

3.1 DESCRIBE THE ROLE OF CANAANITES IN THE NILE DELTA DURING THE 12TH AND 14TH DYNASTIES.

ANSWER: In the second half of the Egyptian 12th dynasty, many Canaanites were allowed into Egypt again but under strict governmental control. Few among the Canaanites found job in Egyptian household as servants other worked in the Egyptian temple state and even served as dancers. Some Canaanites were also brought to Egypt as captives.

3.2 WHAT HAPPENED TO THE CLIMATE AND CULTURE OF EGYPT AFTER THE REIGN OF SESOTRIS III?

WHY WOULD THESE CHANGES HAVE BEEN A THREAT TO THE CONTINUATION OF PHARAOH'S RULE?

WHY WOULD THIS MAKE A PHARAOH APPRECIATE JOSEPH'S WARNING?

ANSWER: After the reign of Sesotris III, many things began to fall apart in Egypt. Nile flood level became erratic. In some years, flood level rose between 12ft and 24ft above the normal food level. Other years the annual flood levels were very low. Low Nile flood level brought famine while high Nile flood level brought great abundance. The Egyptians even taxed people on the basis of high the flood was. However, high Nile flood level brought death and destruction. This erratic food level of Nile brought threat to Pharaoh because he claimed to be in control of Nile food. So a destructive flood levels were a threat to his reign, they question the validity of Pharaoh's rule.

This may have accounted for the reason why rulers followed rulers during these years. Pharaoh lost influence in Canaan and resulted into magic to try to influence events in the North. Since the level of Niles flood determined the economy of Egypt, the impending famine must have been as a result of low Nile flood level, which Pharaoh claimed to be in control. Having enough food to supply to meet the needs of the Egyptians will keep Pharaoh's government in control of Egypt: this must have been why Joseph's "proposal seemed good to Pharaoh and to all his servants" (Gen. 41:37).

3.3 WHAT POLITICAL OFFICE DID JOSEPH HOLD IN EGYPT? HOW DID THE TOMB OF THE VIZIER REKHMIRE INCREASE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF JOSEPH'S OFFICE? WHY WOULD PHARAOH HAVE GIVEN SOMEONE WITH THIS OFFICE A WIFE WHO WAS THE DAUGHTER OF THE PRIEST OF HELIOPOLIS?

ANSWER: Joseph held an important political position in Egypt. Joseph was appointed the Seer of Egypt. In the middle kingdom, the office of a seer was no longer hereditary; Pharaoh assigned the office to the noble of his on choosing. The overseer's authority extended over all of Egypt. The overseer's authority was regulated by very ancient laws because the overseer exercised the king's authority. Most of the things known about this office come from the text from the tomb of vizier Rekhmire, an 18th dynasty overseer. Overseer was important for Pharaoh; while the overseer runs the government, Pharaoh was free to go to war and participate in the religious ceremonies throughout Egypt.

The city of On is theology (Heliopolis) justified Pharaoh's claims to divinity. To support Heliopolis was important to Pharaoh. In the old kingdom, the priest of On had influence on who was to be the next Pharaoh. Pharaoh must have married Asenath to Joseph as a political marriage to strengthen Joseph's authority. He could have also given Joseph a wife who could be trusted to serve as a royal spy in his household.

3.4 WHAT EVIDENCE IS THERE THAT JOSEPH'S BROTHERS HELD HIGH POLITICAL OFFICE IN EGYPT?

ANSWER: Joseph's family shared his authority in Gen. 47:6; Pharaoh suggested ... "If you know any capable men among them (i.e. Joseph's brethren), then put them in charge of my livestock". Pharaoh was not suggesting that Joseph's brethren should be cowmen on the field but Joseph's brothers were given the office of Overseer of cattle. This was an important civil position in Egypt. Several Egyptian tomb texts noted that the tomb occupants had held such position as they rose to political ladder in the cult. In these texts, the office of overseer of cattle seemed to be half way in the political ladder. So Joseph's brothers became closely involved in Egyptian politics.

Another evidence that Joseph's brothers held high political position in Egypt could be seen in Gen. 47:27; Now Israel lived in the land of Egypt, in Goshen and they acquired property in it and were fruitful and became very numerous. All lands and properties in Egypt belong to Pharaoh (v. 20); the only exception was the land of the priest (v. 22) and for the high political position of the Israelites, they must have equally retained their land like the priests.

3.5 DESCRIBE THE GROUPS OF CANAANITES AND AMORITES WHO IMMIGRATED SOUTH INTO THE NILE DELTA DURING THE 13TH DYNASTY. HOW DID THEY BECOME EGYPT'S HYKSOS RULERS?

ANSWER: During the 13th Dynasty, many people from Syria and Palestine immigrated south to Egypt. These Canaanites and Amorites immigrated in a large group. These groups were well organized, well equipped and warlike. The kings who ruled these groups in Palestine continued to do so in Egypt. They retained most of their social and political structures in Egypt. This was also true of the Israelites. Despite Joseph's involvement in the government of Egypt, the Israelites developed a more or less independent tribal structure in Egypt. The Canaanites and the Amorites also maintained some level of autonomy especially in their internal affairs. This was possible because Egypt was having a hard time and Egypt central control of their country had fallen apart. The Canaanites and the Amorites groups in the Delta slowly consolidated their power. As a group, they seized the control of the North East Delta about 1720 B.C. They made Avaris or Tell Ed Daba the capital. These Semitic princes ruled the North-East Delta for forty-five years. They came to be called Hyksos.

In 1675 B.C, the Hyksos prince Salatis captured Memphis and occupied middle Egypt. Salatis began the 15th and 16th dynasties. The Hyksos ruled all of Egypt from 1730 B.C to 1570 B.C. The Hyksos were able to control Egypt from Delta because they formed a strong alliance with the Nubians, Egypt's traditional enemies on their southern border so that the Egyptians were sandwiched between two powerful allied armies. The Hyksos were also allies of the city-states in Palestine, and carried on extensive trade relations with them.

3.6 DESCRIBE ISRAEL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH EGYPT'S HYKSOS RULERS. WHAT KINDS OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CAN BE USED TO APPROACH AN ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION? WHY DID THE HYKSOS LEAVE EGYPT AT THE START OF THE 18TH DYNASTY, AND WHY DO YOU THINK THAT ISRAEL REMAINED IN EGYPT?

ANSWER: The relationship between the Israelites and the Hyksos rulers cannot be determined accurately, but few things are very clear. Israel as a group did not have close ties with the Hyksos; at least Israelites did not help the Hyksos to fence the capital, Avaris. Israel as a whole did not leave Egypt with the Hyksos when they fled Egypt. When Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. When Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, they had a strong antipathy against the nations of Palestine; this showed that they had no feeling at all that they were once close allies in Egypt. Exodus 1:8 say, "Now a new king arose over Egypt, who did not 'know' Joseph". The word

“know” is a technical terminology used both in the Bible and Egyptian texts to suggest participation in a treaty or covenant. While Israel as a group maintained their national identity, it was not impossible that some individual Israelites served in the Hyksos government, just as Joseph served in Pharaoh’s court. Some few individual Israelites might have transferred their loyalty to the new Hyksos rulers, which they had for the Egyptian rulers when they were in Egyptian politics. While Hyksos culture may have appealed to many Israelites, since both groups spoke West Semitic and had come from Palestine, the land God promised Abraham. There is circumstantial evidence that Israelites as a group did not have a close ties with the Hyksos. The Israelites did not assist the Hyksos, as Avaris was besieged by the 18th dynasty pharaoh Ahmose. When the Hyksos fled from Avaris, the Israelites did not flee Egypt with them. When the Israelites entered Palestine, they had a strong antipathy against the nations of Palestine, which must have begun in Egypt. The strong religious difference between the Israelites and Hyksos might have discouraged close ties in relationship. Both the Israelites and the Egyptians practice circumcision but the Hyksos did not. The Israelites worshipped Yahweh, although inconsistently, but the Hyksos worshipped traditional gods like Baal and they paid lip services to Egyptian deities.

The Hyksos left Egypt as a result of the opposition of Egyptians against the Hyksos rulers. Ahmose, who took over leadership after the death of his brother Kamose; besieged the Hyksos capital Avaris with an army of 480,000 Egyptians. The Hyksos negotiated surrender when they could not find a way out and agreed to leave Egypt if the siege was lifted. The Hyksos opened the gates of Avaris and 240,000 Hyksos men, women, and children left Egypt forever. The Israelites did not follow the Hyksos out of Egypt probably for religious reason. The Hyksos worshipped Ball and paid lip service to the Egyptian deities while the Israelites worshipped Yahweh although not consistently. While the Hyksos were in Egypt, the Israelites might not have had a close ties with them and this might be the reason why when Israel entered Palestine, they had strong antipathy against the nations of Palestine, which probably began while they were in Egypt.

3.7 WHY DID EGYPT’S 18TH CYNASTY RULERS BOTH FEAR AND HATE THE HYKSOS AND THE ISRAELITES?

ANSWER: The Egypt’s 18th Dynasty rulers both fear and hate the Hyksos because they thought the people might return to power in the delta. This was a reasonable fear. The princes of Palestine were not only plotting to return to the delta, but the Hyksos’ Nubian allies continue to dominate Egypt’s southern provinces. Ahmose demonstrated his range by attempting to destroy every sign of the Hyksos in Egypt. The fear of the Egypt’s ruler concerning the Israelites was that the Israelites

were multiplying and they feared that the Israelites might join force with the Hyksos and took over Egypt again since both speak west Semitic and they both came from Palestine.

3.8 WHAT BIBLICAL EVIDENCE IS THERE THAT THE ISRAELITES WORSHIPPED IDOLS IN EGYPT? DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THESE ARE LIKELY TO BE EGYPTIAN IDOLS, CANAANITE IDOLS, OR BOTH?

ANSWER: The involvement of the Israelites in Egypt's politics must have involved them in worshipping the Egypt's gods since Egyptians practiced theocracy. Since Ezekiel 20 claimed that Israel worshipped the Egyptian gods, it is quite possible that many of the Israelites worshipped the syncretistic merger of Canaanites and Egyptian deities is common in the eastern delta during their sojourn.

3.9 HOW DID WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT AND CYRUS GORDON UNDERSTAND ABRAHAM'S OCCUPATION? WHAT EVIDENCE CAN BE USED TO SUPPORT THIS UNDERSTANDING OF ABRAHAM'S LIFESTYLE?

ANSWER: Albright believed that Abraham was involved in donkey-caravan trade. He noted that the evidence were circumstantial but compelling. All the places where Abraham sojourns were involved in donkey-caravan trade. Albright mentioned among these are Haran, Damascus, Watershed, Palestine, Neger and Egypt. He further noted that some element of Abraham's account could only refer to donkey-caravan trade.

Gen. 20:1 described journey back and fought between Palestine and Egypt while the patriarchs lived at the caravan base. Gen. 13:1 specifically mentioned caravan stages; Gen. 15:2 mentioned Abraham's outfitters in Damascus. Albright noted that Eliezer was Abraham's heir because Abraham owned him money. The Nuzi text notes that it was a common practice for a moneylender to be adopted in order to get security for the loan. Albright also noted that in Gen. 14:14, Abraham led a force of 318-armed men, and such trained armed men were necessary to prevent the caravan against bandits and raiders. Albright added that Gen. 14:13 called Abraham a Hebrew. Albright argued in detail that in the original, the word Hebrew referred to the donkey caravan.

Albright argued that the Habiru were originally divided into two groups, called the sons of the North and the sons of the South; Albright argued that the sons of the south were called the Bejamina, which he equated with the Benjamites in Israel. He further argued that the word Habiru

was traditionally translated as the dusty ones, he argued that this name was appropriate for someone working behind the donkey in caravan. Albright noted that 18th century B.C., the donkey caravaners were forced to find another occupations, because donkey caravan were replaced with Mules and wagons, then the name came to mean one from beyond by a normal phonetic change. Gordon observed that in the narratives of Genesis, one of the themes was that the Patriarch were businessmen. This could be seen in Gen. 23:16, which noted that Abraham paid 400 shekels of silver. Abraham was described as being very rich having in livestock, in silver and in gold (Gen. 13:2). Gordon suggested that this sound like commercial activities.

Genesis noted that Abraham traveled between Egypt and Padan-Aran, which was dominated by the Hittites. Gordon suggested that Abraham sold Hittites gold in Egypt and Egypt's gold to the Hittites. Gordon further suggested that the business interest of the Patriarch were also reflected latter in Genesis. Gordon noted an interesting parallel to the Patriarchal narratives; he noted that the Hittite tablets written by Hatshepsut III who reigned in Eastern Turkey from 1282 – 1250 B.C., the tablet was found in ugarit. The king passed a decree to curtail the trade movement of the businessmen from Ur. The businessmen from Ur were only allowed in Syria during the harvest; however, they were not allowed in the land during the winter. Ur merchants were not allowed to purchase real Estate and the land owned by the king. The Hittite king did make a decree that any citizen who could not pay his debt to the merchant of Ur, will be handed over to the merchants as a slave. Gordon noted that this treat required three specific things: (i) merchant trading rights were protected; (ii) the merchant were forbidden to purchase property and (iii) they were forbidden to settle in the land. Gordon noted that these three points were addressed in Gen. 34:10, when the king of Shechem offered Abraham the right to buy property in Shechem, the right to settle there and the right to trade there.

