaning the word for his own historical day with its needs (historia) and that word for the future. Both the
literal historical sense and the fulfillment were conceived as one piece. Both were intimate parts of one total whole work of God."

Unfortunately, the Antiochene hermeneutic was overshadowed by and finally officially eliminated in favor of the allegorical approach popularized by the Alexandrian school. It was not until the Reformation that things changed again.

Briefly review the main teachings of the school in Alexandria and the school in Antioch.

Reformation Period
15th century

Reformers such as Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and many of the Anabaptist radical reformers broke away from the medieval allegorical method, which started with the school of Alexandria. These also broke away from the church where tradition was more important and stood above the Bible itself. They abandoned the thought that the church has the right to interpret what the Bible actually means. According to the grammatical-historical method, it was important to know the date of the composition, the historical background, language, etc. in relation to the meaning of the text, and the meaning of the Bible as a whole. Martin Luther said on one occasion: "When I was a monk, I was an expert at allegorizing Scripture, but now my best skill is only to

1Kaiser, 29.
give the literal, simple sense of Scripture, from which
comes power, life, comfort and instruction."¹

Martin Luther

The reformers developed the grammatical-historical
(sometimes called historical-grammatical) method of
interpretation of the Bible based on Martin Luther's
principles of sola scriptura, which means "The Bible only."
His second principle was "Scripture is its own interpreter."
The third was his key phrase "what drives to Christ," was zu
Christo treibet. This principle led to the relegation of
some parts of Scripture as less important than others, i.e.: "canon within a canon."

According to Martin Luther, not every book of the
Bible carried the same value. The epistle of James he
called "letter of the straw," because James stresses
righteousness by works, deeds together with faith. Luther
employed the so-called Christological principle, which means
truly holy books preach and manifest Christ. It is true
that Luther went somewhat astray with his interpretation,
however, he did break away from the allegorical method of
the medieval church.

The biblical principles of interpretation recovered
by the Reformers led to a strong Protestant hermeneutic that
has carried on through post-Reformation times till today,

¹Luther, Table Talk 1540.
and is currently the approach utilized by conservative Evangelical scholarship.

**Post-Reformation Period**  
**16th-17th centuries**

In this period the grammatical-historical method continues. However, Protestant interpretation fossilized into a rigid Orthodoxy with emphasis upon the precise formulation of right doctrine in creeds. This in turn drew many to seek freedom from the stifling authoritarianism of the Church. Thus, in the 17th century we see a shift to individual spiritual life to which many turned. On the other hand, many left the church and embraced empiricism, deism, rationalism.

**The Age of Enlightenment**  
**(18th century)**

During this period doubt again rises. Many abandoned the grammatical-historical method. The Bible, they say, is not what it says it is, and they start seeing problems and inconsistencies within its passages. Thus, the historical-critical method became popular. The word "critical" or "criticism" is used here meaning "methodological doubt." The investigator is free to judge the truthfulness, adequacy, intelligibility, etc. of the Scriptures.
Briefly review the main points of interpretation of the Bible during the Reformation, Post-Reformation and the Age of Enlightenment Periods.

What led to the historical-critical method?

Even before the Age of Enlightenment some people started to question some passages from the Pentateuch.

**Andreas Rudolf Bodenstein (1480-1541)** He was a scholar of the Reformation period and a contemporary of Martin Luther. He raised the question of Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch.

**Benedict Spinoza** In 1670 he wrote a *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* and also raised doubts about Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch. He came to the conclusion that since Moses is referred to in the book of the Pentateuch in the third person, he could not have been the author, nor could he have recorded his own death.

Read Deuteronomy 34:5-12

However, Gleason L. Archer Jr. in his *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* comments:

This argument based on the use of the third person is very weak. Many well-known ancient authors, such as Xenophon and Julius Caesar, referred to themselves in their own historical narratives in the third person exclusively. As to the obituary notice in Deuteronomy 34, it does not even purport to have been written by Moses, and was undoubtedly added by Joshua or some other near contemporary. But this in no way renders doubtful
the Mosaic authorship of the rest of Deuteronomy which does claim to have been his composition.1

Jean Astruc (1684-1766) He studied medicine and was a professor in several French universities. He anonymously published a treatise on the book of Genesis, an event that marked the beginnings of Pentateuchal source criticism.

J. G. Eichorn (1752-1827) His work earned him the title "Father of Old Testament criticism." He believed that the Bible can be studied independently of ecclesiastical authority, religious dogmas, or church traditions.

Even before Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918), a strange genius and 19th century German scholar, came to the scene, years of critical debate regarding the Pentateuch had taken its effect on the religious world. The idea that the Old Testament should be studied by the same principles of careful scrutiny as those applied to secular writings was seen before the 19th century. The Reformation period was a time of revolt against church authority; the 19th century would bring a revolt against the Bible itself.

These critics thought they saw inconsistencies in the Pentateuch. Thus, they could not attribute Moses' account of his own death to Moses himself. The different divine names, like Yahweh and Elohim in the Pentateuch, seemed to point to two different authors or sources.

1 Archer, 81.
Read the story of flood and show how historical-criticism divides it into two sources. Source J is Genesis 6:5-8;7:1-5,7-10,12,16b,17b,22-23;8:2b-3a,6-12,13b,20-22. Source P is Genesis 6:9-22;7:6,11,13-16a,17a,18-21,24;8:1-2a,3b-5,13a,14-19.

This meant that the Pentateuch was not the work of one author, but many. Consequently these critics came up with three different hypotheses, as to what the Pentateuch is: the so-called old documentary hypothesis, the supplementary hypothesis and the fragmentary hypothesis.

Critical thinking before Wellhausen

A) The documentary hypothesis

The theory sees two different sources of the Pentateuch, two lengthy documents which were successively combined by a series of editors who did little but weave the sources together. This means that there were two different sources, which the editors combined or put together, creating the Pentateuch.

B) The supplementary hypothesis

This theory assumed that there was only one source that subsequent editors expanded down through the centuries, thus adding extra material either from other traditions or from the editor's imagination to fill in the details. This

'Driver, 14.
means that the Pentateuch grew from one source to a larger unit, something like a snowball that rolls down a hill.

C) The fragmentary hypothesis

According to this theory, the Pentateuch was composed of a large number of relatively short sources. These short stories were put together by an editor or editors to form the long narrative that constitutes our present Pentateuch. This means that the Pentateuch was not combined by two sources, as in the old documentary hypothesis, or that there was only one source that expanded as in supplementary hypothesis, but is a combination of many fragments. That is why it is called the fragmentary hypothesis.

SUMMARY

Briefly review the main points.

The Pre-Reformation Period

The pre-Reformation period marks the development of two major schools of biblical interpretation. One was found in Alexandria, Egypt, and the other in Antioch, Syria. The school of Alexandria used radical application of the allegorical method of biblical interpretation which claimed that "all scripture has a spiritual meaning, but not all has a literal meaning." This interpretation was based largely on the Greek philosophical system. The Bible was not its own interpreter. It could be understood only through church tradition and philosophy.

The school of Antioch opposed the allegorical method of the school of Alexandria. They were concerned to uphold the plain, literal-historical meaning of Scripture; thus they emphasized the grammatical method.
The Reformation Period

The Reformation period broke away from the church where tradition was more important. The Reformers abandoned the thought that the church has the right to interpret what the Bible actually means. Many used the grammatical-historical method.

The Post-Reformation Period

In this period the grammatical-historical method continues. However, Protestant interpretation fossilized into a rigid orthodoxy with emphasis upon the precise formulation of a right doctrine in creeds. This drew many to seek freedom from the church; furthermore, many abandoned their faith.

The Age of Enlightenment

During this period many abandoned the grammatical-historical method. The historical-critical method became popular.

Critical Thinking before Wellhausen

Some scholars saw Scripture as a compilation of several sources, which could be summed up as three different hypotheses: the documentary, supplementary and fragmentary.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON III

Continuation of lesson II

THE ROLE OF BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS AND
THE UNDERSTANDING OF ANCIENT ISRAEL'S HISTORY

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 7) The learner will describe in no more than forty words the assumption and goal of the historical-critical method regarding the history of ancient Israel, with 80 percent accuracy; 8) The learner will name three of the four critical literary methods of hypotheses that the liberal theologians use to interpret the Pentateuch; 9) The learner will identify Wellhausen's classical four sources or documents that scholars use to separate the five books of the Pentateuch, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

1) Assumptions of Historical Criticism
2) Critical Literary Methods
   a) Source Criticism
   b) Form Criticism
   c) Tradition Criticism
   d) New Literary Criticism
3) A Comparison Between Historical-Critical Method and
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Assumptions of Historical Criticism

As was pointed out, Historical criticism had its roots in the 19th century. However, its triumph was assured in the 19th century by the influential works of Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918). He was a German scholar who popularized an approach to the Historical-critical method known as source criticism.

The Historical-critical method looks at the Bible as a volume of documents from the past to be studied by the same principles as any other ancient document, namely: 1) the principle of correlation; 2) of analogy; and 3) of criticism.

What does the principle of correlation mean? It states that history is a closed system of cause and effect with no room for supernatural intervention. Events are so correlated and interrelated that a change in any given phenomenon necessitates a change also in its cause and effect. Historical explanations therefore rest on a chain of natural causes and effects. This is not to say that all historical critics deny the existence of God or the supernatural; but methodologically, Historical criticism has no room for the supernatural. Scholars using it are required to look for natural causes and effects.
What is the principle of analogy? It assumes that present experience is the criterion for evaluating the probability that events mentioned in Scripture actually occurred inasmuch as all events are in principle similar. In other words, the interpreter is to judge what happened in biblical times by what is happening today. If one does not see a given phenomenon happening now, in all probability it did not happen then. Since no special creation, no worldwide flood is occurring now, they most probably did not happen in the past. The same is true with miracles, resurrection from the dead, etc. These must be treated as non-historical.

What is the principle of criticism? The one that is most characteristic, and without which it cannot remain historical-criticism, is that of criticism. Everyone knows what the word criticism means. But when applied to Scripture, it refers to the autonomy of the investigator to interrogate and evaluate, to judge as to the truthfulness, adequacy, intelligibility, etc., of the specific declaration of the biblical text. Nothing is accepted at face value. Everything must be verified or corrected by reexamining the evidence.

What is the Historical-critical approach to the history of Israel? It assumes that the Bible does not provide an accurate view of Israel's history. Thus, biblical issues such as creation, the patriarchs, the
exodus, the conquest/settlement, the judges, are not historical. Historical-critical scholarship's goal has been to reconstruct early Israel's "true" history, using a variety of methodologies or "tools." These are: Source, Form, Tradition, and New Literary Criticism.

Review the main points

Critical Literary Methods

a) Source Criticism As pointed out before, Julius Wellhausen popularized the Historical-critical method known as source criticism. Source criticism attempts to reconstruct and analyze the hypothetical literary sources that underline the biblical text. The Pentateuch was not viewed as being written by Moses, as Scripture explicitly claims, but rather was seen as a composite of four later documents or sources which Wellhausen designated as: J (for Yahwist; Jahwist in German), E (for Elohist), D (for Deuteronomist) and P (for Priestly code). These components, in Wellhausen's view, were joined together and edited by R, the redactor.

Yahwist (J) was written in the Southern Kingdom of Judah about 880 BC, or 10/9th century BC,¹ the Elohist in

¹The Yahwist (J) (850) BC--Wellhausen; 960-930 BC--post-Wellhausen scholars), written anonymously in Judah during the reign of Solomon. This source traces Israel's history from its patriarchal beginnings to its preparation for entry into Canaan; narratives from prepatriarchal times were added at some point. It may have functioned as the national epic
the Northern Kingdom of Israel about 770 BC or 8th century BC\textsuperscript{1} and the Deuteronomist\textsuperscript{2} in the time of Josiah, 621 BC, or 7th century BC. The Priestly began in the time of the Babylonian exile and continued until the final redaction (compiling and editing) about 450 BC or mid-5th century BC.\textsuperscript{3} This hypothesis brought about a totally reconstructed picture of Israel's history.

What was the basis for these arguments? Scholars noticed the different divine names, variations in language and style, alleged contradictions and anachronisms, and

for the Davidic/Solomonic kingdom. "J" is the symbol for this document, primarily because of its almost exclusive use of "Yahweh." Hamilton, 14.

\textsuperscript{1}The Elohist (E) (850 BC), also written anonymously in northern Israel, shortly after the collapse of the united monarchy. It covers substantially the same period of Israel's history as J, but it starts with the patriarchs and not with creation. Because it prefers the name "Elohim" for God, it is styled the Elohist. As "J" may represent both "J/Yahweh" and "Judah," E may represent both "Elohim" and "Ephraim." Ibid., 14.

\textsuperscript{2}Deuteronomy (D), written at least by the Josianic reform (ca. 620 BC), but perhaps as old as E, and originally from northern Israel, as was E. It is confined obviously, as far as the Pentateuch is concerned, to Deuteronomy. Ibid., 14.

\textsuperscript{3}The Priestly Writer (P) 550-450 BC), heavily concerned with chronological, liturgical, and genealogical matters. Wellhausen's major innovation here was to shift the Priestly code from the earliest document to the latest document, written sometime after the Babylonian exile. Unlike J and E, establishing the basis of Israel's sacral institutions through their connection with history. Thus, the Creation story provides the reason for the Sabbath's institution (Gen.1), and the covenant with Abraham (Gen. 17) establishes the reason for circumcision. Today debate on P focuses on two issues: (1) Is it post-D (JEDP) or is it pre-D (JEPD)? (2) Is P a source or a redaction? Ibid., 14.
supposed doublets and repetitions in the Bible, mainly in the Old Testament.

All of these arguments have been analyzed by conservative scholars and found to be unconvincing. The sad thing is that in spite of the shaky ground this method stands on, it still has not been abandoned.

b) Form Criticism In the 1920s another approach to the historical-critical method was developed, called form criticism. (It comes from German word Formgeschichte, literally meaning "Form Criticism.") This critical approach was pioneered by Hermann Gunkel (1832-1932) in the Old Testament (and Rudolph Bultman in the New Testament). The method focussed on the pre-literary stage of oral traditions behind the written sources. The advocates of this method assumed that the biblical material came into existence in much the same way as conventional folk-literature of modern times.

Building upon the presuppositions of source criticism, form criticism assumed that the sociological forces of the community (in its life setting in German Zietz im leiben) shaped the form and content of the traditions, and that this material developed in a unilinear, evolutionary pattern from short and simple units to longer and more complex traditions.

In other words, the Yahwist gathered up earlier traditions in the time of David and Solomon. The history of
Israel before David is not truly history. When David became king of Israel, he needed to justify his taking the throne. He employed writers who during his time made up the stories of the past in order to justify the present and the future.

c) Tradition Criticism The name comes from a German word *Traditionsgeschichte*. The advocates of this method attempted to trace the pre-compositional history of traditions from stage to stage as passed down by word of mouth from generation to generation to the final written form. The underlying assumption in this approach is that each new generation interpretively reshaped the material. Thus, according to Martin Noth, the traditions were first combined into a *Grundlage* (basic/primitive form called "G"), during the time of the formation of the state, that is, during the period of the Judges. This form was used by later "historians" J, E, D and P in constructing their histories.

In other words, ideas were born among the people and were later written down. The earliest beliefs or ideas were: first, guidance out of Egypt; second, guidance into the promised land. These two attracted other stories, and so we have the Pentateuch.

For example: the story of Jacob's dream at Bethel (Genesis 28:10-17) was originally a legend explaining the existence of a sanctuary (Bethel, "house of El"). Thus, the Israelites took this legend from the Canaanites.
d) New Literary Criticism

This approach focused on the final form of the biblical text as a literary work of art. According to the New Literary Criticism, one should appreciate the Bible as literature in its own right. The Bible storytellers were masters of the craft. Stories of Joseph, Ruth, even when translated, are still incredible. One should try to understand how the author or editor understood and arranged his material. Try to discover a theme that unites the whole Pentateuch.

When one examines a short story, according to this hypothesis, a central concern should be: the use of dialogue, technique, key words, exact repetition and repetition with variations, the use of parallels and the fondness for a group of three. All these are seen as signs of the skill of one sophisticated author.

Hence it is not worth discussing who wrote and when it was written, but rather what the message of the book is about.

However, even though this looks appealing, one should be cautious with the New Literary Criticism. According to this method, the literary productions of the Bible were usually divorced from history and are to be regarded as works of fiction or myth.
A Comparison Between Historical-Critical Method and Historical-Biblical Method

Historical-critical scholarship uses the principles and procedures of secular historical science in order to evaluate the truthfulness of the history of Israel. However, the Historical-biblical method uses Martin Luther's method of sola scriptura. Thus, the Bible is the final norm with regard to content and method of interpretation.

Read Isaiah 8:20

According to historical-critical scholarship, the human investigator has full right to evaluate and criticize the biblical text regarding the history of Israel. However, according to the Historical-biblical method, the Bible is not amenable to the principle of criticism. It is accepted at face value.

Read Isaiah 66:2

Historical-critical method uses analogy, thus present experience is the criterion for evaluating the probability of biblical events to have occurred, since all

'Davidson, Principles of Biblical Interpretation.'
events are in principle similar. Historical-biblical method discards the theory of analogy to allow for the unique activity of God as described in the Scriptures.

Read 2 Peter 1:19-21

Historical-critical method also uses the principle of correlation, a system of cause and effect, with no room for the supernatural intervention of God in history. Historical-biblical method does not believe in the principle of correlation, but accepts and believes in divine intervention in history as described in the Bible.

Read Hebrew 1:1-2

Historical criticism sees disunity in the Bible, because of many different human authors. Hence there cannot be any comparison within the Scriptures. Historical-biblical method believes that many authors were employed, but they were superintended by one. Therefore, Scripture can be compared with Scripture to arrive at biblical doctrine.

