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The purpose of this dissertation was to determine how archaeological data have been used in Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) literature of North America since the first SDA attained advanced qualifications in the discipline (1937). The early twentieth-century SDA literature showed a strong tendency to apply archaeological information apologetically especially in defense of Scriptural reliability and sometimes seeming to imply that Scripture is reliable because archaeology has declared it so.

The thesis was that increased expertise as heralded by the formal training of such SDA scholars as L. H. Wood, E. R. Thiele, S. H. Horn, and their successors, would introduce a more balanced and
diversified usage of archaeology in denominational literature.

In order to test this thesis SDA books containing archaeological data and representative SDA periodicals from the same period (1937-1980) were examined for archaeological usage. This archaeological usage in each of these sources was then classified and analyzed within the framework of three main periods. These divisions coincide with the periods of maximum involvement by the most prolific writers.

To demonstrate the contemporary setting and to elucidate direct input, a limited study was also made of the leading developments in general North American biblical archaeology as focused in the publications of W. F. Albright and his school.
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These trends indicate a growing maturity which will face, without loss of faith, interpretations of data which may at times be difficult.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Biblical Archaeology in SDA History

During the period of its own development as a denomination, the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church, through its publications, has shown a rather consistent interest in biblical archaeology.¹ This is apparent from an examination of the denominational literature even at the beginning of the twentieth century (there are sporadic articles also from the nineteenth century). Although no detailed study has yet been conducted to determine the names and extent of SDA usage of archaeology in the period prior to 1937,² a

¹ We recognize a clear distinction between archaeology as a general discipline and specific biblical archaeology, which pertains to those areas of the Ancient Near East (ANE), and topics which in any way contribute to the background or understanding of Scripture. However, in this research project, the term archaeology is used synonymously with biblical archaeology unless the context distinctly indicates the wider use of the term. See also W. F. Albright's definitions of biblical archaeology on pp. 50-51. Both spellings of the word "archaeology" or "archeology" occur throughout much of the period being studied. Although the trend has been moving in the direction of the latter, the form "archaeology" is used throughout this research except where quoting or giving a title, where the original is retained.

² The significance of this date (1937) was the initial interest in archaeology culminating in the graduation of Lynn H. Wood from the University of Chicago with a Ph.D. in archaeology. He was the first SDA to receive qualifications in archaeology at the doctoral level, and in that same year, he commenced imparting his specialized learning to students in the SDA Theological Seminary as it first opened in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C. This phase of
brief survey reveals that archaeological themes appeared with some regularity. However, the type of articles which appeared and their content, generally speaking, did not reveal very much originality. Since the SDA church had no trained archaeologists in its ranks, there was considerable reliance upon the reports and interpretations of others (some expert and some not).¹

**Varieties of Usage: Apologetics**

Prominent

The same brief survey also reveals a variety of usages of the archaeological materials. Several articles appeared which were devoted to enlightenment of the biblical context, and there were also occasional articles which gave polemical arguments based on archaeology or which presented a travelogue-type description of biblical lands by a missionary. However, the most prominent usage appears to have been a defense of Scripture and its historical reliability in the light of archaeological finds.

**Reason for Prominence of Apologetic**

A simple explanation for SDA pre-occupation with "proof" can be seen generally as a reaction to the nineteenth- and

¹A somewhat typical example of this reliance upon others would be the series of three articles written by the associate editor of the RH, L. L. Caviness ("The Bible and the Hittites," RH, October 26, 1916, p. 6; "Archaeology and the Pentateuch," RH, November 9, 1916, pp. 3-4; "Archaeological Light on the Old Testament," RH, November 16, 1916, p. 5). The author mentioned that he was indebted for his information to George A. Barton, whose book Archaeology and the Bible (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, [1916]) had just recently appeared.
twentieth-century higher critical attacks upon the integrity of Scripture. The Wellhausen focus upon Old Testament (OT) criticism coincided with the period of most rapid growth in SDA church membership. The subsequent period from about 1900 to 1935, which was the heyday of the "History of Religions" (Gunkel) approach, also saw SDA church growth maintained at a moderately high level. Wellhausen showed little interest in the archaeological discoveries of the Ancient Near East (ANE). On the other hand, Gunkel depended upon archaeology for much of the data on religions of the ANE, but interpreted the archaeological data in light of hypotheses which undermined or rejected such traditional positions as the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the Davidic authorship of many of the Psalms.  It is not surprising that there was an increasing awareness among SDA writers of the potential of archaeology for the defense of the OT against the extreme positions of these and other critics. The next stage was to see that each confirmation of the historical accuracy of the OT was a "proof" that the Bible was right (in everything) and that the critics were wrong (wherever they appeared to differ from traditional interpretations). Consequently, it was thought that if evangelism and church growth were to continue successfully, archaeology must be fully utilized defensively.

This polemical situation is the major explanation for the large number of SDA articles on archaeology as a confirming authority during the first third of the twentieth century which

\footnote{Herman Gunkel lived from 1862-1932, and the special landmarks of his success are probably his Genesis übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), and Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926).}
culminated in a book of significant size in 1933, the year following the death of Gunkel. The "proof from archaeology" attitude still predominated because of the historical background, but the stage was set for a better-informed and better-coordinated discussion of the issues by SDA scholars. Up to this time, archaeological articles had appeared in the missionary periodicals of the church mainly as an aspect of evangelistic outreach. Similar articles had appeared in the regular church papers for purposes of evangelism, for the bolstering of faith, and occasionally, it seems, simply to educate the reader concerning the world of the Bible.

**Types of Apologetic**

The term "apologetics" may be used rather generally to include a wide variety of approaches which are aimed at defense (such as defense of Scripture and its reliability). In fact, there are many shades of emphasis between the position which claims to give "proof" of the accuracy of some Scriptural statement or description and the position which attempts "illumination" of Scripture. The latter might be understood as enlightenment (through background, historical, or cultural context or linguistic clarification) of an event in such a way as to make it easier for the modern mind to accept the reliability of the description. It would seem that between these two positions is a medial ground of "substantiation" and "corroboration." In this area, the same kinds of data are used with the definite purpose of building up a "case" in order to

---

give strong argument (substantiation) towards the establishment of the facticity of Scripture details, or simply to show the essential agreement (corroboration) between biblical and archaeological details.

We might further distinguish categories of apologetics in the light of the definition given above. Terminology and approach within a given source might indicate (1) direct and specific apologetics where an issue or issues are taken up and an attempt is made to modify or refute critical positions, or (2) implied or indirect apologetics where critical positions are not directly attacked, but where the presentation builds up a strong case against some well-known critical view, or, finally, (3) contextual discussion which may be seen to add feasibility to a biblical account without direct apologetic statement.

A cross section may also be made in another direction. Some forms of apologetic may be directed at distinctive denominational interests or doctrinal positions and might therefore be termed "parochial apologetics." On the other hand, we could describe as "general apologetics" those arguments which defend positions which are rather widely held by conservative Christians. General apologetics would usually be directed at the arguments of "higher critics," thus defending the historicity of the biblical narratives and the inspiration of Scripture.

**Abuse of Apologetics**

It is extremely important that archaeology be used legitimately and accurately. One cannot deny that there have been
occasions when archaeological reports or interpretations have, in fact, abused the discipline of biblical archaeology by sensational or irresponsible usage.¹ This is not to say that the sensational is necessarily non-genuine (the Dead Sea Scrolls and Tutankhamen's tomb were genuine, but even then not all of the reports or claims concerning them were factual), nor does it deny that a certain amount of creativity and imagination are vitally necessary for archaeological interpretation. It simply warns of the danger of their misuse and advises caution. The archaeologist, or archaeological interpreter who practices dogmatism, is placing himself in a precarious position.

There is also the theological and experiential danger which arises when too much faith is placed in archaeology and its pronouncements. There is certainly danger in an approach which trusts completely in the vagaries² of research and exploration of the historical past, because archaeological discoveries and interpretations (most archaeological data need considerable interpretation) may at times seem to contradict the commonly accepted interpretations of biblical data.

During the pre-1937 period, most of these variations in the usage of apologetic were present in SDA literature, including strong "proof" and "substantiation" elements.

¹Much of the reporting and speculation concerning the so-called discovery of Noah's ark or the ark of the covenant would fall into this category. Other interpretations and applications may seem to have had justification at the time, such as Glueck's "furnaces" at Ezion-geber, and Garstang's walls at Jericho, yet subsequently called for some retraction or restatement along more readily supportable lines. Claims concerning the Nuzi and Ebla parallels are still being debated, but some have been over-drawn.

²By this we mean both the sometimes fanciful interpretations of history, and the fact that our information from the ANE is very incomplete.
Statement of the Problem

As we have noted, an overview of the pre-1937 SDA literature has shown a strong tendency towards apologetic usage of archaeology with its inherent dangers. Since that was the period before SDA scholars had seriously applied themselves to the study of the discipline of archaeology, the question naturally arises, "What changes occurred when they did commence such serious study? Are SDAs still guided by, or heavily dependent upon, apologetics following this landmark, or was there a notable change of emphasis apparent after 1937?" In other words, we wish to discover whether, and in what ways, the newly acquired expertise affected usage of archaeology from 1937 to 1980.

Thesis and Objectives

It is our thesis that changes actually did become apparent from about the year 1937. Therefore, the main objective of this study was to determine how SDAs--especially those trained in archaeology--have used the results of their discipline in representative publications since 1937. That is, have the more scholarly capability and training affected the denominational usage of archaeology, and if so, how? How have SDA scholars viewed the role of archaeology as indicated in their publications? Subsidiary, but related, objectives lead us (1) to examine the way in which the usage of archaeology fits into the context of non-SDA usage during this same period; (2) to trace any trends in usage which developed during the period 1937 to 1980, and (3) to determine whether there have been distinctive trends within specific periodicals or
categories of SDA literature of the period.

Limitations

As already explained, the earlier periods of SDA development saw only sporadic use of archaeology, and that mostly of the same kind: defense of the authenticity of Scripture. By the 1930s, the situation was changing. The commencement of the new era, the period of our study, was marked by Lynn Wood's Ph.D. degree in archaeology from the University of Chicago in 1937, after a study program which included a period at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. At the Seminary in Washington, he immediately began offering the course "Archaeology and Sacred History," and subsequently in 1941 he was the sole teacher in the new Archaeology and History of Antiquity Department. A major concentration in Archaeology and History of Antiquity was offered. Thus a new refinement and extension had come to SDA biblical studies, and the period from 1937 to the present became the most significant for the study of SDA usage of archaeology. Thus taking 1937 as the commencement date, this survey observes the special contributions of a number of SDA scholars who received formal training in OT studies, many of them specifically in archaeology. The most notable names are Lynn H. Wood, Edwin R. Thiele, and Siegfried H. Horn, with a profusion of new names by the 1970s.

The closing date for the survey was placed at 1980, a representative date for the concluding phases of the first full-scale

---

\(^1\)See the respective Bulletins of the SDA Theological Seminary.
SDA-sponsored excavations which were conducted at Heshbon (Hesbân) in Jordan.\(^1\) Also, 1980 is an appropriate date from which to attempt to foresee future SDA participation in archaeological studies and projects.

The survey of SDA literature included books by professionally qualified (archaeologically) and non-professional SDA writers published in North America as well as articles by the same writers in the principal periodicals selected from four different categories as published in North America: a general church periodical, periodicals prepared for outreach, a professional monthly for ministers, and a journal for scholars. Focus was upon the work of professional contributors, but others were also considered since only thus can a broad portrayal of the understood role of archaeology be determined. Publications from North America were selected because this is the original home-base of Adventism and the center of its publishing program.\(^2\) North America has also been the base for most SDA archaeological activities, particularly the Andrews University-sponsored excavations at Heshbon.

The non-SDA literature dealing with or involving distinctive usage of biblical archaeology were selected from representative books and journals from the same period, 1937 to 1980. Because the "Albright School" dominated the North American scene in biblical archaeology during the period chosen for this study, its various

\(^1\)The year 1980 saw work towards publication of the final reports on the series of excavations (1968-1976) proceeding rapidly.

\(^2\)Of the articles and books published by SDAs first in the USA, many have subsequently been reprinted, or translated and printed overseas for the use of the world-wide church.
elements were especially noted.

For the purpose of maintaining certain limits, the biblical archaeology covered in this dissertation was limited chronologically on the downward side by the end of the first century A.D. That is, articles featuring Greek manuscripts from the second and subsequent centuries A.D., mediaeval documents, etc., were not covered in this survey (except where they form part of a comprehensive project as with excavations at Heshbon). On the other hand, no limits were placed on the early period, so that all articles which specifically feature the earliest of human remains were included insofar as they deal with archaeological, not geological, materials.

Methodology

The plan was primarily to examine the general scholarly literature of the period 1937 to 1980 on a survey basis in order to establish the main trends in biblical archaeological usage. As these trends were detected, they were examined in sufficient detail and with reference to their time setting, so that SDA literature could then be studied within this frame of reference. The major portion of the dissertation, then, involves examination and analysis of the trends in archaeological usage within SDA periodicals and books from this same period. Study of the SDA literature for the period has enabled sub-division into three narrower periods, the Wood-Thiele-Emmerson Era, 1937-1949; the Horn Era, 1950-1973; and the Era of Horn's Younger Associates, 1974-1980. Then, within each of these periods individual periodicals as selected are examined for archaeological articles. These articles are then
evaluated on the basis of the state of knowledge at the time of writing, but the degree of dogmatism with which concepts were presented is also observed to see whether room was left for modification in the light of subsequent information. Attempts are made to determine whether emphases and interpretations are especially traceable to specific individuals or to various external factors.

With specific reference to apologetics, it is noted that the 1937 to 1980 period continues to contain various types of apologetic. As articles and books are perused individually, attention is drawn particularly to the examples of direct apologetic usage, as well as to implied or indirect usage. With regard to parochial and general apologetics, it would have been desirable to statistically divide the articles in this survey into one or the other classification, but this was not possible. Rather, from time to time a statement simply notes examples of specific SDA interests.

Taking the works of each author individually, first the periodicals and then the books are treated, with description and analysis on a period-by-period basis. An attempt is made to detect what kind of emphasis was used and whether it was maintained and developed through the sequence of journal articles and books. Consideration of articles by SDAs in non-SDA journals is also included to detect whether the same approach and presuppositions were used as for SDA publications. In this way, a general picture of the historical development of SDA usage of archaeology should become apparent.

Finally, an evaluation and critique of SDA usage is made in the light of parallels to the general trends observed in the
first section. The strengths and weaknesses in approaches and
usages revealed from the entire forty-four year period are made the
springboard for some suggestions for the future.
CHAPTER II

A NORTH AMERICAN PARADIGM IN BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
AS A BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY OF SDA
LITERATURE, 1937-1980*

As a background for the study of SDA usage of archaeology, it is first necessary to establish the way in which archaeology was being used generally in biblical studies. The period since 1937 has undoubtedly seen excitement, rapid developments, and some significant shifts in viewpoint, though the roots of these eventualities lay more in the 1920s.¹ The British OT scholar H. H. Rowley wrote in 1951 that the period since 1920 had seen a general trend towards more conservative interpretations with regard to many of the OT questions and discussions.² After referring

*The dates of 1937-1980 constitute the framework for the SDA period which is subsequently considered in chapters 3-6. They are used for this chapter only in a general way to establish the context of the SDA period.

¹There was actually a considerable lull in archaeological activities during the Second World War, especially in Palestine itself. There the Arab-Jew confrontation from 1936 and the Arab-Israeli War of 1948 extended the complications and restrictions to ten or twelve years. The major work which did continue in Palestine during the war was carried out by the local organizations, though Glueck continued his survey of Transjordan (see George Leslie Kelm, The Role of Archaeology in Old Testament Interpretation as Reflected in American Scholarly Periodical Literature, 1940-1965 [Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 69-11, 760, 1969], p. 27).
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to some of the specific areas where archaeology had influenced these interpretations, he stated:

Exaggerated claims are sometimes made as to the significance of all the new archaeological material. It is suggested that it has proved the accuracy of Biblical records, or that it has conclusively settled such questions as the date of the Exodus. Such unfounded and misleading claims are dangerous. The evidence of archaeology is rarely as simple and clear as we would like to have it, and its bearing on Biblical questions is more often indirect than direct. Not seldom it complicates our problems rather than solves them. Nevertheless, it is true that in a broad way archaeology has tended to bring about a more conservative attitude to some questions. It has not proved the historical accuracy of the patriarchal narratives; but it has shown the historical credibility of those narratives by its evidence that they reflect the situation and outlook of the patriarchal age in a remarkable way. It has brought about a greater disposition to credit many of the poems of the Bible, both in the historical books and in the Psalter, with a higher antiquity than was once thought likely, by its demonstration that similar poetry was known in Canaanite civilization even before the time of Moses.1

The two articles immediately following Rowley's introduction were both written by W. F. Albright,2 and the guarded tribute to archaeological advancement of biblical knowledge could have been applied to no one more appropriately than Albright.

Albright and His School

William Foxwell Albright (1891-1971), who was born to missionary parents in Chile, subsequently received his higher education in U.S.A., culminating in a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University in 1916. His acceptance of higher critical views was greatly modified and even reversed during his years of study and excavation

1Ibid., pp. xx-xxi.

while living in Jerusalem. By 1933 he had swung considerably towards a moderate position. Thus as he mourned the loss of his conservative colleague Melvin Grove Kyle, he noted that he himself had "... gradually changed from the extreme radicalism of 1919 to a standpoint which can neither be called conservative nor radical, in the usual sense of the terms." Reminiscing in later years he made it very clear that archaeological discoveries had constituted the major factor in his change of attitude.

During these fifteen years my initially rather skeptical attitude toward the accuracy of Israelite historical tradition had suffered repeated jolts as discovery after discovery confirmed the historicity of details which might reasonably have been considered legendary.2

After sixteen years of residence in Jerusalem, Albright left on December 29, 1935, so that at the beginning of the 1937-1980 period he was devoting the majority of his time to writing and teaching.3 The former contributed to his total of almost eleven hundred scholarly publications for his lifetime, and the latter contributed to his unconscious development of a "school" of archaeological and OT scholarship.4 The best known members of his

---

3 The lull in archaeological activity during World War II, did not affect Albright's flow of publications which in fact benefitted from his absence from field work and included some of his best known works such as From the Stone Age to Christianity (1940).
4 Leona Running who was one of his students and later a research assistant suggests that he invented the term "Baltimore School" for his students out of modesty, but the "Albright School" is the name which endured (Leona Glidden Running and David Noel Freedman, William Foxwell Albright: Twentieth Century Genius [New York: Two Continents Publishing Group, 1975], pp. 198-99).
school were and are John Bright (1908- ), Frank Moore Cross, Jr.
(1921- ), J. Mitchell Dahood (1922-1982), David Noel Freedman
(1922- ), Nelson Glueck (1900-1971), 1 George E. Mendenhall (1916- ),

In 1952 Albright expressed what he saw as the most important
collection of archaeology to biblical studies in the period since
1932. In his mind that achievement was the consolidation of
"... fragmentary materials into a synthesis of the history of
ancient Eastern civilization, in which the Bible appears in its true
historical perspective." 2 He further pinpointed the most important
components which had contributed to that success. The stabilizing
of chronology was to him of great value, particularly where it had
led towards correlations between Egyptian, Babylonian, and Syro-
Palestinian chronology in the period before 1500 B.C. The dis­
covery of cuneiform tablet collections at Mari and Ugarit had cast
important light on the OT context especially on the "background of
the Patriarchal traditions of Genesis" (Mari), 3 and on the OT poetic
literature. 4 The third element, continuing in chronological order,
was the discovery of documents relative to the exilic and post-exilic

1 It might be argued that Glueck was hardly a part of the
"Albright school" since he took his post-graduate studies in Germany
and only subsequently fell in love with archaeology after studying
with Albright in Jerusalem (1927-1928) and excavating at Tell Beit
Mirsim in 1930 and 1932. However, Albright spoke of him affection­
ately as "the first of my students to master the then obscure art of
dating Palestinian pottery..." William Foxwell Albright, "Nelson

2 William Foxwell Albright, "The Bible after Twenty Years of

3 Ibid., p. 538.

periods, especially the Lachish letters and the Aramaic papyri from Egypt. The Dead Sea Scrolls and related discoveries in Palestine not only revolutionized the study of the OT (particularly in terms of its text) but also gave invaluable background to the study of the NT. Finally from the Christian era came "early Gnostic and Manichean codices from Egypt."  

With his breadth of scholarship Albright used and applied archaeological information in many different ways. It is significant for purposes of this study that he did not ignore apologetics. In a popular article in 1968 he first discussed the tremendous advances in archaeological study and then gave his considered opinion on usage:

In the light of our new information, biblical archaeologists no longer devote themselves primarily to proving the accuracy of Scripture, though this remains important and new confirmations are turning up almost daily. Their main purpose today is to interpret the Bible as fully as possible from the new evidence. The result is throughout favorable to the biblical record, and over and over again reinterpretations of biblical concepts and phraseology in the light of archaeology make the Bible more meaningful for today.  

In subsequent comments he illustrated the importance of archaeological assistance in exegesis, as well as in general linguistic and contextual studies.  

---

1 Ibíd., pp. 540-44.  
3 Ibíd., pp. 3-5. He further described some of the repercussions of these archaeological applications on both biblical and theological studies: "In conclusion we emphasize the fact that archeological discovery has been largely responsible for the recent revival of interest in biblical theology, because of the wealth of new material illustrating text and background of the Bible. As the reader will have seen from this article, new archeological material
One area in which he spoke out strongly concerned the application of information from the Dead Sea Scrolls. As early as 1950 he wrote: "It cannot be insisted too strongly that the Isaiah Scroll proves the great antiquity of the text of the Masoretic Book, warning us against the light hearted emendation in which we used to indulge."\(^1\) Five years later he maintained that the close agreement between the Qumran biblical manuscripts and the MT "... proves conclusively that we must treat the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible with the utmost respect and that the free emending of difficult passages in which modern critical scholars have indulged, cannot be tolerated any longer."\(^2\)

continues to pour in, compelling revision of all past approaches to both Old and New Testament religion. It becomes clearer each day that this rediscovery of the Bible often leads to a new evaluation of biblical faith, which strikingly resembles the orthodoxy of an earlier day. Neither an academic scholasticism nor an irresponsible neo-orthodoxy must be allowed to divert our eyes from the living faith of the Bible" (idem, "Twenty Years of Archaeology," p. 550). Actually Albright and his school contributed substantially to the revival of biblical theology. Kelm (Role of Archaeology, p. 179) observed that since World War II exegetical methodology was revised, and emphasis on source analysis gave way to a concern for discovering the concepts and motivation of the Bible writers (or redactors?). Questions were asked as to why the writers recorded the history of Israel with the specific style or approach which was evident. This trend stressing context and background was naturally "... accompanied by a heightened interest in biblical archaeology" (ibid.). Archaeology therefore helped to destroy the "proof-text" approach to the OT as exemplified in much dogmatic theology (ibid., p. 193). It also assisted in modifying the critical approach to the religion of Israel (ibid., p. 185; cf. William F. Albright and David N. Freedman, "Setting for the Anchor Bible: The Continuing Revolution in Biblical Research," JBR 31 [1963]:110-13).

\(^1\) W. F. Albright, "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery," BASOR 118 (1950):6. In a footnote he admitted that the comment applied to himself as well as others: "This stricture applies equally to the writer, who reacted against the excesses of Duhm and Haupt (his teacher), but who still emended the text much too light-heartedly" (ibid.).

To illustrate the trend in Albright's usage of archaeology, we have chosen to focus on the patriarchal period. The same period is also featured both in the publications of the members of Albright's school and as it appears in the parallel developments of the period.

With regard to the historicity of the patriarchs, we note that Albright regarded them as individual historical figures from about the year 1927. A 1960 statement is representative of his later position:

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob no longer seem isolated figures, much less reflections of later Israelite history; they now appear as true children of their age, bearing the same names, moving about over the same territory, visiting the same towns (especially Harran and Nahor), practicing the same customs as their contemporaries. In other words, the patriarchal narratives have a historical nucleus throughout, though it is likely that long oral transmission of the original poems and later prose sagas which underlie the present text of Genesis has considerably refracted the original events.

A leading factor in convincing Albright of the validity of this position was the cumulative data from excavations at Mari, Chagar Bazar, and Nuzi in the 1920s and 1930s.

Albright accepted Ur as the original home of Abraham's family but tended to emphasize the North Mesopotamian associations.

---

1 Albright had earlier characterized the patriarchs (except Abraham) as deities, and the gradual transition in his views is traced by Stanley Eugene Hardwick (Change and Constancy in William Foxwell Albright's Treatment of Early Old Testament History and Religion, 1918-1958 [Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms 66-9501, 1965], pp. 65-74).


3 Ibid.
He did this on the basis of personal and place names, of cosmological stories which he regarded as parallel to Gen 1-11, of similarities in social customs, and on the basis of a partial equating of the Hebrews with the Habiru.

Albright's concept of the patriarchal life-style was considerably revised in 1961 when he expounded the idea that Abraham was a caravan trader using donkeys to cross the arid Negev. He now defined the 'Apiru (Habiru) in terms of caravaneers, or donkeymen, who were stateless. This concept apparently fitted Glueck's description of several hundred sites scattered across the Negev (Albright saw them as caravan stations) and judged by pottery to date to MBI (twenty-first to nineteenth centuries B.C.).

The dating of the patriarchal period to MBI is evident as early as 1935 in Albright's writing. After a brief fluctuation when he considered that the destruction of Bab edh-Dhra late in the

1 Idem, Recent Discoveries (1955), pp. 73-74.
2 Ibid., pp. 60-70.
4 Idem, "The Smaller Beth-shan Stele of Sethos I (1309-1290 B.C.)," BASOR 125 (1952):32. All of these positions are examined in detail in Hardwick, Change and Constancy, pp. 82-124.
third millennium B.C. might indicate the time of Abraham,\(^1\) he settled down to dating Abraham either early or late in the first half of the second millennium B.C., eventually favoring the twentieth and nineteenth centuries B.C.\(^2\)

G. Ernest Wright and John Bright, as two of the most influential of Albright's students, both essentially endorsed his view of the patriarchs. Wright regarded as one of the most important contributions of archaeology (since about 1920) the fact that it had proved that Abraham's "... life and times as reflected in the stories about him, fit perfectly within the early second millennium, but imperfectly within any later period."\(^3\) He saw the patriarchs as historical characters whose home had been in Northern Mesopotamia,\(^4\) who date to the early second millennium,\(^5\) and who appear to have had some connections with the Hapiru (Habiru).\(^6\)

Bright made similar statements but apparently dropped Albright's concept of Abraham as a "donkey caravaneer" during the

---

\(^1\)Hardwick, *Change and Constancy*, pp. 221-22.

\(^2\)Though he attributed the honor of first making this decision to his student Glueck (Albright, "Glueck in Memoriam," p. 4), more thorough (in some respects) presentation of his views on the patriarchs, including some development of ideas, was published posthumously. Idem, "From the Patriarchs to Moses-I: From Abraham to Joseph," *BA* 36 [1973]:5-33; idem, "From the Patriarchs to Moses II: Moses out of Egypt," *BA* 36 [1973]:48-76.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 50.

\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 42-43.
1970s.¹ In 1972 he wrote that "... the patriarchs are depicted not as camel nomads, but as ass nomads, who confined their wanderings to the settled land and its fringes."² In 1981 he had revised this to read: "In short, they are depicted not as camel nomads like those of later times and today, but as semi-nomadic breeders of sheep and other small cattle whose beast of burden was the ass and who confined their wanderings to the settled land and its fringes, where seasonal pasturage might be found."³

Reactions of the Albright School to the German School and Its Developments

Albright claims that even as a youth he resisted certain aspects of the Wellhausen approach to the OT. This is plain from the following quotation:

At the same time, my partial espousal of the Pan-Babylonian point of view of Hugo Winckler against the school of Biblical historians headed by Julius Wellhausen, which I had opposed since boyhood, brought a sharp reaction against the basic positions of current Old Testament criticism. Wellhausen's view that Israel was cut off from the great civilizations of the ancient Near East and did not form part of a great cultural continuum, as maintained by Winckler, seemed to me just as incredible as Wellhausen's theory of unilinear evolution, which was contradicted by all the facts of Egyptology and Assyriology. I was accordingly led increasingly to insist on the substantial historicity of Mosaic tradition and the antiquity of Israelite monotheism; these principles have remained basic to my teaching ever since.⁴

² Ibid., p. 80; cf. ibid., p. 90 n. 47.
⁴ Albright, Christian Humanism, p. 309.
Albright had thus reacted against Wellhausen primarily in two areas—the concept of an isolated Israel, and the idea of unilinear evolutionary development.

In 1938 Albright had defined his views on Wellhausen in a journal article. He began by spelling out the leading contrasts between what had been "orthodox" positions and those of Wellhausen. The distinctive emphases of Wellhausen were listed as follows:

1. biblical literature is to be subjected to exactly the same methods of analysis and interpretation as are applied to other literatures; 2. the religious institutions of Israel passed through three Hegelian stages of evolution, pre-prophetic, prophetic, and legal; 3. Israelite monotheism did not go back to Moses (before 1200 B.C.) but was the result of a slow evolution, being clearly formulated in the 8th century and fully developed in the 6th century B.C.; 4. in their present form the first six or more historical books of the Bible are a compilation of four main documents designated as J,E,D,P, which were written down between 900 and 450 B.C.; 5. the non-prophetic poetry of the Bible (Psalms, Proverbs, Job, etc.) is almost entirely post-exilic (i.e., it was written after the Babylonian Exile in the 6th century B.C.).

Albright eventually stated that he accepted numbers 1 and 4, rejected numbers 2 and 3, and accepted only part of number 5. Obviously Albright was far from a "conservative," but earlier in the article he had observed:

By now the reader doubtless considers the writer an extreme liberal, full of enthusiasm for the triumph of scholarship, as represented by Wellhausenism, over obscurantist orthodoxy. Actually this is not true, and the writer's position is as far removed from the former as it is from the latter.

He specified that the reasons for his adaptation of Wellhausen's

2 Ibid., p. 178.
3 Ibid., p. 188.
4 Ibid., p. 179.
positions were "... the unprecedented development of Near Eastern
archeology, the change in the philosophical interpretation of
history (the recognition of the artificiality of Hegelian evolu-
tionary development especially as applied to Israelite religion)
and the shift of theological emphasis."\(^1\) By the latter he meant
the return to a more serious examination of Scripture, while
accepting the "more assured results" of scholarly investigation.
He made plain that of these three factors, by far the most
important was the first. He stressed the vast number of archaeo-
logical discoveries and the breadth of knowledge of the ancient
world which was becoming increasingly available (including
parallels emerging from Ugarit and Mari).\(^2\) He also stressed the
manner in which the context of the Pentateuch was becoming
familiar in the finds from the second millennium B.C., and the
fact that "innumerable passages and statements" of the OT had been
confirmed whereas relatively few pointed in the opposite direction.\(^3\)
Thus the prophets like Amos and Hosea might be seen as reformers and
not as "religious innovators,"\(^4\) and the various scripts now known to

\(^1\) Ibid. Albright tended to excuse Wellhausen's lack of inter-
est in archaeology on the grounds that very little work had been done
in his day to relate new discoveries to the Bible and that very little
had been done in Palestine except in Jerusalem (ibid., pp. 179-80).
He thus continued to regard Wellhausen as the "greatest biblical
scholar of the 19th century" (ibid., p. 185). However, two years
later he used rather strong language when he stated that ". . . Well-
hausen, great Semiticist though he was, neglected the new material
from the ancient Orient with a disdain as arrogant as it was com-
plete" (idem, "The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel," JBL 59 [1940]:92).

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 187. In other words they inherited the basic
cultic program from the earlier period of Israel's history--the
period depicted in the Pentateuch.
have been in use in the second millennium B.C. in Syro-Palestine indicate that the "Hebrew historical traditions" including the law need not have been passed on only in oral form.¹ Thus already, in the 1930s he maintained a strong emphasis on a literal, historical, and monotheistic Israel, and a serious view of the historicity of the pentateuchal narratives.²

The foregoing may serve as background to the discussion and disagreement between the Albright school on one hand and Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth on the other. Albright admired much of the work of Alt and Noth but found them too close to Wellhausen in their virtual refusal to give credence to archaeological evidence for the evaluation and understanding of the Pentateuch.

As indicated by Kelm,³ none of the participants in this debate actually thought that archaeology could be used to prove the Bible true. Their discussion concerned the relevance of archaeology in the search for and reconstruction of early Israelite history, and on just how archaeology could be legitimately used for those purposes. Albrecht Alt (1883-1956) developed the school of thought whose proponents include Gerhard von Rad (Heidelberg), Martin Noth (Bonn), and Karl Elliger (Tübingen). Alt's form critical approach to Israelite history was best developed in Noth's The History of Israel,⁴ but Alt's own publications also had a strong impact.

¹Ibid., pp. 186, 188.
³Role of Archaeology, p. 188.
Albright admired the work of Alt¹ and particularly paid tribute to his Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Folkes Israel² on the occasion of the author's death. His admiration particularly extended to Alt's contributions to the understanding of Israelite law and constitutional history.³ However, he also criticized Alt's work for its restricted view of Scripture and archaeology.⁴ Albright felt that the author had devalued Scripture by his insistence on the primacy of form criticism without making allowance for adequate oral pre-history. With regard to archaeology, Albright felt that the "atomistic approach" had caused Alt to become "... more and more detached from the advance of archeological knowledge regarding the place of Israel among the peoples of the second millennium."⁵ As a result he refused to consider the data from Mari, Nuzi, and Ugarit as making any serious contribution to the understanding of patriarchal history.⁶

Both Alt and, especially, Noth stressed internal analysis of the text of Scripture, but in a form critical manner which denied that any Israelite history could be written for the period before 1200 B.C., the time when they believed that the Tribal

⁴Ibid., p. 172; cf. especially the chapter of Alt (Kleine Schriften, pp. 1-66) entitled "The God of the Fathers."
League had been formed. At the time that this confederation was formed and because the possession of the land was regarded as the fulfillment of divine promises therefore the "... tradition of the patriarchs was conceived and developed from this point of view in the Israelite confederation of the twelve tribes" (emphasis supplied).¹ That is, each of the patriarchal stories was explained by Noth primarily in etiological terms. The preconceptions involved in this approach led Noth to discount (with regard to historicity) the majority of archaeological contributions to the understanding of the Pentateuch.² This was his attitude in spite of the strong statements in the introduction to his work where he discussed sources of ancient history and stated that we cannot ignore archaeology when writing a history of Israel. He stressed that literary traditions are the vital ingredient of history but admitted that archaeology can often give "... colour and life to the literary traditions and greatly assists our understanding of them."³ Noth expressed the necessity of beginning with the text itself before proceeding to external sources. However, when he approached the Pentateuch he strongly qualified the historicity of the text. He saw only "... successive coalescing of sacred traditions which in their turn presuppose and are based on particular

²For this reason one needs to bear in mind Noth's methodology when reading his later books where an increasing amount of archaeological data is included. See idem, Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Alrertumskunde, 2 vols. ed. Hans Walter Wolff (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971).
³Idem, History of Israel, p. 42.
historical events."¹ The degree to which any of these patriarchal narratives may be drawn upon for an exposition of Israelite history he said is extremely problematic since the data can "only be used with many provisos."² Furthermore, of the memories of early patriarchal characters and events which may remain, those which feature Abraham and Isaac arise from a much later period than those which featured Jacob.³

According to Noth one of the most significant factors limiting archaeological illumination of Palestine and biblical studies is the overriding importance of written materials from ancient civilizations. He felt that the great enlightenment of the ancient world already attained through archaeology was mainly the result of texts and inscriptions--written materials. Since so little of this type of material (comparatively speaking) has been found in Palestine, he maintained that with regard to Palestine, archaeology could contribute little more than background for historical personalities and events.⁴

Bright, whose own History of Israel in contrast utilized archaeological data throughout (including excavation reports, inscriptions, and textual sources), maintained that the significance of the patriarchal narratives is limited by the scarcity of written evidence. He argued that the historical narratives of the Patriarchal period are not based on direct historical events but are rather the product of a later era, influenced by the cultural and religious context of the Israelite period. The narratives of Abraham and Isaac are seen as arising from a much later period than those of Jacob, reflecting the influence of the later Israelite period on the narratives.

¹Ibid., p. 43. ²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 125. It was claimed that Jacob was originally of the "house of Joseph" but later acquired significance for the whole of Israel (on the basis that his Shechem traditions came to be associated with the settlement of the land). ⁴Ibid., pp. 46-48. Actually both Alt and Noth used considerably more archaeological data in their publications than one would think from the reactions of Albright and Bright, but it is also true that their usage predominantly features written materials, and also that they used much less archaeology when dealing with the early period.
regional surveys, and every other form of information as well as
the written texts), regarded such an approach as vitally necessary
for the elucidation of biblical history and Israelite prehistory.
In his view "Old Testament theology is primarily a theology of
events; it is concerned with events and the interpretation of those
events in the light of faith."¹ Thus he felt that the events of
the Hexateuch are an indispensable background to OT theology and
"history can never be a matter of indifference to the theologian."²

At the same time, Bright, who accepted the essence of
literary criticism (as had Albright), nevertheless deplored the
effect of Wellhausen (or classical) literary criticism on the
historicity of the OT. He felt that the majority of scholars had
come to realize that the documents (specifically of the Hexateuch)
were not only earlier than had been thought, but that all of them
had a substantial pre-history of tradition behind them, and that
the historical element in this tradition was likely to be more sub-
stantial than Wellhausen had thought. ³ He expressed frustration be­
cause the considerable archaeological data had not been widely
successful in correcting the Wellhausen view of limited OT
historicity, and in particular it had not succeeded in establishing
the antiquity of Israelite religion.⁴

When Bright turned to The History of Israel by Noth, he had
two over-ruling criticisms. (1) He objected to Noth's subjectivity

¹John Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing: A
Study in Method, Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 19 (London:
²Ibid., p. 12. ³Ibid., p. 25. ⁴Ibid.
and negativism¹ in stating that the patriarchs did not come from Mesopotamia and also in claiming that any historical elements in the Exodus and Sinai experiences (for example) happened to different groups on different occasions (Moses was not the leader),² and that Israel had not existed prior to 1200 B.C. (the settlement).³ (2) Although Noth had said that the Hexateuch is not adequate for explaining Israel's early history, he refused to turn to archaeology to provide an alternate explanation.⁴ Bright referred to such an attitude as "nihilism." However, Noth did not worry about any alternate explanation, according to Bright, because the narratives are not reliable tradition but only etiological tales.⁵ Bright admitted that archaeological evidences were not "proof" in the sense of "irrefragable evidence that the Bible story happened 'just so'," but he insisted that the historian must place the biblical tradition beside the external (archaeological) evidence, and weigh and accept the "balance of probability" (italics his).⁶

Bright further outlined his objections to Noth's methodology with four more points: (1) Form criticism has its limitations: "... literary form does not, where the facts can be tested, furnish a final test of historicity."⁷ (2) In historical tradition

¹Ibid., pp. 83-84.
³Bright thought that there was evidence for at least some connections between the clans prior to the settlement, and also for adoption of the Yahwistic faith during the wilderness period (Bright, Early Israel, p. 85).
⁴Ibid., p. 87.
⁵Ibid.
⁶Ibid., pp. 88, 89.
⁷Ibid., p. 90.
etiology is not primary but secondary (Bright regarded Alt and Noth as more in error in this area than anywhere else because they insisted on its primacy). 1 (3) The insistence that all traditions have a geographical locale, or cult center to which they are attached, is unproven and often demonstrably untrue (traditions can even change locations and are more likely to adhere to people than places), so it is unreasonable to locate all Jacob traditions at Shechem, and Abraham and Isaac traditions in the Negev. 2 (4) The method used by Noth for tracing traditions is too uncertain and subjective to form the basis for a reconstruction of the early history of Israel. 3 Finally, therefore, Bright insisted on the need for external, objective evidences (archaeology) in order to correctly evaluate the pentateuchal documents and, where possible, to trace back to the original Sitz im Leben. 4

The next two names represent the latest large-scale reactions against the Albright school, though strictly speaking they are not a part of the German school. However, their methodologies bear similarities to it, 5 and, in fact, Thomas L. Thompson completed

1 Ibid., p. 91. He argued the issue of etiology at some length including using some modern analogies to etiology (ibid., pp. 91-100).
2 Ibid., pp. 102-103.
3 Ibid., p. 104.
4 Ibid., pp. 109-10. Wright took a similar position when he placed The History of Israel by Noth beside A History of Israel by Bright. He decided that the method of the former was too subjective and speculative and concluded that, "In spite of the great gaps in our knowledge, the patriarchal era stands in the truest sense at the beginning of Israel's history and faith" (G. Ernest Wright, "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies," Expos T 71 [1959-1960]:296).
5 Both these writers based their approach on form criticism and were even less concerned about an early historical background to the Pentateuch than were Alt and Noth.
his doctoral program at Tübingen where he had worked with students and associates of Alt and Noth. John Van Seters, on the other hand, who has much in common with Thompson, completed his Ph.D. at Yale (1965). Though their views are substantially different, both writers have argued against the authenticity of an early "patriarchal period," especially as portrayed in MBI by the Albright school.

Thompson claimed that the main "evidence" for the "patriarchal period" has been a series of historical parallels, or "coincidences," gleaned from the early second millennium B.C. These evidences, which he doubted, include the occurrence of names similar to those in the patriarchal record found among the Amorites of southern Mesopotamia, at Mari, and among peoples encroaching upon Egypt in the early second millennium B.C. Likewise, various scholars have depicted a widespread West-Semitic migration into Palestine which they identified as "Amorite" and tended to link in some way with the patriarchal movement into Palestine. Part of the Albright argument was that the Amorite movement was semi-nomadic and therefore similar to the biblical description of the life-style of the patriarchs. Confirmation of

2 Albright, Stone Age, pp. 163-64; Bright, History of Israel, p. 77.
4 Albright, Stone Age, pp. 164-66.
other aspects of life-style was claimed from the various family customs revealed in the Nuzi Tablets.\(^1\) The most recent defense of MBI dating of the patriarchs was devised by Albright. It consisted of a donkey caravaneering theory which portrayed Abraham as a trader who used donkeys as pack-animals and plied especially on the route between Egypt and Canaan (since the MBI archaeological evidence showed widespread settlements in the central Negev).\(^2\)

Thompson objected to the Albright comparative historical method and sought to overthrow each of the arguments individually. He launched his attack, however, by first asserting that the "text of Genesis is not an historical document, but is rather a collection of literary traditions whose 'historical background' and 'Sitz im Leben' need to be sought at every stage of each tradition's development."\(^3\) As a literary and form critic, he saw the Pentateuch as written in the first millennium B.C. and therefore looked in that period for its context.\(^4\) At the same time he denied that these literary traditions can be assumed to have historicity since by his definition they do not have historiographic form.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Idem, \textit{Historical Analogy}, pp. 23-27.

\(^2\) See also p. 20.

\(^3\) Thompson, \textit{Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives}, pp. 2-3.

\(^4\) Specifically "around the end of the tenth or during the ninth century B.C. (the time of the J author)" (ibid., p. 316).

\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 3, 315. He does allow that some portions appear as "historiographical reconstruction" (ibid., p. 315). John Tracy Luke ("Abraham and the Iron Age: Reflections on the New Patriarchal Studies," \textit{JSOT} 4 [1977]:37) insists that the "narratives in final form obviously have historiographic intent" and that it is therefore unjustified to rule out historicity on the basis of preconceived forms.
Concerning the patriarchal names, the author admitted that "Abram" and "Jacob" (in various forms) occurred in much of the ANE over a period stretching through the second as well as much of the first millennia B.C. He thus claimed that their early occurrence was therefore of no special significance.

The "Amorite Hypothesis," as he termed the concept of Amorite migration into Palestine, Thompson attacked with special vigor. A comprehensive survey of habitation patterns for greater Palestine for the entire Bronze Age was used by the author to support his position and undermine the concept of a large-scale invasion by Amorites at the transition from EB III to EB IV--MBI. That is, he wished to show cultural continuity from EB III to EB IV--MBI. At the same time he was attempting to counteract two other elements of the widely accepted view of the patriarchal period: that EB IV--MBI was semi-nomadic in greater Palestine, and that according to Albright's later views, there was substantial donkey caravaneering across the Sinai.

He first demonstrated the population pattern, showing that in EB IV--MBI the most heavily populated areas remained (as earlier)
in the Jezreel, Harod, and Jordan valleys, where agriculture would have been more sophisticated. However, in areas where grazing was common for other periods during EB IV--MBI there was a "notable absence of finds" with few exceptions. These were some sites near the shore of Galilee, a few on the Mediterranean coast (both categories were suggested to be either trading or fishing villages), and some sites which "may be understood in terms of seasonal grazing." For the entire Bronze Age, Thompson judged the southern border of agriculture as running through the center of the Beersheba and Arad basins, but there were two basic changes during the EB IV--MBI period. The central hill country became relatively sparsely populated and the Arad and Beersheba basins were virtually abandoned.

Thompson answered the "Amorite Hypothesis" by explaining that the destruction of cities and the drastic population reduction actually took place gradually over several hundred years from late EB II until the commencement of EB IV--MBI. Rather than an invasion, he claimed that the causes were physical and sociological: overstocking, and especially the development of too much pastoral activity in marginal rainfall areas, and the attaining of human

---

1 Ibid., p. 65. There was no discernible disruption of the balance between tombs and settlements.

2 Ibid. The survey was not complete and depended considerably on surface sherding and judgments made by various archaeologists over a fifty-year period (ibid., pp. 1-2).

3 Idem, Negev in the Bronze Age, p. 29.

population saturation, leading to food shortages, inflation, brigandry, and local warfare. He thus maintained that the racial identity of the population remained unchanged during this transition (no Amorite invasion).

The author then proceeded to demonstrate that although the northern Negev was almost deserted there were several hundred villages of varying size in the central Negev and northern Sinai which were inhabited only during EB IV--MBI. These villages which Albright had interpreted as donkey caravan stations, Thompson explained as "transhumance." By this he meant a mixed agricultural and grazing economy, with long-term winter grazing in the highlands followed by dry summer grazing in the crop stubble of the lower northwestern slopes. Acceptance of this thesis would undermine the concept of donkey caravan trade and nomadism for the entire period, as Thompson found no indication of nomadism in other parts of Palestine either. The writer additionally undermined Albright's 1961 interpretation of Abraham as a caravaneer by arguing that Albright's dates for MBI were too late. Thompson insisted that


3 It should be noted that rejection of Albright's donkey caravaneering hypothesis does not necessarily mean rejection of an MBI (about 2,000 B.C.) dating of the patriarchs. His own students were not all convinced of its correctness (cf. pp. 21-22 for Bright's reversal after having adopted it for a time), and it appears to have been one of his "inspirations" which he himself would have dropped in the face of Thompson's evidence.

4 See p. 20.

5 Albright had tended to revise the dates downward, placing MBI between about 2000 B.C. and the late nineteenth century B.C. and thus giving as the basis of the donkey caravan trade the restored stability established by the Twelfth Dynasty of Egypt (see

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the end of MBI can be no later than the beginning of the nineteenth century. He also felt that since he had shown that the northern Negev was virtually unpopulated during MBI, the historicity of the Genesis account was thereby nullified since the record depicted Abraham and Isaac in the vicinity of Beersheba at the time.¹

¹It could be argued that if this normally good grazing country were now deserted (even though it had been overstocked for a time), the Beersheba region might have been the ideal location for a newcomer. Genesis 21:31 states that Beersheba was the name given to a specific well, and the surrounding region became known as the "wilderness of Beersheba" (Gen. 21:14). Isaac used the same name and the reference states "therefore the name of the city is Beersheba to this day" (Gen 26:33). This editorial note makes it clear that the city itself may have been built some centuries later. Archaeology would suggest the latter since Chalcolithic sherds and a little occupation have been found on the mound, but extensive occupation does not appear until Israelite times (Y. Aharoni, "Beersheba, Tel," EAEHL 1:161-62). An alternative view is possible if Abraham's time is located by the longer biblical chronology (Exod 12:40 and 1 Kgs 6:1; cf. p. 106 n. 3). He might then have seen as arriving in Canaan late in EBIII, or perhaps at the beginning of EBIV-MBI depending upon where these transitions are placed. The latter view would place his arrival close to the date of the destruction of Bab edh-Dhra and its fellow cities on the eastern side of the Dead Sea and Araban. Rast and Schaub, who are working on these sites, are inclined to identify them with the "cities of the plains" (Gen 19), especially Bab edh-Dhra and Numeira as Sodom and Gomorrah ("Expedition to the Southeastern Dead Sea Plain, 1979," ASOR Newsletter, no. 8, June 1980, pp. 16-17; cf. "Have Sodom and Gomorrah Been Found?" BAR, September-October 1980, pp. 27-36). The early reports from Ebla prompted Freedman to suggest dating Abraham to the EB period ("The Real Story of the Ebla Tablets: Ebla and the Cities of the Plain," BA 41 [1978]:156-59; cf. Bright, History of Israel, [1981], p. 44 n. 45), but he also recognized some of the difficulties over translation of the Ebla Tablets and his suggestions were tentative (Freedman, "Real Story," p. 143). More recently, Willem van Hattem ("Once Again: Sodom and Gomorrah," BA 44 [1981]: 92) has taken a similar position, and criticized Thompson's explanations as ignoring too many facts.

The modern Nahal Gerar (Wadi Gazza) is presumably some
One more objection by Thompson concerned the usage of parallels in customs such as those from the Nuzi Tablets to elucidate patriarchal history. He analyzed the various parallels which have been suggested by others and concluded that the parallels are not usually very close,¹ and that exceptional materials had been used to the exclusion of the normal.² He regarded the Nuzi Tablets as of great value for general but indirect contribution to the background of the OT, since the customs even of Genesis are admittedly within the category of "ancient Near Eastern family law." His main contentions continued to be that the Nuzi materials cannot be used to attempt to date the Genesis stories,³ and that there is "no historical connection [which] can be drawn between Genesis and Nuzi."⁴

Bright continued to maintain the basic position of the

distance from the biblical Gerar (Gen 20:1,2), but it is of interest to note Thompson's comment concerning that area. He stated that the settlements beside the northern arm of this wadi were large and stable with occupation lasting throughout the Bronze Age (Thompson, Palestine in the Bronze Age, p. 9; cf. idem, Negev in the Bronze Age, pp. 5-9, 11, 29).

¹Idem, Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives, p. 294.
²Ibid., pp. 252-59.
³Ibid., pp. 294-95.
⁴Ibid., p. 295. An excellent response by Selman "Comparative Methods and the Patriarchal Narratives," Themelios, September 1977, pp. 9-16) admitted abuses of the comparative method but insisted on its validity and necessity under careful controls. He took up the basic arguments of Thompson and Van Seters giving answers and pointing out weaknesses in their presentations (ibid., pp. 12-14). Of special importance is his observation that there must be wide examination of "prospective parallel material in its proper context" (ibid., p. 12) and also that some textual material must be evaluated as indicating exceptions or contrasts either to the common practice of the time or to the Genesis account (ibid., p. 15).
Albright school which saw the Genesis customs as belonging to the same ancient and widespread legal traditions as those in vogue in Nuzi.\(^1\) He also admitted the need for cautious use of parallels\(^2\) and stated that they could not be used "to fix the patriarchs in any specific century."\(^3\) The essence of his comment was that the parallels from Nuzi (where valid) when taken with other evidences at least tend to support the antiquity of the patriarchal stories.\(^4\) On this issue he devoted only a few comments to the opinions of Thompson and Van Seters.\(^5\)

One might summarize Thompson's attitude to archaeology and history as both negative and positive. His comprehensive survey of sites, though admitted to be incomplete and questionable in many areas, was helpful in building up a general picture of significant habitation patterns during the Bronze Age. He showed that MBA was not a time of semi-nomadic invasion but of generally poor agricultural settlement with substantial towns also in existence.\(^6\) He also claimed that various patriarchal towns such as Bethel, Ai, and Beersheba do not support a patriarchal context before the Iron Age.\(^7\) The fact that he was attempting to reduce the early history of Israel to non-existence was not unpleasing to the author since he

---


\(^2\) In a footnote he discussed the controversial subject of Rachel's theft of Laban's idols and argued that they obviously had more than intrinsic value, and perhaps constituted "a claim to headship in the family" (ibid., p. 79 n. 24).

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 80. \(^4\) Ibid. \(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Thompson, *Historicity of the Patriarchs*, pp. 319-20.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 325.
claimed that he was thereby being true to the text—which did not present an historical Abraham. Thus he summarized his position:

Salvation history is not an historical account of saving events open to the study of the historian. Salvation history did not happen; it is a literary form which has its own historical context. In fact, we can say that the faith of Israel is not an historical event; it is rather a faith within history. . . . The expression of this faith finds its condensation in an historical form which sees the past as promise. But this expression is not itself a writing of history, nor is it really about the past, but it is about the present hope.  

We do not need to take up Van Seters' work in detail since in many ways it overlaps the work of Thompson. 2 The first portion dealt with archaeological and historical arguments which have been used to identify Abraham with the second millennium B.C. In each case the author attempted to show non-validity of the argument, while applying the same data favorably to the sixth century B.C. Thus the occurrence of camels in the narrative was not described as anachronistic, but simply as the natural choice at a time when it had become commonplace as a beast of burden and as a method of transport. 3 Working in the opposite direction from Thompson, Van Seters defined the MBI period as a time of nomadism but argued that

---

1Ibid., pp. 328-29. For an answer to Thompson from the aspect of methodology, see S. M. Warner ("The Patriarchs and Extra-biblical Sources," JSOT 2 [1977]:50-61), who emphasized that the text of the Pentateuch itself must be our primary source for patriarchal research. It is only there that the patriarchs are specifically mentioned, described, and fitted into a context. Thus it is the extra-biblical data which must be seen as secondary, but as contributing to our understanding of the patriarchs. He concluded by stating that we should see the patriarchal period as a unity (as presented in the text) and that we should study its links with successive biblical periods (ibid., pp. 52, 58).


3Ibid., p. 17.
the patriarchal life-style did not fit that kind of nomadism.\(^1\) Van Seters' overall usage of the data appears to be equally as selective as the more traditional interpreters whom he criticized.\(^2\)

From the literary point of view, Van Seters also set himself to make a new evaluation of Genesis using the "Abraham tradition" (Gen 12-25, plus Gen 26) and his own style of form criticism and structural analysis. On this basis he felt that he was able to approach literary criticism while avoiding the frequent danger of artificial proliferation of sources. From his analysis of the text, he derived similar conclusions to those which he had achieved in the historical section. He concluded that the Yahwistic material (J) was written in the Exilic period and the Priestly material (P) was from the post-Exilic period.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 13-38. He suggested that nomads did not need servants as Abraham had (ibid., p. 18), and that the patriarchs appear as simple pastoralists, with Isaac additionally engaged in agriculture (ibid., pp. 19, 37-38). Considerable discussion of the life-style of the patriarchs has taken place, especially recently, and it is debatable just how valid are arguments concerning the dating of the patriarchs which are based on the assumption that they were or were not nomadic. Even Norman K. Gottwald (The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-1050 B.C.E. [Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979], pp. 451-53), who takes many extreme positions on Israelite origins, concluded that with the evidence which we have, it may be suggested that some of the patriarchs operated as transhumance pastoralists with considerable and diverse agriculture. Also, many of the patriarchal movements were associated with marriages, famines, pilgrimages, and inter-group conflict, which factors might be "better understood as evidence of migration than of nomadism" (ibid., p. 451). We also note that the Genesis record nowhere indicates patriarchal contact with large communities in Canaan, nor that the patriarchs moved as part of general migrations, but neither does it deny such.


\(^3\)Van Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition, p. 310. Thus
The ongoing discussions of methodology and, in particular, of the comparative use of archaeological data have left the remnants of the Albright school and its successors somewhat on the defensive. Bright, however, has continued to follow the basic methodology of his training, simply modifying his position where new data or interpretations seemed to indicate such to be advisable.

Dahood and "Pan-Ugaritic" Usage

The twentieth century has seen the periodic rise of schools of interpretation which were based on diffusionist concepts. A form of Pan-Egyptianism arose in the first quarter of the twentieth century but had its roots in the mid-nineteenth century. During the 1850s and 1860s, John Taylor¹ and Charles Piazzi Smyth² developed a theory which claimed prophetic significance for the shape and dimensions of the Great Pyramid of Giza. This focus of attention on Egypt helped Grafton Elliot Smith³ and William James Perry⁴ (British anthropologists) gain some acceptance for a diffusionist theory which saw archaic civilization generally as having its basic by dating the Yahwist so late, Van Seters virtually rules out an E source and unwittingly almost returns to the place where a single author could have written the Pentateuch or at least Genesis.

roots in ancient Egyptian civilization, that it "took shape in Egypt
and was propagated thence."\textsuperscript{1} Paralleling the emphasis of this
school was a better known Pan-Babylon school which stressed the
concept that both the OT and NT drew their essential elements from
Babylonian religion. The main proponents were the Germans:
Friedrich Delitzsch (1850-1922)\textsuperscript{2} and Hugo Winckler (1863-1913).\textsuperscript{3}
There are traces of pan-Babylonian thought within our period of
study in the publications of Julius Lewy\textsuperscript{4} and his student Andrew F.
Key,\textsuperscript{5} but they have not had wide influence. However, it is safe to
say that these early diffusionist schools have alerted scholars to
the dangers of extreme unilinear development theories and overdrawn
parallelism.\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1] Ibid., p. 428. Especially emphasizing sun worship, megalithic architecture, and mummification (ibid., pp. 428-66).
\item[3] Himmels - und Weltenbild der Babylonier als Grundlage der Weltanschauung und Mythologie aller Fôlker (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903); idem, Der alte Orient und die Bibel nebst einem anhang Babel und Bibel - Bibel und Babel (Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1905).
\item[4] See his argument posthumously published by his student Andrew F. Key, "Traces of the Worship of the Moon God Sin among the Early Israelites," JBL 84 (1965):20-26; cf. Julius Lewy, "The Late Assyro-Babylonian Cult of the Moon and Its Culmination at the Time of Nabonidus," Hebrew Union College Annual 19 (1945-1946):405-89. The former article refers to interaction with Bright over the question of whether Abraham's family was involved in worship of the moon-god or not (Key, "Moon God Sin," p. 21).
\end{footnotes}
In Ugaritic study, scholars were at first very careful to avoid over-emphasizing the interrelationship between Hebrew and Ugaritic. Craigie recently commented that the first twenty years of work on Ugaritic had seen cautious work on the whole with perhaps a few "excesses" by Dussaud (the originator of the Ras Shamra and Minet el-Beida excavations). However, the same author saw a deterioration in objective scholarship particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, so that

An old and familiar process could be seen taking place: carefully phrased hypotheses became 'established facts,' simply by virtue of seniority, and conjectural readings in the footnotes of the thirties became the accepted texts in the speculations of the sixties and seventies.2

As identified by Craigie, three new factors in the 1960s contributed to this trend: (1) In Rome the school of Mitchell Dahood not only reappraised biblical texts but in effect reappraised the Hebrew language itself, so that a particular passage might now be seen in new form as well as with new meaning. (2) A project in Claremont, California, known as the "Ugaritic and Hebrew Parallels Project" was inaugurated and began seeking and applying Ugaritic-Hebrew parallels. (3) A research group called "Ugarit Forschungen" was formed in Münster for basic Ugaritic research. All of these groups have made very constructive contributions to Ugaritic studies, but the first in particular produced

---


2Ibid., p. 101.

3Ibid., pp. 102-04.
radical and debatable results. Since the first group was dominated
by Dahood and the second included his contributions, the approach
and results of this former student of Albright need further eluci-
dation.

In his three-volume commentary on the Psalms, for example, Dahood deliberately set out to provide a new translation and philological commentary using all of the available comparative linguistic data from Ugarit. He furthermore admitted that not all of his proposals would "stand the test of present criticism or future discoveries," but he felt that he was justified in doing his best to demonstrate the potential of the Ras Shamra discoveries. Dahood personally felt that the understanding of Hebrew grammar derived from Ugaritic parallels could be frequently used to defend the consonantal text though not always the MT.

Dahood stated that in his translation of the Psalms, he had deliberately laid "... heavy stress on the Ras-Shamra-Ugarit texts and other epigraphic discoveries made along the Phoenician littoral." His presupposition was not only a close linguistic relationship between Hebrew and Ugaritic (somewhat demonstrable)

1 Psalms I: 1-50; Psalms II: 51-100; Psalms III: 101-05,
2 Idem, Psalms I, pp. xv, xvii. 3 Ibid., p. xx.
4 See his examples: ibid., p. xxii, and his comment that he only favored emending the consonantal text about a half dozen times in the first fifty Psalms (ibid., p. xxi).
5 Even here he states reservations about disregarding the MT because of strong temple and synagogue traditions (ibid., p. xxiii).
6 Ibid., p. xv.
but also a close cultic relationship with Israel borrowing at length the concepts, phrases, and terminology of Ugarit (largely conjectural). His application of this approach may be illustrated from his translation and notes on Psalm 4.\textsuperscript{1} Dahood's notes reveal frequent references to Hebrew and Ugaritic grammatical and conceptual similarities,\textsuperscript{2} but he also appears to have completely re-interpreted the theme and form of the Psalm. He saw it as a "prayer for rain"\textsuperscript{3} at a time of severe drought, and it is clear that his choice of this form had been considerably influenced by Canaanite mythology as revealed at Ugarit. There Baal was seen as the storm god (hence associated with fertility) who was in constant conflict with Mot the drought-causing god, with the ensuing annual seasonal cycle reflecting the recurrent success and failure of each.\textsuperscript{4}

In some senses Dahood's work is a reaction to the form critics who placed the composition of most of the Psalms very late. 

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 22-27. \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 24-27. \textsuperscript{3}He similarly interprets Ps 65, 67 and 85 as prayers for rain rather than as Psalms of praise addressed to God in gratitude for his blessings already received, (idem, Psalms II, pp. 108-17; 126-29; 285-90). In fact, a specific rain terminology (especially rebibim—showers) occurs only in Ps 65, while ṭōb (good) is rendered as rain in Ps 85 (perhaps justifiably) and Ps 4 (dubiously). In Ps 67 the concept of a prayer for rain is based on the reference to productivity (Ps 67:6) and some comparison with the "vocabulary and idioms" of Ps 4, 65, 85. Even more important is his interpretation of verbs as illustrated by nathattah (nathan, perfect—"he gave," "he has given," "he put") as precative (beseeching, expressing a desire), cf. David A. Robertson (review of Anchor Bible: Psalms I, 1-50, by Mitchell Dahood (in JBL 85 [1966]:485), who rejects this interpretation.  

Danood also attempted to restore their Sitz im Leben. In so doing, however, he tended to undermine Israel's distinctive relationship with God and the creativity of its poets.\(^1\) Equally fundamental is the criticism that he too frequently interprets arbitrarily in disregard of parallel phraseology in Scripture and therefore of "established and standard usage."\(^2\)

The concensus of scholars seems to indicate that Dahood has produced some helpful and some brilliant enlightenment of the Psalms (and other books of Scripture) by his use of Ugaritic parallels, but that he has not exercised adequate restraint. This is particularly true because he has incorporated in his translation even the most imaginative possibilities without any adequate attempt to provide a scale of probability.\(^3\) In passages where the Hebrew does not appear to make good sense, his approach may be considered constructive, but in many other passages which are perfectly clear in Hebrew, the effect is rather to confuse the non-specialist and to produce a translation with limited practical use. Albright tended to excuse the exuberance of the

\(^1\)There have also been strong reactions to Dahood's theological interpretation which sees repeated emphasis on Israel's concept of resurrection and immortality. (See especially idem, Psalms III, pp. xli-lii; cf. B. K. Waltke, review of The Anchor Bible: Psalms I: 1-50, by Mitchell Dahood, in Bibl Sacra 123 [1966]:175-77).