Gordon noted that Abraham led a company of 318 men who were of his household. Gordon noted that the text from ugarit mentioned two merchants from Ur. One was merchant who had no troop and the other kind was merchants who do have troops. Gordon noted that Abraham's immigration from Ur was part of a movement for which we have authentic documentation. Gordon noted that the patriarchal narratives and the ancient texts, they fell into second millennium B.C and the culture reflected the names used and the kind of literature used. Gordon also argued that the patriarchal narratives were changed and adapted by latter writers to make political and theological arguments.

3.10 DESCRIBE MOSES' CHILDHOOD. WHAT RELATIONSHIP MIGHT HE HAVE HAD WITH HATSHEPSUT? WHY DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THIS EITHER IS, OR IS NOT, A LIKELY EXPLANATION FOR MOSES' CHILDHOOD?

ANSWER: Israel's growth was a threat to the Monarch of Egypt, Amenhotep I Cor Ahmose I as some believed. He tried to cope with this threat by limiting Israel's growth. According to Ex. 1:22; he made a decree that every male child born to the Israelites was to be thrown to Nile. The parents of Moses, Amram and Jochebed were Levites; were not afraid of the king's command (Heb. 11:23). They hid Moses for three months, after which Amram and Jochebed set the child adrift in a tar lined basket. The reason behind this their action was not disclosed by the scripture; but this might be a way of obeying the king's command without taking the life of their son, Moses. It could also be a way of demonstrating their faith in Yahweh who is able to keep that which is committed into his hand not minding the king's command. "Then the daughter of Pharaoh came down to bathe at the Nile, with here maidens walking alongside the Nile; and she saw the basket among the reeds and sent her maid, she brought it to her..." (Ex. 2:5-6).

It has been suggested that the daughter of Pharaoh who took Moses and adopted him was Hatshepsut. Hatshepsut was the daughter of Thutmose I. Hatshepsut was certainly vain enough to prove her new position in the court by bringing a despised Hebrew child into the court and raising him as her son. Thutmose I, the father of Hatshepsut, was followed by the brief reign of Thutmose II. Thutmose II became Pharaoh by marriage to his half sister Hatshepsut. If Hatshepsut was the adopted parent of Moses, Moses became the son of Egypt's queen. This must have been how Moses became a man of power in words and deeds in the Egyptian court; and was educated in all the learning of Egypt (see Acts 7:22). Thutmose II reigned for five years and he died. He was followed by his son and co-regent, Thutmose III, the son of minor wife instead of Hatshepsut. Thutmose II arranged a marriage between his son Thutmose III and Merytre, the daughter of Hatshepsut. There must have been resentment between Thutmose III, the son of minor wife, and Moses, the adopted son of queen Hatshepsut.

It is believed that Thutmose III came to the throne around 1490 B.C., and from that moment forward, Thutmose III was at least in theory the Pharaoh. However, he was at least a youth (it is believed that, he was the same age with Moses, give or take, a difference of 5 years in age), he was not able to prevent Hatshepsut in ruling Egypt in his place. Roughly three years before the end of Hatshepsut's reign, Moses recognized the call of God upon him. Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. Instead, Moses thought that the reproach of Christ was greater riches than

the treasures of Egypt; “for he was looking to the reward” (Heb. 11:24-26). When Moses visited the Israelites, he was an Egyptian beating an Israelite. Moses took vengeance on the Egyptian and killed him. He believed that they should have recognized that their deliverance by God was through him; but they did not. When the Israelites rejected him, he was forced to flee from Egypt and from the royal court.

Three years after Moses fled from Egypt, Hatshepsut died an unnatural death, leaving Thutmose III on the throne. This is a likely explanation for Moses’ childhood; there was a noted quotation from a contemporary official that described Hatshepsut’s reign in these words: “Thutmose II went forth to heaven and mingled with the gods. His son (Thutmose III) advanced to his place as king of the two lands and ruled on the throne of him who had begotten him. His sister (really Thutmose II’s half sister), the “God’s wife” Hatshepsut governed the land; the two lands were at her will and served her. Egypt was in submission ... for she was a dictator excellent of plans who reassured the two regions by her speaking. She claimed that Thutmose I had intended her to rule Egypt. Hatshepsut also declared that the gods had appointed her to rule many nations. The prominent position Moses reached in Egypt’s politics and education must have been as a result of such powerful woman who had adopted him. The expulsion of Moses from Egypt must have been as a result of the resentment of Thutmose III toward Hatshepsut, who usurp his power and also adopted Moses, a Hebrew slave son, and brought him to the royal court.

CASSETTE #4

4.1 WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN EGYPT DURING THE 40 YEARS THAT MOSES HID IN THE SINAI AS A MIDIANITE SHEPHERD?

ANSWER: Moses left Egypt three years before the unnatural death of Hatshepsut. When Hatshepsut died, Thutmose III was left alone on the throne. The rage of Thutmose III grew against Hatshepsut, and perhaps against Moses. As soon as Hatshepsut was killed, Thutmose III had her name and picture erased from every Temple and monument where it could be found. Thutmose was also enraged at West Semitic peoples like the Israelites because of his ongoing fear and rage at the Hyksos. He treated the Israelites with great brutality. His rage was not limited to the Semitic peoples of Nile Delta; to guarantee Egypt’s security, he established a policy of ruling Syria and Palestine with an iron hand. Thutmose invaded Palestine, as he passed through Palestine, he defeated a confederation of Canaanite city-states at Megiddo. The confederation defeated by Thutmose III included the Hyksos who had escaped from Avaris and Sharuhén. Thutmose III

claimed to have conquered 119 cities in the lowland of Palestine. Between the 23rd and 42nd years of his reign, Thutmose III brought about 5,000 captives. These captives were used to build Temple storehouses. This parallels closely the Israelites' life in the northeast Delta. For both these captives and the Israelites, the reign of Thutmose III was a time of enormous construction. Thutmose III rebuilt many Temples; example this was Pithom, or Per-Atum, the Temple estate of the high god Atum. While Moses hid, the Israelites suffered under the grievous burdens of Thutmose III. Thutmose's empire may have cause problem not only for the Israelites in Egypt but also for Moses as he hid in the wilderness.

4.2 WHY DID THUTMOSE III INVADE PALESTINE AND SYRIA SO OFTEN?

ANSWER: Thutmose III invaded Palestine and Syria often not mainly for economic reason but for Egypt's security. Thutmose III also wanted to control the flow of trade across the region. Controlling Palestine and Syria would prevent an invasion of Egypt from the north. Controlling the trade routes could make Egypt rich.

4.3 DESCRIBE SOME OF THE EVIDENCE THAT ISRAEL'S EXODUS FROM EGYPT OCCURRED DURING THE 18TH DYNASTY

ANSWER: The 18th dynasty Exodus is a time period just after the death of Thutmose III. Thutmose III died somewhere between 1450 B.C. and 1447 B.C. Those who defend 18th dynasty Exodus date the date of the Exodus at 1445 B.C. Some of the evidences for 18th dynasty Exodus are:

- Many Evangelical Scholars date the Exodus at 18th dynasty for Biblical chronological reasons:
- I Kings 6:1 – claims that Solomon built the Jerusalem Temple 480 years after the Exodus. The temple was built in 966 B.C; plus or minus 5 years. This will place the Exodus 1445 B.C. plus or minus a couple of years.
- Judges 11:26 – this claimed that the children had been in possession of trans-Jordan for 300 years by Jephtah's day. This date the Exodus at somewhere before 1350 B.C.
- Exodus 4:19 – this passage suggests that the Pharaoh who sought Moses' life had died after Moses spent 40 years in the wilderness. This suggests that the last Pharaoh before the Exodus must have reigned 40 years before the Exodus. Only Thutmose III and Ramsees the great reigned that long. The argument is that the Exodus must have occurred after the death of one of those rulers.

There are some archaeological evidences for 18th dynasty Exodus. John J. Bimpston and Livingston wrote an article (Re: Redating the Exodus) that Jericho was destroyed by Joshua in Joshua 2 and 6. Jericho was not occupied between 1300 B.C and 1100 B.C so could not be occupied in 19th dynasty Exodus. Gideon made a treaty with Israel in Joshua chapter 9; however, no late Bronze Age city has been found at the site, so it was not occupied in the 19th dynasty. In Joshua 14:13-15, Joshua gave Hebron to Caleb. Excavation showed no evidence of occupation in 13c B.C so it was not occupied in the 19th dynasty.

Homer or Zephath was described, as been a flourishing town during the conquest in Josh. 21:1-3. Excavation showed that the towns were fortified between 1900 BC and 1550 BC. However, it was never occupied after that until after Iron Age. So it was not occupied during 19th dynasty. The lecturer equally contested the occupation of the site during the 18th dynasty. Simpston and Livingston argued that 19th dynasty will be a poor fit for the archaeology of Palestine.

4.4 DESCRIBE SOME OF THE EVIDENCE THAT ISRAEL'S EXODUS FROM EGYPT OCCURRED DURING THE 19TH DYNASTY. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT AN 18TH OR A 19TH DYNASTY EXODUS IS MORE LIKELY?

ANSWER: The big evidence for the 19th dynasty Exodus is in Exodus. 1:11, which says the children of Israel "built for Pharaoh storage cities Pithom and Ramses". The assumption is made that the storage city of Ramses must be associated with pro-Ramses, the city of Ramses the great. If that identification is correct, then the Israelites must have lived Egypt during the early 19th dynasty; when Ramses the great ruled and the exodus must have been surely after the death of Ramses the great.

There are several problems with this; one of the problems is chronology. If Moses was born 80yrs before the exodus, he was born before the beginning of 19th dynasty. The book of Exodus declared that the children of Israel built Pithom and Ramses before Moses was born, so they built Ramses before Ramses the great was born in 19th dynasty. So the link between the city Ramses in Exodus 1:11 and Pharaoh Ramses is very high problematic. 18th dynasty exodus is more likely than 19th dynasty exodus due to weightier evidences in support of 18th dynasty exodus.

4.5 DESCRIBE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO INVASIONS OF PALESTINE BY AMENHOTEP II. HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THIS DIFFERENCE?

ANSWER: There is a remarkable contrast between two campaigns of Amenhotep II into Palestine. Amenhotep II's first campaign occurred during his second year. After fighting a brief fight at Shemesh-Edom, he crossed the Orontes into Syria, and campaigned as far as Ugarit. Amenhotep II captured seven princes and nearly eight hundred men. This was typical of Egyptian's northern campaign. When Pharaoh invaded the north, they generally brought south less than a thousand captives. In the ninth year of Amenhotep II, he invaded again the north. Amenhotep II reigned from 1452 to 1425 BC; the ninth year of his reign would be after 1446 BC. This is the traditional date for Israel's Exodus, for those who defend 18th dynasty Exodus. In his second campaign, Amenhotep II brought back to Egypt 89,600 slaves, despite his very limited objectives. This is almost one hundred times the number of captives that Egyptian Pharaoh's usually brought back from northern campaigns. The difference between Amenhotep II's first and second campaign could be understood if his goal was to obtain work force to replace Israel. God might have equally used this to weaken Canaanites in preparation for Israel's conquest.

4.6 DISCUSS THE EVIDENCE FOR LITERACY IN THE MOSAIC AGE. WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FOR THE ORIGIN OF A WRITTEN SCRIPTURE?

ANSWER: Pentateuch claimed writing from the beginning till the end. There has been academic debate on the Pentateuch taking its source from oral tradition rather than in written documents. The mosaic age was a literate period. The evidences are: Gen. 5:1 says, "This is the book of genealogy of Adam. This suggests that the descendants of Adam were written down just as the king list of Egypt and Mesopotamia were written down from the earliest times. Genealogy seemed to have been preserved throughout Israel's history. This can be seen in Num. 11:16, which includes Eldad and Medad among those who have been registered (v 26). A number of texts suggest that literacy was wide spread in Israel.