Read Luke 24:27; 1 Corinthians 2:13
Historical criticism believes that Scripture was "time-conditioned." Thus, historical context is responsible for the production of Scripture. Historical-biblical method teaches that God spoke through prophets to a specific culture, but that same message transcends cultural backgrounds as timeless truth.

Read John 10:35

Historical criticism separates human and divine elements of Scripture. According to this theory, the Bible contains but does not equal the Word of God. The Historical-biblical method believes that human and divine elements cannot be separated. The Bible equals the Word of God.

Read 2 Timothy 3:16,17

Historical criticism accepts source criticism in order to understand the process of literary development. Thus, sources are a product of the life setting of the community which produced them. However, the Historical-biblical method accepts those units of Scripture that are presented as such, and accepts at face value the statements of Scripture regarding its origin.
Historical criticism assumes that the biblical material has an oral, prehistory-like conventional folk-literature and that it arose on the basis of traditions. The Historical-biblical method accepts at face value the life setting for each form as indicated by the biblical data.

Criticism and Reaction to the Historical-Critical Method

The current opinion on the Historical-critical method reveals that it is involved in a crisis of substantial proportions. Gerhard Hasel in his Biblical Interpretation Today pointed out the dissatisfaction with this method of scholars who are Historical-critics as well as scholars that are not.

The objections are: 1) The Historical-critical method is "secular and profane and so will destroy faith by shaking the old traditions, the landmarks of faith."1 2) Faith and the Historical-critical method have differing means of determining reality. Thus, acceptance of Historical criticism leads the Christian into intellectual dualism and forces him to live in two contradictory worlds. 3) Historicist assumptions claiming a closed continuum of cause and effect without the interference of transcendence do not measure up to the claim of Scripture that "God does his work of grace and judgment not outside man and so, too, 

1Hasel, Biblical Interpretation, 81.
not beyond history, but in and through it." 4) Some scholars demand that history must be allowed the possibility of divine action. 5) The historicist assumption that miracles are impossible is another problem. In principle the possibility of miracles is allowed.

Critical scholars themselves have called Historical criticism "bankrupt," described it as stuck in a "dead-end road," and pronounced its "end." Many scholars of leading stature agree that the presuppositions and understandings of the method as practiced today are in need of change (for example, Pannenberg, Moltmann, Stuhlmacher, Hahn, Grasser, Krentz and others).

Conservative scholars feel that the Historical critical method is inadequate for a person that accepts the Bible as the Word of God. The presuppositions that determine the procedures of the Historical-critical method are grounded in norms and assumptions that are not biblical, they are antibiblical.

SUMMARY

Briefly review the main points

Assumptions of Historical Criticism

'Ibid., 82.'
The Historical critical method looks at the Bible as a volume of documents from the past to be studied by the same principles as any other ancient document, namely: 1) the principle of correlation; 2) of analogy; and 3) of criticism.

The principle of correlation states that history is a closed system of cause and effect with no room for supernatural intervention. The principle of analogy assumes that present experience is the criterion for evaluating the probability that events mentioned in the Scriptures actually occurred, inasmuch as all events are in principle similar. The principle of criticism means that nothing in Scripture is accepted at face value. Everything must be verified and corrected by reexamining the evidence.

**Critical Literary Methods**

Some of the critical literary methods are: Source criticism, Form criticism, Tradition Criticism and New Literary Criticism.

Source criticism contends out that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, but rather was a composition of documents J, E, D, and P. J document comes from the 9th century BC, E from the 8th century BC, D from the 7th century BC, and P document from the 5th century BC. Form criticism assumes that sociological forces of the community shaped the form and content of the traditions, and that this material developed from short and simple units to longer and more complex traditions. Tradition criticism assumes that ideas were born among the people and were later written down, the first idea being guidance out of Egypt and the second, guidance into the promised land. New literary criticism focuses on the final form of the biblical text as a literary work of art. Even though they recognize and appreciate literature in its own right, they do not see it as historically valid, but regard it as works of fiction or myth.

**A Comparison Between Historical-Critical Method and Historical-Biblical Method**

One uses the principles and procedures of secular historical science; the other, sola scriptura. One sees the need of human investigators to evaluate and criticize the biblical text, the other accepts the Bible at face value. One group uses the principle of analogy. The other allows for the unique activity of God. The one uses the principle of correlation; the other believes in divine intervention in history as described in the Bible. One group sees disunity in the Bible; the other allows for comparison within the Scripture. One group believes in "time-conditioned" for the production of the Scripture; the other believes God spoke
through prophets, but the message transcends cultural backgrounds as timeless truth. One group separates human and divine elements, while the other believes that human and divine elements cannot be separated.

**Criticism and Reactions to the Historical-Critical method**

Current opinion is that the Historical critical method is in a crisis of substantial proportions. There is much dissatisfaction within the supporters as well as from its opponents. Some critical scholars have called Historical criticism "bankrupt," as stuck in a "dead-end road," and pronounced its "end."

**Administer-cognitive post-test.**
LESSON IV

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE UNDERSTANDING OF ANCIENT ISRAEL'S HISTORY

Briefly review the main points from the lesson III. 
Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 10) The learner will, as presented in class lecture, define the word archaeology, in no more than ten words, with 80 percent accuracy; 11) The learner will name the founder of the American School of Archaeology, with 80 percent accuracy; 12) The learner will identify the relationship between archaeology and the Bible, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

Non-biblical Method of Interpretation of Israelite History

1) Archaeology

A) Meaning of the term archaeology

B) The Tell and the Ruin

C) Excavation Methods

D) The Finds

2) Geographical setting of Palestine

3) Archaeology and history
4) Problems in archaeological research

Non-biblical Method of Interpretation of Israelite History

1) Archaeology

In all ages and countries, man has been fascinated by his past. Today many people argue that it is only by studying the past that we can properly understand the present and, perhaps, learn from the errors and achievements of our ancestors. A knowledge of the past is vital, too, to the self-respect of nations.

The origins of archaeology go back more than 2,500 years. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon (556-539 BC), excavated the temple of Shamath at Nippur to try to find out who built it. Nabonidus's daughter collected local antiquities and displayed them in the world's first known museum, in the city of Ur, located near the Euphrates. Interest in the past was common to all ancient societies.

A) Meaning of the word archaeology

The latin word archaeologia means "ancient history of extinct peoples." In Greek ἀρχαία (arche) means "beginning," and λόγος (logos) means "word" or "study."

In modern usage, despite occasional confusion, archaeology properly designates the study of the material remains of an ancient civilization, as opposed to written sources, even if the latter have been provided by "archaeological" excavations. Archaeology, therefore, is...
limited to the material, but it studies the material, from
the great classical monuments to the locations of
prehistoric fireplaces, from art works to small everyday
utensils, to the most primitive remains of any industry, in
short, everything that exhibits a trace of the presence or
activity of man. Archaeology not only seeks, describes, and
classifies these materials, it also attempts to explain
them. It compares them with each other and with the remains
of neighboring civilizations.

Nevertheless, archaeology can be used for other ends
than those which are appropriate to it. One can ask of it
more than it is able to give, and what it gives can be
wrongly interpreted. This issue will be discussed later.

B) The Tell and the Ruin

The prerequisites of an ancient settlement were
sufficient land, water, communication routes, and a
defendable position. A combination of these features was
found only in limited areas of Palestine, mainly close to
perennial fountains and rivers. Once a site was chosen, it
was obviously also suited to the needs of later generations,
and the subsequent occupations in the same place created the
artificial mound known as a tell.

Use overhead transparency 1. A Tell (Appendix G)
This phenomenon is fundamental to the archaeology of the Near East. Most of the pre-Hellenistic towns in Palestine are to be found in such tells. They vary in size from 7-20 acres, the smallest known being half an acre, while the largest is 200 acres. Many tells were settled over a period of between one and two thousand years. Their accumulated debris may include more than twenty layers of ruined cities, each forming an archaeological stratum.

In addition to tells, there are thousands of other sites of varying types. Many can be defined as "ruins," inhabited during only one or a few periods.

C) Excavation Methods

Two opposing approaches to field methodology have developed in Palestine since 1948. The traditional method of Near Eastern archaeology was based on wide-scale exposure of complete architectural units. Stratigraphy was analyzed mainly on the basis of the relation between different architectural components, such as walls and floor levels. Assemblages of pottery and other finds on floors of structures represented the last phase of occupation in their situ.

The second approach was introduced by K. M. Kenyon at Jericho. The technique she developed is known as the "Wheeler-Kenyon method." Her method has been adopted by many since and has become standard procedure in this country also.
A grid of 5 x 5 m is the framework for the excavation, balks (unexcavated ground which is left between the squares) form sections of the earth layers, examination of these levels during excavation enables more precise stratigraphic observation.

However, in the current excavations as much as possible of the area of the site is exposed with the intention of uncovering complete architectural units and studying their layout. Cross-examination of the occupational history is achieved by excavating at several different points.

D) The Finds

The variety of finds from settlement sites include architectural remains and burials which contain large quantities of pottery, metal objects, and stone objects, as well as inscriptions, artworks of various kinds (seals, pottery and metal figurines, jewelry, ivory works, etc.), animal bones, and plant remains. All these finds comprise the raw material for reconstructing cultural changes. Their study, processing, and integration into a comprehensive picture is comparable to constructing a huge jigsaw puzzle. Thus, cooperation of specialists in various types of finds is essential.
Broken pottery is the most abundant find in excavations and the best tool for analyzing chronological, regional, and ethnic changes, as well as foreign relations.

2) Geographical setting of Palestine

In spite of its small size, Palestine comprises extremes in topography, landscape, and environmental conditions. Lengthwise it is about 410 km (256 miles), but only half of this territory is suitable for permanent settlement. The width from the Mediterranean Sea to the Jordan River is about 80 km (25 miles).
desert to the east. This unique situation was a basic factor in Palestine's history and cultural development.

As a bridge between the centers of civilization in Egypt and Mesopotamia, Palestine was influenced by both these powers. It was also a pawn in the continuing struggle for control of the Near East between the great powers and their hostile designs upon each other.

3) Archaeology and history

Archaeology is often said to be the handmaiden of history. But the relationship between the two branches of study is not simply that of master and servant.

History depends on the availability of written records. Those are usually incomplete and may well be biased or inaccurate. Archaeology, on the other hand, can reveal much that would ordinarily be left out of written accounts, especially the details of everyday life. It helps, therefore, to round out our view of the past, to make it more balanced.

Further, history deals only with the past of literate societies, a tiny portion of man's story. The written records of ancient peoples tell us much about them, as well as their neighbors who might have not been literate and were their contemporaries. But most of what we know
about the ancient past comes from archaeology. Thus, archaeology is often our only source of information about the thousands of years of prehistory.

Archaeology involves more than just digging among the ruins of the ages. It involves analyzing everything that remains from the past, with the aim of reconstructing it as fully as possible. The cooperation of different disciplines is needed in the field of archaeology in order to reach the right conclusions. Thus, scientists, botanists, zoologists, physicians, anthropologists, computer experts, artists, ariel photographers and many other professionals work hand in hand with archaeologists.

However, it is the study of ordinary things that an archaeologist finds on a dig that help us to reconstruct the past, even though extraordinary finds astonish and fascinate us. For many, these discoveries are an ultimate attraction to the field of archaeology: the golden treasures of Tutankhamen, the vastness of the pyramids, the 4000-year old--exercise books of Sumerian schoolboys.

Before the 17th century, not much was known regarding the ancient world because there was no one who was able to decipher ancient languages. Discoveries of the written records however, unlocked the closed doors of ancient civilizations.

One of the most important finds by the French scholars who accompanied Napoleon during his invasion of
Egypt, was the Rosetta Stone, whose decipherment was the breakthrough in understanding the hieroglyphic system of ancient Egyptians. The decree was written in three scripts—two forms of Egyptian and one of Greek. Jean-Francois Champollion (1790-1832) a French Egyptologist helped produce the first complete decipherment and translation of the Rosetta stone a key that unlocked the mysteries of Egyptian hieroglyphs.

Another important discovery is attributed to a British army officer and archaeologist, Sir Henry Rawlinson (1810-1895). On high cliffs near Behistun (western Iran), Rawlinson copied a lengthy inscription in three ancient languages. It dated from the time of Darius I, ruler of Persia from 521 to 486 BC. The inscription included an account of Darius's victory over rebels against his authority and other events in his life. It was written in Old Persian, Babylonian and Elamite. Rawlinson was the first to translate the Old Persian text. Then he worked on the Babylonian inscription. By the 1850s many scholars were reading Babylonian.

Archaeological research in the Near East during the past one hundred years has completely reshaped our understanding of those countries mentioned in the Bible with
which an ancient Israelite had contact. We now have
knowledge of the peoples who inhabited these lands, of their
writings and languages, their literature and art, their
institutions, history, and religion; and this knowledge will
increase. We know the cities they built, their houses and
workshops, their furniture and tools. In short, we are now
able to reconstruct the human milieu, both intellectual and
spiritual, in which the Bible was composed and was first
heard and read. This flow of new information has produced a
revolution that affects every branch of biblical studies.
Textual criticism and exegesis must take into account those
languages which were not known or understood a century ago,
as well as those manuscripts which have been discovered in
recent years in the region of the Dead Sea. Literary
criticism must compare the genres of the Bible with those of
the literatures once believed lost; Historical criticism
must confront the biblical data with the texts and monuments
that the excavations have uncovered.

The discoveries affecting the Bible and particularly
the Old Testament were: the Moabite Stone discovered in
1868 mentioning Mesha, the Moabite king, also named in the
Bible. The Dead Sea Scrolls (1947) are famous because of
their close connection with the literature and history of
the Old Testament. Then there are: the clay prism of
Sennacherib, which mentions the Judean king Hezekiah;
the Black Obelisk of Shalmanezer portraying Jehu, the Jewish king, bowing before him; the Babylonian Chronicle, providing the basis for dating the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 587 BC; the Cyrus Cylinder, showing the Persian monarch's policy of assisting nations like the Jews to return and rebuild their cities and temples.

This is just to mention a few.¹

4) Problems in archaeological research

Archaeology in Palestine in the past, and to a large extent even today, has been motivated by interest in the Bible. Many of the archaeologists working in the country had a background in biblical research and thus tended to interpret the archaeological finds from historical and biblical viewpoints.

During the 1930s, Albright and his followers, (Albright was considered the father of biblical archaeology) looked upon archaeology as a valuable tool capable of supporting the true biblical history of the Israelites, mainly the patriarchs. These scholars emphasized archaeology and tended to see biblical narratives as more reliable than literary critics.

In that frame of mind, it was tempting to connect

¹McRoy, 24.
the finds with the Bible and claim that archaeology confirms or proves it. Thus, mistakes were made and differences of opinion were evident. An example would be Jericho. Kenyon did not date Jericho to Joshua's time.

Because it seemed that archaeology did not confirm the biblical account, a new school known as the "German school" opposed Albright and his "American school." This group emphasized literary criticism and looked upon archaeology as an unreliable guide in Israelite history.

By the 1970s biblical archaeologists had modified their views on archaeology and the Bible. They concluded that what the Bible records is "sacred history," and it provides a religious interpretation of history. Furthermore, archaeology can assist us only in establishing the facts that have been so interpreted.

Dever also acknowledged the role archaeology should play in today's scholarship. He stated: "Yet because the Bible is not history in the modern critical or scientific sense, archaeology is limited in the contribution it can make. Archaeology may clarify the historical context of events described in biblical history, but it cannot confirm the interpretation of these events by the biblical writers, much less the modern theological inferences to be drawn from them."

Because there is much disagreement among archaeologists concerning the study material, the character of an object, its value as evidence, its relationship to the archaeological material, its purpose, and date, its relationship to the Bible etc., there is a tendency among scholars to discredit the whole enterprise of relating archaeology to biblical study.

The goal of many was to free archaeology from the Bible and make it a more professional, secular enterprise. However, this new independence of archaeology from the Bible is also in flux. Many feel that historians should seek a closer coordination of archaeological and literary studies despite the difficulties and dangers that attend such an attempt.

In summary, without the light which archaeology sheds, the significance of much of the Bible would be missed; so without the Bible, much archaeological material would go unexplained.

**SUMMARY**

Briefly review the main points of the lesson IV.

**Non-biblical Method of Interpretation of Israelite History**

1) Archaeology
In all ages and all countries, man has been fascinated by his past. Today many think that only by studying the past can we properly understand the present and perhaps learn from the errors and achievements of our ancestors. Interest in the past was common to all ancient societies as well.

A) Meaning of the word archaeology

A Latin word archaeologia, means "ancient history of extinct peoples." In the Greek language, arche means "beginning," and logos, "word" or "study." In the modern sense the word designates the study of the material remains of an ancient civilization as opposed to written sources, even if the latter have been provided by "archaeological" excavations.

B) The Tell and the Ruin

An artificial mound, which was settled over a period of time, and the accumulated debris may include more than twenty layers of ruined cities, each forming an archaeological stratum. A ruin is a site that had been inhabited only during one or a few periods.

C) Excavation Methods

The traditional method of Near Eastern archaeology was based on wide-scale exposure of complete architectural units. The second approach was introduced by K. M. Kenyon at Jericho and is known as "Wheeler-Kenyon method." A grid of 5x5 m is the framework for the excavation; balks left between the squares form sections of the earth layers, and examination of these levels during excavation enables more precise stratigraphic observations.

D) The Finds

The variety of finds from settlement sites includes architectural remains and burials that contain large quantities of pottery, metal objects, and stone objects, as well as inscriptions, art work of various kinds (seals, pottery and metal figurines, jewelry, ivory works, etc.), animal bones, and plant remains.

2) Geographical setting of Palestine

In spite of its small size, Palestine comprises extremes in topography, landscape, and environmental conditions. Lengthwise it is about 410 km (256 miles), but
only half of this territory is suitable for permanent settlement. The width from the Mediterranean Sea to the Jordan River, is about 80 km (25 miles). The geographical location of the country determined its important role in the history of the ancient Near East.