\(^2\)Theodor H. Gaster, review of Psalms III (101-150), by Mitchell Dahood, in JBL 93 (1974):296-300. Especially note the large number of examples of biblical parallels which have been largely ignored by Dahood (ibid., pp. 298, 300).

\(^3\)As early as 1966 this weakness was stressed. "It is the duty of the scholar "to produce studies in the probable, not the possible" (italics his) (Robertson, review of Psalms I, p. 484).
author by stating that "... even if Dahood is substantially correct only a third of the time, he has personally recovered more of the original meaning of the Psalter than all other schools together during the past two thousand years." Thus he emphasized the great gains from Dahood's work. Recently, however, a call for greater caution has been emphatic, as it has been pointed out that 25 percent or 30 percent accuracy is too misleading. Nevertheless, the general progress in biblical studies as enriched by Ugaritic and even, in particular, by the prodigious output of Dahood is widely recognized.

Before concluding this section we must state the view of Dahood himself on the future of Ugaritic study, particularly as it relates to the Ebla archives. He first emphasized the interrelatedness of Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Eblaite and demonstrated that Ugaritic will continue to be important for the better understanding of Hebrew and Eblaite. He proceeded to show what he believed to


2 Especially Dennis Pardee, in the panel discussion of "Ugarit in Retrospect and Prospect," by Cyrus H. Gordon, in Ugarit in Retrospect, ed. Young, p. 190; cf. Craigie, "Ugarit and the Bible," pp. 100-06. Concerns have also featured the Ras Shamra Parallels; see DeMoor and Van Der Lught, "Spectre of Pan-Ugaritism," pp. 3-26; Craigie, "Ugarit and the Bible," pp. 103, 110. See also the moderating statement of Stan Rummel, "Using Ancient Near Eastern Parallels in Old Testament Study," BAR, September 1977, pp. 4-11.


4 Mitchell Dahood, "Ebla, Ugarit and the Old Testament," The Month, August 1978, pp. 273-74. Though Ugaritic and Eblaite are similar, the former distinguished twenty-seven phonemes in a cuneiform alphabet, whereas the latter language was recorded by scribes with only ten or eleven distinctive phonemes represented (ibid., p. 273).
be numerous interconnections between Eblaite and the OT and concluded with three major emphases: (1) That the antiquity of much of the OT has been established,\(^1\) especially the Pentateuch, but also some of the Prophetic and Wisdom books and the Psalter.\(^2\) (2) He demonstrated the relevance of Ugaritic as a bridge between Eblaite and Hebrew and, because of this, as a related and near contemporary language to at least portions of the OT.\(^3\) (3) Finally, he expressed the need for much further study, bearing in mind that Hebrew poetry is much more complex than had been thought and that comparative linguistics (especially Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Eblaite), must be developed much more to aid the study of Hebrew poetry.

The threat of a pan-Eblaite development appeared very real in the period immediately following the discovery of the archive at Ebla. However, Freedman, who originally gave the strongest publicity to the "biblical connections,"\(^4\) recognized that much more definitive work (specifically the careful publication of the texts themselves) was necessary before definite positions could be

---

\(^{1}\)In spite of the publications of Thompson and Van Seters (ibid., p. 274).

\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 276; idem, "Ebla, Ugarit and the Old Testament--II," The Month, October 1978, pp. 344-45.

\(^{3}\)He thus showed that orientation in Hebrew etymology and grammatical studies should be towards North Syria rather than Mesopotamia (idem, "Ebla, Ugarit," p. 276). The progress in this direction has been assisted by the bilingual (Sumerian-Eblaite) vocabularies from Ebla which make it clear that many words showed little change in meaning and retained similar form over a period of more than a thousand years (idem, "Ebla, Ugarit-II," p. 344).

supported and moderated subsequent statements. It would appear that Dahood and Freedman remained in personal agreement on the future of Eblaite in biblical studies, but with the death of Dahood (1982), it remains to be seen whether his students will pursue the same goals as rigorously.

Dever and the Question of “Biblical Archaeology”

In the mind of Albright “biblical archaeology” could be defined extremely broadly. Thus he wrote:

... it may be extended to include anything that illustrates the Bible, however superficially. Accordingly, ... to refer

---


2 A 1980 statement by Dahood was unequivocal in stating his position "that both Ebla and the Bible stand to benefit from mutual elucidation," ("Ebla Discoveries and Biblical Research," The Month, August 1980, p. 277) and that the clay tablets from Ebla will continue "illuminating the obscurities of the Bible" (ibid., p. 281). See also both Pettinato's and Dahood's viewpoints in Giovanni Pettinato, The Archives of Ebla: An Empire Inscribed on Clay, with an Afterword by Mitchell Dahood (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1981), pp. 268-69, 271-331. Dahood worked closely with Pettinato and they had considerable agreement on the biblical studies potential from Ebla. In contrast Paolo Matthiae (Ebla: An Empire Rediscovered, trans. Christopher Holme [Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1980]) was opposed to any significant relationship between the Bible and Ebla.
to all Bible lands—from India to Spain, and from Southern Russia to South Arabia—and to the whole history of those lands from about 10,000 B.C., or even earlier, to the present time.\footnote{1}

On the other hand he saw that it might also be used narrowly to signify Palestinian archaeology.\footnote{2} More frequently he appears to have used the term quite widely to signify at least Near Eastern archaeology, and with his breadth of knowledge and multifaceted specialization, even that was very broad. Though he gave up his youthful pan-Babylonian view,\footnote{3} he was always alert for interconnections between Israel and its neighbors.

His student, Frank Cross, summarized Albright's view:

\ldots He was baffled by highly skilled field archaeologists, perfectionistic stratigraphers, who completely confused the history of a site because they read the text of the Bible uncritically, knew little history and no Semitic language, not even Hebrew. He held that both archaeological studies and historical studies must be held together, if not in the same scholar, at least in scholarly discourse. Biblical archaeology could never narrow to 'dirt archaeology' of Palestine.\footnote{4}

Cross proceeded to make his own appeal that separation within the discipline had gone too far in the interests of specialization, and then again referred to Albright's position: "William Foxwell Albright regarded Palestinian archaeology or Syro-Palestinian archaeology as a small if important section of biblical archaeology."\footnote{5}

The reason for Cross' special concern was the recently stated view of William G. Dever.

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item Albright, Archaeology, Historical Analogy, p. 13.
\item Ibid.
\item See p. 22.
\item "W. F. Albright's View of Biblical Archaeology and Its Methodology," \textit{BA} 36 (1973).
\item Ibid., pp. 4-5.
\end{itemize}}
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William Gwinn Dever (1933-) studied under G. Ernest Wright at Harvard and received his Ph.D. in 1966. He could thus qualify as a member of the Albright school. However, in his attitude to "biblical archaeology," he voiced dissent. His first public declaration on the subject was made in the Winslow Lectures at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary in January 1972. He felt that it was time to abandon the use of the term "biblical archaeology." The linking of what he preferred to call "Palestinian archaeology" with biblical studies had served its purpose and should be severed. Looking back, Dever observed that the relationship between the Bible and Palestinian archaeology had been closer in the U.S.A. than in Britain or on the Continent and, in fact, described biblical archaeology as a "peculiarly American phenomenon." At the same time, he did not deny the great success of the various expeditions which have dug at Bethel, Gezer, Hazor, Lachish, Megiddo, Samaria, Shechem, and Tirzah (Tell Farah-North), but he felt that the combination would not continue to be productive.

---

1. His dissertation was entitled: "The Pottery of Palestine in the Early Bronze IV/Middle Bronze I Period, Ca. 2150-1850 B.C.


3. Ibid., pp. 6-12.  

4. Ibid., p. 12.  

5. Ibid., p. 15.
Dever stated the reasons for his positions as follows:

1. The technological advancement of recent years requires reaching out to experts who will not have training in biblical studies (the vast array of primary, secondary, and unpublished literature requires full-time application).

2. There needs to be a more critical, or less biblically biased, attitude in Palestinian and Near Eastern archaeology, because there has been a tendency to ignore the "excesses" of biblical archaeologists—excesses or mistakes which have clearly been an embarrassment to Dever.

3. The secular approach which has been followed by some American institutions made significant contributions but has tended to be overlooked. Furthermore, Dever went on to demonstrate that a trend towards secularized Palestinian archaeology had already begun gathering momentum. He gave the following reasons: (1) improvement

---

1. He mentioned the efforts to uncover the ark of Noah on Ararat, the declaration of the discovery of Joshua's walls at Jericho, attempts to prove the Flood of Noah from sedimentary layers at Ur, the search for Sodom and Gomorrah beneath the Dead Sea waters, the excavation of "Moses' tomb" on Mt. Nebo, and the search for the treasure described in the Copper Scroll from Qumran (ibid., p. 17).

2. Ibid., cf. idem, "Biblical Archaeology," p. 22. He doubted that any "'Biblical archaeologist' can be objective or truly scientific" (idem, Archaeology and Biblical Studies, p. 17). He qualified this statement by indicating that the work of scholars like Albright and Wright—who are far from "the Fundamentalist stream"—was by no means impugned by him as they could not be regarded as "Biblicist," yet he insisted that "even when the Biblical orientation is controlled by the strictest scholarship, the danger of unconscious presuppositions is still there" (ibid., p. 18 n. 18).

3. Harvard University at Samaria, 1908-1910; University of Pennsylvania at Beth-shean, the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago at Megiddo, etc. Dever also stressed that the British, French, and German archaeologists include large secular representation, while the Israeli school consists entirely of secular scholars (ibid., pp. 19-22).
of methods now necessitates a large professional staff, (2) inflationary costs require government sponsorship (not available for partisan religious projects), (3) increasing dependence is upon professionals rather than volunteers, (4) new emphasis has arisen on secular historical interests, and (5) the Israelis now have the initiative and are leading out in a large-scale program of secular archaeology.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 22-25.}

Dever next clarified his position by stating that he was not calling for complete severence of ties between biblical studies and Palestinian archaeology but for a newly defined relationship allowing each area much more freedom. He was clearly thinking particularly of freedom for the secular archaeologist to pursue new concerns which might have little to do with biblical interests.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 30, 36-38.}

When he spoke of sources he admitted that the Bible would remain a very important literary source, but stressed its secondary nature.\footnote{Ibid., p. 36.}

One of Dever's primary motives in adopting his view appears to have been his unhappiness over the apologetic interests of many of the "biblical archaeologists," and so he spoke of objectivity in method and of separating interpretation from description. By this he did not indicate that interpretation is unnecessary, but that it must be distinct and cautious,\footnote{Ibid., pp. 38-41. In the case of "problem-solving" archaeology which is set up to test specific hypotheses, Dever approved but warned of the possibility of "imposing a framework on the material" (ibid., p. 41 n. 19).} and its limitations with respect to faith must be kept in mind:

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 22-25.} \footnote{Ibid., pp. 30, 36-38.} \footnote{Ibid., p. 36.}
Archaeology may clarify, but it can never confirm—not even in historical accounts, let alone in statements of faith; it can augment, but it cannot authenticate. In short, Archaeology can bring understanding, but by the very nature of its own limitations it can neither create nor destroy faith.  

Dever commented that archaeological finds could also raise doubts and indicate negative verdicts on biblical questions, but that biblical scholars and archaeologists were ready to face that risk. Yet,

The fact is that for the most part archaeological discoveries have tended to confirm the basic historical trustworthiness of the Bible, although in a number of details it becomes clear that there are omissions or even contradictions in the Biblical texts, for the authors were not intent upon writing our kind of history.  

The patriarchal period was used by Dever as an example of the necessary cooperation and interaction between what he saw as the two disciplines. In spite of the view of Albright and others who saw MBI as the patriarchal period, Dever rejected such an identification on archaeological grounds. He then added that the biblical scholar can now choose to do as he likes with the data (reject the historicity of the patriarchs or look for a later context), but that he as an archaeologist must proceed with his task—"basically historical and not theological." On the other hand

\[\text{Dever, } \textit{Archaeology and Biblical Studies}, \text{ p. 44.}\]
when he needs input concerning biblical data he will ask the biblical scholar, in fulfillment of his concept of detached cooperation.

In response to Dever's agitation, H. Darrell Lance is one who is most insistent that the term and concept of biblical archaeology must be retained. The excitement of biblical archaeology may have dulled slightly with the death of so many outstanding figures within a decade (Aharoni, Albright, Glueck, Kenyon, de Vaux, and Wright), with the contemporary maturing of Palestinian archaeology as an independent discipline, but Lance saw both these factors as temporary. He argued that since the focus of biblical archaeology is the Bible and not Palestine, the term is essential for holding together the vast interests of those who wish to study the Bible and its historical and cultural setting. He claimed that "Biblical archaeology, like biblical form criticism or biblical anthropology, is a biblical discipline which exists for the benefit and interest of biblical studies" (italics his).

Thus in the face of the mass of archaeological data appearing from all parts of the ANE, Lance called for a real concerted effort to synthesize and make

---

1 Also a student of G. Ernest Wright and a contemporary classmate of Dever.


3 It must reach out to Mesopotamia for details of Israelite and Judean exile, etc. (Lance, OT and Archaeology, p. 95).

available the factual data of biblical archaeology. The result will enable reading of the Bible "with understanding and appreciation."^1

**Technical Developments in Archaeology**

Advancement in archaeological methodology in the Near East has been especially indebted to the Albright school,^2 with significant input from the British. It has involved not only sophistication and refinement of method but also an expansion of interests through the increased influence of secularized archaeology as referred to above. The proliferation of technical staff and specialized projects in recent excavations constitutes a demonstration of this trend.

At Tell Beit Mirsim, Albright himself tested, refined, and applied Petrie's principles of Palestinian ceramic typology, devising a basic historical sequence for Palestine.^3 Though various skills were developed by his students trained along these lines, the essential archaeological approach continued to emphasize architecture

---

^1Ibid., p. 96.

^2Albright described the leading contributions to archaeological method in Palestine for the decades preceding his residence there as: (1) Flinders Petrie (1890s)—the sequential dating system based on changing pottery styles. (2) Architectural developments at Jericho under Sellin and Watzinger (1907-1909) and at Samaria under Reisner and Fisher (1908-1910). Reisner also set an example in accurate surveying and in careful photographic and general record keeping (Albright, Archaeology of Palestine, pp. 29-35); cf. G. Ernest Wright's article featuring Reisner ("Archaeological Method in Palestine—An American Interpretation," W. F. Albright Volume, EI 9 [1969]:120-33), where he explained Reisner's emphasis upon different types of debris as the key to mastering a site.

over stratigraphy until the early 1950s. At that time, Kathleen Kenyon introduced a grid-system of stratigraphic excavation in her work at Jericho which has subsequently been followed in many other excavations in Palestine. Callaway used it at Ai, and Wright used the method at Shechem and Gezer, thereby training Dever and Seger (Gezer), Geraty and Horn (Heshbon), Lapp (Taanach), Rast and Schaub (Bab edh-Dhra and Numeira), Worrell et al. (Hesi), etc. Dever has argued that certain adaptations of the system are necessary while maintaining the basic stratigraphic approach.

Field manuals written in the last few years give some indication of special interests which are now often pursued as a part of the normal procedure during the excavation of a site. The variety of specialists often required includes stratigraphers, 

---

1 So claims William Dever ("Two Approaches to Archaeological Method--the Architectural and Stratigraphic," I. Dunayevsky volume, EII [1973]:1*).


3 Many of the Israeli excavators have apparently found the system too time-consuming and too expensive.

4 Using a pattern of one-meter-wide balks enclosing five-meter squares, which are then ideally excavated to bedrock, but being adaptable in speed and system according to the individual square and site conditions (Dever, "Two Approaches," pp. 6*-8*).

geologists, physical and cultural anthropologists, paleozoologists, paleo-ethno-botanists, and computer programmers.¹

An illustration of the newly diversified interest and method in field archaeology was the use of a flotation tank for the recovery of plant remains from Bab edh-Dhra and Numeira.² Rotary agitation of soil samples placed in water enabled the recovery of heavier items such as sherds, bones, and flint artifacts, while a mass of lighter material including plant debris, insects, and snail shells floated to the surface. Careful examination of the latter materials, particularly those of plant origin, revealed much about the EB environment of these cities. Crops apparently included wheat, barley, flax, lentils, olives, almonds, watermelons, and pumpkins. Material from EBI shaft tombs additionally revealed grape seeds and a peach pit, while at Numeira carbonized whole grapes and several hundred chickpeas were recovered. In order to make possible the best ultimate reconstruction of the ancient environment, the different types of plant samples from each stratum had to be measured, counted, classified, and dated with care.

In 1973 Philip Hammond used electronic equipment for a large-scale survey at Petra.³ About 80 percent of the surveyable ancient

¹See, for example, Dever, Archaeology and Biblical Studies, pp. 22-23.


city was examined by means of four proton-differential magnetometers and two soil-resistivity instruments. The idea was to chart on a map the various buried archaeological materials as they were revealed by these machines which were working across the surface (at almost 16,000 stations two meters apart). As a consequence, thirty-eight of the seventy-one squares surveyed were judged to be priority areas for excavation. In subsequent seasons, excavations have proceeded with the survey data providing part of the basis for the selection of areas for excavation.²

Another area of increasing specialist interest is human osteology. From some sites a vast number of human bones or complete skeletons have been recovered or are regarded as recoverable.³ From these human remains it is possible to recover considerable information concerning the individual and his environment. Such information as the incidence and variety of diseases and the presence of dietary deficiencies may be deduced by the microscopic examination of bones. Indications of mortality rate and of the hazards of earlier, including at Tell Hesban (see Dewey M. Beegle, "Heshbon 1973: Necropolis Area F," AUSS 13 (1975):203-04.

¹Each being thirty meters square.


³A high estimate for human remains at Bab edh-Dhra suggests the burial of 500,000 individuals (A. Ben Tor, "Bab ed-Dhra," EAEHL 1:149).
childbirth can also be uncovered by statistical analysis. The state of health of ancient peoples may at times have had a dramatic effect upon history and culture, and therefore this study of skeletal remains constitutes one more important element in our efforts to understand the ancient world.

These innovations are only representative. Other examples could be given, but the trend is clear. Modern technology can be utilized in many ways to illuminate the life-situation of the peoples who inhabited the different countries of the ANE and who therefore form a part of the biblical context.

From the foregoing presentation it may be seen that the Albright school has had a remarkably formative influence on biblical archaeology during the period featured in our study. Three stages of Albright's influence may be seen: (1) a time in the twenties and thirties when his expertise was being established and his personal views underwent their greatest modification, (2) an era when his influence clearly dominated the historical aspects of biblical studies and strongly influenced most aspects, and (3) a time, especially since about 1960, in which some of his basic positions have been challenged. The concept of a patriarchal period during MBI has probably received the most vigorous and, in the eyes of some, successful attacks. Nevertheless, even at the close of our period, nine years after his death, the foundational work which he accomplished and a large percentage of his ideas remain unchallenged as a testimony to his brilliance and dedication to biblical

archaeology in the broad sense in which he conceived it. Though he admittedly participated in apologetics in archaeology, the very breadth of his interests and abilities demanded a wider scope and emphasis. It is true that the increased interest in elements of ancient life and environment which are only remotely connected with biblical interests has been developed more among the second generation of the Albright school. However, the foundation had already been laid in the wide historical and geographical interests of Albright. The life and thought of Albright himself thus rather thoroughly epitomizes the spirit and accomplishments of the period, 1937-1980.
CHAPTER III

THE USAGE OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY IN SDA LITERATURE, 1937-1980: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

Brief Overview 1901-1936

Before examining SDA literature from the 1937-1980 period, it is helpful to give some attention to the preceding period in order to establish the context. From the five periodicals used in the general survey contained in this chapter, two are here selected as representative for this introductory sketch. These Times (TT, but here referred to by an earlier title as Watchman) is a representative yet compact missionary magazine issued as a monthly through most of its history. It reflects a usage of archaeology similar to that used in the Review and Herald (RH) and Signs of the Times (ST) and covers the period from 1901 to the present, thus

1Actually known as Southern Watchman, 1901-1905, as Watchman, 1905-1916, and as Watchman Magazine, 1917-1945.

2The abbreviation RH is used for the earlier titles such as The Advent Review & Sabbath Herald (most long-lived title), and the Review & Herald (from May 4, 1961 to March 11, 1971). The abbreviation AR is used from January 5, 1978, as the title was then changed to the Adventist Review.

3Predecessors of TT, The Southern Agent (1891-1892) and Southern Review (1892-1907), as well as the absorbed magazines Tennessee River Watchman (1900-1901) and Gospel Herald (1898-1903) were somewhat sporadic in issue and more restricted in scope (dealing considerably with local issues and colporteur work) and are therefore not considered here.
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giving an appropriate timespan for our purposes. The second magazine selected for this introduction is *Ministry*. Begun only in 1928, it is important as an indicator of materials and themes which were thought appropriate for ministers in the instruction of their congregations.

The *Watchman* reflects both the frequency and usage of archaeological data in the pre-1937 period. The observable steady increase of archaeological contributions during the period was interrupted by such factors as World War I, a strong doctrinal emphasis in the three or four years before the War, and a polemic against spiritualism in the period immediately following the war.

Looking back over the total period of thirty-six years (1901-1936), we find that the initial period to 1906 saw no extensive article, but six medium to short-length articles. Only two stressed apologetic for the truth and reliability of Scripture. One was written by John Loughborough after he observed the Rosetta Stone in the London museum,¹ and the second was an article borrowed from the *Christian Herald*, which dealt with the availability of a regular script (cuneiform) in the time of both Abraham and Moses.² Three articles³ gave simple details of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian contextual elements of the Pentateuch, while the fourth was by an SDA

visitor to Jerusalem who emphatically defended the authenticity of the Garden Tomb and rejected the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.\(^1\) (Considering the time-setting of the latter writer, he was well informed of the issues.)

In the subsequent decade (1907-1916), only seven archaeological articles were included. Of these, three were written by Jay J. Nethery, a missionary in Egypt who in 1907 simply described with an occasional homiletic observation the most prominent monuments of that land.\(^2\) In the same year an editorial appeared which used Assyrian tablets to support the antiquity of the Sabbath, since they referred to days 7, 14, 19, 21, and 28 of the month as having special significance (no explanation was given for the inclusion of 19).\(^3\) Two articles in the year 1910 included a little archaeology. The first,\(^4\) on the Tower of Babel, was simply borrowed from a London journal, The Christian Commonwealth; but the second\(^5\) was more significant. Frederick Griggs, a leading SDA educator and administrator, discussed the relationship between Scripture and science and history,


\(^2\)"Egypt: The Pyramids," Watchman, July 30, 1907, p. 492; idem, "The Temples of Luxor and Karnak," Watchman, October 1, 1907, p. 635; and idem, "The Temple of Karnak," Watchman, October 8, 1907, pp. 650-51. It is interesting to note that in the first of these articles, the author simply stated without qualification that Cheops built the great pyramid around 3733 B.C.


\(^5\)"Should the Bible Be Interpreted by History and Science?" Watchman, November 1910, pp. 661-63, 700.
reacting strongly against what he saw as the trend (illustrated by a quotation from an unidentified university theological journal) to interpret Scripture by means of science and history. With regard to history and archaeology, he observed that so-called "assured results" are very often inconclusive, as demonstrated by the recovery of knowledge concerning Sargon II and the Hittites.¹ On the other hand, Griggs maintained that many excavations had given abundant "corroborative evidence of the truthfulness" of Scripture.² In 1916 an article³ borrowed from a non-SDA Christian Herald was simply a description of the buildings and places of the Jerusalem-Bethlehem area in the war context, though with emphasis upon the historical and biblical past. It was thus only the two articles of 1910 which took up the issue of apologetic for Scripture, and one of these was borrowed from a non-SDA source.

The next decade (1917-1926) saw a gradual build-up in archaeological emphasis, coinciding somewhat with decline in war-related articles. This increasing frequency of articles, and also their increasingly apologetic flavor, would seem to be partly an SDA reflection of the contemporary modernist-fundamentalist controversy.⁴ Adventists were certainly not unaffected by the heated

¹He also made a similar, but premature claim concerning the kings from the east who were defeated by Abraham (ibid., p. 662).

²Ibid.


⁴James Hastings Nichols, professor of church history at the University of Chicago, in his History of Christianity 1650-1950: Secularization of the West (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1956), comments on p. 407: "World War I had postponed the great struggle
between this popular pietist theology [which especially blossomed in the 1895-1915 period, cf. ibid., p. 273] and the new currents in the seminaries and urban churches. Great fundamentalist conferences in Philadelphia in 1918 and 1919 now launched a campaign to capture the seminaries, mission boards, periodicals, and, in general, the administrative agencies of several denominations considered to be tainted with 'modernism.' The controversy included such famous episodes as that involving Harry Emerson Fosdick (a target of fundamentalists while preaching in the Old Presbyterian Church in New York) whose case climaxed in 1924 (ibid., p. 407; and Kenneth Scott Latourette, Christianity in a Revolutionary Age, vol. 5: The Twentieth Century Outside Europe [New York: Harper & Row, 1962], pp. 31, 32); and the Scopes Trial of July 1925 with Clarence Darrow contending with William Jennings Bryan over the evolution/creation issue (ibid., p. 103; and Leslie H. Allen, ed. and comp., Bryan and Darrow at Dayton: The Record and Documents of the Bible Evolution Trial [New York: A. Lee & Co., 1925; reprint ed. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967]). The "five fundamentals" of fundamentalism have been summarized by Nichols as "... the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the deity of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Birth, the substitutionary theory of the Atonement, and the bodily Resurrection and imminent bodily Second Coming of the Lord" (History of Christianity, p. 273). These were spelled out in twelve volumes ([A. C. Dixon, Louis Meyer, and R. A. Torrey], eds., The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth, 12 vols. [Chicago: Testimony Publishing Co., 1910-1915]). Of greatest relevance to this present study is the view of Scripture and its inspiration. The concept of passive and mechanical participation by the prophet as he engaged in Scripture writing was clearly expressed in the following statement: "... the prophets themselves did not know what they wrote. What picture can be more impressive than that of the prophet himself hanging over and contemplating in surprise, in wonder, in amazement, his own autograph--as if it had been left upon the table there--the relic of some strange and supernatural hand." (George S. Bishop, "The Testimony of the Scriptures to Themselves," in The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth, ed. [Louis Meyer] 7:52.) Although there is some variation in SDA views of inspiration, the church has generally stressed the inspiration of the writer under the Spirit's guidance, whereas Fundamentalists have stressed the inspiration of the words (Carl Walter Daggy, "A Comparative Study of Certain Aspects of Fundamentalism with Seventh-day Adventism" [M.A. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., 1955], pp. 52-54). However, elements of uncertainty and controversy over inspiration (including Ellen White's authority in regard to historical details) had already troubled SDAs at the 1919 Bible Conference ("The Use of the Spirit of Prophecy in Our Teaching of Bible and History, July 30, 1919," Minutes of the 1919 Bible Conference, Spectrum 10 [May 1979]:27-44; "Inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy as Related to the Inspiration of the Bible, August 1, 1919," Minutes of the 1919 Bible Conference, Spectrum 10 [May 1979]: 44-57).
discussions of these sensitive issues.¹ There were twelve articles during this period, though three might be discounted since their

¹In 1925 two associate editors of the ST, F. D. Nichol and Alonzo Baker, were involved in a public debate on the evolution/creation issue. There were actually two debates with Nichol defending creationism on June 13, and Baker arguing against teaching evolution in state schools on June 14, both against the same defender of evolution, Maynard Shipley, President of the Science League of America. In each case the panel of three judges was divided, but gave the final verdict that "evolution is false, but should be taught in public schools" (The San Francisco Debates on Evolution [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1925], p. 176). There were numerous reports of the Nichol and Baker debates and related presentations in SDA periodicals (some mentioned the parallel which existed with the Scopes Trial) including the following: Francis D. Nichol, "Evolution’s Witnesses Cross-Examined," ST, July 28, 1925, pp. 6-7; idem, "Exploded Theories," ST, August 4, 1925, pp. 8-10; idem, "Darwin’s Place in Modern Evolution," ST, August 11, 1925, pp. 5, 6; idem, "Looking through Darwin’s Glasses," ST, August 16, 1925, pp. 3, 13; C. K. Meyers, "Debate on Evolution," RH, July 30, 1925, p. 2. There was a tendency for SDAs to identify rather closely with fundamentalists without defining the doctrinal implications (ibid., also see previous note). To give a single example, SDA geologist George McCready Price was described in a caption beneath his photograph as "scientist and fundamentalist" (Arthur S. Maxwell, "London Debates Evolution," ST, October 13, 1925, p. 8). However, Clark ("Present Controversy," p. 2) seems to qualify such identification by his statement that "there is much muddled thinking on the Fundamentalist side as well." References to archaeology in the foregoing articles were usually confined to a brief comment on the Babylonian flood account, but in 1926, Baker and Nichol published a book, Creation—Not Evolution, with a foreword by George McCready Price (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association) which included a chapter relying upon archaeology (Hittites, Sargon, and Egyptian evidences) as a witness to the truth of the Bible. The chapter opened with two sentences which may be thought startling: "That the Scriptures are of unique and divine origin is not a truth which one must accept by faith. That the Bible came from a supernatural source is a demonstrable fact, and as verifiable as the multiplication table" (ibid., p. 153). Baker again made an interesting reference to archaeology as a weapon against modernism and higher criticism in 1935: "If I were a higher critic I would tremble in my boots every time I heard of another archaeological expedition setting out for Bible Lands; for each time they go, they bring back something that proves the Bible true and higher criticism baseless. Most every spadeful of dirt turns up some critical theory to limbo." (Alonzo Baker, "Higher Criticism Destroyed," ST, April 30, 1935, p. 7).
archaeology was a minor element. In 1917 there was a single article\(^1\) on the culture, civilization, and education of Babylon, given as an introduction to the study of the book of Daniel. Next to appear was a series of three articles by Francis D. Nichol in 1922.\(^2\) Here we discern a strong element of polemic against higher criticism and an apologetic for scriptural reliability. Two articles by other SDA authors having this same type of emphasis appeared in 1924 and 1925.\(^3\) In 1926 there were three articles which used archaeological data to defend scriptural reliability,\(^4\) and three more by Nils J. Waldorf,\(^5\) who used a little archaeology in tracing the background of Christianity through Judaism. For example, the author claims that monotheism was known even in ancient Egypt, but that it gave place to the manifold polytheism for which Egypt is better known.\(^6\)

If we do not include these last three articles, then eight of the

---


\(^3\)Lyndon L. Skinner, "Digger for Facts," Watchman, November 1924, pp. 18-19, 23; Roy Franklin Cottrell, "Into the Discard?" Watchman, May 1925, pp. 6-7, 16.


\(^6\)Waldorf, "Christianity the Original Religion," pp. 11-12.
nine articles for the decade used archaeology as a strong defense for Scripture against critical attacks.

The decade immediately preceding the year 1937 has the greatest numerical representation of archaeological articles for any period of this journal, with a total of thirty articles. However, ten of these (one in 1934, one in 1935, and eight in 1936) are by one man, James C. Muir (he also contributed ten articles in the period from 1937-1941), who, though he was described in the Watchman as the curator of the University of Pennsylvania Museum at that time,1


2Actually the museum authorities deny that he was ever curator there and doubt that he was directly connected with the museum (Mary Elizabeth Ruwell, archivist, to Lloyd A. Willis, October 5, 1981; October 19, 1981). However he was connected with the University of Pennsylvania as stated by R. E. Crawford ("The Voice of the Past," Watchman, February 1944, pp. 5, 96). R. E. Crawford (1902-1976) worked in various capacities for the SDA church especially in Italy, Pennsylvania, and in Tennessee (in Tennessee he occupied the office of manager of the periodical department and circulation manager at the Southern Publishing Association [publishers of TT, Watchman, etc.] between 1943 and 1949). Crawford, who was awarded an honorary Doctor of Literature degree from Beacon University in St. Petersburg, Florida, was on the lecture team of the University of Pennsylvania. There he became acquainted with Muir who was connected with the University of Pennsylvania Extension Lectures Office from which the magazine Discoveries (Discovery) was published from 1930-1932. Muir at that time had little faith in the historical reliability of the OT. As their friendship developed Crawford asked Muir to read and evaluate the newly published SDA booklet Experiences of David Dare in Bible Research, by Earle Albert Rowell (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1933). The latter contained references to archaeology as demonstrating fulfilled prophecy--Tyre, Egypt.
appears to have written his articles specifically for Watchman. All of these articles by him contain a clear apologetic element defending the accuracy and literalism of the pentateuchal narratives. Other than Muir's contribution, the heaviest concentration of articles for the period was from 1929-1932 (seventeen articles) contributed mainly by Roy F. Cottrell (four), Keld J. Reynolds (three), and F. L. Babylon, etc. Muir at first refused saying that it would spoil their friendship. When pressed for an honest evaluation, he agreed to read the book and found himself so impressed by it that he suggested a new title (which was subsequently used) "Prophecy Speaks." Muir later wrote on archaeology's testimony to the historical accuracy of the Bible (see p. 154), and apparently Crawford was responsible for the publication of Muir's articles in the Watchman. Crawford in turn found his interest in archaeology stimulated by this contact with Muir, and he subsequently was the founding organizer and first president of the Search Foundation which carried out several expeditions to Mount Ararat in search of Noah's ark (Mrs. Etta Crawford, widow of R. E. Crawford, states that their son Bud was on Mount Ararat "10 times with Mr. Navarra of France," but he was killed in an accident in 1970). Sources for the above information include: R. L. Odom to Lloyd A. Willis, February 7, 1982; Etta Mae Crawford to L. A. Willis, [February 1982]; C. M. Crawford to L. A. Wills (sic), February 14, 1982, March 12, 1982; James C. Muir to R. E. Crawford (undated, but stated by Etta Crawford to date to about 1945).

1 See James C. Muir, "Archaeology and the New Testament," Watchman, May 1940, p. 17. The statement in the last paragraph of Muir's article which supports this assertion could conceivably be an editorial insertion. In any case the author was non-SDA (Presbyterian), but a good friend of SDAs.


Chaney (four). None of these men was a specialist in archaeology, though each had wide experience in teaching, administration, or pastoral work both in the United States and overseas. Cottrell and Chaney gave a strong apologetic note. Another article with a strong apologetic emphasis was borrowed from the New York Times, but this was by professional archaeologist John Garstang who wrote on Jericho, where he was currently excavating. The apologetic aspect of archaeology, that is for scriptural defense, is obvious in all of these articles with two exceptions. The series of three articles by Reynolds gave a survey of history featuring the providential "great controversy" type of theme and did not deal with defense of Scripture as such. Likewise distinctive was a 1932 article aimed at promotion of a Holy Land tour which was basically a description of places to be visited. The author of this five-page article was the managing director of the Travel Institute of Bible Research, who was apparently not an SDA. Thus fully twenty-six of the thirty articles in Watchman for this decade were directed either partially, or more frequently, predominantly, at supporting


4 He promised that the entire tour would be under the competent guidance of trained archaeologists, historians, and Bible scholars who were members of his staff and graduates of American universities.
the reliability of Scripture on the basis of archaeology.

The second magazine, *Ministry*, had only four articles on archaeology in the nine-year period from its founding until 1936, but each was significant. In the very first volume, Professor Werline, head of the Department of History of Washington Missionary College, argued strongly for the antiquity of the Sabbath and the weekly cycle. He pointed out that in Babylon where there was some use of seven-day divisions, it was not on the basis of a consistent weekly cycle, nor were the special days (seventh, etc.) closely parallel to the seventh-day Sabbath, since they were "some kind of penitential days." The author claimed that neither the Sabbath nor Sunday can be traced to Babylon, Egypt, Persia, Greece, or even pagan Rome, though the weekly cycle was introduced into Western Rome from the East. It is significant that the editor appears to have been reticent to publish this article without strong scholarly backing and so noted that five specific scholars, including the patriarchal W. W. Prescott, had read the article and confirmed its positions.

The second article was written by Prescott himself four years later. His specific source was the book *Nabonidus and Belshazzar*, by Yale Assyriologist Raymond Philip Dougherty. The

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., p. 18.
article is clearly a defense of Daniel and Scripture on the basis of archaeological discoveries concerning Belshazzar. However, Prescott suggests the fact that he does not base his faith upon archaeology. The fact that this archaeological information "... has been established by documentary evidence made available through the diligent researches of archaeologists, is of great interest even to those Bible students who have already accepted the inspired testimony of the Scriptures as sufficient authority."¹ Thus he sees a major contribution of archaeology as the reassurance of faith. "It is reassuring to have a firm faith in the eternal word of God confirmed by the undisputed evidence furnished by contemporaries of the events described."²

In 1933 George McCready Price seized the statement of British anthropologist, David Randall-MacIvar, which explained that a definite, graduated scale of chronology was (and would likely continue to be) impossible before about 3,500 B.C., and used it to promote a short [biblical] chronology. In contrast with the time scales of what he termed "prehistoric anthropology," he observed that "true archaeology has its feet on the ground; and while it may err slightly as to absolute chronology, it is in general sound in its methods and assured in its results."³ Price appears to have read into the statement more than was intended, for the author gave no indication of preference for a short chronology.

²Ibid.
The fourth article was by Lynn Wood,¹ the bulk of whose contributions are considered in the next phase of this study. He drew evidence from the statements of four outstanding scholars in refuting the then popular "Pyramid Theology." This was really a type of symbolic prophecy based on a fantastic interpretation of Isa 19:19, whereby various measurements of the great pyramid of Khufu were seen as having prophetic significance.

To summarize the archaeological usage in these four articles, it can be stated that those by Prescott and Price were clearly apologetic for Scripture, or in the case of Price, apologetic for a chronology based on Scripture. On the other hand, the first and fourth articles, by Werline and Wood, could better be termed polemical since they are directed against a Babylonian origin for the Sabbath and against "Pyramid Theology."

Although no exhaustive search was conducted for books on archaeology published by SDAs prior to 1937, two books were discovered which are significant and presumably representative of the attitude of SDAs towards archaeology for the period. The first was not exclusively archaeological, but the second was quite specifically directed at defense of Scripture through archaeology.

The author of the first book was Horace L. Hastings.² He

¹"The Great Pyramid and Its Message," Ministry, September 1936, pp. 20-21. This appears to have been his first article on archaeology. The topic he discussed had its roots in nineteenth century England, but recurred until about 1950 (cf. pp. 131, 181-82).

²Though well-known in his day (1831-1899), Horace L. Hastings should be distinguished from the better known James Hastings (1852-1922) of Scotland, founding editor of The Expository Times, and editor of various biblical dictionaries and a twelve-volume Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
and his wife Harriet were not actually SDAs, but had much in common with them in terms of belief and religious commitment. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that SDA publishing houses had reprinted one of his many books in 1923 and printed the same book in condensed form under the same title in 1947. As the title Will the Old Book Stand? suggests, the aim of the book was to substantiate the Scriptures. One chapter is devoted to prophecies concerning Palestine and the surrounding countries and the appeal for fulfillment directed towards archaeology, or more frequently historical geography, through the testimony of early travelers in Bible lands (Seetzen, Burckhardt, Volney, and the friends Irby and Mangles, etc.). Some of the applications of both prophecy and fulfillment were far-fetched, but others show accurate portrayal of prophesied results.

W. W. Prescott (already mentioned for his Ministry article) wrote a 216-page book (the first full-scale book on archaeology

---

1 Harriet Hastings, who considerably outlived her husband, is stated to have observed the Sabbath for "many years" prior to her death, and also to have treasured "every point of present truth." Thus her obituary was recorded in RH, January 22, 1914, p. 94.


3 As where Isa 14:11 (addressed to the king of Babylon), "The worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee," is applied in fulfillment to the palace of Merodach-baladan. "'The base is greatly injured by time and the elements'. . . . 'The summit is covered with heaps of rubbish'. . . . 'The mound was full of large holes, strewed with the carcasses and skeletons of animals recently killed'. . . . In the warm climate of Chaldea, wherever these are strewed, worms cannot be wanting." Hastings (1923), p. 172.
written by an SDA) which follows a chronological sequence in correlating archaeology and the OT narrative for corroborative purposes. Yet he even further delineated his concept that archaeology is not the real basis of true faith. Quoting Paul, he observed that the reasonable basis of faith is the Word of God (Rom 10:17), with its promises and provisions. He then stated:

It is the part of archaeology to contribute such facts as will aid in providing this reasonable basis for faith, but it must not be pressed beyond its proper sphere. The spade has dug up inscriptions, papyri and ostraca, which testify to the historical accuracy of the Scriptures, and invite and encourage faith, but the spade cannot dig up faith. The study of material things, ancient and modern, may supply sufficient knowledge to justify faith, but "he who waits for entire knowledge before he will exercise faith, cannot receive blessing from God." The words of Jesus to Thomas should be thoughtfully noted: "Because thou hast seen me, hast thou believed? blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

So archaeology can provide facts which can encourage faith, but it clearly has its limitations according to Prescott. He further stressed these limitations.

Of course we do not claim that material objects, whether found in the ancient or the modern world, can demonstrate spiritual truth. It is just as true now as ever before that 'we walk by faith, not by sight', and the object of saving faith must always be a Person, the living God, and not dead things.2

Near the commencement of his book he outlined his position thus:

I do not claim that the accepted results of research in the field of archaeology have demonstrated that there is a personal God, and that the writings included in the canon of Scripture are a divine revelation, and that Christianity is the only true religion. Such a claim would be just as unwarranted as the claims of the skeptics. What, then, has archaeology achieved in this field of controversy? . . .

---


2Ibid., p. 214.
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It has shown by such evidence as cannot be discredited by any speculative philosophy or any unproven theories of modern science, that the historical statements in the Scripture are reliable in the many cases where archaeology has made available the contemporaneous testimony of various kinds upon the same facts.¹

Prescott was always a lover of books and this fact was certainly reflected in his style. For the various periods, OT incidents, and city sites discussed in his work, there are numerous quotations amounting to almost 50 percent of the text in some chapters. The quotations are generally of a scholarly nature and the sources include such well-known archaeologists and biblical scholars as Robert Koldewey, S. R. Driver, A. H. Sayce, and E. Sellin.

Looking back over the period from 1901-1936 we can detect a certain trend. At first there was a tendency to borrow from popular non-SDA sources. Gradually there was more selectivity with increased borrowing from professional writers. However, SDA writers did not hesitate to make their own contributions even though their qualifications might be considered inadequate by present-day standards. At the same time within the broad spectrum of these very diverse elements on archaeology there was a significantly strong emphasis on apologetics. Archaeology was seen as a primary means of building faith in Scripture and of defeating critics.

Introduction and Overview 1937-1980

A question of special interest as we begin the survey of the post-1936 period relates to the manner, degree, and speed of change

¹Ibid., p. 14.
in featuring archaeology and using it for apologetic and other purposes in SDA publications as various scholars within SDA ranks gained archaeological qualifications. At the same time we shall also be watching for developing trends in usage of archaeology throughout the entire period.

The period from 1937-1980, upon which we are concentrating, can be conveniently divided into three eras, according to the name or names which predominate in each. The first period may be designated the Wood-Thiele-Emmerson Era, 1937-1949. The second period would then be the Horn Era, 1950-1973; while the final period may be described as the Era of Horn's Younger Associates, 1974-1980. These divisions are somewhat artificial as illustrated by the fact that the literary contributions of Thiele and Emmerson span almost the complete time period, and publications from Horn's pen continue to be prominent even after 1980.¹

Procedure is as follows: (1) There is a brief characterization of the period and of each of the periodicals for that period following the sequence ST, TT, RH, Ministry, and (after its commencement in 1963) AUSS. (2) Beginning with the major contributors,

¹In fact, though all three of these men have retired, they are still actively involved in either publishing (Horn and Thiele) or occasional teaching (Emmerson). Further justification of the transition points may be illustrated by the following summary:
1949--Wood published 8 articles; Horn one in 1948, one in 1949.
1950--Wood's last article in any of these magazines; Horn, 5 articles, 2 in 1951, and thereafter numerous.
1973--Horn became Dean of the Seminary on September 1, 1973, and subsequently retired in 1976.
1974--Horn continued publishing from this date, but the number of his articles was proportionately less, in fact, less in total than that of his most direct successor, Lawrence T. Geraty, and almost half of his contributions were book reviews rather than articles.
following a brief biographical statement (more for major contributors),
the articles and books of each author are analyzed, including his
contributions to non-SDA periodicals. The order of the analysis
follows the same pattern ST, TT, RH, Ministry, but care is taken to
observe any chronological changes which may be apparent in the
author's work. (3) Each period concludes with a summary description.
(4) Each chapter concludes with an analysis of the trends in
archaeological usage for that period.
CHAPTER IV

SDA ARCHAEOLOGICAL LITERATURE PERIOD I:
WOOD-THIELE-EMMERSON ERA, 1937-1949

Only four of our group of selected periodicals were issued during this first period (1937-1949), but analysis of the total number of archaeological articles in these four periodicals shows some consistency in terms of frequency and apparent purpose. From 1937-1941 there was a total of seventy-eight articles,¹ spread somewhat evenly and averaging sixteen articles per year, or four per periodical per year. After 1941 there was a noticeable drop in archaeological contributions with the low point in the year 1945, when none of the periodicals featured a single article. However, after the emphasis on war-related items fell, archaeological features immediately returned to almost the same level as earlier with a total of sixty-three articles from 1946-1949.² The post-war resurgence of interest in biblical archaeology included reflections of the Zionist movement and political activities in the Middle East³ as well

¹Including three book reviews.

²Including two book reviews.
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as the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (six articles featured the latter during 1948-1949).¹

For the whole period, the greatest diversity of emphasis (in terms of quantity) was with the ST, which carried thirty-nine archaeological articles during the 1937-1940 period, only two during 1941-1945, and thirty during 1946-1949. Watchman and Our Times (consecutive TT forerunners) did not give much emphasis to archaeology apart from the ten articles by James C. Muir during 1937-1941. The only other articles for the entire period were five in number, scattered from 1943-1948. The pattern for the RH was approximately the same as for the ST, with eighteen articles during 1939-1942, only three from 1943-1945, and twenty-three (including four on the Dead Sea Scrolls) from 1946-1949. There was no archaeological article in the RH for 1937-1938. Ministry had nothing in 1937, but 1938-1941 issues contained fourteen such features (three of them book reviews), 1942-1945 contained only two articles and two reviews, while 1946-1949 contained six articles and two reviews.

**Lynn Wood**

Lynn Harper Wood (1887-1976) was a keen student and a deep thinker. After completing his college degree in architecture² at the University of Michigan in 1909, he entered denominational employment, ultimately serving on three continents.³ Apparently it

¹One in ST, one in Ministry, and four in RH.

²Actually B.S. in Architecture and Urban Planning, his field being architecture.

³In the U.S.A., among other appointments, he was president, from 1919-1922, of Southern Junior College (later known as Southern...
was while serving as president of Emmanuel Missionary College (fore-runner of Andrews University) in Michigan that Wood's enjoyment of archaeology and OT studies truly surfaced, for he took leave from employment in 1934 to study at the University of Chicago. His M.A. thesis of June 1935 was entitled, "Oriental Influences on Hebrew Religious Architecture." In 1936-1937, while completing his doctoral dissertation, he spent seven months in Jerusalem as Jastrow Fellow at ASOR. There he studied under Nelson Glueck and participated in Glueck's ASOR soundings at Tell el-Kheleifeh and excavations at Khirbet et-Tannur. His qualifications enabled him to function as an expedition surveyor and draftsman. While in Palestine, Wood travelled widely to sites of archaeological interest. He studied under Nelson Glueck and participated in Glueck's ASOR soundings at Tell el-Kheleifeh and excavations at Khirbet et-Tannur. His qualifications enabled him to function as an expedition surveyor and draftsman. While in Palestine, Wood travelled widely to sites of archaeological interest.

His University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation was entitled, "The Evolution of Systems of Defense in Palestine." Its successful defense was conducted on June 1, 1937, exactly two months before Wood's fiftieth birthday. As the first SDA to receive such a degree, he was a model for future generations of archaeologists in the SDA Church.

Missionary College; this was his favorite institution and eventually inherited his archaeology library); he was also president of the Australasian Missionary College (Avondale), Australia, from 1923-1928; and president of Stanborough Park College, England, from 1928-1930. This and the following biographical data is based upon a composite of the following sources: Bulletin of the SDA Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, Washington, D.C. 1937, p. 10; [Maude] Wood (Mrs. Lynn Wood), Diary for the period August 30, 1936-August 19, 1937, Berrien Springs (transcribed); "Archeology, Biblical," SDA Encyclopedia (1976), 10:63; Xema Skeels, interview at her home, Berrien Springs, Michigan, October 14, 1981. Miss Skeels is a cousin of the late Maude Wood.

1In October 1936 he traveled to Syria, via Nazareth, Tyre, Sidon, and Byblos. He drove from Ras Shamra to Antioch and Baalbek, and returned through Damascus. In November he visited Petra and Amman, and on subsequent trips he visited various sites in Palestine and Transjordan. The return to USA included a journey by train to Egypt and a four-day tour of Giza, Memphis, and the environs of Luxor.
qualification in archaeology, Wood immediately took up teaching responsibilities at the SDA Theological Seminary which was being established at this time in Washington. From 1937-1941 he taught archaeology and OT backgrounds courses in the Religious History Department. In 1941 he was apparently instrumental in setting up the new Archaeology and History of Antiquity Department (note that it was not called OT Department at this time) which offered a major in this area. Wood was at first the only teacher in the department. From 1944-1951 he was chairman of the Archaeology Department. Soon after he retired and moved to California.

As we take up the work of Lynn Wood, it is interesting to note that the missionary journals did not make use of this first professionally trained SDA archaeologist. There was only one article by Wood in the ST for the entire period (that single article appeared in 1949), and there was no article by him in the TT predecessors. The ST article comprised both a report concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls and an apologetic for the reliability of the OT text on the basis of the find. Some discussion of the controversy over the dating of the scrolls was given, with obvious inclination

---

1There is some question as to the after-effects of a serious head injury which Wood sustained during the mid-1940s. Doctors predicted loss of mental ability, but this in fact may not have been significant though it is known that he suffered in his sense of direction and also suffered periodic dizzy spells. The pattern of his publications as indicated by the periodicals we discuss here suggest very little writing from 1943-1948.

2Perhaps the editors were reluctant, or more likely, Wood was slow to start writing for them.

towards the widely supported Albright position placing them mostly in the late second and first centuries B.C. Observation was also made concerning the providential preservation of the scrolls and of the apparent accurate preservation of the text (especially the MT). This was an authoritative report using current scholarly sources in a responsible manner at the level appropriate for the magazine.

Though directed towards the general church member, Wood's articles in the RH were nevertheless scholarly in approach and often named the sources used (presumably to enable further reading, as well as to indicate the authority of statements made). Glueck's discoveries at Ezion-geber were the focus of his first article, but a useful survey of Israelite contacts with the town was also featured. Since the author participated in Glueck's ASOR survey of the site which made soundings in 1936, it is not surprising that he enjoyed describing Glueck's subsequent excavations of 1938 and 1939.¹ The author noted that Egyptian copper mining in the Sinai region went back much earlier but expressed the view that it was Solomon who pioneered this activity in the Arabah.² Subsequent reinterpretation of some of the archaeological data and the discovery of Egyptian copper-mining activities at Timnah have not cancelled the value of this survey. Application of the first three strata to the times of Solomon, Jehoshaphat, and Uzziah is sometimes denied, but may still be valid. The dual thrust of the article was to portray the OT context and to show

¹Idem, "New Archaeological Findings Concerning Ezion-geber," RH, October 24, 1940, p. 4. Glueck's third season in 1940 was not covered by this article.

²Ibid.
archaeology as a witness to the OT record.

The next article described Petrie's 1904-1905 Sinai expedition, including his visit to the copper- and turquoise-mining sites at Maghara and Serabit el-Khadem and the discovery of the Sinai alphabetic inscriptions. Although there is some excellent detail and explanation on the expedition, the script, and the Temple of Serabit el-Khadem, again in this article the major thrust is apologetic. Moses, who spent so many years in the Sinai wilderness, had not only the time to write but also a practical, accessible script for recording the book of Genesis.

Discussion of the alphabetic form of writing was continued a week later with a description of the visit to Ras Shamra of the ASOR team from Jerusalem. The alphabetic cuneiform inscriptions

Idem, "The Past Speaks: Archaeology's Findings Near Sinai," RH, February 13, 1941, pp. 3-5. The date of this expedition can be obtained by a careful reading of the autobiography—Flinders Petrie, Seventy Years in Archaeology (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1932), pp. 203-213. The party left Suez on December 3rd, "walking and camelling" and arrived at Maghara on December 9th (p. 208). When finished there, the expedition proceeded to Serabit and commenced work on January 11th (p. 210). Work was completed there and the return journey to Suez commenced on March 18th (p. 212). The mention of "1904" on p. 213 is a reference to an earlier experience. Thus Albright correctly gives the dates for the Serabit el-Khadem excavations as "January 11th-March 18th, 1905" (W. F. Albright, "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," BASOR 110 [1948]:6-7). However, a footnote mentions: "Even the year of his discovery of the inscriptions is often given erroneously as 1904 or 1906" (ibid., p. 7, n. 6). The report by Wood was possibly based on a lecture by Petrie which Wood attended while in Jerusalem. See [Maude] Wood, Diary for November 16, 1936, where she mentions one specific lecture given by Petrie, and earlier (October 5th) mentions meeting Sir Flinders and Lady Petrie at ASOR.

Lynn H. Wood, "The Past Speaks--No. 2: Archaeological Findings in Syria," RH, February 20, 1941, pp. 4-7. Wood and his wife were both members of this expedition.
on clay tablets were seen to go back as far as 1500 B.C., and therefore were seen by Wood (and J. W. Jack whom he quotes) as a denial of the Wellhausen theories. The testimony for the contemporary existence of religious ceremonies and literature, and the characterization of those religious forms in terms of the worship of Baal, etc., as depicted in the OT were seen as strong confirmation and illumination of the OT.

Not only has the deciphering of these tablets overthrown many of the higher critics' theories regarding the time of the introduction of written records, but it has also given us a wealth of extra-Biblical information concerning the culture of the nations among whom Israel came to start their existence as God's chosen people.

Wood also pointed out that there are many texts which we can now interpret more accurately on the basis of the Ugaritic texts and their revelations concerning the concept of Baal's involvement in the seasonal cycle. Thus the writer used archaeology in this article in a multifaceted manner. The bibliography for the article included popular works by Schaeffer, one of the excavators, as well as the more scholarly type of sources.

The next five articles by Wood constituted a series, with each article containing some form of apologetic for Scripture. The first was an attempted exegesis using archaeology as its basis. Two

1Ibid., p. 5. Today, the 14th century B.C. would probably be the most commonly claimed period for the commencement of these texts.

2Ibid., p. 6.

3Ibid., p. 5.

4Ibid., p. 6.

passages in Isaiah, specifically 35:9 and 65:25, both widely regarded as applying to the new earth, have been seen by some as contradictory since the first speaks of the absence of "the lion" and "any ravenous beast," while the second says that "the lion shall eat straw like the bullock." Wood explained the apparent discrepancy by seeing the first passage as applying to the cruel rapacity of the current Assyrian and future Babylonian captivities. As the captors could be symbolized by their own composite-animal type of gods (demonstrated archaeologically), so he suggested, on the basis of Nah 2:8-13, that both idol and cruel captor would in turn be destroyed, whereas the penitent child of God would one day walk the "street of gold."\(^1\) The author expressed satisfaction that the ancient mounds had yielded ". . . such inscriptions and artifacts as will add vividness and reality to the record, and thus aid in understanding what the author had in mind as he penned his thoughts."\(^2\) This article was apologetic only in the sense that it attempted to remove an apparent discrepancy.

The second article contained less specific archaeology but was a defense of Gen 6-8 and a literal world-wide flood. Wood corrected the notion that Woolley's flood at Ur supported the concept of a world-wide flood, but it seems to be too sweeping when he claimed that the "universal opinion of scholars" had come to reject its application to the flood of Noah.\(^3\) The other arguments used were

\(^{1}\)Ibid. \(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 4.

essentially non-archaeological, referring to world-wide flood legends and vast (animal and fish) bone deposits inland from Port (Bur) Safaga, northeast of Luxor.\(^1\) The third article spoke of three evidences which have contributed to our understanding of the biblical context.\(^2\) These were the archaeological confirmation of Sargon II of Assyria, the chronological adjustments which placed Abraham at least two centuries earlier than Hammurabi, at a time when there were four powers in control of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley,\(^3\) and the supposed discovery of the building on the walls of Jericho—"no doubt the building from which the spies were let down over the wall by Rahab."\(^4\) The author stated that trends were consistently in the direction of the "verification of the Biblical story,"\(^5\) and that we must be alert to current events in order to quickly recognize ". . . the trends of modern discovery and analysis, and thus have our faith in His messages to us more firmly grounded."\(^6\) The next article argued against the evolutionary premise of the Wellhausen and History of Religion schools. Wood's argument was based on the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 6.


\(^3\)Apparently these four powers (Akkadians, Elamites, Guti, and Sumerians) were thought to mark the identity of the four kings of Gen 14. The chronological adjustments appear to be of a nature which would place Hammurabi later than had been earlier supposed, but no details were given. Wood's main point was that a difficulty had been removed. If Abraham and Hammurabi were contemporaries (as had previously been thought) then Hammurabi, king of Babylon, would have led the coalition, but instead the Bible portrayed the leader as Chedorlaomer of Elam.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 8.  

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 7.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 8.
fine and detailed workmanship of the objects from the tomb of Tutankhamen, which makes it unreasonable to unequivocally rule out the feasibility of constructing the Israelite sanctuary. He pointed out that even the long bolts of cloth required according to Exod 26:2 were not impossible in the light of such surviving linen shrouds as the one which has survived in Egypt measuring sixty-four feet in length by five feet in width.¹ There was even a silver trumpet embellished with gold and engravings, somewhat parallel to the trumpets of Num 10:2. The final article in this series² demonstrated the providential manner in which Hebrew has been preserved over the ages as a living language (sic),³ while at the same time the other ANE languages with their valuable historical data, though lost for centuries, have been providentially recovered. He concluded with a tribute to archaeology which "is strengthening man's confidence in the accuracy of this text" (the OT)⁴ which has been so reliably transmitted. Thus in each of these five articles Wood used archaeology quite clearly to bolster faith in either the text, message, or details of content of Scripture.

A distinctive and important article by Wood in 1943 warned

¹Idem, "Archaeology and the Bible--No. 4: Ancient Craftsman-
ship," RH, September 24, 1942, p. 5. This was not the shroud of Tutankhamen (which may have been larger, but was in a highly carbonized condition and could not be measured), but from a mummy from an earlier dynasty.

²Idem, "Archaeology and the Bible--No. 5: Living versus Dead Languages," RH, October 1, 1942, pp. 3-5.

³Although there is much similarity between ancient and modern Hebrew, modern Israeli Hebrew might be best described as a reconstructed language.

⁴Ibid., p. 5.
against the misuse of archaeology. Archaeological forgeries have included pottery, statues, and written materials, as in the well-known Shapira case.\(^1\) Wood also castigated many unwarranted and misleading reports such as those claiming the discovery of Noah's ark, and of an early "translation" of a Serabit inscription supposedly written by Moses in gratitude to Hatshepsut. Other statements, including the claim that the names of the first ten patriarchs have been found to coincide with the names of the Sumerian prediluvian kings, were simply not factual, Wood stated. Thus he appealed for responsible use of archaeological data.

In April 1949, Wood introduced a new feature to the RH, a special column entitled "Archaeology and the Bible," which began to appear approximately once per month. The feature was maintained for only about one year, but the first seven columns, all in 1949, were written by Wood himself, and all except one contained some degree of apologetic for Scripture. The first\(^2\) was essentially a description of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It also constituted an initial statement of their importance in confirming the MT and of the new scope which they promised for studies in Hebrew grammar and paleography. The second article\(^3\) reported the controversy over


the dating of the scrolls, recording the fact that the preponderance of scholarly opinion (including W. F. Albright, J. C. Trever, and Solomon A. Birnbaum) insisted on dating them before the Christian era. Wood concluded, "All this shows what marvellous discoveries are being made and will be made to demonstrate beyond all question of doubt the accuracy and authenticity of the Scriptures." 1 With the awakened interest in biblical manuscripts, the third article 2 described the Nash Papyrus fragment which, even before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, had also been dated to the pre-Christian period. Wood proceeded to show surprise that Egyptian Jews of the Maccabean period would emphasize Exod 20 over Deut 5 as the basis of Sabbath observance. He explained it on the ground that their residence in Egypt would call for stress upon the creation basis rather than dwelling upon the aspect of redemption from Egypt. Again Wood underlined the fact that the newly discovered manuscripts contribute much to "determining the accuracy of the original Hebrew." 3 In the fourth article he returned to an earlier theme to answer persistent rumors concerning the supposed discovery of Noah's ark. Appeal was made to use great care in the use of popular sources. 4 The next article 5 was really an apologetic for Scripture's reliability on the basis of the recovery of knowledge of the Hittite civilization.

1Ibid.
3Ibid.
Specifically, here the emphasis was on the recent discovery by Bossert of lengthy Hittite/Phoenician bilingual inscriptions from Karatepe. Wood commented, "So again, every stone uncovered and every inscription deciphered only adds its mite to demonstrate the accuracy of God's Word." He described a new and successful attempt by George Cameron to complete the work of Rawlinson on the Behistun Rock Inscription in his sixth article. He not only gave the details of this enterprise and its difficult scaffolding solution but also gave the historical setting of Darius the Great who was responsible for the fantastic monument. The article was very much a preliminary report, with the new details based on a popular source, the magazine section of the Christian Science Monitor. Wood expressed the hope that adequate publication would proceed in the near future, and stated that such details "... will add much to the harmonizing of extra-Biblical evidence with the statements of Holy Writ." The

1 Ibid.


seventh article in this series was an announcement and explanation concerning the discovery of the pseudo-biographical book of Enoch among the Dead Sea Scrolls. This ancient copy of the book was written in Aramaic and identified rather late because of its deteriorated condition which required special treatment. The apologetic note here was less obvious and based mainly on the Dead Sea Scrolls as considered collectively. At the same time there was an indirect expression of hope that the various emerging materials (especially those in Aramaic) may vindicate the early dating of Daniel and Ezra. The main thrust of the article appears to have been that scholarly opinion may at times change quickly.

Turning to the Ministry articles, we note two of importance which appeared only a few months after the completion of Wood's Ph.D. degree. The first contained a brief description of the theological movements of the period since Jean Astruc, including the emergence and wide acceptance of higher criticism. Wood clearly saw archaeology as a providential weapon for the defense of Scripture, since it developed at a time when so much of Scripture was either being questioned or rejected by a large part of the scholarly world. Though not explicitly stated, one may gain the impression that he saw even the discoveries which enlightened cultural context and background of OT narratives (such as the excavations at Ur) less from the aspect

---


2Ibid.

of understanding Scripture as from the apologetic angle.\(^1\) The title of the two articles points in this same direction. This does not mean that he regarded the reconstruction or discovery of Biblical context as unimportant, for he gave a number of examples in these pages, but the emphasis seems to have been apologetic. Thus in the second article\(^2\) he mentioned that the discovery of the early alphabetic script in Sinai, together with comparative linguistics, indicates an early, Egyptian-flavored origin of the Pentateuch. "Thus the trends of archaeological inquiry are all toward a confirmation of a Mosaic authorship of the early portions of Scripture." Again he stated that "... prominent archaeologists are recording the convictions of their souls that the Bible is well able to stand its ground and that the trends are all toward the verification of its story."\(^4\) Wood proceeded to say that archaeology was at that time (1938) in a better position than ever before to help restore confidence in God's Word. After once more stressing the providential nature and timing of the discoveries, he concluded with what appears to have been his personal burden:

> It is to be earnestly hoped that the detailed facts supplied by this fast growing science can be made available to our workers and schools in all parts of the world, for surely they will be a means of inspiration and increased faith to any sincere Bible student.\(^5\)

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 18-19.