Gen. 41:42 claims that Joseph received Pharaoh's inscribed signet ring to seal documents. Such signet rings were common in Israel in the wilderness; they are mentioned in Ex. 31:50 and 35:22. Legal dealing required sealed written documents. For example when a couple divorced Deut 24:1-3 noted they were required to receive written certificate of divorce. Books were present in the community, for example Num. 21:14 quotes from the book of the wars, of the LORD. The extent of literacy in Israel is suggested in Deut. 6:8-9, 11:18-20. These passages suggest that Israel were required to wear God's written command on their garments and write God's command at the doors

and gates of their house. This suggests that every family was involved in literacy in some degree. Israel's relationship with God was closely related with literacy. Exodus 32:32-33 suggests that book exists in heaven in some form. Israel's most holy object, the tablets of the law, the first copies of these tablets were written by God himself. God carved the second set of these tablets through Moses. These tablets are described in Exodus 24:12; 31:18; 32:15, 19; 34:1-4; Deut. 4:13; 5:22; 9:9-11; 9:15-17; 10:25. They are mentioned so often that the centrality of literacy in Israel's covenant is obvious. Writing was also used in some other ways in Israel's relationship with God.

Writings were used in cultic ceremonies. Exodus 39:30 note that Aaron's golden crown was inscribed with engraving signet ring. Numbers 5:23 note that in the case of adultery, "the priest shall then write these curses on a scroll, and he shall wash them off into the water of bitterness". Numbers 17:2-3 notes that Aaron's name was written on the rod of Levi. Writing was very closely involved in Israel's teaching and covenant. Exodus 17:14 note that God asked Moses to write God's judgment against the Amalekites in a book and to recite it to Joshua. Exodus 24:4 note that Moses wrote all of God's words and laws in a book. Exodus 24:6-7 note that blood was sprinkled on the book of the covenant and then the book of the covenant was read to Israel.

Exodus 34:27-28, God commanded Moses to write the words of covenant. The written records of Israel's history came to be called "the testimonies". It was placed near the Ark of the Covenant. This written testimony are mentioned in a great number of passages in the books of Moses. It could be observed that the written testimony beside the Ark of the Covenant was an important thing in Israel. Deut. 17:18-19 Moses commanded that Israel's rulers must write for themselves "a copy of this law on a scroll in the presence of the Levitical Priests. The ruler is to read this scroll that he himself has written all the days of his life and to observe all the words of the law. Deut. 27:1-8 requires the Israelites to write the words of the law on a pile stones as they cross the Jordan. Deut. 28:58-61 warned Israel that they would suffer all the curses written in the book, if they refuse to obey the law written in the book. The same idea is expressed in Deut. 29:20-21; 27-29. Israelites will be blessed if they obey God's law (Deut. 30:10). Deut. 31:9-11 recorded that Moses wrote all the words of the law and gave the documents to the Priests who carried the Ark. Moses then required that at the end of every seven years, the book would be read to Israel. Deut. 31:24-26 notes that this written document will become a witness against Israel because of their sin. There is another kind of written materials in the wilderness community. Deut. 31:19-22 noted that Moses wrote a long song and taught to Israel. The implication of this is that the Ancient_Near_East was a literate word and the testimonies of the books of Moses reflect this. The scripture were not just

handed down through oral tradition but were written down as the old testament and culture of the ancient near east agreed with this.

4.7 DISCUSS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORAL TRADITION AND WRITTEN TRADITION REFLECTED IN THE SONG OF MOSES RECORDED IN DEUT. 31:19-22

ANSWER: Deuteronomy 31:19-22 noted that Moses wrote a song and taught the children of Israel. The song of Moses became an oral tradition handed down in Israel. However, the oral tradition had its root in a written version. This written tradition preserved the accuracy of the oral tradition.

4.8 HOW COULD THE NAMES USED FOR GOD IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS CONTRIBUTE TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK?

ANSWER: The appearance of the names of God in Genesis could be divided into sections according to the names of God in each section. In Gen. 1, the only name for God is Elohim, this name appears twenty seven times. The name Elohim also appears frequently throughout the book. In Gen. 2 and 3, the name YHWH Elohim appeared twenty times. These combinations nowhere else appeared in the book of Genesis. In Gen. 4 through 32, the name Yahweh appeared very frequently. It appeared a total of one hundred and sixty two times in the book as a whole. The name Yahweh also appeared in chapters 38 and 39. However, the name Yahweh does not appear at all in Genesis 33 to 37. The name only appeared once in Gen. 40 to 50. These entire look much like there was a block of materials that used different name for God.

4.9 WHAT DID YEHUDA RADDAY AND HIS ASSOCIATES CONTRIBUTE TO AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS IN THEIR BOOK GENESIS: AN AUTHORSHIP STUDY IN COMPUTER ASSISTED STATISTICAL LINGUISTICS?

ANSWER: Yehuda Radday and his associates penned down the exact boundary in the book of Genesis from JED & P. When they began the study, they believed that the study was needed because there was so little agreement which verses in Genesis should be associated with these sources. Radday and his associates looked at the small fragments of Hebrew language that people used unconsciously. They ran the data through a computer to look for sections of the book where different of Hebrew occurred. Radday and his associates discovered that they are indeed four different kinds of Hebrew in the book of Genesis. However, this four kinds of Hebrew are not Hebrew that could be associated with JED & P. The four kinds of Hebrew were divine speech,

human speech, narration before Joseph's account and narration after Joseph's account. Radday and his associates concluded that at least in the book of Genesis there is no evidence at all of documentary hypothesis. It simply cannot be correct. Radday and his associates made a strong case of the literary unity of the book.

4.10 WHAT PURPOSE WAS SUGGESTED FOR THE CREATION ACCOUNT IN GENESIS? WHY DO YOU EITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THIS SUGGESTED PURPOSE?

ANSWER: The purpose suggested for the book of Genesis are: Genesis was written to meet the needs of the people that just came out of Egypt, the wilderness community had a very great many needs. The people were in chaos; some have to worship the gods of Egypt, some had to worship Hasus gods of Canaan. Within this community were those who did not know God at all. How could this confused people be turned to the people of God? Genesis was written to teach the people who they really were before God. If they have to learn whom they were before God, Moses had to give them creation account. This is important because the Egyptian's theological tradition were grounded in their creation account. Most of the Egyptian's temples were constructed with artistic motifs based upon their creation account. Pharaoh's claim to divinity was based on the theology of Egypt's creation and flood accounts. Many of the disturbed and distorted theology among the wilderness community were based on Egyptian's creation and flood account.

If Moses was to build a solid faith for Israel, he had to begin by offering his own account for the creation and flood account instead. This suggested purpose for the creation account is reasonable and in agreement with both the testimony of the scripture and Egyptian theology. Genesis chapter 1 has similarities and several features with the Egyptian theology. The Biblical creation account was intended to be a theological argument against the mythology of the Ancient Near East. The Genesis creation account used mystical terms and images, but it was used in a way that is incompatible with mythology of the Ancient Near East.

It has been argued that the Genesis creation account was intended to argue against the error contained in the myth of the Ancient Near East. The Genesis creation account mimic the Egyptian creation account, it formed a parallel that was close enough that the Israelite could jump from one account to another.

CASSETTE #5

5.1 LIST SOME OF THE EGYPTIAN PARALLELS TO THE CREATION ACCOUNT IN GENESIS.

ANSWER: Some of the parallels between Genesis creation account and Egyptian creation account:

Gen. 1:1 stated that God created the heaven and the earth, this contrast sharply with the creation account found Heliopolis where the gods Gep and Nut fell from the sky and were born by gods. In the Egyptian creation account, the earth was not really created, but it rolled as a result of natural forces through the birth of gods from other gods. Moses thought that Yahweh created physical objects before the heaven and the earth. These objects were never in any sense personified, they were simply physical objects created by Yahweh. Gen. 1:2 stated that the earth were already present but were formless and void when the spirit of God hover over the surface of the water. The god Aamun at Hevakleopolis was the wind, the source of life Aamun was hovering over the sea, steering them into activity and producing the first land. Several other motifs were also present in Egyptian texts.

Gen. 1:3 Yahweh declared let there be light and there was light, subsequent creation occurred by the word of God. In some Egyptian creation text, the god Patum thought a word in his mind spoke the word and the things that he spoke were created. In other texts, both god Atum and god Osiris were depicted as wishing in their heart, speaking the word and creating by the power of their word. Gen. 1:5 stated that there was evening and morning one day subsequent creation occurred in the series of days. The Egyptians also structured time in seven periods were based on the four faces of the moon 28 days cycle. The idea of days was reflected in the Egyptian creation account in several different ways. It can be seen in the days of the completion of eye of Horus. Another text note the five days in which the sons of Nuk were born, this list of days stressed the events that occurred in each of these creative days. The closest parallel to Genesis 1 could be seen in creation days described at Herakleopolis. The first creation days parallel very closely four days of Genesis creation accounts. At Herakleopolis the first day of creation of the great deep and the second day, the birth of god moved on the waters and on the third day, light was created, fourth day land rolled from waters. This is a very close fit to the genesis account. In Gen. 2:8, God planted a garden in the east, in Eden. There, a few Egyptian parallel of the heavenly garden in the east. Most of these are associated with solar ray theology. This is an extremely important theology in the eastern Nile delta where Israel lived.

Gen. 2:20: noted that God created a man named Adam. The name Adam is essentially the same as the Egyptian primario god Aatum. This god was the father of all other gods. Aatum is believed to have completed all other gods in him and he was preserved in an appearance of a man. Aatum was the first man-like being in Egypt. Moses trusts that the first man was fully man and was created by Yahweh. Gen. 2:7 stated that God formed Adam from the dust of the ground and Gen. 2:21 added that God formed Eve from Adam's rib. It has been observed that in Egyptian texts, the word rib and clay sound the same and were often confused with each other. If so, Genesis may be saying that Eve was formed from Adam's clay instead of Adam's rib. The word translated formed (Hebrew) in Gen. 2:7 came from the same root as the word porta. This is important because the Egyptian god Khnum then breathed into the man the breadth of life and became a living man.

Gen. 2:7 Moses was insisting that Yahweh formed man's body instead of the Egyptian porta god, Khnum. In Gen. 1:26 God said let us create man in our image and the Egyptian wisdom text called instruction of Merikarab claimed that all men were god's images created from gods' body. The real image of god in Egyptian text was Pharaoh; he was the living incarustion of the god, Horus. Pharaoh's claimed to be the image of god because he believed he was god. Moses stressed that all men were formed in God's image and not just Pharaoh. Moses also stressed that this status, God's image, does not give any man the claim to divinity but instead a creation and a servant of Yahweh. In brief, the book of Genesis has a purpose and that purpose began in creation and food account. The creation account proofed that the Israelites owned their existence to Yahweh not to the gods of Canaan or Egypt.

5.2 HOW DID ISRAEL'S SEA CROSSING WERVE AS A THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST EGYPTIAN THEOLOGY?

ANSWER: Israel's sea crossing mimicked key aspects of Egyptian theology. The Egyptian Field of Reeds theology justified Pharaoh's claim to divinity. Field of Reeds theology also provided the Egyptians with a hope for a blessed after life. The sea crossing made a strong argument that Yahweh was God not Pharaoh or the Egyptian gods. The Egyptian believed that the righteous dead would serve Pharaoh forever in a fast water long Field of Reed. The righteous lived an island in a swap. It was only possible to arrive at this region by crossing a miraculous pathway opened by god himself for Pharaoh and his servants. How did Israel's seas crossing served as a theological argument against Field of Reed theology? Israel's sea crossing mimicked key aspects of Field of Reed theology but this served in a way as proof that Yahweh was God.

The first parallel between the sea crossing and the Egyptian Field of Reed theology was the fact that the Egyptian cross Yam suph or sea of Reeds. Most Egyptian's depiction of the underworld described somewhere in some other terms, that there is a huge diversity in the Egyptian description of the underworld. The theological significance of this was that the Israelites were able to actually cross an area that the Egyptians hope to be able to cross after they died.

The second parallel is that Israel crossed the Reed miraculously through the pathway created by God Himself. Such divinely provided pathway appeared countless times in Egyptian description of the underworld. Pharaoh expected his god to open such a pathway for him so that he can cross to the presence of his god. Pharaoh's hope might happen after he died. Israel crossed the real Field of Reed through the pathway created by Yahweh.

The third parallel is that Israel crossed a pathway formed by the east wind. The Egyptian coffin spell 162 declared that Pharaoh's path through the underworld would be opened by the east wind. This is not an important detail in Egyptian text, but it is not unknown. When Israel left Egypt, a real east wind opened the pathway through a real Field of Reed.

The fourth parallel could be seen in Exodus 15:13. This verse states that God has led Israel to God's holy dwelling place. In Egyptian text, Pharaoh crossed the Field of Reed to arrive at god's mansion. Israel crossed the real reed to arrive at real holy mountain dwelling place.