3) Archaeology and history

Archaeology is often said to be the handmaiden of history. While history depends on the availability of written records, archaeology, on the other hand, can reveal much that would ordinarily be left out of written accounts, especially the details of everyday life.

Albright is considered the father of biblical archaeology. He considered archaeology as a valuable tool capable of supporting the true biblical history of the Israelites, mainly the patriarchs.

4) Problems in Archaeological Research

Many were tempted to say that archaeology proves the Bible. Because there is much disagreement among archaeologists concerning the study material, the character of an object, its value as evidence, its relationship to the archaeological material, its purpose and date its relationship to the Bible, there is tendency among scholars to discredit the whole enterprise of relating archaeology to biblical study. There was a trend to separate the discipline of archaeology from the Bible. However, without the light which archaeology sheds, the significance of much of the Bible would be missed. Without the Bible, much archaeological material would go unexplained.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON V

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLE

Briefly review the main points from the lesson IV. Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon this behavioral objective: 13) The learner will describe in no more than thirty words the contributions of archaeology in every day life and will identify what the Bible and archaeology are, and what they are not, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

A) Current Approaches to the Bible

B) Purpose of Archaeology

C) Relationship Between Archaeology and the Bible
   a) What is the Bible?
   b) How is archaeology related to the Bible?
   c) How should archaeology be viewed in relation to the Bible?

D) Development of Biblical Archaeology

Current Approaches to the Bible

For centuries people were divided into two groups: those who were believing scholars and the secular biblical
critics. Today Scripture is not so simple a topic as used to be believed. Some scholars divide biblical scholarship into three groups: the confessionalists (the Bible is a map in which one part illuminates the whole); negative fundamentalists (those who date the whole by its latest elements); the Pyrrhonists (those who deny the possibility of acquiring knowledge from the past; they are literary critics).

There are those who divide biblical scholarship into four groups: the orthodox, the archaeological, the traditio-historical (OT traditions were preserved first orally and later written down through a process of redactors or editors, not authors), and the socio-economic (Israel originated in the land of Canaan).

If you read Norman L. Geisler's book Decide for Yourself How History Views the Bible, you would meet six different groups of biblical scholarship: modern orthodox, liberal, fundamental, neoorthodox, liberal, evangelical, and neoevangelical. These divisions indicate that biblical scholarship has not reached a consensus where issues of the Bible are discussed.

**Purpose of Archaeology**

When archaeology was a young discipline, much work in the Middle East was legitimately motivated by a desire for a fuller understanding and exposition of the Bible. In that context, Edward Robinson wrote at the end of his second
pioneering survey of Palestine in 1852: "The one great object of all my investigations has been the historical topography of that country in its relations especially to the Holy Scripture."¹

It is not surprising that people thought that the goal of archaeology was to prove the Bible. That is why many times the work of an archaeologist has been misunderstood. Even today for many people in our skeptical age, archaeology does and should prove the Bible. If it does not, it is not worth an investment.

Some people feel more secure and comfortable in their beliefs if a wall, a city, or a manuscript can be produced to suggest that, after all, the Bible just may be true. But we have to ask ourselves, does the Bible need proof? Is the Bible only an historical book that needs to be confirmed? Does the Bible always explain causes for the action, human or divine?

Relationship Between Archaeology and the Bible

a) What is the Bible?

For a Christian today, the Bible is not merely an account of man's past and the reality of his present. It is also the way through which and in which God reveals Himself and His will. Through the Bible, we see that history is a series of moments given by God. Sustained by the Eternal
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Creator, it has a beginning and a purpose throughout its course. It is the presence of history that makes possible the coming of the kingdom of God. The Bible views history in two ways: as a record of the past and a medium of revelation. This sets the Bible apart uniquely from other religious writings. It is not merely or mainly moral, spiritual, and ritual teachings, but the story of a people to whom, it confesses, God revealed himself.

Read Luke 2:1-7

These words from the Gospel of Luke are not merely the objective account of history that most people take them to be. They are also a profound confession of faith. The Eternal God makes himself known through history, in ordinary times and places; for example in Bethlehem, when Quirinius was governor of Syria.

The Bible explains the origin of sin. It explains the plan of salvation.

Read 2 Timothy 3:16

It gives directions on how to be saved. It is a redemptive book, a communication from God to mankind of every age. It is the word of God that points to Him who stands above all
human description. It gives hope. Thus, the Bible is first a theological book.

The biblical writers were not concerned only with the question: "What happened?" but with a larger question, "What does it mean?" For them the Bible was the true account of how God acted to save His people. But does this mean that the historical events are not true, that they never happened, even though the Bible in some of its parts makes fairly unmistakable historical truth claims? In the so-called historical books of the Old Testament, as well as in the Gospels and the book of Acts in the New Testament, we read about historical events. Could not the Bible be one giant parable and still teach us truth about God?

There are many today who feel that "the historicity of the events described in the Bible is irrelevant; indeed, the idea that either the meaning of the Bible or its truth depends on its historical accuracy is probably the silliest manifestation of historical criticism."¹

When thinking of the Exodus of Israelites and the establishment of the Israelite nation at Mount Sinai, G. E. Wright, pointed out that "In biblical faith everything depends upon whether the central events actually occurred."² Furthermore, faith does not require that the factuality of the biblical events be proven. On the other hand, should it

¹Cooper, 65-66.
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be shown that the historical events did not happen, not only would the veracity of the Bible be seriously undermined, but the fall of historicity would inevitably bring down Christian faith with it. Furthermore, "Were the narratives written or read as fiction, then God would turn from the Lord of history into a creature of the imagination, with the most disastrous results."

For us today also, the Bible is the truth in every sense of the word. Thus, all the historical events in it really happened. The Bible contains an account of particular peoples and occurrences at particular places in time. But these are recorded only to illustrate God's actions and their consequences for people then and now.

The unnatural things were the result of God's intervention in the human race. Often today, it is hard for us to understand these things, because they do not happen in our modern world. However, just because God does not intervene in humanity the same way he did in the past, does not mean that, for example, waters could not stop flowing, or bushes could not burn without burning up.

The Bible tells us much about political history, but very little about social and economic history. It is almost always couched in personal terms. We do not find out from the Bible how people dressed in ancient times, how they
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looked, what they ate three times a day, what their houses were like, what they slept on. We do not know much about what went on in the streets and market places. How they planted their crops? How they traded? How they entertained themselves. We do not know much about the diseases they died of, or the cures, and much more.

b) How is archaeology related to the Bible?

Archaeology gives answers to the above questions. It provides us with the details of everyday life. The Bible portrays public life and spiritual aspects of life, while archaeology fills in knowledge of everyday existence and culture. Both aspects are essential if we are to understand fully the life of the ancient Israelites.

Archaeology also has helped in understanding difficult passages of the Bible. For example, it has revealed parallel texts, (Ugaritic texts helped us understand the customs of the patriarchs). But archaeology does not stand above the Bible, it is not a guide to the Bible; it cannot prove the Bible.

c) How should archaeology be viewed in relation to the Bible?

Archaeology is a discipline with artifactual data. The Bible is a book containing textual data. These two disciplines may be called parallel inasmuch as they rarely converge, despite our expectations. This is because not all the data that was left from long ago has survived. Thus,
what has been buried in the rubble of a tell, cannot all be retrieved. Money is the first problem, then time. But even if we had all the money and time in the world, and even if we found a record that Abraham came from Ur and left for the promised land, can we prove that God spoke to him? We cannot.

The goals of archaeology and the Bible are not similar. Archaeology can only try to reconstruct the past lifestyle of long ago. It cannot obtain the meaning of the Bible. The Scriptures as the inspired revelation of God to man meet man's deepest needs, today as in the past.

Thus, the positive contributions of archaeology are all historical, not theological. First, archaeology has restored the Bible to its original setting by recovering the forgotten peoples, places, and cultures of the Ancient Near East. It has opened to us the long-lost world in which Israel originated and her life and literature took form and meaning. The Bible is no longer looked upon as one of the relics of antiquity, something made up, without credibility. Even though archaeology cannot prove that God spoke to Abraham or Moses, it has demolished the notion that the Bible is pure mythology. The Bible is about real, flesh-and-blood people, in a particular time and place.

Furthermore, the discoveries of archaeology through centuries have brought back to life Israel's neighboring ancient Near Eastern cultures. This has given us a context
in which we can study Israel comparatively and thereby appreciate more fully both her similarities to other peoples and her distinctive differences.

Due to multidisciplinary archaeology (many disciplines work together in better understanding of the excavated data) we understand not only the isolated events in ancient Israel, but the larger context in which they took place (the environmental setting, topography, climate, land and water resources, settlement patterns, etc.).

Even though archaeology cannot prove the Bible, it can clarify the historical circumstances of numerous individual texts and the events they describe. It can reveal material culture, the common everyday life of the average Israelite. If it can "prove" the truth of the Bible, where is the need of faith?

Finally, we can say that archaeology can help answer such questions as: What probably took place? When did it occur? Who were the principal participants? How did it happen? But this is as far as archaeology can go. It usually cannot answer the question, Why?

The great value of archaeology lies in its ability to place our biblical faith in its historical setting and to demonstrate clearly the cultural setting in which biblical events took place. As someone has said, "The value of
biblical archaeology is in its ability to locate the faith in the realities of ancient history."¹

Review the main points

Development of the Biblical Archaeology

Biblical archaeology began with Edward Robinson,² who is considered the founder of modern Palestinology. The actual fieldwork in Palestine began later with a British scholar, Sir William Flinders Petrie. It was then that Americans organized many societies for the illustration and defense of the Bible. However, it is William Foxwell Albright³ who is known as father of biblical archaeology.

¹McRoy, 26.

²Robinson was an American Biblical scholar and seminary professor, who during topographical research on journeys in 1838 and again in 1851 rediscovered more than two hundred long-lost Biblical sites, even before the birth of modern archaeology, by utilizing Arabic place-names. Robinson laid the groundwork for all modern historical geography and archaeology and, furthermore, permanently fixed the attention of the American scholarly and lay public on the potential of scientific exploration in the Holy Land for illuminating problems of biblical interpretation.

³He was the child of American missionary parents. He became the most distinguished Orientalist this century has ever produced. His bibliography lists over twelve hundred items. Having mastered Assyriology, Egyptiology, and ancient Near Eastern history, he moved on to Northwest Semitic philology and Palestinian archaeology, where he was soon the acknowledged master. For a generation he dominated American Old Testament studies, first as director of the famed American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem (now named for him) in the 1920s and 1930s, then until 1958 as professor at Johns Hopkins University, where he turned out
He was the one who deserves credit for the establishment of biblical archaeology as a respectable academic discipline. He reacted against the then prevailing extremes of nineteenth-century European literary criticism, better known as Historical criticism.

Much of what was written at that time by Albright and his followers was for the confirmation of the Bible. Albright's goal was to prove the existence of the patriarchs, the biblical Exodus and conquest. Thus, Wright, one of the leading American Palestinian archaeologists wrote: "in Biblical faith everything depends upon whether the central events actually occurred."

By the 1950s and into the 1960s biblical archaeology almost completely dominated the American archaeology of Palestine. However, even in the early 1960s its power started to fade in Europe. It was not until the 1970s that American liberal scholars widely reacted against Albright and his school. The most obvious objection to biblical archaeology arose from its failure to solve the basic historical problems to which it had set itself under Albright's leadership. These were: the historicity of the patriarchs, Moses, and the conquest of the Israelites.

When asked about the relationship of archaeology and the Bible, David Noel Freedman remarked: "The combination of the Bible and archaeology is somewhat artificial; the two more than fifty PhDs.
have not really matched up very well. The biblical scholar deals with one kind of material and the archaeologist with another. On rare but important occasions, there is significant contact, and both disciplines gain from the exchange of data and ideas. Often, however, there is no point of contact and nothing significant happens. Archaeology has not proved decisive or even greatly helpful in answering the questions most often asked and has failed to prove the historicity of biblical persons and events, especially in the early periods."

It is evident that Freedman is too negative in his comments because he feels that archaeology was not capable of "answering the questions most often asked," and second that archaeology did not "prove the historicity of biblical persons and events." However, scholars feel that the biggest mistake was made because the wrong questions were asked. It should never have been supposed that the purpose of archaeology was to "prove" the Bible in any sense. Thus, it was not archaeology that failed, but rather biblical scholars who misunderstood and misapplied archaeology.

Today many feel that biblical archaeology should not be one discipline, but two. Consequently, the two disciplines that come out of the above would be biblical studies and archaeology. Hence archaeology needs to be called Syro-Palestinian archaeology and become an
independent discipline with its own approach and individual contribution to make.

But can archaeology separate itself totally from the biblical text? Many feel that it cannot. There should be closer coordination of archaeological and literary studies.

Archaeology has much to contribute to the historical study of the Bible. "Archaeology helps to keep vital biblical scholarship as a whole. When all is said and done, few tasks in the study of the Bible can match it in excitement and importance, for it is the source of ever new data to increase our ability to read the Bible with understanding and appreciation."1

So what can archaeology contribute to the task of historical reconstruction? It can supplement, but should not be allowed to supplant, the Bible. It can suggest the plausibility, or otherwise, of specific events, but it can seldom prove or disprove them.

**SUMMARY**

Briefly review the main points of the lesson V.

**Current approaches to the Bible**

For centuries people were divided into two groups: those who were believing scholars and the secular biblical critics. However, Scripture is not as simple a topic as it
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used to be believed. Scholars divide into many different groups, depending on their viewpoint of the Bible.

**Purpose of Archaeology**

When archaeology was a young discipline, many thought that its purpose was to prove the Bible. It must be understood today, that the Bible does not need to be proven. The purpose of archaeology is not to prove the Bible.

**Relationship Between Archaeology and the Bible**

a) **What is the Bible?**

The Bible is not merely an account of man's past and the reality of his present. God revealed himself through His Word. The Bible has a purpose. Through biblical history one sees a revelation. The Bible explains the origin of sin, and it gives a plan of salvation. It is a redemptive book. It is the word of God. Biblical, historical accounts are true history.

b) **How is archaeology related to the Bible?**

Archaeology provides us with the details of everyday life. Archaeology also help in the understanding of difficult passages of the Bible. But archaeology does not stand above the Bible, and it cannot prove the Bible.

c) **How should archaeology be viewed in relation to the Bible?**

Archaeology is a discipline with artificial data; the Bible is a book and thus contains textual data. The two disciplines rarely converge. The goals of the two are not similar. Archaeology can never obtain the meaning the Bible has. Thus, its positive contributions are all historical, not theological. Archaeology had demolished the notion that the Bible is pure mythology. Today we can see that the Bible is about real, flesh-and-blood people, in a particular time and place. The discoveries of archaeology have brought back to life Israel's neighboring ancient Near Eastern cultures. The great value of archaeology is its ability to place our biblical faith in its historical setting, and to demonstrate clearly the cultural setting in which biblical events took place.
Development of Biblical Archaeology

Biblical archaeology began with Edward Robinson. The actual field work began with William Flinders Petrie. William F. Albright is known as the father of biblical archaeology. He established biblical archaeology as a respectable academic discipline. He reacted against the then prevailing extremes of nineteenth-century European literary criticism, better known as historical criticism. Albright's goal was to prove the historicity of the Pentateuch, that the biblical Exodus really happened and the Israelites conquered the promised land as the Bible states in the book of Joshua. By the 1970s liberal scholars widely reacted against Albright and his school. Today some feel that biblical archaeology should not be one discipline but two. However, many feel that these two disciplines cannot be separated. There should be closer coordination of archaeological and literary studies. Archaeology has much to contribute to the historical study of the Bible. Therefore archaeology can supplement, but should not be allowed to supplant the Bible. It can suggest the plausibility, or otherwise, of specific events, but it can seldom prove or disprove them.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON VI

CASE STUDY I

APPLICATION OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

THE PATRIARCHAL PERIOD

Briefly review the main points from the lesson V.
Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 14) The learner will identify the time of the Patriarchal period, as presented in class, with 80 percent accuracy; 15) The learner will name a verse in the Bible that helps in calculating the time of the Patriarchs, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

1) Debate on the date and historicity of the patriarchal period
   
   Biblical data
   The date of Abraham's time
   a) Short Chronology
   b) Long Chronology
   
2) The City of Ur

Debate on the date and historicity of the Patriarchal period
Biblical data

The biblical history of Israel before the exodus from Egypt is referred to as the Patriarchal period. The biblical story of the patriarchs usually covers Abraham and his departure from Ur, his journey from Mesopotamia to Haran, and from there to the land of Canaan. In Canaan he has his son Isaac, who becomes the father of Jacob, who is also called Israel. Jacob had 12 sons, the ancestors of the 12 tribes of Israel. They all settled in Egypt, where their descendants became slaves.

Did Abraham really exist? What does the Bible say?

Read Gen 26:24;35:12; Joshua 24:3; Psalm 105:6-10; Matthew 8:11; Luke 13:28

These passages indicate that Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, and David, as well as Matthew and Luke, confirmed Abraham as an historical figure.

The date of Abraham's time

Because the biblical description of the patriarchal period is concerned largely with private affairs, and there are only a few references to public events none of which corresponds to a known event in general history, it is difficult to determine the historical context in which the patriarchal account belongs.

Our starting point is 1 Kings 6:1.
This verse informs us that from the day of the exodus to the beginning of the building of Solomon's temple there were 480 years. That year, according to the same biblical text, was the fourth year of Solomon's reign. It is now well established and widely accepted that the kingdom of Israel was divided after Solomon's death in 931 BC. Since he reigned 40 years (1 Kings 11:42), his rulership as sole king began at 971 BC. We have to allow a few years for his coregency with his father David. This possibly puts the fourth year of his reign at 970 BC. Therefore, Solomon had begun building the temple in 970 BC.

Since the years of BC time go backwards this means that to 970 BC we should add 480 for the period between the exodus and the beginning of temple building. Thus the exodus took place during 1450 BC.