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 14.

\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 41, 42.
A review of James C. Muir's *His Truth Endureth* was not altogether complimentary. Wood appreciated the author's basic position on Scripture but deplored inaccuracies and the failure to incorporate the results of more recent investigations. Wood also wished that all four theories on the dating of the Exodus had been given, rather than only the two most popular arguments.

In 1940 Wood wrote a series of three articles emphasizing the Bible's contribution to our understanding of human origins, as confirmed by archaeology. In the first, he showed that contrary to widely accepted theories there is increasing evidence that monotheism was the earliest religion on earth and that the progression from naturism and animism to monotheism was only an evolutionary hypothesis. The author gave no detailed evidence from archaeology but relied considerably upon the opinion of Stephen Langdon who had excavated at Kish. The second article dealt specifically with

---


2. Wood is understood to have held to a less popular Hyksos period Exodus as the result of reading Martin Anstey, *The Romance of Bible Chronology*, vol. I: Treatise; vol. II: Chronological Tables (London: Marshall Brothers, 1913), 1:132-33; 2:10 (interview with William H. Shea, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, 28 May, 1981). However, Wood's 1937 dissertation is noncommittal, settling simply for "the Late Bronze Age," though mentioning four views as: i. at the beginning of the 18th dynasty (Hall); ii. entry to Canaan ca. 1400 B.C. (Garstang); iii. entry about 1290 B.C. (Albright); iv. entry in 1186 B.C. (Petrie). Lynn Wood, "The Evolution of Systems of Defense in Palestine" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1937), p. 4.


mankind's original fall into sin, showing from archaeology the way in which parallels to, or variations of, the Genesis story have been found widely scattered in the ancient world. The apologetic emphasis is clearly evident in a closing sentence: "What an opportunity is ours as Christians to become thoroughly acquainted with the various lines of evidence which point to the accuracy and historicity of the biblical account of man's fall into sin, that in these days of bewilderment and despair, hope may replace fear in the hearts of earth's multitudes." In the third article, Wood attempted to demonstrate that the biblical concept of death had been perverted in the ancient world. Throughout the ANE (and very clearly so in Mesopotamia and Egypt), there was belief in an existence after death. However, differentiation within that life expectancy on grounds of morality in earthly life was unknown in Babylonia, while in Egypt it was blurred into a form of identification with the god Osiris. Wood seems to have seen the latter as a special perversion of the Christian concept of identification with Christ as typified in the sanctuary services of the Israelites. Thus he stated rather broadly,

As Israel set before the world the revelations of God concerning His desire for the people of the earth, the priests of the various polytheistic religions in contact with

---

1Ibid., pp. 16-17. Three stories came from tablet fragments from Ashurbanipal's library, and a fourth from 14th century B.C. Egypt. Each described some form of a story which told of man falling from an innocent and blissful state to one of sin and sorrow.

2Ibid., p. 46.

3Idem, "The Bible and Archaeology--No. 3: Life after Death," Ministry, June 1940, pp. 8-10.
Israel changed the tenets of their religion to be as near like the true as possible, and still reject the salvation offered by Christ.¹

Thus apologetic for both the historicity and theological accuracy of the Scriptures, especially the early chapters of Genesis, is uppermost in these three articles.

When fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the destruction of Tyre (Ezek 26) was questioned, Wood responded with a strongly historical article.² In it he told of the mainland city of Tyre and of its fortified island counterpart. He concluded that there is adequate information to show that under Nebuchadnezzar's attack and siege the mainland city had been destroyed (and the remnants later removed by Alexander), while the island city had made a negotiated surrender.³ What little archaeology there was in this article (some historical information from archaeological sources and some description of the modern site) was used to reconstruct history and thereby show fulfillment of prophecy. The essay was therefore basically apologetic.

In 1946, Wood again took up the matter of Noah's ark.⁴ This time he carefully showed that each report contained fabrications,

¹Ibid., p. 10.


³Wood's dissertation research obviously lay behind his comment that the original fortification of the island city was according to the "Hyksos plan" of city defense (ibid., p. 24).

or had inadequate sources, and he warned that much greater care needed to be taken before promoting such reports. Thus he concluded: "It would seem most inadvisable to accept this sensational story and give it publicity until it has been well authenticated by scientific archaeological research, thus far lacking."¹ According to the editorial note which introduced the article, this warning was timely as "some pulpits and press reports among us" had already been promoting these stories.²

Wood's purpose in promoting The River Jordan, by Glueck,³ appears to be to encourage the "feel" for the ancient Israelite setting. Because of the historical significance of the entire Jordan Valley and its associated features, Wood felt the study of this book would assist in the visualization and understanding of the Scriptures. Thus he gave some balance to the rather consistent apologetic emphasis.

Turning now to Wood's contributions to non-SDA publications, we find one article published in BASOR in 1945.⁴ It is especially interesting that this article was not in the area of archaeological architecture, as we might expect, but in Egyptian chronology. Using time references in the Kahun Papyri, he worked back from astronomically fixed dates in the eighth century B.C., and by the process of

¹Ibid., p. 46. ²Ibid., p. 12.
⁴Idem, "The Kahun Papyrus and the Date of the Twelfth Dynasty (With a Chart)," BASOR 99 (1945):5-9. It would seem that the plural "Papyri" should have been used in the title as it was within the text.
elimination (of several apparently possible dates and reigns) arrived at the date December 6, 1879 B.C., for the commencement of the first year of Sesostris III. Then on the basis of widely accepted collations of the first kings of the Twelfth Dynasty, he was able to calculate that the beginning of the reign of Amenemhet I, and thus of the Twelfth Dynasty, would have been 1 Thoth (January 3rd) 1991 B.C.1 Possibly Wood's interest in the topic arose from a general SDA interest in the chronology of the patriarchal period, the time of Joseph's entry into Egypt, and associated events.

A second article2 was essentially an abstract of Wood's Ph.D. dissertation,3 so that a separate discussion of each is unnecessary. The dissertation topic was related more to Wood's architectural interests and qualifications than to any apparent apologetic theme.4 The author attempted to trace the main developments of defense systems used by the peoples of Palestine from prehistoric times until the time of the Babylonian captivity. It involved a thorough investigation of sites (particularly wall and gateway ground-plans) of

---

1Most Egyptologists still accept 1991 B.C. for the commencement of the Twelfth Dynasty, but their basis is the work of Richard A. Parker, The Calendars of Ancient Egypt, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 26 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 63-69. Parker agreed with Wood's date, but pointed out two errors in calculation which, however, cancelled one another exactly. Parker regarded the consequent agreement with his calculations as a "remarkable coincidence" (ibid., p. 81).


the ancient towns already excavated at that time. This appears to have been done at least primarily through published sources (sketches and descriptions in excavation reports), rather than by on-site study in Palestine.¹ It is clear that he did not visit most of the non-Palestine sites (Nippur, Carchemish, Boghazköy, etc.) which he used for comparison. In the earliest period many of the homes were in caves² which sometimes contained ingenious protective systems, while in the subsequent (pre-Hyksos) period the building of towns soon came to involve the construction of strong defensive walls. In the Hyksos period innovations included the enclosure of large fortified encampment areas with huge earth ramparts and steep sides, and in some cases plastered stone revetments at the base of the town walls to prevent access to siege-breaking engines. A natural hill might be utilized with the addition of a glacis and a fossé, and where the site was particularly enlarged, as at Hazor, a smaller portion was especially fortified as a citadel.³ The post-Hykos (Canaanite) period saw some apparent restrictions (by the Egyptians) on the building and repairing of mighty fortifications, but some city fortifications

¹He completed the writing of the dissertation while in Palestine, was in fact "nearly finished" by January 4, 1937, reworked the introduction on February 16, and mailed the finished work on February 26. M. Wood, diary for 1936-37.

²L. H. Wood, "Systems of Defense" (dissertation), pp. 7-8. This is perhaps reflected in biblical instances such as those involving fleeing Lot (Gen 19:30), fugitive David (1 Sam 22:1), and as when Obadiah hid the prophets from Jezebel (1 Kgs 18:4). It might also relate to the cave burial by Abraham (Gen 23:9). However, none of these instances indicates regular cave habitation.

³Yadin prefers to avoid the terms "enclosure" or "camp" for the Hazor lower city, since it was a "built-up area with fortifications" (Y. Yadin, "Hazor," EAEHL 2:494).
were carefully maintained. Finally, in the Hebrew period some extensive military planning was indicated by the location as well as the style of the leading fortified cities. Wood saw a certain amount of similarity in wall and gateway structures throughout the "Fertile Crescent," especially in the early first millennium B.C.\textsuperscript{1} Protected water-supply systems from the Canaanite and Hebrew periods were particularly impressive. In the dissertation, direct reference to biblical characters was not frequent, with the exception of a number of references to Solomon and structures attributed to Solomon.\textsuperscript{2} The work was well illustrated even though the number of excavated and thoroughly researched sites for illustration was more restricted than it is today.\textsuperscript{3} The primary purpose of the dissertation appears to be a reconstructive study of the defensive aspects of the lives of the early inhabitants of Palestine, thereby enabling a better understanding of the biblical characters and events in their respective contexts. Chronology has been a somewhat sensitive area for SDAs and we note that Wood used the standard terminology (Paleolithic, 

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 86, 88, 91, 108, 109, 117, 126.  
etc.), but without specific definition and conceivably with certain mental reservations.

Apart from his dissertation, Wood wrote no book on archaeology, but he did contribute to the research which was the basis of the book written by Siegfried Horn (with assistance from Julia Neuffer) on the chronology of Ezra 7. This was published under the joint names of Horn and Wood and is discussed in the context of the next period.

A general statement concerning Wood’s usage of archaeology would indicate that he saw archaeology as contributing significantly to the restoration of the cultural and historical context of the OT. This element was uppermost in his few contributions to non-SDA publications. There was no direct apologetic element visible in these latter publications, though it could be argued that even reconstruction of the biblical context and chronology could be seen as indirectly apologetic (where it demonstrates the cultural, historical, or chronological portrayals of Scripture to be accurate). However, in the light of the large number (about three-fourths) of his denominational articles which deal with, or which contain apologetic materials, or which make apologetic statements, it may be seen that this aspect was regarded by Wood as archaeology’s major contribution to biblical studies. The main difference in writing for the two types of readers (SDA and non-SDA) consists of this dominant apologetic

strain in SDA articles, and the broader, but cautious, references to early chronology of the ANE in non-SDA publications.

**Edwin R. Thiele**

Edwin Richard Thiele, who was born in Chicago in 1895, completed his B.A. in Religion with a minor in Biblical languages (College Ministerial Course) at Emmanuel Missionary College in 1918. After two seven-year terms of service in editorial and publishing work in China,¹ he completed an M.A. at the University of Chicago in 1937 and commenced teaching at Emmanuel Missionary College in that same year. For the remainder of his career he taught there in the Department of Religion and Philosophy (department head from 1943) until his retirement in 1963.² While teaching Thiele completed his Ph.D. in archaeology and ancient history at the University of Chicago with a dissertation in the area of OT chronology.³ A considerable

¹Two years in Nanking, and twelve in Shanghai. Before leaving the U.S.A., he served as Home Missionary Secretary of the East Michigan Conference (1918-20) and in between his terms in the Far East he spent two years in the U.S.A., including a year teaching at Washington Missionary College (now Columbia Union College). This biographical sketch is based upon the following sources: Berrien Springs, Mich., Andrews University Heritage Room, "Edwin R. Thiele biographical file"; Emmanuel Missionary College Bulletin for the respective years; "This Week," RH, July 3, 1980, p. 2; "Archeology, Biblical," SDA Encyclopedia (1975), 10:63; Beverly Hessel, "SM Bought First Desk under Thiele," Student Movement (Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.), March 28, 1979, p. 10; "Graduation Climaxes Successful Year," Andrews University Focus, May-June 1965, pp. 1, 5; Edwin R. Thiele to Lloyd A. Willis, November 16, 1981.

²As Emeritus professor in May 1965 he was awarded an honorary doctorate (D.D.) by the college which had by then become Andrews University. He moved to Porterville, California, in 1966, and to Angwin, California, in 1981.

part of his published work was in this area, but other articles are more specifically archaeological. Thiele visited Italy, Greece, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia in 1957. ¹

Taking up the SDA periodical articles of Thiele, we observe that for the first period he wrote a total of eleven articles and two book reviews. The articles in the missionary journals consisted of a series of seven in the ST in 1939, before he had finished his professional training. Also the Ministry contained a single book review in 1939, three items in 1944, and one article each in 1946 and 1949.

The title of the ST series in 1939 was "The Exodus Story: Fact or Fiction?" The title itself set the tone for an apologetic emphasis which took up the defense of this biblical narrative. In the first article ² Thiele observed that there are many missing details (such as the names of Pharaohs) in this Exodus story, but that some of these details can be supplied satisfactorily "from the Bible and from the results of archaeological excavations." ³ However, though Thiele may have been correct in his conclusions, he made a number of assumptions which do not necessarily follow from the biblical data. His statement that we must look for a period when Joseph, as a non-Egyptian, would have been acceptable for his high post (presumably meaning at a time when there was a non-Egyptian Pharaoh or

¹ See articles by various tour members in Ministry, January 1958.

² Idem, "The Exodus Story: Fact or Fiction?" ST, July 18, 1939, pp. 11, 13-14.

³ Ibid., p. 11.
dynasty) is one such assumption. Even to state that there must have been a new line of kings in order to find one who "no longer knew Joseph" is an interpretation. To use such assumptions for the formulation of a hypothesis would be valid. To use biblical texts and data, and various dates and reigns to form a chronology of the events would also be both valid and desirable, provided that it is a suggestive or tentative chronology which makes room for unknowns and variables. The foregoing assumptions and that of a firm chronology form the basis of the subsequent articles. The description of the Hyksos period in the second article gave as much detail as could be expected at that time. Thiele observed that the biblical details and names (of the Joseph story) fitted well into the Middle Kingdom of Egypt. The portrayal of the character and accomplishments of

---

1 This would be especially essential when the period is remote, so that correlations are difficult. Hence the question of the counting of years of the David/Solomon coregency needs to be kept open, so that Thiele's suggested 1446 B.C. date for the Exodus might in fact be more accurately stated as 1450 B.C., as suggested by W. H. Shea, "Ancient Near Eastern History," class notes, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., p. 32 (handwritten). The same question arises over the suggested 1876 B.C. date for Abraham's entry into Canaan and the interpretation of Exod 12:40.


3 He seems to imply that since they fitted there, they would also have fitted the Hyksos period which intercepted it, but of which our knowledge is so much more limited. One evidence which Thiele gave to support linkage of the Exodus story with the Hyksos period (that is, on the basis of the short chronology of Exod 12:40, LXX, and Gal 3:17--only 215 years in Egypt) carries limited conviction. At least it can be stated that though it harmonizes with the Exodus story it is somewhat hypothetical, while there is another explanation based on the longer chronology (Exod 12:40, MT) which fits equally well. Reference was made to "at least a partial ownership of the land on the part of the king" back in earlier (pre-Hyksos) times. Then it was suggested by Thiele that the system probably broke down
Hatshepsut and Thutmose III were featured in the third article, and a manner was demonstrated by which they may be synchronized with the biblical narrative. The fourth article dealt less with archaeology than with the geographical setting of the Exodus and wilderness experiences. The author also gave "natural" explanations or parallels to the miracles associated with the story. The report of Garstang's excavations at Jericho constitutes the bulk of the fifth

during the period of reduced central authority (the period which made
the Hyksos take-over possible). It was thus proposed that under
Joseph (during Hyksos' rule) the ownership was restored to Pharaoh,
since that is the condition found at the beginning of the Eighteenth
Dynasty. The problem is that we lack the evidence for this breakdown
of private ownership and for its restoration in the early Hyksos
period. Therefore, if on the basis of the longer chronology Joseph
were in Egypt during the Twelfth Dynasty, then the restoration of
Pharaonic autocratic power (presumably including land ownership,
since the landed aristocracy were completely reduced at this time)
would fit the Joseph account at this earlier period. W. H. Shea,
"The Bible and Archaeology," Andrews University, n.d., pp. 9-11
(mimeographed); cf. William C. Hayes, "The Middle Kingdom in Egypt," in
The Cambridge Ancient History, 3rd ed., ed. I. E. S. Edwards,
C. J. Gadd, and N. G. L. Hammond (Cambridge: University Press,
1971), vol. I, part 2: Early History of the Middle East, ch. 20,
pp. 505, 506. Overall, one could just as easily suggest that if the
Israelites were in Egypt before the Hyksos period, the coming of the
Hyksos might then help to explain the successful expansion of Israeli
tite power and influence until it was curtailed by the Eighteenth
Dynasty kings. Thus we have two alternative hypotheses which both
appear to harmonize with the historical and biblical data on one or
the other of the alternative chronological reconstructions.

1 Edwin R. Thiele, "The Exodus: Fact or Fiction?--3: Pharaoh's
Daughter Identified," ST, August 1, 1939, pp. 11, 13-14.

2 Idem, "The Exodus: Fact or Fiction?--4: From the Nile to
the Jordan," ST, August 8, 1939, pp. 11, 13-14.

3 Strong winds which drove back the sea, quail migrations on
a large scale, water caught in porous rock which may gush forth when
harder rock layers are removed, and land-slides which at times dam
the Jordan River (ibid., pp. 13, 14).
article.\textsuperscript{1} It continues to be of interest today despite Kenyon's conflicting findings.\textsuperscript{2} Thiele observed that the 165 scarabs from the Hyksos period to the early Eighteenth Dynasty which were found in the Jericho cemetery were the most significant dating factor at Jericho. This was especially so since they included scarabs from Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, with the series ending with Amenhotep III.\textsuperscript{3} Confirmation of Scripture and description of its context were both featured in the sixth article.\textsuperscript{4} Thiele commented on Egyptian influence in Palestine especially under Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, as contrasted with evidence from the Amarna letters representing the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C. About twenty-seven of the cities occurring in the Thutmose lists also occur in the lists of Joshua (10-12). The Amarna letters give intriguing insight into conditions in Palestine at that time. The author also mentioned the destruction of Hazor and claimed that examination of the site had shown a destruction from about the time of Joshua.\textsuperscript{5} This is a very

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., "The Exodus: Fact or Fiction?--5: The Fall of Jericho," ST, August 15, 1939, pp. 11, 14.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Thiele, "Fact or Fiction?--5," p. 14. Thus though the data concerning the walls is now outdated there is still indication of habitation on the site in the LB period and from the tomb scarabs it appears to have lasted until about 1400 B.C. (the time suggested for the conquest by the biblical data).
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Ibid., "The Exodus: Fact or Fiction?--6: The Conquest of Canaan," ST, August 22, 1939, pp. 11-13.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 11.
\end{itemize}
useful article though today we recognize the need for a qualified
opinion of the term "Habiru." Thiele saw the Habiru (Hapiru) as
clearly applying to the "Hebrews entering upon their conquest of
Palestine."¹ The final article of this series discussed the identity
of the Pharaoh of the Exodus.² Thiele rejected the thirteenth-
century dating for the Exodus largely on the basis of 1 Kgs 6:1, and
he rejected a Hyksos-period Exodus on the grounds that if Israel had
left Egypt with the Hyksos there would have been no scarabs from
Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, and Amenhotep III in the Jericho tombs.³
Also he said that a stele of Seti I from Beth-shean demanded an
earlier Exodus for it claimed victory over neighboring "Aperu"--
thought to be Hebrews or Ephraimites.⁴ As final and conclusive evi-
dence he gave the stele of Merneptah, which in about 1223 B.C.
claimed victory over various peoples of Palestine including Israel.
Among his observations on "Rames" in Exod 1:11, which he saw as an
updated name, was a reference to Gen 47:11 which speaks of Israel
originally settling in Egypt in the "land of Ramses," and he indi-
cated that few would suggest that that settlement took place at the
time of Ramses. Therefore the conclusion was stated that Thutmose

¹Ibid., p. 13. Today we would say that the term was applied
more widely to invaders or nomadic intruders. See Moshe Greenberg,
The Hab/piru, American Oriental Series, vol. 39 (New Haven, Conn.: Am-
ERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, 1955); Jean Bottero, "Habiru," in
REALLEXIKON DE ASSYRIOLOGIE UND VORDERASIATISCHEN ARCHAEOLOGIE, vol. 4,
ed. Dietz Otto Edzard (Bremen: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), pp. 14-
27; Roland de Vaux, The Early History of Israel, trans. David Smith

²Edwin R. Thiele, "The Exodus: Fact or Fiction?--7: The

III must be the main Pharaoh of the oppression and Amenhotep II the Pharaoh of the Exodus.¹

The first Ministry item by Thiele was a review of The Bible Comes Alive, by Marston.² Thiele commanded the author for his endeavor to restore confidence in the "intrinsic value of the word of God." The early part of the book dealt with pentateuchal narratives and the conquest of Canaan, but then concentrated upon the Lachish excavations. While giving general approval to the work, Thiele warned against the chronological statements and time-charts for early Egypt and Mesopotamia, because he felt that the chronology needed to be "materially reduced."³ He also warned against identifying Woolley's flood at Ur with the flood of Noah and acceptance of a Babylonian origin for the Sabbath.

The article which appeared in the February 1941 Ministry was, in fact, a paper which had been presented to a biblical language group at a Bible and History Teachers' Convention in July/August 1940 at Washington, D.C. Although the focus was upon biblical and ANE languages rather than archaeology, the article deserves mention. It

¹Ibid., pp. 11, 15.
²Idem, review of The Bible Comes Alive, by Sir Charles Marston, in Ministry, November 1939, p. 39.
³Marston gave 2812 B.C. for the commencement of the Tenth Dynasty; and 2751 B.C. (or about 2800 B.C.) for Sargon of Akkad (Charles Marston, The Bible Comes Alive [London: Religious Book Club, 1937], pp. 40, 288). Today there is general acceptance of a variety of shorter chronological schemes for the third millennium B.C.; cf. p. 259.
⁴E. R. Thiele, "Our Attitude toward Higher Criticism," Ministry, February 1941, pp. 7-9, 44.
constituted a call for SDAs (especially ministers and Bible teachers) to show appreciation for the diligence and honesty of higher critics, challenging SDA scholars to attain the same standard of proficiency through enthusiasm and diligent study habits. Thus proficiency should include not only the respective languages, but also the geographical and historical knowledge of the ANE and its "Biblical archaeological lore."¹

Thiele also reviewed Garstang's book entitled The Story of Jericho.² He regarded it as helpful for understanding the conditions in Palestine at the time of the conquest and also recommended serious study of the evidences given for the fifteenth-century dating. Thiele's attitude toward the book is expressed in the statement: "To the biblical archaeologist, the student of Scriptures owes a large debt of gratitude for furnishing him with much important and illuminating information on subjects which in the Bible are treated with meager detail."³

The next article by Thiele⁴ was an archaeological update largely devoted to Glueck's excavations at Ezion-geber which were continuing in spite of war conditions (World War II). The report was based upon and quoted from J.W. Jack, whose description and claims with respect to the site seem rather more imaginative than

¹Ibid., p. 8.
³Ibid., p. 37.
⁴Idem, "Recent Archaeological Research," Ministry, December 1941, p. 12. There was also a two-part article, Idem, "Solving the
those of the excavator, since he wrote not only of the "smelter refinery" but elaborated on the ghastly slave labor situation envisioned as having prevailed there in the period known as the Solomonic period.

An article with some exegetical and some apologetic purpose examined the three passages in Revelation which speak of a seven-headed dragon or monster. Thiele pointed out that the concept of a seven-headed beast who opposed the gods was known from a Ras Shamra tablet. A somewhat similar "dragon of chaos, ushumgal," appeared in Sumerian literature. At least two pictorial representations have been found. One showed a seven-headed beast being attacked by two

Problems of Daniel 1," Ministry, August 1941, pp. 7-8, and idem, "Problems of Daniel 1 (concluded)," Ministry, September 1941, p. 18. However, the approach was clearly historical and chronological rather than archaeological and is not included in this survey.


Thiele, "Recent Archaeological Research," p. 12. The observation that the war situation involving Europe and Asia had given significant stimulus to American archaeology was also of interest (ibid). Doubtless there are articles written by different authors where archaeology was used to assist exegesis which this survey has overlooked. Nevertheless, the few that have been found illustrate the possibility for greatly extending this usage.


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
gods (the seven-headed beast had four heads already limp and apparently lifeless), and the second, a seven-headed snake from Tell Asmar. Thiele suggested that as with the ANE creation, fall, and flood narratives, we have in the "dragon" instances also dependent upon a common original, imperfectly remembered (in the polytheistic societies). His interpretation of the Scripture passages saw the dragon as a symbolic portrayal of the powers of evil including both the Devil and the cooperative earthly forces through whom he achieved his goals. Thus archaeology indicated that the concept of an evil dragon was not new, and the apologetic thrust was to show that such a widespread symbol must have had ancient roots reaching back to the times of beginnings as described in Genesis. In other words, the Bible writers (or Genesis, Revelation, etc.) were not simply taking over pagan concepts which had no basis in historical fact.

1ANET, pp. 60-72.  
2Ibid., pp. 101-103.  
3Ibid., pp. 42-44, 93-97.  
4It is possible that the dragon concept originated in the experiences recorded in Gen 3, but it could also be argued that the Spirit or the biblical writer chose to use symbolism taken from the contemporary context, giving it a new orientation and perhaps purging some of the former connotations. If the latter were the case, it would certainly be an illustration of divine condescension; cf. Lloyd Willis, "Exodus 25:9, 40 and the Sanctuary Typology," Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1978, pp. 9-12 (typewritten), for a brief discussion of a similar possibility with regard to the sanctuary system. A third view (and none of the three need be seen as mutually exclusive) suggests that some occurrences of various words such as tannin, "great sea monster"--specifically its occurrence in Gen 1:21--are non-mythological and, in fact, may be polemical, as in this creation context, contradicting "the notion of creation in terms of a struggle as contained in the pagan battle myth" (Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Polemic Nature of Genesis Cosmology," Evangelical Quarterly 44 [April-June 1974]:87). For another interesting use of tannin, see p. 138.
The final *Ministry* article for the period\(^1\) was a polemical note directed at British-Israeliteism. In order to show that Israel could have made no contribution to the building of the pyramids, Thiele used Scripture and E. G. White statements to support a short chronology—with Abraham entering Canaan in 1876 B.C.

During his long term of teaching at Emmanuel Missionary College Thiele wrote a number of syllabi for the courses which he taught. Although the apologetic aspect is present it appears that the major emphasis (when considering the archaeological elements) in these syllabi is upon biblical backgrounds and thus upon improved exegesis. From the 1940s we have first his *Biblical Backgrounds*,\(^2\) which expressed as its aim to increase the "understanding of biblical truth" as well as to enrich knowledge through the avenues of the "geographical, historical, literary, religious, archaeological, and chronological."\(^3\) Archaeological elements are most obvious in such chapters as those which dealt with "The Hittites," "The Exodus," and "The Entry into Palestine."\(^4\) The archaeological sources were generally of a respectable standard though sometimes in popular form. A second *syllabus*\(^5\) was mainly geared to reconstruction of the ANE

---


3. Ibid., p. ii.

4. Thiele regarded Amenhotep II as "Probably the Pharaoh of the Exodus" (ibid., pp. 49, 52).

secular environment into which biblical history can be fitted. In the year 1947, a third syllabus was produced which was dedicated to increased understanding of the book of Daniel,\(^1\) which it considered "in all probability the most important [OT book] for our own time."\(^2\) Daniel was seen as a source of the understanding of history and of history's significance from the divine viewpoint.\(^3\) References to Babylonian and Persian historical and archaeological material (especially from ancient texts) were quite frequent.\(^4\)

In his M.A. thesis\(^5\) Thiele attempted to trace the development of the early systems for transportation in Mesopotamia approximately to the end of the third millennium B.C. Many of the basic materials used by human society even during the early period of the development of civilization needed extensive transportation. Likewise the conduct of warfare called for mobilization of men and supplies. Thiele based his research on evidences from a number of Mesopotamian sites. The evidences included models of wagons and chariots (which were especially numerous at Tepe Gawra and Kish),\(^6\) portrayals on seals and seal impressions, and other pictorial forms as those appearing on the Royal Standard of Ur.\(^7\) There were also actual vehicular

\(^2\) Ibid., p. ii.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 22, 45, 49, 50, etc.; see also the bibliography at the close of each section.
\(^6\) Ibid., pp. 43, 47.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 53.
remains from the "Y" cemetery at Kish (early part of the Early Dynastic period), and from the Royal Cemetery at Ur which enabled considerable detail to be given of both the materials used and the manner of construction.¹ Chariots became quite common as early as the Early Dynastic period, and Thiele suggested that they played a part in religious and mundane peaceful activities in addition to their use in warfare.² He also attempted to determine the type of draft animals which had been used.³ This thesis was analytical and descriptive, but showed no direct links with Scripture or apologetics. It did portray something of the environment or background of Abraham.

The topic of Thiele's M.A. thesis was not his first choice. In the first class period of his M.A. program, attention was drawn to the problems of the Hebrew royal chronologies by deprecating remarks of Professor William Irwin.⁴ Thiele asked to work on the problem (of whether the chronologies and synchronisms were reliable) and was refused. Later, in spite of the skepticism of both Irwin and his major professor, George G. Cameron, he persevered on his own until he could sufficiently impress them with his progress so that the topic was approved for his Ph.D. dissertation.⁵ This

¹Ibid., pp. 46, 49. ²Ibid., p. 46. ³Ibid., p. 67.
⁴Hessel, "Thiele," p. 10. Horn observed that a view which disparaged the synchronisms (or even rejected the entire chronological data) of the Hebrew regnal record was not at all unusual earlier in this century (Siegfried H. Horn, "From Bishop Ussher to Edwin R. Thiele," AUSS 18 [1980]:46-47). This article is adapted from Horn's Founders' Week address at Andrews University, March 8, 1979, in honor of Edwin Thiele.
dissertation deserves to be mentioned because of the interdependence of archaeology and chronology. Although it was purely chronological in nature and was based upon the biblical data, it made use of archaeological data especially in synchronisms with the fixed dates and extended periods of Assyrian and Babylonian chronology. Thus the dissertation was a very real contribution to archaeology and general biblical studies. This broad contribution certainly included defense of Scripture as is clear from its origin as his topic, from the presuppositions of his approach, and as stated by those who praised him.

Taking an overview of Thiele's publications for the period

1Ibid., pp. 2, 4, etc. Also idem, "The Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel," JNES 3 (1944):154-63, 182, 183, being essentially a reprint of the dissertation.

2Horn praised the work highly as "the greatest breakthrough in the study of Old Testament chronology" ("The Chronology of King Hezekiah's Reign," AUSS 2 [1964]:47), and foresaw the day when it might be even more widely adopted after the pattern of Ussher (idem, "Thiele," p. 49). He ultimately came to agree with Thiele on all but the Hezekiah period where he made his own proposals (idem, "King Hezekiah," pp. 48-52. See pp. 266-67). Albright immediately commended some areas (especially synchronisms of the Tiglath-pileser period) but was unhappy with others (notably the Asa period) and also with Thiele's insistence on minimal scribal errors (W. F. Albright, "Recent Publications Received by the Editor," BASOR 95 [1944]:41; idem; "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," BASOR 100 [1945]:17-19). Thiele in turn rejected what he called the "violent adjustments" of Albright because they rejected so much of the biblical data and depended upon "agreement with an impossible chronology"--Rowton's chronology for the kings of Tyre (Edwin R. Thiele, "A Comparison of the Chronological Data of Israel and Judah," VT 4 [1954]:188-90).

3As illustrated in the citation at the conferring of his D.D., "Because in a tangled web of biblical numbers you saw a challenge to extricate one more evidence of the historical reliability of the Divine Word. . ." ("Citation Read at Spring Commencement 1965," "Thiele Biographical File," Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.)
we can state that his interest and usage were balanced between illumination of context and background of Scripture on one side and apologetic for Scripture on the other. The dissertation fits both categories but is possibly even stronger in a third category which we might describe as a combination of exegetical and the general illumination of Scriptural content. Two other usages on a small scale are polemical and general promotion of scholarly study.

H. Lindsjo

Holger Lindsjo was a creative thinker who showed a special interest in archaeology and the ANE. He studied and toured in Palestine at the same time as Lynn Wood (1936-1937) and earned his Ph.D. in the Department of Oriental Languages and Literature at the University of Chicago in 1939. Thus in point of time he was the second SDA to complete such a program. After teaching at Walla Walla College, he accepted a call to teach at the SDA Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C. in 1946. For several years he taught in the Department of Archaeology and History of Antiquity (as well as in other departments) with Wood, but from 1949 he was also librarian, and from 1951 to 1954 he transferred to Washington Missionary College (now Columbia Union College) where he taught for several years before dropping out of denominational employment.

1Purely in terms of numbers the ST series of seven favors the apologetic side, but the M.A. thesis, though written for a non-SDA audience, shows a significant interest in contextual work.

2Thiele, "Pyramids," p. 15.

3Idem, "Higher Criticism, pp. 7, 8, 44.

4His name appeared for the last time in the Columbia Union College Bulletin 1961-62. Apparently there were some who at various
Lindsjo wrote a syllabus¹ for one of his seminary courses which contained considerable detail in addition to course and topic outlines. In the introductory chapter he discussed the question of legitimate archaeological usage. He gave first place to illumination of biblical backgrounds. The second contribution he listed was the explanation of "obscure passages" of Scripture by linguistic and cultural enlightenment. Finally he stated that archaeology also "gives assurance of historical correctness" (which may not be what we have assumed to be correct) so that, "On the whole, within the sphere of archaeology, the Bible has been most excellently confirmed."² He also mentioned that there would at times be areas where we have inadequate information, that new questions would at times be raised, and that it would be limited in its sphere--it could not testify to Creation and the origin of life, to the origin of sin, or to the


¹Holger Lindsjo, Archaeology and the Bible: Some Outlines and Notes for Beginning Study ([Washington, D.C.: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary], 1948).

²Ibid., p. [2].
divine communications involved in inspiration or in the salvation process. He therefore concluded that to attempt to prove the Bible is an erroneous approach, since proof would lie "... in the power it possesses, the effect that it has, the life it begets. ... A life lived--not stones or bones even though in heaps and mounds of a thousand kinds!" Likewise, it is the Spirit who indwells--not stones, but hearts. The material contained in the syllabus concentrated on contextual and background enrichment, but also entered into apologetics in that it took up such critical arguments as the earlier assumption which stated that "... laws such as those of Moses could not have been given at the time of Moses." Of particular interest was a very helpful survey of the various theories and chronologies of the Exodus including the different supporters of each theory up to the 1940s. At least in the syllabus the author remained personally noncommittal.

Lindsjo's other contribution to a church publication and also his Ph.D. dissertation were of peripheral interest to archaeology. The former warned against fraudulent claims being made for so-called first century documents from Pilate, Caiaphas, Gamaliel, 

1Ibid.
2Ibid., p. [23].
3Ibid., pp. [30-34] (Appendix 1).
and others. The dissertation basically dealt with the OT cultus primarily on a linguistic basis.1

We do not have sufficient publications from Lindsjo for extensive comment, but his attitude to archaeological usage is clear from the syllabus which he wrote. The quotations and comments on his work might be considered as a summary of his contribution along this line.

W. L. Emmerson

Probably the most prolific SDA writer on archaeology at the popular level (apart from Siegfried Horn who wrote at both the popular and professional levels) has been Walter Leslie Emmerson. Born in 1901, he graduated from Stanborough Missionary College (fore-runner of Newbold College) in England in 1928. After graduation he worked at the British Publishing House first as assistant editor (1928-1936)2 and thereafter as chief editor (1936-1966) in which latter year he retired. Though without professional training in archaeology, Emmerson early developed a love for the subject and was asked to teach "Christian Evidences"3 at the college in 1929 and again in 1935. His interest was especially stimulated by the reports

1 Ibid., pp. 269-70.

2 He was assistant to Arthur S. Maxwell who in 1937 became editor of the ST (American) in which he published numerous articles from the pen of his former colleague.

3 An earlier name for archaeological and scientific (flood geology, etc.) studies directed toward the support and enlightenment of Scripture.
of Garstang's 1930-1936 excavations at Jericho. Between December 1935 and March 1936 he toured Greece, Egypt, Palestine, Transjordan, Syria, and Iraq, meeting James L. Starkey at Lachish and J. D. S. Pendlebury at Tell el-Amarna. From that time on he published numerous articles on archaeology and the Bible lands. Again in the sixties he travelled to the east visiting Greece, Turkey, Iran, and India and especially tracing portions of the journeys of Paul. Just prior to retirement and on a number of occasions since he has taught archaeology at Newbold College. The largest selection of his archaeological articles may be found in the British Present Truth (The Bible and Our Times, 1950-1973, British Signs of the Times since 1973), but many of these articles were reprinted in English-speaking countries or translated and used in other lands. Between 1937 and 1949, forty-nine of his archaeological articles appeared in the four periodicals which we are here considering, making his contribution numerically about double that of Wood who was closest to that figure.

As we begin to survey his articles we note that in the ST


2Ibid.

3Usually in the Newbold Post Graduate School.

4In ST-36; in TT-2; in Ministry-3; and in RH-8.

5Wood's total for the period was actually twenty-six, including two book reviews.
his contributions consisted of three series and two isolated articles. The first series was based upon the Palestinian portion of his Near Eastern tour, and the second and third portrayed different phases of his observations in Egypt.

The Palestinian series constituted a vivid portrayal of that land in this period before turbulence rose to its more violent levels and is of special value because of the detailed observations from that historic time. Beginning with an exhilaratory and well-informed description of the first impressions which the land makes upon a visitor, and describing some of the main geographical features, he then proceeded to the Jerusalem area. These first two articles contained nothing specifically archaeological, though they suggest several site identifications. The third article specifically described the excavated ruins and ancient features of the Ophel area including the Gihon spring and Warren's shaft, as well as the remnants of the Jebusite wall. He described the circumstances of discovery and gave a translation of the Siloam inscription. Emmerson next turned

---


3 Idem, "With Bible and Spade in the Holy Land--3: In King David's City," ST, April 20, 1937, pp. 8-10.


5 Emmerson, "David's City," p. 10.
to the question of Solomonic connections, describing the temple platform from currently existing evidences. He suggested that Byzantine galleries below the eastern end of the el-Aksa mosque were likely to have followed the floor plans of Solomonic stables built below the king's palace. He also stated that Robinson's arch may go back to Solomon and introduced an apologetic note to support the scriptural assertion of aid from Hiram of Tyre (2 Chron 2:1-16), for he stated that one of Warren's deep shafts around the walls of the old city had revealed Phoenician signs. Features of Jerusalem dating from the time of Christ were also described by Emerson, both from the environs of the temple and also in the area of the Herodian "citadel" or palace site. He also claimed that a funeral inscription from the Mount of Olives bearing the words "The Ossuary of Nicanor of Alexandria, who made the doors," must refer to the one who built the "gate beautiful" between the Court of the Men of Israel and the Court of the Women in the temple. Reference was also made to the recently discovered plaque which forbad entry by Gentiles to the restricted area of the temple.


2Ibid., p. 10. Apparently this was a reference to marks incised and painted on stones discovered at the south-east angle of the modern sacred platform (Haram esh-Sharif). Charles Warren and Claude Reignier Conder, The Survey of Western Palestine: Jerusalem (London: Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, 1884), pp. 751-52.


4Ibid., p. 9.

5Ibid.
Pool of Bethesda (or Beth-zatha) have also been accurately identified.\footnote{Ibid. The latter identification was possible as excavation proceeded following the discovery of twin pools in northeast Jerusalem in 1888.} The author attempted to realistically evaluate the sites connected with the passion week and gave moderate approval to the Latin Gethsemane, was dubious about the suggested location of the "upper room," Caiphas' house, etc.,\footnote{Ibid., pp. 8-10. Supposedly in the vicinity of the present Zion gate.} and for some of the "Stations of the Cross,"\footnote{Ibid.} but was impressed by indications of the genuineness of the "Garden Tomb" and "Gordon's Calvary."\footnote{Ibid., pp. 10-13, though he does not use the designation "Gordon's Calvary."} His evaluations generally appear to be reasonable and in most cases non-dogmatic.

Emmerson next moved to Bethlehem on the journey noticing fragments of the aqueduct which had been built by Pilate to carry water from the Pools of Solomon to Jerusalem, and also the traditional tomb of Rachel.\footnote{Ibid., "With Bible and Spade in the Holy Land--7: Back to Bethlehem," \textit{ST}, May 25, 1937, pp. 8-9.} Giving a fascinating description of the history of Bethlehem, he postulated the genuineness of the site of the church of the Nativity.\footnote{Ibid., p. 10.} The setting of the eighth article\footnote{Ibid., "With Bible and Spade in the Holy Land--8: In the Home of Abraham," \textit{ST}, June 1, 1937, pp. 8-10.} of this series was the area south and west of Bethlehem. Of particular interest are the details which he gave concerning the Haram area of
Hebron (the commonly accepted site of the cave of Machphelah, Abraham's family burial vault) and the evidences for its antiquity.\(^1\)

Passing on to the more southerly area, the author noted the pastoral setting where tents replace most buildings, leaving few permanent evidences of habitation. Towards the coast, Tell el-Jemmeh (identified by Petrie as Gerar) with its many stone sickle fragments from Philistine times was mentioned.\(^2\) While speaking of Gaza, the author gave an incidental apologetic observation on the style of Canaanite temple construction which makes the death circumstances of Samson feasible.\(^3\) He also gave some observations concerning the other leading Philistine cities.\(^4\) The strongest apologetic element in this whole series appeared in the articles on Jericho\(^5\) and Samaria.\(^6\)

Emmerson was particularly impressed by the walls of Jericho

---

\(^1\) Especially the enormous dressed stones in the enclosing structure which resemble those in the Western (Wailing) wall in Jerusalem. He observed that some have suggested that those stones are from the "defensive works of Rehoboam or one of the other kings of Judah." Ibid., p. 10. Cf. 2 Chron 11:5, 10. Alternatively they may represent monuments erected by the Jews as mentioned in Luke 11:47.


\(^3\) Emmerson, "Home of Abraham," p. 10.

\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 9-10, 14-15.


as interpreted by Garstang and noted that a portion of the northwest wall which Garstang attributed to Joshua's time was intact to a height of about ten feet. This led Emmerson to suggest: "Perhaps this was the section on which Rahab's house stood, and remains today to testify to the absolute accuracy of every detail of the story."\(^1\)

He was also very much impressed by Garstang's over-all testimony (which he quoted) and concluded: "Thus once again, the 'stones' have spoken to refute the hasty conclusions of the destructive critics, and to vindicate the trustworthiness of the word of God."\(^2\)

That which he emphasized most from Samaria was the luxurious royal palace, plus the ostraca, and the thoroughness of the Assyrian destruction.\(^3\)

Articles twelve\(^4\) and thirteen\(^5\) were particularly devoted to tracing the Galilean footsteps of Christ, giving some good passing descriptions of nearby archaeological excavations. Especially notable were the details of the excavated tell at Beth-shean. The last article\(^6\) of the series actually followed Saul's journey from Palestine to Damascus, and in that connection it was mentioned that the great Umayyad mosque of Damascus contains materials from and seems

---

2 Ibid.
built upon the same site as the temple of Rimmon.¹ Before writing this series (and presumably before leaving on the tour), Emerson must have undertaken considerable serious research. This is evident from his acquaintance with names of excavators, attempted site identifications, and detailed descriptions and background knowledge including ancient and modern points of reference. In spite of a lack of formal training in archaeology and ANE studies, his familiarity with the literature made his travel extremely meaningful. His writings reveal a good general understanding of the issues as well as of the achievements of scholarship. His literary gift was demonstrated by vigorous and lucid prose supported by diligent observation of the multifaceted life of Palestine and a sympathetic treatment of its people.

A single article in 1938² was essentially an update on the Lachish letters, reporting the discovery of three more (in addition to the original eighteen). It also stressed the fact that one of the earlier ones "actually referred to the flight of Urijah the prophet" as in Jer 26:20-21.³ Another detail given this time from one

¹Ibid., p. 10.
³This is a reference to Ostracon III which is the best preserved and probably the most interesting of the larger ostraca. The name Urijah (Uriah) does not occur, but the contents and context were interpreted by Torczyner--Tur Sinai (Lachish I: The Lachish Letters, Wellcome Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East Publications, vol. 1 [London: Oxford University Press, 1938], pp. 52-73) as supporting the identification of Urijah in Jer 26 with the unnamed prophet on this ostracon. However, the identification is vague and involves a chronological difficulty since Jer 26 is placed in the reign of Jehoiakim, whereas the ostraca generally fit the latter part of Zedekiah's reign. Torczyner
of the new ostraca was the occurrence of the words "in the ninth."\(^1\) This was taken to refer to the reign of Zedekiah (2 Kgs 25:1), being the year of the commencement of the siege. The apologetic element was most prominent in this article.

Another clearly apologetic article which appeared in 1902 attempted to show that the reference to Canaanite "chariots of iron" (Josh 17:16) in 1400 B.C. (chronology based on literal 1 Kgs 6:1) was not anachronistic, nor incompatible with a fifteenth century Exodus. The evidences quoted were literary sources from Ramses II and Tushratta, one of the Mitannian kings of the Amarna tablets, nineteen objects of iron from the tomb of Tutankhamen, and a hardened iron therefore suggested that the name Jehoiakim in Jer 26 was an incorrect later insertion (Torczyner Lachish I, pp. 68-72). He appears to have been persuaded to accept this interpretation by the newly prevalent view (cf. p. 145, n. 2) that the two destruction levels (III and IV) represented 597 B.C. and 588 B.C., and since the ostraca were found between these destruction layers. Torczyner also claimed to find the remnants of Urijah's name in Ostracon XVI (Lachish I, pp. 65, 173), but this is not convincing. D. Winton Thomas ("The Lachish Letters," JTS 40 [1939]: 5-6) rejected the latter suggestion and expressed a number of the basic arguments also used by Albright and others in rejecting the identity of Urijah with the prophet of Ostracon III, (idem, ed., Documents from Old Testament Times, translated with introductions and notes by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study [New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1958; Harper Torchbook ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1961], p. 215; cf. ANET, p. 322, bibliography). Most of this discussion was still in the future when Emmerson wrote his articles.


\(^2\) Walter L. Emmerson, "Bible Story Proved True," ST, December 17, 1940, p. 5.
battle-axe from Ras Shamra which would date approximately to the
fourteenth century B.C.¹

Though published ten years later, the next series by Emmerson
was a continuation of the Holy Land series published in 1937. He
commenced by describing the journey from Jerusalem to Egypt with
archaeological and historical comments and biblical orientation and
proceeded through the series of articles from the delta region to
the Amarna region. En route to Egypt, Emmerson noted² the ruins of
one of the Egyptian frontier fortified towns near Lake Balah and
briefly described Petrie's excavations at Tahpanhes (Tell Defenneh).
He also mentioned a canal which is supposed to have connected the
Nile to Lake Timsah, and the latter to the Red Sea in the days of
Seti I.³ The second article⁴ featured the Great Pyramid of Khufu

¹See p. 257, n. 4; cf. Siegfried H. Horn, "References to
Iron in the Pentateuch--Part I," Ministry, November 1953, pp. 32-34,
where he refers to both terrestrial and meteoric iron in third and
second millennium B.C. Egypt.

²W. L. Em merson, "In the Land of the Pharaohs--1: Down
into Egypt," ST, April 22, 1947, pp. 8-9, 14.

³Ibid., p. 14. Whether such a canal turned south from Lake
Timsah to the Red Sea as early as Seti I is unclear. William H.
Shea has shown that although the canal of Darius I did that (Darius
completed the work commenced by Necho II) the earlier canal appears
to have been built not for commerce but for defense purposes, and
it extended from the Nile to Lake Timsah and then north to the
Mediterranean coast. He found textual evidence that this north-
reaching canal (of which southerly portions were known, but for
which aerial photography has now given evidence in the north) may
have been completed by Amenemhet I (1991-1962 B.C.), first ruler
of the Twelfth Dynasty, who constructed a "wall" (or a canal with
two walls--Shea suggested) as a barrier to the troublesome Asiatics
who had wrought havoc during the First Intermediate Period. (William
H. Shea, "A Date for the Recently Discovered Eastern Canal of Egypt,"
BASOR 226 [1977]:31-38.

⁴W. L. Em merson, "In the Land of the Pharaohs--2: Exploring
the Pyramids," ST, April 29, 1947, pp. 6-7, 14.
(Cheops), including details of its internal structure, while the subsequent installment\(^1\) devoted some of its space to what the author calls "that strange theological aberration" which regards this pyramid in all its intricate parts as a "prophecy in stone" complementary to scriptural prophecies.\(^2\) Various incidental details about the nearby pyramids were also given including the comment that the basalt sarcophagus of Menkaure (Mycerinus) was lost with the ship carrying it to England off the coast of Spain.\(^3\) Emmerson's remarks on the commemorative tablet of Thutmose IV in front of the Sphinx indicate that he regarded the father, Amenhotep II, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.\(^4\) The author's visit to Memphis was recalled in the article which described the few ruins there and the main antiquities at Saqqara.\(^5\) He twice referred to the opinions of Abraham S. Yahuda who for a time taught at London University and who held the view that Joseph's period in Egypt must be pre-Hyksos in a purely Egyptian society.\(^6\) On this basis Emmerson paid special attention to the wall paintings in the tomb of Ti (Tjey), a court official of the Old


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 9.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 14.


\(^6\) Ibid., pp. 4-5. Two indications supporting this view were the reference to shepherds as "an abomination unto the Egyptians" (Gen 46:34) and the Egyptian practice of not eating with foreigners (Gen 43:32). Both references were held to be unfavorable to a Hyksos context; cf. A. S. Yahuda, The Accuracy of the Bible: The Stories of Joseph, the Exodus and Genesis Confirmed and Illustrated by Egyptian Monuments and Language ([New York]: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1935), pp. 45-55, where counter arguments are also discussed.
Kingdom, in order to reconstruct the life-style of the Middle Kingdom.\footnote{Emmerson, "Joseph Ruled," p. 5.} Emmerson devoted the fifth article to the obelisk of Sesostris I at Heliopolis, noting that two of its later companions (erected by Thutmose III) now stand in London and New York.\footnote{Idem, "In the Land of the Pharaohs--5: The Obelisk of On," \textit{ST}, July 29, 1947, p. 12.} Apparently Heliopolis, or On, is the Beth-shemesh of Jer 43:13, and the author here asserted that the obelisks were the Egyptian equivalents of the Canaanite "standing stones," or masseboth. The next article was essentially non-archaeological,\footnote{Idem, "In the Land of the Pharaohs--6: Life along the Nile," \textit{ST}, August 5, 1947, pp. 67.} but used modern customs to illuminate Bible verses. Brief reference was made to the Bahr Yousuf or "water of Joseph" canal which waters the Faiyum basin and which may have been constructed or repaired by Joseph.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7. Hayes, "Middle Kingdom," p. 505, states that this development project appears to have been the accomplishment of Sesostris II (1897-1878 B.C.) whose reign W. H. Shea has shown to parallel the time of Joseph calculated on the basis of 1 Kgs 6:1 and a 430 year residence of Israel in Egypt ("The Bible and Archaeology," pp. 9-11).} Itinerating southward the writer next described the rock-cut tombs at Beni Hasan and their wall paintings, especially those from the Twelfth Dynasty.\footnote{W. L. Emmerson, "In the Land of the Pharaohs--7: The Rock Tombs of Egypt," \textit{ST}, August 12, 1947, pp. 6-7, 11.} The vital realism of these depictions is most striking and the Semitic caravan shown in the tomb of KhnemhotepIII additionally throws light on patriarchal life-style.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 6-7; William H. Shea, "Artistic Balance among the Beni Hasan Asiatics," \textit{BA} 44 (1981):219-28, has recently analyzed...
impressed by Khnemhotep's inscription of self-praise and by funerary inscriptions from other tombs which show the burial of Jacob as conforming to much of the Egyptian protocol. The article thus concluded on an apologetic note.

From Tell el-Amarna we have an excellent non-technical portrayal of excavation techniques and arrangements under the leadership of J.D.S. Pendlebury, whom Emmerson had previously met in London. The expedition house was an ancient mansion accurately restored for the team's convenience. At the time of this visit, work was proceeding on the plan of Akhnaten's palace. The description of the Amarna excavation was concluded in the final article of this series. Here the writer told of his personal inspection and mental reconstruction of the ancient city and gave an attempted representation of the investiture of Joseph based on the tomb paintings of various royal officials. The series therefore may be seen to contain only a minor element of apologetic for Scripture with reconstruction of the biblical context as a more prominent goal.

the scene and demonstrated a symmetrical, even chiastic arrangement of its figures and details.

1Emmerson, "Rock Tombs," pp. 7, 11.


4The tomb of Meri-Re, high-priest in the Aten sun-temple, shows his own investiture by Pharaoh. It involved decoration with gold collars, while in a second ceremony gold rings were placed on his neck and feet. Another Meri-Re, a royal scribe, and also various other officials were shown receiving a variety of golden ornaments as indications of royal approval or promotion. (ibid., p. 13).
Emmerson's final series for this period in the ST deals with the sites he visited in Upper Egypt. Although he did not stress apologetic aspects, they were present and appear to have been regarded as of prime importance, for an editorial comment introducing the new series stated that here in Upper Egypt the author found "striking corroboration" for the "story of Moses, the bondage, and the Exodus."\(^1\) This first article focused on the war of independence against the Hyksos and the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty. At El-Kab on the eastern side of the Nile opposite Hierakonpolis there are about thirty tombs of the Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Dynasties. Most significant of these is that of naval officer Ahmosi (Ahmose), whose father fought under Theban king Seqenenre, and who himself claims to have served under Ahmose I (helping capture Sharuhen) and to have continued until the reign of Thutmose I.\(^2\) Emmerson interpreted this successful war of independence as constituting the framework of Israel's enslavement (since Israel was Semitic) and concluded with several inscriptions supporting the new status of Asiatics.\(^3\)

Emmerson took Hatshepsut to be the adoptive mother of Moses, and wrote at some length on her life and monuments.\(^4\) He submitted


\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 15.

\(^4\) Idem, "Light from the Land of Bondage--2: At the Temple of Pharaoh's Daughter," ST, May 11, 1948, pp. 10-11, 15. He used 1447 B.C. as the date of the Exodus and referred to Garstang's Jericho excavations as having "established" such a chronology, (ibid, p. 10). He also referred to Josephus (AJ, ii, 224-32) who used the name Thermuthis for the adoptive mother. Emmerson claimed this name to be a mistaken repetition of the father's name and to clearly link her to "the age of the Thutmosides" (ibid., p. 11).
the idea that Moses would have received his training in Thebes and possibly may have even been born among Hebrew slaves who may have been brought south to Thebes. In order to comment on the education of Moses, the author next concentrated on evidences from the religious and educational centers of Dendera (a center of Hathor worship) and Abydos (chief city of the Osiris cult). He made clear that Moses would definitely have been taught to read and write, while at Dendera he would have acquired a knowledge of science and astronomy. At Abydos he surmised that Moses may have been taught history before a predecessor of the Table of Abydos (king list) in the temple of Seti I.

The next article gave an accurate description of the Valley of the Tombs of the Kings with special emphasis on the tombs of Thutmose I and II and Amenhotep II. The treasures of Egypt were

---

3 He stated that the circular zodiac at Dendera "shows the constellation of Cancer, not as a crab, but as a beetle," ibid., p. 15.
4 Ibid.
7 This larger tomb contained portraits of the king and some of his family members and in the third antechamber the names of 741 gods and goddesses (Emmerson, "Moses' Protector," p. 11).
8 The mummy was not only in the tomb then, but on display with the face uncovered (ibid., p. 14). Emmerson contemplated him as the pharaoh whose obstinacy brought the ten plagues.
next described\textsuperscript{1} with a summary of jewelry and art objects from before Tutankhamen and a good description of the opening of Tutankhamen's tomb and its art treasures. The design of the author was to portray the context of Moses and to magnify the "sacrifice" involved in his choice when he "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter" (Heb 11:24).\textsuperscript{2}

The desire to illuminate the period of Israel's bondage prompted the next expedition and the subsequent sixth article in the series. This involved visiting the tombs of Sheik Abd el Qurna\textsuperscript{3} on the hills to the east (in front of) the Valley of the Kings. These relatively simple tombs of court officials contain vivid portrayals of day-to-day life in ancient Egypt, whereas the paintings in the tombs of the Pharaohs were more concerned with the "underworld." Emmerson was especially interested in officials from the court of Thutmose III, including his vizier Rekhmara. In spite of the apologetic overtones, Emmerson was constantly watching for contextual illumination and saw in the vizier's list of duties a reflection not only of Israel's bondage but also of the responsibilities of Joseph.\textsuperscript{4} Rekhmara's tomb paintings and inscriptions include depiction of Semitic slaves making bricks for the temple of Amen and a reference

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1]\textsuperscript{1}Idem, "Light from the Land of Bondage--5: The Treasures of Egypt," ST, June 1, 1948, pp. 10-11, 15.
  \item[2]\textsuperscript{2}Idem, "Light from the Land of Bondage--6: Relics of Israel's Bondage," ST, June 8, 1948, pp. 10-11, 15.
  \item[3]\textsuperscript{3}Named after the family which has cared for the tombs in modern times.
  \item[4]\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 11.
\end{itemize}
to the rebuilding of a storehouse. Emmerson proposed that some of the Israelite slaves were likely to have been brought this far south.\(^1\) From various other sources he drew labor items such as the record of a strike (under Ramses XI), and an attendance record for laborers including the excuses for absenteeism.\(^2\) A regular excuse was the need to worship or sacrifice to the gods, showing that the requests of Israel were in keeping with current practice. In the seventh article,\(^3\) the author took the popular view that Josh 24:12 was not speaking of literal hornets but making a symbolic reference to various terrors which enabled Israelite victories,\(^4\) and Emmerson suggested specifically the Asian campaigns of Thutmose III which weakened

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 11, 15.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 15.


the Canaanite forces. The basis of this concept was that the heraldic badge of Thutmose III was a hornet. On a pylon in the great Karnak Temple is a list of 119 cities of Palestine attacked by Thutmose, thus unwittingly "preparing the way" for Israel. Special attention was given to his first campaign including the successful attack on Megiddo and the consequent weakening of Canaanite power.¹

It may be queried whether the author is justified in denying any literal fulfillment of Josh 24:12 (and presumably Exod 23:28 and Deut 7:20), however, this article by Emmerson certainly displays an interesting blend of apologetic, contextual, and exegetical elements. The plagues of Egypt received attention next as the writer showed their relevance to the gods of the land.² He also referred to an observation of Yahuda that in the account of Moses and Aaron before Pharaoh the word tannin might be better translated as "crocodile" rather than snake, and therefore might be an intended blow against Sebek.³ He stated that the term "lice" should actually read "mosquitoes," and that "flies" would be better rendered as "scarabs" (beetles).⁴ Since no evidence was given for the latter statements, it appears that he was dependent upon the linguistic expertise (and comments?) of Yahuda, or others, and might have been wiser to make these as suggestions rather than as statements.

The next two articles dealt with the providential

¹Emmerson, "Hornets," p. 11.
³Ibid., p. 10, cf. p. 113, n. 4.
⁴Ibid., p. 11.
circumstances of the Amarna period, focusing first on the building
program of Amenhotep III which distracted his attention from Pales­
tinian affairs,\(^1\) and then upon the similar but more revolutionary
activities of his son Akhenaten.\(^2\) Emmerson commented on the apparent
contradiction between the appearance of tribute bearers from Syria
with two chariot loads of gifts shown on the west wal. of the main
hall of the tomb of Huya, Akhenaten's treasury superintendent, and
the general picture of decimated Egyptian influence in greater Syria
as illustrated by the Amarna letters.\(^3\) The writer felt that the for­
mer showed some “wishful thinking,” or else indicated suppression
of information. Influenced by S. H. Langdon, Emmerson viewed the
Habiru of the Amarna Letters as true Hebrews,\(^4\) a branch of the
“Eberites” and descendents of Eber.

The concluding article\(^5\) gave even more detail of the contents
of the Amarna Letters regarding them as corroboration of the conquest
account.\(^6\) However, some of the readings suggested by the author

\(^1\)Idem, "Light from the Land of Bondage--9: The Stay at


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 11

\(^4\)Ibid., cf. Louis Herbert Gray and John Arnott MacCulloch,
ed., \textit{The Mythology of All Races}, 13 vols. (Boston: Marshall Jones
72-73.

\(^5\)W. L. Emmerson, "Light from the Land of Bondage--11: When

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 10.
(possibly based on the work of Olmstead) are not widely accepted. He refers to a certain Mut-Baal (Mut-Ba'lu), a Palestinian city ruler who was writing to Ianhamu, the Egyptian governor of Palestine, caustically suggesting that if he did not accept Mut-Baal's testimony he should "ask Benenima (Benjamin), . . . [and] ask then Iashuia (Joshua)"—whom Emmerson said—"must surely be the Israelites of those names mentioned in the Bible." Albright argued against the identification of Benelima (as he read it—hence "Son of the Gods") with Benjamin and against Ya-šu-ia as an equivalent of Joshua. Emmerson also thought that a suggestion of Marston might have some truth—that Akhenaten may have shown some sympathy to the monotheistic Israelites and therefore been loathe to intervene in their conquest of Palestine. Commenting on the collapse of the monotheistic revolution, Emmerson wrote, "Thus ended a remarkable episode in the political and religious history of Egypt, the record of which fits

---

1Ibid., cf. A. T. Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), pp. 188, 197.

2Emmerson, "Israel Invaded," p. 10.

3He did, however, accept Ayyab as identical with the Bible name Job in the same text and identified Pella as the home city of Mut-Baal. W. F. Albright, "Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley," BASOR, 89(1943):9-12. See also under EA, no. 256 in ANET, p. 486.

4Probably from Charles Marston, The Bible Is True: The Lessons of the 1925-1934 Excavations in Bible Lands Summarized and Explained (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1934; London: Religious Book Club, 1938), pp. 236-37, where he proposes that during the Amarna period "there were good religious reasons for at least a benevolent neutrality, between the Egyptians and Israelites . . . while the latter were conquering the grossly polytheistic Canaanites and Amorites."

5Emmerson, "Israel Invaded," p. 11.
perfectly into the Bible story, illuminating much that would otherwise be obscure, and corroborating in a remarkable way the accuracy of the records set down for us in the early books of the Old Testament. 1 Thus the series ended on a muted apologetic note.

Emmerson's only two articles in Our Times (IT predecessor) both dealt with Moses and the scripts which were available to him, and both were apologetic in nature. The first 2 described the battle between "orthodoxy" and the German critical school, 3 while the second discussed the three scripts available in the Egyptian sphere around the fifteenth century B.C. 4 The three scripts were Egyptian

---

1 Ibid., p. 15.
3 Emmerson told of William Gladstone's (British Prime Minister) refusal to appoint A. H. Sayce to the chair of professor of Hebrew at Oxford because he was regarded as far too critical—a champion of the skeptical views of H. Hupfeld, Abraham Kuenen, K. H. Graf, Julius Wellhausen, and Bishop J.W. Colenso. Instead, the appointment was given to S. R. Driver, who subsequently became a leading proponent of the German critical school, while Sayce became a champion of orthodoxy. According to Emmerson, the reason for Sayce's change of attitude was the discovery of the Amarna tablets which showed that writing was possible in the time of Moses, thus removing a central support from the Graf-Wellhausen theory. From his Reminiscences, Sayce was quoted as saying, "Hence forward the character and credibility of a Hebrew document must be settled not by assumptions and subjective fantasies or the ignorance of the critic, but by archaeological research." Thus Sayce assumed the chair of Assyriology at Oxford [1891-1919] from whence he continued publishing in defence of Scripture until his death in 1933 Emmerson, "Critic's Den," pp. 10-11, 15; cf. A. H. Sayce, Reminiscences (London: Macmillan & Co., 1923), pp. 213-14, 273.
hieroglyphics, Babylonian cuneiform, and the alphabetic script of Phoenicia/Palestine/Sinai.¹

In the RH for this period Emmerson published a single series of eight articles entitled "The Spade Answers the Critic." First² he set the apologetic tone for the series by describing the extreme positions of the critical school by which many OT characters were reduced to mere mythical figures whose origins were associated with Babylonian religion. He then stated that archaeology had succeeded in answering these criticisms by accurately revealing much of the real context of the biblical narratives.³ Much of what the writer claimed was true, but the optimism of this period led to overstatement—not everything was clarified or proved. Some interesting details were given, however, as the series proceeded. Emmerson reported the discovery of the ancient city of Ur⁴ and the foundation cylinder (found beneath a corner of the Ziggurat by J. E. Taylor) which mentioned Nabonidus and Belshazzar. He then discussed the


²W. L. Emmerson, "The Spade Answers the Critic: Did the Patriarchs Ever Live?" RH, September 21, 1939, p. 6.