The fifth parallel is that Israel cross the reed at night. According to Ex. 14:25, Pharaoh's chariot were driven back from Yahweh's presence during the morning watch. It is observed that the morning watch is between 2.00 a.m. and 6.00 a.m. in the morning. Ex. 14:27 noted that Moses stretched out his hand at dawn and the water swept away the Egyptian army. This was a very hard time of day for Israel to be crossing the sea. The footing at Yam suph sea bed could not have been very good. Crossing in the dark could have been extremely confusing. Why would God lead Israel in the Yam Suph in the dark? The answer could be discovered in the events of the intended theological purpose. In the Egyptian text, both the sun god Ra and Pharaoh bath in the Field of Reed at dawn. They did so to prepare themselves to rise to heaven. Dawn was also the time sun god was worshipped. Egyptians believed that Re rose at dawn to judge the wicked, the Egyptian enemies and protecting the Egyptians. When the Egyptians army crossed the real sea of reed into Yahweh's presence; they did indeed based in the field of reed in God's presence. They drown in

the field of reed and perished in God's judgment. When the sun rose, the sun god Ra did not rise to deliver Egypt. The Egyptian army died because they stayed in the presence of the true God.

The last parallel is that the Egyptian army could not approach the Israel at night because they could not pass through the pillar of cloud of fire. This is important because the Egyptian field of reed was full of areas of spiritual fire. The underworld was divided into 12 chambers by fiery gates that burned in the underworld gates. There was lake of fire in the underworld where the wicked were consumed. The dwelling place of the underworld god was fire. Fire surrounded the sun god, Ra. Pharaoh believed that some magical power is needed to pass through the supernatural underworld fire. However, Pharaoh's army encountered real spiritual fire in the real field of reed, they were driven back by the fire, they could not cross the field of reed to God's holy dwelling place.

In summary, there were things the Egyptian theology claimed Pharaoh and his righteous servant should be able to do in the underworld. And there were things the Egyptians believed the wicked could not do in the underworld. The Egyptians considered the underworld as the field of reed. When the Egyptians encountered the real field of reed when they were chasing Israel, they could not do what their theology claimed they could do because they were facing the real field of reeds. But they could only do what the wicked could do in the underworld when they encountered the real field of reed.

5.3 HOW DID ISRAEL'S EXPERIENCE AT MOUNT SINAI SERVE AS A THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT AGAINST BAAL WORSHIP AND BAAL'S HOLY MOUNTAIN ZAPHON?

ANSWER: Yahweh brought Israel to His holy mountain, Mount Sinai. Sinai was a place where Israel encountered Yahweh, and heard His great voice thunder from the heart of heaven. It was a place where divine decree was issued. Sinai was the source of life giving water. Israel had worshiped Baal in Egypt; but now they saw the foolishness of Baal worship in the light of the burning glory of Yahweh.

5.4 WHY DID THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS FORBID EATING PIGS AND REQUIRE THAT THE RIGHT SHOULDER OF ANIMAL SACRIFICES BE GIVEN TO THE PRIESTS?

ANSWER: Lev. 11:7 noted that pig was an unclean and God forbade the children of Israel from eating pig. Pig was an abomination to the Egyptians because Zeph had manifested himself as a pig. Eating pig then became part of worship of Zeph-Baal in Egypt. Pig was probably eaten in

Baal worship. Israelites were forbidden from eating pig in order to prevent Baal worship. By asking the Israelites to give right shoulder of the animal sacrifice to the priest; Moses was preventing a dangerous idolatry practice.

5.5 HOW DID THE LECTURE SUGGEST THAT THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF NUMBERS SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD? WHY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THIS SUGGESTION?

ANSWER: The lecture suggested that the book of Numbers should be understood as a collection of unrelated short documents. It looked like either Moses or one of his successors wrote down his many brief texts as it could be used to fill a scroll and that collection became the book of Numbers. This suggestion may not be the accurate description of the book of Numbers. As the lecture claimed, the beginning of Numbers was written shortly after the Exodus and the conclusion shortly before the conquest. This will show continuity in thought between the book of numbers and the book of Exodus, which was written to educate the wilderness community on how to relate rightly with Yahweh, their God.

5.6 DISCUSS THE ISSUES RELATED TO DETERMINING HOW MANY PEOPLE LEFT EGYPT WITH MOSES?

ANSWER: Numbers 1:44-46 claimed that 603,550 men 20 years old and upward left Egypt excluding women and children. The total number of the people who left Egypt could be estimated to be around one million people. The lecture claimed this number to be too large to be accurate because the population of Egypt around that time was four million people. And when the Hyksos left Egypt they were around a quarter of a million people. The problem with the figure could be viewed this way: how can one million people drink from a stream flowing from Sinai? How can one million people walk around Jericho seven times in one day? Why would one million people be frightened when thirty six people were killed at the gate of Ai? Some scholars suggested that the numbers in Numbers 1-3 should not have been translated the way they were translated.

Discussions are centered around two Hebrew words, “elep and allup”. Without vowels these two Hebrew words look alike; the original Hebrew are written without vowels. Either of these word could be the correct Hebrew word in the book. “Elep” mean thousand families or clans; “allup” means chieftain. Does the number in numbers 1-3 refer to the total number of people or the total number of tribes or groups or the number of chieftain in the group? The word “Aleph” should be understood as “1000” and the number of Israelites fighting force total about 600,000 men. This

conclusion can be arrived at when the total number is added up in the text. The addition will not work if “elep” is translated as any other thing than “1000”. The scriptural evidence proves that the growth of the population of the Israelites was a dramatic outworking of God’s grace, a fulfillment of God’s promise. Exodus 1:7 is emphatic: “but the Israelites were fruitful and multiplied greatly and became exceedingly numerous, so that the land was filled with them” (cf Deut. 1:10).

5.7 ACCORDING TO THE LECTURE, WHY DID GOD CHOOSE TO PROVIDE WATER FOR ISRAEL IN A MIRACULOUS WAY? WHY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THIS SUGGESTION?

ANSWER: According to Num. 20:8, God commanded Moses to speak to the rock in the wilderness of Ziri and a spring will come forth and give them water. But instead, in anger, Moses struck the rock twice with his rod. A spring immediately burst forth for the Israelites. A parallel to this could be seen in the Egyptian text in the 19th dynasty during the reign of Ramses the great. Ramses wanted to go to the wilderness to acquire gold. All attempts to carry enough water there failed. Ramses the great summoned his court and sought their advice on what to do. His court told him that he should be able to bring up water from prima deep since he claimed to be the living image on earth of his father; the prima god, Adam. Since that was true, Ramses should be able to command water of the prima deep to come up to the mountains. Pharaoh controls the rise and fall of this prima water every year when Nile flooded at his command, so he should be able to call up water to the desert. Recognizing that this was true, Ramses decided to dig a well; those who dug the well were amazed when the underwater rose up to fill the well. From their belief, the water of the under deep has responded at the command of Ramses the great. God must have provided water for the Israelites in a miraculous way to show to the wilderness community that Yahweh is the only one who has control over the water of the prima deep.

If 19th dynasty is defended this miraculous act of Yahweh must have reminded the Israelites that the water that filled the well was brought forth by Yahweh and not Ramses. But since 18th dynasty is more certain, the Israelites would have left Egypt some centuries before Ramses the great. But this miracle would have demonstrated to the Israelites the kind of Egyptian mind-set they had.

5.8 WHY IS THE DATE OF THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY A VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION IN CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGICAL DEBATES?

ANSWER: The structure of the book of Deuteronomy has important implication for the date of the book. The date of the book of Deuteronomy is more important than the date of any other book in the Old Testament (OT). The dating of the book of Deuteronomy is important because well housing documentary hypothesis hand on seven century date for the writing of Deuteronomy yet the book of Deuteronomy can be pushed back to the Mosaic age, then the who J.E.P.D structure collapses. The debate about the date of Deuteronomy is conferred on whether it was structured on the pattern of international treaty from the Mosaic age or treaty from the age of Hezekiah.

5.9 HOW DOES THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY RESEMBLE THE 2ND MILLENNIUM BC INTERNATIONAL TREATIES?

ANSWER: Treaty in 2nd Millennium BC has six elements:

- (i) A preamble that the people were making a treaty, when it was made and why?
- (ii) The historical prologue, which traced the good things, the servant had done in the past for the vassal, then explain why the vassal should have been a servant.
- (iii) The stipulations; this section leads to the specific and general terms of the treaty. These were the laws the Vassar was to follow.
- (iv) The provision for preserving the treaty documents and for reading them periodically
- (v) The list of gods who will serve as witnesses to the treaty.
- (vi) The blessings and the curses of the treaty. These are the consequences that will follow the obedience or the disobedience.

Examining the structure of the book of Deuteronomy, it resembles the second Millennium BC treaty. Deut. 1:1-5 is the preamble; 1:6-4:49 is the historical prologue; 5:1-26:19 gives the general and specific stipulation for treaty; Deut. 27:1-30:20 give the blessings and curses of covenant. Deut. 31:1-34:12 give the provision for the disposition of the treaty documents. Reading through the book of Deuteronomy shows that the book has long historical prologue and long set of blessings. These elements of the book are consistent with the Mosaic age treaties not with Assyrian treaties.

5.10 WHAT IS THE HOLINESS CODE IN THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS, AND HOW DID ROBERT KUGLER AND ISRAEL KNOHL UNDERSTAND IT?

ANSWER: The holiness code runs from Leviticus 17-26. From the liberal critical scholars perspective, the holiness code is seen as a different source from J. E. P. D; the holiness code is called H. Traditional liberal critical scholarship argued that the priestly writers received the holiness code intact and then incorporated it into their own version of the text. Kugler discussed this suggestion of Israel's knohl and believed it was added by the holiness school that worked after the priestly writers. Knohl argued that the priestly writers of the P source had not paid much attention to the needs of individual Israelites. The H source then corrected this deficiency by adding laws that have meaning for the average person. Kugler argued that there is a serious problem with Knohl's position; Knohl continued to accept the position of the old liberal critical scholarship. The old group believed that there was a group of writers who created the P materials. There was another group of people also who created the H materials, the holiness code.

CASSETTE #6

6.1 DISCUSS THE ISSUES RELATED TO DATING THE EVENTS IN JOSHUA'S LIFE.

ANSWER: The dates for Joshua's life are problem. According to Joshua 24:29, Joshua died when he was one hundred and ten years old, this is the only data available in the life of Joshua to work with. It is uncertain the age of Joshua when Moses died but Numbers 11:28 showed that Joshua was Moses attendant since he was a child. So, Joshua must have been following Moses during most of the wilderness wondering. Joshua was already an adult and a leader during the exodus. Joshua first appeared in the Bible in Exodus 17:9 where Moses ordered him to choose his men and lead a military campaign against the Amalekites. It is reasonable to assume Joshua's age to be around 30 years at that time, since the people of his culture assume leadership responsibility at that age.

Joshua was one of the spies in Num. 13:2. God commanded that each of the spies should be a leader from the twelve tribes. This suggests that Joshua was old enough to be considered as a leader in his tribe. The only spy whose age was known was Caleb who was forty years. That seems to be a reasonable age for Joshua as well. Working by this age of Joshua, in a rough estimate, the conquest began in 1405 BC, and the first wave of conquest was over by around 1375 BC plus or minus a decade or two.

6.2 WHAT WAS UNUSUAL ABOUT PHARAOH AKHNATON'S RULE AT TELL EL-AMARNA?

ANSWER: Akhnaton was the son of Amenhotep III who probably ruled with his father as co-regent. Akhnaton's rule was the hardest in the Egyptian's history. Akhnaton tried to change Egypt's religion. He tried to suppress all the Egyptian gods and worshiped only the sun god, Athan. He moved Egypt capital to a new city, which he built at Amarna at Nile River. He was far too busy building his city and religion to worry about the events in Syria and Palestine.

6.3 WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN PALESTINE WHILE AKHNATON REIGNED AT AMARNA?

ANSWER: During the Akhnaton's reign, letters poured in to Egypt from Palestine begging for help to resist the Hapiru/Habiru who were invading the land.

6.4 HOW DID THE LECTURE DESCRIBE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HEBREWS AND THE HAPIRU/HABIRU OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST?

ANSWER: The Israelites were called Hebrews from the Patriarchal period and down. The Israelites were a part of the Hapiru/Habiru, even though the Hapiru/Habiru included far more groups than the Israelites. The invasion of the Palestine by the Israelites during the Akhnaton's reign could be regarded as the invasion of the Hapiru/Habiru even though Hapiru invasion elsewhere may refer to other people. This can even be seen in the way the word Hebrew is used in the Old Testament.

In Gen. 39:17, Joseph was called Hebrew slave quite contemptuously. In Gen. 40:15, Joseph told Pharaoh that he had been kidnapped from the land of the Hebrews. This shows that the Hebrew were a group much larger than the Patriarch. Gen. 43:32 says Joseph's brothers could not eat with the Egyptians because that was an abomination to the Egyptians. This would suggest that the Hebrews were much larger group than the Patriarchs and the Egyptians have been having problems with the Hebrews long time before Joseph's days.