Scholars are divided concerning the period of time the Israelites spent in Egypt. Some would suggest that this period covered about 215 years (Horn). Others say that we should count the whole 430 years, as recorded in Exodus 12:40.

According to MT, it is clear that the author of the book proposed that the sons of Israel spent 430 years in slavery. That period should be counted from the exodus itself to the time when Jacob entered Egypt, due to famine.
Others, as mentioned before, would rather follow the account of LXX, which indicates that a period of 430 years covers the span from the exodus to the time when Abraham entered Palestine. Since Abraham's entry to Jacob's entry into Egypt took 215 years, the sons of Israel spent only the rest (215 years) in bondage.

a) Short Chronology

Use overhead transparency 9. Short Chronology (Appendix G)

If we follow the interpretation of those who follow LXX, the Israelites spent 215 years in bondage, as indicated in Exodus 12:40. This means that Jacob came into Egypt during 1665 BC. According to the Bible (Genesis 47:9), he was then 130 years old, which means that he was born during 1795 BC. At his birth his father Isaac was 60 years old (Genesis 25:26) which puts Isaac's birth at 1855 BC. When Isaac was born his father Abraham was 100 years old (Genesis 21:5). Twenty-five years prior to Isaac's birth in 1880 BC, Abraham was called to leave his homeland and depart toward Palestine. Following this calculation, Abraham was born in 1955 BC.

When these years are compared to the archaeological periods, Abraham was born and lived, as did also his son
Isaac and his grandson Jacob, during the Middle Bronze Age (1950-1550).

b) Long Chronology

Following MT, it appears that the sons of Israel spent the full period of 430 years in Egypt. This means that Jacob's arrival in Egypt happened during 1880 BC, when he was 130 years old. According to this, he was born in 2010 BC, when his father Isaac was 60 years old. This places the birth of Isaac in 2070 BC, Abraham's departure to Palestine would fall in approximately 2095, and Abraham's birth would be in 2170 BC.

Comparing the years to archaeological periods, it appears according to this chronology that Abraham, as well as his son Isaac and grandson Jacob, all were born and lived during the Early Bronze IV Age (2250-1950 BC). In addition most of Jacob's life and his arrival in Egypt occurred during the Middle Bronze Age (1950-1550 BC).

While the historicity of Abraham is energetically rejected by liberal scholars like Wellhausen and his followers, those who consider themselves conservatives differ considerably from each other in their suggestions. The majority of them see Abraham in an MB II setting, while
a very few prefer LB period. Some of them see EB III as the best time for Abraham, yet very few agree with an EB IV/MB I period.

There is no existing consensus among archaeologists concerning the "best" time of Abraham, as well as on many other issues.

Review the main points

The City of Ur

The Old Testament is quite clear in its statement that Abraham's home was originally in lower Mesopotamia, specifically in the city of Ur. He emigrated to Haran in upper Mesopotamia on his way to Canaan (Genesis 11:28-31; 12:1-4; 15:7; Nehemiah 9:7). Joshua 24:2 reads: "Your fathers dwelt of old time beyond the River, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nahor: and they served other gods." This statement has also been illuminated by the excavations of Ur.

In 1854 J. E. Taylor was employed by the British Museum to investigate some of the southern sites of Mesopotamia. He chose for his chief work the Mound of
Pitch, or "Tell al Muqayyar." Here he unearthed inscriptions which for the first time revealed that the nameless ruin was none other than Ur, so-called "of the Chaldees," the home of Abraham. Taylor excavated only for two seasons, but the work was continued by Sir Leonard Wooley from 1922-1934.

Ur lies about half-way between Baghdad and the head of the Persian Gulf, some ten miles west of the Euphrates. To the east of the ruins is the capital of Iraq, and westward is a desert. Standing on the mound, one can distinguish along the eastern skyline the dark tasseled fringe of the palm gardens on the river bank, but to the north, west and south, as far as the eye can see stretches a waste of unprofitable sand. To the southwest lies a ruin of the sacred city of Eridu, which the Sumerians believed to be the oldest city upon earth. It seems incredible that such a wilderness should ever have been habitable for man; yet the mound revealed temples and houses of a very great city.

The reports from Tell al Muqayyar, or ancient Ur, force each individual to change his opinion of Abraham. He was far from being a primitive Bedouin accustomed only to the wide spaces of the desert and the stern traditions of a nomad tribe. He was heir to an age-old civilization, sharing the complex life of a great trade center.

The most impressive discovery from Ur was a ziggurat.
The ziggurat was a mountain of brickwork. In every important city of Sumer there was such a tower, an artificial hill of solid brick and bitumen on top of which stood the most holy shrine of the patron deity. They called it "the hill of heaven" or the "mountain of God." They planted trees and shrubs on its stages, in imitation of the real hills of their native home. The whole design was a masterpiece, the lines of the walls being built on calculated curves to give the appearance of lightness and strength. The tower measured 200 feet by 150. Standing 70 feet high, it was built in steps or stages communicating with each other by stairways. Besides the temples and sanctuaries, the rooms of the ziggurat were used as storerooms and offices which housed the business affairs of the god.

There were also extensive working-quarters. Women worked at the looms weaving into cloth the wool brought in. These quarters were regular factories, run on very business-like lines, and their records still survive, found in the ruins, with their detailed accounts of output and expenses of the women balanced in parallel columns of profit and loss.

\textsuperscript{1}Unger, 109.
The inner city of the old town was walled for defense. Within its ramparts the houses of the citizens were huddled together along narrow winding lanes. These houses had no windows on the walls facing the streets, only entrance doors, but once entered, were seen to be very comfortable.

They were built of brick, burnt brick for the lower parts of the walls and crude mud brick above. The walls, plastered and whitewashed, stood two stories high. From the entrance one passed through a small lobby where was set a jar of water for the washing of feet, into the paved central court around which the house was built. An interior staircase led up to a wooden gallery running round the walls of the court from which access was gained to the upper rooms. The nearly flat roof of the house projected inward with wide eaves to protect the gallery, but the middle part was open to the sky and through this came light and air for the rooms.

The chambers on the ground floor had no windows, only doors for ventilation and light, but with the strong
sun of Mesopotamia no more than that was needed. One of the chambers was a reception room to which guests would be introduced. Another was the kitchen with its open hearth for burning wood or charcoal, its bread oven and its rubbing-stone for the milling of grain. Another chamber was for the servants. Under the staircase was a lavatory, and yet another chamber might be the private chapel where domestic worship was conducted. A large vault acted as the burial place of the household.

The upper chambers, devoted to the family, were the living-quarters proper. These also looked out over the courtyard and perhaps had windows as well as doors.

As far as decorations and furnishings are concerned, they had tables and chairs with barred legs and ornamental arms, beds with string or reed mattresses stretched on wooden frames, decorated with carvings of flowers and birds. Clothes were stored in clay or wooden chests, and a wealth of cooking and feeding vessels in clay, copper, or, for rich families, silver. There were also small clay figurines, teraphim, the gods of the domestic cult.

In such houses of twelve or fourteen rooms, a family might live a comfortable and a very civilized life. The material existence was on a par with the highly developed social and intellectual life of the time.

Whatever the father's business, it would be conducted in accordance with a most elaborate system of
commercial laws and precedents. The mother enjoyed a degree of independence unknown at any later date in the East for she might be engaged in business on her own account. The sons would go to schools attached to one of the temples, and taught reading, writing, arithmetic, and geometry and might advance to the higher sciences of medicine, astrology, and law.

Altogether the life of such a man as Abraham at Ur in the 20th century BC was the sophisticated life of a citizen. Leonard Wooley admits that future discoveries might never produce direct evidence of Abraham's life at Ur. But with the information of life in Ur, at our disposal, it is concluded: "Abraham's journey from Ur was like going from London to the Shetland Isles to engage in the revolution against the civilized idolatry in which our forefathers lived, and from which he escaped in order to found a new, better and truer religion."

According to the Masoretic Text, which uses a long chronology, Abraham lived in Ur under the new Sumero-Akkadian empire of Ur-Nammu, the founder of the famous third dynasty of Ur (c.2135-2025) BC. Ur-Nammu was the ruler who took the new title "King of Sumer and Akkad," and whose mightiest work was the erection of the great ziggurat at Ur. Abraham would have departed from Ur when it was just entering the heyday of its power and prestige under a strong dynasty that lasted over a century. He would, moreover, be
leaving Haran for Canaan when his native city had reached the height of its influence in southern Mesopotamia.

**SUMMARY**

Briefly review the main points of the lesson VI.

**Debate on the date and historicity of the Patriarchal period**

**Biblical data**

The biblical history of Israel before the exodus from Egypt is referred to as the Patriarchal period. Many biblical passages confirm the existence of the patriarchs.

**The date of Abraham's time**

Because the biblical description of the Patriarchal period is concerned largely with private affairs, it is difficult to determine the historical context to which the Patriarchal account belongs. The starting point must be 1 Kings 6:1. Through it we find when Solomon began building the temple (970). If we add 480 to this number, the exodus took place during 1450 BC.

There are two different opinions as to the time the Israelites spent in Egyptian bondage. Some suggest that this period covered about 215 years; others suggest 430 years. MT suggests 430 years; however LXX suggests that 430 years covers the period from the exodus to the time when Abraham entered Palestine. The period from Abraham's entry to Jacob's entry to or sojourn in Egypt is about 215 years passed, the sons of Israel spent only the rest (215) years in bondage.

**Short Chronology**

If we comply with the interpretation of those who follow LXX, the sons of Israel spent 215 years in bondage as indicated in Exodus 12:40. Abraham as well as his son Isaac and his grandson Jacob were born and lived during the Middle Bronze Age (1950-15550 BC).

**Long Chronology**

Following the MT it appears that the sons of Israel spent the full period of 430 years in Egypt. According to
this chronology, Abraham, as well as his son Isaac and his grandson Jacob, were born and lived during the Early Bronze IV Age (2250-1950 BC).

In addition, while the historicity of Abraham is rejected by liberal scholars, those who consider themselves conservative differ in their suggestions as to the time of Abraham. The majority see him in MB II setting; few see him in LB period. Some suggest EB IV/MB I, and few EB III period.

The city of Ur

The Bible tells us that Abraham came from lower Mesopotamia, specifically from the city of Ur. Archaeologists have found Ur. It lies half-way between Baghdad and the head of the Persian Gulf, some ten miles west of the Euphrates. The reports from this ancient tell indicate that Abraham was far from a primitive Bedouin accustomed only to the wide spaces of the desert and the stern traditions of a nomad tribe. He was heir to an age-old civilization, sharing the complex life of a great trade center.
LESSON VII

CONTINUATION OF CASE STUDY I

ABRAHAM AND MIDDLE BRONZE II CUSTOMS

Briefly review the main points from the lesson VI.
Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 16) The learner will identify Abraham and the time he lived in, with 80 percent accuracy; 17) The learner will describe, in no more than thirty words, two of the laws written on the Nuzi tablets that correspond to the laws found in the Old Testament, with 80 percent accuracy; 18) The learner will name a group or party responsible for the destruction of the EB III urban centers, with 80 percent accuracy; 19) The learner will write in no more than forty words why Abraham fits best in the Early Bronze IV/Middle Bronze I period, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

1) Destruction of EB III Urban Centers

2) Cities of Abraham
   a) Sodom
   b) Salem
   c) Gerar
   d) Hebron

268
Destruction of EB III Urban Centers

During the Early Bronze III period, many changes occurred throughout the ancient Near East. In both pharaonic Egypt and Sumerian Mesopotamia, civilization was highly developed. This civilization was characterized by a complex system of government and by religious, administrative, and social hierarchies. At the same time, Palestine and Syria felt the impact of the two great civilizations and their urban centers flourished. At the peak of their flourishing, however, something happened that puzzles many scholars: the urban civilization in Palestine collapsed within a short time, to be replaced by totally different non-urban patterns that lasted for about 300 years.¹

Archaeologists have been struggling for years, suggesting various hypotheses for the cause of the destruction of urban culture in EB III period. While Albright and Wright suggested that the Amorites might be responsible for the destruction of the period,² B. Mazar and

¹Mazar, Archaeology of the Land, 141.
²Richard, "The Early Bronze Age," 34.
Callaway proposed the Egyptians to be the cause.¹ A third theory has been given by Lapp, who saw Indo-European people as invaders and destroyers of the period.² In addition, W. G. Dever and S. Richard have suggested a fourth theory.³ They do not see the destruction as caused by intruders of the EB III period but rather by natural causes such as drought, plagues, or earthquakes.

Because of the destruction of the urban culture of EB III period, perfect conditions were created to make nomadic travel possible. Only at such a time, when the land was not overpopulated and ruled by strong city centers, the task given by God could be accomplished by Abraham and his family. This is possible if we follow MT (long chronology as seen in lecture VI), which suggests that Abraham lived during the EB IV Age (2250-1950 BC).

Cities of Abraham

J. J. Bimson has listed more than twenty biblical cities that have same relation to Abraham. Most of these show no archaeological evidence of existence during EBIV/MBI.⁴ It is necessary to bear in mind that the narrative was written five or six centuries after the actual

events occurred. In order to help contemporary readers trace Abraham, Moses marked Abraham's sojourn by places that existed during the writer's lifetime.

In view of these circumstances, the study of the existence of these cities should be limited to the places with which Abraham made direct contact. The Scripture records only four such cities. Abraham personally met the king of Sodom (Gen 14:21-24); the king of Salem, named Melchizedech (Gen 14:18); and Abimelech, the king of Gerar (Gen 20:1-18). The fourth direct contact was made with Hebron where Abraham dealt with people and the existence of the city is evident (Gen 23:1-20). All the other cities and places mentioned could be understood as places known to Moses contemporaries, in order to present a clear picture of where Abraham traveled. The following examination of the cities with which Abraham made contact is confined only to the proof of their existence in the EB IV period.

a) Sodom

The ancient city of Ebla was excavated by Italians, and 7,000 tablets were discovered. On one tablet the names of five cities appeared to be the same as those listed in Gen 14. D. N. Freedman accepted this view and published an article concerning those five cities, identifying them as Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Seboim and Bela (Zoar).¹

¹Freedman, 143-146.
Nevertheless, a certain degree of uncertainty, noted by A. Archi concerning the names of the cities on the tablets, left Freedman more or less alone in connecting Abraham to that period.¹ In addition, most of those that accept the story about Sodom as historical believe that Sodom and other cities connected to it rest at the bottom of the Dead Sea, covered by a thick layer of salt.²

During the early 1970s, Rast and Schaub excavated the eastern plateau of the Dead Sea region. They discovered five cities that came to an end in the EB III period. All had suffered destruction, three of them by fire.³ When Rast and Schaub excavated Bab-edh-Dhra in 1974, they were very reluctant to say that the city might be connected with the biblical story.⁴ In 1987, however, Rast was confident enough to state that the biblical cities mentioned in Genesis 14 (Sodom and Gomorrah) should be identified with Bab-edh-Dhra and Numeira.⁵

If Rast is correct, then Abraham would have lived before the EB III destruction or earlier (2300 B.C.), which is contrary to biblical chronology. Second, the above

¹Archi, 145, 146.
²Van Hatten, 88.
³Ibid.,
⁴Ibid., 89.
⁵Rast, 49.
hypothesis faces lack of archaeological evidence to connect the time of Abraham to the EB III period.

However, further excavation of Bab-edh-Dhra made it evident that the population did not come to an end by destruction in EB III. Buildings and additional EBIV/MBI pottery were found supporting the assumption that after the destruction in EB III the city was still inhabited. That the city was destroyed by fire during EBIV/MBI period is affirmed by a subsequent amount of soft, ashy material found in the strata. ¹

b) Salem

The city of Salem has generally been identified as Jerusalem, ¹ Jerusalem is one of the cities that has been the most excavated. From 1867, when the first significant excavation began with Captain Charles Warren, ¹ to the present time many excavations have taken place. Due to the fact that a large part of the old city is occupied, a complete excavation cannot be undertaken at present.

Despite this limitation, enough material has been discovered to support the assumption that the city existed in the EBIV/MBI. An even earlier occupation of the ancient

¹Ibid., 32.
²Rast and Schaub, 32.
³Barrios, 166.
⁴Vos, 182.
city is evident. 1 B. Mazar has noted that "various data point to the continuity of settlement of this historical site from EBA." 2 Therefore Abraham and Salem have their place in history.

c) Gerar

During the mid-fifties, D. Alon excavated Tell Abu Hureira and found that the site "was inhabited continually through every period from Chalcolithic times to the Iron Age." 3 It has been suggested by Albright and Aharoni that this site is to be identified as Gerar. 4 In contrast, Dever rejected this proposition due to the lack of excavated material. 5 Bimson indicated that Gerar must be in the region of Wadi Gaza, 6 near the site of Tell Abu Hureira. In addition, Thompson has noted settlement of the site through all the periods of the Bronze Age. 7

d) Hebron

1 Burrows, 846.
2 B. Mazar, 583.
3 Vos, 168.
5 Dever, "The Patriarchal Traditions," 100.
7 Thompson, "The Background," 25.
In 1964 Philip C. Hammond excavated Jabel-er-Rumeideh which was, according to him, identified as Hebron.¹ Dever discovered "several isolated MBI cemeteries and even some seasonal settlements in the Hebron hills"² but nothing else. On the other hand, Albright stated in 1932 and 1961³ that Hebron lies under the modern el-Khalil. If he is correct, it is unlikely that further evidence will appear in the near future.

Cities that were in close relationship with the patriarchs have found their place in history. All three—Sodom, Salem, and Gerar—have the evidence of EBIV/MBI occupancy. Even Hebron, although unexcavated, could be accepted in the same range of EBIV/MBI. Therefore according to existing evidence, Abraham had his place in EBIV/MBI period.