³He commented that even the critics had gone and excavated but could not answer the evidences which they had found so it could be stated that: "Abraham and the other Old Testament patriarchs proved to be real persons, . . . " (ibid).
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question of the earliest inhabitants of Mesopotamia, giving some
evidences of early dark-skinned people as hints of the truthfulness
of Gen 10--early Hamitic settlers in the area. He also mentioned
the Deluge tablets and the old Sumerian king list (with its distinc­
tive break of continuity at the time of a great flood) as evidences
of connections with the biblical record. The third article outlined
the history of Ur with indications of its advanced culture as demon­
strated by the standard of housing in early times. Turning to the
story of Sodom and Gomorrah, the author referred to doubters and
hence stated: "It has thus again fallen to archaeology to dispel
the critical doubts and vindicate the veracity of the Bible."^ A

A notable feature mentioned from the region south of the Dead
Sea was the complete absence of habitation evidences between about
2000 B.C. and early Christian times. At the same time the region
is generally "burned out," while the southern portion of the sea is
shallow. Emmerson suggested that it "was in all probability the site

1It would appear that the editor may have inserted the head­
ing "Tenth Chapter of Genesis Confirmed," since the writer stated
a few paragraphs later that much remained to be settled and ". . .
we must wait for time again to vindicate the Scriptures and show
that the first inhabitants of the land of the Chaldees were indeed
the children of Ham" (ibid).

2Ibid., "The Spade Answers the Critic: In the Days of

3Ibid., "The Spade Answers the Critic: The Fate of Sodom

4Ibid., p. 7.

5This has been qualified in recent years, cf. Willem C.
van Hattem, "Once Again: Sodom and Gomorrah," BA 44 (1981):91-92,
but Emmerson appears to have been quoting from Melvin Grove Kyle,
Explorations at Sodom: The Story of Ancient Sodom in the Light
of the ill-fated cities.\textsuperscript{1} He also referred to the report of an officer of the Royal Air Force based in Amman who claimed to have seen ruins of a town below the surface of the water in that area.\textsuperscript{2}

The writer concluded this account with a statement of his essential position:

In every essential feature, therefore, the Bible account is substantiated, and while there are details which we cannot hope to verify, the accuracy of those points which we have been able to test makes it reasonable to receive with confidence the whole account.

Abraham and Lot were very clearly not mythical figures as the Wellhausen school so confidently asserted a few decades ago. They were characters as real as you and I, and the modern science of Biblical archeology has proved the accounts of their lives and experiences to be trustworthy down to the very smallest details.\textsuperscript{3}

The fifth article\textsuperscript{4} took up Garstang's excavations and interpretations at Jericho, stressing the thoroughness of the burning and the fact that food stores had not been touched by the victors (Josh 6:17-18), while the sixth\textsuperscript{5} spoke of Exodus and Conquest evidences from Egypt.\textsuperscript{6} Emmerson was right up-to-date in his

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{1}] Emmerson, "Fate of Sodom," p. 7.
  \item[\textsuperscript{2}] With the water level today reduced by irrigation in the north, the likelihood of this story is generally doubted.
  \item[\textsuperscript{3}] Ibid., p. 20.
  \item[\textsuperscript{4}] Idem, "The Spade Answers the Critic: Voices from the Dust: up Bible History in Old Jericho," RH, November 2, 1939, pp. 12, 18.
  \item[\textsuperscript{5}] Idem, "The Spade Answers the Critic: Archaeology and the Exodus: Findings in Egypt and Palestine Corroborate the Bible Story," RH, December 7, 1939, pp. 10, 11.
  \item[\textsuperscript{6}] The equating of Abdi-Khiba, King of Jerusalem in the Amarna tablets, with Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem in Josh 10:1, 3, is not convincing.
\end{itemize}
reporting of the Lachish excavations, for he wrote of the new ostraca, of the double walls of Rehoboam, and of the various relics of the Assyrian attack such as a bronze helmet crest, iron arrowheads, and scale armor fragments. He accepted the older (Starkey's) explanation of the two destruction levels III and II applying them to the two Nebuchadnezzar attacks of 597 B.C. and 588-586 B.C. Apparently he saw no problem in the 3000 B.C.


2 There appears to have been three phases of dating interpretation. At first Starkey and Torczyner gave the approximate dating of the ostraca as late in the reign of Jehoiakim, "about 597 B.C." (J. W. Jack, "The Lachish Letters: Their Date and Import: An Examination of Professor Torczyner's View," PEQ, 70 [1938]:168-70; J. L. Starkey, "Excavations at Tell El Duweir 1934-1935," PEQOS 67 [1935]:205; Torczyner, Lachish I, p. 68). Starkey all along saw the two destructions as 598/597 B.C. and 588 B.C. (J. L. Starkey, "Lachish as Illustrating Bible History," PEQOS, 69[1937]:176).

A second phase saw virtual unanimity with identification of Level III destruction in 597 B.C. (Jack uncertain of this), and destruction of Level II in 588/586 B.C., with the ostraca dated to about 588 B.C. (Torczyner, Lachish I, pp. 68-72; Jack, "Torczyner's View," pp. 168-72; Albright, "Re-examination," p. 16). For more extensive bibliography of the early discussions, see W. F. Albright, "The Lachish Letters after Five Years," BASOR 82 (1941):18-24. Torczyner's earliest views were published in the Bialik Memorial Volume (Kenëset le-zëkker, H. N. Bialik, Tel Aviv, 5696), in modern Hebrew, referred to by Albright in BASOR 62 (1936):11; and BASOR 82 (1941):18. The third phase has shown Olga Tufnell supported by L. H. Vincent, Y. Aharoni, and Ruth Amiran today denying this interpretation, linking Level III destruction with Sennacherib and Level II with Nebuchadnezzar's 588-586 B.C. campaign (Olga Tufnell, "Lachish," EAEHL, 3:745; idem, Lachish III [Tell ed-Duweir]: The Iron Age, with contributions by Margaret A. Murray and David Diringer [London: Oxford University Press, 1953], pp. 56-57). Tufnell's evidences include an intermediate ash layer in Level II, which she took as representing 597 B.C., and pottery typology, and are neatly summarized by David Ussishkin ("The Destruction of Lachish by Sennacherib and the dating of the Royal Judean Storage Jars," Tel Aviv 4 [1977]:32). Initial reaction to this new interpretation included its rejection by G. E. Wright (review of Lachish III, by Tufnell, in VT 5 [1955]:100-104) and less dogmatically by W. F. Albright ("Some Recent Publications," BASOR 132 [1953]:46), and
dating suggested by the excavators for the largest city to occupy
the mound. 1 The remainder of the Lachish ostraca were featured
in the last article of this series, with emphasis on Ostracon
III. 2 Emmerson identified the prophet Urijah (Jer 26:21-23) with
the unnamed prophet in this letter, probably from having read
Torczyner (Tur Sinai). 3 It is clear that Emmerson regarded these
letters as a capstone of biblical confirmation.

In the Ministry Emmerson gave a practical evaluation of
the need for evangelists to present materials that would build
faith in Scripture. 4 He observed that "the preacher today must
invoke the evidential method of approach" 5 because of the preva­
ience of skepticism. Since these evidences deal with the intel­
lect, they are no substitute for the Gospel which appeals to the
heart and the will, but

... they are able to lead the unbeliever to the thresh­
old of faith. They show that the Christian is not a
victim of blind credulity against the evidence of his
senses. They demonstrate, on the contrary, that faith

Briggs W. Buchanan (review of Lachish III, by Tufnell, in AJA 58
[1954]:335-37). As pointed out by William H. Shea ("Nebuchadnezzar's
Chronicles and the Date of the Destruction of Lachish III," PEQ
111 [1979]:113-16), recent excavation has added support to
Tufnell's view, while Shea adds his own literary and chronological
support.

1Emmerson, "Lachish Identified," p. 16.
2W. L. Emmerson, "The Spade Answers the Critic: Remarkable
3Toryzyner, Lachish I, pp. 168-72.
4W. L. Emmerson, "Christian Evidences in Evangelism,"
Ministry, April 1939, pp. 9-10, 45.
5Ibid., p. 9.
is eminently reasonable, and in harmony with the most recent scientific investigations.

It is only with the latter point that we might disagree, since faith will not always be able to agree with scientific investigations which may on occasion be mistaken in premise, methodology, or interpretation of results. Several of the guidelines given by the author for application to all Christian evidences remain relevant and helpful for archaeological usage. (1) Master the facts and state them accurately. (2) Be positive—showing that "the Bible is right, rather than that the critic is wrong." (3) Simplify technical language in accordance with the specific audience.  

Emmerson's second article in the Ministry was essentially the same as that published by him during this same month in the ST.  

The final article in this magazine was biographical. Although giving a brief survey of Petrie's life and achievements,  

---

1 Ibid., p. 10. The types of Christian evidences which he included in addition to archaeology were prophetic fulfillments and creationistic science—opposing biological evolution. We note that he gave no counsel on procedure in cases where such evidences appear to disagree with Scripture.  

2 Ibid. Though some of his own titles may be seen as somewhat negative, as "The Spade Answers the Critic . . ." series in RH, September 21-December 21, 1939; and "An 'Iron' Nail in the Critics' Coffin," Ministry, December 1940, p. 12, we must remember that the author may not have been responsible for these titles and that the content material was often milder in note.  

3 Ibid.  

4 See p. 129.  

even here there was an apologetic note in the statement that "no excavator has done more to confirm by his 'finds' the trustworthiness of the Old Testament narrative." The two major contributions attributed to Petrie were his recognition of the significance of pottery fragments for establishing or illustrating chronological sequence, and his recognition of the Middle-eastern mounds or tells as constituted of successive layers representing successive cities or levels of habitation. Emmerson observed that this discovery had enabled innumerable confirmations of the Bible as at Jericho, Lachish, and Ur.

In his book The Bible Speaks Emmerson briefly summarized some of the archaeological data from his years of reading and writing as evidences of the reliability of Scripture. He also listed a few of his favorite authors on the subject as sources for further reading.

As we conclude this survey of the larger proportion of Emmerson's American publications, we must admire his enthusiasm in utilizing this subject with which he had become acquainted by his own initiative. The element of confirmation or apologetic is clearly

1Ibid., p. 17.
2In Israel a tel and in Arabic-speaking areas a tell.
3Ibid.
5These were mainly outstanding scholars including A. H. Sayce, Frederick Kenyon, R. P. Dougherty, William M. Ramsay, and J. Garstang.
6More follows in the two succeeding periods.
evident (in about half of these articles, though often a minor element in the ST articles), though only in about a third does it constitute the major thrust of the article. More frequently as he recorded his Bible-land journeys the author was content to reconstruct as much as possible of the Bible context, with an occasional attempt to specifically assist in interpreting a passage of Scripture.

W. A. Spicer

William Ambrose Spicer (1865-1952) gained wide experience in administrative and mission service, culminating in appointment as General Conference president (1922-1930) and general field secretary (1930-1940). Although he officially retired in 1940 he remained an associate editor of the RH until a few weeks before his death in 1952.¹ His main qualifications for writing on archaeology appear to have been his love for the subject and frequent visits to museums and learned convocations.²

Spicer's first archaeological article³ in the ST for this

¹He was an associate editor (or editor 1909-1911, 1945) of the RH from May 1902 to August 1952.


³W. A. Spicer, "Ancient Dust Heaps Speak," ST, January 16, 1940, pp. 4-5.
period was clearly apologetic, but in a homiletic vein and without much archaeological detail (he was seventy-five years of age). It did contain a testimony to the rich materials (available in the great museums) which support Scripture (such as Sennacherib's boasts concerning Jerusalem), and it proclaimed archaeology to be a bulwark against unbelief. Six years later in a series of three articles he wrote of the providential nature and timing of archaeological finds in these days of skepticism. As in the previous article, he recalled having met Hormuzd Rassam in the British Museum in London.\footnote{Idem, "Buried Records Speak Again," ST, October 8, 1946, p. 5. This meeting apparently occurred about 7890.}

He reported on Rassam's discovery of Cyrus' "burnt clay cylinder" which described the capture of Babylon,\footnote{Ibid. Presumably this is the "Cyrus Cylinder," cf. Thomas, Documents, pp. 92-94.} and also wrote concerning the library of Ashurbanipal, but he appears to have confused the latter with Ashurnasirpal II (884-859 B.C.) for he described him as having lived "almost two centuries before Sennacherib."\footnote{Spicer, "Buried Records," p. 5, whereas Ashurbanipal (669-627? B.C.) was actually the grandson of Sennacherib. This was apparently only a slip because A. H. Sayce whom he quoted ("Nineveh, Library of," The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia [1939], 4:215) does not have the facts confused.}

Next Spicer recalled the marvels of Babylon recovered by Koldewey,\footnote{W. A. Spicer, "The Lordly Lions of Babylon," ST, October 15, 1956, pp. 5, 11.} but this time he used the antiquities as a means of restoring the context of Daniel.\footnote{Ibid., p. 11.} Concluding his short series, Spicer
wrote further concerning Babylon featuring Belshazzar's banquet hall, and combining archaeological description with Scripture passages to make a homiletic application on personal accountability.  

Spicer's other archaeological compositions were *RH* editorials. In 1941 he contrasted the Hebrew and Babylonian perception of the sun. His aim was apologetic in the sense that he attempted to show that Scripture gave the original story of origins, and that the Babylonians retained only faint recollections of the original story. In the context of discussion of the significance of the date 1844, Spicer wrote to demonstrate the archaeological significance of that date. A modern addition to the Behistun Rock inscription of Darius I reads "H. C. Rawlinson, 1844." Apparently it was carved there by Rawlinson as he proceeded with the copying of the inscription. Spicer linked the original decrees of [Cyrus], Darius, and Artaxerxes (Ezra 6:14, etc.) with the

---

1 Idem, "Could These Stones Speak!" *ST*, October 22, 1946, pp. 2-3.


4 He began work on the Old Persian portion of the inscription in 1835 while stationed at Kermanshah, and after interruption caused by the Afghan War, he was able to return to Behistun in 1844 to copy and attempt decipherment of the Babylonian portion. In that year (actually in one week) he copied the remainder of the Persian, all of the Elamite and the accessible portions of the Babylonian inscriptions. In 1847, with the help of a Kurdish boy, he copied the remainder of the Babylonian inscription and proceeded with its decipherment. His translation appeared in 1851 (Arthur John Booth, *The Discovery and Decipherment of the Trilingual Cuneiform Inscriptions* [London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902], pp. 108-14.)
commencement date of the great time prophecy of Dan 8:14, and thus seeing 1844 as the conclusion of that prophecy he was greatly impressed that the name of Darius and the languages of his inscription should be so prominent in that very year.\(^1\) The writer was much disturbed by the tendency of some scholars to equate Danel of the Ugaritic [Aqht legend] tablets with the Daniel of Ezek 14:14,\(^2\) thus detracting from support for a renowned Daniel contemporary with Ezekiel. He saw this as a deliberate attack upon the prophetic book of Daniel and deplored the subjectivity of its approach.

The next of these editorials\(^3\) gave a rather vague and non-professional description (first-hand description by a friend) of the "Tower of Babel" which seems to have been referring to the mound known as Babil or Babel to the north of the city of Babylon (thought now to have been Nebuchadnezzar's summer palace) or else to the Temple of Marduk in the heart of the city (within the Esagila enclosure).\(^4\) He also mentioned a twelfth-century witness, Benjamin of

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 3, cf. Francis D. Nichol, ed., SDA Bible Commen-


\(^4\)Today the most popular candidate for the Tower of Babel within the environs of the old city of Babylon is the ziggurat known as Elemenanki (the foundation stone of heaven and earth) of which only the foundations now remain. See "Babel," SDA Bible Dictionary
Tudela, whose description was rather similar.\(^1\) The object of the editorial was apologetic, attempting to show the accuracy of the Bible in depicting the origin of the tower (Gen 11:19). Spicer also wrote of the tithes and offerings brought to the gods in ancient times and reasoned that these contributions reveal perversions or relics of the practices originally instituted by God.\(^2\) Quoting Yale professor R. P. Dougherty he observed that Belshazzar paid a tithe to the temple treasurer.\(^3\) In the last of this sequence of editorials,\(^4\) the author wrote a polemic against idolatry, especially featuring processions where idols are carried. His emphasis was upon the ancient processions of this type (Babylonian) using archaeology to illustrate [Isa 46:1, 2], and then he drew modern parallels to the practice, ending on a polemical and homiletic note.

Spicer showed a strong concern for apologetics with five of

---

\(^1\)Spicer, "Bricks of Babel," p. 6. Both descriptions mentioned some melting or fusing of materials.


\(^3\)Ibid., cf. Raymond Philip Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar: A Study of Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, Yale Oriental Series: Researches, vol. 15 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), where the comment was made that the wording of the texts indicates that the tithe was paid yearly and that careful records were kept.

these ten articles being predominantly aimed at archaeological
defence of Scripture. In particular he emphasized that the Bible
is the source of reliable explanations of origins. He read widely
and consulted reputable sources for most of his archaeological data,
but there are a few understandable indications of declining scholar­
ship at his advanced age.¹

James C. Muir

James Cecil Muir worked with the University of Pennsylvania
in Philadelphia in the 1930s and 1940s.² He wrote articles for the
Philadelphia Evening Bulletin (newspaper) during this period and
these articles are understood to have formed the basis of the four
books which he published.³ Each of the books dealt with the back­
ground and context of Scripture using archaeological data, but only
the third, The Spade and the Scriptures, had an obvious apologetic
purpose.⁴

The Watchman published ten articles from the pen of Muir
between 1937 and 1941. The first two reveal an apologetic approach

¹ Specifically, two or three factual or reference errors,
and what appears at times to be a tendency to ramble.
² See pp. 70-71.
³ Edwin B. Chatfield, editor, National Publishing Co.,
Philadelphia, Penn., to Lloyd A. Willis, October 26, 1981.
⁴ James C. Muir, His Truth Endureth: A Survey of the Begin­
nings and of Old Testament History in the Light of Archaeological
Discoveries (Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1937); idem,
Business Men of the Bible: A Study of the Advance Agents of Trade
and Commerce (Philadelphia: National Publishing Co., 1938); idem,
The Spade and the Scriptures (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1940);
Idem, How Firm a Foundation: A Survey of the New Testament and
the Birth and Establishment of Christianity in the Light of Archae­
ology and Secular History (Philadelphia: National Publishing Co.,
1941).
with the archaeology of Jericho used to support the Joshua narrative\(^1\) and the excavation at Beth-shean used to illustrate Philistine expansion in the period after Joshua's limited contact with them (Josh 13:3).\(^2\) The latter also referred to other archaeological data such as Philistine temple designs which he claimed have helped to confirm the story of Samson's death.\(^3\) In the third article,\(^4\) Muir's uncertainty over the Exodus date may be reflected in his reference to Garstang's survey of Ai (et-Tell) having revealed an eighteenth- to fourteenth-century habitation of the site.\(^5\) His claim that evidences of "infant sacrifice have been found by excavators at many sites in Palestine, including Jericho,"\(^6\) is still in need of adequate substantiation today.

Muir next turned to Beth-shan for enrichment and confirmation in regard to the story of Saul's death.\(^7\) He noted that probably for the first time two temples specifically mentioned in Scripture

\(^1\) Idem, "The Gateway of Palestine," Watchman, January 1937, pp. 4-5. Here the Exodus was linked to the time of "the feeble Ramesids," whereas in his book (Muir, Truth Endureth, pp. 64, 74), he was non-committal on the date though apparently leaning toward a thirteenth-century date on the basis of Exod 1:11.


\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 5, 17.


\(^5\) Ibid., p. 7; cf. J. A. Calloway, "Ai," EAEHL 1:37-58, for a brief report on Garstang's soundings and presentation of the later excavations which indicate a habitation gap in MB and LB.


\(^7\) Idem, "The Last Days of Saul," Watchman, August 1937, pp. 4, 18.
from the same town have been identified,\(^1\) namely--"the house of Ashtoroth (1 Sam 31:10)" and the "Temple of Dagon (1 Chron 10:10)."\(^2\)

A series of four articles in 1940 proposed to demonstrate that Christianity was a prime agent in the advancement of civilization, and in the first installment\(^3\) Muir used archaeology to show that in non-Christian civilizations such as the Egyptian there was decline rather than continued progress.

In the successive articles the author used archaeology to illustrate the Roman world as the context of the NT,\(^4\) to illuminate the reign of Herod the Great,\(^5\) and to show the historical accuracy of Luke the Gospel writer.\(^6\) In 1941 Muir wrote "A Journey to Jerusalem"\(^7\) describing the setting of Christ's journey from Nazareth to Jerusalem without giving archaeological emphasis, though mentioning that Ain Farah was probably the original setting for the Shepherd

\(^1\) By the University Museum of Pennsylvania excavations, 1921-1933, cf. F. James, "Beth-shean," EAEHL, 1:209-10.

\(^2\) Muir, "Days of Saul," p. 18.


\(^6\) Idem, "Caesar Augustus," Watchman, October 1940, pp. 6-7. The archaeological data consisted mainly of papyri fragments which have helped clarify Roman practices with regard to taxation.

\(^7\) Watchman, February 1941, pp. 5, 7, 17, 18.
Psalm. His last article derived tax categories and collection practices from the Faiyum papyri of Egypt.

Of these ten articles five had a clear apologetic purpose, while the others gave more emphasis to context and background of Scripture. His conservative positions and informed presentations apparently had considerable appeal for SDAs.

Roy F. Cottrell

Roy Franklin Cottrell (1878-1970) gave more than sixty years service to the SDA church. He contributed predominantly as a writer and pastor both in China (1908-1919) and California. He had a particular affinity for archaeology, seeing it as a defense of Scripture in the light of modern criticism. For the period under consideration he wrote nine articles and a booklet on archaeological themes.

In the ST he first wrote an article on Babylon which used

1 Ibid., pp. 7, 18.
3 He mentioned poll tax, property tax, excise tax, temple tax, sales tax, bath tax, and a probable occupational tax (one source mentioned a special tax paid by a "horse doctor"), ibid., p. 7.
4 A close association with the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania is especially evident in the details he gave concerning Beth-shean.
5 See also comments on pp. 70-71.
archaeological data from reputable though old sources\(^1\) to demonstrate
the accuracy of the OT portrayal of Nebuchadnezzar's city. He then
drew a specific parallel between that city and empire and modern
Rome, the "seven-hilled city by the Tiber" (by which he meant Roman
Catholicism), warning against modern forms of paganism and idolatry.\(^2\)

Another article\(^3\) was apologetic in the sense that it used
archaeology to show that Bible prophecies had been fulfilled—speci-
fically concerning Tyre, Babylon, and Jerusalem—but again quoting
nineteenth-century authors.\(^4\) Cottrell also wrote an article\(^5\) in
which he assembled a list of archaeological evidences (mainly from
Palestine) of the reliability of Scripture, and on the whole, des-
cribed them rather accurately. However, he definitely gave the

\(^1\) Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. Agnes
S. Johns (London: Macmillan & Co., 1913); A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light
from the Ancient Monuments: A Sketch of the Most Striking Confirma-
tions of the Bible from Recent Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine,
Assyria, Babylonia, Asia Minor, 7th ed., By-Paths of Bible Knowledge,
no. 2 ([London]: Religious Tract Society, 1892).


\(^3\) Idem, "Prophecy Speaks: And Cities Fall," *ST*, January 9,
1940, pp. 8-10.

\(^4\) George Rawlinson and Uriah Smith, and in the latter case
(where the author was certainly not an archaeological authority)
a revised edition with corrections of this quoted Babylonian material
appeared only four years later. Uriah Smith, *Daniel and the Reve-
lation: The Response of History to the Voice of Prophecy: A Verse
by Verse Study of These Important Books of the Bible* (Battle Creek,
Mich.: Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1897; Mountain View,
Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1907), pp. 47-49;
(Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1944),
pp. 42-43.

\(^5\) Roy F. Cottrell, "The Jews of Palestine--2: Voices from
impression that the Ras Shamra site and its tablets pertained to the Hittite civilization\(^1\) and did not mention Ugarit or Ugaritic at all.

His only article\(^2\) which dealt with archaeology which was published in the Watchman was a reworked version of his 1937 ST article. Archaeological usage was identical, including the same quotations, but there was more variation in the treatment of Catholicism.\(^3\)

Cottrell's RH contributions began with a discussion of the origins of sun-worship,\(^4\) which was basically historical in nature. The only archaeological data consisted of references to sun worship in ancient civilizations and these were taken from general reference works. The author wrote a series of four articles in 1946 in which he supported the Bible from archaeology.\(^5\) His introductory discourse spoke particularly of the finds (Rosetta stone and Behistun rock) which enabled the unlocking of the ANE scripts and then also of the Moabite stone and the Amarna letters. He stated that from the many discoveries "... the critics have been rebuked and silenced; while the historical accuracy of the Book, including innumerable details,

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 4-5.
\(^3\)Ibid., "Two Babylons," pp. 12-14.
has been marvellously authenticated. The second article attempted
to gather evidences from the world of Abraham and Moses as well as
referring to myths of origins from Sumer and Babylon, while in the
following article he largely featured Palestinian finds. Reference
to the walls of Jericho and the charred remains associated with them
are puzzling, for he dated these remains to about 1411 B.C., whereas
in the previous article he seems to have accepted Ramses II as the
Pharaoh of the Exodus. Finally Cottrell wrote emphasizing that
the ruins of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon have helped vindicate Scripture
as a whole, the book of Daniel in particular.

Two booklets published by Cottrell in 1947 are relevant to
our study. The first was primarily concerned with the current Zionist
movement and Christian debates on the related topics of "British
Israelism" and "Pyramid Predictions." On both of these topics he

1Ibid., p. 7. He acknowledged dependence upon the follow­
ing works for this series: Muir, Truth Endureth, and idem, Firm
Foundation; Prescott, Spade and the Bible; George A. Barton, Archaeo­
logy and the Bible, 7th rev. ed. (Philadelphia: American Sunday­
School Union, 1937); J. A. Hammerton, Wonders of the Past: A World­
wide Survey of the Marvellous Works of Man in Ancient Times Written
by the Leading Modern Authorities, 2 vols., new ed. (New York:
Wise & Co., 1941).

2Roy F. Cottrell, "Our Grand Old Bible--No. 2: Living Testi­

3Idem, "Our Grand Old Bible--No. 3: Ancient Dust Heaps

4Ibid., p. 9.


6Idem, "Our Grand Old Bible--No. 4: Voices from Babylon

7Idem, The Jews and Palestine (Mountain View, Calif.:
attempted to show false and non-Scriptural premises, in the latter case by giving an archaeologically oriented description of the Great Pyramid (which he stated gives no hint of fantastic prophetic intent). An earlier chapter was much more specifically devoted to archaeology and gave a series of examples of its testimony to the accuracy of the OT. However, it was essentially identical with the SJ article already mentioned and repeated the apparent Ras Shamra-Hittite identification.

The second book in spite of its title, was only partly archaeological and that part consisted mainly of magazine articles already discussed here (including the same "Hittite--Ras Shamra" data). A section not noted elsewhere described the discovery by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt of numerous papyri, including many in Koine Greek. They were found in rubbish heaps at Oxyrhynchus (modern Behnesa) and as stuffing in mummified crocodiles in a cemetery at Umm el-Baraqat in the south-west of the Faiyum.

---

1He showed that the Pyramid Predictions depended upon the capricious use of subjective formulae, with re-interpretations as necessary--so that (to illustrate) 1936 instead of ushering in a "millennium of peace" ushered in a period (1936-1953) of terrible conflict (ibid., pp. 80-82). Another calculation he stated was based upon the product of 153 (the fish caught by Christ's disciples) and the number twelve (Cottrell observed that it had been forgotten that Judas was already dead so that the number should have been eleven) to give 1836 [inches?]--the length of the grand gallery and therefore the "fishing period" of the disciples (ibid., pp. 82-83).

2Ibid., "Jews of Palestine--No. 2."


4Ibid., p. 23.

5Ibid., pp. 26-29. Cottrell described the project as taking place simply "in the Nile valley south of Cairo" (ibid., p. 26),
Cottrell's use of archaeology was predominantly apologetic with six of nine articles explicitly so, and two others partially apologetic and partially polemical (opposing Catholicism). The other article was more historical-theological (concerning Sunday-worship). Both books contained apologetic applications of archaeology. Unfortunately the author's work at times revealed a paucity of background in the area, and he often depended on rather outdated sources.

Taylor G. Bunch

Taylor Grant Bunch (1885-1969) from Myrtle Point, Oregon, graduated from law school and then trained for the ministry. Subsequently his service included the broad spectrum from pastor and evangelist to writer, executive, and educator. He published about twenty books and numerous articles.

His contributions on archaeology consisted mainly of a single series of six articles in the ST in 1940. He described with some drama the suspense as critics and conservative Christians awaited the unlocking of the inscription materials made possible by the Behistun rock and Rosetta stone. "The skeptics were confident that the Bible records would utterly fail under modern research. The Christians were just as confident that their faith was founded on facts, and they fearlessly awaited the consequences of the crucial

but see Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and David G. Hogarth, Fayum Towns and Their Papyri, Egypt Exploration Fund, Greco-Roman Branch (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1900), pp. 21-22.

As a conference president he served in Southern Oregon, Idaho, and Michigan, and while pastoring the Sligo Church in Takoma Park, Maryland, he also taught at the SDA Theological Seminary and at Columbia Union College.

Taylor G. Bunch, "The Stones Cry Out: Sacred History Marvellously Vindicated by Archaeology," ST, October 1, 1940, pp. 8-11.
The results as interpreted by Bunch were "... the verification of Old Testament history and the silencing of its enemies." He quoted others who were a little less sweeping in their statements and then cited Albright: "Innumerable obscurities have been cleared up, and nothing tending to disturb the religious faith of the Jew or Christian has been discovered." The author proceeded to describe evidences from Assyria which reflect upon the biblical narrative, but his application of Heb 2:11 where it was declared that "the stone shall cry out of the wall" to archaeological testimony may be questioned. However, he made the application by stating that "... the very stones in the temples and walls of ancient cities are breaking the silence of millenniums, and speaking to the modern world in defense of the Biblical records." Generally speaking, Bunch used long quotations from reputable sources as he recounted the revelations of the ancient city of Nineveh, especially concerning the library of Ashurbanipal and the palace and inscriptions of

1 Ibid., p. 9.
2 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p. 8.
6 Even the National Geographic Magazine article, "Pushing Back History's Horizon: How the Pick and Shovel Are Revealing Civilizations that Were Ancient When Israel Was Young," February 1916, pp. 162-210, was written by Yale professor of Assyriology and Babylonian Literature, Albert T. Clay.
Sennacherib. In his third article\(^1\) Bunch wrote of the criticisms directed at the book of Daniel and optimistically stated that "... modern science has erased these questions and silenced the critics."\(^2\) He also emphasized the advanced state of Old Babylonian civilization as a confirmation of the Abrahamic story and referred to the ziggurat [the E-zida] at Borsippa as the tower of Babel.\(^3\) When he turned to the Exodus theme,\(^4\) Bunch's dependence upon a large number of varied sources involved him in a contradiction. He quoted various authors concerning bricks and building methods at Pithom\(^5\) in the time of Ramses II as evidence of the Exodus context, and spoke of the name "Israel" as preserved on the monument of the "Pharaoh of the Exodus" (presumably referring to Merneptah son of Ramses II

\(^1\) Taylor G. Bunch, "The Spade Confirms the Book" ST, October 15, 1940, pp. 8-9, 13-14.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 8, 14.

\(^4\) Idem, "Bible History Confirmed," ST, October 22, 1940, pp. 8-9, 14-15.

\(^5\) The identification of these eastern delta cities has been much debated with Raamses/Avaris having been suggested as Tell el-Maskhuteh (Lepsius), Tell er-Resaba (Petrie), San or San el Hejar (Montet), and Tell ed-Dab'a at Qantir (Bietak, Hamza, W. C. Hayes, van Seters, Uphill, Shea). The latter now seems the most likely. In turn Pithom has been identified with Tell el-Maskhuteh (Naville) and Tell er-Resaba (Gardner). Tell el-Maskhuteh is now more frequently thought of as Succoth ("Pithom [Pi-tum]"), Biblical World, pp. 458-59, "Raamses (Tanis Zoan)," ibid., p. 472; Manfred Bietak, Tel el-Dab'a II: Der Fundort in Rahmen einer archaeologisch-geographischen Untersuchung über das ägyptische Ostdelta (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975), pp. 23-32; Shea, "Ancient Near Eastern History," pp. 29-30. Here Bunch was apparently using Naville's identification of Pithom, and the evidence does at least illustrate the general Egyptian practice in brickmaking.
and the Merneptah stele. However, Bunch then proceeded to affirm a fifteenth-century date for the Exodus and to defend the identification of Hatshepsut with the adoptive mother of Moses. This would appear to be a case where the writer did not see the conflict in his data and therefore attempted to use the evidence from both (contradictory) theories in order to support the Bible! The next article opened with an interesting statement by Simon Greenleaf (Harvard professor of law). He maintained that the biblical narrative stands credible until proved otherwise and rebuked Christians for being so much on the defensive. Bunch agreed, but (in effect) stated that since we have the evidence we might as well use it. Various ancient versions of the Garden of Eden story and the Fall were discussed in this light. Finally, the writer examined the ancient Flood legends, interpreting them as evidences for the worldwide Flood of Noah. He also used the eight feet of flood sediment found by Woolley at Ur as an additional evidence although it has since been recognized as indication of a local flood. Most puzzling

---

1 The Merneptah stele might have been used to support the fifteenth-century Exodus date, but the article quoted did not do so.

2 Taylor G. Bunch, "Was There a Paradise on Earth?" ST, October 29, 1940, pp. 8-9.

3 Ibid., p. 8.

4 Idem, "Was There a Universal Flood?" ST, November 5, 1940, pp. 8-9.

is the reference to a tablet deciphered by "Dr. Romanoff of Yale University" which told of a flood which resulted from heavy rains and the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep."¹ No other source was given, but this appears to be a reference to an article² by Paul Romanoff of New Haven, Connecticut. In the article he had analyzed the Flood account of Genesis and suggested a third source (M) in addition to J and P.³ It would seem that Bunch had misunderstood or been misinformed concerning a "tablet."

The efforts to utilize archaeology in biblical studies as made by Bunch were not altogether successful largely because of his inadequate background in this area. All six of his articles were almost exclusively apologetic in their archaeological usage.

F. D. Nichol

Francis David Nichol (1897-1966) was born in Australia but grew up in the U.S.A.⁴ After a brief period in pastoring he was asked to do editorial work and remained in that line of work for the rest of his life.⁵ Possibly his greatest contribution to the

---

¹Bunch, "Universal Flood?" p. 8.
³That is, he was merely suggesting a variation of pentaeteuchal source criticism.
⁴When he was eight years old his parents moved from New South Wales to Loma Linda, Calif. ("Nichol, Francis David," SDA Encyclopedia [1976], 10:974; Miriam Wood and Kenneth H. Wood, His Initials were F. D. N. [Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1967], pp. 35-40).
⁵As an associate editor of the ST (1921-1927), associate editor of the RH (1929-1945), and as editor of the RH (1945-1966).
church was the editing of the SDA Bible Commentary set. Nichol made a memorable trip to the Bible lands in 1947, and his five informative reports were written in the Middle East and sent to the RH as "editorial correspondence."

The travelogue style of these RH articles took in the progress of the SDA church in the various countries visited but gave major attention to an overall portrait of each country including its biblical and archaeological connections (with an occasional short homiletic excursus). The first two articles featured a glimpse of Greece (especially the Parthenon and Mars' Hill), Egypt (with a little emphasis on Luxor and a noncommittal statement on the Pharaoh of the Exodus), and Palestine. The portrayal of pre-partition Palestine is most interesting historically, though few archaeological details were given. Nichol was impressed by the archaeological evidence (which he did not specify) which he felt favored the identifications given to the "garden tomb" and the suggested Golgotha site north of the Damascus Gate. The journey from Jerusalem to Damascus via Samaria and Galilee was described with only brief archaeological comment and the same was true of the visits to Baghdad, Mosul, and Nineveh. The series closed with Nichol's descriptions of his visits

---

1 Francis D. Nichol, editorial correspondence, "From Mars' Hill to the Land of the Pharaohs," RH, October 2, 1947, pp. 5-7; idem, "Palestine--Land of Contrasts and Conflicts," RH, October 9, 1947, pp. 4-5.

2 Ibid., p. 5.

3 Ibid., p. 5.

to Iran\(^1\) where he was particularly impressed with the Archaemenid ruins at Persepolis and Pasargadae and with the tombs at Naqsh-i Rustam,\(^2\) and to Egypt once more\(^3\) on his way back to Europe. This time he gave a few details of the Faiyum area and of the Greek manuscripts found there.\(^4\)

This series is indicative of one who was sufficiently interested in archaeology to undertake a journey to the Near East but as a non-expert who recognized his limitations and was content to leave details and controversial discussion to experts. The archaeological elements present appear to indicate a blend of contextual and background usage with small elements of exegetical and apologetic application.

\(^1\)Idem, editorial correspondence, "In the Land of Queen Esther," RH, October 23, 1947, pp. 5-6.

\(^2\)He was able to climb into the tomb of Darius I with the help of a long ladder. This tomb, No. I, is actually the third from the left at Naqsh-i Rustam; Tomb No. II (probably Xerxes) is to the right of Darius I; Tomb No. III (Artaxerxes I?) is second from the left; and tomb No. IV (Darius II?) is on the far left.

Back at Persepolis, when facing the mountain outcrop (east), the middle or "Scuth Tomb" is No. V (Artaxerxes II?), to the left is the North Tomb" No. VI (Artaxerxes III?) and to the far right is the "Unfinisned Tomb" No. VII (Darius III?). Erich F. Schmidt, Persepolis II: The Royal Tombs and Other Monuments. Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 70 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 7, 9, figs. 1 and 2, pp. 80-107.

\(^3\)F. D. Nichol, editorial correspondence, "From Cairo to London," RH, November 13, 1947, pp. 3-4.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 3.
Benjamin Franklin Allen (1885-1960) was a graduate of the University of Arkansas. He taught for some time and then after taking a law degree entered politics. He became assistant secretary of state for Arkansas, and during World War I rose to the rank of Captain and Judge Advocate. He became an SDA in 1926 and, having a special interest in geology, was one of the founders of the Pre-deluge Society.

Allen wrote three articles for the ST in defense of the Flood narrative of Genesis. His first presentation was essentially a discussion of the flood evidences from Ur. He wrote of the pre-flood settlements at Ur and Al-Ubaid, but was dubious about the clay deposit being adequate evidence for Noah’s Flood. In addition he claimed that the flood legends (written and oral) demanded more basis than large local floods as claimed by Woolley. Allen did concede that Woolley’s date of 3500 B.C. for the flood was close to an approximate 3600 B.C. date for the Flood based on the LXX (and Syriac). He gave much emphasis to the Flood because he reasoned

---

1He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the Fayetteville Campus in 1912. No major area is listed in the records, but there was a strong emphasis in both German and History (Paul S. Eddy, Registrar, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, to Lloyd A. Willis, January 20, 1982).


3Benjamin Franklin Allen, "Did Noah's Flood Really Happen?" ST, January 2, 1940, pp. 6-7, 10, 14.

4Printed as "Ubiad" in this article.

5Ibid., p. 7.
that "... if it actually happened, its remains, its burials, its overwhelming effects on the whole surface of the earth, its human, animal, and plant fossils, would be capable of positive proof" (italics his). He also very tentatively suggested that Gen 2:10-14, by omitting any locality for the Euphrates, may be implying that the river was in the same locality before and after the Flood, and if that were the case then evidence of a relatively mild flood in the Euphrates area would indicate a miraculous preservation of that locality, would give some indication of the original location of the Garden of Eden, and would make the pre-flood artifacts intriguingly interesting. Allen's second article gave the basic facts concerning the Flood tablets from Ashurbanipal's library, but he curiously gave as his leading source Atlantis by Ignatius Donnelly. Allen also discussed stories of ark remains on Ararat.

1Ibid., p. 14.

2Ibid. Though reserving judgment on several questions this article was generally better informed than that by Bunch, "Universal Flood," pp. 7-8; cf. p. 165.

3Benjamin Franklin Allen, "Flood Story Confirmed," ST, January 9, 1940, pp. 6-7, 14.

4New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882, pp. 75-81, 439. This writer though well educated and successful in politics (Minnesota Republican in Congress 1863-1869, James Grant Wilson and John Fiske, eds. Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography, 5 vols. [New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1887], 2:201) might be regarded as more speculative than scientific. He not only attempted to prove the existence of Atlantis but also wrote another work, Ragnarok: The Age of Fire and Gravel (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1885), in which he attempted to prove that deposits of gravel, clay, and rock were the result of contacts between earth and a planet. This book also referred to the Mesopotamian flood tablets as additional evidence of the great world disaster (ibid., pp. 223-25).
and of supposed Flood evidences in ancient star maps.\(^1\) After a sequence of articles using non-archaeological data, another contribution appeared\(^2\) in which the author appealed to the witness of John D. Peters (who had dug at Nippur 1888-1896) who claimed that the tower of Babel had been identified (virtually) as the ziggurat at Borsippa.\(^3\)

All of these articles by Allen were clearly written in defense of the Scriptures and the Genesis Flood account. Some of his concluding words best summarized his aim: "Have we not arrived at sufficient accumulation of evidence exterior to the Bible for a reasonable faith that is true, or at least that it is worthy of thorough study and testing?"\(^4\)

**R. L. Odom**

Robert Leo Odom (1901- ) has been interested in archaeology for many years specifically because of the light it has shed on the history of the Sabbath and upon studies in Daniel. He completed no formal archaeological studies but read widely and visited archaeological sites in the Near East.\(^5\)

In 1943 Odom described Glueck's Jordan Valley survey\(^6\) in


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 13.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 14.

\(^5\)R. L. Odom to L. A. Willis, November 22, 1981.

which he had indicated that thirty-five village sites had been located along the east side of the Jordan from approximately the thirteenth to the sixth centuries B.C. There were indications of heavy agricultural development during this period and an estimated population of 35,000-40,000 in the region. This news was taken from the New York Times\textsuperscript{1} and used by Odom to confirm the deuteronomistic record and to show by contrast with later conditions the fulfillment of Deut chaps. 28-30. In the RH he wrote a series on the book of Daniel, and in one issue\textsuperscript{2} he used archaeological data from Clay\textsuperscript{3} and Dougherty\textsuperscript{4} to substantiate details from the fall of Babylon to Gobryas and Cyrus. Both of these articles contain an apologetic element, though in the second, the archaeological usage would also fit the classification of contextual enrichment.

**Limited Contributors**

F. C. Gilbert (1867-1946) came from an orthodox Jewish home and after his conversion committed himself to working for his people. One of his articles\textsuperscript{5} on Palestine drew on support from archaeology for illustrating the reliability of Scripture. The sites mentioned

\textsuperscript{1}June 1, 1943.


\textsuperscript{4}Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar.

\textsuperscript{5}F. C. Gilbert, "The Earth Bears Witness," ST, November 8, 1838, pp. 6-7, 14.
by Gilbert were Beth-Shemesh (Ain Shems), Gezer, Shechem, and Samaria. His sources were respectably scholarly and his claims moderate.

Varner J. Johns wrote a series defending the truth of Scripture; the third article\(^1\) constituted an appeal to archaeology: "Every time the spade of the archaeologist is upturned, evidence for the truthfulness of the Bible is uncovered. The science of archaeology has silenced many a scoffer and converted many a skeptic."\(^2\) He gave rather general archaeological data, then concentrated on OT chronology. Citing the variety of opinions which had been held on early Egyptian chronology, he observed that the recent trend had been towards a shorter chronology, and he then wrote: "You may depend upon it that Egyptian history does not extend before the Bible date for the Deluge."\(^3\) He concluded by claiming that early chronology for Mesopotamia and China was also extremely unreliable and the antiquity exaggerated.

An article by Murl Vance\(^4\) compared worship (or veneration) of the dead and the immortality of the soul concept in Babylonia and ancient Egypt with saint worship and the immortality-of-the-soul doctrine in Christian teachings--rejecting these on the basis of scriptural teaching. Though not an in-depth study, yet it made some valid comparisons. The usage here might best be described as polemical.


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 9.

Once more the "Pyramid Prophecies" were featured in an article by E. A. Beavon, who undermined some basic assumptions of the theory and stressed that the pyramid was a symbol connected with the sun-god Re and not Yahweh. This was another polemically oriented article.

Ernest Lloyd wrote a brief article claiming that archaeology supports the Bible, but he gave only a general statement. He claimed that God has had witnesses "hidden in the sands of Egypt" which have eluded searchers until now "when fresh confirmations are timely, God gives the word and there is a resurrection of these witnesses."

In order to answer the old question as to why the Canaanites should have been destroyed ST printed an article by Joseph P. Free (of Wheaton College) borrowed from The Bible Today. The author drew evidences of depraved religion from Palestinian sites, especially Gezer. This article revealed theological and contextual usage of archaeology.

---

1 "The 'Pyramid Prophecies' Fact or Fiction?" ST, November 5, 1940, pp. 10-11.
2 Referring to Arthur Weigall (not Weigal [sic]). Ancient Egypt (London: E. Benn [1928]).
4 Ibid.
5 "Archaeology and the Canaanites," ST, August 22, 1944, pp. 5, 14.
6 Ibid., cf. R.A.S. Macalister, A Century of Excavation in Palestine (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. [1925], pp. 276-79). It should be noted that although many of Macalister's interpretations are widely rejected today, as W. G. Dever has said concerning the "high place" at Gezer: "A cultic interpretation still seems best. . . ." "Gezer," EAEHL, 2:438.
As a scientist,\(^1\) Harold W. Clark looked at archaeology\(^2\) to see how it harmonized with anthropological explanations of the supposed evolutionary development of the human race. To his way of thinking, the earliest traces of civilization in the ANE showed a high level of cultural development thus confuting evolutionary concepts. He was able to refer to copper utensils in some of the earliest habitation levels at Susa (regarded as fourth millennium B.C. or earlier)\(^3\) and to give some other data to support his position. Clark's sources were reputable though some—like the following quotation from Sayce—were very old (1899):

> The history of the ancient East contains no record of the development of culture out of savagery. It tells us indeed of degeneracy and decay, but it knows of no period when civilization began. So far as archaeology can teach us, the builders of the Babylonian cities, the inventors of the cuneiform characters, had behind them no barbarous past. \(^4\)

(italics his)

---

\(^1\) Clark was a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley, and biology teacher at Pacific Union College for thirty-five years.

\(^2\) Harold W. Clark, "Did Civilization Evolve?" \(ST\), February 5, 1946, pp. 6-7, 14-15.

\(^3\) Similar comments have been made about Kuyunjik (Seton Lloyd, The Archaeology of Mesopotamia: From the Old Stone Age to the Persian Conquest [London: Thames & Hudson, 1978], pp. 25-26) and also the artwork at Teleilet el-Ghasul in Jordan presents a similar example of early advancement (Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine, pp. 67, 68, stated that "It is a striking fact that the art of painting elaborate geometrical designs reached a higher pitch of achievement in the early fourth millennium in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia than it did for thousands of years thereafter"). However, recent studies seem to reveal no consistent single-line advancement or decline over large areas, but rather complex patterns of development at least in the Neolithic period (Lloyd, Archaeology of Mesopotamia, pp. 25-30).

Clark claimed that widespread Neanderthal (and Neanderthal-like) settlements were established soon after the Flood, while nearby highly civilized cities and settlements in Mesopotamia, other Near-Eastern lands, and around the Mediterranean co-existed on their own level. He felt that such a theory justified his conclusion that "the literal Bible chronology has nothing to fear from the discoveries of the archaeologists any more than from those of the geologists."  

George McCready Price (1870-1963) attempted to demonstrate the complete reliability of Scripture through a biographical sketch of Archibald Henry Sayce (1845-1933), showing his thorough reversal of position with regard to higher criticism. Sayce made a scholarly contribution in the defense of orthodoxy through his work on the Amarna letters, the Siloam inscription, and on the recovery of the Hittites and countless other projects. Price emphasized Sayce's influence in undermining higher criticism by clarifying the issue of scripts potentially available to Moses.

The next article was written by William T. Ellis and

---

1 Clark, "Did Civilization Evolve?" p. 15.
2 George McCready Price, "He Learned to Believe the Bible," ST, May 21, 1946, pp. 4-5, 13.
3 According to Price, Sayce in his old age even retracted his critical views on Daniel (ibid., p. 13).
5 Price, "Learned to Believe," p. 5.
borrowed from the American Bible Society. The author had travelled throughout the Bible lands and claimed "spectacular corroborations of Scripture" in such areas as biblical geography and historical data from excavations (Lachish, Ras Shamra, etc.), and that both Hebrew and early Christian history had been thereby reduced "from the realm of unreality to definite proofs, some of which have been sensational." In a balancing statement, he admitted that "while some extravagant claims for archaeology's testimony to the scriptures have been made by overzealous amateur archaeologists, the body of undisputable evidence is overwhelming." He also observed that the internal witness of Scripture which meets the Christian where he is and gives power, comfort, and guidance is an even stronger evidence for the inspiration of the Scriptures than the archaeological testimony.

M. K. Eckenroth (1914-1975) wrote a short apologetic article defending Scripture on the basis of excavation at Jericho, Lachish, Ras Shamra, etc., and referring to the testimony of such archaeologists as Charles S. Fisher and Garstang. Most of the details appear similar to those given in Ellis's article which had been published only a few months earlier.

The last ST article for this period came from Ashley G.

1Ibid., p. 3.  
2Ibid.  
3Ibid.  
Emmer, who discussed archaeological witness to the accuracy of Scripture in the light of the various higher critical views. He stated: "Subsequently, archaeological excavations have verified the authenticity of Bible names, places and events that have been subjected to criticism." In 1949 he felt that he could say that "disputed questions, such as the walls of Jericho, the size of Nineveh, the siege of Sennacherib, have been proved historical by modern archaeology."

A single brief article in the Watchman by R. E. Crawford was essentially quoted from James C. Muir. Crawford observed that Muir had given a clear explanation of the manner of growth of ANE cities and then quoted the words of Muir where he illustrated superimposed city-levels by reference to twenty-one successive levels at Beth-shean. He stated that stratification tended to grow at about five feet per century and that sections of Jerusalem itself are today eighty feet higher than they were in the time of Christ. Crawford used these thoughts, apologetically stating that "the digging of a century has not proved the Bible record false, not even in a detail. If the excavations of archaeologists were to continue on for a millennium, the same would be true." 

1 "The Stones Cry Out!" ST, November 1, 1949, pp. 10-11.
2 Ibid., p. 10.
3 Ibid.
5 Quoting from Muir, Truth Endureth, pp. 4-5; cf. pp. 77-79.
6 Crawford, "Voice of the Past," p. 5.
7 Ibid.
Another polemical composition on the "Pyramid Prophecies" attempted to prove from OT history and the context of Isa 19, that there is no validity to a prophecy based on the measurements of the Pyramid of Cheops. The author appealed to Egyptologist A. Weigall for the true significance of the pyramid.

In 1946 Charles C. Crider visited Hamadan (ancient Ecbatana and Achmetha--Ezra 6:2) in Iran and wrote of his impressions. He mentioned some ruins of the ancient summer palace and of Sang-i-Sheer (stone lion) which probably marked one of the entrances. He also expressed the opinion that the so-called tombs of Mordecai and Esther, though old, are not what the names would indicate. The archaeology in this article was used for general interest with a view to evangelistic promotion.

In November 1949 the RH carried a report of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a follow-up to the articles by Wood. Associate editor

W. J. Young, "Do the Pyramids Point to Our Time?" RH, August 14, 1941, pp. 3-5.

Supposedly 1000 pyramid (or prophetic) inches being equal to 1001 "British inches" and each of these pyramid inches representing a year until 1910, and thereafter representing a month (ibid., pp. 3, 4).

Ibid., p. 4.


Frederick Lee, "Discovery of Bible Manuscript Amazes Scholars," RH, November 17, 1949, pp. 6-7.

Lee was essentially reporting the lecture by Albright as three of the scrolls were about to be displayed in the Library of Congress. Though basically a report with some emphasis on the value of the Isaiah scroll, there was an apologetic note in the reference to God bringing "His truth to light when it is needed most."^1

M. I. Fayard, editor of the Buenos Aires Publishing House, wrote for the Ministry a strongly apologetic article^2 aimed at showing the historicity of the Bible as a result of Hittite discoveries. The approach was historical with wide appeal to reputable sources and with a note of rebuke for those who had not taken the Hittite references in the OT more seriously.

A short article by R. Allan Anderson^3 gave recently found references to Belshazzar as "son of the king" and as "king." One tablet which was translated after Dougherty's publication^4 was reported to read "Nabonidus King of Babylon city and . . . son of the king"--amounting to a clear statement of dual rulership. Anderson^5 concluded with gratitude for archaeology's "constant vindication of Scripture veracity."^6

The next two items were both book reviews which gave general commendation. The author of the first had some reservations on

2M. I. Fayard, "Hittites in Bible History," Ministry, October 1941, pp. 9-10, 46.
4Nabonidus and Belshazzar.
5Anderson, "Confirmatory Witness," p. 9. 6Ibid.
Diggers for Facts\(^1\) which contained some speculation including a pre-
Adamite theory, but the book was regarded as basically confirming
SDA faith in the OT. The second, a review of *A Conservative Intro-
duction to the Old Testament*,\(^2\) was very brief but commended the writ-
er for fair evaluation of recent discoveries. Another brief book
review in 1948\(^3\) recommended the reading of *Holy Hours in the Holy
Land* as a helpful substitute for a personal visit. Essentially the
commendation was given because the book conveyed Bible context.

A very thorough analysis of the "Pyramid Prophecies" was
written by Bible Instructor Abbie Dunn.\(^4\) She first gave the literal
details of the Great Pyramid,\(^5\) then described the speculations which
have been devised concerning it. Some examples of this speculation
were given including one based on the "fact" that the entrance was
"off center [by] exactly 286.1022 inches to the east."\(^6\) She also

\(^1\) B. R. Spear, review of *Diggers for Facts*, by J. A. Kinnaman
in *Ministry*, May 1942, p. 15.

\(^2\) Carlisle B. Haynes, review of *A Conservative Introduction
to the Old Testament*, by Samuel A. Cartledge, in *Ministry*, October
1944, p. 25.

\(^3\) Carlisle B. Haynes, review of *Holy Hours in the Holy Land*,

\(^4\) "Survey of Pyramid Teaching," *Ministry*, November 1946,
pp. 15-17.

\(^5\) She would have done better to use a more reliable source
for this data than Rev. Anton Darms ("The Pyramid Delusion," *Moody
Monthly*, June 1945, p. 532) whom she quoted and who stated that some
of the stones of the Great Pyramid weighed eight hundred tons. The
maximum weight of the blocks of stone is usually given as about
fifteen tons (I. E. S. Edwards, *The Pyramids of Egypt* [Baltimore:
p. 85; Ahmed Fakhry, *The Pyramids*, 2nd ed. [Chicago: University

\(^6\) Dunn, "Pyramid Teachings," p. 16. Such exact measurements
are mystifying when it is remembered that the outer casing of the
gave the details of a spectrum of date-setting (and adjusting) "prophecies" connected with the pyramid and concluded with parallel columns giving the "Pyramid Teaching" in contrast with a more orthodox (SDA) interpretation of eight biblical topics.¹

Siegfried H. Horn

This name is considered briefly here, but without biographical data since the next section features Horn so prominently. His first article appeared in the Ministry in 1948.² It consisted of a report of three significant discoveries with some apologetic thrust. Most prominent was his description of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls³ published at a time when the age and value of the scrolls had only just been realized.⁴ Although many of the details of the pyramid is completely missing. This figure was used to represent years (another said "months") in a great time prophecy (ibid).

¹Ibid., pp. 16-17. Two M.A. theses (by Julia Neuffer and Alger F. Johns) could be mentioned here but since they come late in the period and were never published, they are mentioned with the main contribution of each author in the next period (for Neuffer see p. 366, for Johns see p. 372).

²Siegfried H. Horn, "Important Archaeological Discoveries," Ministry, November 1948, pp. 7-9, 54.

³This was the first report of these finds in the periodicals we are here surveying. The first to appear in the RH were Wood, "New Discovery," April 7, 1949, p. 12; idem, "Isaiah Scroll," May 12, 1949, p. 7, and a brief newsmote, September 29, 1949, p. 2. The ST carried a report by Wood, "Sensational Discoveries," on August 23, 1949, pp. 8-9, 13-15.

⁴Though discovered by a young Bedouin in February or March 1947, a series of events led up to the official announcement of the discovery by Miller Burrows on April 11, 1948 (G. Ernest Wright, "A Phenomenal Discovery," BA 11 [1948]:21). They were at first referred to as the "Jerusalæm Scrolls" (John C. Trever, "Preliminary Observations on the Jerusalem Scrolls," BASOR 111 [1948]:3; W. F. Albright, "Editorial Note on the Jerusalem Scrolls," BASOR 111 [1948]:2-3).
find were still unclear and a footnote described contradictory reports concerning the existence of a second Isaiah scroll, this prompt report was amazingly accurate. Horn also reported the discovery of a tablet which indicated a Mar-duk-a, or "Mordecai," as an official of Xerxes\footnote{Horn, "Archaeological Discoveries," p. 8; cf. idem, "Mordecai, A Historical Problem," Biblical Research 9 (1964):20-23.} and the discovery of long-sought bilingual inscriptions to assist in deciphering Hittite hieroglyphs.\footnote{Idem, "Archaeological Discoveries," pp. 8, 54. This was a series of bilingual inscriptions (Phoenician alphabetic and Hittite hieroglyphic) found on the gates and palace buildings at Karatepe by H. T. Bossert.} The article might be classified as a report and an apologetic statement. The second article\footnote{Idem, "Early Christian Tombs near Jerusalem," Ministry, May 1949, pp. 5-7.} gave a report of the controversy surrounding the discovery and interpretation of a tomb near Jerusalem. Sukenik regarded it as essentially an early Christian tomb (final use in the middle of the first century A.D.) and interpreted the markings on several ossuaries as crosses, names of Christians, and the word "woe."\footnote{Ibid., pp. 5-6.} Horn revealed the skepticism of some authorities to Sukenik's interpretation and warned against more than very cautious use of the data, at the same time expressing the opinion that however interpreted, these interpretations would make little difference to the pastor's message, since few serious scholars doubt the historicity of the crucifixion. He wrote that even if these were the graves and remains of NT Christians, they would hardly be significant.
apologetically or theologically—only sentimentally. We thus have a warning against inappropriate use of archaeological materials and views.

For his M.A. thesis Horn investigated Egyptian sources which have a bearing on the topography of Palestine and Syria.\(^1\) Updating of earlier studies was necessary because of the availability of new texts and lists. The study especially featured the execration texts of the Twelfth Dynasty and the Amarna letters and Asiatic campaign lists of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. Unfortunately the identification of city names has been only partial.\(^2\) Furthermore, plagiarism (borrowing from the lists of earlier kings)\(^3\) was common and also the evident purpose of the texts was to glorify the Pharaoh, so that reliability of the information must often be questioned.\(^4\) Nevertheless, much very helpful topographical data has been gathered from these sources and thereby given considerable contextual enrichment to our study of the OT. As in the case of Sheshonk I (Twenty-second Dynasty), Horn observed that the records which we have give both "a good confirmatory document of the Biblical record about the invasion" and help to clarify to some extent "the

\(^{1}\)Idem, "The Topographical History of Palestine and Syria According to the Egyptian Asiatic Lists and Other Egyptian Sources" (M.A. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, 1948).

\(^{2}\)To illustrate, Horn stated that of the approximately 350 names from the Thutmose III lists only about 100 had been identified with otherwise known names in Western Asia and "of them only about fifty can be topographically localized" (p. 25; cf. ibid., p. 45).

\(^{3}\)Horn claimed that "Ram ses II . . . copied parts of the lists of Seti I, who had taken over many of the names for his lists himself from the originals of Thutmose III" (ibid., p. 25).

\(^{4}\)Ibid., pp. 25-26.
history of the divided kingdoms in their infancy."\textsuperscript{1} He said that in this case the Bible and the list of Sheshonk supplement each other "in a perfect way,\textsuperscript{2} and--concerning the whole study--that "no contradiction exists between the Biblical and Egyptian records."\textsuperscript{3} Perhaps in deference to Professor Wood, Horn allowed the possibility of Israelites being present in Palestine in the time of Thutmose III,\textsuperscript{4} and he observed that even in the thirteenth century when they were certainly present, their residence in the mountainous regions reduced the likelihood of friction with Egypt, thus producing "a silent harmony between the Scriptural and Egyptian sources."\textsuperscript{5} The study constitutes an interesting blending of geographical, historical, and contextual reconstruction with an element of apologetic application.

\textbf{Summary of Usage 1937-1949}

Looking back over the first period of 1937-1949, we notice that of the total of 149 articles (excluding seven book reviews) there are eighty-seven articles where the apologetic element is prominent or predominant. In addition, another nine articles contain a smaller element of apologetic giving a total of ninety-six out

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 119.
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 124. He also asserted that the place-names which Sheshonk recorded "show beyond doubt the trustworthiness of his report and the narrative of the Bible" (ibid., p. 126).
\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 125.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 126.
of 149 or about 64 percent (58 percent where it is prominent or predominant).

As we look at the variety of other usages in these articles, we should note that there are many articles for which two or more usages are apparent. Nevertheless, the attempt has been made to feature the most prominent usages. Biblical background and context (including the illustration of customs, etc.) is the next most common, with 40 percent, and polemical, and discovery reporting each having about 8 percent. There are about 5 percent which have a strong homiletic application. Minor usages of archaeology amounting to about 2 percent each include theological/philosophical, exegetical, incidental interest, and warnings against misuse of archaeology.

Of the eight non-periodical items (books, theses, syllabi) written essentially for SDA readers or for evangelistic use all contained elements of apologetic. There was also considerable Bible background and contextual usage especially in the syllabi and Horn's M.A. thesis. Four publications for more general readership included no apologetic, though it can easily be inferred in the latter two cases by Thiele.

The publications which have been examined reveal a certain eagerness for any ammunition which might prove effective in the

---

1 Book reviews are probably less likely to reveal a writer's (reviewer's) desire for apologetic, but if they are included the figures are almost the same, 63 percent (57% where it predominates).