Egypt's allies in Palestine were having problem with the Habiru during the Amarna age. In the Amarna's letters various kings in Palestine accused each other of been in league with the Habiru. The king of Shechem was accused of helping the Habiru and the king's son joined the Habiru. The

king of Jerusalem was complaining that the Habiru were invading his territory and were threatening his security. The king of Jerusalem complained that several towns in Shephlah were helping the Habiru. The king of Hazar united with the Habiru and his land fell into their hands. The area highly threatening by the Habiru during the Amarna age were the wooded Island of Syria and Palestine. These Islands contained not only partial land but also thick forest made chariot walker impossible. Even infantry will invade the islands with difficulty because of the dense wood cover that provides excellent cover for ambush. This Habiru land was outside Egypt's allies in the coast, it is striking that this was the area controlled by the Israelites during the judges.

6.5 WHO BUILT THE CITY OF BETH-SHEAN, AND WHAT WAS ITS PURPOSE?

ANSWER: The city of Beth-Shean was built originally by Thutmose III. Beth-Shean was Egyptian stronghold. It occupied by Egyptian garrison all the way down to the time of king David. The Egyptian fortress was relatively safe from Israelite attack. Thutmose III had constructed Beth-Shean as a fortress design to control the east-west trade route during the Amarna age.

6.6 AFTER THEIR INITIAL VICTORIES, WHY WERE THE ISRAELITES UNABLE TO CONTROL THE COASTAL PLAINS?

ANSWER: Egyptian chariots protected the Canaanites city-states and made Israel's victory almost impossible. These were Iran chariots that the Egyptians purchased from the Hittites; before the Hittites began to see the Egyptian as a threat to their security.

6.7 HOW DID JAMES HOFFMEIER COMPARE THE STRUCTURE OF JOSHUA 1-6 TO THE ANNALS OF THUTMOSE III?

ANSWER: James Hoffmeier compared the structure of Joshua 1-6 to the annals of Thutmose III and brought out these similarities:

- (i) Both texts included divine commission to conquer Palestine.
- (ii) Both texts recorded an attempt to get intelligent report before the invasion.
- (iii) Both described a march into the land through different route were used.
- (iv) The setting up of a camp and preparation for war.
- (v) Both described a siege Megiddo by Thutmose III, Jericho by Joshua.
- (vi) Both described surrender or defeat of the cities that were besieged. There are similarities in the contents of the two texts.

6.8 HOW DID THE LECTURE SUGGEST THAT THE MIRACLE OF JOSHUA 10 COULD BE UNDERSTOOD? WHY DO YOU EITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE SUGGESTION?

ANSWER: Joshua 10:9-11 described how Israelites defeated the Amorites at Gilgal. Joshua 10:12-15 described the same battle in another terms. In the second description of the battle, Joshua prayed that the sun should stand still so that he could defeat Israel's enemy. Joshua 10:13 claimed that the sun stood still for a whole day. The lecture claimed that this passage is problematic and the most problematic aspect of the passage is vs. 12-14. These verses claimed that in the battle, God was throwing rocks at Israel's enemy and while this was happening; Joshua prayed that the sun should stand still upon Gibeon, while the battle has moved away fifty miles away to Lichrish. The lecture argued that the actions in the story moved back and forth between two locations that were too far apart for rapid changes of location in the text. The lecture claimed that the story was a merging of two incompatible sources. This view is the liberal critical perspective point of viewing the text and does not agree with the evangelical point of viewing of which I agree with.

The word translated "stand still" is often translated "be silent". Joshua may have been requesting that the sun not shine with its normal brightness and heat Joshua desired a most favorable condition so as to be able to make the most of the victory. After all the night march, the sun's heat would have sapped the strength of the weary Israelites and relief from the heat would have helped just as much as extended daylight. But this explanation does not explain the mention of the moon; perhaps it merely provides a poetic parallel to the sun.

The Hebrew word "amad" (stand, stand still or stop) is used for the moon in parallel with "damam" for the sun. the word "amad" was used in Joshua 3:16 to say that the water of Jordan "stopped flowing". In a poetic passage like this, it could mean "stop moving" or even "stop shining". So, Joshua asked that the sun should not rise and the moon should not set (since Gideon on the east horizon and Aijalon was on the west horizon). God did not answer Joshua's prayer by stopping the earth rotation; but God answered by sending thunderstorm that darkened the sky. Infact, the sun did not come up for half a day. The storm was so terrible that hailstones that fell killed more Amorites than the Israelites did according to Joshua 10:11.

6.9 WHY DO SOME AUTHORS CLAIM THAT JOSHUA 11 AND JUDGES 4 CONTRADICT EACH OTHER? HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN THIS APPARENT CONTRADICTION?

ANSWER: Some authors claimed that Joshua 11 and Judges 4 contradict each other. In Joshua 11, Israel fought the confederation of some city states led by Jabin the king of Hazor. The city-states together filled a large army with many wooden chariots. Joshua attacked this army by the waters of Merom; burned the wooden chariots, killed every person in Hazor and burnt the city with fire and killed Jabin the king of Hazor. The problem with this is Judges 4. In Judges 4, Deborah and Barak fought Jabin the king of Hazor; Jabin had nine hundred iron chariots. Deborah and Barak fought Jabin's chariot near Kishon River and destroyed Jabin's army. Israel did not burn Hazor at this time; they did defeat Jabin and put more and more pressure on Jabin until they destroyed them.

How can these two accounts be reconciled? Four explanations have been offered:

- (i) Deborah fought Sisera after his boss Jabin has been killed by Joshua
- (ii) Albright suggested that Joshua 11 and the song of Deborah in Joshua 5 were essentially historically accurate but that Judges 4 was not correct. Albright believed that it was a late editorial gloss.
- (iii) Some German scholars believed that the story in Joshua had no historical value. They believed that the conquest was a peaceful immigration that led to local conflict.
- (iv) Another scholar suggested that the war in Judges 4 occurred before the one recorded in Joshua 11. To make this to work, Joshua should have had nothing to do with the war described in Joshua 11. The war would have been long before Joshua's time. Which of this approach is correct? An archaeologist discovered some potteries after excavating Hazor and concluded that these potteries were discovered from the destruction layer of the Israelites conquest of Hazor. Israelites could not have used pottery in the wilderness, but they would have used wineskin instead. And Hazor at this time would have been in the hand of Canaanites this time.

The solution to the problem is simple. It is common for sons and grandsons to take the name of the former ruler; an example of this was Hadad and Benhadad of Damascus. Joshua destroyed Hazor in Joshua 11 and it must have been rebuilt and occupied in Judges 4. Hazor was an important location; it guided the North into the Jordan valley. If you lived in Hazor you could easily become rich because of the trades that went through the town. So whenever it was destroyed someone had

interest in rebuilding it. Hazar was sacked by Thutmose III and Amenhotep II and must have been rebuilt during Joshua's conquest, which was forty years later. It could have been rebuilt at the time Deborah which was around the end of 18th dynasty. Deborah's conquest must have been before Hazar was destroyed by Thutmose IV, which was at the beginning of 19th dynasty. At any rate, Joshua 11 and Judges 4 were describing two different events. In Joshua 11, Hazar was not strong enough to oppose Israel, so it had to combine its limited force with the forces of other city-states to oppose Israel. This was what was expected during the Egyptian 18th and 19th dynasty. Egypt will prevent any city-state in Palestine to develop enough army to oppose Egypt's domination.

In Judges 4, Hazar had nine hundred chariots; these were probably Hittites chariots. This was age among the Hittites but still Bronze Age in Egypt. The Hittite empire was trying to expand its border until Ramses the great brought it to stand still. The Hittites probably helped to rebuild Hazar as a staging area for their intended expansion south into the Jordan valley. So, the contradiction between Joshua 11 and Judges 4 is only superficial and is not a real incompatibility.

6.10 HOW DID THE LECTURE EXPLAIN THE STRUCTURE OF JOSHUA 24? WHY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE SUGGESTION?

ANSWER: Many scholars believed that Joshua 24 is an example of international treaty in second millennium BC. Joshua 24:1 is the prologue to Joshua's treaty. 24:2-13 formed the historical prologue. In this section, Joshua listed God's faithfulness to the Patriarch and the wilderness generation. Israel was called to obey the treaty because of the mercy God had shown to them in the past. Joshua 24:14-18 gives the stipulation of the covenant; this is the heart of the treaty. The heart of the treaty was that the Israelites should serve God alone and obey His law. Joshua 24:19-20 counts the blessings and the curses of the covenant. Joshua 24:22, 24, 26-27 count the two witnesses of the covenant. In verse 22, the Israelites were the witness that they choose to serve God. Verse 26 also noted that a large monument of stones were also witness. Joshua 24:26 constitute the provision established to preserve the records of the covenant. The words of the covenant were to be written in the book of the law of the LORD. Though the structure of the book of Joshua 24 was constructed with the standard of international treaty by Joshua; it is not a treaty document but a record of historical events.

CASSETTE #7

7.1 DISCUSS THE EVIDENCE FOR WHEN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA WAS WRITTEN.

ANSWER: It is difficult to date the book of Joshua. Traditionally, the book of Joshua is believed to have been written by Joshua. But when exactly was the book written; was it written during 25–30 years period of Joshua's reign as the leader of Israel? According to Joshua 24:26, Joshua made covenant with the people and wrote it in the book of the law of God. The book of Joshua could be seen as addition to the history Moses began. This is not to say according to some scholars that the book of Joshua is included in five books of the Pentateuch, calling the whole collection Hexateuch. The Pentateuch is distinct (Josh. 1:7-8; II Chr. 34:14 cf; Christ's own testimony – Luke 24:44). While Joshua forms a sequel to the law of Moses, nevertheless it is distinct from it.

The book of Joshua may not have been put in its final form because it describes Joshua's death (24:29-30); this part might have been later editorial gloss. The book may not have been written finally at this time period, because there are indications in the book showing that it was looking back. Joshua 8:28 so Joshua burned Ai and made it a heap forever, a desolation to this day.

10:27 ... which remain until this day.

15:63 ... but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem to this day.

16:10 ... and they did not drive out the Canaanites who dwelt in Gezar; but they Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites to this day and have become forced laborers. This passage is looking back to past events from historical perspective. It is not clear whether Joshua 25-30 years of his reign was long enough for this historical perspective to develop.

17:12-13, Canaanites were put on tributes, Judges 1:35 made the same claim. This described historical process that went on for sometimes. It is uncertain whether the historical process occurred during his 25-30 years of his reign.

The book of Jasher is mentioned in 10:13; when was this written? Was it during the time of Moses? If so, Joshua was written then too. In the Septuagint (i.e. the Greek version of O:T) that was written 300BC; I Kings 8:53, the book of Joshua was mentioned which referred back to the time of Moses. Joshua 11:21 mentioned the mount of Judah, the mount of Israel, this might prove the division of the tribes had occurred, if so, the book of Joshua must have been written during the time of Rehoboam, Solomon's son. But this is not good evidence; Judah had always occupied a prominent

position even right from the time of Jacob. Since Joshua was the primary author and eyewitness to many of the events described (Josh. 5:1, 6) and since Rahab was still alive (Josh. 6:25), the date of the book must be placed shortly before and after Joshua's death. The book must be pre-solomonic (Josh. 16:10 cf; I Kings 9:16) and pre-Davidic (Josh. 15:63 cf II Sam. 5:5-9). As the Philistines were not a menace to Israel in Joshua's day, the book must have been written prior to the Philistine invasion of Palestine shortly after 1200 BC. Moreover, according to Joshua 13:4-6 and 19:28, Sidon was the most important city of Phoenicia, thus indicating the period of the twelfth century BC; after which Tyre attained the domination in Phoenicia. It is most likely that the concluding verses of Joshua were written during early judgeship of Othniel (ca 1370-1330).

7.2 HOW DOES TRUDE DOTHAN UNDERSTAND ISRAEL'S ENTRANCE INTO PALESTINE? WHY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH DOTHAN'S POSITION?

ANSWER: Trude Dothan's believed that the people who will become Israel entered into Palestine in two great waves. The first wave of the people to possess the land was in four century BC. These people settled at the mountain of upper Galilee. However, the most important part of Israel's settlement was later in Thirteen century BC. Dothan suggests that most Israelites lived by agriculture in small settlement. They were poor people who lived by agriculture in an unwalled villages and underground pegs. Trade Dothan's understanding is mask by his presupposition; his thought is unevangelical and lacks Biblical and historical backing. The Israelites came out of Egypt as a group of people not two groups and they entered Canaan as a group of people of Yahweh.

7.3 WHAT ARGUMENT DID ZECHARIAH KALLAI MAKE FROM THE GEOGRAPHICAL PHRASE "FROM DAN TO BEERSHEBA?" HOW WOULD YOU EXPLAIN THE USE OF THE NAME DAN IN DEUTERONOMY 34:1?