Review the main points

Patriarchal Names and Customs Compared to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels

As a result of archaeological research, a large quantity of inscriptional material is now available which

¹Vos, 174.
²Dever, "Patriarchal Traditions," 100.
has an important bearing on the patriarchal age. This does not mean however, that the new material has proved the accuracy of the Old Testament narratives in any direct way. But there is a great deal of indirect evidence showing that the stories fit into the background of the age. The customs which appear in the stories prevailed in the world in which the patriarchs are set.

a) The Nuzi Tablets

The year 1896 marks the beginning of a special branch of Assyriology devoted to the study of the Nuzi tablets. This was the year when the first Nuzi tablet was published by the British Museum. It was soon noted that many similar tablets existed in various European museums, and these were also published. These tablets were not excavated but came from the same source, Kirkuk or its immediate neighborhood.

In 1925 the attempt was made to excavate Kirkuk, but difficulties arose, since the site was buried under a modern city. Dr. Edward Chiera instead excavated Yorgan Tepe, a small site situated ten miles southwest of Kirkuk, (southeast of Nineveh) which was also reported to be the source of tablets of the same type. Thus from 1926-1931 the site was excavated. At that spot Nuzi was discovered, which was to give its name to the several thousand tablets found there.
The main discovery at Nuzi consists of the 4,000 or so tablets. These belonged to either private archives found in the houses of rich families or to official archives kept in the palace. They were of legal, business, or administrative character. There is a wealth of texts pertaining to land transactions, family contracts in the form of marriage documents and wills, transcripts of litigations and of declarations in court, loan tablets, slavery contracts, lists and inventories of objects, and many other varieties.

The tablets were written in cuneiform letters in the Akkadian language. It was difficult to date them. However, one mentioned a king of Maitani, who was a contemporary of Amenophis II, who ruled about 1450-1415. By this reckoning the tablets are dated to the second half of the 15th century BC. All these texts enable us to reconstruct the social and economic life of Nuzi in the middle of the 2nd millennium (15th century) BC.¹

These tablets provide numerous illustrations of the customs that figure in the patriarchal narratives.

**Adoption**

At Nuzi a childless couple frequently adopted a freeborn person or a slave to look after them when they grew old, bury them when they died, and inherit their property. Nuzi tablets also indicate that if the adopter should

¹Gelb, 1-2.
afterward beget a son of his own, the adopted son must yield to him the place of the chief heir. Abraham, who initially had no children, refers to Elezer as his heir in Genesis 15:2.

Another tablet parallels to some extent the relationship that existed between Jacob and Laban (Genesis 29-31). A man could adopt another as his son, giving him his daughter to wife and making him and his children heirs, unless the adopter should later beget a son of his own. In this case the adopted son was to receive an equal share of the estate with the actual son. However the adopted son's children would in this circumstance forfeit any rights. It is also indicated that the adopted son would not be entitled to take another wife in addition to the daughter of his adoptive father.

Marriage laws

Nuzi marriage regulations stipulate that if a wife is barren, she must furnish her husband with a slave wife. This illustrates Sarah's action (Genesis 16:1-16), and later Rachel's and Leah's (Genesis 30:3,9). However, if the wife should beget a son, the slave wife's son should not be expelled from the house.
Rights of Primogeniture

At Nuzi a legal arrangement existed whereby the privileges of the firstborn were transferred to another. In one instance they were transferred to one who was not actually a brother, but who was adopted as a brother. In another case one who surrendered his rights received three sheep. This is, to some extent a comparable experience of Jacob and Esau.

The Teraphim

The possession of the household gods implied leadership of the family and in the case of a married daughter assured her husband the right to the property of her father. By stealing her father's gods, Rachel aimed at preserving for her husband the chief title to Laban's estate.

b) Mari Tablets

Mari excavations began in 1933 by Andre Parrot. This ancient city on the middle Euphrates is represented today by Tell Hariri, about seven miles north of modern Abou Kemal. The results greatly enhanced the picture we have of the culture of the time of the Old Babylonian Kingdom. Among buildings discovered at Mari was the royal palace, a
temple of Ishtar, and a ziggurat. It was a very large structure covering more than 15 acres and containing some 250 rooms. In it were not only the residential quarters of the kings, but also storerooms, administrative offices, and a scribal school.

In this palace more than 20,000 clay tablets were found. These are especially important from an historical standpoint, for many of them contain diplomatic correspondence of Zimri-Lim with his own officials and with Hammurabi of Babylon. Hammurabi could be dated as ruling around 1728-1686 BC (17th century BC).

The city of Nahor (Genesis 24:10) is mentioned quite frequently in the Mari letters. Another biblical name that appears is Banu-Yamina, or Benjaminites, and Dawidum which means a leader. Dawidum seems to be the original form of the name of Israel's most famous king.

Briefly review the main points on Nuzi tablets.

SUMMARY

Briefly review the main points of the lesson VII.

Destruction of EB III Urban Centers

During the Early Bronze III period many changes occurred throughout the ancient Near East. In both

1Strand, 114.
pharaonic Egypt and Sumerian Mesopotamia, civilization was highly developed. However, something happened at the end of EB III which puzzles scholars even today. At the peak of this flourishing civilization, Palestinian urban life collapsed within a short time, to be replaced by totally different non-urban patterns of life which lasted for about 300 years. Scholars are not certain as to who or what caused the destruction. They suggest Egyptians, Amorites, Indo-European (Kurgan) people, or natural causes as possible causes. However, because of the destruction of the urban culture of this period, perfect conditions were created to make nomadic travel possible.

Cities of Abraham

Scripture mentions four cities that Abraham had direct contact with. He personally met the king of Sodom, the king of Salem, named Melchizedek, and Abimelech, the king of Gerar. The fourth direct contact was made with Hebron, where Abraham dealt with people, and the existence of the city is evident.

It is evident that the cities which were in close relationship with the Patriarchs have found their place in history. All three Sodom, Salem, and Gerar have the evidence of EBIV/MBI occupancy. Even Hebron, although unexcavated, could be accepted in the same range of EB IV/MBI. Therefore, according to existing evidence, Abraham had his place in EB IV/MB I period.

Patriarchal Names and Customs Compared With Ancient Near Eastern Parallels

As a result of archaeological research, a large quantity of inscriptive material is now available, which has an important bearing on the patriarchal age. This does not mean, however, that the new material has proved the accuracy of the Old Testament narratives in any direct way. It has furnished a great deal of indirect evidence showing that the stories fit into the background of that age. The customs which appear in the stories prevailed in the world in which the patriarchs are set.

The Nuzi tablets

The tablets date to the 15th century BC and provide numerous illustrations of the customs that figure in the patriarchal narratives. Adoption, marriage laws, the rights of primogeniture, and the teraphim are explained in Nuzi tablets.
The Mari tablets

Many biblical names appear in the Mari letters. The city of Nahor, the name of Banu-Yamina, or Benjaminites, and Dawidum (David) are all found in Mari tablets.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON VIII

CASE STUDY II

THE TIME OF THE EXODUS

Briefly review the main points from the lesson VII. Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon these behavioral objectives: 20) The learner will identify the two centuries in which Exodus could have taken place, with 80 percent accuracy; 21) The learner will identify two biblical, one historical, and three (out of six) archaeological evidences for the support of the later date of the Exodus, as presented in class.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

Critical views - The Exodus took place but not in such conditions as the Bible describes it, or it did not take place at all, but was based on legends or myths; the Israelites had never been in Egypt, or there was only a small group who came out of there.

Traditional view - There are two dates suggested by the scholarly world for the Israelite Exodus.

1. The 13th century BC Exodus (19th dynasty 1320-1200 BC)
2. The 15th century BC Exodus (18th dynasty 1570-1320 BC) (Discussed in lecture IX)

The 13th Century BC Exodus

A) The Biblical Story
B) The Biblical evidence
   - Israel's place in Goshen
   - Cities they built for Egyptians (Exodus 1:11)

C) Historical evidence
   - Merneptah stele (Israel stele) - 1230 BC

D) Archaeological evidence
   - surveys
   - cultural changes & new system of life

E) Objections to this theory

F) Conclusion

The Biblical Story

Exodus is a name given to the second book of the Bible. It tells the story of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt. Exodus is the book's Greek title in the Septuagint (LXX). In Hebrew it is called (from the opening words) we' elleh shemoth, "and these are the names," or simply Sh'moth, "Names."

The event is recorded primarily in the book of Exodus, chapters 1-14, with the preceding events narrated in the last chapters of Genesis. The family of Jacob had migrated to Egypt during a severe famine at a time when Joseph was the food administrator of Egypt. Sometime after Joseph's death, there "arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph" (Exodus 1:8). Fearing that the rapidly increasing Israelites might join possible enemies, the king of Egypt enslaved them in an attempt to weaken them. During that time Moses, the future leader of Israel, was born.
The story of a baby set afloat in a basket and found by a princess is familiar to every child. At the age of 40, Moses had to flee from Egypt to the Wilderness of Sinai. There he became a shepherd. Forty years later God commissioned him to go back to Egypt to lead His people out of their humiliation. Only after the Egyptians had lost heavily of their crops and domestic animals, had been smitten with diseases, and had even lost their first-born children, did Pharaoh allow the Israelites to leave Egypt.

The departure took place on the 15th day of the month Abib, the morning after the Passover supper, which was initiated at that time by divine order, to be celebrated by the Israelites henceforth as a feast in memory of their liberation from slavery. When the Israelites left Goshen, the area of their habitation, they journeyed toward the Red Sea. In the meantime Pharaoh, who had let them leave Egypt, having recovered from his shock of losing the crown prince, now regretted his generosity and rushed after them. It was then that God divided the waters of the Red Sea and enabled His people to pass to the other shore. The pursuing Egyptians, on the other hand, were swallowed up by the returning waters. The crossing of the Red Sea marked the accomplishment of the Exodus from Egypt.

When did the Exodus occur?

Since Egyptian records mention neither the stay of the Israelites in Egypt nor their departure, many argue
against the historicity of the Exodus, and believe that the whole account was based on legends or myths. A critical view on the issue of the Exodus suggests that it took place but not in such proportions as the Bible describes. Some scholars suggest that if there was an Exodus, only a small group escaped from bondage. Was there really an Exodus? If there was, when did the Israelites come out of Egypt?

Scholars' opinions differ widely as to the time of the Exodus. Many place the Exodus in the 13th century BC but others believe it happened in the 15th century BC. Others place the Exodus in the Hyksos period c. 1730-1570, but this theory is losing acceptance in the scholarly world. The list of ideas regarding the Exodus goes on. However, the 15th century and 13th centuries have the largest number of advocates.

The 13th Century BC Exodus

The Biblical Evidence

Israel's place in Goshen

The Bible informs us that Jacob settled in Goshen when he came to Egypt with his family (Genesis 47:6). This was part of lower Egypt.

Use overhead transparency 17. Map of Egypt (Appendix G)
Due to the fact that Moses had easy access to Pharaoh and the people of Israel, the capital or royal residency should also have been in lower Egypt, the delta area. Egyptian history informs us that only three times was the capital in the Delta area. During the 12th, 19th and Hyksos dynasties. According to this fact, the Exodus could have occurred only during the rulership of these three.

**The Cities the Israelites built**

Exodus 1:11 indicates that the Israelites built Pithom and Raamses (usually spelled "Rameses") for the pharaoh of the oppression. There were no pharaohs called Ramses before the 19th dynasty. According to the stele of Merneptah, which some scholars use as an archaeological evidence to support the 13th century Exodus, (to be discussed later) only two pharaohs preceding Merneptah bore the name of Ramses.

**Pharaohs of the 19th dynasty, 1320-1200**

- Ramses I (1320-1318)
- Sethos I or Seti I (1318-1304)
- Ramses II—the Great (1304-1237)
  - pharaoh of oppression
  - great warrior - battle at Kadesh
- Merneptah (1236-1223)
  - pharaoh of Exodus
- Amenmesses (1222-1217)
- Siti II (1216-1210)
- Siptah (1209-1200)
Ramses I was not very significant, since he reigned less than two years. However, Ramses II ruled Egypt from 1304 to 1237. He was a great builder whose monuments are known throughout Egypt. Papyrus Anastasi III describes his royal residence in the city of Pi-ramses, located in the delta. If the reference to this city in Ex. 1:11 is related to this information from Egypt in a straightforward manner, Ramses II should be connected in one way or another with the events of the oppression and the Exodus. Thus the archaeology of this site might offer some assistance in deriving the date of the Exodus, if the site has been correctly located and excavated.

At first it was thought that Tanis could be the city of Pi-ramses. This suggestion was soon rejected, because the monuments that were unearthed were brought to this site to be used as building materials. Furthermore, Egyptian textual evidence concerning the location of Pi-ramses does not accord with Tanis. Qantir became the next candidate. The fertility of the fields around this city, its location on both the land and sea routes to Asia, the existence of a palace of Ramses II there, seem to correspond with the literary references to Pi-ramses.

Briefly review the main points.
Historical Evidence

The famous Merneptah stele, also known as the Israel stele, was discovered by Pietrie, in the ruins of Merneptah's mortuary temple at Thebes, in 1895. It can be seen in Cairo and a fragmentary duplicate in the Temple of Karnak. Pharaoh Merneptah (1236-1223) led an expedition to Canaan, where he clashed with the Israelites. The monument is a series of hymns related to Merneptah's victory over the Libyans in the spring of his fifth year (1230 BC). In that context the name "Israel" is mentioned for the first time in non-biblical writings. Merneptah's victory ode stated in part:

Use overhead transparency 19. Merneptah's victory ode in part (Appendix G)

The princes are prostate, saying 'Mercy!'
Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows.
Now that Tehenu (Libya) has come to ruin, Hatti is pacified;
Canaan has been plundered into every sort of woe:
Ashkelon has been overcome;
Gezer has been captured;
Yano'am is made non-existent.
Israel is laid waste and his seed is not;
Hurru is become a widow because of Egypt.

This discovery caused some confusion among scholars. Since this is the first time that Israel is mentioned outside the Bible, it became a starting point for many scholars. Was Israel already established as a nation in
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about 1230 BC? If yes, then the exodus must have occurred earlier. However, some scholars think that the Israel stele is part of the Exodus enterprise, and thus Merneptah was the pharaoh of the Exodus.

**Briefly review the main points.**

**Archaeological Evidence**

When Transjordan was surveyed by archaeologists for the first time, the results indicated that Ammonites, Moabites, Amorites, and Edomites did not occupy the land in the 15th century BC. But the survey confirmed their existence in the 13th century BC.

Archaeology has revealed that Palestine underwent noticeable cultural changes during the 13th century. A new system of life is evident in that century. A new age began, called by archaeologists an Iron age.

It was thought that these cultural changes were the result of the influx of new people, such as Israel.

a) Many new settlements were established on new locations.

**Use overhead transparency 20. Late Bronze sites in Palestine (Appendix G)**
b) Terracing was invented for agricultural purposes in hill country. This can be seen even today in the Middle East. Coerced to live in the hill country, it was necessary for the Israelites to adapt to such an environment and come up with some land to produce food. After building a tiny village, often the remaining nine-tenths of the city ruins was put into cultivation. The terraces were constructed all the way down the face of the hill. They were used for growing grapes, olives, nuts, and even cereals.

c) Cisterns started to be used for collecting rain water for summer dry months during the rainy seasons in winter. Since the Israelites occupied arid inhospitable areas that lacked natural water sources, a new way of obtaining water was necessary. The cisterns were cut out of the chalk and limestone and shaped in the form of a pear. In some places a cistern was connected with two others located under the house. Rainwater was directed from the roofs of the houses to flow into cisterns. Rocks that were placed at the bottom trapped larger impurities, while a hole drilled in the side allowed water to travel from one cistern
to another, filtering it along the way to the inside of the house. There was a narrow opening at the top which was closed with a flat round capstone.

**Use overhead transparency 23. A Cistern (Appendix G)**

d) New pottery called collar-rim ware was also attributed to the newcomers. The pottery is so called because its rim is thick and folded, and its neck has a ridge or "collar." It is not known if it was put there as a decoration or for some other purpose.

**Use overhead transparency 24. Collared-rim jar (Appendix G)**

e) A new system of architecture was introduced at this time, a four-room house. In this type of house there are three rectangular spaces—one across the back and two along the wide walls at right to that at the rear. These three spaces are the interior dwelling units on the general floor, and they are always, in the domestic house, of approximately the same length and width. The central entrance to the house is in the center of the outer wall opposite the transverse rear sector. This entrance leads into what has been called the fourth "room," but which from its installations in certain examples is the courtyard of the house. The feature that separates this house from a
three—room, long building is a back room the width of the building.

Use overhead transparency 25. A Four-room house (Appendix G)

Briefly review the main points.

Objections to this Theory

Egyptian history has revealed that most of the dynasties had two capitals, one in Upper and one in Lower Egypt. This fact allows every dynasty to be a candidate for the Exodus.

When the Bible mentions the name Ramses, it does not employ it with the same chronological specificity with which it is used in Egyptian texts. This is evident from Genesis 47:11, which refers to the "land of Rameses" as that part of Egypt in which Jacob and his descendants settled. Since no one dates the arrival of the biblical Patriarchs in Egypt to the time of Ramses II of the 19th Dynasty, the use of that name in Genesis must represent the modernization or updating of an older name for that region. If the name of Ramses was used in this way in Genesis 47:11, it could have been used similarly in Exodus 1:11. Thus the mere presence of the name of Ramses in Exodus 1:11 cannot be the final arbiter of the date of the Exodus.
Ramses II corresponds well to the pharaoh of the oppression, employing state slaves on his many building projects, but Merneptah does not correspond to the pharaoh of the Exodus very well. If Merneptah was the pharaoh of the Exodus, the Exodus must have occurred early in his reign, because the Israelites were already in Palestine by the time his stele mentioning Israel was inscribed. But that does not allow sufficient time for Israel to wander in the wilderness. In any case Merneptah did not die at the time of the Exodus. His mention of Israel by name would be too close to their escape, and the plagues that were associated with Israel would still be remembered.

Many scholars do not see any correlation with the innovations in the Iron Age. Archaeology has revealed that they existed already in Late Bronze period.