2 So that the total is more than 100%.

battle with higher critical proponents. The majority of the articles written for this period were by non-professionals (those without archaeological training), especially editors, but also teachers, pastors, and administrators. In fact, the apologetic element was somewhat less frequent among the non-professionals. Those more specifically trained in archaeology were more careful in their selection of sources but revealed elements of the same apparent defensive-ness. We must understand their situation, since SDAs with their conservative interpretations and high view of the inspiration of Scripture would have faced opposition or personal disagreement with some scholars during their external training. Their publications, therefore, must be expected to reveal both defense of their minority positions and a desire to instruct or assist their colleagues and fellow church members. The missionary periodicals likewise would represent the desire of the writers to share their own meaningful religious convictions. Although this concern to uphold the Scriptures, their historicity, and the reliability of their text was admittedly both legitimate and admirable, one may still wonder if it had not been overstressed almost to the point of implying insecurity or doubt. In contrast, there was an occasional article or

1 Such as Emmerson, Spicer, and Nichol.

2 Particularly from the influence of Emmerson whose apologetic usage was less than most others (see pp. 148-149).

3 With the possible exception of Lindsjo from whom we have a smaller corpus for making a judgment.

4 See p. 67.
series\(^1\) which accepted the Scriptures as a reliable record of God's dealings with individuals and nations, and of His periodic interventions on their behalf and approached archaeology of the ANE with enthusiasm in order to see what other details might be learned.

\(^1\)Such as most of Emmerson's 1937 ST series (see pp. 123-28).
CHAPTER V

SDA ARCHAEOLOGICAL LITERATURE PERIOD II:
HORN ERA, 1950-1973

The second and longest period has a profuse array of articles and books. In the first period, periodical articles average twelve per year, in the second period eighteen per year. Clearly predominating are the contributions of Siegfried Horn. Of the total 433 articles for this period, Horn wrote 225 (52%) and specifically from 1954-1957, of the 99 articles featuring archaeology in the ST, TT, RH, and Ministry, Horn wrote 81 (82%). There was actually a general dip in the number of articles from 1960-1966, at least partly explainable by the fact that the earlier period marks the prolific writing period of Horn after completing his dissertation in early 1951. This pre-1960 period also contained various reports of the Bible lands tour of 1957. Another factor was Horn's participation in the Shechem excavations in 1960, 1962, and 1964 which apparently reduced his writing slightly, while the excavations at Heshbon, begun in 1968, produced many articles by the various participants boosting the percentage for the last part of the era.

1 The yearly average actually dropped from nineteen to seventeen from the time that the fifth periodical, AUSS, was added.

2 See the special archaeology issue of Ministry (January 1958).
The period was begun in the ST with three long series by Roy Cottrell (1951), Emmerson (1952), and Horn (1955). Articles were considerably less frequent in the 1960s. Apologetic emphasis came from other sources in addition to archaeology, as illustrated in the article by R. E. Hoen, "Fossils Prove the Flood." There was no noticeable editorial change, for Arthur S. Maxwell remained as editor from 1937-1970 and was replaced by his son Lawrence (1970). The other missionary periodical, TT, had considerably less archaeological emphasis with only an occasional article or short series. The RH was thoroughly dominated by Horn, who wrote 131 articles (77%) of the total of 170 for the period. The heaviest concentration was during the middle and late 1950s. The RH generally gave much emphasis to the Papacy and to various aspects of inspiration and scriptural authority in the 1960s, the latter remaining prominent into the 1970s. The Ministry saw a wider archaeological participation than any of the other three periodicals as thirty writers contributed seventy-four articles and reviews, with Horn writing thirty of them (41%). The AUSS also had rather wide participation.


2A total of twenty-seven articles for the period.

3The other thirty-nine articles were contributed by seventeen different authors.

4The early "seventies" also gave much emphasis to black SDAs and their notable contributions.

5Most notably in 1958 as the Bible lands tour was reported largely by tour members (ten in addition to Horn, see Ministry, January 1958) and in 1973 as the trend for the following period commenced.
from the beginning with contributions by scholars including (after 1968) numerous participants in the Heshbon excavations.¹

Siegfried H. Horn

Siegfried Herbert Horn (1908- ) was born in Wurzen, Germany, and received his earlier education first in Germany (including attendance at a Jewish grade school where he learned Hebrew) and later in England, at Stanborough College, where he trained for the ministry. Even as a child he had shown a keen interest in ANE history,² so he hoped that graduation might bring him an appointment to the Near East. Instead, he spent two years in Holland preparing for his appointment to the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia). Upon arrival in the mission field he found himself isolated from a good library and commenced building his own reference library.³ In 1940 the progress of World War II led to Horn’s internment.⁴ He set for himself a rigorous program of study in archaeology, biblical languages, French, and Latin, and also in Bible translation.⁵ After

¹For the eleven-year period from its commencement in 1963 AUSS included seventy-seven archaeological articles and reviews from thirty-five writers, with nineteen (25%) of these items by Horn.


³Including journals from U.S.A., England, Germany, and Palestine, (ibid., p. 27).

⁴First on an island in the Java Sea, then in Sumatra and finally in three camps in India. The last of these was near Dehra Dun at the foot of the Himalayan mountains.

⁵He also taught regular Greek and Hebrew classes to his fellow inmates and wrote manuscripts for five books which, though never
six and a half years of internment, Horn was released on August 18, 1946, and at the age of thirty-eight resumed his formal education. He completed his M.A. in archaeology and history of antiquity at the SDA Theological Seminary in 1948 and (after some initial work under Albright at Johns Hopkins University) in 1951 completed his Ph.D. in Egyptology from the University of Chicago. In addition to hundreds of articles referred to previously, he wrote nine books in English (four of them jointly authored with colleagues), several of which were translated into other languages. In addition he contributed a large number of articles to books edited by others and frequently published in non-SDA journals. During the period from 1950-1973, he taught at the SDA Theological Seminary where he was chairman of the Department of Archaeology and History of Antiquity from 1952-1955, and chairman of the Department of OT Studies from 1955 to 1974 (teaching mainly archaeological and ANE history-type courses). Horn served as Dean of the Seminary from September 1973 until his retirement in 1976. He participated in three seasons of excavation at Shechem (1960, 1962, 1964) and was director of the first three seasons (1968, 1971, 1973) of the excavation at Heshbon in Jordan. He regularly spent time in the Bible published, subsequently became the basis of various classes which he taught (ibid., p. 28).

1 Scores of articles were also printed in locally published English, Dutch, French, German, and Portuguese periodicals.

2 Including German, Italian, Spanish, and Korean.
lands\(^1\) and conducted three tours of the Near East for ministers and teachers \(1957, 1959, 1966\). Horn has been recognized for his scholarship and wide knowledge of biblical archaeology.\(^2\) A member of various societies, including the Palestine Exploration Fund, the Palestine Oriental Society, the German Palestinian Society, and the American Oriental Society, he has played a variety of roles in the American Schools of Oriental Research. His major contributions include influencing many SDAs to view biblical archaeology as a witness to the historical reliability of Scripture, writing the SDA Bible Dictionary, participating in the excavations at Shechem and Heshbon, the recovery of the Assyrian king list,\(^3\) and the clarification of the post-exilic Jewish calendar and calendrical practices through the study of the Brooklyn Papyri.\(^4\) He expressed his personal position on the relationship between archaeology and faith by stating "You couldn't say that my faith in God or in the reliability of the Bible is based on archaeological findings, but my faith in the Bible has been substantiated frequently by such discoveries."\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Twenty-four times altogether and likely to continue. To illustrate, he made a trip each year from 1974 to 1981 with the exception of 1977.

\(^2\) Albright is reputed to have referred to Horn as "one of the best-informed archaeologists in the world" (Michael A. Jones, "Profiles of Professors: Siegfried H. Horn," \(\text{T|T}\), March 1972, p. 25).

\(^3\) Known as the "SDA Seminary King list." See I. J. Gelb, "Two Assyrian King Lists," \(\text{JNES} 13\) (1954):209-30.


As he looked back upon his archaeological activities Horn summarized his aims and expectations with regard to the discipline:

I have tried to employ the results of Near Eastern archaeology for an elucidation of Biblical history, to show how a knowledge of the ancient world with its geographical, historical, and cultural background makes Bible history more meaningful, and have attempted to prove the veracity of the historical statements of the Scriptures and the faithful transmission of its text.

Horn's first ST articles constituted a summary statement on the discovery and significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some details were also given of the excavations by de Vaux at Khirbet Qumran in 1951 by way of confirmation of the historical context of the scrolls themselves. The finds at Wadi Murabbaat and many additional scrolls or fragments (including the copper scroll) found during 1952 in the Qumran area were also reported. The apologetic reflections were clearly expressed by Horn:

This is a matter of great joy to the lover of the Bible, and to those Christians who have believed all the time that they could completely trust the Scripture in the form they possess. . . . To see these ancient Bible manuscripts declare the reliability of God's word in a time of increasing unbelief, when concerted efforts are made in many ways to destroy the faith of Christians in the basis of their

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
faith, the Holy Scriptures, is a matter of gratitude and joy.¹

In 1955 there was a double series of articles (total of ten) on biblical archaeology from Mesopotamia and Western Palestine which later formed the basis for much of Horn's book, The Spade Confirms the Book (SCB).² The first article³ set the stage for an approach using archaeology to reveal OT backgrounds and for apologetics, especially stressing the recovery of details concerning Sargon II and the capture of Samaria. The next two articles gave helpful summaries of the work of Layard and Mallowan at Nimrud (ancient Calah)⁴ and of the various excavations at Nineveh.⁵ Both made continued apologetic observations and the latter mentioned tablets from the library of Ashurbanipal as telling the Flood story "in practically the same form as the Bible records it."⁶ Horn argued that the "three days' journey" applied to Nineveh (Jonah 3:3) must apply to itinerating the streets of the explicit city (not the surrounding plain and its cities as well).⁷ Proceeding southward Horn next described

¹Ibid., p. 13.
⁶Ibid., p. 9.
⁷Ibid., p. 13.
the cities of Babylon\(^1\) and Ur,\(^2\) in the former case giving a brief description of some of its most famous ancient features and in the latter case describing an archaeologist's impressions of the ziggurat and the advanced standard of Ur's housing and sanitation. Both articles had an underlying apologetic application, though on Babylon the author stressed more archaeology's testimony to fulfilled prophecy. After a brief break, the sequence of articles was resumed with specific reference to Palestine. An insightful analysis of the geography of the land combined with explanations for the relative paucity of large archaeological ruins\(^3\) was followed by an article on the genuine and spurious sites of Jerusalem.\(^4\) The sites which are less than has been often claimed included the "stables of Solomon" (crusader structures),\(^5\) the "Wailing Wall" (Herodian, not Solomonic), the "Tower of David" in the citadel (NT structure), and "Absalom's Tomb" (Hellenistic period). For genuine sites Horn concentrated upon the Ophel area--especially Hezekiah's tunnel.\(^6\) The emphasis


\(^3\)Idem, "Palestine Visit--1: The Holy Land: Country of Surprises and Contrasts," \textit{ST}, April 19, 1955, pp. 8-9, 14-15. Reasons for the latter were given as lack of monumental building projects (apart from the temple) or extensive cities (partly because of lack of a strong central government through most of Israelite history), innumerable wars, and humid climate.


\(^5\)Below the south-east corner of Haram esh-Sharif.

\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 9, 14-15.
here was clearly upon the biblical setting as Horn concluded: "Bible history becomes real in its geographical environment and natural setting." In an article on Samaria, Horn observed that the city had probably never been taken by storm and in commenting on the Samaria ostraca and ivory plaques found there, referred to their importance in both illustrating the Bible and corroborating its record. The sister city of Shechem was described by the author in his next article, and he noted the somewhat "haphazard" excavations which had taken place there—not knowing of his future involvement with the site. The final article of this series described the writer's observations on Gibeah, Mizpah, Bethel, and Shiloh combining a travelogue style with aspects of Bible context and a little apologetic and homiletic usage.

In 1957 a continuation of the same type of regional survey

---

1 Ibid., p. 15.
3 He suggested that the city surrendered to the Assyrians because of lack of water and food (ibid., p. 8).
4 Ibid., p. 15.
6 Horn was to serve with the Drew-McCormick Archaeological Expedition (under the direction of G. Ernest Wright) as a supervisor for the 1960, 1962, and 1964 seasons. See pp. 209-10, 240, 243-44.
8 The author agreed with the commonly accepted identification of these four sites.
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featured the Arabah, Jordan, and Syria. Horn gave the then current interpretation of Glueck's refinery and furnace rooms at Ezion-geber and mentioned Glueck's discovery of copper and iron mining sites in the Arabah region. The author also visited Petra and described the Nabataean remains as well as the Edomite site on Umm el-Biyara. The Great High Place and the free-standing obelisks on Jebel Zibb Atuf were described without attempt at dating, though the adjective "ancient" was used. Travel through the Moabite Territory included mention of the ruins of the Nabataean temple at Khirbet et-Tannur (excavated by Glueck in 1937) and a more thorough description of Dhiban (Dibon) and the Moabite Stone. In the next article, Horn moved into Ammonite territory and visited the Madeba map, Mount Nebo, the acropolis of Amman, dolmen fields near As-Salt, and Gerasa (Jerash). The approach was basically descriptive, portraying the context of various OT stories. Finally, he described sites and objects of archaeological interest in the city of Damascus and then

---

1Essentially SCB, chaps. 22-27.
6Idem, "My Trip through the Kingdom of Jordan," ST, April 1957, pp. 21-23.
summarized his friendly relationships with the Arab peoples during all of his archaeological travels.¹

The survey was continued in 1959² with a series portraying Horn's travels in Iran beginning with a general survey of the territory between Teheran and Persepolis.³ The next two articles⁴ also featured a travelogue style but described the ziggurat and ruins of Tshoga Zanbil⁵ (old Elamite Dur Untash) and the Mount Elvend trilingual inscription of Darius the Great in some detail. Beginning with Ecbatana⁶ the rest of the series gave much more emphasis to individual sites and their archaeological and biblical significance. Since Ecbatana was the ancient capital of the Medes, Horn briefly traced their history with some archaeological illustration. At

¹Idem, "My Life among the Arabs," ST, June 1957, pp. 21-23.
²Too late for the 1st ed. of SCB, but selectively included in the 1980 ed.
Pasargadae\(^1\) he studied the various monuments and city remnants which are poor when contrasted with those of Persepolis. Apart from the tomb of Cyrus and a few remnants of his palace buildings there are few notable remains. A huge platform erected against one of the nearby hills was thought by Horn to mark the base of the treasury of Cyrus.\(^2\) The description of the Behistun inscription and its decipherment\(^3\) contained apologetic as it was observed that many ANE records were thereby made meaningful so that the Bible found confirmation.\(^4\) However, the story of Darius and biblical references suggest that Bible context and background were the primary emphases here.

The final articles on Persia dealt with Susa\(^5\) and Persepolis.\(^6\) In the former, a major point was made concerning the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi, with the author stating that this was a real blow to critical scholars for it showed that law codes existed before the time of Moses and also threw light on the advanced civilization of patriarchal times, revealing "that the author of the first book

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 31.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 13.
of the Old Testament knew what he was talking about." Horn believed that Darius had planned Persepolis as the first truly Persian city since other cities used as capitals such as Babylon, Ecbatana and Susa "had originally been built by other nations and showed foreign characteristics."

Horn's five final ST articles constituted a loosely knit series dealing with recent work in Palestine. Three contained significant apologetics. Excavations at Ramat Rahel have convinced most scholars of the identity of the site with Beth-haccerem (Jer 6:1), and Horn reported on the work (directed by Aharoni--1954-1962) there especially describing the citadel and seals from the time of Jeremiah. Horn described the excavations at that time in progress at Ashdod (directed by M. Dothan, 1962-1972) and gave some details of the early history of the city, particularly emphasizing the

---

1. Idem, "Esther's Capital," p. 22. Horn also sorrowfully mentioned the fact that the castle-like structure beside the excavations (and even the floor of the courtyard and stables) was constructed from ancient bricks including many with cuneiform inscriptions (ibid., pp. 21-22).


5. Ibid.

Philistine period including the destruction by Sargon II. Remnants of a stele of this king were found in the debris of the city, and the writer also recalled the recovery of the first non-biblical reference to Sargon, "... rightly hailed as a triumph for the Bible." The third article gave a good factual report on two sites in the Jordan Valley. Tell Deir Alla has been widely identified with Succoth and Tell es-Saidiya with Zarethan (the cities are mentioned together in 1 Kgs 7:45, 46, and 2 Chr 4:16, 17). Of special interest at the first site was an LB temple showing Egyptian influence and containing three clay tablets (Horn suggested that they may be of Philistine origin) in an unknown script having some similarity to Linear B from Crete and Mycenaean Greece. Horn linked the discovery of a rich tomb at the site with Solomon's choice of the area for his bronze-casting projects (1 Kgs 7:27-37), since the tomb contained a variety of bronze objects. He commented that the discoveries at these sites have contributed both background and confirmation of Scripture.

---

1Ibid., p. 30.
2Ibid., p. 29.
4Though the excavator of Deir Alla prefers to identify Succoth with nearby Tell el-Aḫṣaṣ and sees the larger site of Deir Alla as probably the "main city of the valley of Succoth" (H. J. Franken, "Deir Alla, Tell," EAEHL 1:321).
5Linear B was an early form of Greek which was recognized as such and deciphered by Michael Ventris in 1952 (Michael Ventris and John Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek: Three Hundred Selected Tablets from Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae with Commentary and Vocabulary, with a foreword by Alan J. B. Wace (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), pp. 21-27.
The author next surveyed the latest investigations of mining in ancient Palestine and concluded that the richest copper-mining site at Timnah was active in Chalcolithic times and again in the late second millennium until about 1100 B.C. However, the smaller mines at Feinan and Petra were operational in the time of Solomon—thus supporting the biblical statements (Deut 8:9, 1 Kgs 7:45-47). Finally, Horn reported on the excavations at Arad. The main discussion concerned the Hebrew temple uncovered at Arad and the consequent illustration of the type and extent of apostasy in Judah during the Monarchy period.

Horn's first article was a significant summary of written materials from throughout the ANE which have recently contributed to our background knowledge of Scripture and especially to the confirmation of the Bible. Among the items mentioned were Jehoiachin's ration list, the letter from Adon of Philistia to Pharaoh Hophra at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, the Lachish letters, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Brooklyn Papyri. Special place was given to the latter for their contribution to our knowledge of the context.

---

3 Apparently Horn wrote this article before reading the report in the February 1968, BA, for he stated that the temple was finally destroyed by Hezekiah (Horn, "Hebrew Temple," p. 30), whereas Aharoni ("Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," BA 31 [1968]:26) indicated that he regarded this as the work of Josiah, with the city wall built across the former temple site in this "last period of the monarchy."
of Ezra and Nehemiah and for their confirmation of the calendar system used by Nehemiah for recording the years of the Persian kings.\(^1\)

Similar but additional items were reported a year later.\(^2\)

This time the main emphasis was on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the observation was made that with the finds from Cave IV (4Q) all books of the OT were represented.\(^3\) Two years later that statement was qualified in Horn's next article\(^4\) where it was stated that fragments of all OT books except Esther had been found.\(^5\) The article proceeded to defend the antiquity of the scrolls in the light of attacks by Solomon (not "Samuel," sic) Zeitlin\(^6\) who essentially believed them to be the product of semi-skilled or mediocre copyists of the Middle Ages.\(^7\) Zeitlin and Horn from different perspectives each rejected

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 22, cf. p. 193 n. 4.
\(^2\)Siegfried H. Horn, "The Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls," \(\text{T}\)T, May 1956, pp. 7-10.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 8.
\(^4\)Idem, "The Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls," \(\text{T}\)T, March 1957, pp. 24-27.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 24.

the position of John W. Allegro, who saw a "Teacher of Righteousness" former leader of the Qumran community as a prototype of Christ and argued that Christianity was in no way original but was instead a modified Jewish sectarian religion.¹

In 1959 Horn wrote an article² which was both a biographical statement on Albright and a reaction to an outstanding article by him.³ Albright's unique position as a virtual specialist in many fields of Oriental studies,⁴ plus his background as a critical scholar, gave special significance to his call for a return to biblical emphasis and serious treatment of the historical data of Scripture. Horn applauded Albright's admission of the "substantial historicity" of the OT record and went on to express his own optimism for future solutions to current problems.⁵ Later, Horn gave another


²Siegfried H. Horn, "Return to the Bible," TT, July 1959, pp. 4-6.


⁴In this sense Horn called him a "universalist" (Horn, "Return to the Bible," p. 5).

⁵Ibid., p. 6. Albright had said that the various OT narratives have been "confirmed and illustrated" to an extent which he had considered impossible forty years earlier (ibid., quoting from Albright, "Return to Biblical Theology," p. 1329). Horn appears to have emphasized the confirming aspect in his article. He also noted that Albright had attributed much influence to the Dead Sea Scrolls in the trend towards more conservative attitudes to the Scriptures (Horn, "Return to the Bible," p. 6).
survey of recent developments with some emphasis on the new excavations at Hazor (Yadin, 1955-1958) and giving his own interpretation of the excavator's data. The article contained clear apologetic usage in addition to Scripture background. An update on the 1956 discoveries in Cave XI near Qumran mentioned that several relatively complete scrolls had been found (Psalms, Leviticus, and an Aramaic translation of Job). These and other discoveries mentioned in the article prompted the author to declare that archaeology "has done more than any other discipline to re-establish confidence in the historical veracity and accuracy of the Bible and in the faithfulness of its transmission during the centuries before printing was invented." The next article by Horn not only reported outstanding archaeological contributions to the understanding and appreciation of the OT (Nuzi, Ugarit, Jerusalem water system, etc.) but attempted to portray the special need for enlightenment and confirmation.

---

1. Idem, "Recent Archaeological Discoveries Shed Light on the Bible," _TT_, November 1959, pp. 4-7, 15.


3. Horn did not disagree with the approximate destruction dates, but where Yadin attributed the fifteenth-century destruction to Thutmose III or Amenhotep II, Horn suggested Joshua, and for the thirteenth-century destruction which Yadin attributed to Joshua, Horn suggested the destruction by Deborah and Barak (Horn, "Recent Archaeological Discoveries," p. 5).

4. Ibid., p. 6.

5. Ibid., p. 15.

He referred especially to the writings and influence of Friedrich Delitzsch and Julius Wellhausen who taught that particularly in the first seven books of the OT there is indiscriminate mixing of "legends and fairy tales" with historical data.\(^1\) Horn thus gave background and justification for his own work as well as for that of other biblical archaeologists, but then observed that the "situation has changed completely" as a result of the excavations of the previous forty years.\(^2\) By way of summary he stated:

> The respect of scholars, ministers, and laymen toward the Old Testament has grown as the result of this archeological work of the last decades, and the critical attitude so generally held by many scholars a generation ago has given way to a more cautious conservatism.\(^3\)

Horn also recommended that Bible scholars withhold judgment in areas where the evidence has not appeared to support the biblical record.\(^4\) He wrote: "We should never forget that all our evidence is fragmentary and incomplete, spotty in some parts and fuller in others. To reach conclusions on incomplete or negative evidence [argument from silence?] can be entirely misleading."\(^5\) In 1963 Horn

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 4-5.

\(^2\) Commencing with Alan Gardner's decipherment of the Proto-Semitic alphabetic inscriptions from the Sinai in 1917 (ibid., p. 5).

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 27.

\(^4\) He illustrated with the lack of confirmation of Nebuchadnezzar's attacks on Jerusalem (in spite of a century of excavation in Babylonia), until Weidner's translation of the Jehoiachin ration tablet just before World War II, and Donald Wiseman's recovery of the chronicles of Nebuchadnezzar in 1955 (ibid., pp. 26-27).

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 27.
wrote a two-part survey of recent work in Jordan and Israel. In the first article the author described Kenyon's excavations in Jerusalem, Pritchard's work at Gibeon (1956-1962) including the water systems, and the latest work at such sites as Shechem, Deir Alla, and Araq el-Amir. In the article on Israel the writer described progress at various sites including Caesarea Maritima, Arad, and Ashdod, and illustrated the weakness of argument from silence with a long-awaited inscription mentioning Nazareth (which had been poorly attested for NT times). As an answer to the question, "Why should there be biblical archaeology?") Horn wrote expressing what he saw as its main contributions to biblical studies. The first was that it puts the Bible in correct perspective, apparently meaning in its historical context, and the second was that it provides "illumination for many of its obscure texts"—that is, those requiring "a knowledge of the customs and living conditions of the ancients." The third contribution according to Horn is that archaeology provides "effective weapons for its [the Bible's] defense." 

---


4 He mentioned that only about 250 years ago Isaac Newton regarded Ramses II as a contemporary of Ahab of Israel (ibid., p. 11).

5 Ibid., p. 10.

6 Ibid., p. 12.

7 Ibid., p. 10.; cf. ibid., pp. 12-13.
Reporting on his participation in the Shechem excavations of 1960-1964, Horn first described the various archaeological activities on the Balatah site prior to the commencement of the Drew-McCormick Archaeological Expedition's excavations in 1956. The three stages of Sellin's excavations (1913-1914; 1926-1928; 1934) ended tragically with the destruction of most of his records and many of the objects in the bombing of Berlin in 1943. Horn proceeded to portray the history of the site in the light of the then current excavations in which he shared, mentioning the visits of Abraham and Jacob and suggesting that a destruction of about 1550 B.C. may represent final Egyptian incursions against Hyksos strongholds. A non-aggression treaty between Shechem and Israel was suggested by Horn on the basis of an Amarna tablet's witness to the fact that Labaya, king of Shechem, had turned the city over to the Habiru. Horn felt that this would explain Israel's apparently unmolested dedicatory services between mounts Ebal and Gerizim (Josh 8:30-35); and also, since the local god worshipped at Shechem was known as El Berith—"God of the Covenant" (Judg 9:46) or Baal-Berith—"Lord of the covenant"


2Ibid., pp. 10-11, though Horn himself was successful in locating objects from the 1913-1914 expedition in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna and publishing them in "Objects from Shechem Excavated 1913 and 1914," Jaarbericht Van Het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux 20 (1967-1968): 71-90; Reprint Leiden, 1968.

3"I Saw Bible History Come to Life--Part 2," TT, August 1967, pp. 8-11.

4Ibid., p. 11.

5Ibid.
(Judg 8:33; 9:4), that Shechem may have followed a form of Yahweh worship.\(^1\)

In the third article\(^2\) a strong point was made of the dating of the destruction of the great temple at Shechem by potsherds at mid-twelfth century B.C., whereas a biblically derived date would place the reign of Abimelech and the destruction of the city at about 1170 B.C.\(^3\) Horn declared that "The confirmation of this biblical date was another example of how archaeological evidence corroborates the Scriptural records and provides important data to verify biblical history." Horn also described the discovery of a substructure of Hellenistic date beneath the Roman temple on Tell er-Ras (a lower summit of Mount Gerizim) which is thought to be the remains of the Samaritan Temple.\(^4\) He felt that the evidences from Shechem have clearly served to "supplement, illuminate, and corroborate the Scriptural records."\(^5\) Finally, in June 1969 Horn published a survey article on the modern recovery of the Hittites and the stages of decipherment of the Hittite scripts.\(^6\) Defense and illumination of Scripture were equally evident.

---

\(^1\) Ibid.  
\(^5\) Horn, "Judges Period," p. 15.  
Horn's first RH article\textsuperscript{1} for the period reported the discovery by M. Dupont-Sommer of four letters from the fifth century B.C. which contain references to the Sabbath as a day of rest. They were written in Aramaic on potsherds found on Elephantine Island and indicate that there was at least a nucleus of faithful Sabbath observers and Yahweh worshippers within this community of generally syncretistic Jews in Egypt. These data constitute context for the study of Ezra-Nehemiah and possibly reflect the influence of Nehemiah's reforms (Neh 10:31; 13:15-22). The following article\textsuperscript{2} gave further details of the Dead Sea Scrolls with emphasis on Leviticus fragments which were written in the old Phoenician script. The latter were dated to the fourth century B.C. by de Vaux on the basis that the form is predominantly pre-exilic, written with a smooth elegance of style.\textsuperscript{3} An apologetic usage is evident.

A short series which appeared in 1952 is very relevant to our study. Horn described the origins of higher criticism\textsuperscript{4} and observed that although SDAs have made a valuable contribution to the defense of scriptural reliability with regard to prophecy, they have not yet used archaeology to its full potential. He felt:


\textsuperscript{4}Siegfried H. Horn, "How Archaeology Supports the Bible--1: Modern Scholarship and Bible History," RH, November 27, 1952, p. 3.
The archaeological research carried on in Bible lands during the last century has provided us with much material which--used in the right way--shows by many examples that the veracity of the historical parts of the Bible can be demonstrated just as successfully as that of the prophetic parts.\footnote{1}

Horn believed that the modern explosion of archaeological knowledge was truly a providential answer to the extremes of Bible criticism, and he stressed the fact that the various discoveries from the ANE "... cannot prove that the Bible is the Word of God, but they have demonstrated that its historical parts are recorded facts."\footnote{2} Biblical archaeology has disproved widely accepted critical teachings and become a valuable tool for the Bible student, so that:

It helps him to solve difficult problems, bridges apparent gaps, clarifies obscure passages, and illuminates many unintelligible texts. Furthermore it confirms the faith of the believer and strengthens his confidence in the infallibility of God's Word.

Horn proceeded to describe the basic support which archaeology has given to the historicity of the patriarchal narratives,\footnote{4} including the probable location of Sodom and Gomorrah somewhere in the vicinity of the southern part of the Dead Sea.\footnote{5} Appeal was made to evidences from Ras Shamra to illustrate the depravity of Canaanite religion\footnote{6}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{1}{Ibid.}
  \item \footnote{2}{Ibid., p. 4.}
  \item \footnote{3}{Ibid.}
  \item \footnote{4}{Idem, "How Archaeology Supports the Bible--2: Genesis Account of the Patriarchal Age," RH, December 4, 1952, pp. 4-5.}
  \item \footnote{5}{Idem, "How Archaeology Supports the Bible--3: The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah," RH, December 11, 1952, pp. 5-6. He described luxurious gardens observed in that region in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and made a passing reference to the ruined site of Bab edh-Dhra.}
  \item \footnote{6}{Idem, "How Archaeology Supports the Bible--4: The Depravity of the Canaanites," RH, December 18, 1952, pp. 9-10.}
\end{itemize}
and a number of possible instances of infant sacrifice in Palestine were mentioned.\(^1\) The final article in this series\(^2\) drew support for Scripture from the excavations at Samaria (especially the Samaria ostraca) and also from the data on the Moabite Stone. There were elements of exegetical, contextual, and apologetic use of archaeology in Horn's presentations on the chronology of Ezra 7 and the reign of Artaxerxes I.\(^3\) Essentially the author brought together evidences pinpointing the accession of Artaxerxes and data defining the Jewish calendar of the Ezra-Nehemiah period. The next two

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 10. There is still little specific evidence from archaeology for child sacrifice in Palestine, but Horn mentioned three possible instances: (1) Numerous burials of newborn infants in the vicinity of the "high place" at Gezer, some showing marks of fire; (2) Two Megiddo tombs in which children were buried with the skeleton positions and other indications revealing that the children were buried alive; (3) Twenty infant burials (in jars) near the rock altar at Taanach. Recent excavations at Carthage have shown such a preponderance of infant burials (though interspersed with some interred lambs showing that it was cultic and not simply a cemetery) that they have been seen as child sacrifice and as support for similar practice among the related Phoenicians and Canaanites. Samuel Wolff, "The Rite of Child Sacrifice in the Light of Recent Excavations in Carthage," paper presented at the Midwest Region of the Society of Biblical Literature and the Middle West Branch of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 5, 1980; cf. T. H. Gaster, "Sacrifices and Offerings, O.T." IDB 4:153-54; Alberto Ravinelli Whitney Green, The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East, American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series, no. 1 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975).


articles\(^1\) were the same as those printed in the ST.

In 1954 Horn's four articles\(^2\) on his visit to the ruins of Babylon attempted to answer a number of problematic questions concerning the city. Horn first undertook to answer the question of the accuracy of the description of Babylon given by Herodotus. Using the excavation reports of Koldewey he showed that Herodotus had overstated the size of the city which should be reckoned as about twelve miles in total circumference (the inner and outer cities).\(^3\) The author gave credit to Herodotus for other details of his description and attributed his exaggeration as illustrated above to reliance on estimates and oral reports, since the city had been destroyed before the time of his visit. A second problem was mainly a question of prophetic hermeneutics: Isa 13:20 had indicated that the site

\(^1\)Siegfried H. Horn, "Recent Discoveries of Hebrew Bible Manuscripts," RH, June 25, 1953, pp. 3-5; idem, "Recent Discoveries of Hebrew Bible Manuscripts (Concluded)," RH, July 2, 1953, pp. 4-5; cf. idem, "Across the Centuries," pp. 8-9, 13-15; idem, "Proved True," pp. 12-13; (p. 194).


\(^3\)Idem, "Size of Ancient Babylon," p. 4. Likewise the walls were not 85 feet thick by 340 feet high, none was thicker than 26 feet with a matching inner wall 24 feet thick. The height is unknown but was likely to have been considerably less than 340 feet (ibid.).
would be abandoned whereas there are four villages in the vicinity today.\(^1\) The third problem\(^2\) concerned the identification of the tower of Babel, and Horn described the two most likely contenders as the Ezida tower of Birs Nimrud twelve miles south of Babylon,\(^3\) and the tower of Babylon Etemenanki, which was about 300 feet high as restored by Nebuchadnezzar.\(^4\) Horn also commented on the false stories concerning the "discovery" of the fiery furnace of Dan 3 and the lions' den of Dan 6.\(^5\) However, the banquet hall of Belshazzar has been identified with reasonable certainty, and various finds have shown that the Mesopotamian kings did keep wild animals in cages.\(^6\) These four articles therefore show a blend of apologetic, exegetic, and contextual usage.

Two other apologetic articles based on Ur, and Nineveh

---

\(^1\) Idem, "Prophecies Fulfilled," pp. 5-7. Horn showed that in fact none of the four villages is within the area of the Babylon of Isaiah's time (which was smaller), and alternatively that the basic idea of ruin and abandonment has been fulfilled (ibid., pp. 6-7).

\(^2\) Idem, "Locating the Tower," p. 5.

\(^3\) It was probably less than 200 feet high and has clumps of fused bricks, probably from the ruins of a kiln which may have been erected on top for firing unbaked bricks from the core for modern use.

\(^4\) Horn favored the latter since it appears to be in the right place and is the largest, highest, and most famous of the ziggurats known to us today. It was destroyed by Xerxes and then further demolished by Alexander who, however, had planned to rebuild it (ibid., pp. 5-6).

\(^5\) He discovered that these and other stories like them mainly originated from practical jokes of Koldewey during the visit of pious tourists (idem, "Fiery Furnace," p. 5).

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 6.
were almost identical with ST articles.¹

Horn next undertook a series of six articles² on Egypt which was rather similar in content to that by Emmerson in 1948.³ He also described the tombs of the Twelfth Dynasty provincial rulers at Beni Hasan⁴ and gave details of the war of independence (which cast out the hyksos) from the tomb of Ahmose at Elkab.⁵ Some additional details gave the names of some of the slaves awarded to the soldier Ahmose for his valor in the war of independence.⁶ Horn saw the hatred of the Hyksos and the circumstances of their expulsion as the cause and setting for Israel's enslavement,⁷ and this explanation was further developed in his description of Thebes and the


³See pp. 134-40, also parts of his 1947 series, pp. 130-33.

⁴Horn, "Beni Hasan Cave Pictures," pp. 4-5.

⁵Idem, "Inscriptions at Elkab," pp. 5-6.

⁶The names include Tamasiah (similar to Amasiah in 2 Chron 17:16), Astarimi, and Hari. One was simply called "the Asiatic" (ibid., p. 6).

⁷Ibid.
earlier rulers of the Eighteenth Dynasty. ¹ The Amarna period and its correspondence was interpreted as illustrating the time of the Hebrew conquest of Palestine, and it was emphasized that the Amarna Letters had been invaluable in "defeating Bible critics and in clarifying important parts of ancient history. . . ."² The article on Elephantine Island³ was also strongly apologetic, for it cited the recovery of various details from the Aramaic papyri found on the island as having "corroborated the authenticity of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah" in addition to giving evidence that the Jewish civil year began in the fall.⁴ Horn also stated that the Aramaic demonstrates the "originality" (genuineness?) of the Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra.⁵ In the feature on the Egyptian Museum in Cairo,⁶ Horn emphasized several objects--each of which was given apologetic significance. The Merneptah stela was used to emphasize that the Exodus must be dated earlier than the thirteenth century (actually arguing for the fifteenth century in accord with 1 Kgs 6:1),⁷ and the description of the tomb of Tutankhamen underscored the presence of iron objects in order to negate the argument that

¹ Idem, "Ancient Thebes and Home of Moses," pp. 7-9. Hatshepsut was suggested as the step-mother of Moses and Thutmose III as the great builder who succeeded her.


⁴ Ibid., p. 7.

⁵ Ibid., p. 8.


⁷ Ibid., p. 4.
the mention of iron in Joshua and Judges indicates a late origin for these books. Horn concluded with a statement on the proto-Canaanite inscriptions from Sinai and the significance of the fact that their date indicates that the script would have been available in the time of Moses. The last three of these articles could be classified as apologetic.

Horn's next series of six articles in the RH discussed archaeological sites from Palestine and Syria. He first dealt with sites which are thought to be false or which are based mainly on

---

1 Ibid., pp. 4-5. Horn said that the statement that the Canaanites had chariots of iron (Josh 17:16-18; Judg 1:19; 4:3, 13) probably means that they had some iron parts.

2 Ibid., p. 5. Albright dated the inscriptions to 1550-1450 B.C. and probably 1525-1475 B.C. (William Foxwell Albright, The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment, Harvard Theological Studies, No. 22 [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966], p. 6). Horn also mentioned the stages of decipherment attained by Alan Gardiner, A. E. Cowley, Kurt Sethe, and climaxed by Albright (ibid., cf. W. F. Albright, "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," BASOR 110 [1948]:6-22). The language has been described by Albright as an unknown LB Northwest Semitic dialect, "a kind of Canaanite koine" (Albright, Proto-Sinaitic, p. 37), whose origins he felt were probably no earlier than the Thirteenth Dynasty (eighteenth century B.C.), though he admitted that on the basis of certain similarities between this script, the Ugaritic alphabet, and the South-Canaanite counterpart "... we may ultimately find ourselves forced back into the Twelfth Dynasty for the origin of our alphabet" (ibid., p. 15). Albright identified the miners responsible for these Serabit el-Khadem inscriptions as Semites (probably recently conquered Hyksos) from Egypt, or workers who had been in close contact with Northwest Semites in Egypt (on the basis of Egyptian elements present including at least five Egyptian deities named in the inscriptions--(ibid., pp. 12-13).

3 Also found with some revision in SCB, chaps. 16-20, 28, 29, and SCB (1980), chaps. 21-25, 33, 34.
The Garden Tomb and Gordon's Calvary are included in this article since there is virtually no evidence to support their authenticity, although the tomb does constitute a genuine example of a Roman/Byzantine tomb. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher is so named and revered from an early tradition (apparently preceding Emperor Constantine who built the first church on the site), and the site cannot be categorically denied genuineness since it is located outside of the walls of the Jerusalem of Christ's time. Turning to genuine sites, Horn especially noted the Ophel area with the Jebusite ramparts, Virgin's Spring (Gihon), Hezekiah's tunnel, and the pool of Siloam. He also mentioned the Temple Mount, and the lower portions of the Tower of David (Herodian defenses).

The purpose of the third article was to clarify press reports of the latest finds from the Dead Sea caves. The 1952-1953 finds were mostly fragments of scrolls, but some of these are of great value. Some were of Jewish apocryphal writings including a

2 Ibid., p. 7; cf. p. 242 n. 2.
4 Siegfried H. Horn, "Visit to Palestine and Syria--2: True Historical Sites in Jerusalem," RH, October 14, 1954, pp. 5-7.
number which were dated and therefore of vital assistance to paleographers.\(^1\) The material in the next article\(^2\) was essentially the same as that covered in two ST articles in 1955 (Jerusalem to Samaria). In the next issue\(^3\) Horn gave a useful background history of Tyre and then faced the question of the existence of Tyre today in spite of Ezekiel's prophecy (26:2-6, 12-14) of its annihilation. He pointed out the accurate fulfillment of the prophecy by the complete destruction of ancient mainland Tyre (its material remains were used by Alexander to construct the mole) so that even the site of the former city is now uncertain.\(^4\) Context and background of Scripture are the most prominent usages in this series though apologetics are also seen in the article on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Tyre and Ras Shamra.

In 1955 there was a sequence of ten articles, eight of them under the title "Archeology Confirms the Bible."\(^5\) Horn first faced the Kenyon reports on Jericho.\(^6\) Garstang's tomb discoveries were

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 5. Horn observed that the majority of biblical fragments conform to the MT, though some are closer to the LXX or give details not included in the MT as in the case of 1 Sam 1, 2 (Horn, "Jerusalem Museum," pp. 5-6).

\(^2\) Idem, "Visit to Palestine and Syria--4: An Archeologist's Trip from Jerusalem to Samaria," RH, November 18, 1954, pp. 5-6; idem, "Samaria the Forgotten City," pp. 8-9, 15; idem, "Bible Memories Reviewed," pp. 8-9, 14.


\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 7-8. He stated that the island in those days was hardly a residential area.

\(^5\) The second and sixth articles though apologetic did not carry this title as they were distinctive major articles.

not to be discounted but Kenyon claimed that heavy erosion had
removed most traces of the LB settlement, though her discovery of
a small floor space with an oven and a fourteenth-century juglet
did confirm that some settlement had existed.¹ A rather general
survey² included such features as the rediscovery of the Hittites,
the Ugaritic alphabet, and the Elephantine papyri, apologetically
used, as well as more contextual-type items like the new discoveries
concerning the Qumran community and a report of renewed excavations
at the ancient sacred city of Nippur.³ A feature on the archaeologi-
cal identification of Nehemiah's three chief enemies⁴ stressed the
contextual enlightenment of this post-exilic period, and apart from
the title gave no explicit apologetic. The next article⁵ reported
the successful decipherment of a rock-cut Hebrew tomb inscription

¹Ibid.; cf. Kathleen M. Kenyon, "Excavations at Jericho,
PEQ 86 (1954), p. 61. W. Shea argues that Kenyon minimized each
phase of LB evidence at Jericho thus not permitting that the MBII
wall might have continued in use until the time of Joshua (W.
H. Shea, "Exodus," Class Syllabus, Andrews University, Berrien
Digging up Jericho: The Results of the Jericho Excavations 1952-
1956 [New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, 1957], pp. 261-
263).

²Siegfried H. Horn, "The Latest Archeological Discover-

³By the Universities of Chicago and Pennsylvania, ibid.,
p. 4.

⁴Idem, "Archeology Confirms the Bible: Geshem, Nehemiah's
Enemy Resurrected," RH, June 9, 1955, p. 6. Stress was on Geshem,
since he was the last of the three to be identified with reasonable
certainty.

⁵Idem, "Archeology Confirms the Bible: An Important
Inscription of Hezekiah's Time Deciphered," RH, July 14, 1955,
pp. 6-7.
from the slopes of the Mount of Olives. Though the owner's name was mostly obliterated, Horn supported an identification with Shebna (Shebanyahu) an officer of Hezekiah.¹

An article which was both exegetical and strongly apologetic² was based on the discovery of lead within some of the cuneiform wedges of the Behistun Rock inscription. This discovery was used to explain Job 19:24 and to "put the critics to shame."³ The feature article on the Dead Sea Scrolls⁴ emphasized the close agreement between the second Isaiah Scroll (IQIs⁵) and the MT. Horn examined the major variations between the two texts showing their general insignificance. There were elements of apologetic, reporting, and exegetical usage. Horn next reported⁵ the discovery of a monumental stone inscription which mentions Queen Bernice and King Herod Agrippa together, "... thus supporting certain Bible texts (Acts 25:13 and other passages) as well as the Jewish historian

¹N. Avigad favored the same identification ("The Epitaph of a Royal Steward from Siloam Village," IEJ 3 [1953]:150-152). Shebna is mentioned in 2 Kgs, chaps. 18 and 19, and also in Isa 22:15-19, where he was rebuked in connection with the construction of a prominent tomb. The prophecy (Isa 22:17, 18) seems to indicate that he would not be buried in his tomb, and it is interesting to note that the excavator (Clermont-Ganneau) thought that the inscription had been defaced with a hammer (Avigad, "Epitaph," p. 137).

²Siegfried H. Horn, "Archeology Confirms the Bible: Job Vindicated by the Behistun Inscription," RH, August 18, 1955, pp. 6-7.

³Ibid., p. 7.


Josephus.

A report of Mallowan's excavations at Nimrud contained some exegetical usage and illustration of Scripture and also some apologetic. New finds included writing tablets of wood and ivory which had been hinged to form a book (as Isa 30:8), and a new inscription mentioned that Sargon carried from Samaria "the gods of their trust" in addition to captives.

Horn suggested that this may refer to the calves originally located at Dan and Bethel, as well as to other gods worshipped by Israel.

In the next article Horn discussed the evidences for a long-continued pagan cult on Mount Carmel. Classical writers indicate that Zeus worship (the chief god of any other country was so named by the Greeks) was practiced on Carmel from the fourth century B.C. to the first century A.D. and recently the inscribed base of a monumental statue was found on Carmel (but not in situ), indicating that the practice continued as Zeus worship until at least the late second or early third century A.D.

Classification for this article would

---

1 Ibid., p. 5.
3 Ibid., p. 6.
4 Cf. 1 Kgs 12:28-30; 2 Kgs 17:7-16.
be contextual and apologetic. In the final contribution for the year Horn gave a further update on the Dead Sea Scrolls, this time featuring Daniel and showing that the fragments of the two manuscripts found by this time are close to the MT, contain the transition from Hebrew to Aramaic in Dan 2:4, and do not contain the apocryphal song of the three companions in the furnace (found after chap. 3:23 in LXX).  

Horn's contributions to the RH for 1956 numbered fourteen, and these fall into four categories: an isolated pair, a sequence on higher criticism, three general articles, and finally two on textual criticism. The first two articles essentially continued the sequence from 1958. Horn's "Scientific Observations on the Sea of Galilee" was given under the title "Archeology Confirms the Bible," but in fact is geographical rather than directly archaeological. The second article reported on a collection of Aramaic papyri purchased in Egypt by L. Borchardt. Although the place of their

2Ibid., pp. 7, 23.
3RH, January 12, 1956, p. 4.
4He explained that fish are not caught at night in this lake even with deep sea nets since they take shelter near the steep eastern shore and near deep mineral springs, but apparently may be caught very early in the morning as they make their way to shallows near the entrance of the Jordan. In the daytime fishermen do not "launch out into the deep," but use throw nets in the shallow water. He also reported studies concerning rapid air movements resulting from the low-lying sea beside the steep mountains (ibid).
discovery was not revealed it is clear that they are from the fifth century B.C., and one of the participants in the correspondence, Arsham, is known to have been the highest Persian official in Egypt in the second half of that century. One letter, No. VI in G. R. Driver's publication,¹ was a Persian equivalent of a passport² and forms a parallel to Neh 2:7. Thus Horn commented on the contextual and apologetic value of this find stating that it shows the author of Nehemiah to have been an "eyewitness" of that which he wrote.³

Horn began the series on higher criticism with an article⁴ which defined his approach and gave a background to historical criticism. He found it virtually impossible to change the thinking of skeptics who refuse to believe the Bible narrative on the basis that it contains miracles or appears unlikely to have happened (from the twentieth century viewpoint). By citing parallels we may show that such an event was possible, but this would not prove that such an event did in fact occur. On the other hand, where biblical data indicate a fact or event and critics have declared such to be false or non-historical, and where such statements are shown by archaeology to be false, in those cases the biblical archaeologist can demonstrate

²It requested the supply of specific provisions at each halting place between Persia and Egypt (Horn, "Nehemiah's Time," p. 6).
³Ibid.
such arguments or criticisms to be untenable. The next article continued the description of the historical development of critical ideas, especially dealing with the documentary hypothesis during the second half of the nineteenth century. Both articles were apologetic in tone, laying the foundations for the sequence of five articles of attempted refutation. Horn began answering the higher critics by attacking the original basis of the documentary hypothesis—the use of divine names. He showed that between the MT and the LXX there is considerable irregularity in the usage of divine names, and then using the Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (IQIs) he made a chart illustrating sixteen occasions where the MT differed, with most possibilities of contrasts occurring. He thus indicated that in the ancient Hebrew communities, the divine names were to a large degree interchangeable so that there is no conclusive evidence for determining authorship on the basis of the occurrence of divine names.

Concerning the Babylonian Flood Epic, he asserted that it is only one of the many worldwide recollections of an original


3 That is, 'Elohim is not always represented by Theos, nor Yahweh by Kurios; but in many places Kurios is found in the LXX where the MT has 'Elohim, etc. (ibid., p. 5).

4 With some fervor he stated that "... inasmuch as the edifice of higher criticism has been built upon the varying usage of the divine names, the entire structure is left suspended like a mirage on the trembling horizon of the arid desert of skepticism" (ibid.).
worldwide event and therefore is a witness to the Genesis record.\(^1\) Two major arguments were taken up in the next article: the availability of a script in which Moses could have written and the question of the patriarchal context. The former was answered by reference to the Amarna Letters and the Proto-Sinaitic (Proto-Semitic) script,\(^3\) and the latter by reference to the ancient law codes and the cultural context portrayed in the Nuzi Tablets.\(^4\) Data were also given to show that some use of iron and the domestic use of camels occurred at least on a small scale in patriarchal times.\(^5\) Four more higher critical arguments were taken up in the third article of this type.\(^6\) Horn wrote of the archaeological resurrection of the Hittites, of early occurrences of Aramaic words or references to Aramaeans from the mid-second millennium B.C., and of Egyptian elements in the Exodus narrative which support the historicity of the Egyptian sojourn and of the Exodus. The argument that the OT books must have been written in close chronological proximity because of their relative uniformity had been countered by the suggestion that

\(^{1}\)Ibid., pp. 6-7.


\(^{3}\)He mentioned that examples of the script have been found at many Palestinian sites including Lachish, Tell el-Hesi, Shechem, Megiddo, and Beth-shemesh (ibid., p. 6).

\(^{4}\)See p. 282.

\(^{5}\)Horn, "Arguments of Higher Critics," pp. 6-7.

spelling and grammatical updating had occurred from time to time. Comparison of the two Isaiah scrolls from Qumran has now supported this argument, for it has demonstrated that there was a library in the time of Christ which had "... two different copies of Isaiah, one representing an earlier stage of spelling and grammatical revision than the other. It is thus unmistakable that copyists spelled words according to current rules of spelling—which changed from time to time..." Hence it is impossible to date the composition of a Bible book from the current form of the Hebrew text. Horn next wrote of the way that archaeology has reversed the criticism that the OT is chronologically inaccurate. Recognition of the practice of accession-year dating and of official coregencies has shown the detailed accuracy of most chronological data in Scripture even though a few unresolved questions remain. On the accuracy of the recording of events, it is now abundantly clear that Egyptian and Assyrian records are especially biased with a decorated and edited statement meant primarily to magnify the monarch. In contrast, the biblical record with its descriptions of royal and national mistakes has been shown to be

1 Ibid., p. 7.
2 Ibid., p. 8. Followed in Babylon and Assyria—whereby the first year was counted as "accession year," but not as the first "regnal year."
3 Ibid., p. 8. Followed in Babylon and Assyria—whereby the first year was counted as "accession year," but not as the first "regnal year."
4 As in the case of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram as well as other kings of Judah.
conspicuously objective. The conclusion of this study\(^1\) featured official decrees as found in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther and illustrated by the contemporary Aramaic papyri from Elephantine Island, and also arguments against the supposed Maccabean origin of most of the Psalms.\(^2\) All five of these articles were clearly apologetic in purpose.

Three general articles ensued, two of which used archaeology to verify the Scriptures. In the first\(^3\) Horn wrote of some minor details which nevertheless contribute to our understanding and to the evident "reliability and veracity" of the Bible. There is an interesting occurrence of a parallel to Dan 2:38 in a text of Shalmaneser III, "Minurta and Palil, who love my priesthood, have given me all the beasts of the field."\(^4\) The latter phrase was apparently an idiomatic court expression similar to that also recorded by Daniel. The practice of royalty riding on mules rather than horses\(^5\) has been illustrated by a text written to the king of Mari advising him: "Let [my lord] not ride on horseback, but let it be in a chariot or only on a mule which my lord rides,

\(^{1}\)Idem, "Higher Criticism in the Light of Archeology: Arguments of Higher Critics and Their Refutation--5," RH, April 12, 1956, pp. 6-7, 24-25.

\(^{2}\)Arguments answered by reference to parallels in grammar and phraseology from Ugaritic texts (ibid., pp. 7, 24).


\(^{4}\)Ibid., p. 15.

\(^{5}\)Shown in the records of David and his sons (1 Kgs 1:33, 38, 44; 2 Sam 13:29; 18:9).
and that he may thus honor his royal head." \(^1\) There was also mention of a text referring to 400 iron javelins from about 1800 B.C. (Syria), and some records of the terrible effects of famine in besieged or famine-ravaged areas. \(^2\) In the next article \(^3\) parallels were given for the story of Dan 3, including one from the eleventh year of Nebuchadnezzar where he personally condemned a man to execution by decapitation and was apparently present at the execution. \(^4\) Nebuchadnezzar's son-in-law Nergal-shar-usur said that he "burned adversaries and disobedient ones," and from the time of Rim Sin of Larsa there is record of a slave who was to be thrown in a furnace. \(^5\) The third article \(^6\) was essentially a report concerning early Christian tombs in the vicinity of Jerusalem and, in spite of the title, was hardly apologetic.

Horn's contributions for 1956 concluded with two articles \(^7\) on textual criticism (lower criticism) of the Bible as affected by archaeology. After giving an excellent survey and evaluation of the various witnesses to the OT text and after deplo red the

---

\(^{1}\) Horn, "Minor Archeological Discoveries," p. 15.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 31.


\(^{4}\) Ibid.

\(^{5}\) Ibid.


\(^{7}\) Ibid., "Textual Bible Criticism in the Light of Archaeology--1," RH, October 25, 1956, pp. 4-6; idem, "Textual Bible Criticism in the Light of Archaeology--2," RH, November 1, 1956, pp. 5-6.
former tendency to free emendation, he described the vastly increased respect accorded the MT since the Dead Sea Scrolls materials had become available. He concluded by stating:

It is gratifying to see that archaeological discoveries are now providing the weapons by which the destructive forces of lower criticism of the Old Testament can be defeated, just as the results of Biblical archaeology have successfully met the onslaughts of higher criticism. Although the battle against higher Bible criticism has been waged for a long time, that against textual criticism is only now shaping up. . . . When all the material recently found in the desert of Judea has been published and studied, an unprecedented flood of light will shine on the venerable text of the Old Testament, whose reliability is rendered more certain by every new discovery.

Thus the apologetic note was clearly evident.

In 1957 there was a continuation of the general sequence of articles under the title: "Archeology Confirms the Bible." The first was essentially a report concerning the so-called "Scroll of Lamech," which when completely opened was seen to be a midrash on a portion of Genesis. The second article illustrated deceptive

---

3 Ibid.
5 Also known as the "Lamech Apocalypse" until opened and then known officially as "A Genesis Apocryphon" (O. Betz, "Dead Sea Scrolls," IDB, 1:791-92).
6 Horn did not use the term midrash as only preliminary details had been released, but he mentioned the contents of Gen 12-15, in addition to comments, stories, and legends (Horn, "Secret," p. 7).
methods used for manipulation of some of the so-called "oracles" of the ANE\textsuperscript{1} and could be best classified as containing contextual usage. The mysterious copper scrolls from Cave III were finally opened and reported in the third article.\textsuperscript{2} The next article\textsuperscript{3} dealt with the controversy over the relationship between the Dead Sea sectarian writings and the NT and was similar to the article in \textit{Ti}. Horn also gave a report\textsuperscript{5} of recent information from the Babylonian Chronicles. He mentioned that with the new publication by D. J. Wiseman\textsuperscript{6} we now have official records for all but six years of Nabopolassar's reign, for the first ten years of Nebuchadnezzar, and for one year of Neriglissar.\textsuperscript{7} Horn stressed the information

\textsuperscript{1}As the statue of Horus whose beak could be manipulated by a hidden string and various altars which contained or were located over secret chambers in which a priest could hide (ibid., p. 5).

\textsuperscript{2}Idem, "Archeology Confirms the Bible: Dead Sea Copper Scrolls Reveal Their Secret," RH, March 28, 1957, pp. 5-7. The contents of the copper scrolls turned out to be a description in Mishnaic Hebrew of the hiding place of about sixty accumulations of treasure (ibid., p. 6).


\textsuperscript{4}Idem, "Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls," pp. 24-27; see p. 204.

\textsuperscript{5}Idem, "Archeology Confirms the Bible: Recently Discovered Cuneiform Tablet Dates Fall of Jerusalem," RH, June 6, 1957, pp. 4-6. Horn also gave scholarly answers to the exaggerated claims made regarding the Syriac "Codex Yonan" ("Archeology Confirms the Bible: The Syriac 'Codex Yonan,'" RH, May 16, 1957, pp. 6-8), but since this item concerned the seventh century A.D. it is outside the scope of this work.

\textsuperscript{6}Chronicles of Chaldean Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1956).

\textsuperscript{7}Horn, "Tablet Dates Fall of Jerusalem," p. 4.
from Nebuchadnezzar's seventh year because of its references to the campaign against "the city of Judah" (Jerusalem) in Hatti-land (Syria/Palestine) and the details which he gave concerning the capture (March 15/16, 597 B.C.), appointment of a new king, and seizure of tribute. The usage here was primarily apologetic and contextual. The final article of this sequence for 1957 drew contextual and apologetic details concerning the captivity of Daniel from the Babylonian Chronicle for the year 605 B.C. It spoke of the defeat of Egyptian forces at Carchemish and of their flight for home, and of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of the whole of "Hatti-country," apparently before he heard of the death of his father. Horn also referred to Berossus' Babylonian history which specifically mentioned Jewish captives which had to be entrusted to others at the time of Nabopolassar's death.

A series in the RH on Horn's archaeological travels in Iran has been covered already as it appeared also in the ST.  

1Ibid., pp. 4-5. Further data was also given from this record in conjunction with 2 Kgs 24:12 to prove the existence of a distinctive Jewish civil calendar (Horn, "Fall of Jerusalem," pp. 5-6; cf. p. 217).


3Ibid., p. 7.

4Which was lost but with excerpts quoted by Josephus (Josephus Against Apion, 1.19 [trans. Thackeray, LCL, 1:132-37]).

5See pp. 199-200. The series was only slightly modified for the ST—an occasional simplification or abbreviation by removal of personal reminiscences. As may be seen the titles were also slightly different; Siegfried H. Horn, "Visiting Ancient Persia: From Teheran to Persepolis," RH, November 7, 1957, pp. 16-17; idem,
Horn wrote a series on the Seven Churches of Asia Minor for the RH in 1958. The actual amount of archaeological material available for discussion varies greatly from site to site. The first article gave a sketch of the ancient and modern setting of the churches, while the next two articles were devoted to the city of Ephesus (beside modern Seljuk). Unfortunately little can be seen of the Artemision or Temple of Diana, though the foundations and its remaining features were uncovered by J. T. Wood in the nineteenth century. Another monumental feature of the ancient city was the theater which is said to have had a capacity of 24,500 and still remains a most impressive ruin. Horn used the archaeological features to recreate the NT (as well as subsequent church history)


2Idem, "Visiting the Seven Churches of Revelation--2: Ephesus and the Temple of Diana," RH, April 10, 1958, pp. 3-4; idem, "Visiting the Seven Churches of Revelation--3: Ephesus, the First and Largest City of Ancient Asia Minor," RH, April 17, 1958, pp. 3-4.

3Idem, "Temple of Diana," p. 3. It covered four times the area of the Parthenon in Athens and stood on a great platform with a surrounding staircase.

4Idem, "First and Largest City," p. 3.
context. The second city visited was Smyrna (modern Izmir). The beautiful modern city covers most of the ancient ruins, but recent excavations have uncovered the unique triple-level agora, an indication of ancient prosperity. Ancient Pergamum (modern Bergama) was described by Horn as a strong and wealthy city. He observed that the illustrious Altar of Zeus and the Asclepieion (a complex of buildings or a compound for healing dedicated to Asclepius, god of healing), two of the most outstanding antiquities of Pergamum, have both been interpreted as "Satan's seat" (Rev 2:13).

His next article identified the site of Thyatira as lying buried beneath modern Akhisar, but no archaeological work of significance had been undertaken there. The ruins of Sardis

---

1 Ibid., p. 5. The circumstances of the Council of Ephesus held in A.D. 431 and the basis of the interest in Mary as the "mother of God" were detailed.

2 Idem, "Visiting the Seven Churches of Revelation--4: Smyrna the City of Suffering," RH, April 24, 1958, pp. 3-5.

3 Idem, "Visiting the Seven Churches of Revelation--5: Pergamum, the Seat of Satan," RH, May 1, 1958, pp. 16, 35.

4 The altar is forty feet high with a horseshoe shape and is 127 feet long and 120 feet wide. Horn commented that the altar had been dismantled and carried away by the Russians after World War II (ibid., p. 35). However it has been returned and reconstructed and may now be seen in the Pergamon Museum in East Berlin.

5 The two Asclepius snakes used to symbolize the medical profession are visible on a monument in the courtyard (ibid.).


7 The author was successful in locating a recently discovered sarcophagus whose Greek inscription included the name Thyatira (ibid.).

lie beside the village of Sart. Work on the site was carried out from 1910-1914 and 1922 by H. C. Butler directing the Princeton University expedition. The great temple of Cybele (equated with Diana/Artemis) was uncovered at that time and some hints of the grandeur of this former capital of the Lydian Kingdom were revealed. The eighth article featured the old city of Philadelphia (modern Alasehir), but the author admitted that there is no trace of the majestic buildings once standing on this site. The last of the seven churches was Laodicea, near ancient Colossae and Hierapolis. Horn observed that two Roman theaters, a large stadium, and various aqueducts, colonnades, and church ruins were visible, but no excavation had been carried out. This entire series was distinctive in containing no clear apologetic, but was specifically oriented towards

---

1 Excavations were resumed by B. F. M. Hanfmann and A. H. Detweiler (joint expedition of Harvard and Cornell universities under the auspices of the American Schools of Oriental Research) and have been conducted annually since this date. The results include some fascinating discoveries and large-scale reconstructions (see especially David Gordon Mitten, "A New Look at Ancient Sardis," BA 29 [1966]:38-68; George M. A. Hanfmann, "The Sixteenth Campaign at Sardis [1973]," BASOR 215 [1974]:31-60; Crawford H. Greenewalt, Jr., "The Sardis Campaign of 1977," BASOR 233 [1979]:1-32).


3 Horn made the interesting observation that Christianity survived and thrived longest in Philadelphia and Smyrna (until the Kemalist Turkish violence of 1922/1923) the two cities whose churches received no rebuke in John's letter (ibid., p. 4).


5 Ibid., p. 3.
NT context and background with an occasional homiletic thrust added in conclusion.

Horn wrote five articles for the RH in 1959. These were mainly reports of new discoveries, but contained some strong elements of apologetic as well as contextual usage. Horn reported excavations by Yadin at Hazor (1955-1958) and Pritchard at Gibeon (1956, 1957), in addition to briefer updates on the Dead Sea Scrolls, excavations at Ephesus, and the identification of the site of Derbe.

The origin of the Sabbath had been attributed to ancient Babylonian practices by Friedrich Delitzsch. Horn took up the challenge to invalidate this claim in a sequence of four articles. He

---

1The data of these five articles (in slightly compressed form) were included in the TT article of November 1959, idem, "Recent Archeological Discoveries," pp. 4-7, 15; cf. p. 205.


5Idem, "Discovery of an Ephesian Artemis," RH, July 23, 1959, pp. 9-10. A marble statue of Asiatic Artemis (as distinct from the Greek Artemis who was a contrasting chaste goddess of hunting and purity) was the first artisan's reproduction of the goddess to be found on the site. With the upper portion of her body covered with breasts and variously adorned with many symbolic animals the statue clearly represented the oriental fertility goddess who was known to the Romans as Diana (ibid.).