ANSWER: According to Zechariah Kallai "From Dan to Beersheba" described the limit of the land in king David's time. These geographical boundaries accurately described Israel during the time of the Monarchy. The boundaries during Joshua's days were the same as during David's day. The whole conquest tradition in the book of Joshua was written under the influence of the geographical limit of the time of the Monarch. He concluded by saying, the book of Joshua must have been written during David's time. The use of the name Dan in Deut. 34:1 is a description of the area one would see from Nebo when looking first northward (from Gilead to Dan).

7.4 WHAT DID MARTIN NOTH MEAN BY AN AMPHICTYONY, AND WHAT DOES THIS HAVE TO DO WITH ISRAEL'S ORIGIN?

ANSWER: What Martin Noth meant by an amphictyony was the confederation of twelve tribes, which began during the time of the Judges. According to Noth, before this time no confederacy of the twelve tribes existed, even the tribes did not exist. He further said that separate and independent clans and family wander under the edge of the desert. These clans and families after entering into Palestine merged to form tribes and the tribes merged to form federation. Old Testament mentions several tribal federal Gen. 22:20-24 talks about twelve Armenian tribes, which descended from Nahor. Gen. 25:13-16 name twelve sons of Ishmael who founded the tribes. Gen. 36:10-14, the twelve sons of Esau who found the Idumite tribe. Gen. 25:2 lists six Arabic tribes who descended from Abraham through Keturah. Gen. 36:20-28 originally discusses the six Horian tribes. Martin argued that Israel was the same kind of tribal federation as these other groups. Federation was made up of different tribes at different times. Martin Noth is not expressing the thought of the evangelical since his thought is not coherent with the testimony of the scripture.

7.5 WHAT BOOKS DID MARTIN NOTH BELIEVE WERE INCLUDED IN THE "DEUTERONOMIC HISTORY?" WHEN DID HE BELIEVE THAT THESE BOOKS WERE WRITTEN?

ANSWER: Martin Noth believes that Joshua, Judges, I & II Samuel and I & II Kings constitute the books that preserved Israel's history from the time of the conquest of Canaan through the Babylonian exile. This history has come to be called "Deuteronomic history". One author wrote it during the exile in Babylon. This exilic writer presented the history of Judah and Israel and cast that history in the light of the principles laid down in the book of Deuteronomy, the first book of the series. The purpose of that history is to present how Babylonian exile resulted from people's failure to live up to the Mosaic law.

7.6 ACCORDING TO RICHMOND HESS, HOW DOES THE PRESENCE OF NON-SEMITIC PERSONAL NAMES IN THE BOOK OF JOSHUA PROVIDE EVIDENCE FOR THE HISTORICAL ACCURACY OF THE BOOK?

ANSWER: The non-Israelites personal names that appeared in the book of Joshua were west-Semitic names. The first was Rahab in I Kings 11 and followed by Rehoboam, king Solomon's son. The name Rahab appeared in the text in the second millennium BC from the area. The name appeared both in the Ugaritic and Tunoc late Bronze Age. The name is common at Mari from the middle age. In Joshua 10:3, the ruler in Lachish was named Japhia. This name appeared in the

Amarna letters where it name two people. First, inhabitant of babilos in Syrian coast. Second, a ruler in Gaza, which was very close to Lachish.

In Joshua 11:1, Jabin is mentioned. It appeared in Amarna letters and described a ruler in Lachish. It also appeared in Mari text, the name of a ruler in Hazar. Joshua 10:3 discussed about Adoni-Zedek. The name means the LORD is righteous. In Amarna letters, this name described those living in Northern Palestine. In Joshua 15:14, Hess discussed the name Sheshai and Talmai; both are Harian names and both appear in the text from Nuzi and Ugaritic text from Roshamai. Some scholars claimed that the book of Joshua was written by late redactor who made up names that was necessary for his account. The appearance of non-Israelites names in the book of Joshua demonstrated that these names were in use in Syria and Palestine in first and second century BC. Hess noted that the Harian names in the book of Joshua are significant. None of the Harian names appeared in the Near Eastern text in the first century BC. Harian names only appeared in the second millennium BC.

7.7 DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN TRACING THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES?

ANSWER: It is difficult to draw chronological line between the events in the book of Judges and across the ancient Near East as a whole. Most of the things known at this time come from the Judges of Ruth; it was probably written during the time of David. The scribes who wrote the book of Judges arranged the events in a loose chronological scheme. There are four parts to the book of Judges.

1:1-2; 10, events during Joshua's lifetime.

2:11-3:4, Basic message of the book from historical perspective of David's kingdom.

3:5-16; 31 – the detail of how the principles laid out in previous events were worked out in Israel's history. These historical commentaries were very loose chronologically. The events described only involved limited number of tribes. When the book declared that the people had rest for a period of 20 or 40 or 80 years, the rest involved the area where the conquest actually occurred. A chronology of the whole nation is very hard to construct from the book. Judges 17:1-21:5 gave three things that happened because no king ruled the nation. These three examples have no chronological relationship with the rest of the book. Example, the story of Danites in Judges 18 actually occurred during Joshua's life time according to Joshua 19:40-48.

7.8 DISCUSS THE RISE OF THE HITTITE EMPIRE DURING THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S JUDGES.

ANSWER: The Hittites were able to overcome the Hurrians of North Mesopotamia during the time of the Judges, and established Hittite new kingdom. The new kingdom began with the reign of Suppiluliuma who reigned between 1375 – 1340 BC. The Hittites controlled the former Egyptian territory until they saw people destroyed their empire around 1200 BC. The Hittites dominated the Northern territory of Syria even the king of Ugaric became Hittite vassal. But the region of Tyre and Sidon did not fall into the Hittites' hand.

7.9 DISCUSS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EGYPT'S 18TH DYNASTY RULERS AND PALESTINE DURING THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S JUDGES.

ANSWER: The Egyptian of the 18th dynasty had been very oppressive. Few new towns were established and there were gradual depopulation. The administration of the 18th dynasty empire remained consistently corrupt. A scholar described this corruption in the mid 14th century BC. The city-states who survived were requested to send their wealth south to Egypt. Michel W. Severa suggested a complete different approach; he argued that the time period between Thutmose III and Hatshepsut was a period of maximum stability in Palestine. He argued that many abandoned towns were re-built in this time period including Bethel, Megiddo, Jericho, Gaza and Tanak. He further suggested that the fewer destruction levels were shown either before or after 18th dynasty.

Henry Thomas Frank suggested that Canaanite culture flourished during Egyptian empire. He further suggested that Canaanite culture reached its height this time especially North of Israel and Syria. Defending the 18th dynasty will place the conflict between Deborah, Bereak and the king of Hazor, at the close of 18th dynasty.

7.10 DISCUSS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FACT THAT JABIN HAD 900 IRON CHARIOTS AT HAZOR.

ANSWER: Where did Jabin, king of Hazor, get 900 iron chariots? During the Egyptian empire age, it was only possible to get chariots from two countries: Egypt and Hittite empire. Egyptians would not have given Jabin 900 chariots; but the Hittites would have done so. At the close of 18th dynasty, the Hittites were expanding their empire in all directions. They would have been interested to support an ally at the North and at the Jordan valley. Besides iron chariots, the Hittites were already making objects of iron, the Egyptians were not. But the Egyptians were making all

their objects from Bronze. Jabin had received 900 iron chariots from the Hittites, using Hazor to expand their territory south into Palestine. Expanding south would have cut into Israel, which the Egyptians were not trying to do. The northern territory of Israel was suffering from the tax of Jabin's chariots down the Jordan valley. Deborah defeated Jabin by getting him to send forth his chariots down to Jordan valley, west through the valley of Jezreel out into the plain of Ajalon. The plain of Ajalon was a great plain for chariot warfare when it was dry. But Yahweh sent down flood through river Kanish when Jabin's chariots were in the plain. The flood from Yahweh proved that Yahweh was in control of weather, not Baal god which the Canaanites worshipped. Jabin's iron chariots were in trouble with the flood, since iron chariots are heavy; the chariots were drowned in the flood and Jabin's army were forced to flee.

CASSETTE # 8

8.1 WHY DID PHARAOH SETI I CLAIM THAT HE INVADDED PALESTINE? WHAT MIGHT THIS HAVE TO DO WITH GIDEON'S VICTORY OVER THE MIDIANITES? WHY DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THIS EXPLANATION?

ANSWER: Many of the 19th dynasty rulers often launched military campaign in the North; example of this is Seti I (reigned 1318 – 1290 BC). In the first year of Seti I, he invaded Palestine. Seti I reason for invading Palestine is very interesting. Seti I claimed that Chasem-Addu had made common calls together against the Palestine. The invasion of Palestine by Chasem-Addu has caused complete breakdown of trade, communication and authority in Palestine. Seti I claimed the Chasem-Addu tribal chief had attacked each other and killed each other; they disregarded Egyptian law.

Defending the 18th dynasty exodus, the Chasem-Addu attacked by Seti I were the Amalekites and the Midianites who were defeated by Gideon in Judges 6 & 7. Judges 6 & 7 claimed that the Midianites and the Amalekites killed each other, which was consistent with Seti I's account. The Judges account also claimed that the Midianites flowed through the land even to Gaza. The evidence is weak to claim that the Chasem-Addu attacked by Seti I were Midianites, if 19th dynasty Exodus is defended. The Midianites and the Chasem-Addus were two different group of people. But accepting the 18th dynasty Exodus, is a good historical fit. Judges 6 & 7 will have to fall within the periods of Thutmose III and Seti I. It is almost inconceivable that the Midianites would have attacked Gath either when the Egyptians were campaigning in the North or when the Sea people settled in South-West Palestine.

8.2 HOW OFTEN DID RAMSES THE GREAT CAMPAIGN IN SYRIA AND PALESTINE? WHY DO YOU THINK THAT HIS CAMPAIGNS WERE NOT RECORDED IN THE BOOK OF JUDGES?

ANSWER: Ramses the great, who was also known as Ramses II (reigned 1299 – 1232 BC). During his first twenty-one years reigned, Ramses II campaigned constantly in the North. The book of Judges did not mention Ramses II campaign for several reasons.

- (i) Most of his campaigns were not conducted in Palestine; he marched north to fight against the Hittites in Lebanon and Syria.
- (ii) Ramses II was not particularly interested in the events in the island of Palestine where the Israelites lived. His attitude towards the island could be seen in a letter popularly used in scribal schools in the 19th dynasty, to teach literacy. This letter described the problems people faced in crossing the hillside in a chariot.

The Egyptians were not interested in what was going on in the island where the Israelites lived provided they did not threaten the Egyptian interest. The Egyptians were not interested in extending their culture and religion to the region where the Israelites lived. So, Ramses II campaign was irrelevant to most of the Israelites except Dan and Asher; so it is no wonder that the book of Judges did not describe them.

8.3 WHAT DO YOU THINK PHARAOH MERNEPTAH MEANT WHEN HE RECORDED THAT “ISRAEL’S SEED WAS NOT?”

ANSWER: When Merneptah claimed that “Israel’s seed was not”, it was not necessarily a reference to much of a battle. If Merneptah’s army had invaded Palestine, it would have taken them hard time to get to the Israelites; the Israelites would have had enough time to hide in the caves and dens just as they had hidden from the midianites. So, Merneptah’s record simply means, he could not find anybody there to fight.

8.4 WHO WERE THE SEA PEOPLES WHO INVADED PALESTINE DURING THE REIGN OF RAMSES III?

ANSWER: The Sea people were the massive invaders who invaded Nile Delta in 1190 BC. They had the intention of settling permanently in the Delta, they brought with them their families and all their possessions and everything they could carry. It took Ramses III six years to be able to drive them out of the Delta. Ramses III drove them north, the southern Palestine and they settled down in the five chief cities of Philistine Pentapolis including Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath and Ekron. When they first settled down in Palestine, the Sea people were not organized nation. The

Sea people as a whole rapidly developed culture led by the law of Philistine Pentabulus. The Sea people greatly increased Philistine's power; who before this time were not threat to Israel. After the death of Ramses III, the Philistines were far too strong for the Egyptian to fight; they ended the Egyptian powers in the north. Philistine seized most of Judah's territory; the Israelites could not stand against them. Samson's greatest enemy were the Philistine who had come to dominate the region.

8.5 DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS THAT SEAN WARNER RAISED FOR DATING THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

ANSWER: Sean Warner notes that the traditional date for the book of Judges becomes acceptable once the literary analysis of the book is accepted; by this he means accepting the liberal critical method. He notes that the book of Judges is divided into three parts; it begins with introduction 1:1-2; 5; the main body of the book is Judges 2:6-16: 31; then the book concludes with Judges 17:1-21:25. These chapters are usually taken as the later edition of the text. Warner believes that the introduction to the book is generally believed to be historically problematic. Warner claimed that the basic framework of the main part of the book has nothing to do with the individual stories in the book. He then claimed that the conclusion of the book is highly problematic and it is impossible to know if any of the story in the book ever really happened.