Increased archaeological excavations in Transjordan indicate that surveyors were wrong when they negated the existence of Ammonites, Moabites, Amorites and Edomites in the 15th century BC.

**Conclusion**

Thus, there is no satisfactory way to harmonize the historical, archaeological, and biblical evidences and the rulers of the 19th Dynasty with all that is stated or implied in the Bible with the 13th century exodus. If the Exodus is to be dated at this time, then a pharaoh did not die while Moses was in the wilderness (Exodus 2:23), or a
pharaoh did not die with his army at the time of the Exodus (Exodus 14-15; Psalm 136:15), or Moses did not wander very long in the wilderness (Numbers-Deuteronomy), etc. The lack of satisfactory historical correlations with these elements in the biblical record casts some doubt upon dating the Exodus during the 19th Dynasty.

SUMMARY

Briefly review the main points of the lesson VIII.

There are two possible dates suggested by the scholarly world for the Israelite Exodus. One suggestion places the event in the 13th century BC, during the rulership of the 19th dynasty. The other identifies the Exodus in the 15th century BC, during the reign of 18th dynasty. This lesson discussed the first option, the 13th century BC, 19th dynasty.

The 13th Century BC Exodus

The Bible informs us that Israelites had settled in the land of Goshen when they came to Egypt. Due to the fact that Moses had easy access to Pharaoh and the people of Israel, the capital of royal residency should also have been in lower Egypt, the delta area. Egyptian history informs us that only three times did Egyptians have their capital in that area. This was during the 12th, 19th and Hyksos dynasties. According to this fact, the Exodus could have taken place only during the rulership of these three dynasties.

Furthermore, the Bible also informs us of the cities of Pithom and Raamses that the Israelites had built for the Pharaoh of the oppression. There was no pharaoh called Ramesses before the 19th dynasty. In this dynasty there were two. However, the first Ramses ruled a very short time, and the second one was called the Great. He is known as a great builder.

The famous Merneptah stele, also known as Israel's stele, mentions for the first time the name of Israel outside the Bible. Was Israel already established as a
nation in about 1230 BC? If yes, then the Exodus occurred earlier.

Archaeology has revealed that Palestine went through noticeable cultural changes during the 13th century BC. A new system of life is evident in that century. It has been suggested that these cultural changes were the result of an influx of new people, such as the Israelites. Settlements were established on new locations. Terracing was invented, cisterns, a new pottery, new system of architecture are also evident in the 13th century BC.

Objections to this Theory

Egyptian history has revealed that most of the dynasties had two capitals, one in Upper, the other in Lower Egypt. This fact would allow every dynasty to be a candidate for Exodus. Furthermore, when the Bible mentions the name Ramses, it does not employ it with the same chronological specificity with which it is used in Egyptian texts. It could represent the updating of an older name for that region. The mention of the name Israel by Merneptah would be too close to their escape.

Conclusion

If the Exodus is to be dated at this time, then a pharaoh did not die while Moses was in the wilderness, or a pharaoh did not die with his army at the time of the Exodus, or Moses did not wander 40 years in the wilderness. The lack of satisfactory historical correlations with these biblical references casts some doubt about an Exodus during the 19th dynasty, in the 13th century.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON IX

CONTINUATION OF CASE STUDY II

THE 15TH CENTURY EXODUS THEORY

Briefly review the main points from the lesson VIII. Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon this behavioral objective: 22) The learner will identify archaeological assumptions that are used for supporting the earlier date of the Exodus, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

A) Biblical Evidence
B) Egyptian Evidence
   18th dynasty kings connected to the Exodus
      a) Thutmose I
      b) Hatshepsut
      c) Thutmose III
      d) Amenhotep II
C) The 10th plague
D) Archaeological evidence for 15th century Exodus
E) Conclusion
Biblical Evidence

The main biblical text that helps in reconstruction of the 15th century Exodus is 1 Kings 6:1, which states that Solomon began to build the temple in the fourth year of his reign, 480 years after the Exodus. Since the dates for Solomon's reign are generally agreed to be ca. 971-931 (perhaps beginning earlier if a coregency with David is allowed), the Exodus would be dated ca. 1450. Another text that may be correlated roughly with this date is found in Judges 11:26, where Jephthah (ca.1100) states that the Israelites had lived in Transjordan for three hundred years. Thus, the Conquest can be dated to ca. 1400 and the Exodus to ca. 1440. This means that the Exodus should be placed in the middle of the fifteenth century B.C. The kings that ruled Egypt at that time were very powerful pharaohs of the 18th dynasty.

The Bible indicates in Exodus 1:7-8 that the children of Israel increased in the land of Egypt until finally there arose a king "who did not know about Joseph." This pharaoh determined to prevent further increase of the Israelites by putting to death the male children at birth (Exodus 1:15-16). Then a princess had adopted a baby, whom she named Moses. Furthermore, a pharaoh prince had died as the result of the 10th plague, and one had died in the Red Sea. Which pharaohs of the 18th dynasty did not know
Joseph, adopted a baby slave boy, died as the result of the 10th plague, and drowned in the Red Sea?

**Egyptian Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18th Dynasty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmose I</td>
<td>1580–1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmenhotep I</td>
<td>1554–1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis I</td>
<td>1532–1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis II</td>
<td>1518–1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td>1503–1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis III</td>
<td>1504–1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td>1450–1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis IV</td>
<td>1425–1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1417–1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep IV/Akhenaton</td>
<td>1379–1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhare (co-regent for 2 years)</td>
<td>1364–1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamin</td>
<td>1361–1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1352–1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemhab</td>
<td>1348–1320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to the 18th dynasty, Egypt was in the hands of the Hyksos' dynasty, an Asiatic group of people who immigrated to Egypt peacefully and through many years took over power from the Egyptians. Kamose, a general in the Egyptian army, fought against the Hyksos and tried to expell them from Egypt but was killed in a battle. However, his brother Ahmose I (1580–1554), considered the first ruler of the 18th Dynasty, finished the job and liberated the Egyptians from the Asiatic rulers.
NEW KINGDOM AND THE EXODUS

Ahmose
1580-1554

son
daughter

Amenhotep I
1554-1532
had no heir

Ahmose---Thutmose I---Mutrotre
1532-1518
commoner wife

Hatshepsut---Thutmose II----Ese
1504-1482 1518-1504
commoner

Moses
ca.1530
adopted son

Nefrure----Thutmose III----Meryetre
1504-1450

Amenhotep II
1453-1425

key: ---married
Ahmose had a son, Amenhotep I (1554-1532), who died without an heir. He also had a daughter who was married to Thutmose I. Because Amenhotep I died without an heir, the throne went to Ahmose's son-in-law Thutmose I (1532-1518), who was married to the pharaoh's daughter with the same name as her father Ahmose. The throne could not go to a commoner unless he was married to a pharaoh's daughter. Thutmose I was married to a commoner also. With her he had a son by the name of Thutmose II. Thus, Thutmose I married his daughter Hatshepsut, which he had with pharaoh's daughter, to his son Thutmose II, which he had with his commoner wife, in order to ensure him a throne. Thus, Hatshepsut was married to her half brother. Thutmose II did not have a male child with Hatshepsut, but only a daughter by the name of Nefrure. But he had a son with his commoner wife Ese, who was a concubine of the pharaoh. The name of the son was Thutmose III. Thutmose II died young. Because Thutmose III was too young to take on the responsibilities of the throne, Hatshepsut became a pharaoh. She married her daughter Nefrure to Thutmose III, but the daughter died without leaving an heir.

Thutmose III had a son with another woman. That child's name was Amenhotep II.

Who were all these pharaohs?

Before we discuss their achievements and their accomplishments, let us turn back to the biblical story of
Exodus. When Moses was born, a decree was in effect which ordered that all male babies born to the Hebrews were to be killed (Exodus 1:22). Aaron does not appear to have been threatened by this decree, though he was only three years older than Moses (Exodus 7:7); hence this decree may have been proclaimed only a short time before Moses was born. Moses was eighty years old when he went to negotiate with pharaoh (Exodus 7:7). Adding these eighty years to the date of 1450 for the Exodus, Moses could have been born in 1530. Thus, Moses' birth, when the death decree was in effect, falls in the early reign of Thutmose I. Aaron had been born three years earlier, when the death decree was not in effect at the end of the reign of Amenhotep I. These considerations suggest identifying Thutmose I as the pharaoh who proclaimed the death decree.

a) Thutmose I (1532-1518)

In some respect the character of Thutmose I would fit that part very well. Prior to his time, the 18th dynasty had been mainly on a defensive footing after defeating the Hyksos. It was Thutmose I who set this dynasty on the road to an empire; he expanded the territory of that empire by campaigning all the way to the Euphrates. Some of his barbarity can be seen in his act of hanging the head of his executed Nubian enemy, as Amenhotep II did later, from the prow of his royal barge. He moved his court to Memphis, where the palace he built was still used by
royalty 150 years later. He had a daughter by the name of Hatshepsut, who would become the first woman to rule Egypt. It was here in the north that she, the daughter of the pharaoh who issued the death decree, came in contact with the baby Moses (Exodus 2:1-10). All factors considered, therefore, Thutmose I fits reasonably well as the pharaoh of the death decree.

b) Hatshepsut (1503-1482)

She was the daughter of the king of Egypt, and some day she would be the queen also. But she was a king! Hatshepsut's husband Thutmose II was her half brother. He died young and left behind a problem of the succession, a domestic situation similar to the one that prevailed after his father's death. His chief wife, Hatshepsut, had borne no sons, only daughters. By a woman of lowly birth, a palace concubine, Thutmose II, Hatshepsut's husband, had one son, Thutmose III. After the death of her husband, Thutmose III was supposed to be the king. However, he was just a child, too young to take such responsibilities. Hatshepsut dared to do something which none of her spiritual kinswomen ever dreamed of attempting: she cast off the trailing skirts of a woman and put on the kilt and crown of king.
Hatshepsut succeeded not only in gaining the throne but in holding it for more than twenty years.

Under her reign the land prospered. She traded with far away countries. She built magnificently. One of the most beautiful temples in Egypt one of the finest of all ancient buildings, is that at Deir al Bahri. From one of her obelisks we learn that the queen measured out the precious metal by the bushel, like sacks of grain.

It is possible that she was the pharaoh's daughter who rescued the baby Moses (Exodus 2:1-10). If Moses was born ca. 1530, the pharaoh who decreed the death of all Hebrew male babies would have been Thutmose I, Hatshepsut's father.

Moses would have grown up during the reign of Thutmose I and Thutmose II (Hatshepsut's husband), and with Hatshepsut's sponsorship he could have attained the prominence that later tradition attributed to him (see Acts 7:22). If Moses fled Egypt when he was四十 (Acts 7:23), then it was late in the reign of Hatshepsut (1503-1482), and her corregent Thutmose III (1504-1450). According to this scheme, Hatshepsut also would have been the pharaoh who died while Moses was in exile (Exodus 2:23). The masculine reference here may be explained by Hatshepsut's adoption of all royal titles and prerogatives, including the masculine ones.
c) Thutmose III (1504-1450)

He was the son of Thutmose II, Hatshepsut's husband, or Hatshepsut's stepson. He was the greatest warrior Egypt ever produced. He was, as his adult life demonstrated, a man of varied and profound capabilities: soldier, strategist, statesman and administrator. He did not have a good relationship with his stepmother. After her death he destroyed most of her monuments.

He died in the Red Sea at the time of the Exodus. No reference in Egyptian sources to his death need be expected. Not only would such a reference be contrary to the propagandistic nature of the royal inscriptions of Egypt, but it would also be contrary to the Egyptian theology of kingship. Pharaoh was a god. Gods, of course, do not die in the human sense of the term. In spite of this qualification, a few random dates of pharaohs' deaths have survived. Thus, we know today that he died in the year of the Exodus, according to the chronologies worked out, and he also died at the right time of that year.

A mummy labeled with his name in the Cairo Museum warrants closer inspection. Occasionally it has been objected that neither Ramses II, Merneptah, Thutmose III nor Amenhotep II could have been the pharaoh of the Exodus because their mummies have all been found, whereas the pharaoh of the Exodus drowned and his body should have been
lost in the Reed Sea. However, his body could have washed ashore and been recovered by a search party when it became evident that he and his troops were overdue. But further evidence needs to be considered. These mummies have been x-rayed recently to determine their ages at death. The one labeled Thutmose III has been estimated to have been between forty and forty-five when he died. Since Thutmose III reigned fifty-four years, he presumably should have been at least sixty years at death. Thus, it may be that another body was substituted for Thutmose III when his was not recovered from the Red Sea.

Thutmose III was one of the great military pharaohs. He established Egypt's Asiatic empire by a series of some sixteen campaigns into Syro-Palestine, conducted almost annually from his twenty-third year, the year after Hatshepsut died, to his forty-second year.

d) Amenhotep II (1450-1425)

He was corregent with his father Thutmose III, according to Egyptian evidence. This conclusion is gathered from monuments on which their names appear together. Furthermore, it has been established that Thutmose III and the reign of his son Amenhotep II overlapped by three years.

Thus while Amenhotep II was campaigning in Palestine in his third year, the last year of his coregency with his father, Thutmose III died. It was not until he returned
from his campaign that he found out that his father had died three months earlier.

This campaign of Amenhotep II in Palestine provides a good reason why Thutmose III would have been residing in the delta where Moses consulted with the pharaoh. Since this was his son's first campaign, it is to be expected that Thutmose III would reside in the delta awaiting for news of his son's success. From Israel's point of view, this was a good time to leave Egypt since most of its troops were away. During his last dozen years, Thutmose III did not campaign in Syro-Palestine. This absence led to a revolt among his vassals there and he dispatched his son Amenhotep II to quell this revolt in the last year of his reign. When Amenhotep II returned, he found his father was already dead.

After giving the date of Thutmose III's death, the Egyptian record describes the coronation of Amenhotep II. This description is remarkable in that it contains a reference to the execution by beheading of the foreign chiefs he brought back to Egypt with him as captives.

Several reasons for this extraordinary action can be suggested when it is viewed from the standpoint of the events of the biblical Exodus. First, the rebellion raised by these princes took Amenhotep away from Egypt when he should have been there with his troops to defend his father. This reflected upon his kingship. Second, the escaped Hebrew slaves who caused his father's death were Semites and
the royal captives he executed were Semites. He could have expressed his anger at the Semites as a group in this way. Third, the Hebrews had rebelled against Pharaoh by escaping from Egypt. It was in the interests of Amenhotep to provide the strongest possible deterrent to prevent any other subjects, a native or foreign, from attempting to follow their example. Executing these foreign princes and parading their heads up the Nile warned everyone else against such a course of action. From a biblical point of view, therefore, these actions of Amenhotep II fit very well with the actions of the enraged son of the pharaoh of the Exodus who returned to Egypt to find his father dead from circumstances caused by the Hebrews.

Egyptian records also indicated that in Amenhotep's seventh and ninth years, he claimed that he brought 90,000 slaves back to Egypt. This could have been a compensation for the escape of the Hebrews four years earlier. Taking all the factors discussed above into consideration, Amenhotep II fits well as the pharaoh after the Exodus.

Review the main points

The 10th Plague

Amenhotep II was not the eldest son of Thutmose III, for he had an elder half brother named Amenemhet who died
earlier in the reign of Thutmose. Thus Thutmose III's firstborn son was not alive in 1450 when the tenth plague fell on Egypt. The Bible informs us that the household of a pharaoh suffered the loss of a son in this plague. Who died as the result of the plague?

The son of Amenhotep II died when the pharaoh was twenty, and this is the reason why Thutmose IV came to the throne. It has been proposed, quite apart from any consideration of the Exodus, that Amenhotep II has a son named Thutmose. Even though no inscriptional evidence for this son named Thutmose has been recovered, he has been suggested as the one who was originally first in line for the throne. If Amenhotep II did have such a son, he would have been born late in the reign of Thutmose III and would have died early in the reign of Amenhotep II, which would make him the best current candidate for the royal son who died in the tenth plague. This relationship could have given Thutmose III added cause to pursue the Hebrews.

Therefore while Amenhotep II was on his campaign in Palestine, his father was the pharaoh who ruled Egypt. He also left his first-born son in care of his father. When he returned, he found out that his father had drowned and his son had died as a result of the 10th plague.

**Briefly review the main points.**

**Archaeological evidence for the 15th century Exodus**
This was the Late Bronze period in Palestine. During that time the cities in Palestine were vassals to Egyptian kings. Cuneiform tablets were discovered in Egypt, in the city of Amarna. These tablets were sent from Palestine to Egypt. They reported a great upheaval and turbulence in Palestine. These were complaints of Palestine kings fighting each other in a conspiracy against Egypt. Apiru seem to be their main concern.

Who were these apiru? Apiru or Habiru is a term that does not designate an ethnic group but rather a social layer of society. The word was widely used in Mesopotamia and other regions as well. Apiru would correspond to outlaws, criminals etc. In the Amarna letters apiru is used to refer in a derogatory way to rival Canaanite rulers.

Some scholars see invading apiru as Hebrews. It might be true that in some instances, especially at conquest/settlement time Hebrews would appear as apiru, but it must be stressed that not all apiru were Hebrews. They may have come from other Semitic groups.

Conclusion

The major objection to the 15th century Exodus has come from the results of excavations in Palestine. Some of the sites that are thought to have been conquered at the conquest/settlement time show no such evidence of destruction. However, it is evident that they were destroyed in the 13th century. Archaeological evidence does
not seem to support a thirteenth-century Exodus, rather much of it points to a fifteenth-century date.

From the above discussion it is evident that the Israelites when recording the information in 1 Kings 6:1, held chronological views that dated the Exodus to the 15th century BC. While it is possible that these data could have been corrupted in transmission, the most reasonable approach is to examine in more detail the historical context in which the Exodus could be placed. This biblical date has more of a reciprocal relationship with the events described in Exodus as related to Egyptian history. It is evident that considerable agreement of the evidence from Egyptian and biblical sources point to the period of the 15th century and support the accuracy of the chronological datum (480 years) from which the search started.