6Idem, "The Discovery of Derbe," RH, July 30, 1959, p. 10. Derbe was the last of NT cities of Asia Minor to be identified and this was accomplished by the discovery of a block of stone bearing an official Derbe inscription at Kerti Hüyük (ibid.).

7Delitzsch, Babel and Bible, p. 38.
first examined and rejected each of the supposed evidences that the weekly cycle and a sacred seventh day were observed in Babylonia.\(^1\) Then he examined Jewish papyri and other written records especially from Egypt and the Dead Sea region to show that strict Sabbath observance was maintained at least by some Jewish communities in Palestine and Egypt in the period between Ezra and Bar Cocheba.\(^2\) A somewhat similar observance by Christians lasted at least until the fourth century A.D., according to evidences quoted from the so-called Gospel of Thomas and an Oxyrhynchus papyrus (No. 903).\(^3\) The question of a Babylonian "Sabbath" (shabattu, shapattu) was further examined in the fourth article\(^4\) where it was demonstrated that the Babylonian day was the "fifteenth day of the month, the day of the full moon."\(^5\) Similarity with the Sabbath was therefore minimal and quite possibly coincidental. Certainly the archaeological evidence has not shown that the Babylonians knew and observed a weekly seven-day cycle and a sacred observance of the seventh day. Archaeological usage in this series could be described as polemical.

\(^1\) Siegfried H. Horn, "Archeology and the Sabbath--1: Was the Sabbath Known in Ancient Babylonia?" RH, May 4, 1961, pp. 1, 8. Any special significance of the seventh day was as an evil or unlucky day (ibid., p. 8).


\(^4\) Idem, "Did the Sabbath Originate in Babylonia?" RH, July 6, 1961, p. 4.

\(^5\) Ibid.
Horn's participation in three seasons of excavation at Shechem were each time published in RH articles.\(^1\) After tracing the history of the city, insofar as it is known,\(^2\) the author undertook to describe general archaeological procedure and camp life,\(^3\) and then the more specific details of excavation.\(^4\) The fourth article\(^5\) constituted a statement on the history of the excavations held at Shechem up to the year 1960. These four articles give some biblical background but were mainly reports of work done and procedure being followed.

A single article in 1962\(^6\) reported further discoveries in the Judean wilderness, especially fragments and a Minor Prophets scroll from Wadi Murabbaat. Horn stressed this additional confirmation of the accuracy of the MT since the variations were slight.\(^7\)

---

\(^1\) Commencing November 2, 1961; May 16, 1963; and April 1, 1965. There is considerable overlap with the briefer statement in the series in TI for July-September 1967; cf. pp. 208-10.


\(^3\) Idem, "Excavating Biblical Shechem: Life at an Archeological Camp," RH, November 9, 1961, pp. 1, 4-5.


\(^7\) The scroll came from the first half of the second century A.D., though habitation in the caves themselves was Chalcolithic, MB (early), Iron Age, as well as from the time of Bar Cocheba (ibid., pp. 1, 8).
He also wrote of an Israeli expedition which discovered many new items in wilderness caves in the south including Roman vessels of metal.\(^1\)

A progress report\(^2\) on the 1962 season of excavation at Shechem first summarized the earlier series and then described the commencement of new work. An apologetic element was introduced with regard to the confirmed date of Abimelech. Much of the second article\(^3\) consisted of emphasis upon necessary care in order to discover such items as clay tablets, as Horn himself found one fragment which others scorned as mere pottery.\(^4\) The writer also described the solid style of buildings as excavation progressed in his Field VII from the 722 B.C. Assyrian destruction back to Stratum X (time of David and Solomon).\(^5\)

Three articles in 1963 featured new discoveries in Israel. In 1961 a stone inscription was found in Caesarea naming Pontius Pilate as Prefect of Judea (the first time his name had been found


\(^{4}\)It turned out to be a cuneiform religious text probably directed to Shamash (ibid., p. 3).

\(^{5}\)Though no walls were found in Stratum X of Field VII, and there were other times of relative weakness (ibid., p. 3).
in an inscription). A year later the name Nazareth appeared in fragments of a synagogue inscription. Horn also reported a simple inscription in a tomb near Lachish, from about 700 B.C. which expressed faith in Yahweh as the "God of all the earth" and as the "God of Jerusalem." Another message recently found was a crude, seventh-century letter written on a potsherd to entreat the return of the writer's garment—which appears to have been confiscated because the owner was resting instead of working. These three articles constitute biblical context, with the first two also containing apologetic.

The site of Golgotha was discussed by Horn in 1964 in more detail than he had used a decade earlier. Attempting to sift legends and sectarian prejudices from genuine historical clues, Horn eventually defended the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher as "the most likely site of our Lord's death and resurrection."

---

2 Ibid., p. 5; cf. p. 208.
3 Siegfried H. Horn, "Recent Discoveries in Israel--2: An Inscription Mentioning Yahweh, God of Jerusalem," RH, June 6, 1963, pp. 213. He also summed up other archaeological references to Yahweh (ibid., p. 3).
4 Idem, "Recent Discoveries in Israel--3: A Petition of a Poor Hebrew Peasant," RH, June 13, 1963, p. 8. The petitioner claimed that he had finished his work before resting, or perhaps—before the Sabbath came.
7 Horn, "Site of Golgotha," p. 10; cf. p. 219 n. 3.
In the succeeding discussion Horn indicated that Gordon's Golgotha was a rather fanciful suggestion as an alternative to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, but concluded by saying that we cannot insist dogmatically that any of the suggested sites is the genuine Golgotha.

These two articles might best be described as NT context.

A series of four articles used archaeology and Scripture to illustrate the context of the prophet Daniel. Horn began with a portrait of the political and religious context of Daniel's childhood and youth, with Josiah leading out in reform and Babylon jockeying for dominance over Assyria and Egypt. The second part of this presentation concerned the period from 605-597 B.C. and suggested that Jehoiakim began supporting Egypt after the clash between Egypt and Babylon in 601 B.C. An exegetical contribution here suggested that the attacks and harassment by local enemies (2 Kgs 24:2) were encouraged by Babylon during the period when Nebuchadnezzar was...

---


2 Horn no longer described the Garden Tomb as "dated in the Roman or Byzantine period" as he had in 1954 ("Has the Tomb of Christ Been Found?" p. 7), but stated that: "All authentic Palestinian tombs of the time of Christ were constructed in a different way, as every student of archeology knows. The Garden Tomb, on the other hand, shows the typical features of the early Byzantine period, and was probably not constructed before the fourth or fifth century" (idem, "Gordon's Golgotha," p. 3).

3 Ibid., p. 4.


6 Ibid., p. 5.
rebuilding his army after it had been devastated in the battle with Egypt.¹ For the third article² which featured the third Babylonian attack on Jerusalem, Horn gave contextual background by stating that Psamtk II of Egypt visited Palestine with an official delegation in 590 B.C.³ If diplomacy was his goal it apparently succeeded in gaining Zedekiah's allegiance, since Nebuchadnezzar subsequently attacked and destroyed Jerusalem. The concluding article⁴ gave an excellent précis of the background and career of Cyrus the Great and his victory over Babylon.

In 1965 six articles encompassed Horn's participation in his final season at Shechem (1964) and his survey of other recent work which he studied while in Palestine. Beginning with recapitulation Horn placed the various projects at Shechem in true perspective,⁵ and then proceeded to give a rather detailed report of the Drew-McCormick excavations.⁶ In the third and fourth articles⁷ Horn

¹Ibid. Jehoiakim apparently was captured and subsequently died during these raids and Jehoiachin surrendered when Nebuchadnezzar's forces arrived (ibid., p. 6).


³Ibid., p. 4.


⁷Siegfried H. Horn, "The 1964 Shechem Expedition--3: An Important Discovery--The Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim," RH.
drew attention to the history of the Samaritans and the search for their temple on Mount Gerizim. He concluded that ruins from the Hellenistic period which underlay Hadrian's Roman temple on Tell er-Ras must be the remains of the Samaritan temple. Horn also reported the discovery of about 200 skeletons and the Samaria papyri in a cave east of Samaria (in Wadi ed-Daliyeh). Horn next used recent discoveries by Kenyon to strengthen arguments for the authenticity of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. The last article in this series gave a brief history of Masada together with the story


1Ibid., p. 7. In subsequent excavation on the site, R. J. Bull was also convinced of this identity and felt that a huge half-cube of unhewn stones was probably the remains of the altar of sacrifice ("Tell er-Ras," EAEHL 4:1022; cf. p. 210).

2Horn, "Expedition--4: The Samaritan Temple," p. 4. The cave is believed to have been the shelter of people of Samaria who at first escaped from Alexander the Great but then were discovered and massacred. The papyri were mainly legal documents, and the number of skeletons was revised to about 300 after the excavations. Two men by the name of Sanballat are mentioned in the papyri as governors of Samaria, evidently descendents of the Sanballat in Neh 2:10, 19; 13:28, etc. (Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri," BA 26 [1963]:110-21; Paul W. Lapp, "Bedouin Find Papyri Three Centuries Older than Dead Sea Scrolls," BAR, March 1978, pp. 16-24; Frank Moore Cross, "The Historical Importance of the Samaria Papyri," BAR, March 1978, pp. 25-27; Paul W. Lapp and Nancy L. Lapp, eds., Discoveries in the Wadi ed-Daliyeh, AASOR 41 [1974]:1-106).

3Siegfried H. Horn, "The 1964 Shechem Expedition--5: More Light on the Authenticity of the Holy Sepulcher," RH, April 29, 1965, pp. 2-3, 6. Kenyon had discovered that the area between the presumed northern wall of Jerusalem and the famous church had been used as a quarry (and therefore was outside the city walls) for about 300 years beginning in the seventh century B.C. (ibid., p. 6).

of its excavation by Yadin. 1 This series was basically contextual with clear apologetic included only in the second article.

There were six articles on archaeology written by Horn in the RH for 1967. Five were essentially the same as the ST articles of 1968-1969, 2 but another was distinctive. 3 Scholars had argued against identification of behemoth in Job 40:15-24 with the hippopotamus because the beast was thought to have become extinct in Asia in prehistoric times. However, more recently hippopotamus bones have been located at Ras Shamra and Tell Sukas on the coast of Syria and at Tell Qasile near Tel Aviv. 4 The new conclusion is that they did not become extinct until after 1000 B.C. These six articles include four with prominent apologetic.

To mark the centenary of the discovery of the Moabite Stone, Horn wrote a three-part series in 1968. He first told of the discovery, destruction, and eventual restoration of the stele. 5 He

1 Horn gave the dimensions of the plateau as "600 feet long and 200 feet wide" (ibid., p. 6), but it would seem that "meters" should be read instead of "feet." Yadin gave the dimensions as "600 meters from north to south and 300 meters from east to west in the center" (Y. Yadin, "Masada," EAEHL 3:793).


4 Ibid.

then recorded the associated events set forth in the Bible, mentioning the frustration of scholars over the question of whether the events referred to on the stone occurred before or after the military campaign of Israel and its allies.¹ Horn favored the view that the majority of the events referred to in the inscription occurred after the allied military campaign.² The author concluded by summarizing the new information gained from the Moabite Stone. There are elements which confirm the Bible narrative, but Horn also noted items which remain enigmatic. Apparently Nebo was a large town with a sanctuary of some kind, for Mesha claimed to have taken from it sacred vessels and 7,000 captives and to have devoted all of these to his god Ashtar-Kemosh.³ We cannot know precisely what this involved and the identity of the deity remains conjectural. These articles were aimed at supplementing and illuminating the OT record and are therefore contextual with some apologetic intent as well.

The basic approach to the Andrews University Heshbon excavation was reflected in the sequence of five articles in 1969 which reported the first season's excavations. Commencing with reasons for having chosen this specific site,⁴ Horn wrote of the need for persevering in archaeological work while problems and questions

²Ibid., p. 4.
³Ibid., p. 6.
concerning the OT remained, especially since such work had "... illuminated numerous obscure passages, supplemented many historical facts, and verified or supported numerous stories of the Bible."\(^1\)

He pointed out that SDAs had traditionally used archaeology to "explain and defend the Bible."\(^2\) Thus in 1941 the Seminary had joined ASOR as a corporate member. Reasons for the choice of Heshbon for the first excavation sponsored and directed predominantly by SDAs included: (1) it was a virgin site, (2) it was accessible, and (3) it was biblically significant (especially with regard to the dating of the Exodus).\(^3\) The second article\(^4\) traced the history of the site from biblical and historical references, while the second and third articles described the general organization in camp and at the tell\(^5\) and the specific archaeological techniques employed in excavation.\(^6\) The final article summarized the accomplishments of the first season.\(^7\) On the acropolis (Area A) a Byzantine church was partially excavated and in Area B, on a ledge of the mound, a large wall was uncovered, as were a post-exilic ostraca and ultimately a few LB sherds. In Area C thick debris yielded many objects

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 2.  \(^{2}\)Ibid.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., pp. 3-4. The Exodus dating problem was explicitly discussed as a factor.


and a cistern fifteen feet deep was uncovered. Area D revealed the ascent to the acropolis and beneath Arab ruins was found a stone pavement. This sequence of five articles was distinctive in that it was reporting in some detail a specific project and its background. However, the introductory section emphasized the need for illumination of Scripture (exegetical element), for supplementary facts (context and background), and for verification and support of biblical data (apologetic element), and the entire body of excavation reports probably fits these categories of usage, plus the basic concept of reporting all new finds and developments.

A stele discovered at Tell el-Rimah about sixty-five miles west of Nineveh in 1967 was the basis of Horn's next contribution to the RH.¹ This stele of Adad-nirari III named king Jehoash of Israel as a vassal of Assyria and thereby probably constitutes a partial explanation of his three successful campaigns against Syria (enemy of Assyria). A summary statement of the eleven kings of Israel and Judah who had previously been known from the Assyrian and Babylonian records was also given. The archaeological usage here was predominantly contextual since it specifically supplemented the biblical data of the eighth century B.C.

Two articles in 1970 recalled the fall of Jerusalem nineteen centuries earlier.² The main sources for the information used were


the writings of Josephus, but the description of the various portions of the city which fell one by one concluded with references to the surviving monuments. In particular the "tower of David" (part of the modern citadel) was mentioned as a relic of the fortified palace of Herod in the western portion of the city. The archaeological element in this case constituted an updating of the older historical source and could be described as NT contextual usage.

Five RH articles reported on the 1971 season at Heshbon. Again there was a review of the town's history and some recapitulation of the earlier work at the site. Two articles were devoted to a description of the program, especially emphasizing the necessity of having more specialists in the archaeological team since refinement of techniques has developed so rapidly in recent years. The final articles described the accomplishments of the 1971 season. The Byzantine period was represented by further work on the church and also by the disclosure of a large lime kiln in Area B and walls of houses

---


3 Idem, "Excavating Biblical Heshbon--1971," RH, December 30, 1971, pp. 4-6. The article also explained that civil war conditions in Jordan had necessitated cancellation of a proposed excavation in 1970 (ibid., p. 6).


in Area C. Some structures from the Roman period were uncovered, but they were non-substantial since much of the building material had been re-used in Byzantine buildings. The Hellenistic and Persian representation was mainly in the form of pottery and there was an ostracon from about 500 B.C. which bore five names.\(^1\) From the "period of Isaiah and Jeremiah" Ammonite pottery was found, but no structural remains, and from the earlier periods only scattered Iron Age sherds were found (plus one certain LB sherd from the 1968 excavations).\(^2\) Three distinctive types of Roman tombs were cleared near the site (a swinging door tomb, a rolling stone tomb, and another early Roman tomb) and from these and several other tombs (mostly recently robbed) came a selection of pottery, glassware, jewelry, and even a Roman incense shovel.\(^3\) The purpose of these articles was essentially to report and other usages were not evident.

Methods used in crucifixion were revealed through the remains in an ossuary from a tomb found north of Jerusalem.\(^4\) A male in his twenties had been buried with a nail attaching his heel bones to a portion of a plaque on one end and to an olive wood knot from the shaft of his cross on the other end. The angle indicated that the body of the victim had been supported by a cross bar while the legs

\(^1\)One Babylonian, one Egyptian and two West Semitic in form, with the fifth poorly preserved (idem, "Heshbon in 1971--4," p. 11).

\(^2\)Ibid. The presence of apparent LB sherds at Heshbon is now debated, since no LB habitation was ever identified (cf. pp. 247, 333, 391).


were bent to one side. The leg bones were broken and a scratch on the radius indicated that nailing had been not through the hands but in the arms close to the wrists. Usage appears to combine contextual with an apologetic which is largely implied.¹

Another article² promoting the Archaeological Museum of Andrews University³ spoke of the need for ancient objects as visual aids for Bible and ancient history classes. The main feature of the article was a Hebrew parchment scroll of Esther with a carved olive-wood case.⁴

Horn's final article in the RH for this period⁵ was an appropriate summary of the achievements of biblical archaeology for the period since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Those items considered worthy of special note were the scrolls themselves, an alphabetic tablet from Ugarit, a cuneiform tablet which revealed the exact date of the captivity of Jehoiachin, and more briefly the location of Abimelech's date from the Shechem excavation, the confirmation of Ezra's return under Artaxerxes I as occurring in 457 B.C. (Elephantine Aramaic Papyri), details of Sabbath observance by Jews

¹The title of the article was the clearest apologetic element.


³Now renamed the Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum.

⁴This relatively modern object had been entrusted to SDAs in Holland during World War II, but the owners apparently perished in the holocaust.

at Elephantine from ostraca found there, and the location of the walls of OT Jerusalem with consequent reflections on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In this key article the primary emphasis was upon apologetic usage, but with reference also made to the importance of exegetical and contextual contributions.

The abundant RH articles by Horn reflect a strong desire to acquaint church members with Bible backgrounds (Scripture context). At the same time frequent use of archaeology for apologetic purposes demonstrates the desire to convince readers of the reliability of Scripture and to equip them with arguments for meeting non-members or non-Christians in confidence.

Horn's articles in the Ministry for this period began with a series of three on the question of Aramaic in Daniel.¹ He first described the problem very frankly, stating that his study had convinced him that "the Aramaic of the book of Ezra belonged to the early part of the third century B.C., but Daniel's Aramaic was seemingly of a slightly later stage."² He further admitted that though some scholars agreed others would lower these suggested dates by about a century. Horn's proposal was that both books had been revised and updated in both orthography and grammar. On the basis of documents and inscriptions from the eighth century B.C. and later, comparative stages of the development of the language have been


demonstrated. Horn stated that since the discovery of the Elephantine Aramaic papyri there had been a swing toward recognition of the genuineness of Ezra with a fifth-century authorship and a third-century form. In order to emphasize that the same attitude should be taken to the book of Daniel, Horn illustrated from the Qumran Isaiah manuscripts that the time of origin cannot be proved by the form of the text, only the time of revision. These articles were essentially apologetic though also contextual in a sense and were well researched.

In the following year Horn wrote two articles. In the first he defended the fifteenth-century dating of the Exodus by describing one of the first evidences to contradict Glueck's conclusion that the Transjordan area was uninhabited from 1800-1300 B.C. This new find was a Hyksos (about 1600 B.C.) tomb found in Amman, and Horn made much of it, though admitting that much more thorough

---

1 Idem, "Daniel--2," p. 36.
2 Ibid., pp. 37-38.
investigation was necessary to clarify all questions of early Hebrew chronology. The second article reported the trend towards more fundamental positions in biblical studies (or at least the recognition that conservative scholarship was making a significant contribution) as encouraged by the Albright school. The author felt that the chronological work of Thiele and Wood had made a notable impact thereby encouraging this trend. Both of these articles were apologetic, but the first more directly so.

Three book reviews in 1952 and 1953 were aimed at informing the ministry of current research. The first was only indirectly archaeological, but praised Thiele's chronological work and joined Thiele's professor (W. A. Irwin) in stating that Thiele had demonstrated conclusively "the precise and dependable accuracy of Hebrew chronology at the times of the kingdom." Next, Horn heartily recommended a brief survey of the early literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls, but was a little more cautious with Finegan's Light from the Ancient Past.

---

1 Horn, "Discovery on Date of Exodus," p. 41.
2 See pp. 116-17.
3 See pp. 99-100.
6 Ibid.
7 Idem, review of The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey, by A. Dupont-Sommer, in Ministry, June 1953, p. 41.
Finegan's interpretation of the prehistoric period and of the Flood as a local phenomenon. A certain element of apologetic was evident in the first and third of these reviews.

Five articles in 1953 contained considerable apologetic, but a sixth did not. This latter was a brief corrective article which clarified and corrected an earlier reference to the times at which certain ancient and modern nations have observed the day's commencement. Horn wrote a rather thorough summary of references to camels in the context of the second and third millennia B.C. He gave adequate examples to illustrate that there was at least limited domestication of these beasts at that time. In the next issue Horn featured his chronological work on the time of Ezra and the methods of recording years in the fifth century B.C. The purpose was apologetic in that it defended both the writings of Ezra and prophetic interpretations based on the seventh year of Artaxerxes I (Dan 8:14; 9:24-27). Reporting on the Seminary Extension School held at Collonges in 1953, Horn took the opportunity to stress what he had already emphasized in France—that archaeology could be used much more effectively "in proving the accuracy of the historical

1Idem, "Day's Beginning (a Correction)," Ministry, April 1953, p. 44.
4See also p. 305.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
parts of the Bible." His preliminary remarks were:

Seventh-day Adventist ministers--whether evangelists or pastors--have to demonstrate the authenticity of the Bible, raise up faith in God's Word, and prove that it is an inspired book. In most cases this important work is accomplished with the help of the fulfilled prophecies, in the exposition of which we as a denomination have definitely made an important contribution in the field of Biblical scholarship.

Another field of study of which our ministers have not yet made use to full advantage is Biblical archaeology.

The writer further maintained that by using the approach which he recommended the arguments of higher critics could be met and honest doubters encouraged in faith. At the same time he warned against fanciful and sensational interpretations and distinguished between discoveries which "prove the authenticity of the Biblical record" and those which merely illustrate. The two final articles for the year constituted a thorough discussion of the question concerning pentateuchal references to iron in the period before the twelfth century B.C. Horn gathered evidence from many sources to illustrate

---

1 Ibid., p. 27.
2 Ibid., p. 28.
3 He mentioned the stories of the "discovery" of Noah's ark and the lions' den of Daniel.
4 He gave the Babylonian flood tablets as an example of this type, since he felt that they only encourage the faith of those who already believe in Scripture (ibid.).
6 Horn noted that even Albright used the references to iron in Deuteronomy as one of the evidences of a late (ninth-century B.C.) origin (idem, "Iron in the Pentateuch--Part I," p. 32; cf. Albright, Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, p. 155).
that even non-meteoric iron\(^1\) was known in Egypt in the third millennium B.C.\(^2\) He gave similar examples from Mesopotamia including the earliest known example of terrestrial iron--apparently what had been an iron blade--from Tell Chagar Bazar, dated by the excavator between 3000 and 2700 B.C.\(^3\) There have been many apparent second millennium B.C. finds of iron objects in Syria, Palestine, and Anatolia,\(^4\) but most of these were from the days of less scientific excavation making exact dating difficult or impossible. Also analysis for nickel content has frequently been neglected. The apologetic purpose was particularly evident in these last two articles.

The only Ministry article by Horn in 1954\(^5\) described some

---

\(^1\)Meteoric iron is distinguishable by the relatively high content of nickel, varying from about 5-26 percent, but usually about 7-8 percent. Terrestrial iron rarely contains nickel or if so in minute proportions. A high nickel content in ancient iron objects is usually taken to indicate meteoric origin. Horn, "Iron in the Pentateuch--Part I," p. 35; cf. A. Lucas, Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries, 3rd rev. ed. (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1948), p. 258.

\(^2\)Two examples of terrestrial iron came from Fourth Dynasty Egypt (an iron blade from one of the air channels of the pyramid of Khufu, and a flint wand bearing the remains of some iron material), and a Sixth Dynasty specimen found by Petrie with other tools at Abydos (Horn, "Iron in the Pentateuch--Part I," p. 33).


\(^4\)The most notable item was an axe-blade (the excavator referred to it as a Mitannian battle axe) from Ugarit (late fifteenth or early fourteenth century B.C.) of near steel quality. (Horn, "Iron in the Pentateuch--Part II," p. 29; cf. Claude F. A. Schaeffer, Ugaritica, I, Mission de Ras Shamra, vol. 3 [Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1939], pp. 107-25).

of the new finds and interpretations made necessary by the ongoing work of Kenyon at Jericho.\(^1\) In addition to the corrections and explanations given in the RH article\(^2\) Horn gave for ministers a more detailed description of the superimposed cities and walls of Jericho and also gave reassurance that the date 5000 B.C. suggested by the excavators for the earliest city level was as even the excavators admitted--purely "guesswork."\(^3\)

A very practical article\(^4\) on how ministers might use archaeology effectively while avoiding pitfalls was published in 1955. Horn first stated that although archaeological discoveries "... have not produced, and cannot produce, evidence which proves that the Bible is the Word of God, they have in many cases demonstrated the historicity of disputed characters, events, and places."\(^5\) The minister must use common sense and careful judgment in selecting sources to illustrate and support the biblical data, so Horn suggested that only recently published books of an interpretive type should be chosen.\(^6\) They should be written by competent scholars rather

\(^1\)Cf. p. 108.

\(^2\)Horn, "Discoveries at Jericho Uncover Parts of Joshua's City," p. 8.

\(^3\)Horn, "Recent Discoveries at Jericho," p. 31.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 42.

\(^6\)Since interpretations can be changed dramatically as in the case of additional information coming to light, he used the progressive information on Belshazzar to illustrate this type of accumulative reconstruction which is reflected in progressive interpretation (ibid., pp. 42-43).
than popular journalists. Finally, he mentioned the Dead Sea Scrolls as an example of the finds which "... can be used to the fullest extent to build up confidence in the Bible."\(^1\) The same issue of the Ministry carried a review of Merrill Unger's Archaeology and the Old Testament\(^2\) in which Horn recommended the work as a textbook but upbraided the author for inadequate care in the selection of chapter bibliographies—a similar warning to that which he gave in the accompanying full-length article.

Next in sequence were two book reviews of works which Horn recommends as tools for ministers. The first\(^3\) was a popular-level sourcebook on Mesopotamian archaeology by the chief curator of French National Museums and excavator of Mari. This was followed by a review of the Rand McNally Bible Atlas, by Emil G. Kraeling,\(^4\) which Horn found to be accurate, though he warned that the text was written from a higher critical point of view. The next article was a significant summary of the revisions which had occurred in Mesopotamian chronology during the first half of the twentieth century.\(^5\) New discoveries had indicated that the Babylonian king lists did not give a continuous sequence of kings but at times included contemporary dynasties. Thus the assigned period for the reign of Hammurabi

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 45.

\(^2\) Ministry, October 1955, pp. 46-47.

\(^3\) Idem, review of Discovering Buried Worlds, by André Parrot, in Ministry, May 1956, p. 42.

\(^4\) In Ministry, May 1957, p. 38.

was moved by stages from the twenty-fourth century B.C. to an ultimate 1728-1686 B.C.\textsuperscript{1} The tone of the article was apologetic, though there was no explicit apologetic statement.\textsuperscript{2} The author gave no details concerning his reasons for rejoicing over the trend towards a "short chronology," but he did say that readers need not worry over the dates frequently assigned to the prehistoric period, whose divisions he termed "hypothetical periods."\textsuperscript{3}

As an introduction to the special issue of the Ministry which featured the Seminary Guided Tour to Europe and the Bible Lands, Horn wrote a statement concerning the significance of biblical archaeology.\textsuperscript{4} This was perhaps a justification of the tour, for the writer mentioned the way in which our knowledge of the cultural

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 5-8. The latter date was Albright's (W. F. Albright, "A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia," BASOR 88 [1942]:28-36), but the more popular position today is to place Hammurabi at or near 1792-1750 B.C. (see A. L. Oppenheim, "Hammurabi," IDB [1962], 2:517; Lloyd, Archaeology of Mesopotamia, pp. 157-59; Hallo and Simpson, The Ancient Near East, p. 98). Kramer was more cautious suggesting that his reign may have commenced in "approximately 1750 B.C., plus or minus fifty years" (Samuel Noah Kramer, The Sumerians: Their History, Culture, and Character [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963], p. 32). After detailed examination of the possibilities, M. B. Rowton ("The Date of Hammurabi," JNES 17 [1958]:97-111) considered 1792-1750 B.C. as the most probable with the evidence then available (ibid., p. 111).

\textsuperscript{2}Except that the discovery that Shamshi-Adad I was a contemporary of Hammurabi was heralded as "great news" since it led to further lowering of Hammurabi's dates (Horn, "Chronology of Western Asia," p. 6).

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 4.

setting of the Bible has been improved by 150 years of discovery. Horn also wrote of the confirming and enlightening of Scripture as well as of the confirmed accuracy of transmission of the text. Along similar lines, but with explicit details and examples, he wrote advising in what way objects in the museums of Europe (British Museum and Louvre) can contribute to our understanding of Scripture and "corroborate its truth and veracity." Both articles gave some stress to apologetic as well as contextual usage.

In 1959 Horn wrote the sequel to his article on Mesopotamian chronology, demonstrating a similar trend towards shortening of Egyptian chronology. He showed that the concept of a Sothic cycle was no valid proof that the Egyptian calendar was adopted in 4241 B.C., because there were other possibilities for explaining the Egyptian discovery of a 365-day yearly cycle. Most early Egyptian

2Ibid., p. 10.
4See p. 260.
5A period of 1460 years in which the calendar year (based on successive heliacal sightings of Sothis, or Sirius) moved entirely through the seasonal year because no compensation was made for the extra one fourth day (no leap year system) in a solar year (or astronomical year, of 365.2422 days). (Horn, "Chronology of Egypt," pp. 29-30).
6Such as averaging the number of days between successive inundations of the Nile. Therefore the Egyptian calendar had not necessarily begun at the commencement of a Sothic cycle. Horn did state that the solar calendar must have been introduced at least by the third millennium B.C., since Fifth Dynasty records indicate its existence at that time (ibid., p. 31).
dates remain tentative, but 2850 B.C. is the last date for the commencement of the Dynastic Period to have scholarly acceptance.¹

Again, the apologetic for a short chronology is not directly stated.

The next five items are all book reviews representing the period from 1959 to 1966. The first book² dealt with the last six centuries of the pre-Christian era, and Horn pronounced it "reliable but non-technical," while the author, J. A. Thompson, was declared "balanced and well informed."³ Horn recommended The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures, edited by James B. Pritchard⁴ as a cheaper publication than ANET and ANEP though containing the most important material from each. Being textual rather than interpretive, Horn said that the book would remain significant for many years. His own views on the identification of "Darius the Mede" led him to give only a very cautious approval to a work on that subject.⁵ Horn also had strong reservations on the next work

¹More frequently 3100 B.C. is taken as the approximate date for this event (Halo and Simpson, Ancient Near East, p. 299; Alan Gardiner, Egypt of the Pharaohs [London: Oxford University Press, 1961; Oxford University Press Paperback, 1964], p. 430). The latter suggests 3100 B.C., plus or minus 150 years.

²Siegfried H. Horn and Association Advisory Committee, review of Archaeology and the Pre-Christian Centuries, by J. A. Thompson, in Ministry, August 1959, p. 43.

³Ibid., p. 37.

⁴In Ministry, August 1959, p. 43.

⁵Idem, review of Darius the Mede, by John C. Whitcomb, Jr., in Ministry, September 1959, p. 44. He felt that inadequate attention was paid to the possibility of identifying Cyaxares son of Astyages with Darius the Mede [which was Horn's own view, see "Additional Note on Chapter 6," [Daniel], SDA Bible Commentary [1953-1957], 4:814-17]. Horn also noted some disagreements between the book reviewed and statements of E. G. White (ibid., p. 816; Horn, review of Darius the Mede, p. 44; cf. Ellen G. White, The Story of
he reviewed because it contained numerous inaccuracies. He approved of the style and basic content but felt that considerable revision was necessary in the chapters dealing with archaeological discoveries. When reviewing the important volume published as a tribute to Albright, Horn revealed much of his own attitude to current scholarship. He mentioned the increased esteem for the OT text, the intensified interest in the historical and cultural context of the ancient Israelites, and the extremely helpful influence of Palestinian archaeology on biblical studies. He appears to have agreed with criticism of the Kittel and Kahle Biblia Hebraica, and to have been much impressed by the contribution of Frank M. Cross, Jr., in the chapter entitled, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." He expressed agreement with the short chronology of Prophets and Kings: As Illustrated in the Captivity and Restoration of Israel (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1943), pp. 523, 556-57 (and presumably other unspecified pages).

1 Siegfried H. Horn, review of Archaeology and the Bible, by G. Frederick Owen, in Ministry, October 1963, pp. 40-42.

2 Such as attributing the discovery of the story of the journey of Wen-Amon to Montet when excavating Byblos [1921-1924] rather than [by fellahin] at el-Hibe in Egypt in 1891; and saying that there is no town or village on the site of Samaria, whereas in fact Sebastieh occupies a part of the site.

3 Idem, review of The Bible and the Ancient Near East, edited by G. Ernest Wright, in Ministry, September 1966, pp. 43-44.

4 The book was intended to outline the progress in biblical archaeology since the end of the first World War--the period of Albright's active participation in the discipline, and to sketch the problem areas which still remained.

Albright, D. N. Freedman, and E. F. Campbell, but disagreed with their chronological system for the kings of Israel and Judah (himself agreeing essentially with E. R. Thiele).\(^1\) In conclusion he warned that readers would not entirely agree with the work, especially in areas of prehistory, chronology, and with regard to certain critical views.\(^2\)

In 1973 Horn wrote an introductory statement\(^3\) for the archaeological feature of the new format Ministry. He indicated three objectives: (1) to report the latest discoveries, (2) to indicate new trends in scholarly thinking, and (3) to recommend recent literature. Horn pledged that the attempt would be made to keep Ministry reports "nontechnical but thoroughly reliable," so that ". . . the minister can confidently quote these articles or use information from them without embarrassment or fear of later having to retract statements. . . .\(^4\) These objectives reveal a desire to make archaeology an effective ministerial tool for the purposes stated elsewhere.\(^5\) Horn's final Ministry article for this period\(^6\) was a summary of the archaeological contributions and of the progressive theological


\(^2\)Horn, review of Bible and the Ancient Near East, p. 44.


\(^4\)Ibid.


stance of W. F. Albright, with selected quotations from his writings. He was especially impressed by Albright's gradual movement away from the extreme liberal positions of Wellhausenism towards a moderating position perhaps halfway between the latter and what he termed "obscurantist orthodoxy."¹

During the period from the commencement of AUSS in 1963 to 1973 Horn wrote eleven articles three of which concerned the Heshbon excavations. In addition he wrote eight book reviews. For this full period he was also the editor of the journal.²

The first article³ concerned early references to Byblos in the ANE. Since it was a key port for the export of cedar wood, it is not surprising that the name occurred with some regularity for 2000 years beginning with the Fourth Dynasty in Egypt and also quite frequently in cuneiform records beginning with the Third Dynasty of Ur.⁴ In Egypt Horn located a spelling change from ḫbn to ḫpn as having occurred in the late Twelfth Dynasty and used this factor for dating certain Execration Texts⁵ and an obelisk found at Byblos.⁶ In Mesopotamia a spelling change from Kubla to Gubla, Gublu, and Gubal occurred at about the same time (late nineteenth century

¹Ibid., p. 7.
²His last year was 1974 in which he shared the editorship with Kenneth A. Strand who succeeded him in 1975.
⁴There was also a special word meaning "Byblos-ships" associated particularly with sea-going ships for the transport of lumber (ibid., p. 53).
⁵Ibid., p. 54.
⁶Ibid., pp. 58-59.
B.C.), leading Horn to suggest that some change of pronunciation of the place name occurred in the early second millennium B.C.¹ Usage here might be described as reporting investigative study leading to improved understanding of the OT context.

Horn summed up his personal involvement with the chronology of the Hebrew monarchy in 1964.² During his internment he had worked on a solution, having already studied previous attempts at solving the puzzle. His assumption was that the records given were basically accurate, so he set himself to understand them. He concluded from his study that no single calendar or system had been followed and that the civil year in Israel had been reckoned as commencing in the Spring (with the month later known as Nisan), whereas in Judah it had commenced with the Autumn (with the month later known as Tishri). He rejected interregna but accepted several coregencies in the south and one in the north. He felt that shifts had occurred in the application of antedating and postdating systems, and recognized that coregencies were sometimes referred to in terms of a king's entire reign and sometimes of his sole reign. Furthermore each kingdom applied its own system when referring to the kings of the rival kingdom.³ When he was released Horn found that Thiele had already published⁴ his similar solutions which were more complete

¹Ibid., p. 57.
⁴See p. 116.
than his own, and he ultimately accepted Thiele's proposal of 723/722 B.C. for the fall of Samaria and the fact that Pekah had appropriated the years of his two predecessors in his own regnal record. Significantly Horn accepted the latter on the basis of an archaeological parallel.\(^1\) Finally Horn unravelled the solution to three more texts by indicating that coregencies between Jotham and Ahaz and between Ahaz and Hezekiah had been recorded in a distinctive manner.\(^2\) This enabled synchronisms between Hoshea of Israel and Hezekiah of Judah.\(^3\) Although the archaeological element in this article was essentially in footnotes, it was important and assisted the contextual and apologetic contribution, but more particularly it contributed exegetically.

The question (both historical and chronological) of whether Sennacherib had invaded Judah once or twice has often been discussed.\(^4\) Part of the problem has been the inadequate data on the reign of Tirhakah which Horn discussed as an introduction to his presentation.\(^5\) Horn referred to discoveries at Kawa (ancient Gematen) in

\(^1\) Possibly posthumously, but in fact, Haremhab's reign (late Eighteenth Dynasty Egypt) had been counted as including the years of his four predecessors (Horn, "Chronology of Hezekiah," pp. 46-47).

\(^2\) Ahaz's reign did not count the years of coregency with his father Jotham but recorded simply the sixteen years from the death of Jotham to his own death (2 Kgs 16:2); and likewise Hezekiah's reign of twenty-nine years was counted only from the death of his father Ahaz until his own death (2 Kgs 18:2). Horn, "Chronology of Hezekiah," pp. 48-51.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 48; cf. 2 Kgs 18:1, 9, 10.


\(^5\) Siegfried H. Horn, "Did Sennacherib Campaign Once or Twice against Hezekiah?" AUSS 4 (1966):3-11.
Sudan which have filled in details of Tirhakah's reign and indicate that at the age of twenty he became coregent with his brother Shabataka in 690 or 689 B.C.¹ He commenced his sole reign in about 684 B.C.² These facts make it clear that Tirhakah could not have been king or general in Palestine in 701 B.C. and therefore favor two campaigns by Sennacherib, the second occurring between 690-686 B.C.³ (during the reign of Tirhakah but before the death of Hezekiah). Sennacherib's records are far from complete, especially for the last seven or eight years of his reign (689-681 B.C.), and an unsuccessful campaign was unlikely to have been recorded anyway.⁴ Horn regarded the capture of Lachish as most likely occurring during the proposed second campaign⁵ and gave a clear outline of events for the two campaigns as he interpreted the evidence.⁶ On linguistic and archaeological grounds, he suggested that the number of Assyrians slain (by bubonic plague?) was probably 5,180.⁷ The article attempted

¹Ibid., p. 28, postscript would suggest that this should read 691 or 690 B.C.
²Ibid., p. 10.
³Or perhaps 691-686 B.C. (ibid., p. 28, postscript).
⁴At least not factually (ibid., pp. 12-13, especially n. 41).
⁵Ibid., pp. 16-17.
to settle the interpretation of details of 2 Kgs 18, 19, and Isa 36, 37 and is therefore predominantly exegetical and contextual. However, there is also an implied apologetic in the effort to show the details to be historical.

The next item again involved chronology. Horn combined information made available in Wiseman's Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings with his own conclusions on the use (in Judah) of a civil calendar which began in the autumn to refine the dates for a number of events in the late seventh and early sixth-century period. First he demonstrated that the battle of Megiddo can now be located in May or early June 609 B.C., with Jehoahaz reigning until August or September of that same year. Neco apparently established his headquarters in Riblah and then summoned Jehoahaz to come there for that purpose (2 Kgs 23:33). He also showed that the battle of Carchemish should be dated between April 12, 605 B.C. (the beginning of Nabopolassar's twenty-first year) and the end of May (probably). The capture of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin was clearly on March 16, 597 B.C., but the successive fall under Zedekiah, though frequently identified with 587 B.C., was pinpointed by Horn as occurring on


4 Ibid., p. 18.

5 Ibid., p. 20.

6 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
July 18, 586, with the destruction four weeks later on August 14.¹ Horn also interpreted Jer 52:28-30 as indicating small-scale special deportations, distinct from the much larger deportations of 597 and 586 B.C.² Usage closely parallels that of the previous article.

The next three items were reviews by Horn, commencing with Thiele's revised edition of his full-scale discussion of the chronology of the Hebrew monarchy.³ Horn noted the increased use of charts and the inclusion of recent archaeological data, and he also restated his own agreement with most of Thiele's positions.⁴ Next Horn turned to a work which claimed to demonstrate NT reliance upon an Essene heritage.⁵ He concluded that the author's reconstruction of the Essene community was an "artificial history" and that his claim that The Testimony of the Twelve Patriarchs (especially the portion known as the Testament of Levi) does not contain Christian

¹Ibid., p. 22 (2 Kgs 25:2-4, 8-9). That is by correlating the fall-to-fall calendar of Judah with the Babylonian calendar. Horn rejected Albright's reckoning which assumed that the Jewish analysts used the antedating (non-accession year) system for Nebuchadnezzar, but the postdating (accession-year) system for their own kings (Horn, "Babylonian Chronicle, p. 23; cf. W. F. Albright, "The Nebuchadnezzar and Neriglissar Chronicles," BASOR 143 [1956]: 32).


⁴Ibid., p. 24; but not with his chronology of Hezekiah's reign. See p. 267.

⁵Siegfried H. Horn, review of The Essene Heritage or the Teacher of the Scrolls and the Christ, by Martin A. Larson, in AUSS 6 (1968):219-21.
interpolations but is original Essene material in its entirety is baseless. In conclusion, the reviewer listed some of the historical errors which he had noted.\(^1\) Turning to a work on historical geography by Avi-Yonah,\(^2\) Horn noted the expertise of the author, especially in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and commended the book for reference with some sections also noted as very interesting reading. At the same time he did disagree with some of the author's interpretations, notably the inclination to exclude Lod, Hadid, and Ono (coastal cities) from the province of Judea in the Persian period. Horn felt that the evidences given were inconclusive,\(^3\) while the fact that Ezra and Nehemiah mentioned them (Ezra 2:33; Neh 7:37; 11:34-35) would argue against the author. This was in effect an apologetic note in defense of the integrity of Ezra and Nehemiah, though contextual use is also obvious. The previous review was more polemical with an apologetic for the originality of Christianity, while the first probably had more contextual and exegetical elements with an implied apologetic.

In 1968 Horn wrote an article on a seventh-sixth century

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 221.
\(^3\)Avi-Yonah had mentioned that these cities sent no builders for Nehemiah's wall construction (Horn said they lived in a sensitive border area), and that the plain of Ono must have been outside Judea to have been an acceptable meeting ground for Sanballat and Nehemiah (Neh 6:2), but Horn thought that may have been a compromise (it was close to Samaria) to encourage Nehemiah's attendance (ibid., pp. 205-206).
Aramaic papyrus from Saqqara. Attempting to pinpoint the historical setting from the content material (the writer, Adon, and his Egyptian overlords were threatened by a Babylonian invasion which had already reached a nearby city called Aphek), he succeeded in identifying conditions indicative of the time of Nebuchadnezzar. The mention of Aphek gave little assistance in the identification process, for Horn concluded after an exhaustive analysis of the possibilities that the city remained unidentified (there were five different towns of that name in ancient Syro-Palestine). Consequently it was impossible to definitely identify the city or state over which Adon ruled unless further evidence should be found. Usage in this case was predominantly contextual.

Two reports of the first season's excavation at Heshbon were jointly written by Horn and Boraas in 1969, the first introducing

1Idem, "Where and When Was the Aramaic Saqqara Papyrus Written?" AUSS 6 (1968):29-45.

2Ibid., pp. 34-35.


the site and giving the history and organization of the expedition and the second summarizing the results. These reports parallel, and were at times identical, with the reports given in the RH, but additional technical details were given in AUSS. The most interesting difference between the AUSS and the RH reports was that the former omitted any apologetic justification for the campaign and for the choice of the site so the only evident usage was reporting and contextual enlightenment.

Horn had a strong interest in Shechem. It had been feared that some of Sellin's Taanach finds might be mixed with the objects from his Shechem (1913-1914) expedition in the Vienna Museum. However, the discovery of the expedition's Fundbuch alleviated that worry. The objects retained by the Turkish government were lost, but fifty-three complete or restored vessels from Shechem remained in Vienna. Because of the poor excavating and recording methodology used by Sellin, vessels had to be dated typologically by Horn and his student, L. G. Moulds. The majority of these vessels were rather

---

1Cf. pp. 246-47.

2See p. 247. Presumably it was thought necessary to justify the expenses involved in such a campaign in the general church paper, whereas in the scholarly journal this was not necessary. The comments on the biblical history of Heshbon (in Horn and Boraas, "First Campaign," p. 99) hint at the expectations of the excavators but there was no mention of the Exodus dating problem.

3This was the suspicion at the time of Horn's article on objects from Shechem ("Objects from Shechem: Excavated 1913 and 1914," JEOL, 20 [1967-1968]:71-90).

evenly distributed from MBII--Iron I, with smaller representation from Iron II, Hellenistic and Roman periods.\(^1\) This was a purely descriptive report with indirect contextual contributions.

Horn next contributed three book reviews. He apparently enjoyed and recommended Aharoni's *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography* because of its interpretations in the light of political history.\(^2\) His main criticisms were that the book stopped at the time of Nehemiah with no discussion of NT Palestine and assumed that certain sites such as Ekron and Gath were correctly identified with Khirbet el-Muqanna and Tell es-Safi without discussion. Harrison's monumental *Introduction to the Old Testament* received rather strong approval, though the reviewer expressed disappointment mainly in regard to a certain amount of negativism.\(^3\) Horn noted that higher critical views were regularly refuted or negated, but that strong positive supporting arguments on these issues did not always accompany them. Horn also felt that the author had understandably failed to do justice to either Near Eastern archaeology or chronology of the ANE in the fifty to sixty pages allotted to each. Yet he still acknowledged that Harrison's familiarity with a vast range of literature made this work a most valuable statement of conservative views and a fair summary of their more liberal counterparts.\(^4\) Jeremias' work on the social and economic conditions of NT Jerusalem was recommended as indispensable for the "serious student of NT

---

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 23-46.  
\(^3\)In *AUSS* 9 (1971):77-78.  
\(^4\)Ibid.
history," in spite of the fact that it was little changed in content from the earliest forms published in the 1920s and 1930s (in German) and used archaeology rather sparsely (much less was available at that time). One significant change Horn noted with respect to earlier German editions was the downward revision of the estimate of the population of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Two of these reviews emphasized the contextual aspect, but in the case of Harrison's book it was essentially a report of an available conservative study aid.

A brief article by Horn described eight scarabs in the Andrews University Archaeological Museum. The scarabs are of uncertain provenance, though presumably all from Palestine, with five reputed to be from the vicinity of Samaria. The first was described as from the early Second Intermediate period or early Hyksos, the next four as Hyksos, two bore the prenomen of Thutmose III, and the last appeared to come from Seti II. The article was a scholarly report.

A good example of exegetical (as well as contextual) usage


2 Jeremias virtually halved his earlier estimate of 55,000 for the walled city and its external suburbs (without the Passover influx) to 25,000-30,000 (ibid., p. 81).


4 Now known as the Siegfried H. Horn Archaeological Museum.

5 Ibid., p. 142.
of archaeology was written by Horn in 1973.\textsuperscript{1} Both 2 Sam 12:30 and 1 Chron 20:2 contain problems or ambiguities with regard to a crown captured by David at Rabbath-Ammon.\textsuperscript{2} Horn discussed eight sculptures (seven being essentially of heads only) found in the vicinity of Amman which all show similar types of crowns. He concluded that it is likely that these sculptures represent the type of crown captured by David; he also favored the MT reading which would indicate that the crown was worn by the Ammonite king (rather than the god, though the latter was not ruled out).\textsuperscript{3}

A report of the 1971 Heshbon expedition paralleled that in the RH.\textsuperscript{4} It was clearly stated that the big surprise was that no significant remains had been found which pre-dated the seventh century B.C., so that the author wrote saying "... all evidence thus far encountered indicates that Tell Hesban, identified since at least


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., pp. 170-73. (1) The Type of crown (atarah) which Horn insisted must be a helmet or hat-like crown (he also gave parallels from Egypt and Syro-Palestine, ibid., pp. 174-75). (2) Did the original Hebrew text indicate that it was a crown "of their king" (MT) or "of Melchol/Molchol their king" (LXX, possibly by dittography or conflation of variants. Ibid., p. 171). Horn favored the MT since David would be unlikely to wear the crown of an idol. (3) Is the weight of one talent to be taken literally? Horn felt not (was it rather the value or some alternative?). (4) Did David wear the crown or the precious stone mentioned with it? Since 1 Chron 20:2 says that the stone was in the crown it would seem that he wore both (Horn, "Crown of the King," p. 173).

\textsuperscript{3}The fact that the first statue had a manlike appearance with bear feet Horn took to indicate a king on sacred ground (ibid., p. 179).

the time of Eusebius with OT Heshbon, cannot be King Sihon's capital of Moses' time.¹

Horn paid warm tribute to his late friend Roland de Vaux as he reviewed his posthumously published work.² Apart from chapter 10, which he stated to be considerably outdated, Horn commended the book—actually a collection of essays—as stimulating and informative. His review likewise recommended in the highest terms Kenyon's Royal Cities of the Old Testament,³ but he did express a few reservations. Kenyon gave Yadin's reinterpretation of R. A. S. Macalister's "Maccabean Castle" but omitted references to Dever's re-excavation of this installation with its support for Yadin.⁴ Horn also regarded some of the chronological statements as arbitrary or unwarranted.⁵

¹Boraas and Horn, "Second Campaign," p. 15; but see p. 437 for later mention of Iron Age I discoveries.


³In AUSS 11 (1973):210-12.


⁵Specifically, where she regarded the death of Solomon in 926/925 B.C. as the "first fixed date," when in fact this was clearly debatable (Horn, review of Royal Cities, p. 212); also completion of Jerusalem's temple construction under Zerubbabel in 516 B.C. (Horn specified 515 B.C.); Nehemiah's wall construction in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes as 440 B.C. (Horn said 444 B.C.); and finally she stated that part of Jerusalem and the temple were sacked in 598 B.C. (Horn observed that there is no evidence for such, though various vessels were taken [ibid.]).
Turning to Horn's books we note that the first has a clearly stated objective in the introduction:

"... to examine the chronological basis of the time prophecy of the 2,300 days of Dan 8:14."

Although this is a chronological study, much of its source material was drawn from ANE archaeology. The first two chapters illustrated the various methods of reckoning time which were used in the ancient world, with an introduction to the Julian and Gregorian systems, but giving special emphasis to the systems used in ancient Egypt and Babylon. The third chapter used archaeological evidence (Gezer Calendar) with biblical data to demonstrate that the pre-exilic Jews used two overlapping calendar systems concurrently (an ecclesiastical year beginning in the spring and a civil year beginning in the fall) from the time of Solomon to the fall of the monarchy.

In the subsequent chapter he showed that the same practice was revived in post-exilic times and was used by Ezra and Nehemiah. Evidence for the latter included data from the Aramaic papyri from the Jewish colony at Elephantine, and especially helpful were those papyri known as the Brooklyn Museum Papyri. Most decisive in showing that the

---

1Horn and Wood, Chronology of Ezra 7; cf. p. 103. Apparently Wood did some of the groundwork and formulated a methodological approach, while Horn did much of the actual research and (assisted by Julia Neuffer) all of the writing.


3The solar year (ibid., pp. 38-45).

4A luni-solar year, consisting of twelve months of twenty-nine or thirty days each, with one month repeated every second or third year (ibid., pp. 47-50).

5Ibid., p. 63.
Jews in Egypt were using their own fall-to-fall calendar for recording events,\(^1\) in addition to the legal Egyptian calendar, was a papyrus known as "Kraeling 6."\(^2\) Correlating of the Egyptian and Persian calendars had already been achieved, but correlating the data in the double-dated "Kraeling 6" (and also "Kraeling 7") was only possible on the assumption that the writer was using the Jewish fall-to-fall calendar.\(^3\) On this basis, the final chapter approached the chronology of Ezra 7 and the dating of Artaxerxes I. It was demonstrated with reasonable certainty that Xerxes was murdered in December\(^4\) 465 B.C., and thus Artaxerxes I came to the throne in that month.\(^5\) Using the accession-year system of the Jews, Artaxerxes' first regnal year would not have begun until fall of 464 B.C., and thus his seventh year would have been fall 458 B.C. to fall 457 B.C. Ezra's journey (dated in Ezra 7:8-9) which lasted from Nisan (spring) to Ab (summer) would have been from late March to late July of 457 B.C.\(^6\) Although this book is clearly contextual in its contribution, it is also partly apologetic. The approach which was indicated in the introduction as well as in the related article in Ministry\(^7\) indicates that a fundamental aim of the research was to demonstrate the reliability of Ezra and Nehemiah (especially with regard to higher

---

\(^1\) Including details concerning the Persian kings.
\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 82-87.  \(^3\) Ibid., p. 84.
\(^4\) Probably just before December 17 (ibid., pp. 101-102).
\(^5\) Certainly by January 2, 464 B.C. (ibid., p. 103).
\(^6\) Ibid., pp. 104-106.
\(^7\) Horn, "Seventh Year of Artaxerxes I," p. 24.
critical attacks on their chronology\(^1\), as well as to substantiate
the chronological base for interpretation of Dan 8:14 and 9:24-27.
This does not detract from the scholarly accomplishments of the book,
but its essentially "internal" objective may help explain why even
conservatives like R. K. Harrison\(^2\) have not adopted this thesis.
The revised edition\(^3\) gave a much more comprehensive coverage of the
relevant Elphantine Papyri as "Appendix 2" and was enlarged and
updated, incorporating data from Wiseman's *Chronicles of Chaldean
Kings*\(^4\) and the updated version of Parker and Dubberstein's *Babylonian
Chronology* 626 B.C.-A.D. 75.\(^5\)

Light from the Dust Heaps\(^6\) was written by Horn as a popular
booklet to explain the accomplishments of biblical archaeology for
the layman. The statement of purpose spoke indirectly of contextual
aid from archaeology, but more specifically stressed apologetic
aspects: the Bible student has been assisted in seeing

\(^1\) Ibid.

a Comprehensive Review of Old Testament Studies and a Special Supplement
on the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1969),
pp. 1140, 1148. Horn and Wood, *Chronology of Ezra 7*, was not even
mentioned in the bibliography of Harrison's chapter on Ezra and
Nehemiah.

\(^3\) Siegfried H. Horn and Lynn H. Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra
7*, 2nd rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald Publishing Asso-
ciation, 1970).

\(^4\) Cf. p. 232.

\(^5\) *Brown University Studies*, no. 19 (Providence, R.I.: Brown
University Press, 1956).

1955.
... how recent discoveries in those countries [Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Palestine] have proved that the Bible contains true records of the past. Seeing his confidence in the Bible confirmed, the reader then will not only appreciate much better its sublime truths but will also more willingly follow its teachings.  

In this way it was hoped that the booklet would "... buttress the faith of its readers in the eternal values of God's Word."  

The first chapter portrayed the critical context of the nineteenth century together with the providential discoveries which "greatly helped to nullify the disastrous effects of higher criticism." Other more positive contributions were referred to from time to time. The end of World War I was seen as the time when biblical archaeology came to sufficient maturity to call it a scientific study, so Horn used chapters 2 and 3 to summarize the progress up to that time (mentioning some contextual and some apologetic aspects and examples).  

Of this period when critical views had been so successful, he wrote stating that the various archaeological discoveries had "... showed for the first time that historical events described in the sacred pages of Holy Writ could be proved by contemporary records of other nations." For his report of recent discoveries and much of Israel's later history, Horn gave data similar to that included in his articles, but when dealing with the patriarchal period he gave more

---

1 Ibid., p. 4.  
2 Ibid.  
3 Ibid., p. 7.  
4 Including the recovery of details of Sargon II, and general background, contextual, and apologetic materials from various parts of the ANE (ibid., pp. 10-24).  
5 Ibid., p. 16.
attention here to the Nuzi Tablets than he had in the periodicals. When dealing with the Exodus he gave brief arguments in support of the fifteenth-century dating for that event and then made comparisons between the Code of Hammurabi and the Ten Commandments presented to Moses at Sinai. Horn attributed the similarities to common origin through the original worship of the same God, and he made the apologetic point that Hammurabi's Code and older codes recently discovered have shown that there is nothing anachronistic about claiming that the Law was given to Moses in the fifteenth century.

1 Including the adoption story of Nashwi and Wullu, with suggested parallels to Laban and Jacob (ibid., pp. 31-33; cf. ANET, pp. 219-20). For more complete sources on Nuzi see Cyrus H. Gordon, "Biblical Customs of the Nuzu Tablets," BA 3 (1940):1-12; Harold H. Rowley, "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," BJRL 32 (1949-1950):48-50, 73-79; C. J. Mollo Weir, in Archaeology and Old Testament Study, ed. Winton D. Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 73-86. The more limited use of Nuzi parallels advocated recently is expressed by B. L. Eichler ("Nuzi," IDB Supplement, pp. 635-36), but a more positive yet balanced position has been presented by Martin J. Selman ("Comparative Methods and the Patriarchal Narratives," Themelios 3 [September 1977]:9-16). Selman suggests usage of the Nuzi and similar materials for biblical studies in three ways: (a) "to provide a further example of a similar practise"—not adding to our understanding, but as a simple parallel; (b) to provide a "fuller background to a biblical passage;" (c) and sometimes in addition to furnishing background detail, to "offer an explanation of a poorly understood biblical custom." It is this third category which Selman stresses because of its potential for enriching our knowledge of the context and hence of the Scripture itself (ibid., p. 11).

2 Horn, "Arguments of Higher Critics--2," p. 6; see p. 228.

3 Horn, Dust Heaps, pp. 37-41; cf. p. 260.

B.C. The final three chapters emphasized the providential preservation of biblical manuscripts, especially the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Wadi Murabbaat materials which have done so much to confirm the reliability of the text. Albright praised the booklet as an informative survey of recent discoveries.¹

Horn's third book, The Spade Confirms the Book,² was an apologetically oriented collection of articles from his travels in the Middle East. The articles also give considerable insight into the biblical context and were arranged to emphasize the geographical localities.³ Horn suggested that the remarkable work of excavation has now enabled us "to reconstruct to a large extent the history of antiquity,"⁴ thereby providing an accurate backdrop for the Bible. When the work was revised,⁵ the chapter on Ezion-geber was omitted.⁶ There was also considerable re-writing in the chapters on Shechem and its environs,⁷ particularly to incorporate the new excavations at Shechem.⁸ Other chapters which were considerably updated were chapter ¹⁷⁹ on the historical sites of Jerusalem—including

¹"Some Books Received by the Editor," BASOR 142 (1956):39.
²SCB; see p. 195. The repetition of this material in various sources can be found in Appendix II (generally changes between the material in RH and ST and SCB [1957] were slight).
³Mesopotamia, Egypt, Palestine, Transjordan, Lebanon, and Syria.
⁴SCB, p. 5. ⁵SCB (1980).
⁶SCB, pp. 185-93; cf. p. 198.
⁷SCB, chaps. 19 and 20; SCB (1980), chaps. 24 and 25.
⁸See pp. 117-18, 138, 139, 141.
⁹SCB (1980), chap. 22.
references to the excavations of Kenyon\(^1\) and Mazar,\(^2\) chapter 18 on the Dead Sea Scrolls\(^3\)—which was thoroughly updated—and chapter 25 which was rewritten\(^4\) to include the Andrews University excavations at Heshbon.\(^5\) Five new chapters covering the most significant (biblically) sites in Iran were included in the enlarged edition.\(^6\) One additional chapter included in the 1980 edition described work on sites in Israel (as distinct from those on the West Bank). At Tel Dan, Horn noted that Avraham Biran had discovered a fourteenth-thirteenth century B.C. tomb which contained a rich assortment of Mycenaean ware and objects of bronze, ivory, gold, and silver, as well as forty-five skeletons.\(^7\) On the Acropolis a large square platform was discovered (erected in the ninth century B.C.) which was on the site of an earlier installation and thought to be possibly the site of Jeroboam I's sanctuary.\(^8\) The brief description of excavations at Hazor and Megiddo included the Solomonic gates and walls and the huge water systems.\(^9\) The author also wrote briefly on

\(^1\) SCB (1980), pp. 183-84.  \(^2\) Ibid., pp. 191-92.

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 194-207 (chap. 23).

\(^4\) As SCB (1980), chap. 30.

\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 271-83.  \(^6\) Ibid., pp. 128-65.

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 235; cf. A. Biran, "Tel Dan," EAEHL 1:316.


Lachish mentioning work there by Aharoni and Ussishkin in addition to the earlier excavations which had produced the Lachish Letters.

He finally described excavations at Masada, the Hebrew temple uncovered at Arad, and Aharoni's work at Beersheba.

Horn's next book was a truly monumental undertaking. The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary assignment was given to him in 1957, and in his own words he was "involved in that project in every waking free minute until the spring of 1960." Though edited by Don Neufeld, the main burden fell on Horn who wrote all articles using significant archaeological data and the articles on geography, history, and most of those which were biographical. The plan was to aim at


3See pp. 128-29.


6Idem, "Tel Beersheba," EAEHL 1:160-68.


8Idem to Willis [January 25, 1982].

9Although the majority of the book was written by Horn, notable contributions were also made by Raymond F. Cottrell who wrote the essays on individual Bible books, a number of biographies including those of the apostles, and some theological articles. "Preface," SDA Bible Dictionary (1960), p. xix.
completeness in coverage of names and significant terms, but to limit articles somewhat in terms of length in order to maintain a single volume format. To illustrate the archaeological element in the dictionary we first take a town which has not been unanimously identified, Ekron. Horn gave three alternative sites which have been suggested, made no judgment, but seemingly favored the latest suggestion. In the revised edition the same sources were referred to, but a single sentence summary of evidences from the third site, Khirbet el-Muqanna, strengthened the impression of the author's acceptance of this identification. Likewise he accepted Tell el-Farah (north) as Tirzah, in the light of de Vaux's excavations there, though in the 1960 edition Horn had considered the question as undecided. The identification of other sites such as Kadesh-barnea was discussed but left open. Archaeology was used in these cases essentially for reconstructing the Scripture context, and even with such sites as Tyre there was no directly apologetic statement. Where there was no difficulty in identifying a city site as with Jerusalem, or Hazor, the author gave the background of the city as

---

1 "Ekron," ibid., p. 298.

2 "Ekron," SDA Bible Dictionary (1979), p. 314. Ruins of buildings and of the city wall were mentioned, as well as typical Philistine and Israelite pottery, but no excavation had been carried out. One of those quoted, J. Navah ("Khirbat al-Muqanna: Ekron: An Archaeological Survey," IEJ 8 [1958]:91) mentions that the maximum area which had been enclosed by the wall was "about 40 acres."


it appears in ancient records (and in Scripture), described both the site itself and the history associated with it, and concluded with the archaeological research in the environs of the city and its results.\(^1\) Abstract subjects like the rainbearing "South Wind" were illustrated by archaeology,\(^2\) as also were the many factors of ancient life and culture such as water supply\(^3\) and agriculture.\(^4\) Biographical articles used archaeology for additional contextual and historical information where possible, as illustrated by the features on "Nebuchadnezzar" (various details of his reign),\(^5\) "Jeroboam" (a seal which belonged to one of his officers),\(^6\) and several Assyrian kings.\(^7\) On the general topic of the identification of the Habiru,\(^8\) he concluded that those mentioned in the Amarna

\(^1\)With regard to Jerusalem the latter portion was enlarged and updated in 1979 to take in the excavations conducted in the city since 1960 (idem, "Jerusalem," SDA Bible Dictionary [1979], pp. 580-83). Though still tentative, the map of the city was also revised to reflect current knowledge of the size of the city from the time of Hezekiah (ibid., p. 574, cf. ibid., p. 583).