Warner then argued that the explicit evidence for dating the book of Judges came either from Judges 1:1, which he considers problematic or Judges 2:6, which he considers secondary and unreliable. Warner then argued that the editor who put together the book of Judges was concerned with historical reliability at all. He claimed that the editor of the book of Judges made heroes out of people who were not heroes at all. Warner argued that there are two ways the events in the book of Judges could possibly be dated. Firstly, if the people or events in the book were mentioned in other text from the ancient Near East. The problem with this approach is that none of the events in the book of Judges are mentioned in any extra biblical source. The second approach possible in fixing the date of the events in the book is if any of the events are mentioned in the Old Testament, which could be dated.

This established an end point. The people or events had to occur somewhere before that time. However, no part of the OT mentioned the events in the book of Judges, so the book of Judges exists in historical vacuum. Another way to get the date for the book of Judges, Warner suggested, is to look at the nations mentioned in the book of Judges. If the origin of these nations can be

determined, then it will be possible to pen down the cultural and historical environments in which the stories in the book of Judges occurred.

Unfortunately, there is little evidence for the Peruzzites, Havites, Kanites, Amelikite and Midianites. Warner noted that the Amorites, Hittites and Canaanites are mentioned in the Ancient Near East texts. Warner noted that there is evidence that the Amorites, Hittites and the Canaanites did live in Palestine during the late Bronze Age. Archaeological evidence proved that the whole area of Transjordan was uninhabited until 1275 BC. So, the Idunites, Moabites and Amorites must have risen after that time. For decades, this was established as a fixed fact of history. If this is true, all the stories in the book of Judges must have occurred after 1275 BC. Warner concluded that it was impossible to know anything about the period of the Judges with any certainty at all. However, it could be possible that this period could have started as early as 1376. Warner argued that the stories in the book of Judges would have occurred before the tribes of Israel entered the land of Canaan either conquest or infiltration. Warner's thought line is in total disagreement with the Evangelical point of view. Warner does not believe in the truth of the Bible.

8.6 HOW DID LAWRENCE STAGER DESCRIBE THE TOWNS IN THE HIGHLANDS OF PALESTINE WHERE ISRAEL LIVED? CONTRAST THESE HIGHLANDS WITH THE CITIES OF THE COAST WHERE THE CANAANITES LIVED.

ANSWER: Lawrence Stager described the towns in the highlands of Palestine where Israel lived as being populated by small-unwalled villages. The time period under consideration by Stager was between 12th century BC and 11th century BC. These villages were normally located on the hilltops and houses were usually placed beside each other to offer a limited amount of defense. Most of these villages had less than 200 people and most of them were related to each other somehow. The villagers grew what they needed for themselves instead of production for commercial purpose. These made the highlands culturally separated from the plain; it kept the Israelites poor. They could grow food but they had little cash to purchase things.

In contrast to the Israelites, the Canaanites in the coastal plain were very wealthy. Stager exploits the reason why only 6 tribes responded to Deborah's call to fight the Canaanites. Those that responded were those living in the central and northern islands. They lived largely independent of the Canaanites of the plain, so they were ready to fight the Canaanites. The other tribes were more involved with the Canaanites' culture and markets for their goods; so they were not willing to join Deborah to fight the Canaanites.

8.7 HOW DID BRIAN PECKHAM ARGUE AGAINST MARTIN NOTH'S THEORY THAT ISRAEL BEGAN WITH AN AMPHICTYONY OF 12 TRIBES?

ANSWER: Peckham argued that the 12 tribes amphictyony suggested by Martin Noth's could not have existed. Amphictyony is the organization of 12 tribes bound together by loose organization of culture and religions tradition. Noth had argued that such amphictyony well common in the ancient world. Noth had argued that the tribes of Israel were originally independent of each other, until they merged into a loose political structure when they individually moved into Canaan. Peckham argued that there is no historical evidence that such amphictyony ever existed. The whole idea is a theoretical construction based on highly questionable use of historical evidence. Peckham argued that there is no evidence that the Canaan was confronted by a united coalition of 12 tribes anytime up till the time of Saul. He argued that the Northern tribes developed national identity in the time of David because of their relationship with Judah. The evangelical will rightly disagree with both Peckham and Noth, since the Evangelical believes that the 12 tribes entered Canaan at the same time and began the conquest of Canaan with an armed military conquest.

8.8 WHAT ROLE DID GEORGE MENDENHALL SUGGEST THE 'COVENANT' PLAYED IN THE FORMATION OF ISRAEL?

ANSWER: George Mendenhall suggested that the tribes of Israel were unrelated to each other. Mendenhall argued that they came to be held together by the existence of a covenant. This covenant prescribed legal responsibility to the whole community of tribes. He argued that the existence of a community bound by covenant couldn't be doubted during the period of the Judges. How far back in history is this covenant bound community existed? Mendenhall argued that the federation of tribes seen during the time of the Judges could only be really explained that there was a conscious continuation and re-adaption of an earlier tradition. He suggested that this earlier tradition went back to the time of Moses, which of course was dated to around 1250 BC.

8.9 WHAT LIGHT DID ABRAHAM MALAMAT SUGGEST WAS THROWN ON THE PERIOD OF ISRAEL'S JUDGES BY THE TEXTS FROM MARI?

ANSWER: Abraham Malamat suggested that it has become fashionable to discredit the historical reliability of Israel's life before the Monarchy. He argued against this kind of skepticism. Malamat noted that the Bible described the early social and legal institutions that are appropriate to a tribal culture instead of Monarchy. Malamat used the old Babylonian text from Mari to illustrate the antiquity of this institution. Malamat noted that Mari shared common origins with the early

Israelites well as other west Semitic groups. Since largest collection of tablets was from Mari in comparison with other west-Semitic groups, the comparison of Israel's Bible with Mari text should be valuable. Malamat argued that many terms that appeared in the Bible also appeared in the Mari. He discussed the Hebrew word "goel" that appeared in Mari text as "gayum". It means the tribal unit at Mari. Malamat talked about the word "Nawum" which means semid and pasture land at Mari. Malamat noted also the basic social institutions in those of the Bible and the Mari text; land is not always sold outside the family. Normally land is inherited, apportioned or assigned. The verb "Nahahum" described this kind of inheritance in the Mari text. In the Bible, the comparable word is "Nahau" – inherit. Malamat noted that these are west-Semitic terms; they do not appear in acchadian or other texts from Mesopotamia. Malamat adds that the possession of land is inalienable; it can only be passed down the family, it cannot be sold.

8.10 HOW DID ALAN HAUSER ARGUE AGAINST THE POSITIONS OF NOTH, MENDENHALL, AND GOTTWALD?

ANSWER: Alan Hauser noted that recent discussion of the period of the Judges have often been shaped by the desire to see some kind of organizational unity to Israel before the Monarchy. This desire to see this organization has led to two very popular explanations to Israel's origin. The first is Martin Noth's view that Israel started with a structure called amphictyony, this is a loose association of independent tribal group bound together by shared religious tradition and shared sanctuary. From Noth's view, the tribes that made up Israel came from different places and different background. The second view was the theory developed by Mendenhall and Gottwald.

These men suggested that Israel began as an alliance of groups who tried together to shake off the oppression of the powerful Canaanite city-states. Hauser disputed these theories because they presuppose an organization that did not exist. Hauser argued that all the figures in Judges 3:16 had in common that fact they were all leaders. However, there are much differences among them as well, some military delivered, some were not; some remained in power after their military victories, some do not. Hauser argued that each of these men rose to power in response to crisis. They did not reflect a kind of religious or political office that would have given cohesiveness to the nation. Hauser argued that during the time of Israel's Judges, Israel had by and large a very unsettled, chaotic and disorganized political and military structure. Hauser suggested that there was no broad based religious organization. He further argued that there was no unified conception of worship of Yahweh. There was no universal commitment to the exclusiveness to the worship of Yahweh.

There was no central religious authority with the ability to enforce a standardized worship practice among those who did worship Yahweh. Hauser defined Israel during the time of the Judges as loose affiliation of a variety of groups and clans that were bound together by the worship of Yahweh. However, these worshipper of Yahweh were not bound together prominently by any political or religious institution. There is an impression that Hauser was trying to argue against Mendenhall, Noth and Gottwald but he is unfair to appreciate the role of the Levites, Elders and the Prophets in Israel, who really did a great deal to hold the nation together. The nation was also held together by their shared history.

CASSETTE # 9

9.1 HOW DID DANIEL BLOCK SUMMARIZE THE LIBERAL/CRITICAL APPROACHES TO THE STORY OF GIDEON IN JUDGES 6 TO JUDGES 9?

ANSWER: Daniel Block gives the liberal/critical approaches to the story of Gideon in Judges 6 to Judges 9. He began by noting that liberal/critical scholars have traditionally seen the same sources behind the book of Judges that they identified behind Pentateuch, which are the five books of Moses. David Block summarizes the liberal/critical approaches by claiming that they shared a contemptuous and carelessness approach to the Biblical text. Block argued that there is a huge difference in the conclusion drawn by the representatives of these positions. These differences in approach produces little confidence in either the method used to interpret the text or the results obtained from these methods.

9.2 HOW DID DANIEL BLOCK SUGGEST THAT THE BOOK OF JUDGES SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

ANSWER: Daniel Block in an alternative to the liberal/critical method constructed an interpretation of Judges 6-9 that has implication for understanding the whole book. Judges begins by listing twenty of Gideon's personal strengths; however blocks listed 16 weaknesses in Gideon's life. Why would Gideon be depicted as having such strengths and weaknesses? The liberal/critical approach was that the strengths and the weaknesses point to a diversity of sources of some kind. But block suggested that this could be explained by the role Judges 6-9 played in the book as a whole. He suggested that the book of Judges has a closely net plot. Block noted that one key phrase appeared four times in the last five chapters of the book of Judges, the phrase is "there was no king in Israel". Block notes that scholars have often argued from this, that the book of Judges was a theological argument written to support monarchy in Israel. The chaos of the whole period is

seen as supporting the need for centralized monarchy. The book is also seen as opposed to Ephraim in the north. The book is also seen as an allegory supporting Davidic Monarchy. The book also contains the element that is critical of the Monarchy.

Block disagreed with these interpretations. Block argued that the book of Judges is not a political pamphlet; he rather sees the book as been written in the tradition of the prophets. It was written to show how the Israelites had been influence by the religion of the Canaanites. It was a call to covenant and to abandon idolatry. Block argues that this can be seen in the book's broad structure and in the individual stories of the book. He noted that the book of Judges began with prologue in Judges 1:1 and 2:5, that explains why Canaanites' religion became problem in Israel. The basic problem was that the Israelite had refused to drive the Canaanites out of the land as God had commanded them. Block noted that the biggest of the book is the list of the deliverers in Judges 2:6-16:31, this section described the consequences of the failure of the Israelites in not driving out the Canaanites. Block noted that the series of six apostasies and deliverances demonstrated the continuous influence of the Canaanites and how it went worse.

The real climax of the book of Judges is the stories of the tribe of Dan and Benjamin. The stories of these tribes demonstrated how Israelites had fallen apart both religiously and socially. Block argued that the six cycles of apostasy, oppression, outcry and deliverance were not just six examples of the same thing. Instead they are evidences of social and religious decay. These slowly decay could be seen in the character of Israel's Judges. Othman is depicted as the best of lots. After him, Israel's deliverers became troubled. The worse of all was Samson who combined all that was wrong in Israel. Gideon was not as bad as Samson but he had very serious problems. The narrator of the Judges described Gideon in both positive and negative way, to show that even the best men in Israel were not that righteous. When Gideon died, Abimelech led Israel into revolt and the worship of Baal. Block seems to have a very good point, but the problem with his position, is that he uses the immigration of the tribe of Dan to illustrate the Israelites spiritual depravity at the end of the Judges. It is easy to make that mistake since the immigration happened at the end of the book of Judges. But the immigration actually happened when Joshua was still alive. This is an illustration to show that the book of Judges was not laid out in a chronological order.

9.3 WHY DOES K. VAN DER TOORN SUGGEST THAT SAMSON WAS FORCED TO GRIND GRAIN AFTER HE WAS CAPTURED?

ANSWER: K. van der Toorn notes that Samson grinded grain in the Gazan when the Philistines captured him. Van der Toorn notes that this was a common treatment for the prisoner of war in Mesopotamia. When Samson was captured, they gouged out his eyes and bounded him with bronze chains, and he was a grinder in the prison. Toorn notes that when Nebuchadnezzar captured king Zedekiah, he was subjected to the same treatment. Zedekiah was blinded, bound with bronze fetters and was kept in the house of mills until he died. Van der Toorn note that parallel between these passages and the letter written by Hezekiah to his god asshe. This letter described Hezekiah's siege of Huppoma in the land of Subria. When the king of Huppoma realized that he could not avoid capture, he sought mercy by sending to Hezekiah two images of himself bound with bronze fetters and bound to a grinding wheels. By sending these images, king Heze accepted his force labor on a grinding wheel. He concluded by saying that Samson's fate was a common fate for a prisoner of war.