SUMMARY

Briefly review the main points of the lesson IX.

The main biblical text that helps in the reconstruction of the 15th century Exodus is 1 Kings 6:1. The calculation points out that the date of the Exodus would be ca. 1450. This means that the Exodus should be placed in the middle of the 15th century. The kings that ruled Egypt at that time, were very powerful pharaohs of the 18th dynasty.

The pharaoh of the death decree could be Thutmose I. Hatshepsut, the daughter of Thutmose I, could have been the princess that adopted Moses. She later became a very powerful pharaoh. Thutmose III was Hatshepsut's stepson, and Thutmos's II son. He was a coregent with her. He was the greatest warrior Egypt ever produced. He could have
been the one that died in the Red Sea. Amenhotep II was not the firstborn of Thutmose III. He was on a campaign in Palestine during the Exodus. In Egypt he executed many slaves that he brought from Palestine as captives. His son could have been the firstborn that died as the result of the 10th plague.

The archaeological evidence for the 15th century Exodus

The cuneiform tablets that were discovered in Egypt, in the city of Amarna, mention a social confusion in the land of Palestine, indicating that cities were being attacked by a group called apiru. Some scholars see the resemblance in apiru with the Israelites that tried to take over the land. However, apiru does not designate an ethnic group, like Hebrews, but rather a social level. In the Amarna letter, apiru is used to refer in a derogatory way to rival Canaanite rulers.

Conclusion

It is more evident today that the archaeological evidence does not seem to support a 13th century exodus. Rather, much of it points to a 15th century date. It is evident that considerable agreement of the evidence from Egyptian and biblical sources point to the period of the 15th century and support the accuracy of the chronological date (480 years) from which the search started.

Administer cognitive post-test.
LESSON X
CASE STUDY III
THE ISRAELITE SETTLEMENT

Briefly review the main points from the lesson IX. Administer cognitive pre-test.

The following lesson is based upon this behavioral objective: 23) The learner will name the three theories of Israelite conquest/settlement and in no more than sixty words describe each theory, with 80 percent accuracy.

LESSON OUTLINE

Briefly outline the main points that will be studied.

The three main hypotheses or models on Israelite settlement are:

1. The Conquest Model
2. Peaceful Infiltration Model
3. Peasant Revolt Model

A) Biblical Story
B) Conquest model
   a) Representatives
   b) Theory
   c) Weaknesses of the theory
C) Peaceful infiltration model
   a) Representatives
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The Biblical Story

The Israelites escaped from Egypt under the leadership of a man named Moses. They then began their 40-year trek to the Promised Land. On their way they stopped at a place called Sinai. The people entered into covenant with God in which they agreed to obey his laws and in return they became his people, the recipient of his blessings. After their 40-year sojourn in the desert, they finally arrived at the Promised Land.

At this point it seems that the Bible gives us two somewhat different accounts of how they took possession of the Promised Land. The first is in the last part of the Book of Numbers and the Book of Joshua. The second and somewhat different account is in the Book of Judges.

The account in Joshua portrays a lightning military campaign lasting less than five years. In this campaign, the various peoples of Canaan are defeated.
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After these victories, the land west of the Jordan was allotted among the Israelite tribes.

The account in Judges seems somewhat different. First of all, the order is reversed. In Judges, the allotment comes first. Afterward they attempt to take possession of the land by conquest. In Judges there is no unified effort by "all Israel" to conquer the land, as seems to be the case in Joshua. In Judges the effort to possess the land seems to be the work of individual tribes or groups of related tribes.

Most important, Judges makes it clear that by no means was the entire land subdued. In Judges 1 is a list of 20 cities whose people were not driven out by the newcomers. These cities included Jerusalem, Gezer, Megiddo, Taanach, Beth-Shean and Beth-Shemesh (Judges 1:21,27-33). These are some of the most important cities in the country. So it seems that we have quite a difference here between the Book of Joshua and the Book of Judges. In any event, it seems that the Israelites, as reported in the account in Judges, gradually took possession of the land of Canaan over a longer period of time.

Because of these "so called" differences, a discussion of how Israel as a nation came to be present in Canaan has occupied many scholars for a long time. This
period of conquest/settlement has been called "the most difficult problem in the whole history of Israel."

Many believe that the narrative in Joshua 1-12 is not as simplified and unified as the author wants us to believe. Others regard the conquest narrative as containing projections of later ideas back into the past. Thus, the Israelites were not the destroyers of Canaanite cities, but the destruction could be the work of the impoverished original inhabitants. Because of all these different ideas, scholars have advocated different explanations on how the land of Canaan was taken into possession by the Israelites.

There are three main hypotheses or models that divide scholarly world. One group of scholars bases its ideas on the work of A. Alt and M. Noth. They interpret the entry of Israel into Canaan as a peaceful infiltration by semi-nomad groups. Other scholars follow G. E. Mendenhall, who saw the rise of Israel as indigenous peasants revolting against their ruling towns and their feudal aristocracy. Yet others follow the biblical tradition of invasion and conquest supported by W. F. Albright and his followers. Generally speaking these three hypotheses, no matter how old, are still influential today.

Who is right? Which theory or hypothesis should we support and follow?
The first major model of hypothesis on the conquest/settlement of Israelites is simply called Conquest Model.

The Conquest Model
This model was developed by the Albright school, which took its inspiration from William F. Albright. G. Earnest Wright, John Bright, and Paul Lapp were followers of the same model. These scholars propagated the total destruction of most Canaanite cities and their immediate occupation, in corroboration of the biblical story of Joshua. They believed that the account of Joshua 1-12 is correct in every sense.

Read some verses from Joshua 12:7-

Thus, the Israelites took by force Canaanite cities in a swift campaign. They destroyed most of the cities in this new land and immediately occupied them. So God's promise was fulfilled and they inherited the land that was promised to them through their ancestors.

Read the text in Genesis 12:1-3; 46:3; 50:24, 25.
God promised Abraham, Isaac, Jacob the Promised Land. Even Joseph wanted his bones to be taken back to that country.

The advocates of the conquest model (Albright, Wright, Bright, Lapp) believed that archaeological finds confirmed the biblical stories of conquest under Joshua's command. In tell after tell, archaeologists found a destruction level that they thought they could identify with the Israelite conquest of Canaan. Many sites were destroyed around 1200 BC, then reoccupied. The excavators noted that above the destroyed level was a much cruder culture. Beneath was the sophisticated, technically competent Canaanite culture. This led them to believe that many of the cities that are mentioned in the Joshua report were destroyed by the Israelites.

However, some scholars argue that the findings of archaeology do not provide a clear and compelling support for the biblical stories. Since archaeological methodology has improved, we can date levels much more securely and more sites have now been excavated. Some like Jericho (Joshua 6:20-26), were questioned by a British archaeologist K. Kenyon. Ai also (Joshua 8:28) appears to have been uninhabited at the time Joshua was supposed to have conquered it. But what is important is that the dates of destruction of various sites that the Israelites conquered do not fit together. The time and space paths of
destruction levels do not match. Many years of research and debate seem to have finally settled the dilemma of Jericho.¹

¹Bryant Hood has reexamined the archaeological evidence relating to the destruction of Jericho. There was a destruction at Jericho. All archaeologists agree on this. But when did it occur? The most famous excavator of Jericho, the British archaeologist Kathleen Kenyon, dated this destruction to the Middle Bronze Age, after which the site was abandoned. Thus, she said, there was no city here for Joshua to conquer at the end of the Late Bronze Age. This view has been widely accepted and has posed a major problem for the conquest model. In his careful reexamination of the archaeological data, not only from Kenyon's excavations but also from earlier excavations, Hood has shown that this destruction at Jericho occurred in uncanny detail just as the Bible describes it. There was a strong wall there, just as the Bible says. The wall even came tumbling down, according to the archaeological evidence. Actually there were two walls around the city, the main city wall at the top of the tell and a revetment one lower down. Outside this revetment wall, Kenyon found piles of red mudbricks that had fallen from the city wall at the top of the tell and then tumbled down the slope, piling up at the base of the revetment wall. (Or the bricks could have been on top of the revetment wall and tumbled down from there; the difference is insignificant. The fact is they came together in a heap outside the revetment wall.) The amount of bricks piled up was enough for a wall 6.5 feet wide and 12 feet high.

There collapsed bridsks then formed a kind of ramp that an invading army could have used to go up into the city. Sure enough, the Bible tells us that the Israelites who encircled the city "went up into the city, every man straight before him" (Joshua 6:20).

Kenyon found that the city was destroyed in a fiery conflagration: the walls and floors were blackened or reddened by fire. But, she adds, "the collapse of the walls of the eastern rooms seems to have taken place before they were affected by the fire." This was the sequence of events in the biblical account of Jericho's conquest: The walls fell down and then the Israelites put the city to the torch.

The archaeologists also found heaps of burnt grain in the houses, more grain than has even been found in any excavation in what was ancient Israel. This indicates two things: First, the victory of the invaders must have been a swift one, rather than the customary siege that would attempt to starve out the inhabitants (the biblical victory was, of course, swift one). Second, the presence of so much grain indicates that the city
Furthermore, the destruction of Hormah (Numbers 21:3; Judg. 1:17), and Hazor (Josh. 11:1-15) were also questioned.

Many modern scholars, wanting to be in the forefront of research, have written off the idea of an Israelite conquest model. Furthermore, these supposed failings of the conquest model gave popularity to the second model or hypothesis, that will be discussed.

**Briefly review the main points.**

**The Peaceful Infiltration Model**

This model was developed in the 1920s by the Alt-Noth school and supported by Weippert. Albrecht Alt (1883-1956) was a German biblical scholar (not an archaeologist) who proposed that the Israelites rather than conquering Canaan militarily, peacefully infiltrated the hill country of Canaan.

The lack of archaeological evidence at Jericho, Ai and other sites sparked the existence of this model in the century. The Bible tells us that the Lord commanded that everything from Jericho was to be destroyed; they were to take no plunder.
circles of the opponents of the conquest model. Some sites that Albright excavated supported the biblical account, but others did not. Furthermore, there were sites that were destroyed, but are not mentioned in the Bible.

Alt suggested that "the tribal confederacy did not exist at the time when those who later became the Israelites entered Palestine." According to this theory, the central hill country of Canaan, where the Bible says the Israelites settled, was almost empty at the time the Israelites entered Canaan. So the Israelites could readily infiltrate quite peaceably. This, in the view of those who supported this theory, was precisely what they did. Advocates of this theory looked for support in the book of Judges.

Peaceful infiltration supporters explain that when the vegetation in that area ceased in the summer, the Israelites had to go further into the cultivated land. They came to an understanding with owners of the land about summer pasturage in the harvested fields and in the woods. In other words, settlement resulted "out of regular change of pasture on the part of nomads with small cattle." These nomads "began to practice agriculture once they had turned these wooded areas into arable land. This peaceful process of transition... to a sedentary life was... the real process of settlement and it was a peaceful development."
However, the book of Judges also reports that as the Israelites extended their territory, they clashed against the Canaanites, and they could not occupy many cities.

Alt had an explanation even for this situation. He concluded that the Israelites claimed the territory where resistance would be the least. Thus the settlement was not a military conquest as Joshua 1-12 indicates.

However, Alt and his followers admitted that there were some local military engagements by individual tribes, and this is what people remembered, not the peaceful infiltration. Thus, these military encounters were part of a second stage of Israelite settlement during the period of the Judges when Israel wanted to expand its territory.

Nevertheless, the Alt-Noth school had its critics for fictionalizing the character of the biblical conquest narratives from their literary analysis. According to some scholars, the major weakness in this model was characterization of the Israelites as nomads, for which there was lack of evidence as well. Enmity between nomads and sedentary people was always present in that part of the world throughout antiquity. Even the Bible indicates that when Jacob came to settle in Egypt, the Egyptians despised...
nomads. Agricultural soil was guarded well, especially during the time of famine. To take someone's land peacefully is impossible. It never happened in history (an example are the Hyksos), nor does it happen today (e.g. former Yugoslavia).

Briefly review the main points.

The Peasant Revolt Model

Doubts about the peaceful infiltration model of Israelite settlement led to the development of a third model, generally known as the peasant revolt model. This was pioneered by George E. Mendenhall (a University of Michigan scholar) in the mid 1960s. This theory was considerably developed by a New York Theological Seminary professor named Norman Gottwald.

Mendenhall got his theory by reflecting on the revolts that occurred in Canaan during the Amarna period. He identified the biblical Hebrews as late "apiru," who were described as "uprooted individuals of varied origins, without tribal or family ties, who joined in bands which

could be hired as soldiers by organized states, or acted on their own."

Consequently a social reorganization took place inside the land among the people of the Canaanite city-states. Israel, as a nation or one distinctive group of people, emerged from peoples already in Canaan, peasants who revolted against their overlords. Israelites are associated with peasants, farmers, pastoralists, outlaws, mercenaries and adventurers. Nevertheless, an important group that had escaped from bondage in Egypt joined in. This caused decisive transformation of the settlement structures.

The religion of the fugitives that had escaped from Egypt was a key factor in the economically oriented struggle in Palestine at the time of the conquest period. The Canaanite rebels embraced the religion of Yahweh because Yahweh is the Lord and Giver of the land, the God of freedom, and a God who will fight for them and lead them to freedom from the power under which they suffered. It was the covenant made at Sinai between Yahweh and a small group of fugitives from Egypt that had triggered the revolution.

The supporters of this model also relied on archaeological evidence. For example, they point to Canaanite antecedents of the four-room house and the collar-rim jar. And it is undoubtedly true that there are cultural continuities between Late Bronze and Iron I Canaan, although there are often differences too.
Objections were raised to the Peasant revolt model. Scholars doubt the power attributed to Canaanite rulers at the time of revolt and feel that it was underestimated. The Yahweh concept and Canaanite peasants are without evidence. Ethnicity was always very strong in Canaanite society. To give up identity and become something completely different is hard to accept. Nevertheless, the most obvious criticism is the origin of the Israel nation, for the Bible states that they were not indigenous to the land of Canaan.

Conclusion

Was the emergency of Israel an inside or an outside job? Did Israel emerge from within Canaanite society or did Israel come into the land from outside?

The complexity of "researching the beginnings of Israel" is evident in this discussion. The basic factors presented in this lesson are not new.

The Peaceful infiltration model has weak foundations due to archaeological excavations. The Peasant Rebellion model lacks the evidence that the main constituency of Israel derived from former Canaanite peasants who, by accepting Yahweh, overthrew their oppressors. The term indicating that apiru is a synonym to the word Hebrew has
been rejected and is without foundation. However, the Conquest model must be re-examined as well. It was certainly not a swift campaign, and not all the land was acquired through military conquest (Joshua 9:15, 17). It took Israel a long time to become the sole rulers of the land.

**SUMMARY**

Briefly review the main points of the lesson X.

The three main theories of models of Israelite settlement are: the Conquest Model, the Peaceful Infiltration Model, and the Peasant Revolt Model. The Conquest Model was developed by the Albright school. Therefore they followed the proposed ideas of William F. Albright. Albright and his followers suggest the total destruction of most Canaanite cities and their immediate occupation, as corroboration of the biblical story of Joshua. However, some scholars argued that their archaeology does not provide a clear and compelling support for the biblical story of settlement. Jericho was in question.

The Peaceful Infiltration Model was developed by the Alt-Noth school. Albrecht Alt proposed that the Israelites, rather than conquering Canaan militarily, peacefully infiltrated the hill country of Canaan. The major weakness of this model was the characterization of Israelites as nomads, for which there was lack of evidence. To take someone's land peacefully is impossible.

The Peasant Revolt Model was pioneered by George E. Mendenhall and later developed by Gotwald. A social reorganization took place inside the land among the Canaanite city-states (Amarna letters and apiru). According to this theory, Israel as a nation, or one distinctive group, emerged from peoples already in Canaan, peasants who revolted against their overlords. By embracing the Yahweh
religion, they became one distinctive group. However, objections were raised to this model also. The Yahweh concept and Canaanite peasants are without evidence. To give up identity and become something different is hard to accept. There is no biblical basis for this theory. The Bible states that Israelites were not indigenous to the land of Canaan.

PARTICIPANT'S MANUAL

LESSON I

Philosophical Background; Importance of History

What is History?

It could be

1) written record of actual events
2) events that happened in the past
3) ______________________

History is defined as the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of relevant data available in the historian's own present experience.

The earliest writing invented was the cuneiform script used by ________ five thousand years ago.

The understanding of history involves the interpretation of textual account written towards a specific end.

History is concerned with important things that have happened in the human past.

The main source of the history of Israel is the __________.

Why is History Important to a Christian?

Notes:

Galatians 4:4

329
1 Corinthians 15:14; Romans 1:20

1.

2.

3.

Historie means the study of past events with a view to discovering what actually happened.

Geschichte means the study of the past; thus discovery of what happened calls for decisions about our past.

Chronicle a simple narrative, events in chronological order without any statement.

Significant narrative not only tells us what happened but lets us explore why it happened.

When did Israelite History Begin?

Notes:

Biblical History and Other Ancient Histories

In common:

Notes:

Differences:
The concept of a monotheistic God.

Yahweh not a projection of anthropomorphic features.

Divinely ordained history and revealed covenant.

Does it Really Matter?

The whole problem of the history of Israel depends to a large degree on the scholar’s presuppositions about ______________________ portrayed in the biblical text, and the value of ______________________

"In biblical faith everything depends upon whether the central events actually occurred."

We cannot escape the debate. Its results appear in our daily newspapers, in books on the paperback rack in stores, and in the curricula of our high schools and colleges. Its presence raises the question of the nature of responsible and valid interpretation that reflects accurately the contents of biblical texts and tells us what happened in the past.