\(^2\)From the Tower of the Winds in Athens which represented that direction by a youth with a water vessel (SDA Bible Dictionary [1960], p. 1037).


\(^4\)From early Mesopotamia pictures have survived which show a seed funnel attached to a plough, though Horn noted that even hand sowing appears to have been carried out in rows at times. "Sowing," SDA Bible Dictionary, 1960, pp. 1037-38; cf. Isa 28:25.

\(^5\)SDA Bible Dictionary (1960), pp. 759-60.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 553.

\(^7\)Including Tiglath-pileser III (Pul), Shalmaneser V, Sargon II, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon.

Letters were most likely the Hebrews, though related groups were also referred to by the term. As an example of a longer and very crucial topic, we note that the article on "Chronology" discussed ancient chronology generally as well as more specifically within the Israelite period and in detail for the Israelite monarchy.

Though Horn clearly favored a relatively short chronology, he argued that the OT does not give complete data on chronology so that there is room for different interpretations. Thus to impersonalize the final position it was stated that

... this dictionary, although it holds to the accuracy of the account of Creation as given in Genesis, and to the substantial accuracy of whatever chronological data are furnished, does not presume dogmatically to set forth the exact date for the creation of the earth.

References have been made to changes in the revised dictionary and, in fact, these amounted to more than 3,300 corrections, revisions, and additions. A notable example of a corrected archaeological article is that which described the ancient gulf town of "Ezion-geber," with Glueck's revised interpretation given in brief form. Horn's phenomenal general knowledge and the quality of the research which he contributed to the dictionary led Albright to characterize it as "... in some ways, the best recent one-volume Bible dictionary now available, ..." while he also noted that it was distinctly conservative in tone and reflected denominational views on dating


2 Including twenty-seven new articles (idem, SDA Bible Dictionary [1979], p. xxiv).

3 Ibid., pp. 356-57; cf. p.111; the refinery smelters now being regarded as a large port warehouse.
and authorship of Bible books. The high quality and conservative views were retained in the revised edition. In summary, it can be said that this is an excellent Bible dictionary, in which there appears to be little direct apologetic use of archaeology, though usage reflects the desire for thorough enlightenment of the context and background of the entire Scripture corpus by a combination of all available sources.

In Records of the Past Illuminate the Bible, Horn appears to have placed more emphasis on scriptural context than he had in his earlier books on biblical archaeology. Introductory remarks stressed the contribution of ancient records in illuminating Scripture, though the apologetic aspect was not forgotten: these sources [archaeological]—

... illuminate in a remarkable way many poorly understood passages of the Scriptures, support or verify some strange statements, bring to life long-forgotten customs and facts, and show that many Biblical stories frequently considered to be fiction or folklore are actually true. (Italics supplied.)

Thus the book was written to illuminate Scripture, but it also "supports and corroborates" at the same time. In the epics and other

---


2 Naturally, the cumulative effect of this approach is to bolster the believability of Scripture and therefore, though very indirectly, to become apologetic.


4 Light from the Dust Heaps, and SCB; see pp. 168-70.

5 Horn, Records of the Past, p. 5.

6 Ibid.
ancient texts from Mesopotamia, Horn saw reflections or recollections of a perfect world, of the origin of sin, and of the Flood.\(^1\) Horn made more use of the Nuzi texts here than he had earlier,\(^2\) and he appears to have been aiming to demonstrate that the time period and historicity of the patriarchs as shown in Scripture are accurate (apologetic), as well as throwing extra light on their cultural setting (contextual usage).\(^3\) Apologetic aspects were evident in the description of Hazor's destruction levels as fitting a fifteenth-century Exodus, and also in the dating of Abimelech's destruction of the fortified temple of Shechem. The monarchy period was described essentially as in periodical articles.\(^4\) The final section of the book dealt with the post-exilic period and gave interesting details concerning the archive of a banking institution in the vicinity of Nippur. Many lenders and borrowers were Jews, and the name Marduka (Mordecai) occurred regularly in the period of Artaxerxes I.\(^5\) Of equal importance are the indications that many Jews of this

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 7-16. \(^2\) See p. 282. 
\(^3\) Idem, Records of the Past, pp. 17-26. 
\(^4\) An interesting sidelight here is Horn's reference to supplementary information on the details of the murder of Sennacherib. He mentioned that Ashurbanipal claimed to have killed the murderers in the same place and with the same instruments as they had used in killing Sennacherib, that is, with "sculptures of protective deities" (ibid., p. 46). He then stated that this confirms the biblical description (not mentioned in Assyrian records) that the king was killed in a temple (2 Kgs 19:37; Isa 37:38). However, Horn did not mention the complication that both Scripture references say that they killed him with a sword (obviously several weapons could have been used).

\(^5\) Horn, Records of the Past, p. 59. The author suggested that this name must have been extremely popular in the previous generation (time of Ahasuerus, or of Xerxes), but was not found at all among receipts of the later Darius II period (ibid.), (cf. pp. 324-25).
time enjoyed considerable wealth and respect. Thus the blend of apologetic and contextual use is clear in this small book. The apologetic aspect was again alluded to in the final words as the writer stated that through archaeological discoveries, Christians find their "faith strengthened and confirmed as their confidence in the Scriptures is increased."¹

The last two books written by Horn (and Boraas)² which fall within this period were both technical reports of the excavations at Heshbon. Both were, in fact, reprints of AUSS articles so that Horn's contributions in this direction have already been examined.³

Horn also wrote much material which was included in books edited by others. His presentation of archaeological evidences which "confirm the Bible" given at the 1952 Bible Conference in Washington, D.C., was published in this form.⁴ The majority of the contents of this consolidated lecture constitute in compressed form the same information and arguments as his articles from this period. The author wished to show "... in how many directions

¹Ibid., p. 62.


³See pp. 272-73, 276.

ancient remains have corroborated the veracity of the Bible. To illustrate, he spoke of the Nuzi texts giving support to the patriarchal stories, of the evidences for early use of iron, and for early domestication of camels; and he argued for the fifteenth-century dating of the Exodus at some length. One of the supports used by Horn for identifying the Hebrews with the Habiru (as far as the time factor was concerned) was challenged by Gardiner's demonstration that the particular inscription of Haremhab had been read from the wrong direction and that it therefore did not deal with the relocation of a transplanted people (i.e., it did not fit the suggestion of Canaanites fleeing from Hebrews). It would seem, however, that the text might still give some support to Horn's argument if the undetermined "foreigners" were from Canaan. The author proceeded to cover discoveries from subsequent periods of Israelite history and finally the Dead Sea Scrolls as in the periodicals. After referring to the authenticating force of these various evidences Horn concluded by saying:

1 Ibid., p. 66
3 Horn, "Recent Discoveries," p. 71; cf. pp. 256-57.
4 Horn, "Recent Discoveries," p. 71; cf. p. 255.
5 Horn, "Recent Discoveries," pp. 73-79. His summary of the evidences from Jericho was soon outdated and had to be corrected and updated soon after (see idem, "The Recent Discoveries at Jericho," Ministry, February 1954, pp. 29-31; cf. pp. 257-58).
6 Horn, "Recent Discoveries," pp. 76-77.
This material used in the right way can give tremendous strength to our fundamentalist position of accepting the whole Bible as God's inspired word. The years of study in this field have profoundly strengthened my confidence in the sure foundation on which our faith is built. We do not need to be afraid to proclaim Bible truths that we cannot prove yet by outside sources, as long as we remain on that sure foundation that has never failed us yet, the infallible Word of God.

Numerous unsigned articles in the SDA Bible Commentary series were written by Horn, the majority of them in the OT volumes. The first article contained considerable linguistic material discussion of the history of the canon, and information concerning Bible manuscripts (especially the Dead Sea Scrolls). Another archaeological element was a short description of ancient writing materials, especially papyri and leather scrolls. Usage was purely to contribute background and context to Scripture.

A general article on the origin and development of biblical archaeology also included a description of the resulting change in attitude with regard to the historicity of the Bible. The author

1Horn, "Recent Discoveries," p. 116.

21953-1957. The list here followed is based on conversations with and the research of Leona G. Running as appearing in Leona Glidden Running and Beverly U. Currie, compilers, "Selected Bibliography of Siegfried H. Horn" (Xeroxed.) For other contributors to the SDA Bible Commentary there are various oral and written (but unpublished) sources indicating authorship.


5Ibid., 1:30-31.

gave a useful survey of the recovery of the history of both Egypt and Mesopotamia as well as describing the decipherment of their mysterious scripts which unlocked the treasures of ancient documents. In Palestine work had begun later and had often been less rewarding.¹ Horn also briefly described the progress of excavation in Syria, Anatolia, Persia, and ancient Arabia. The intent of the article was to show that archaeology supplies context and background as well as defense of the historicity of the Bible. Horn wrote concerning the Palestinian section:

The Holy Land has thus through such archeological material made an important contribution for the establishment of the reliability of the Bible. In ancient times Palestine was the land in which most of the history described in the Old Testament was enacted, and it is now furnishing the proofs by which the mouths of infidels, critics, and doubters can be silenced.²

Significant changes when the commentary was revised included the omission of reference to the Gezer high place and Joshua's walls at Jericho (somewhat qualified in the earlier edition), the correction of Glueck's interpretation at Ezion-geber,³ and the comment that the stables at Megiddo "formerly dated to Solomon" were "now dated later, probably to Ahab's time."⁴

¹Jewish religion discouraged building some types of monuments and long periods of poverty generally prevented monumental constructions. At the same time, frequent wars and humid climate account for much of the loss of that which had been produced (ibid., 1:119-20).

²Ibid., 1:127.


⁴Ibid., 1:123.
In his next article, Horn gave an excellent summary of the early history of the Mesopotamian valley, Anatolia, and Egypt. This was a more detailed characterization of the political situation and outstanding achievements of the individual periods drawn up as a backdrop for patriarchal history. Only passing reference was made to the pre-literate Halaf and Ubaid periods, and it was stressed that the trend had been to shorten the earlier chronological calculations for these ancient civilizations. The essential intent of this article was contextual, with apologetic elements in the chronological statements.

The portrayal of daily life in the ancient world was undertaken separately for the three spheres of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Palestine. An approximate period of 2000-1500 B.C. was suggested for the patriarchal times and it was emphasized that in those days cultural changes were much less dramatic (in time and also often in distance) than more recently. Horn gave no documentation in this section but obviously gleaned details from extensive reading and his personal knowledge of that part of the world. Thus he was using archaeological data to supply myriads of tiny items of information.

1"The Historical Background of the Patriarchal Period," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:133-48.
2Ibid., 1:133. 3Ibid., 1:134, 140.
5For example, the fact that in both Egypt and Mesopotamia people sat on chairs, rather than reclined in Greek or Roman style (ibid., 1:157), and that the consciousness of sin and guilt was much clearer or more readily confessed in Babylonia than in Egypt (ibid. 1:158).
for reconstructing the mosaic of ancient life. For Palestinian daily
life the most helpful single source was the illustration from the
tomb of Khemhotep at Beni Hasan in Egypt.¹

Horn outlined the present understanding of "Weights, Mea­
sures, and Money Values in the Old Testament" in the article that
follows.² In the revised edition it was updated by subsequent finds
and scholarly contributions so that the pre-exilic Hebrew (at least
of Judah) linear measurements were based upon a slightly shortened
Egyptian cubit,³ rather than the Egyptian royal cubit.⁴ Various
discoveries⁵ have led to an upward adjustment of weights⁶ which Horn
also recorded, but he abandoned the attempt to give modern monetary
equivalents to the ancient gold and silver weights. Usage was
clearly contextual.

¹Ibid., 1:159-61; cf. pp. 132-33.
²SDA Bible Commentary, 1:163-69.
³Of 17.7 inches, but 17.5 for Israel. SDA Bible Commentary
(1958):205-14. The strongest evidence for this reckoning is the
Hezekiah tunnel which was described in the Siloam inscription as
1200 cubits in length and was measured by Vincent as 1749 feet, giv­
ing an approximate 17.5 inch cubit (ibid., pp. 208-209, 214). But
see also David Ussishkin ("The Original Length of the Siloam Tunnel
in Jerusalem," Levant 8 [1976]:82-95) who has argued for a tunnel
which was about 20 percent longer (going beyond the present Pool
of Siloam) and for a longer cubit of approximately twenty-one inches
(ibid., p. 89).
⁴Of 20.6 inches.
⁵Especially weights found in Jerusalem (idem, "The Scale-
⁶So that a Palestinian shekel is now reckoned to be .402
ounces, and a talent 75.38 pounds ("Weights, Measures," SDA Bible
The introduction and commentary for the book of Genesis were written by Horn. He briefly described higher critical views of the book and then proceeded to give positive arguments for Mosaic authorship. The main archaeological elements in the commentary section were parallels, details concerning place names mentioned in the narrative, and comments for enlightening context or exegesis. Parallels were used in various ways including implied apologetic. Implied apologetic seems to be the usage with the first two parallels, a Sumero-Akkadian bilingual poem concerning a maiden who sinned by eating "that which was forbidden" and the flood account in the Epic of Gilgamesh. At least in the latter case the author suggested that the story was a pagan recollection of an historical event. The author also referred to a ninth-century occurrence of the name "Zaphnath-paaneah," a Twelfth Dynasty famine record (simply as a contextual parallel since he advocated a Hyksos dating for Joseph), and Asiatic staffs with carved handles from the time of Thutmose III (to illustrate the staff of Judah, Gen 38:18). Although these instances illuminated context, Horn was cautious with another

1 "The First Book of Moses Called Genesis," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:201-487.
2 Ibid., p. 203.
3 Ibid., p. 231.
4 Ibid., p. 261; cf. ibid., p. 275.
5 Ibid., p. 448.
6 Ibid., p. 449.
7 Ibid., pp. 463-64.
8 Ibid., pp. 435-36. He also mentioned the Judicial Papyrus of Turin which gives a similar experience to that of the butler and baker in a conspiracy against Ramses III (ibid., p. 442).
He strongly denied that the "story of the two brothers,"1 dated to about 1225 B.C., could have had anything to do with the origin of the Joseph story.2 Horn also made specific exegetical applications as with Abraham's purchase of burial ground at Hebron in the light of Hittite laws,3 but in this case there was also apologetic for he was defending this early reference to Hittites in Palestine. Another apologetic section defended the reference to the "land of the Philistines" (Gen 21:32) at this early juncture on the grounds that Ugaritic documents from "before the 15th century B.C." had mentioned them in the north and therefore some Philistines may also have been settled in the south by that time.4 Attempted definitions and descriptions of ethnic groups (Gen 10)5 and place names such as Shechem,6 Bethel,7 and Nahor8 include elements of apologetic, contextual, and exegetical usage.

1ANET, pp. 23-25.
2"Genesis," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:440.
4"Genesis," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:347. This is clearly possible, though hardly a strong argument since the traditional home of the Philistines on Crete (cf. Amos 9:7, and Gen 10:14 and Horn's comments on the latter verse) was probably in closer contact with coastal Syria than with Palestine. An alternative explanation might be that the name of the land and its later inhabitants was projected backwards or "updated" by copyists (as in the case of Dan in Gen 14:14 and of Raamses and Pithom in Horn's interpretation of Exod 1:11, cf. next paragraph, and n. 3), for earlier inhabitants who may or may not have been racially connected. The popular view as depicted by J. C. Greenfield ("Philistines," IDB 3:791-95) simply views these pentateuchal references to Philistines and Philistia as anachronisms.
5"Genesis," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:268-82.
6Ibid., 1:296.
7Ibid., 1:297.
8Ibid., 1:362.
Horn's contributions on the book of Exodus were less extensive and contained less archaeology. Horn accepted the identification of Tell el-Maskhuta as Succoth, but was non-committal on Raamses and Pithom. He rejected the suggestion that strawless bricks discovered at Tell el-Maskhuta were evidence for Israelite labor there, since the record (Exod 5:7) simply indicates that they were required to supply their own straw. Other references to historical data from Egypt were in line with correlations suggested for the fifteenth-century dating of the Exodus, and the "Story of Sinuhe" was used to illustrate the possible hardships of Moses' flight into Sinai. Again in these references we see a combination of contextual, exegetical, and apologetic usage, while the extended parallels between the Code of Hammurabi and the Decalogue were used both apologetically and contextually.

A survey of the history of Israel and its neighbors (Egyptian, Hittite, Mittani, Assyrian empires, etc.) from 1400-586 B.C. was Horn's outstanding contribution to the next volume in the

2 Ibid., 1:556.
3 Ibid., 1:497; though he tended to favor identifying "Rameses" (Exod 12:36) with "Raamses" (Exod 1:11), and regarded both as later names for Tanis (Avaris) or modern San el-Hagar ("Exodus," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:556).
6 Ibid., 1:506; cf. ANET, pp. 18-22.
commentary series. The article clearly outlined the political framework for the major portion of the OT, while also adding significant data of a cultural nature. The latter element was specifically represented by the description of Canaanite religion. In one instance an Ugaritic story with some parallel to the story of Jezebel and the vineyard of Naboth (1 Kgs 21) was used as an illustration of Canaanite thinking and a possible background to the Bible story. Conditions during the time of the Judges were illustrated by the travel experiences of Wen-Amon and the satirical letter describing the journey of an Egyptian envoy. Horn modernized a number of dates in the revised edition, the most significant being for the commencement of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty. The original article and chart portrayed the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Dynasties as contemporaneous (750-715 B.C.; and 750-663 B.C., respectively), but the revision shows the Twenty-fifth Dynasty as dating from 715-663 B.C. This whole article used archaeology essentially for restoration of OT context.

2 Ibid., 2:38-41.
3 Ibid., 2:41; cf. ANET, pp. 151-55, for the full story of Aqhat whose life was taken by Anath because he refused to surrender his bow which she coveted.
4 ANET, pp. 25-29.
6 Ibid., 2:52, 77.
7 "Ancient World,” SDA Bible Commentary (1976-1980), 2:77. This could be a typographical error, but more likely Horn
Music was an important element of ancient Hebrew life and any knowledge concerning appearance and function of biblical musical instruments is therefore a contribution to OT context. Horn drew on a wide selection of archaeological and literary sources in order to give a more accurate definition of OT musical instruments than had been possible when the KJV was translated. Because of the paucity of instrument remains or illustrations of them from Palestine, recognized the limitations of sovereignty of the Nubian Kashta and his son Piankhi, for it was Shabaka who actually eclipsed the Twenty-fourth Dynasty by defeating and killing Bocchoris in 715 B.C. Nevertheless it was Piankhi who chose Thebes for his capital and who conquered Lower Egypt and Horn seems to have recognized his full sovereignty at the end of his reign for he listed him as the first ruler of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty ahead of Shabaka (ibid.). K. A. Kitchen (The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt [1100-650 B.C.] [Westminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1973]) came to essentially the same conclusions, though he listed the dynasty as commencing with Shabako (Shabaka) in 716 B.C. and dated the death of Piankhi (Piankhi) in that same year (ibid., pp. 371-72, 378, 468).

1"Musical Instruments of the Ancient Hebrews," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:29-42.

2The comparative chart (ibid., p. 42) was especially helpful and discussion of individual instruments in relation to Hebrew words was very well informed (ibid., pp. 30-41). Most helpful research sources listed were Curt Sachs, The History of Musical Instruments (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1940); and on a more popular level Ovid R. Sellers, "Musical Instruments of Israel," BA 4 (1941):33-47.

3Exceptions include two pairs of cymbals from Bethshemesh and Tell Abu Hawam, and the handle of a sistrum (a kind of rattle) found in pre-Israelite Bethel ("Musical Instruments," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:30, 32). Other direct or indirect evidence from Palestine included portrayal of lyres and trumpets on second-century A.D. coins (ibid., 3:36, 40), and trumpets on the Arch of Titus in Rome (ibid., 3:40). Lyres were being carried by prisoners (apparently Jewish) who are shown on a relief from Nineveh (ibid., 3:35). Lyres of two variant styles are shown being carried by a Semite (probably an Amorite from Canaan) in the Beni Hasan wall painting (ibid., 3:34) and on a late eleventh-century B.C. vase from Megiddo (ibid.).
the author proceeded on the assumption that the similarities of instruments in Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt would indicate that Hebrew instruments were also closely related. A total of eleven different biblical instruments was identified in the article, most very convincingly.

A survey of "The Ancient World from 586-400 B.C."\(^1\) contained only occasional direct references to archaeology (though Horn's archaeological and historical knowledge was apparent throughout the essay) except for the last section. There Horn gave considerable emphasis to the witness of the Elephantine Aramaic papyri to the context and genuineness of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Of special importance was the "Passover Letter" of Darius II, which, though fragmentary, proves the involvement of the Persian government with Jewish law and customs and thereby has attested the credibility of the decree recorded in Ezra 7:11-26.\(^2\) This apologetic use was exceptional since the majority of the article was a comprehensive description of the context of the exilic and post-exilic biblical record. It gave a proficient description of the political history and some cultural developments from 586-400 B.C. as well as characterizing the significant monarchs of Babylon and Persia for the period.

An interesting combination of apologetic and exegetical writing

\(^1\)SDA Bible Commentary, 3:43-84.

\(^2\)Horn said that opposition to the reliability of this particular record has now "become silent" (ibid., 3:74). He suggested that "the Persian chancellery probably had a department in which experts in Jewish law and customs advised the king in legislative matters. These experts were doubtless Jews" (ibid.; cf. ibid., 3:82-83).
is to be found in the two-page section of the introduction to 1 Chronicles which was written by Horn.\(^1\) He explained that the numerical element in the Chronicles had been widely discounted (claimed to have been exaggerated) because of the extremely large numbers which occur from time to time. Horn argued that since the basic reliability of the chronicler has been increasingly attested, a number explanation other than the non-reliability of the author must be found. Instead, he suggested that the author who obviously used pre-exilic documents for many of his sources (1 Chr 29:29; 27:24), frequently misread the numbers in that old script as he transferred them to the square Aramaic script in which he was writing.\(^2\)

Horn's introduction and comments on Ezra\(^3\) used archaeology predominantly as a contribution to context and the closely related area of exegesis. We note a reference to the archives of "Egibi and Sons" (who were bankers in Babylon), which was used to indicate the movements of Cyrus in the period following the fall of Babylon (the time of the decree for the return of the Jews).\(^4\) Archaeology was also quoted to indicate that Persian decrees would have appeared in written form from the time of Cyrus (Ezra 1:1), while this would

\(^{1}\) SDA Bible Commentary, 3:122-23.

\(^{2}\) To illustrate, the symbol for "100" and the word for "thousand" when written side by side and intended to be read "1100," could easily have been misunderstood and recorded as "100,000" (ibid., 3:123).

\(^{3}\) SDA Bible Commentary, 3:319-88.

\(^{4}\) Ibid., 3:325. The motivation here also had an apologetic element as the writer was endeavoring to show that the seventy-year prophecy of Jer 25:11-12; 29:10 was exactly fulfilled.
not have been true earlier. The Behistun inscription was mentioned as an indication of the languages in which such decrees might have been written. Parallel forms of address for God have been found in Elephantine documents and in Ezra 1:2. Some parallel use of names was also noted from these documents and Ezra 4:8, and some extra details concerning Ashurbanipal (Asnapper) also enrich our contextual understanding of the period.

Horn suggested the "king's treasure house" (Ezra 5:17) was essentially a library or archive comparable with archives found on various ANE sites. Whether these libraries also contained other treasures has not been ascertained, but Horn thought it quite possible. More explicitly exegetical (though also contextual) was the attempt to identify and explain the actions of the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4:7-24. Horn argued that this could be and almost certainly was the historical Artaxerxes I since evidence has shown him to be unpredictable and capricious and

1"Ezra," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:325.
2Including Aramaic, since a copy of that inscription material has been found in Aramaic (ibid., 3:326).
3Ibid.
4Assyrian records speak of wars between Assyria and its Babylonian and Elamite enemies, but Ezra additionally speaks of deportees from such places as Babylon, Susa, and Erech (Ezra 4:9-10) who had apparently been settled in Samaria ("Ezra," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:334; cf. ANET, pp. 298, 300).
5Such as Mari, Nineveh, Ugarit, Boghazköy, and Amarna ("Ezra," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:355), and today we could add Ebla (Giovanni Pettinato, "The Royal Archives of Tell Mardikh-Ebla," BA 39 [1976]:44-52).
therefore quite capable of the changes in policy indicated by such an identification.  

The commentary on Nehemiah was written by Horn, and in it he used archaeology in the same way as in the section on Ezra, leaning especially on the Elephantine documents for further contextual details concerning the time of Nehemiah. The description and translation of a travel document thought to be similar to that issued to Nehemiah (Neh 2:7) was particularly helpful. Horn also used references to Johanan, high priest in Jerusalem in 410 B.C. and son of grandson of high priest Eliashib (Neh 3:1), to support the placing of Nehemiah during the reign of Artaxerxes I. An annual interest rate of 12 percent (Neh 5:11), that is, 1 percent per month, was condemned by Nehemiah even though Horn was able to illustrate that by the standards of surrounding nations this was far from exorbitant. Contextual usage by Horn appears to have predominated in this part of the commentary.

1Ibid., 3:349-350; cf. Ezra 7:11-28; Neh 2:1-8. These references show him favoring the Jews, whereas Ezra 4 reveals an Artaxerxes who opposes the Jews. Horn in fact did not exclude the possibility of the alternate identification of the Artaxerxes of Ezra 4 with false Smerdis. See the various arguments presented for the two views ("Ezra," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:347-51).

2SDA Bible Commentary, 3:391-53.


5The few records which we have that give such details indicate that at Gozan (Tell Halaf) in Mesopotamia in the seventh century
In "The Chronology of the Old Testament Prophets," Horn made only incidental references to archaeology. His interest here was contextual and he suggested some possible sites for the home of Nahum.

In the introduction to "The Book of Daniel," Horn briefly described the portions of the book of Daniel which had been found at Qumran. He gave further details of the fragments from Cave IV and Cave VI in the revised edition, but lamented that the leather fragments from Cave IV still had not been published (in 1976). The papyrus fragments from chaps. 8, 10, 11 found in Cave VI contain nine minor spelling variants (in seventeen verses). Other significant archaeological items included the discovery that accession-year B.C. the rate was 50 percent for silver and 200 percent for grain. In Babylonia and Assyria the normal rates were 20-25 percent for silver and 33 1/3 percent for grain. In Egypt in the Ptolemaic period the rate was from 12-24 percent ("Nehemiah," SDA Bible Commentary, 3:414).

---

1 SDA Bible Commentary, 4:17-24.
2 Ibid., 4:23.
3 SDA Bible Commentary, 4:743-754.
4 "Daniel," SDA Bible Commentary (1976-1980), 4:744; cf. Frank M. Cross, Jr., "Cave 4 of Qumran (4Q): Report of Dr. Frank M. Cross, Jr.," BA 19 (1956):85-86. Cross reported that "a sizable proportion of the book of Daniel is extant in three relatively well-preserved MSS" (ibid., p. 86), including two copies of the transition from chap. 7 to chap. 8 with the language change as in the MT, and with a generally close conformity to the MT.
dating had been used in Babylon, evidences for Nebuchadnezzar as a great builder, and the discovery of inscriptions concerning Belshazzar. In each of these cases the main thrust was apologetic in defense of the antiquity and reliability of Daniel.

Horn wrote the commentary on Dan chaps. 1, 3-6. There were many references to archaeological data but most of these points had been covered in the periodical articles. A minor point of contextual interest was that at least one of the treasure houses in Babylon was a genuine museum with objects and inscriptions representing different parts of the empire, presumably many of them trophies of war. An extensive description of the city of Babylon as uncovered by Koldewey was given in a special note, and a similar extensive coverage was given to Belshazzar. The third of these historical and archaeological discourses discussed the identity of "Darius the Mede." The blend of exegetical, contextual, and apologetic usage

---

2 Ibid., 4:748.
3 Ibid.
4 SDA Bible Commentary, 4:754-64, 778-817.
6 SDA Bible Commentary, 4:757.
7 Ibid., 4:794-97.
8 Ibid., 4:806-808. Horn implied that the "queen" in Dan 5:10 was probably the mother of Belshazzar, since his grandmother had already died, and it would have been an unlikely boldness on the part of a wife (ibid., 4:803).
9 Ibid., 4:814-17. Horn favored equating Darius the Mede with Cyaxares II, but admitted that evidence was far from conclusive (ibid., 4:817).
probably favored context, but there were constant apologetic over-
tones.

The brief article on the non-biblical Qumran literature showed that NT context will be increasingly better informed as this
literature of the Qumran sect is published and studied. Horn gave
the popular opinion that the Qumran community either consisted of
Essenes or had a close relationship with them. He briefly described
the Damascus Document in addition to those found at Qumran, but gave
no additional details in the revised edition.

1 "The Literature of the Qumran Community," SDA Bible Commen-
tary, 5:90-92.

2 Ibid., 5:91. Recent discussion of the identity of the com-
munity members tends to equate them with Essenes, or at least to
refer to the people at Qumran as "Qumran-Essenes." James A. Sanders
("The Dead Sea Scrolls--A Quarter Century of Study," BA 36 [1973]:
120-25) was somewhat cautious and suggested "Qumran-Essenes" or use
of the term "Essene-like" to describe the community. James H.
Charlesworth ("The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of
the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran
Essenes," RQu 38 [1980]:213-33) saw the community as distinctively
Qumran Essenes originating in mid-second century B.C., and after
two phases ending in A.D. 68 he posits a residual "post-Qumran
Essenism" (ibid., pp. 230-33). Frank Moore Cross is one of the
strongest proponents of the equating of the Qumran community with
Essenes ("The Dead Sea Scrolls and the People Who Wrote Them," BAR,
The discussion hinges considerably upon dating and the paleographic
and other arguments of Cross are impressive (ibid.), though it should
be noted that he does not limit the community to Qumran (Cross,

3 He did not mention the Temple Scroll which was known but
was published only as Horn was working on his revisions (Yigael
Yadin, The Temple Scroll, 3 vols. and supplementary vol. (Jerusalem:
Israel Exploration Society, 1977; cf. Elisha Qimron, "New Readings
in the Temple Scroll," IEJ 28 [1978]:169-72; Jacob Milgrom, "The
Temple Scroll," BA 41 [1978]:105-20; Baruch A. Levine, "The Temple
Scroll: Aspects Of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Charac-
Although dealing largely with linguistic matters and manuscripts from later centuries, Horn's article on the NT canon\(^1\) did contain some archaeology. The Greek documents (papyri and ostraca) from Egypt which began to receive serious attention in the late nineteenth century came from the daily life experiences of average citizens and witnessed to the genuineness of the NT text as written for common people (hence Koine--"common one") as distinct from the language of scholars known previously from classical sources. These written sources from garbage dumps and stuffed animals made a serious contribution to NT studies both exegetically (better understanding of uncommon words), contextually (life of the people), and apologetically (support for the text).

Horn's article on biblical criticism\(^2\) commented on the revolutionary effects of the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries as far as establishing confidence in the text and reversing the trend towards frequent emendation.\(^3\) This portion was completely rewritten for the revised edition emphasizing the same point but also illustrating the distinctions between the two Isaiah scrolls (IQIs\(^a\); IQIs\(^b\)) and also demonstrating that they, with the LXX agree in differing from the MT in Isa 53:11.\(^4\) Horn also listed major arguments of higher


\(^3\)Ibid., 5:137-40.

\(^4\)"Bible Criticism," SDA Bible Dictionary (1976-1980), 5:138. These three sources have the additional word "light," thus supporting the reading "after the travail of his soul he shall see light."
critics with his own answers to them, based partly on archaeology. Examples include the indication (from the Dead Sea Scrolls) that the divine names were used somewhat interchangeably by the ancient Hebrews (thereby negating a foundation of source criticism); the indications that the biblical Flood account were not dependent upon the Babylonian account; the fact that Moses could have written the Pentateuch in cuneiform or in a proto-Semitic script; and other aspects already mentioned in periodical articles. The accuracy of biblical chronology (especially the period of the Hebrew kings) was also used apologetically to support the reliability of Scripture. In summary, Horn concluded that the trend in biblical criticism within recent years has been toward more conservative positions as discoveries have contributed to the refutation of many extreme arguments. In addition, he stated that "the great majority of critical arguments against the authenticity of the Bible stand only as unproved hypotheses." A seventeen-page article on "The Seven Churches of Revelation" was very similar to Horn's sequence in the RH. Slight The same three sources also agree in reading "their transgressions" rather than "transgressors" in Isa 53:12--though the statement is incorrect in not including the designation "verse 12," thus giving the impression that this variant is also in Isa 53:11.

1 "Biblical Criticism," SDA Bible Commentary, 5:159-60.
2 Ibid., 5:160-61.
3 Ibid., 5:161-63.
5 Ibid., 5:189.
6 SDA Bible Commentary, 7:86-102.
7 See pp. 234-37.
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updating of the revised edition included a brief description of the Hanfmann excavations at Sardis. The usage here was mainly contextual.

Horn wrote the article on archaeology for the SDA Encyclopedia. He gave a brief history of SDA interest in the subject and explained the reasons on the basis that archaeology makes a threefold contribution:

(1) It provides contemporary illustrations of customs and practices mentioned in the Bible and clarifies obscure statements. (2) It furnishes much supplementary material, especially to the historical portions. (3) It corroborates the accuracy of the Bible record.

He also noted that SDA interest had been attracted from time to time by the discoveries "that tended to confirm the credibility of the Scriptures." Summarizing the contributions of Thiele, Wood, and Horn himself, he also described the emphasis which had been given to this area of study in the SDA Theological Seminary. Finally, in the revised edition Horn made a rather extensive statement on the Heshbon excavations followed by reference to the work of L. T. Geraty (especially at Heshbon), K. L. Vine (especially at Caesarea), and J. H. Stirling (Caesarea and Heshbon). He also commented on

---


3"Ibid., 10:49. 4Ibid.

5"Archeology, Biblical," SDA Bible Encyclopedia (1976), 10:64.

6Loma Linda University has been one of the sponsors of the Caesarea excavations since 1972 (ibid., 10:64-65).
the growing collection of artifacts in the archaeological museum at Andrews University.¹

Horn wrote a number of syllabi during his teaching career, but most of these were simply reproduced and made available in loose-leaf form. One which appeared in bound form was his Syllabus of Course 0503: Old Testament Backgrounds I.² The author stated that archaeology elucidated the historical sections of the Bible and also had an apologetic value.³ However, the syllabus appeared to emphasize context of Scripture with only hints of apologetic in the outlining of such topics as the patriarchal period,⁴ the Flood,⁵ and the Exodus.⁶ Nuzi parallels were drawn, but it was not clear whether they were to be used apologetically or only contextually.⁷ The syllabus covered ANE history down to the twelfth century B.C., but in the case of Israel's history, stopped at the Conquest. A similar syllabus (unbound)⁸ carried on the story for the Judges and Monarchy periods but also repeated the Exodus data. An earlier syllabus⁹ was more comprehensive in range but less detailed in some places and was clearly used as the basis for the syllabi described above.

¹Ibid., 10:65.  
³Ibid., p. 2.  
⁴Ibid., pp. 15-17.  
⁵Ibid., pp. 6-7.  
⁷Ibid., p. 17.  
It was quite explicit in stating that biblical archaeology is necessary to meet the challenge of higher critics but also warned against unrealistic expectations and demands (archaeology by nature has its limitations).¹

We turn now to Horn's contributions to non-SDA publications. These consist of his doctoral dissertation (not actually published), his articles in dictionaries, and articles and book reviews in various journals.²

Although the topic of Horn's dissertation was non-biblical and dealt specifically with "The Relations between Egypt and Asia during the Egyptian Middle Kingdom,"³ it does constitute useful context for a part of the patriarchal period. Indeed on the first page Horn mentioned the stele of Khu-Sebek,⁴ whose campaign to Palestine was directed against Skmm (Shechem).⁵ The purpose of the research

¹Ibid., p. 2.

²Since the nature of our topic focuses on the North American scene, articles in U.S. journals are specially noted, but in order to gauge Horn's influence, reference is also made to articles in overseas journals.


⁴ANET, p. 230.

⁵James H. Breasted (A History of Egypt: From the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest, 2nd ed. [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909], p. 189) had referred to this campaign under Sesostris III (Senusret III, Senwosre III) as simply a "plundering expedition." Horn thought of it in terms of the context of Abraham ("Shechem," SDA Bible Dictionary [1979], p. 1017), but Shea who favors the longer chronology sees it as possibly an Egyptian entourage which accompanied the family of Jacob as the official representation of the Pharaoh on the occasion of Jacob's burial (W. H. Shea, "Exodus" class notes, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., 1979.
as expressed by Horn was to correlate work done on the topic of Egyptian relations with Palestine in the Middle Kingdom, especially with regard to the dating of the execration texts. The two types of texts\(^1\) both contained curses addressed to either Egyptians or foreign enemies. After various rites, the objects bearing the inscriptions were smashed, so activating the "curse." Horn eventually concluded that the texts were written near the end of the Twelfth Dynasty,\(^2\) but that the various evidences (including clues from the execration texts) were not strong enough to prove that Egypt had an Asian empire at that time. He felt that the state of knowledge in 1951 only justified the conclusion that a strong commercial

\[\text{[Handwritten], p. 10A; cf. Gen 50:4-14].} \]

Putting together the information from the Stele of Khu-Sebek and of Gen 50, Shea suggests that the itinerary followed was to cross the northern Sinai to Edom (a family reunion with the relatives of Esau), north through Transjordan (via the King's Highway) to the threshing floor of Atad (Gen 50:11), possibly close to the Jabbok (sacred to the memory of Jacob) and then crossing the Jordan and climbing to the highlands in the vicinity of Shechem (via one of the valleys such as Wadi Farah). As they turned south for the funeral at Hebron, Shea suggests that they were attacked from behind by Shechemites who had no love for the memory of Jacob (cf. Gen 34). The Khu-Sebek inscription was inscribed on the side of the stele which suggests that it was not an ordinary campaign (Shea, "Exodus Notes," p. 10A). The translation in ANET, p. 230, does suggest that the Pharaoh himself was present and that the purpose was "to overthrow the Asiatics," but this does not make Shea's suggestion untenable.

\(^{1}\)Those published by Kurt Sethe (Die Achtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1926]) were inscribed on jars, plates, and bowls, while those published by Georges Posener (Princes et Pays d'Asie et de Nubie [Brussels: Fondation Egyptologique reine Elisabeth, 1940]) were inscribed on clay figurines and dated paleographically to a generation later (Horn, "Egypt and Asia," pp. 5-10).

\(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 305.
link had existed, probably with a high degree of Egyptian exploitation of Syria-Palestine.¹

Four articles by Horn appeared in an archaeological dictionary edited by Charles F. Pfeiffer.² His article on "Capernaum"³ gave the known history of the town and suggested that Tell Hum was clearly the site. He lamented that Orfali's work on the site had not been adequately published and that the only preservation had been that of the uncovered synagogue.⁴ In the article on "Gibeah,"⁵ Horn explained the archaeological record in conjunction with the biblical record, agreeing with the conclusions of Albright, Sinclair, and Lapp.⁶ Horn also wrote concerning "Scarabs"⁷ which first appeared in Egypt in the Sixth Dynasty, apparently as charms since

¹On the basis that occasional statuettes and other objects have been found in Syro-Palestine from this period, and also because of occasional Middle Kingdom references to Asia or Asiatics in Egyptian documents (ibid., pp. 320-22).


³Biblical World, pp. 162-64.


⁵Biblical World, pp. 259-61.

⁶See the summary article, L. A. Sinclair, "Gibeah," EAEHL, 2:444-46.

they were uninscribed. By the Middle Kingdom they were used as amulets and as inscribed seals. He mentioned that the tendency to preserve scarabs as charms or heirlooms limits their use for archaeological dating, especially those from Thutmose III which were especially prolific. The largest number of scarabs found in Palestine have been in the coastal cities of the south and at Lachish, and these date mainly from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Dynasties, with some also extending over the range from the Twelfth to the Twenty-second Dynasties (and occasionally later). The final article discussed "Seals" of the ANE and their manner of use—to convey authority, to legalize documents, and for the sealing of structures. A number of seals have appeared to bear the names of royal officers and kings of Judah but no apologetic application was made by the writer. In fact, each of these articles was essentially directed towards Bible context with an occasional exegetical hint.

The Egyptian tendency to accept and then adopt foreign gods was the basis of an interesting article by Horn. This practice became popular in the Hyksos and Empire (New Kingdom) periods. Temples dedicated to foreign gods are known from various places including Elephantine and Syene in southern Egypt. References in

1 Some were used as amulets on mummies sixteen centuries after the death of Thutmose III (ibid., pp. 509-10).
4 Baal (who came to be identified with Seth) and Resheph apparently had temples at Memphis, Anath had a temple at Tanis, Horan
the Elephantine papyri indicate that the Jews in that vicinity worshiped Yahu (Yahweh), Bethel, Ashim, Anath, and Herem. Four Asiatic gods are now known to have had temples at Syene: Nabu, Benit, Bethel, and the "Queen of Heaven." Horn was interested in identifying the latter goddess (cf. Jer 44:15-19) and concluded that it was either Ishtar or Anath. The usage here was contextual and exegetic.

Horn wrote fifteen articles for the revision of the eminent James Hastings Bible dictionary. "Carchemish" was described with its long historical past, and the Bible connections by way of the condemnation of Assyria (Isa 10:9) and Nebuchadnezzar's victory over Neco II (Jer 46:2; 2 Chr 35:20). The brief note on "Rephidim" mentioned that the site had not been identified, though suggestions have been made in accordance with each of the suggested locations of Mount Sinai. To illustrate his usage in the articles on tribes, we refer to "Amalek, Amalekites," and "Amorites." The Amalekites had a sanctuary at Gizeh, and it seems that Qudshu had a guest role in the Ptah temple at Memphis (ibid., p. 37).

1Ibid., p. 39. 2Ibid., pp. 41-42.


5Dictionary of the Bible, p. 842.

6Dictionary of the Bible, pp. 24-25.

7Dictionary of the Bible, p. 27.
were described as probably having inhabited Canaan before the time of Abraham and as being unrelated to the Israelites. They were leaders in the harrassment of Israel before and after the Conquest (Exod 17:8-16; Deut 25:17-19; Num 13:29; Judg 3:13; 6:3, 33; 7:12). The Amorites were described as apparently an aboriginal tribe of Canaan (though their origins are obscure) who spread across the Fertile Crescent and harrassed and then ruled Mesopotamia.\(^1\) Notable Amorite rulers included Hammurabi (who ruled a vast Babylonian Empire) and Zimri-Lim of Mari. Horn mentioned that Amorites are listed among the Hamites in Gen 10:6, although knowledge of their language (based largely on names) identifies it as Semitic. He suggested that they were probably listed as Hamitic "more for religious than for ethnological or linguistic reasons."\(^2\) After being incorporated into Solomon's forced labor organization (1 Kgs 9:20-21; 2 Chr 8:7-8) they disappeared from history. A predominant contextual and background-type usage was apparent in these articles.

There were forty-five relevant articles and reviews by Horn

\(^1\)They are first mentioned as giving trouble in the days of Shu-Sin (late Third Dynasty of Ur) when they provoked him into building a defense wall in his third year (about 2034 B.C., ibid.; cf. Hallo and Simpson, Ancient Near East, p. 75). Soon afterwards the whole of Syria-Palestine became known to the Babylonians as "Amurru."

\(^2\)Horn, "Amorites," Dictionary of the Bible (1963), p. 27. Strangely, in the article "Amorites" in the SDA Bible Dictionary of 1960, and unchanged in the revised edition (1979), he gave an entirely different explanation. He said that, "The only reasonable solution to this problem is to assume that the Hamitic Amorites at an early stage of their history had taken over a Semitic language through close association with Semites, and through an active inter-marriage with Semites had also lost some of their Hamitic features, and therefore had become in appearance and speech largely Semites."
in non-SDA journals during the 1950-1973 period. About one-third of these were devoted to reports or investigations concerning excavations at Shechem or Heshbon.

A brief article in 1953 discussed a list of towns supposedly captured by Ramses II. One Edomite tribal name ended with yhw (Yahweh) and Horn briefly touched on the possible significance of this fact. The main discussion, however, concerned the possible appearance of the name "Jericho" on the list. The reading is far from sure and Horn pointed out the difficulties, especially with the first consonant, and concluded that the identification of the name with Jericho was a doubtful possibility since Ramses II was a "notorious plagiarist," often using the lists of Thutmose III, Amenhotep III, and Seti I, so that even if the name were truly "Jericho" on his inscription it would not necessarily mean that Jericho was in existence at the time of Ramses II. Usage in the article was contextual with apologetic overtones.


^ Either there was a reflection of Yahweh worship or it may have been a coincidence (ibid., p. 201).

^ The similarity to a list of Amenhotep III from Sulb according to H. W. Fairman (review of Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia, by J. Simons in JEA 26 [1940]:165), may indicate that it was copied from Amenhotep III. If that were so this list of Ramses II throws little light on the much discussed Exodus date. Horn briefly discussed these and concluded that Jericho was probably destroyed somewhere "between 1400 and 1300 B.C.," which would be in harmony with existence during a part (at least) of the reign of Amenhotep III ("Topographical List," p. 202). B. Maisler (Mazar) agreed with Horn's skepticism of the identification of the name in the inscription with Jericho ("A Comment on the Preceding," JNES 12 [1953]:203).
Much of the next article was a restatement of the material in the second appendix of the book by Horn and Wood on the Chronology of Ezra. Horn was able to illustrate from the double-dated papyri (especially "Kraeling 6") that the civil year was observed by the Jews from fall to fall, as indicated in Neh 1:1 and 2:1. The study was primarily contextual, endeavoring to reconstruct the post-exilic Jewish calendar system, but there was also indirect apologetic in the corroboration shown between the papyrus "Kraeling 6" and the Nehemiah statements.

A sequence of book reviews began with the review of a volume on ancient history written by experts such as Rudolf Anthes (Egypt), Anton Moortgat (Sumerian and Akkadian periods), Guiseppe Furlani (Babylon and Assyria), and W. F. Albright (Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine). Horn's criticisms of the work especially focused on chronology--Hammurabi's dates were too low, the end of Nabonidus' reign (538 B.C.) was one year too late, and the commencement of Hezekiah's reign not before 715 B.C. (rejecting the possibility of a coregency with his father Ahaz) ignores the reliability of the

---

4 Ibid., p. 116. The dates suggested by Furlani were about 1704-1662 B.C., cf. pp. 259-60.
5 Horn, review of Grundlagen, p. 116.
chronological data of the Books of Kings. Horn also doubted the assertion that Sargon II had captured Samaria and that he was the son of Tiglath-pileser III.

Horn regarded a book on the Hyksos by Mayani as comprehensive and generally commendable as it traced the Hyksos to the Caucasus region. However, Horn regretted the omission of some evidences such as the Brooklyn Papyrus from the Twelfth-Thirteenth Dynasty which listed Egyptian slaves whose names indicated a large percentage of Semites. He also disagreed with the author's rather

1Ibid., p. 117.

2Sargon's claim to have taken Samaria is commonly accepted today (as A. L. Oppenheim, "Sargon," IDB 4:223) though the question is still debated (Hayim Tadmor, "The Campaigns of Sargon II of Assur: A Chronological-Historical Study," JCS 12 [1958]:33), and some agree with Horn and regard the capture of Samaria as having been completed by Shalmaneser V and only claimed later by Sargon (ANET, pp. 284-285) to fill a gap in the records of his first year (Hallo & Simpson, Ancient Near East, p. 138). Sargon does appear to go to some pains to stress his legitimacy in the "Assur Charter" (H. W. F. Saggs, "Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon II of Assyria: The 'Assur Charter,'" Iraq 37 [1975]:15, 17-18, 20). It is admitted even by those attributing the victory to Shalmaneser (as Hallo and Simpson, Ancient Near East, p. 138) that Sargon may have been second in command at Samaria. The question of Sargon's lineage is also debated, but opinion seems to favor acceptance of Sargon's claim (as Oppenheim, "Sargon," pp. 222-23; D. J. Wiseman, "Sargon," The Illustrated Bible Dictionary, 3:1394), to be the son of Tiglath-pileser III, and therefore a brother of Shalmaneser V, and a legal successor. Georges Roux (Ancient Iraq, 2nd ed. [Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1980], p. 287) accepts that he may have been a legitimate heir, while Pfeiffer ("Sargon II," Biblical World, p. 503) is more dubious.


arbitrary efforts to condense patriarchal history from the projected
birth of Abraham in 1610 B.C. to an Exodus in 1264/1260 B.C.,¹ and
regarded his thesis of Hyksos connections with the Amarna revolution
as conjectural.² The reviewer refrained from presenting his own
views of the Exodus data, though apologetic overtones were evident.

The next review concerned a publication of the above-
mentioned Brooklyn Papyrus,³ though some details were here slightly
revised.⁴ The occupations of the Asiatic workers indicated a high
degree of skills or training which the reviewer suggested might mean
that the Asiatics had been brought to Egypt through slave trading.⁵

In assessing Gordon's OT introduction,⁶ Horn appreciated
the emphasis upon Israelite environment in the world of surrounding
countries, but he disagreed with his late chronology which continued
to place the patriarchs in the Amarna period. He also objected to
Gordon's refusal to take seriously the chronological statements

¹Horn, review of Les Hyksos, pp. 217-218.
²Ibid., p. 217.
³Idem, review of A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the
three insertions added to the verso of the document, two were dated
to the early Thirteenth Dynasty.
⁴Ibid., p. 209. The total number of names was here listed
as ninety-five, and the number of Semitic names was given as forty-
eight, though some names are poorly preserved.
⁵The Asiatic male occupations included two housemen, no field
hands, one tutor, one brewer, and two cooks(?), while the Asiatic
women included eighteen manufacturers of cloth, "four? as magazine
employees, and only one as a laborer" (ibid.).
⁶Idem, review of The World of the Old Testament, by Cyrus
on the kings of Israel in the light of Thiele's contribution on the subject.1

Horn next reviewed a popular volume2 with a very broad coverage including the details of several ANE kings. A rather enigmatic statement had been made concerning an Egyptian queen who requested a royal husband from Suppiluliumas. Horn clarified that the Pharaoh whose death had occurred was Tutankhamen,3 and he also corrected a number of errors including a series of dates which were each incorrect by one or two years.

An article published in 19624 correlated the various details concerning scarabs found at Shechem from the 1926-1927 campaigns (eighteen specimens) and the 1956-1960 campaigns (twenty specimens).5 Earliest scarabs from Shechem were from the late Middle Kingdom or early Second Intermediate Period and indicate only loose contacts between Egypt and Palestine at that time.6 However, since more than half of the specimens found at the site were from the Hyksos period, he interpreted this as indicating either strong local production or close ties for the period. The fact that 25 percent were from

---

3. Ibid., p. 227.
5. Ibid., pp. 3-8. Other scarabs and records of them from the early campaigns (German) were probably lost in the bombing of Sellin's house (ibid., p. 3).
the New Kingdom including one (B57, no. 98) inscribed "The King's Wife Tiy," he saw as an indication that ties continued to be quite strong.\(^1\)

A scaraboid seal with a special design was featured in another article.\(^2\) The seal was probably found in Syria or Lebanon and bears the inscription "Belonging to Beraka." Horn dated it on paleographic grounds to the eighth or seventh century B.C. Two figures wearing Egyptian loincloths are shown kneeling one on either side of a stylized date palm(?) which was thought to symbolize the tree of life. Parallels exist between this design and Hyksos seals, but this example appears to be a Syrian imitation from a millennium later.\(^3\)

The scriptural record was always taken seriously by Horn and this was illustrated in an article on Mordecai.\(^4\) It did not deny the historical problems connected with the book of Esther, but showed that recent finds have increased its credibility. A Mordecai (Marduka) who was an official at Susa either late in the reign of Darius I or early in the reign of Xerxes has been located in a cuneiform tablet.\(^5\) Horn also gave further details concerning the

---

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 18.
\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 20-21; cf. p. 290. Horn suggested that the tablet might refer to the early service of Mordecai, who obviously had worked his way to high responsibility over a period of time. In
archive of the Murashu Sons of Nippur and their implications. The wealth\(^1\) and high office\(^2\) of many Jews, as indicated in these records, could be explained by a change of circumstances made possible by the events recorded in Esther (in contrast to the relative poverty and unimportance of Jews generally under Darius I and earlier).\(^3\) Here we see a mild or tempered apologetic usage.

A report on the excavations at Shechem\(^4\) (including a description of the history of the site) was similar to other reports,\(^5\) though more technical in nature. Here much more attention was given to the discoveries concerning the early history of the site. Summarizing the results of the Drew McCormick Expedition to Shechem, Horn included a description of the earliest remains. A Chalcolithic (fourth millennium B.C.) corpus of pottery and a possible campsite were followed by only sherds without architectural remains (at least in the areas excavated) in the EB period.\(^6\) The discoveries for MBI\(^7\) these early years he would have heard of the plot on the king's life (Esth 6:2).

\(^1\) Including Jews who were able to borrow in huge amounts (Horn, "Mordecai," p. 24).

\(^2\) Including a superintendent of a tax office, several district governors, and a keeper of birds--possibly a zookeeper (ibid., pp. 23-24).

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 24.


\(^5\) See pp. 239, 240, 243.

\(^6\) Horn, "Shechem: History," p. 298.

\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 298-299. The dates 1950-1850 B.C. were given for this period.
were similar to EB, but building remains were found for successive periods.

Joshua's final assembly and covenant commitment at Shechem was the topic of the first of four books reviewed by Horn in 1966. Schmitt regarded the tree-sanctuary of Josh 24:26 as identical with the site of the "patriarchal traditions" of Gen 33:19-20; 35:4, and looked for it near the city rather than under the foundations of the great Baal-berith temple. He also allowed for the Sinai experiences but explained that they were not mentioned in Josh 24 because this passage "is concerned with what Yahweh has done for his people, and not with what he wants from it [his people]." His view was that the assembly of Josh 24 was "a single historical event." It is interesting to note that Horn did not express his personal views on this moderately stated source critical analysis, as he undoubtedly would have done at some length in an SDA periodical.

Horn praised Pritchard's prompt publication of his excavation

---

1 Ibid., p. 299.
4 Horn, review of Der Landtag, p. 74.
5 Ibid., p. 75.
6 Though it was probably more a matter of scholarly opposition to popular audiences than religious persuasion; cf. p. 331.
of the Bronze Age cemetery at el-Jib and noted that the identification as Gibeon was quite plausible. He observed that the author used Kenyon's system of classification by which the forty-six caves were regarded as originating in MBI, twenty-nine were re-used in MBII (seventeenth century B.C.), and seven contained LB objects.

The next review dealt essentially with matters of linguistic and exegetical concern, for Zobel attempted to explain the "blessings" expressed concerning Israelite tribes by Jacob (Gen 49), Moses (Deut 33), and in the Song of Deborah (Judg 5). Horn gave few reactions other than praise for a genuine contribution to the study of the subject and disappointment over the fact that the literature on excavations at Shechem was outdated and that all relevant Scripture passages had not been discussed.

Horn's interest in chronology was evident in his review of Hornung's book. He was especially pleased with the author's concept of integrated ANE chronological study. New Kingdom chronology has remained an area of special concern as seen especially in the debate over the accession year of Ramses II. Hornung chose the low accession date. 

---


4 In 1304 or 1290 B.C. Ibid., cf. M. B. Rowton, "The Material from Western Asia and the Chronology of the Nineteenth Dynasty," JNES 25 (1966):240-58. The latter now favors the longer chronology but significantly stated that "... a chronologist's task is not
chronology as a result of several factors including a synchronism between Ramses II and Shalmaneser I, but Horn remained unconvinced.

The publication of eighteen scarabs, scarab fragments, and scarab impressions by Horn marked the second stage of this project. These specimens were found during the excavations of 1962 and 1964. Fourteen were dated with reasonable certainty to the Hyksos period and two to the New Kingdom. One of special interest showed an outstretched hand which perhaps indicates supplication and is reminiscent of a stele bearing two such hands from Area C at Hazor.

Horn wrote a clearly contextual article analyzing the biblical and archaeological information in an attempt to identify the Egyptian father-in-law of Solomon. By establishing with some certainty the dates of Solomon's reign (ca. 970-931/930) he was able to correlate the approximate dates of Shishak as about 945-925 B.C. He was then left with a choice between Siamon (ca. 974-957 B.C.) and Psusennes II (ca. 957-945 B.C.) as the father-in-law of Solomon.

---

1 Horn, review of Untersuchungen, p. 281.
3 See pp. 323, 337.
4 Y. Yadin, "Hazor," EAEHL 2:476-77; three other scarabs of somewhat similar type are also known (Horn, "Scarabs and Scarab Impressions--II," pp. 54-55).
6 Shoshenq, or Shoshonk.
He chose the first of these on the ground that Solomon moved into his new palace complex about 947-946 B.C. and had apparently been married for some years before that, and also because Siamon appears to have been the more accomplished and active Pharaoh, according to the monuments.\(^1\) In addition, the fragment of a relief from Tanis suggests that Siamon campaigned into Philistia, hence constituting circumstantial evidence for the defeat of Gezer and the wedding gift to his daughter, Solomon's wife (1 Kgs 9:15-17).\(^2\)

Horn was especially appreciative of the exhaustive work of Wolfgang Helck\(^3\) on relations between Egypt and Asia in the second and third millennia B.C. The author believed that the western Delta area had an Asiatic population while the eastern Delta was roamed by Semitic nomads and claimed that the "invention of writing and the use of niched facades in brick architecture were of Egyptian origin and not borrowings from Sumer."\(^4\) Horn doubted that these views would be widely accepted.

The publication of the objects from Sellin's 1913-1914 excavations at Shechem\(^5\) complements the article from AUSS already

\(^1\)ibid., pp. 13-14.  
\(^2\)ibid., pp. 14-17. The main clue comes from a double axe of Cretan and apparently Philistine style held in the hand of a defeated enemy of the king. Macalister found a similar specimen in the ruins of Gezer (Macalister, Excavation of Gezer, 2:242).  
\(^4\)ibid., p. 129.  
described. A large proportion of the finds were fragments of bone inlays, spindle whorls of bone or stone, and a large assortment of bronze weapons. The article could be classified as contributing to biblical context.

A limestone slab from Iron Age Amman bore an eight-line inscription which was published by Horn. Known as the Amman Citadel Inscription, it was dated by the writer to the early eighth century B.C.

Another review by Horn was essentially an analysis of the theories on Hebrew origins expressed by Seebass. The latter envisaged separated lines, one through Jacob and one through Israel, and also conceived of a Moses clan which experienced the Exodus and an Aaron clan which did not. Archaeology was mentioned by Horn only in terms of a contributing source of information, but his position was to challenge the bases of the work.

A brief review by Horn praised the condensed portrayal of ancient Egyptian history, noted its limitations, and regretted the absence of a bibliography.

---

1 See p. 273.


3 For the contents see p. 332.


A general article on the contributions of biblical archaeology was written in 1968. The whole article paralleled articles in SDA publications and the approach was certainly similar to that used in writing for SDA readers. The author stressed that archaeology had helped give a better understanding of the Bible and had also contributed "verification of the Bible stories." Similar illustrations were used from Nuzi (for verification), and the Jerusalem water system for explaining the meaning of 2 Sam 5:6-8; 1 Chr 11:6 (Joab's capture of the Jebusite city). Since this was a popular Christian magazine, rather than a scholarly journal, the apologetic element was clearly acceptable to the editors.

While publishing a Palestinian (?) seal, Horn attempted to explain the two words inscribed on it. One name appeared similar to Qelayah (Ezra 10:23), possibly meaning "to pay homage to Yahweh," and the second was more enigmatic but might mean "Wait on God." The seal was dated to the seventh century or early sixth century B.C. We might classify the article as remotely contextual.

The report of the first season of excavation at Heshbon published in the ASOR Newsletter showed no significant difference from those reported in AUSS except that it was briefer.

---

5See pp. 272-73.
Horn reviewed a new work on Israelite kingship in 1969 and gave general praise for the book. However, he corrected the author's misunderstanding of Kenyon's report, showing that she had in fact shown the feasibility of Joab's entry to the city via the water shaft, rather than denying it. Horn also denied that Shishak was still on friendly terms with Jeroboam I at the time of his invasion of Judah, since there is evidence that Shishak also invaded Israel at that time.

"The Amman Citadel Inscription" was the title of Horn's in-depth study of this important discovery. It is the earliest Ammonite inscription (Aramaic script) of significant length, containing seventy-six reasonably well-preserved characters and another seventeen which are less clear or problematic. Since he classified it as a building inscription, Horn took the first word Milkom to represent part of a theophoric name such as Matan-Milkom, the builder or his father. We might describe this article as indirect contextual usage.


3. A fragment of a Shishak victory monument was found in excavations at Megiddo in 1926. It was twenty inches thick and the excavator estimated its original dimensions as five feet wide and ten feet thick (Clarence S. Fisher, The Excavation of Armageddon, Oriental Institute Communication, no. 4 [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929], pp. xi, 12-15).


The report on the first season of excavation at Heshbon for RB simply paralleled other reports. It mentioned that Heshbon went back to LB according to the Scriptures (Num 21:26-30), but stated that such early periods had not been represented in the discoveries thus far except by some pottery sherds.

Horn's descriptive article on Shechem and its archaeology, which was published in the Asbury Seminarian, was in most ways similar to his reports in SDA periodicals. It included some additional technical details and assumed the basic accuracy of the biblical record while stating that Gen 48:22 "preserves the tradition" of Jacob's conquests in the area. In conclusion, Horn gave the stamp of contextual application to the entire Shechem project, noting that the references to the city in Scripture were thereby illuminated—especially those which referred to Abimelech (Judg 9).


1Siegfried H. Horn, "Heshbon (Jordanie)," RB 76 (1969): 395-98.


3Such terminology is open to misinterpretation in the light of the interpretations of von Rad (Old Testament Theology, 1:109-11), for whom "traditions" might have minimal historical bases.


at Heshbon for BA was semi-technical. It combined some history of
the site with a brief description of organizational details and a
report of the results area by area. The purpose of the article was
clearly to report on the progress achieved, while also giving certain
biblical contextual data.

Describing the "Recent Excavations in Jerusalem," Horn
was especially impressed by the Herodian stone paving to the south
and west of the enclosure walls of the Second Temple. One pillar
had been found bearing the names of the Roman emperors Vespasian
and Titus who had been responsible for the Roman victories during
the first rebellion, A.D. 66-70. The article clearly involved OT
and NT contextual usage.

As director of the American Schools of Oriental Research
in Amman in late 1970 and 1971, Horn reported on the current archaeological activities in the country and on the state of the museum
after the civil war conditions of 1970. This was essentially a
report without other specific archaeological usage, though the author
expressed special interest in eleven sculptured heads found in a
hole in the ground four miles south of Amman.

---

1 ASOR Newsletter, no. 6, January 1971, pp. 1-4.

2 He also reported numerous other discoveries including the clarification of "Robinson's Arch," and the "top cornerstone of the southwestern corner of the Temple enclosure" (ibid., p. 2). The recovery of 19,000 coins was mentioned because of their contributions to dating of remains (ibid.).


4 Ibid., p. 4; cf. p. 276.
Horn wrote a technical description of "Three Seals from Sahab Tomb 'C'" in 1971. Sahab is seven miles southeast of Amman. At least one of the three seals from tomb "C" dates to the end of LB or to the Early Iron Age, and the finds at Sahab generally have given support to the concept of continual habitation of the Amman area from MB to the Iron Age, a concept which is gaining acceptance, yet which Horn refrained from mentioning. The report therefore constituted a contextual contribution, though clearly indirect.