9.4 HOW DID THE PHILISTINES BECOME THE STRONGEST POWER IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST BEFORE THE DAYS OF SAUL, DAVID AND SOLOMON? WHY WERE THE POWERS OF EGYPT AND MESOPOTAMIA SO WEAK?

ANSWER: The time period of Saul, David and Solomon is between 1030 BC and 930 BC give or take. The sources of information for this time period are the books of I & II Samuel, I & II Kings and I & II Chronicles, which were written during or after the Exile based on documents written when the events happened. During this time period, the dominating power in the ancient near east was the Philistines. I Samuel 13:5 claims that the Philistines had thirty thousand chariots, six thousand horsemen and troops like the sand of the sea shore. It is very hard to imagine someone in that era to accumulate that number of chariots because chariots were very expensive. It is probably a copying error. For that parallel, see the difference between I Kings 4:26 and 2 Chronicles 9:25.

I Kings 4:26 claims that Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses. II Chronicles 9:25, which is the parallel claims that Solomon had 4,000 stalls for horses and chariots. Both passages claim that Solomon had 12,000 horsemen. Either 40'000 or 4,000 are a copying error, and the smaller number is more likely than larger number. It may be likely that the same copying error lies behind I Kings 13:5, that the Philistines had 30,000 chariots. However, the fact still remains that the Philistines were much stronger than any other force within the region. Egypt was so weak at this time that it was no longer united nation; it had broken into smaller areas that were loosely related to each other.

The merchant princes of Tenise ruled the Delta. The descendant of a prince named Herry Hoer ruled Southern Egypt from Thebes. So, Egypt was not in a position to threaten Palestine.

9.5 ACCORDING TO CHRISTIAN E. HAURER JR. WHAT WAS SAUL'S STRATEGY IN FIGHTING THE PHILISTINES?

ANSWER: According to Christian E. Haurer Jr., Saul fought a battle against the Philistines in mount Giboa in 1000BC. The battle of mount Giboa was a disastrous climax to a policy that had worked well for Saul up till that point. Haurer suggested that Saul's strategy was to accomplish three things: (i) To secure Israel's center after the battle of Mickmash. (ii) To secure the Judean South (iii) To attempt to secure the far north. Examining this strategy in a more detent, first try to secure Israel's center after the battle of Mickmash. The Philistines were the great threat to Israel; the battle of Mickmash was Saul's decisive military action against the Philistines. Before this time, the philistines were able to do whatever they wanted to do in the hill country where Israel lived.

After the battle of Mickmash, the Philistines lost the control of the hill country. Saul controlled the area between Mickmash and Bethel with two thousand troops. Jonathan, Saul's son, controlled with one thousand troops. Jonathan fought the Philistines to choose between giving Israel autonomy and re-attacking Israel in force. The Philistines chose to attack in force. Saul was forced to fall back to Gaba putting worthy between his army, and the philistine army that had occupied Mickmash. The Philistines sent three groups of raiders through Israel to cut-off Saul's popular support by spreading terror and destruction.

The main Philistines garrison at Mickmash then moved out to keep an eye on Saul. Hauser noted that the Philistines believed that Saul's army will move away under pressure and the Philistines will gain control of Island without a battle. The Philistines strategy almost worked, Saul's army melted down to 600 men. Jonathan bold attack broaded the Philistines army and Saul's whole army pursued them. After this attack the Philistines were not able to launch incursion into the island, so Israel's center of Israel's territory became secured, for the first time in many years. Haurer noted that Saul's campaign in Judah were small-scale attacks, unlimited target. He did not have a strong enough army to launch large-scale attack against the Philistines. The limited attack was enough to secure Israel's center and south. The third stage if Saul's attack was to secure the north. The problem of Saul was that a band of land under the control of Philistines divided Israel's territory. This band of land connected cities that had been controlled by Philistines for a long time. Saul

made efforts to break Philistines band of land and to unite Israel. He fought Philistines at mount Giboa. Saul moved into Jezreel valley and took a position half way between Philistines cities on the coast and Belhan. The lord of the Philistine cities responded by mass attack against Saul. The Philistines pressed hard on the Israelites, and Saul was killed.

9.6 ACCORDING TO FRANK MOORE CROSS, WHY DID THE AMMONITES INSIST ON MUTILATING THE ISRAELITES IF THEY SURRENDERED? WHAT EVIDENCE DID HE SUGGEST TO ANSWER THIS IN 4 Q SAMA?

ANSWER: According to Frank Moore cross, the Ammonites insisted on mutilating the Israelites if they surrendered, the Jebeshites were giving aid and comfort to ammon's ancestral enemies, the Reubenites and Gadites, who occupied territory traditionally claimed by the Ammonites; therefore the Jabeshites should receive the same harsh treatment earlier meted out to the Reubenites and Gadaites. Obviously 4 Q Sama contains valuable background information and provides a helpful rational for what otherwise he is an abrupt and vicious treat by the Ammonites king against the inhabitants of Jabesh Gilead. Cross points out that the vengeful punishment insisted on by Nahash is best explained by the 4 Q Sama additional paragraphs.

9.7 HOW DID BRIAN PECKHAM EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN OF THE KINGDOM OF DAVID AND SAUL?

ANSWER: Brian Peckham argued that Saul was able to establish a tribal unity among the tribes that came up to make the tribe of Israel. Peckham argued that the empire was established on David who ruled from 1000 BC – 961 BC. David began by defeating the Amalekites, Saul had fought against the Amalekites, and he had been unable to or unwilling to defeat them completely. Peckham argued that this failure caused Saul the allegiance of southern tribes. David capitalized on Saul's political blunder and campaign against the Amelekites until he had destroyed them. As a result of this Judah elders appointed David as king. Peckham suggested that David consolidated his power and the northern tribes are great to make David king if he will defeat Philistines for them. David was able to do so; restricting the Philistines territory to the five great cities of the Pentabulus: Gath, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod and Ekron. Peckham view may not be completely wrong, though he neglected the Biblical materials, which shaved the kingship due to Saul's character and David's character instead of the politics of the day.

9.8 WHAT EVIDENCE DID KENNETH A. KITCHEN PROPOSE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT KING DAVID WAS A REAL HISTORICAL PERSON?

ANSWER: Kenneth A. Kitchen mentioned the possible references to king David in the ancient Near East. The earliest references were written in 925 BC during the reign of Pharaoh Sheshon KJ. This Pharaoh invaded Palestine during the reign of Samson Samriban. A text that had a name associated with southern Palestine, which Kitchen suggests is probably king David. Some authors have suggested that the name refers to a god named Dad. Kitchen suggest that is no existence of such god anywhere in the ancient Near East. If Kitchen understanding of this name is correct, Sheshork I's description of his Palestinian campaign mentioned king David 50 years after David's death. Kitchen pointed to another possible reference to king David at the Tel ban Stella. The Tel ban Stella at Tell al Qata which is the ancient city of Leish. The problem about this Stella for years is about the translation of the text and how to fix in some of the holes in the text. The Stella described the conflict between Israel and Damascus that occurred not later than 841 BC. The king of Damascus wrote the text. The text claimed that he had defeated or killed Jehoham, the son of Ahab, the king of Israel. And also claimed that he had killed Ahasiah, the son of Jehoam, the king of the house of David. This text demonstrates that Judah was called to the house of David more than centuries after David's death.

Kitchen also mentioned a reference to king David on Demecious Stella; in this Moabites text king Masha claimed that the house of David had lived in Horonan until the god Kimish commanded Masha to capture Horonan. It is credible to claim that David was a real historical person no matter how the Biblical text is evaluated. David first rose to fame in I Samuel 17 when he accepted the challenge of the giant called Goliath. This Philistine champion was from Gath. This passage makes much sense in the light of Joshua 11:22 recorded that Joshua had killed all the sons of Anak in the land and had driven those who remained into the Philistine cities, Gaza, Gath, Ashdod. All the sons of Anak were giants like Goliath, though they were usually 5 cubic tall. The presence of these giants in the region was described in the 19th dynasty Egyptian text. Other biblical text also described this unusually tall people including Gen. 6:4, Num. 13:33, Deut. 1:28, 2:11, 20, Deut. 3:11; Deut. 9:2.

9.9 WHY DID ZAFRIRA BEN-BARAK SUGGEST THAT DAVID DEMANDED THAT HIS FORMER WIFE MICHAL BE RETURNED TO HIM WHEN HE WAS CROWNED KING? WHY DID HE HAVE A LEGAL RIGHT TO MAKE THIS CLAIM?

ANSWER: David had married Saul's daughter Michal, before he became king (I Sam. 18:20-28). David lost Michal when he had to flee from Saul and she was giving to another man. But when David became king, he ordered that she be returned to him, despite the fact that he had other wives and choose very happy to marry someone else. Why did David order her return back to him? In II Sam. 3: 13-15 described how David had ordered the return of Michal, his ex-wife to him, when he assumed the throne. From his, Saul had originally given Michal to David as a wife (I Sam. 18:22-28); Michal had helped David escaped from Saul (I Samuel, 19:9-17); then David went into other relationship as he fled from Saul. Michal was given in Marriage to Palti the son of Laish (I Sam 25:44).

When David became king, he insisted that Michal be taken from her husband and be given to him. According to Ben-Barak, David demanded the return of his wife Michal because his marriage to Michal justified his claim to rule Israel and will act as a bridge between the two halves of the nation. But Ben-Barak asked how was it possible for David to have married Michal and then to Palti and back to David again. Ben-Barak believed that this would have been understood as adultery and would have David's re-marrying Michal could be reconciled with the law in Deut. 24:1-4? This law forbade a man from reclaiming his wife after she had married another man. Ben-Barak tried to answer this question by pointing to ancient Near Eastern parallel. He pointed to the law of Eshnuma, which was written in 19th century BC. This law permitted the captives who could return back home from captivity could reclaim back their wives; though their wives had married to another in their absence. Women, whose husband had been carried out of the country as military captives, had the right to remarry. However, when their husbands return back from captivity, they had the right to return back to their former husbands.

Another Near Eastern parallel could be seen in paragraph 135 of the laws of Hammurabi. These laws were written in the 18th century BC. This law decreed that if a man had no money to support his household, his wife could enter into another man's house. However, when the man returns, he must receive back his wife; however, any son born during his absence would remain with her father, instead of with him. Ben-Barak claimed this law was applicable to men who were forced to live the country because of political action. Ben-Barak pointed to a parallel in paragraph 45 of tablet A of the middle Assyrian laws. The middle Assyrian laws discussed the situation at substantial link.

This law required a woman to wait for two years after her husband had been taken away as military captives. During these two years, she may sell her properties to provide for her needs. After two years, she may marry another if she lacks other means of support. However, if her first husband returns, she must go back to him; any property she has sold may be purchased back by her first husband. However, any son she had born to her second husband must stay with her second husband. These Mesopotamian laws, Ben-Barak claimed, explained why David's wife, Michal, was given to another man when he fled from home and why she was returned back to him when he returned back home. So, the whole relationship between David and Michal was appropriate within the historical setting in which the events claimed to have occurred.

9.10 HOW DID BENEDIKT OTZEN DESCRIBE THE EXTENT OF DAVID'S REIGN?

ANSWER: Benedikt Otzen noted that David established an empire around 1000 BC during the periods when the great powers of the fallen crescent were very weak. The Hittites had disappeared; the Syrian had retreated to Assyria after Shalmaneser I had conquered Northern Syria. The Egyptians were ruled by the weak 21st dynasty. David's empire covered Palestine proper, three east Jordan states, the Aramean states of the Syrian octaland, perhaps as far as the Euphrates River. The northern parts of David's empire were thinly populated, but David controlled a great deal of land. David's administrative measures were different from empire to empire because his empire was so large and compact. Otzen noted that David chased the Philistines out of his territory but he did not conquer them and incorporated them into his empire. Otzen noted that the scholars had debated why David did not conquer the Philistines. Some scholars claimed that David considered them as Egyptians vassals and did not dare to attack them.

Otzen suggested that David used the Philistines as buffer against the Egyptian expansion. Considering Otzen last point from the historical perspective, the last point made by Otzen was wrong. The reason why David could not conquer the Philistines' stronghold, was simply because they were too strong. David defeated the Philistines from time to time and drove them back to their stronghold. But David was unable to conquer their stronghold. There was no reason for David to use the Philistines as a buffer against the Egyptian's expansion; the Egyptians were no threat during David's days. The Philistines were the only threat, not only to Israel but also to the Egyptians.