The Role of Biblical Hermeneutics and the Understanding of Ancient Israel's History

Pre-Reformation Period

Prior to the 18th century, the Christian church had always taken at face value the claims of the Pentateuch to have been composed by the historic Moses of the 15th century BC. However, even in the 1st century of the Christian era, there were those who doubted the authority of the Scripture.

Notes:

School of Alexandria

Notes:

This school used a radical application of the allegorical method of biblical interpretation which claimed that "all scripture has a spiritual meaning; not all has a literal meaning.

Notes:

School of Antioch

Notes:

This school emphasized grammatical studies. They tried to understand what the writers of Scripture intended to convey to their hearers or readers.

Notes:
The reformers developed the Grammatical-historical (sometimes called Historical-grammatical) method of interpretation of the Bible based on Martin Luther's principles of *sola scriptura*, which means "The Bible only."

Notes:

The Post-Reformation Period

This period continues with the Grammatical-historical method. However, due to scientific influence, there comes a shift in belief.

The Age of Enlightenment

Many abandoned the Grammatical-historical method. They claimed that the Bible was not any more what it said it is. Many started seeing problems and inconsistencies within its passages. Thus, the Historical-critical method became popular.

What led to the Historical-critical Method

Even before the Age of Enlightenment, people started to question passages from the Pentateuch.

Andreas Rudolf Bodenstein

Benedict Spinoza

Jean Astruc

J. G. Eichorn

One of the problems the Historical-critical method sees in Scripture is in the relationship of sources and their dating. Thus they saw inconsistencies in the Pentateuch. The different divine names, they said, pointed to two different authors.
Critical Thinking Before Wellhausen

The Documentary Hypothesis

Notes:

The Supplementary Hypothesis

Notes:

The Fragmentary Hypothesis

Notes:
The Historical-critical method looks at the Bible as a volume of documents from the past to be studied by the same principle as any other ancient document, namely: the principle of correlation, of analogy, and of criticism.

**The Principle of correlation**

Notes:

---

**The Principle of analogy**

Notes:

---

**The Principle of criticism**

Notes:

---

Historical criticism assumes that Bible does not provide an accurate view of Israel's history. Thus, biblical issues (such as creation, the patriarchs, the exodus, the conquest/settlement, the judges) are not historical. The Historical-critical scholarship's goal has been to reconstruct early Israel's "true" history, using a variety of methodologies or "tools." These are: Source Criticism, Form Criticism, Tradition Criticism and New Literary Criticism.

**Critical Literary Method**

**Source Criticism**

Notes:
Form Criticism

Notes:

Tradition Criticism

Notes:

New Literary Criticism

Notes:

A Comparison Between the Historical-critical Method and the Historical-biblical Method

The Historical-critical method used the principles and procedures of secular historical science. The Historical-biblical method uses Martin Luther's method *sola scriptura*.

Read Isaiah 8:20

In the first method, the human investigator has the right to evaluate and criticize the biblical text, while the other believes that the Bible should not be subjected to the principle of criticism.

Read Isaiah 66:2

The Historical-critical method uses analogy. The Historical-biblical discards the theory of analogy to allow for the unique activity of God, as described in the Scripture.
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Read 2 Peter 1:19-21

The Historical-critical method uses the principle of correlation. The other believes in divine intervention in history as described in the Bible.

Read Hebrew 1:1-2

The Historical-critical method sees disunity in the Bible; the other believes in a comparison within the Scriptures.

Read Luke 24:27; 1 Corinthians 2:13

Notes:
Non-biblical Method of Interpretation of Israelite History

Archaeology and the Understanding of Ancient Israel’s History

Archaeology

In all ages and all countries, man has been fascinated by his past. Today many people argue that it is only by studying the past that we can properly understand the present and, perhaps, learn from the errors and achievements of our ancestors.

Meaning of the word archaeology

Archaeology is

The Tell and the Ruin

a Tell is

a Ruin is

Excavation Methods

The traditional method of Near Eastern archaeology was based on wide-scale exposure of complete architectural units.

The second approach was introduced by Kathleen M. Kenyon, who developed a technique known as the "Wheeler-Kenyon method."

Notes:

The Finds
A variety of finds from settlement sites includes architectural remains and burials which contain large quantities of pottery, metal and stone objects, including inscriptions, artworks (seals, pottery and metal figurines, jewelry, ivory works), animal bones, and plant remains.

**Geographical setting of Palestine**

The geographical location of the country determined the importance of its role in the history of the ancient Near East. On the one hand, Palestine formed a bridge between the two ends of the Fertile Crescent, Egypt on the south and Syria and Mesopotamia in the north. On the other hand, it was compressed between the Mediterranean Sea on the west and the desert to the east. This unique situation was a basic factor in Palestine's history and cultural development.

**Notes:**

**Archaeology and History**

*Rosetta Stone*

Jean-Francois Champollion (1790-1832)

*Behistun inscription*

Sir Henry Rawlinson (1810-1895)

**Problems in archaeological research**

Archaeology in Palestine in the past, and to a large extent even today, has been motivated by an interest in the Bible.
During the 1930s, William F. Albright and his followers, (Albright was considered the father of biblical archaeology) looked upon archaeology as a valuable tool capable of supporting the true biblical history of the Israelites, mainly the patriarchs.

Prove the Bible

"Yet because the Bible is not history in the modern critical or scientific sense, archaeology is limited in the contribution it can make. Archaeology may clarify the historical context of events described in biblical history, but it cannot confirm the interpretation of these events by the biblical writers, much less the modern theological inferences to be drawn from them."¹

Nevertheless, without archaeology much information about the Bible would be missed; so without the Bible much archaeological material would go unexplained.

LESSON V

Archaeology and Bible

The Patriarchal Period

Current Approaches to the Bible

For centuries people were divided into two groups: scholars who were believers and the secular biblical critics. Today Scripture is not as simple a topic as it used to be believed.

Notes:

Purpose of Archaeology

For many years many individuals thought that the goal of archaeology was to prove the Bible. But does the bible need proof?

Notes:

Relationship Between Archaeology and the Bible

What is the Bible?

The Bible is not merely an account of man's past and the reality of his present; it is primarily the way through which and in which God reveals Himself and His will.

Notes:

Could not the bible be one giant parable and still teach us the truth about God? There are many who believe
that the historicity of the events described in the Bible is irrelevant.

Even though faith does not require that the factuality of the biblical events be proven, if the historical events described in the Bible did not happen, not only would the truth of the Bible be seriously undermined, but the fall of historicity would inevitably bring down Christian faith with it.

Notes:

How is archaeology related to the Bible?

Archaeology provides us with the details of everyday life in Bible times.

Notes:

The great value of archaeology lies in its ability to place our biblical faith in its historical setting, and to demonstrate clearly the cultural setting in which biblical events took place.

Development of Biblical Archaeology

Edward Robinson

Notes:

William Foxwell Albright

Notes:

Archaeology can supplement, but should not be allowed to supplant the Bible.
Application of Archaeology in Biblical Hermeneutics

Debate on the Date and Historicity of the Patriarchal Period

The Date of Abraham's time

1 Kings 6:1

Notes:

Short Chronology (LXX)

Notes:

Abraham, his son Isaac and grandson Jacob were born and lived during the Middle Bronze Age (1950-1550).

Long Chronology (MT)

Notes:

Abraham, his son Isaac and grandson Jacob were born and lived during the Early Bronze IV Age (2250-1950). Jacob's arrival in Egypt occurred during Middle Bronze Age (1950-1550).

The City of Ur

J. E. Taylor, in 1854

Mound of Pitch or Tell al Muqayyar
Sir Leonard Wooley from 1922-1934

ziggurat

New Sumero-Akkadian empire

Ur-Nammu 2135-2025

Abraham was far from being a primitive Bedouin accustomed only to the wide spaces of the desert and the stern traditions of a nomad tribe. He was the heir to an age-old civilization, sharing the complex life of a great trade center.
LESSON VII

Abraham and Middle Bronze II Customs

Destruction of EB III Urban Centers

Amorites
Egyptians
Indo-European people (Kurugan people)
natural causes

Cities of Abraham

Sodom
Salem
Gerar
Hebron

Cities that had a close relationship with the
Patriarchs have found their place in history. According to
existing evidence, Abraham had his place in EBIV/MBI period.

Patriarchal Names and Customs Compared to Ancient Near
Eastern Parallels

Nuzi Tablets
Adoption
Marriage laws
Rights of Primogeniture
The Teraphim

The Mari Tablets

Biblical names such as Nahor, Banu-Yamina, Dawidum,
are quoted in the Mari letters or tablets.
LESSON VIII

The Time of the Exodus

The 13th Century Exodus

The Biblical Evidence

Israel's Place in Goshen

Cities they built for Egyptians (Exodus 1:11)

Historical Evidence

Merneptah stele (Israel stele) - 1230 BC

Archaeological Evidence

surveys

Cultural changes & new system of life

terracing,

cisterns,

collar-rim jar,

four-room house,

Objections to this theory

Egyptian history reveals that most of the dynasties had two capitals, one in Upper Egypt and one in Lower Egypt. While the Bible mentions the name Ramses, it does not employ...
it with the same chronological specificity with which it is employed in Egyptian texts.

Notes:
The 15th Century Exodus Theory

Biblical Evidence
1 Kings 6:1

Egyptian Evidence
18th Dynasty Kings connected to the Exodus:
Thutmos I
Hatshepsut
Thutmos III
Amenhotep II

The 10th Plague

Notes:

Archaeological Evidence for 15th Century Exodus
Amarna tablets
apiru

Archaeological evidence supports the 15th century Exodus more than it does the 13th century one. It is also evident that considerable agreement of the evidence from Egyptian and biblical sources point to the period of the 15th century and support the accuracy of the chronological date (480 years from building of temple to Exodus) from which the search started.
The Israelite Settlement

Conquest Model

Representatives: William F. Albright, G. Earnest Wright, John Bright, and Paul Lapp.

Theory:

Notes:

Weaknesses of the theory: Findings of archaeology do not provide a clear and compelling support for the biblical stories. The dates of destruction of various sites that the Israelites conquered do not fit together. Destruction of Jericho and Ai were questioned.

The Peaceful Infiltration Model

Representatives: Albrecht Alt, Noth, as well as Weippert.

Theory:

Notes:

Weaknesses of the theory: Characterization of the Israelites as nomads, for which there is lack of evidence. To take someone's land peacefully is impossible. It never happened in history, nor does it happen today.

The Peasant Revolt Model
Representatives: George E. Mendenhall and Norman Gottwald.

Theory:

Notes:

Weaknesses of the theory: Scholars doubt the power attributed to Canaanite rulers at the time of revolt. The Yahweh concept and Canaanite peasants is without evidence. Ethnicity was always very strong in Canaanite society. The most obvious criticism is the origin the nation of Israel for the Bible states that they were not indigenous to the land of Canaan.
Overhead transparency 1. A tell

Courtesy of the Institute of Archaeology/Horn Museum
Note: Adapted from John McRay, "The Bible and Archaeology," in Discovering the Bible, ed. Tim Dowley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 12.
Overhead transparency 4. Lamp types

Early Bronze Age

Middle Bronze Age

Late Bronze Age

Persian Period

Iron Age

Roman Period

Hellenistic Period

Note: Adapted from Victor Matthews, "Keep the Lamps Burning," in Discovering the Bible, ed. Tim Dowley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 57.
Overhead transparency 5. Map of Israel
Overhead transparency 7. The Rosetta Stone
Overhead transparency 8. The Cyrus Cylinder

Note: Adapted from T. C. Mitchell, Biblical Archaeology: Documents From the British Museum (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 83. (Artist Brian Manley).
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Overhead transparency 12. A ziggurat

Note: Adapted from Leonard Wooley, Excavations At Ur (New York: Oxford University Press, 1923), 130, Fig. 7.
Overhead transparency 13. Ur in the Abrahamic Age

Note: Adapted from Murrill R. Unger, Archaeology and the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1954), 110.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Overhead transparency 14. Restoration of a house

Note: Adapted from Leonard Wooley, Ur of the Chaldees, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), 164, Plate XII.
H. NUII AKKADIAN

(1) Sale-Adoption

The tablet of adoption belonging to Kuzu, the son of Karmishe: he adopted Tehip-tilla, the son of Puhishenni. As his share of the estate Kuzu gave Tehip-tilla 40 imers of land in the district of Iphushshi. If the land should have a claimant, Kuzu shall clear (it) and give (it) back to Tehip-tilla. Tehip-tilla in turn gave 1 mina of silver to Kuzu as his honorarium. Whoever defaults shall pay 1 mina of silver and 2 minas of gold.

(The names of fourteen persons and the scribe as witnesses, each preceded by the witness-sign.)

(2) Sale-Adoption

The tablet of adoption belonging to Nashwi, the son of Ar-shenni: he adopted Wullu, the son of Puhishenni. As long as Nashwi is alive, Wullu shall provide food and clothing; when Nashwi dies, Wullu shall become the heir. If Nashwi has a son of his own, he shall divide (the estate) equally with Wullu, but the son of Nashwi shall take the gods of Nashwi. However, if Nashwi does not have a son of his own, then Wullu shall take the gods of Nashwi. Furthermore, he gave his daughter Nuhuya in marriage to Wullu, and if Wullu takes another wife he shall forfeit the lands and buildings of Nashwi. Whoever defaults shall make compensation with 1 mina of silver and 1 mina of gold.

(The names of five persons and the scribe as witnesses, each preceded by the witness-sign.)
(3) Real Adoption

The tablet of adoption belonging to [Zike], the son of Akkuya: he gave his son Shennima in adoption to Shuriha-ilu, and Shuriha-ilu, with reference to Shennima, (from) all the lands . . . (and) his earnings of every sort gave to Shennima one (portion) of his property. If Shuriha-ilu should have a son of his own, as the principal (son) he shall take a double share; Shennima shall then be next in order (and) take his proper share. As long as Shuriha-ilu is alive, Shennima shall revere him. When Shuriha-ilu [dies], Shennima shall become the heir. Furthermore, Kelim-ninu has been given in marriage to Shennima. If Kelim-ninu bears (children), Shennima shall not take another wife; but if Kelim-ninu does not bear, Kelim-ninu shall acquire a woman of the land of Lullu as wife for Shennima, and Kelim-ninu may not send the offspring away. Any sons that may be born to Shennima from the womb of Kelim-ninu, to (these) sons shall be given [all] the lands (and) buildings of every sort. [However], if she does not bear a son, [then] the daughter of Kelim-ninu from the lands (and) buildings shall take one (portion) of the property. Furthermore, Shuriha-ilu shall not adopt another son in addition to Shennima. Whoever among them defaults shall compensate with 1 mina of silver (and) 1 mina of gold.

Furthermore, Yalampa is given as a handmaid to Kelim-ninu and Shatim-ninu has been made co-parent. As long as she is alive, she (i.e. Yalampa) shall revere her and Shatim-ninu shall not annul the [agreement].

If Kelim-ninu bears (children) and Shennima takes another wife, she may take her dowry and leave.

(The names of nine persons and the scribe as witnesses, each preceded by the witness-sign.)

The remaining sons of Zike may not lay claim to the lands (and) buildings belonging to the (above) one (portion) of the property.

The tablet was written after the proclamation.

(Sealed by eight persons, seven of whom were already named as witnesses.)

ANET, p. 220.
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Pharaohs of the 19th dynasty, 1320-1200

Ramses I (1320-1318)
Sethos I or Seti I (1318-1304)
Ramses II-the Great (1304-1237)
  pharaoh of oppression
  great warrior - battle at Kadesh
Merneptah (1236-1223)
  pharaoh of Exodus
Amenmesses (1222-1217)
Siti II (1216-1210)
Siptah (1209-1200)
The princes are prostate, saying 'Mercy!'
Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows.
Now that Tehenu (Libya) has come to ruin, Hatti is pacified;
Canaan has been plundered into every sort of woe:
Ashkelon has been overcome;
Gezer has been captured;
Yano'am is made non-existent.
Israel is laid waste and his seed is not;
Hurru is become a widow because of Egypt.
Overhead transparency 20. Late Bronze sites in Palestine
Overhead transparency 22. Terraces

Overhead transparency 23. A Cistern

Note: Adapted from Zeev Herzog, “Administrative Structures in the Iron Age,” in The Architecture of Ancient Israel, ed. Aharon Kempinski (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 228, Fig. 9.
Overhead transparency 24. Collared-rim jar

Note: Adapted from Seymour Gitin and William G. Dever, Recent Excavations in Israel: Studies in Iron Age Archaeology (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 92, Fig. 4.22.
Overhead transparency 25. A four-room house

Note: Adapted from Ehud Netzer, "Domestic Architecture in the Iron Age," in The Architecture of Ancient Israel, ed. Aharon Kempinski (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 228, Fig. 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18th Dynasty</th>
<th>1567-1320</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmose I</td>
<td>1580-1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmenhotep I</td>
<td>1554-1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis I</td>
<td>1532-1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis II</td>
<td>1518-1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td>1503-1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis III</td>
<td>1504-1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td>1450-1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmosis IV</td>
<td>1425-1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1417-1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep IV/Akhenaton</td>
<td>1379-1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhare (co-regent for 2 years)</td>
<td>1364-1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamin</td>
<td>1361-1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1352-1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemhab</td>
<td>1348-1320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ahmose  
1580-1554

son  
Amenhotep I  
1554-32  
had no heir

daughter  
Ahmose  
daughter  
1580-1554

Thutmose I  
1532-18  
commoner

Mutrotre  
commoner wife

Hatshepsut  
1504-1482  
commoner

Thutmose II  
1518-04  
commoner

Ese  
commoner

Moses  
ca. 1530  
adopted son

Nefrure  
commoner

Thutmose III  
1504-1450

Meryetre

Amenhotep II  
1453-1425

key: ----- married
Overhead transparency 28. Hatshepsut

Note: Adapted from Ian Wilson, Exodus The True Story (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985), 138.
Overhead transparency 29. Hatshepsut portrayed as a male

Note: Adapted from Ian Wilson, *Exodus The True Story* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985), 78.
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