Horn's report of "The Second Season of Excavations at Heshbon" in the ASOR Newsletter paralleled reports already mentioned.

The vital importance of pottery for Palestinian archaeology was stressed by Horn in a detailed review of the first book published on the subject since 1930. He concentrated upon the technicalities of Amiran's book, giving corrections and suggestions.

2. Ibid., pp. 103-105. It was found in the part of the tomb containing LB burials and bore a "corrupt form of the phenomen of Thutmose III." It seemingly belongs to the Nineteenth Dynasty, rather than to the Eighteenth (ibid., p. 103).
5. See pp. 249-50, 276.
6. Review of Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land from Its Beginnings in the Neolithic Period to the End of the Iron Age, by Ruth Amiran, in Bibl Ur 29 (1972):204-206. Horn noted that the previous work Corpus of Palestinian Pottery, by J. Garrow Duncan (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1930) was already outdated when published (Horn, Review of Ancient Pottery, p. 205).
Reviewing Yadin's book on Masada (Dutch edition), Horn described the heroic-tragic history of the defenders of the fortress and the remains as discovered by the excavators.

Reporting the second season of excavations at Heshbon, Horn's article was again similar to the more detailed AUSS reports. His puzzlement over the virtual absence of remains from LB and Iron Age I was evident.

Horn gave a similar report in BASOR to that already published in the ASOR Newsletter as he described the return to normalcy of archaeological work following the disruptions of 1970.

Another short technical article described "A Seal from Amman." It showed a roaring lion facing some indistinct object and the inscription "Belonging to Amasel." Horn noted the similarity of this name to that of a military officer of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr 17:16) and also to "Amos." He dated the seal paleographically to the early eighth century.

The summary of the 1971 Heshbon excavation which Horn wrote

---

3See p. 276.
4Horn, "Heshbon (Jordanie)," RB 79 (1972):425.
6See p. 334.
for ADAJ\textsuperscript{1} was specifically stated to have been based upon the more lengthy reports in AUSS.\textsuperscript{2}

The third stage of Horn's publication of Shechem scarabs appeared in 1973,\textsuperscript{3} representing the finds from the 1966 and 1968 excavations. The total of twenty-one items was made up of nine scarabs, a scarab fragment, three scaraboids, a seal, and seven scarab impressions. The style and context of most of these objects indicated that they were from MBII (Hyksos) and the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. Only indirect contextual usage was indicated here.

Horn's preliminary report on "The Excavations at Tell Hesban. 1973,"\textsuperscript{4} briefly outlined the successes achieved in this third campaign. Particularly notable were the recovery of Abbasid and Persian remains, the latter in the form of a great buttressed wall, and an Iron Age water reservoir made of thick plaster. Pure Iron Age I layers were also mentioned in this report.

The last three items by Horn were reviews on a variety of subjects. In the first,\textsuperscript{5} which reviewed a general portrayal of the field of biblical archaeology, he expressed disappointment that the author had not measured up to his title by stressing the aspect of

\textsuperscript{1}``The 1971 Season of Excavations at Tell Hesban,'' ADAJ 17 (1972):15-22.
\textsuperscript{2}``Ibid., p. 15.
faith in relation to biblical archaeology. Though generally appreciating the author's contribution and fair handling of ambiguous data, Horn pointed out many errors needing correction. The fine details of these corrections testify to Horn's thoroughness as well as to the breadth and depth of his archaeological knowledge. Although the second review featured the later history of Nazareth, it is included here since reference was made to the excavation of three MB and LB tombs in Nazareth. Horn observed that the Roman and Byzantine epigraphic and ceramic finds from Nazareth are of limited value because of the lack of reliable stratigraphic excavation. Horn's review of Archäologie und biblisches Leben, by Joachim Rehork, praised the book from the point of view of language and interest. At the same time, Horn hinted that Rehork's diversionary style (discourses on barely related issues) was somewhat distracting.

Looking back over Horn's SDA periodical articles for the

1 Ibid., pp. 339-40.
2 Idem, review of Excavations in Nazareth, vol. 1, From the Beginning till the XIIth Century, by B. Bagatti, in Bibl Or 30 (1973):252-63. Two other reviews from this same period are essentially from the period following the first century A.D. and therefore are not discussed but merely given for reference: Idem, review of Early Churches in Palestine, by J. W. Crowfoot, in JNES 32 (1973):270; and idem, review of Bar Kochba, die Herontdekking van de legendarische held van de laatste joodse opstand tegen het Romeinse Keizerrijk, by Y. Yadin, in Bibl Or 30 (1973):447-48. The latter featured Yadin's fascinating project in the "Cave of Letters."
3 In Bibl Or 30 (1973):446-47.
4 Horn illustrated by observing that the author moved from a discussion of millstones discovered in a cave at Mugharet al-Wad at Mount Carmel to various sociological and cultic aspects of the usage of grain in Palestine (ibid.).
period, we detect a strong apologetic emphasis in ninety-seven of the 203 articles\(^1\) (48 percent). If those with a slight or less direct apologetic element are included the figure rises to 54 percent. The highest percentage of apologetic articles by Horn appeared in Ministry, followed by the missionary periodicals, and then the RH (still about 50 percent). For AUSS on the other hand, as Horn directed his articles to the scholarly community inside and outside the church, apologetics were relatively rare\(^2\) and when present were more by implication than direct statement. The same is essentially true concerning Horn's articles for non-SDA journals. There apologetics were generally rare, or only implied, while in the majority of cases articles simply gave reports of scholarly investigations which could at the most be classified as contributing to biblical context.

Horn's books for the period all had an apologetic emphasis except the SDA Bible Dictionary\(^3\) and the two technical reports on Heshbon.\(^4\) Likewise his article in Our Firm Foundation\(^5\) was strongly apologetic, and his article on archaeology\(^6\) in the SDA Encyclopedia and the various syllabi\(^7\) alluded to apologetic contributions from archaeology.

\(^1\)Discounting the nineteen book reviews and three AUSS articles on Heshbon. Ten other Heshbon articles in the other periodicals have been included here though they were mainly reports with some contextual emphasis and a single occurrence of mild apologetic.

\(^2\)About 25 percent if the mild or implied apologetics in the book reviews are included.

\(^3\)See pp. 285-89, where it clarifies that there was some indirect apologetic.

\(^4\)See p. 291.

\(^5\)See p. 291.

\(^6\)See pp. 311-12.

\(^7\)See p. 312.
Of the nineteen significant contributions which Horn made to the seven-volume SDA Bible Commentary, ten contain clear apologetic usage of archaeology.¹

Thus it is undeniable that Horn in practice used archaeology as a notable apologetic weapon. This was especially apparent in his writings intended for ministers and the reading laity and in evangelistic-type publications,² but was much less evident where he wrote on a higher scholastic level as in AUSS and most of the non-SDA journals. Apparently he felt that ministers and average church members would be in contact with higher critical influences and arguments without adequate preparation, and he thus attempted to help them.

Recalling Horn's own approach and statements of objectives, we recognize that he applied himself consistently and admirably to the defense of a conservative view of the Bible itself and the historical reliability of its writers. He made it plain that higher critical theories had extensively undermined the Christian concept of Scripture,³ that the Dead Sea Scrolls and other archaeological discoveries had greatly contributed to the restoration of confidence in Scripture,⁴ and that in his view SDAs should take archaeology

¹See pp. 293-311. Almost all of these articles contain contextual insights or illumination, and there is significant exegetical application in articles commenting on biblical books.

²Such as ST, TT, and the booklets, Horn, Light from the Dust Heaps, and idem, Records of the Past.

³See p. 206-207.

⁴See p. 205-206.
more seriously as an apologetic weapon. Yet Horn also recognized certain limitations with regard to archaeology. He noted that its evidences are fragmentary and may be misleading. He also noted that archaeology cannot prove the Bible to be God's Word, and he stated that his own faith in God and in the reliability of the Bible were not based upon archaeological findings.

W. L. Emmerson

It is clear that Emmerson had the same burden as Horn with regard to answering higher critics. However he was without the same formal qualifications and did not pursue that goal with quite the same persistence as Horn. His first article for this period expressed his attitude unequivocally. As he reported the discovery of the Babylonian ration tablet which mentioned Jehoiachin and five of his sons, Emmerson stated that this "... provides still another evidence to add to the long list of evidences which have forever silenced the critics who used to say that Bible history is nothing more than an assemblage of legend, myth, and folklore." He

1See pp. 208, 212.
2See p. 207.
3See p. 212.
4See pp. 193-94.
5Because of the size of his contribution Emmerson is considered here, but the order in which subsequent names are considered emphasizes professional training, balanced also by the size of the contribution as with Roy F. Cottrell.
6See pp. 208, 340.
8Ibid.
furthermore added that "... wherever a Bible statement can be checked against contemporary evidence unearthed out of the dust of the ages, the Bible record always proves to be absolutely correct."  

In the same tone he wrote a few months later to report concerning an apologetic address by Sir Frederick Kenyon, in which he acclaimed the Dead Sea Scrolls and similar finds and applauded those who would hold to a high view of Scripture.

An apologetic article using a biographical approach told of the conversion of William Ramsay from higher critic to defender of biblical historicity on the basis of his own archaeological work in Asia Minor and Greece. Apparently the turning point for Ramsay was the realization of the geographical accuracy of Acts 14:6, but he went on to pursue numerous Pauline and other NT historical and geographic connections.

Emmerson's most extensive contribution for this period was only peripherally apologetic. His series of thirteen ST articles in 1952 traced biblical sites and connections throughout Transjordan and the Arabah, but his style was to feature the background and setting of Bible stories so that any apologetic was almost incidental.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., "Bible Critics Routed," ST, September 19, 1950, pp. 11, 15.
3 Presidential address to the Victoria Institute, London.
The series followed his own journey undertaken in December 1935, from Jerusalem to Jericho and then crisscrossing the territory of Transjordan. On the way to the Jordan River he visited OT Jericho where Garstang's excavations were in progress and whose discoveries impressed him greatly. The writer argued strongly for the location of the "cities of the plain" in the region to the north of the Dead Sea, but he was not dogmatic. He discussed a number of the tells in that region and was especially impressed with Tuleilat el-Ghassul which he described as Neolithic followed by an advanced civilization "in the fourth millennium B.C." The next article described the region around Nebo and Heshbon, and Israel's clash with the Amorites. Emmerson followed the King's Highway southward and, noting a number of ancient tells (and the reports of Glueck's regional survey), he suggested that the extinction of EB civilization in Transjordan was the result of Chedorlaomer's or similar invasions. He then

---

2 Ibid., p. 15. He said that these Jericho discoveries "remarkably confirm the Bible account of the coming of Israel," but he did not tarry there and moved on to the east.
4 Emmerson, "Cities of the Plains," p. 9. This advanced level he referred to as the "Bronze Age City," whereas today it is generally described as Chalcolithic (AP, pp. 65-66; J. R. Lee, "Tuleilat el-Ghassul," EAEHL 4:1205, 1213).
7 Ibid., p. 8.
theorized that after a gap of several hundred years, increasing prosperity of tribes inhabiting Moab and Ammon had attracted the Amorite incursion. Three articles were devoted to the visits to Kerak and Petra and their environs. The author traveled as far south as Akaba and, writing later, said that he was two years too soon to enjoy the "spectacular" discoveries of Glueck at Ezion-geber. In the succeeding article Emmerson told the story of the recovery of Ezion-geber giving Glueck's earlier interpretation, and then briefly described a number of copper mining sites of the Arabah. Emmerson concluded by saying that although such matters are only briefly mentioned in Scripture "... archaeology fills in the details in a wonderful way and provides the background to the high civilization which was attained by Israel in the great days of the monarchy." Emmerson next traveled in a long sweep across the desolate region

1 Ibid., p. 9. The complete archaeological picture of habitation in Transjordan is still emerging (cf. pp. 253, 335).


5 Ibid., pp. 8-9; cf. pp. 197-98.


from Akaba to Kuntillet Ajrud and on to the vicinity of Kadesh-barnea. He discussed the location of the ancient town of Kadesh-barnea and concluded that Ein el-Qudeirat was the most likely site. Another of the typical incidental apologetic references appears in the article on the Jordan Valley. Noting the high standard of Jericho pottery in the first half of the second millennium B.C., the writer observed that thus the remains "confirm the Bible references to the highly developed civilization of the Jordan Valley at that time." Emerson was probably thinking especially of his concept of the "cities of the plains" when he made that statement, but in the context of Joshua's attack he said that the ruins of Jericho "... testify in no uncertain way to the truth of every detail of the Bible story of its capture." In the last two articles, the

1 For recent focus on this site see Zeev Meshel, "Did Yahweh Have a Consort?" BAR, March-April 1979, pp. 24-34.
2 Emerson, "Israel's Footsteps," p. 10. The question is still widely debated but attention has tended to focus more on Ein el-Qudeirat than its main rival, Ein-qedeis. However, even at Ein el-Qudeirat the earliest finds to date are from the tenth century B.C. (Rudolph Cohen, "Did I Excavate Kadesh-Barnea?" BAR, May-June 1981, p. 33; idem, "Excavations at Kadesh-Barnea 1976-78," BA 44 (1981):104.
4 Ibid., p. 10.
5 Cf. ibid., p. 11; and idem, "Cities of the Plains," pp. 8-9, 15.
6 Idem, "Fords and Fortresses," p. 11. These unusual apologetic elements in this series are explainable on the basis of Emerson's 1981 recollection (Emerson to Willis) that Garstang's work at Jericho had made a very strong impression upon him, which remained even though the conclusions of Garstang were modified.
author\(^1\) followed a northerly path up the Jordan Valley to Beth-shean and across into Gilead.

In 1957 Emmerson wrote an article\(^2\) which combined apologetics and polemics. After commenting on the confirmation of the antiquity and reliability of the OT text by the Dead Sea Scrolls (especially emphasizing Daniel),\(^3\) he proceeded to attempt to refute arguments which claimed that Christianity had sprung from the Qumran sect.\(^4\)

The Pilate Inscription from Caesarea\(^5\) was reported by Emmerson\(^6\) with some apologetic statements concerning the veracity of Scripture in portraying Pilate as serving during the reign of

---


\(^3\) His statement on this book needs qualification. The number of scroll fragments of Daniel which were found does not automatically prove that Daniel was a part of the Hebrew Scriptures. However, the fact that Daniel had gained considerable popularity by the Maccabean period implies the passage of time for his work to have attained this recognition and thus gives some weight to the argument for early composition. Additional support may be seen in the reference to "Daniel the Prophet" (cf. Matt 24:15) in the florilegium from 4Q (see Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 1107).

\(^4\) He showed that similarities are outnumbered by contrasts and that supposed parallels might be best explained on the basis of a common OT background (Emmerson, "Verdict," pp. 9, 31). For references to Allegro, cf. p. 205.

\(^5\) Cf. pp. 240-41.

Tiberius. The writer suggested that the spelling "Tiberieum" did not contain a superfluous "e," but that it likely was the name of a temple in honor of Tiberius similar to the "Augusteum" temple (honoring Augustus) also located in Caesarea.\textsuperscript{1}

The report on Masada\textsuperscript{2} was apologetic and contextual, especially emphasizing the usefulness for comparative dating of the various manuscripts found there.\textsuperscript{3} Thus comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls adds to the assurance of their antiquity.

In 1966 Emmerson attempted to assess the impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially in the light of comparisons between the two Isaiah scrolls.\textsuperscript{4} He described lQlsa\textsuperscript{a} as a later, interpolated, and inferior text, though virtually complete, and considered one of its chief values as the reinforcement of the integrity of the earlier Isaiah scroll lQlsa\textsuperscript{b}. The latter, also known as the Jerusalem Scroll, though partial, is older and purely consonantal. Emmerson quoted Sukenik as saying that it is "exactly" like the consonantal base of the MT, and Yadin as saying that they are "almost identical."\textsuperscript{5}

The article eventually demonstrated apologetic usage in defending the MT and also contextual usage through illumination of the Intertestamental and MT periods.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Idem, "Old Fortress Yields Rare Treasures," \textit{ST}, January 1965, p. 29.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Since the periods of habitation there are reasonably well-known and precise.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Idem, "Verdict of the Scrolls," \textit{ST}, October 1966, pp. 18-20.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 19.
\end{itemize}
Emmerson opposed the evolutionary concept of the development of religion\(^1\) and defended the primary origins of monotheism. He saw the Sumero-Babylonian epic literature as evidence of perversion by polytheistic religions which had sprung from monotheism. His final argument was that texts from Nuzi and Ugarit had illustrated the antiquity and context of Moses and vindicated the Mosaic record.\(^2\)

Four articles by Emmerson which used archaeology\(^3\) formed a portion of a longer series featuring a return to the Bible, or the "recovery of belief." The first article featured the remarkable discovery of OT and NT manuscripts which have testified to the dependability of the transmitted texts, while the second drew upon a long list of discoveries which have shown Bible writers to have been essentially accurate both geographically and historically. Some of the apologetic claims and statements appear to have been stronger than justified.\(^4\) The third article\(^5\) spoke once more of the Sumerian, Assyrian, and Babylonian creation and flood accounts


\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 30-31.

\(^3\)The Bible on Trial--2: The Failure of Destructive Criticism," RH, July 23, 1953, pp. 4-6; idem, "The Bible on Trial--3: Discoveries Prove the Bible Record True," RH, July 30, 1953, pp. 3-4; idem, "The Bible on Trial--4: The Incomparable Word," RH, August 20, 1953, pp. 4-5; idem, "The Bible on Trial--6: Declaring the End from the Beginning," RH, September 3, 1953, pp. 4-5.

\(^4\)It must surely be an exaggeration to say concerning Belshazzar that "Today we know every important detail of his life from his boyhood to the time of his death" (idem, "Discoveries Prove the Bible Record True," p. 4).

\(^5\)Idem, "Incomparable Word," pp. 4-5.
with their cosmology so different and inferior to that of Genesis. Emmerson also used archaeology to show accurate fulfillment of prophecy as illustrated by Nineveh (Zeph 2:13-15), Tyre (Ezek 26), and Sidon (Ezek 28), thus constituting another apologetic application of archaeology.¹

We can see that Emmerson's use of archaeology remained light in his travelogue-type articles, but was strongly evident in most of his other articles. Like Horn, he was particularly anxious to stress the apologetic import of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but in most articles he also gave attention to context and reported new discoveries as he heard of them.

Lynn Wood

Wood's last article before his retirement appeared in 1950.² He reported the discovery of a Twenty-sixth Dynasty family tomb (of a temple scribe) at Saqqara. Since this period coincides approximately with the time of Nebuchadnezzar II when a synchronism between his reign and that of Jehoiakim is given (Jer 25:1), Wood hoped that further study of the contents of the tomb would further clarify the historical details of the period. This usage appears to be contextual, as well as reporting.

Wood was responsible for the section of the SDA Bible Commentary on "The First Book of Samuel,"³ and in it he made use of

¹Idem, "End from the Beginning," p. 5.
archaeology from time to time mainly in a contextual manner. He suggested sites for the location of such towns as Ramah,\(^1\) Beth-car,\(^2\) and Jabesh-gilead,\(^3\) and made comparative comments on Dagon\(^4\) and Canaanite religion generally.\(^5\) He also mentioned the Hittite nation and its decimation (as well as other activities of the Sea Peoples) as being indicative of the unsettled conditions which eventually encouraged Israel to desire a king.

Another publication from this author for this period was the jointly authored *Chronology of Ezra 7*, which has already been discussed.\(^6\) Since the work was apologetic as well as contextual we may state that Wood continued to give some emphasis to apologetic usage of archaeology.

**Edwin R. Thiele**

Thiele's contributions to SDA periodicals for this period were neither numerous nor prominent. Three were published in *Ministry* and two in *AUSS* and of this total of five articles, four were basically chronological, but all five contained some archaeological connotations.

As a member of the 1957 Bible Lands tour Thiele reported his reactions to the site of Pompeii.\(^7\) Describing the outstanding facilities and evidences of unvarnished debauchery of the city,

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 454, 458-59. \(^2\)Ibid., p. 482.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 498. \(^4\)Ibid., pp. 473-74.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 477. \(^6\)See p. 278.
Thiele interpreted these ruins as a backdrop for the NT. He not only made contextual application, but added a form of homiletic usage by likening the fate of Pompeii to the end of this world.\(^1\)

The other two *Ministry* articles\(^2\) championed the veracity of OT chronologies, and though not using archaeology very directly they were partly based upon the information recovered from Assyrian tablets and monuments.\(^3\) The articles actually constitute an apologetic for the reliability of the OT writers (especially 1 and 2 Kgs) and their chronological data and give evidence of sound and persistent scholarship.

Thiele's chronological explanations were also featured in *AUSS*.\(^4\) In the first section he outlined Israelite use of the non-accession year system (with each reign therefore appearing one year longer than actual), whereas in Judah the accession year system was followed until the time of Jehoshaphat.\(^5\) Archaeological data was interpreted as supporting Thiele's non-accession year system in the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 14.

\(^2\)Idem, "Zeal Not According to Knowledge--2: The Veracity of Bible Chronology," *Ministry*, July 1960, pp. 26-27, 46; idem, "Zeal but Not According to Knowledge--Concluded: The Problem of Overlapping Reigns," *Ministry*, August 1960, pp. 33-35. An earlier article had spoken of Job as an example of one who spoke without adequate knowledge (idem, "Zeal, but Not According to Knowledge," *Ministry*, June 1960, pp. 22-23) and the application was made in the two subsequent articles that critics who had claimed that the chronologies of Kings and Chronicles were worthless had also spoken in ignorance.

\(^3\)Idem, "Overlapping Reigns," p. 33.


ninth century B.C.\(^1\) The writer saw 2 Kgs 8:16 as marking the commencement of non-accession year dating in Judah at this time of close relationship between the two kingdoms.\(^2\) The second part of the presentation\(^3\) gave special attention to coregencies in Judah and the overlapping rival kingdom of Pekah in Israel.\(^4\) The outstanding element was Thiele's attitude of scriptural reliability which led him to look for a solution both biblical and archaeological. Thus he stated:

> In the patterns here set forth it should be recognized that no efforts at modification of data have been made, but we have accepted them as they are allowing them to establish their own chronological framework in accord with their own particular requirements.\(^5\)

His usage here and in most of his chronological writing showed a combination of the contextual apologetic and exegetical.

Thiele's contributions to the SDA Bible Commentary series included the commentary on six OT books: 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, and Isaiah. Apart from the suggested identification of many place names, there were also periodic references to archaeological data, mainly for contextual enlightenment. Examples of such references include a note on the Cherethite followers of

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 138.  \(^{2}\)Ibid., p. 137.

\(^3\)Idem, "Re-evaluation--II," pp. 120-36.

\(^4\)Overlapping with Menahem and Pekahiah (ibid., pp. 127-35).

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 134.
David, identification and notes on Shishak, Megiddo, Gezer, and Ezion-geber, as well as brief details on the battle of Qarqar. Benhadad II was distinguished from Benhadad III, and two Sennacherib campaigns against Jerusalem were supported. The Chronicles sections included notes on the Cimmerians as probable descendants of Gomer (1 Chr 1:5), as well as references to Succoth, and the Sea Peoples. In the comments on Isaiah many references were made to the Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran and variant readings were incorporated as alternatives. There was much historical material on the rivalry between Assyria and Babylon, and their involvement with Judah.

Thiele's chronological interests were uppermost in his non-SDA journals for this period as they had been earlier. His most

3Ibid., p. 775.
4Ibid., pp. 775, 776.
5Ibid., p. 777.
6Ibid., p. 829.
7"The Second Book of the Kings: Commonly Called the Fourth Book of the Kings," SDA Bible Commentary, 2:886, 929.
11Ibid., p. 248.
complete published statement on the chronology of the Hebrew kings appeared in 1951. In addition to the comments already made concerning his chronology, we note that in this volume he explained at some length the details and reliability of Assyrian chronology, where the years were adjusted to the solar year (as in Babylonian and Hebrew reckoning). In this way, when points of contact between Assyrian and Hebrew chronology can be established as with 853 B.C. -- the year of the Battle of Qarqar and Ahab's last year -- it means that we have a way of checking the dates for other points of contact. Thiele's arguments have both upheld the Scriptures and generally convinced the majority of critics. The debate with Albright was maintained since the latter rejected much of the biblical data.


See pp. 351-52.


Ibid., pp. 50-52, 66.

As with the confrontations between Tiglath-pileser III (Pul) and Menahem (2 Kgs 15:19-20) and Uzziah (Azariah of Judah). See ANET, p. 283; Thiele, Mysterious Numbers (1965), pp. 90-117.

Th. C. Vriesen (Review of The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdom of Israel and Judah, by E. R. Thiele, in Bibl Or:12 [1955]26-28) attributed Thiele's success to his open-minded approach, saying that he had looked at the text without a system of preconceptions and thus exhibited a methodological trust rather than a dogmatic trust (ibid., p. 26). He thus concluded: "If he is right, then there has not only been gained an important insight into the ancient Israelite time, but also a strong assurance [sic] of the reliability of the historical records of the O.T. In any case, as things now appear, the Books of Kings far exceed in historical trustworthiness the expectations of the students of the O.T." (ibid., p. 28).
because he held that 814 B.C. was a firm date for the founding of Carthage. Thiele wrote a brief article in 1955 in which archaeological information was brought in only briefly where it supplied the fixed point in Assyrian chronology (Qarqar 853 B.C.) with which Israelite chronology could be correlated. In 1956 Thiele further reinforced his positions on Hebrew coregencies by referring to Scripture statements and the practices as known from Egyptian records. The publication of Wiseman's work prompted Thiele to apply the newly available data to the last kings of Judah. It was now possible to give the exact date for the death of Jehoiakim and the dates for Jehoiachin's reign. Thiele also thought that the data favored 586 B.C. for the fall of Jerusalem. A published lecture given at Wheaton College in 1963 gave very little additional detail.

3 Ibid., p. 40.
5 Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings.
7 Ibid., pp. 26-27.
However, it stressed that it is archaeology which has enabled the
great progress in biblical chronology by making it possible to secure
absolute dates in Hebrew history by application of Assyrian synchron­
isms. Thus Thiele stated that without the Assyrian data there would
be "... no way of checking on the accuracy of the Old Testament
chronological data. As a result of archaeological findings, however,
we now possess means that make possible a number of absolute and
many approximate dates for events in Hebrew history."\(^1\) In \(\text{VT}^2\) Thiele
affirmed his concept of Pekah having reigned as a rival king from
752 B.C., but denied a coregency between Ahaz and Hezekiah.\(^3\) In
all of these cases the most obvious archaeological usage was context­
ual and exegetic, but an underlying apologetic element is also appar­

--

\textit{Roy F. Cottrell}

Roy F. Cottrell wrote rather prolifically on archaeological
topics and obviously read quite widely on the subject. However,
his sources tended to be old\(^4\) and at times sensational.\(^5\) His

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 1.


\(^3\) Ibid., p. 100; but cf. p. 267 for Horn's alternate approach.

\(^4\) Including such writers as Stephen Langdon (1876-1933),
Melvin G. Kyle (1858-1933), and George A. Barton (1859-1942)--all
men of some archaeological experience, but whose writings were even
in the 1950s somewhat dated.

\(^5\) See especially Harry Rimmer, Dead Men Tell Tales (Berne,
Ind.: Berne Witness Co., 1939; 10th ed., 1945). The latter was
a keen apologist who, for example, wrote of a unique fresco which
depicted a parade of fourteen cattle. In his words, "The first seven
are round, fat, and in fine condition. They are followed by seven of
twelve-part sequence in the ST in 1951 was quite specifically apologetic in most of the articles. In the first,\(^1\) he described with a reasonable degree of accuracy\(^2\) the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, Behistun Inscription, and Moabite Stone. Cottrell still referred to Woolley’s flood at Ur as evidence of the biblical Flood\(^3\) and argued that the remains of the ziggurat at Birs Nimrud (Borsippa) represent the ruins of the tower of Babel.\(^4\) The writer claimed that “according to the best authorities” Abraham would have visited Egypt in the Hyksos period,\(^5\) and he also averred in the next article that the skinniest cows that ever ambled on four legs. No word of explanation is needed to clarify this scene for those who are familiar with the history of that time” (ibid., p. 73). In his description of additions to the temple at Karnak, the writer appears to have Seti I preceding Thutmose III (ibid., p. 156), and he wrote in some detail of the mummies and treasures taken from the Great Pyramid at Giza, and also from the second pyramid (ibid., pp. 158-159). He quoted the supposed translation of an inscription from Sinai as follows:

"I am the son of Hatshepsut
overseer of the mine workers of sin
chief of Mana Jahua of Sinai
thou oh Hatshepsut
wast kind to me and drew me out
of the waters of the Nile
hast placed me in the temple (or palace)" (ibid., p. 175).

It was this writer whom Cottrell most frequently quoted or used as a source.

\(^{1}\)Roy F. Cottrell, "The Stones Cry Out," ST, July 24, 1951, pp. 8-9, 14.

\(^{2}\)Though it is hardly correct to describe the Behistun Inscription as on the "side of the peak" (ibid., p. 9).

\(^{3}\)"The Spade Confirms the Book: Creation and the Flood," ST, July 31, 1951, p. 9.

\(^{4}\)"The Tower of Babel: Fact or Fiction?" ST, August 7, 1951, p. 8.

\(^{5}\)Idem, "Sodom’s Fiery Fate," ST, August 14, 1951, p. 8.
Joseph likewise would have entered Egypt during their rulership.\(^1\) Cottrell gave evidences supporting both Ramses II and Thutmose I as the "Pharaoh of the oppression" and did not commit himself fully to one or the other, though he appeared to lean towards the latter in the light of his emphasis upon Hatshepsut and the "Sinai inscription" attributed to Moses.\(^2\) While defending the uniqueness of the Decalogue, Cottrell rather overstated the situation by describing the Hittite Law Code as reflecting "extremely low moral standards."\(^3\) When dealing with Jericho\(^4\) the writer argued vehemently for dating the Israelite Conquest around 1400 B.C., castigating those who had tried to "undermine the Bible chronology" by placing the Exodus in the twelfth or thirteenth century, but he then quoted Albright (who held a thirteenth century Exodus theory) as if he (Albright) rejected the thirteenth century dating.\(^5\) This failure to be acquainted with the basic facts was unfortunate and misleading. The article\(^6\) that followed constituted an attempt to uphold the historicity of the Bible, for the article described the modern recovery of the Hittite

\(^1\)Idem, "Light from Egyptian Monuments," \textit{ST}, August 21, 1951, p. 8.

\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 9, 14; cf. p. 357.

\(^3\)"Modern Discoveries in Bible Lands," \textit{ST}, September 4, 1951, p. 9. Though less strict than the Mosaic law, the Hittites condemned adultery, rape, incest, and some forms of bestiality, etc. (see "Law [Hittite]," \textit{Biblical World}, p. 355).


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 9.

Empire; but by referring to the ruins of Ras Shamra as a legacy of the Hittites,\(^1\) he again showed a lack of background. His depiction of the history of Jerusalem\(^2\) was more contextual and homiletic in approach, and even the brief references to the "Habiri" (Habiru) and the king "Ebed-Hepa" (Abdu-Heba) of Jerusalem in the Amarna period were not explicitly apologetic. By mentioning some of the former magnificence of Megiddo, Ezion-geber, and Ahab's palace in Samaria as indicated by archaeology,\(^3\) the author gave contextual and apologetic testimony. The Annals of Sennacherib he regarded as "unquestionably one of the strongest bricks in the wall of defense that archaeology is erecting around the sacred word of God,"\(^4\) since they clearly spoke of "Hezekiah the Jew" and his circumstances.\(^5\) The article on Daniel\(^6\) was especially apologetic and in some places apparently apocryphal. In addition to details which were also given by Horn and others,\(^7\) Cottrell described an inscription found inside a kiln which supposedly read, "This is the place of burning where men who

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 9.

\(^2\)Idem, "Jerusalem's Checkered History," \textit{ST}, September 25, 1951, pp. 8-9, 11.

\(^3\)Idem, "Israel's Glory and Decline," \textit{ST}, October 9, 1951, pp. 8-9, 15.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 15. These words were quoted from an unnamed author.

\(^5\)Cf., \textit{ANET}, p. 287.

\(^6\)Roy F. Cottrell, "Daniel Freed from the Critics' Den," \textit{ST}, October 16, 1951, pp. 8-9, 15.

\(^7\)See p. 230, 242-43, 252-53.
blasphemed the gods of Chaldea died by fire." Cottrell also wrote a general article describing the discovery of various ancient manuscripts which affirm the antiquity and reliability of Scripture and enlighten its meaning.

Three other ST articles by Cottrell were rather varied. In the first he gave an homiletic type description of Abraham and his experiences, but included some contextual type usage of archaeology in his descriptions of the city of Ur. Four years later Cottrell wrote to defend Scripture by giving a very sketchy account of such discoveries as the Deluge Tablets and the recovery of Belshazzar. He concluded by testifying:

---

1 Roy F. Cottrell, "Daniel Freed," p. 9. He also claimed that Marcel Dieulafoy [who excavated at Susa from 1884-1896] while digging at Babylon had fallen into a pit which had been used as a cage and bore an inscription which read, "The place of execution where men who angered the king died torn by wild animals" (ibid., p. 15). The first of these stories came from Rimmer, Dead Men, p. 325. The second is questionable since Dieulafoy worked mainly at Susa, and if at Babylon at all, he appears to have left no publication concerning such excavation. It is likely that both stories originated in Koldewey's practical jokes (see p. 215 n.5).


3 He was particularly impressed by the work of B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt who found vast quantities of day-to-day manuscripts (including many in Koiné Greek) at Oxyrhynchus (Behnesa) in Egypt (ibid., pp. 8-9). One more article completed this series, but it was essentially homiletic and made only passing reference to archaeology as a means of enlightening our biblical reconstructions and illustrating fulfillment of prophecy (idem, "The Book of the Ages," ST, October 30, 1951, pp. 8-9, 14).


5 "Has the Bible Been Shot Full of Holes?" ST, August 1957, pp. 14-15.
Though thousands of ancient manuscripts and inscriptions have been recovered, no archaeological discovery has disproved a single statement of Scripture or given comfort to one doubting Thomas. Instead of the Bible's being shot full of holes, it is now evident that all the attacks of the infidels during the past two millennia have in no way impaired its shining armor.

A somewhat similar article in 1966\(^2\) additionally spoke of the integrity of the text as illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls. Cottrell concluded this apologetic statement with the words of J. W. Newton, "Not since Christ ascended back to heaven have there been so many scientific proofs that God's Word is truth."\(^3\)

A single RH article\(^4\) traced the most ancient Bible manuscripts which are known to us today, emphasizing the reassurance we may have toward the reliability of the texts we use. He also underlined their value in answering critics.

Two small booklets published by Cottrell were similar in content. The first\(^5\) consisted of his 1951 ST series in booklet form

\(^{1}\)Ibid., p. 6.


\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 13. He correctly attributed the words to Newton, but The Spade and the Book was written by W. W. Prescott (see pp. 76-77) who had not given the full reference, and probably neither Cottrell nor Prescott realized that in their context they referred to discoveries of ancient ruins which Newton claimed were a valid defense of creationism since they pushed Creation back long before 4000 B.C.! (J. W. Newton, "How Many Years from Adam to Christ?" Christian Faith and Life, February 1932, pp. 89-90). George McCready Price (an SDA) wrote in the same issue defending a short chronology of ancient times ("A History of the Flood Theory of Geology," Christian Faith and Life, February 1932, p. 77).


with only slight modification in a few places. The modifications
did not include the deletion of the more questionable statements
noted above.

The other booklet\(^1\) covered the same ground in more abbrevi­
ated form, but included some updating. Some of Kenyon's conclu­
sions on Jericho were mentioned, especially the fact that some four­
teneth century remains were found.\(^2\) He also appears to have bene­
tited from some recent chronological work.\(^3\) The section on Daniel
was rather extensively edited omitting some of the material taken
from Rimmer,\(^4\) but he continued to identify Ras Shamra as a Hittite
site.\(^5\)

Thus both of Cottrell's books for this period and fourteen
of the sixteen articles which he wrote were distinctly apologetic.

Carl G. Tuland

Carl G. Tuland (Tulaszewski before he became a naturalized
U.S. citizen) gained his early education in Germany and first served

sequence of chapters is the same as the ST articles, but the ST
(October 23, 1951) article by Cottrell, "The Word that Stands For­
ever," was subdivided to become two chapters in the booklet, with
more attention given to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

\(^1\)Idem, We Can Believe (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 22-23.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 27. Quite possibly this may have been Wiseman,
Chronicles of Chaldean Kings.
\(^4\)Roy F. Cottrell, We Can Believe, pp. 35-38; f. Rimmer,
Dead Men, pp. 325-26.
\(^5\)Roy F. Cottrell, We Can Believe, p. 33.
as a minister in Germany and Hungary. He was born in 1901 and died in 1980 after having served as a minister and administrator on four continents.\(^1\) He was granted an M.A. in Systematic Theology by the SDA Theological Seminary in 1951 and subsequently commenced OT related studies at the University of Chicago in 1951 (continuing until 1956).\(^2\) Having served in the Middle East he took a strong interest in ANE studies and subsequently became a member of the American Schools of Oriental Research, the American Oriental Society, and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.\(^3\) He was also a Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.\(^4\)

\(^1\) He was in ministerial work in Germany in 1921-1922, in Hungary from 1922-1930, president of the West Persian Mission 1930-1936, then after a brief return to Germany he served as president of the Rio Espíritu Santo Conference in Brazil from 1938-1946. After a brief time in the U.S.A., he served as president of the Central Argentine Conference for nearly four years (1946-1950). After about a year in the SDA Theological Seminary he took up pastoral work in the Illinois Conference in 1951 and continued in this work until his retirement in 1970.

\(^2\) For some reason he never received the Ph.D. degree toward which he had worked. Horn suggested (Siegfried H. Horn to L.A. Willis, October 5, 1981) that this may have been on the basis of age, or he may have failed some examination(s), or it is possible that he was not recognized as a graduate student since he may have lacked a recognized B.A. degree. When Horn asked about his graduation he gave an evasive answer, and his widow twice ignored the matter in response to letters written in 1981 and 1982 (Maria Tuland to L.A. Willis, January 28, 1982; February 28, 1982). The University of Chicago confirmed that the degree was never conferred (Mary Helen Waters, Registrar's Office, University of Chicago to Lloyd A. Willis, February 18, 1982).

\(^3\) He served as vice-president of the Mid-West Section of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for 1964-1965, and as president for 1965-1966.

\(^4\) These various biographical items were based mainly on the letters mentioned in n.2 above, and also on the "Carl G. Tuland Biographical Sketch" in the Heritage Room, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.
Tuland wrote two articles for AUSS in this period. The first concerned the reliability of Josephus in his description of the post-exilic return of the Jews. Tuland illustrated the fact that archaeology has exonerated Josephus on some questions, such as the historicity of a second Sanballat, but noted that Josephus sometimes used sources rather indiscriminately and freely. Tuland also showed that Josephus was definitely mistaken in identifying Artaxerxes with Xerxes and in fact defended the accuracy of the Ezra-Nehemiah record—although this was not the primary purpose of the article. The usage could be defined as historical-contextual, with minor elements of apologetic and exegetic.

Tuland's second article took up the question of the size of the ancient city of Jerusalem. He discussed reductions in the size of the walled city of Nehemiah in the light of Kenyon's excavations which seemed to indicate that the lower part of the eastern side of the Eastern Hill had been abandoned. Tuland also claimed that a correct interpretation of Neh 3:8 would support reduction in the size of Nehemiah's city in the northwestern area so that the


2 Ibid., pp. 177, 192. Especially in the light of the Samaria Papyri, cf. p. 244.


4 Ibid., p. 179.


6 Ibid., pp. 165-67.
post-exilic city would have again been confined to the Eastern Hill. The author took the biblical data very seriously and was attempting to combine exegetical and contextual usage in this article.

Two articles appeared in non-SDA journals in 1958. He wrote an exegetical article on two Aramaic words found in Ezra explaining that the temple structure had not progressed beyond a foundation platform at the time of Tattenai's complaint (Ezra 5:6-17). Comparative data on styles of building as well as word meanings enlightened by archaeology were used to support his interpretation. Tuland also wrote a basically contextual article making a strong case for identifying Hanani and Hananiah in the Elephantine Papyri with an individual named Hanani in Jerusalem (Neh 1:2) who was the brother of Nehemiah. He further explained the latter to be identical with Hananiah in Neh 7:2 (with an explicative waw). Finally he used the consequent correlations to confirm that "Nehemiah was active under Artaxerxes I" and to further support the "biblical chronology of that period."

Tuland's usage in these few examples indicates predominant exegetical contextual usage, with some apologetic overtones.

---

1Ibid., pp. 169-73, 179.
2Idem, "'Ussaya' and 'Ussarna,'" JNES 18 (1958):269-75.
3Consequently he saw no conflict between Ezra 5:16 and Ezra 5:9, for in both cases he illustrated that the word used indicated early stages of construction (ibid., p. 269).
4Ibid., pp. 269-70.
6Ibid., p. 161.
Julia Neuffer developed an interest in the ANE while in high school and wrote her freshman research paper at Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina on archaeology on the island of Crete. About a year before graduation from college she became an SDA, and some time later took some religion classes at Columbia Union College (1941-1942). Studying only part time she commenced classes in the SDA Theological Seminary in 1942 and continued until she received her M.A. from the Department of Archaeology and History of Antiquity (the first graduate of the department) in 1947.²

Although Neuffer's M.A. thesis was chronological,³ it is briefly mentioned here because of its relationship to archaeology. Ptolemy wrote his canon in the second century A.D. as a support or

¹ She worked in the Washington Adventist Hospital until November 1943, when she joined the work force of the Review & Herald Publishing Association, for the first eight months in the proofroom. She subsequently joined the book editorial staff as a research assistant, was promoted to research editor in 1954, assistant book editor in 1959, and associate book editor in 1971. She officially retired in 1973 but continued to spend time working with Horn on the archaeological updating of the SDA Bible Commentary series (from 1974), and from 1974-1979 working long summer sessions for the Review & Herald Publishing Association. In the summer of 1980 and 1981 she helped catalog the manuscripts in the Heritage Room at Andrews University.

² The main source for this sketch was an interview with Julia Neuffer, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., November 7, 1981. She stated also that in several classes with Wood she was the only student and was thus able to undertake a variety of research including mathematical calculations for Wood's research on the Kahun Papyri (cf. pp. 99-100.).

³ And actually fell in the first period, since unpublished it is included here with her other contributions. Julia Neuffer, "A Study of Ptolemy's Treatment of the Babylonian and Persian Regnal Years" (M. A. Thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, 1947).
illustrative framework for his astronomical theories. In recording the length of reign of the various kings, Neuffer showed that he had used a system which was a combination of antedating and postdating, the application of which appears to coincide with whether the king came to the throne in the first or second half of a year. It is not known whether this system was intentional or accidental, but the result is reckoned to be a reliable kinglist in accordance with the Egyptian calendar and therefore giving a chronological framework for Babylonian and Persian (and later) periods. The overall usage of the archaeological data in her thesis is probably contextual, though the length of "Appendix C," dealing with "The Theological Treatment of the Seventh Year of Artaxerxes," indicates some apologetic interest.

Neuffer wrote three articles for the selected SDA periodicals of this period. Two were general and the third concerned her chronological specialty.

The RH article had an interesting background. The author was granted the opportunity to attend the American Oriental Society meetings in Baltimore in April 1956 on condition that she would

---

1Ibid., pp. 98, 104. In fact all of the Babylonian and the first of the Persian kings (up to Xerxes) are postdated, and they all ascended the throne between Nisan and Thoth. All the Persian kings following Xerxes for whom we have clear accession date data are antedated and came to the throne between Thoth and Nisan (ibid., p. 99).

2Ibid., pp. 117-50 (23% of the contents excluding the ten-page bibliography).

produce an article as a result. After giving various examples of the vindication of biblical history, the author focused on a paper by H. Tadmor of Hebrew University. In it he gave new data on Sargon II which apparently agreed with the biblical record but gave fewer details, hence the title, "The Bible Corrects the Monuments."

The Dead Sea Scroll discoveries were described by Neuffer on the occasion when three scrolls were displayed in the Library of Congress in 1949. These were the complete Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa), the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab), and a Manual of Discipline, or Sectarian Document (1QS). While the former article was largely apologetic, this one combined apologetic with a general report.

In AUSS the author discussed the various possibilities from known sources concerning the accession date of Artaxerxes I. She succeeded in explaining that the sources may be reconciled and seemed inclined to the explanation that Xerxes did die in August 465 B.C., but that the ensuing power struggle led to dating complications and confusion since it was at first unclear whether or not dating should commence in the reign of Artaxerxes I. The article

---

1 The title for the article was inspired by remarks from the floor by E. A. Speiser at the conclusion of a lecture (see ibid., p. 25).

2 Ibid., pp. 17, 25.


6 His security on the throne was apparently jeopardized by rivals (ibid., pp. 83-87).
was both contextual and a technical report.

All four articles by Neuffer in the SDA Bible Commentary\(^1\) can be mentioned together since they were basically similar chronological presentations. In writing these essays she had to attempt to harmonize the variations in the views of Wood, Thiele, and Horn as well as state her own conclusions.\(^2\) She briefly discussed alternative theories on Exodus dating, but strongly defended the fifteenth-century theory.\(^3\) The archaeological data in the second article was more specifically contextual since it consisted mostly of information on calendary practices in different parts of the ANE,\(^4\) with special attention given to the post-exilic period.\(^5\) In the next article the general principles of Hebrew chronology were explained and the latest and best possible harmonizations with other ANE chronologies were presented.\(^6\) Apart from occasional apologetic


2She observed (Neuffer interview) that Wood tended to insert interregnums to "stretch out" shorter reigns, and that Thiele accepted a half dozen errors in the records of 1 and 2 Kgs, whereas Horn attempted to explain these (see Horn, "Hezekiah's Reign," AUSS 2 [1964]:40-52; idem, "Ussher to Thiele," AUSS 18 [1980]:39), and also attempted to "tone-down" Thiele's chronological statements in the SDA Bible Commentary, vol. 2. Neuffer claimed responsibility for the 1445 Exodus date, stating that Thiele had arrived at 1447 B.C., and Horn at 1446 B.C., whereas she felt that "in the four hundred and eightieth year" (1 Kgs 6:1) would mean that only 479 years had passed from the Exodus to the laying of the Temple foundation. For Shea's more recent defense of 1450 B.C. see p. 106 n. 1.

3"Early Bible History," SDA Bible Commentary, 1:189-95.


5Ibid., pp. 117-21.

6"Exodus to Exile," SDA Bible Commentary, 2:152-58.
thrusts, the fourth article¹ was essentially contextual including clarification of the seventh year of Artaxerxes as fall to fall 458-457 B.C. (Jewish reckoning)² and considerable elements from the Wood and Horn contribution as seen in The Chronology of Ezra 7.³

It can be definitely stated that Neuffer's writings show a dual emphasis upon contextual and apologetic usage of archaeological data. From appearance the former predominates.

Alger F. Johns

Alger Francis Johns (1918-1972) completed his M.A. at the SDA Theological Seminary in 1949 after having served in pastoral work and for a brief time as a teacher at Middle East College. After a further period of teaching and writing⁴ he completed his Ph.D. at Johns Hopkins University in 1959. He taught at the Seminary from 1955 to 1972.⁵

A theological-contextual article by Johns appeared in Ministry⁶ and in VT.⁷ The author attempted to trace the date and day

²Ibid., p. 103. ³See pp. 278-80.
⁴He taught at La Sierra College 1949-1954; and then for some time was involved in the writing of the SDA Bible Commentary. He also wrote some articles for the SDA Bible Dictionary.
of the week involved in Nebuchadnezzar's attacks on Jerusalem in 597 B.C. (the day the city fell), in 588 B.C. (initial attack), and 587 B.C. (the biblical [?] day of the fall). ¹ He concluded that in each case the day was a Sabbath, and suggested that this was a tactic of Nebuchadnezzar since the Jews apparently engaged in no active defense on the Sabbath at that time. ²

Two book reviews ³ by Johns gave basic approval and recommendation. The former contained a few reservations on the origins of early biblical materials, while the latter, reviewing the book of an SDA colleague, gave unstinting praise.

Johns' next two articles ⁴ gave a portrait of the life and circumstances of Nebuchadnezzar. There was a contextual element including enrichment from the Babylonian Chronicles but also a noticeable homiletic strain.

In an interesting article ⁵ Johns proposed that David kept

---

¹But cf. "Chronology," SDA Bible Dictionary (1979), p. 214 for Horn's justification of August 15 or 18, 586 B.C. as the date of this event.

²Though in Maccabean times the policy was changed by Mattathias (Johns, "Military Strategy," Ministry, August 1964, pp. 28, 29). Johns admitted that subsequent discoveries might illustrate that the two latter dates might be incorrect (ibid., p. 29).


an annual record of major events somewhat similar to the type used in Assyria. His proposed reconstruction was drawn from the narrative account in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings, and he appears to have made a strong case for a parallel with the longer or expanded limmu lists. Clearly this article fits a contextual category.

His M.A. thesis\(^1\) was historical in nature and dealt with the early Persian administration, attempting to throw light on the circumstances of the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. Johns used archaeology to supply data to enrich understanding of the context and to elucidate the different royal policies. Thus he referred to such sources as the Cambyses "400" tablet,\(^2\) Elephantine Papyri,\(^3\) and the Behistun Rock Inscription.\(^4\)

Johns' Ph.D. dissertation\(^5\) also constitutes a contextual-type study. In it he attempted to analyze and correlate recently published and earlier known cuneiform sources on the Chaldean kings. He was able to clarify the dates for the Battle of Megiddo (609 B.C.), (Battle of Carchemish, 605 B.C.), and the capture of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin (March 16, 597 B.C.), as well as locate the conflict of 601 B.C. between Egypt and Babylon as occurring in November or December. He made reference to relevant Scripture passages from time to time.


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 2. \(^3\)Ibid., p. 30. \(^4\)Ibid., pp. 51-53.

Johns' work clearly gave predominant emphasis to a contextual type of usage.

Kenneth A. Strand

Kenneth Albert Strand (1927- ), a native of Tacoma, Washington, took his baccalaureate studies at Walla Walla College and Emmanuel Missionary College, receiving a B.A. (theology) in 1952. From the University of Michigan he received an M.A. in 1955 and Ph.D. in 1958. Both of these degrees were in history with emphasis (at the doctoral level) in Reformation studies. His major contribution has been as a teacher in the SDA Theological Seminary (since 1959). ¹

The article in Ministry² was only peripherally archaeological, since it addressed the question of Christian origins in the light of theories of direct descent from Qumran or an Essene heritage.³ The article constituted a careful polemical statement without entering a detailed discussion of archaeological evidences of the

¹He worked first as a minister in the Michigan Conference (1952-1959) and in 1959 he commenced teaching at the seminary by caring for the archaeology courses on the Berrien Springs campus (for this transitional year, as the seminary was in the process of moving to Berrien Springs. Horn taught the same courses in Washington, D.C.). In addition to teaching and other responsibilities, Strand served as associate editor of AUSS from 1968 until January 1974, and as editor beginning with the issue of July 1974. The main source for this general biographical data was: Interview with Kenneth A. Strand, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., March 15, 1982.


³The author stressed the fact that similar practices do not necessarily indicate direct borrowing, that distinction must be made between "form and content," and that significant differences had been ignored.
Qumran life-style. It could at the same time be described as an 
apologetic for Christian and NT distinctiveness.

Strand gave a favorable review of *The Biblical Meaning of 
History*, by Siegfried Schwantes. He commended the viewpoint and 
perspective of the book but maintained that its scope was far too 
great for the size of the volume and needed more expanded treatment. 
The review itself made no direct reference to archaeology.

Although broad in coverage, Strand's own book on the ANE gave a useful introduction to the study of the subject. The overall 
approach of the author was to look seriously at both the biblical 
data and the historical archaeological data and to report the com­
posite results. The few apologetic statements were mainly indirect 
or apparently incidental, such as passing references to the recovery 
of the Hittites and information concerning Sargon II, and a brief 
description of Thiele's vindication of the chronology of the Books 
of Kings. Likewise, there was a matter-of-fact approach to the 
most ancient Mesopotamian village cultures--mentioning a "neolithic 
culture" at Jarmo and the "Hassuna culture" lower down in the valley, 
etc. The author's pragmatic approach encompassed the dynastic 
developments of the third millennium B.C. and used archaeology fre­
quently, especially to illustrate the literary and legal developments 
in Mesopotamia. After commenting on covenant elements in the

1In *AUSS* 10 (1972):199-201.

2*Idem*, Brief Introduction to the Ancient Near East: A Pano­
rama of the Old Testament World (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Braun-Brumfield, 
1969).

Hexateuch and Hittite parallels, he made an apologetic application to support the early origin of these books.\(^1\) The book reveals a strong featuring of historical context with apologetic elements incorporated.

The emphasis of this author, indicated by his *Ministry* article and book, has been contextual, with lesser elements of apologetic or polemical usage.

**S. Douglas Waterhouse**

Samuel Douglas Waterhouse was born in Honolulu in 1931. His education included a B.A. from La Sierra College with a history major, plus completing all religion requirements.\(^2\) His M.A. from the SDA Theological Seminary in 1957 was from the Department of Archaeology and History of Antiquity. Following this phase of his study he spent two years (1957-1959) at the Oriental Institute in Chicago and subsequently worked at the University of Michigan which granted his Ph.D. degree in 1965. He has taught at Andrews University since 1963.

Waterhouse wrote a rather non-sympathetic portrayal of Egyptian polytheism\(^3\) which gave both the Egyptian context of the early developments of the Israelite nation and a polemic against evolutionary

---

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 174-77.

\(^2\)His graduation was delayed by a two-year term of army service. Interview with Douglas Waterhouse, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., March 11, 1982.
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theories on the development of religion.\textsuperscript{1} The Serapeum\textsuperscript{2} was used to illustrate the debased nature of animal worship.

A well-researched article\textsuperscript{3} on the barren state of Palestine today in contrast with its biblical description\textsuperscript{4} explored possible weather changes and other factors capable of reducing productivity. The question of pronounced climatic change remains controversial, but a common position today avows little change between 2000 B.C. and NT times.\textsuperscript{5} Archaeological data was used to illustrate the productivity of the land in the OT period,\textsuperscript{6} but human causes (goat herding and indiscriminate tree felling) combined with the hot dry summer were seen as leading factors in the loss of productivity.

\begin{enumerate}
\item He claimed that there had been a development from worship of gods in human form (accompanied by the sacrifice of animals) to veneration of animals (ibid., p. 16). He also claimed (ibid., p. 17) that the ten plagues (Exod 7-12) had widely undermined confidence in the Egyptian gods and brought monotheistic repercussions much sooner than the time of Akhenaten (see p. 377).

\item From the Greek corruption of "Osiris-Apis," representing the underground vaults and passageways at Saqqara where the Apis bulls were interred in granite sarcophagi. For a summary description of the discovery, see Gardiner, \textit{Egypt of the Pharaohs}, pp. 325-326.


\item Exod 3:8, 17; cf. Jer 3:19.


\item Waterhouse, "Milk and Honey," pp. 158-63.
\end{enumerate}
Main usage was contextual, with perhaps indirect defense of the biblical descriptions.

The review of Schwantes' second book was appreciative of the compact work, but showed disappointment at some of the omissions. Waterhouse was particularly opposed to the view that nomads put constant pressure on the agriculturally settled, since he regarded that theory as refuted.

One more article was a technical Area Report from Heshbon. The monotheism of Akhenaten was the basis of Waterhouse's M.A. thesis. He argued, however, that Aton worship grew from beginnings under Thutmose IV, perhaps with disillusioned nobles reverting to primitive monotheism, but eventually becoming supreme under Akhenaten by exclusion and not by syncretism. The similarity between Ps 104 and the "Hymn to Aton" Waterhouse regarded as not disturbing (irrespective of the explanation) since the latter expresses a reaching

---


5 Ibid., pp. 24-30, 144. He regarded the disillusionment with Egyptian gods as a result of the ten plagues.

6 ANET, pp. 370-71.
The conclusion of Waterhouse's investigation was that Akhenaten may be regarded as a worshiper of the true God though it cannot be known whether he was influenced by the contemporary Hebrews. Usage here might be termed investigative contextual, with reflections of apologetics.

Waterhouse wrote his Ph.D. dissertation with the specific objective of constructing a history of Syria for the Amarna period, that is, for the "sixteen years when Akhetaten (modern Tell el-Amarna) served as Egypt's administrative capital." As a buffer state between Mitanni, the Hittites, and the Egyptian empire, Syria was intimately involved in the power struggles of the time. Thus Waterhouse, who accepted a fifteenth-century Exodus date was hoping to build upon his former study of Akhenaten and further elucidate the details of Joshua's Israelite invasion of Canaan.

The overview of this author's writing reveals a strong

---

1 Waterhouse, "Pharaoh Ikhnaton," p. 148. On the other hand, Derek Kidner (Psalm 73-150: A Commentary on Books III-V of the Psalms [London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975], pp. 367-68) stresses the differences between the two hymns and regards the Psalmist as deliberately underlining the difference between the worship of the sun and the worship of its Maker. The essential order he says comes from Gen 1.


4 Ibid., p. 11.

5 Idem, "Pharaoh Ikhnaton," p. 3.

6 Waterhouse interview.
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interest in contextual-historical study and archaeological usage, with some underlying apologetic purposes also apparent.

Siegfried J. Schwantes

Though born in Brazil, Siegfried Julio Schwantes (1915–) has worked on four continents.¹ His qualifications included a B.A. in physics from Pacific Union College in 1938, an M.A. in Theology from the SDA Theological Seminary in 1949, and a Ph.D. in Old Testament Studies from Johns Hopkins University in 1963.² He participated in the 1968 Heshbon excavation.

Schwantes wrote two books which made some use of archaeology.³ The first was a compact history of the ANE which gave a survey of political history with some human interest enrichment. Archaeology was used throughout the work to help construct a framework of history and also to enrich this portrayal with many details. The goal of the book did not permit much theorizing, but concentrated on giving a basic skeleton history. Thus we find no mention of a

¹His teaching appointments have included Instituto Adventista de Ensino (Brazil College, Sao Paulo, Brazil); Andrews University; Middle East College (Lebanon); Universidad de Montemorelos (Mexico); and Seminaire Adventiste (France).


³A Short History of the Ancient Near East (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965); The Biblical Meaning of History (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1970). He also made brief references to archaeology (Moabite Stone) for exegetical purposes in his linguistic and historical study of the word 'r'lm ("A Historical Approach to the 'r'lm of Is 33:7," AUSS 3 [1965]:75-66). He interpreted the word as a proper noun, the name of a fierce Gadite clan.
fifteenth-century Exodus in the section dealing with the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, except for the brief note that the Merneptah Stele "... shows that the Israelites were already occupying at least part of Palestine by the end of the thirteenth century B.C." When discussing Israelite history the author used 1 Kgs 6:1 to demonstrate that 1447 B.C. might represent the biblical date for the Exodus, but he briefly outlined arguments for both a fifteenth- and a thirteenth-century Exodus without insisting upon either. A reconstruction of the context of the OT appears to have been the primary aim of the work.

In the second book, the author used archaeology to illustrate the varied concepts of history in the ancient world. For example, the Moabite Stone had historical intent but revealed no sense of historical continuity as was evident in Hebrew writings. Likewise the massive monuments and inscriptions of Egypt and Mesopotamia were analyzed by Schwantes to discover the respective concepts and goals of each civilization.

It would appear from this limited number of samples that Schwantes favored a rather broad spectrum of archaeological usage with emphasis on the contextual aspects, while apologetic appeared only in an indirect form.

1 Schwantes, Short History, p. 98.
2 Ibid., pp. 156-58. 3 Idem, Biblical Meaning.
4 Ibid., pp. 41-42. He felt that "Israel's historical consciousness grew out of its experience of deliverance from Egyptian bondage" (ibid., p. 42).
5 Ibid., pp. 63-92.
Gerhard F. Hasel

Gerhard Franz Hasel (1935- ) was born of German parentage in Vienna and grew up in Germany. After migrating to the U.S.A. he earned a B.A. (major in German and theology) from Atlantic Union College. His M.A. (Systematic Theology) from Andrews University in 1960 was followed by a B.D. in 1962 with almost equal hours in OT and NT. Hasel's Ph.D. in Religion from Vanderbilt University in 1970 involved an OT dissertation but followed an equal emphasis in OT and NT. His denominational employment included a year in pastoral work, four years teaching at Southern Missionary College (1963-1966), and, since 1967, teaching at Andrews University. He served as Chairman of the OT Department from 1974-1981 and as Dean of the Seminary since fall 1981. Hasel was a member of the Heshbon team in 1971 and four years later made a two-month tour of the Bible lands. He sees the role of biblical archaeology as significantly contributing to Bible backgrounds and contexts both by parallels (or similarities) and by contrasts. He emphasizes the latter because he sees the Bible as distinctive and as containing its own authority, though an integral part of the ancient world. Hasel feels that the form critical school has overplayed the authority of archaeology so that for it archaeology has become the control, whereas Hasel feels that the biblical data should be the control while accepting contextual enrichment (and consequent exegetical assistance) from archaeology.1

1 Interview with Gerhard F. Hasel, Dean of the SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., April 12, 1982.
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During this period Hasel wrote three articles and five reviews which contained archaeological data for AUSS. The first review made only passing reference to the "mountain of God" motif in Korahite Psalms which are thought to have acquired this concept from Northern Syria and Mesopotamia. Hasel argued for a pre-exilic "Zion theology" which included the "mountain of God" concept (cf. Isa 2:1-5) and therefore maintained that it is not justifiable to insist on post-exilic composition of the Korahite Psalms. Likewise in the next review he used archaeological information (fragments of Psalms from Qumran) to temper judgments on the origins of the Psalms. A third review praised the latest collection or edition of all available material from the Babylonian and Sumerian flood stories. Hasel suggested that the authors could have supported a theory wherein both the Sumerian and Babylonian as well as the biblical account shared a common earlier Mesopotamian tradition.

Hasel wrote a linguistic study for exegetical purposes on Isaiah's son Shear-Jashub. He compared personal names recovered

---


4 Ibid., pp. 185-86.

from various Syrian (Amorite and Ugaritic) sites and concluded that Isaiah's son bore a "verbal sentence name" correctly rendered "A-Remnant-Shall-Return," with emphasis on the remnant and thereby constituting a promise of hope. Although this article constituted a linguistic analysis, it used data recovered from archaeological research and expressed the hope for further use of archaeology in exegesis.

Another review briefly touched on the "history of religions" description of apocalyptic because various authors had drawn their sources from Babylon, Egypt, Ugarit, etc., in support of that school of interpretation. Likewise the Qumran discoveries had stimulated the interest in apocalyptic origins. In the same issue Hasel also reviewed in cautious terminology Proverbs: A New Approach, by William McKane. The author had given a form-critical analysis of Proverbs in the process of attempting to illustrate parallels with ANE wisdom forms. The reviewer pointed out the hypothetical nature of the author's reconstructions.

Hasel examined the terms and motifs of Gen and compared them with those of the ANE creation epics. He was able to show in


2In AUSS 10 (1972):188-90.

3Especially the "instruction" genre which was regarded as having first affected Israel via the training program for Solomon's civil servants (ibid., p. 189).

several instances that the terms used and concepts portrayed in Genesis are both antmythical and sublimely elevated in nature. Thus, although some remote common origin is acceptable, the author emphasized that the "Hebrew understanding of reality . . . is fundamentally opposed to the mythological one." Usage here could be designated apologetic-theological.

In an AUSS article and also in his Ph.D. dissertation, Hasel used ANE cognates (West Semitic) and archaeological illustrations to help determine the broad significance of the Hebrew word shear (remnant) in order to enlighten its use in Scripture. In the dissertation detailed investigation was given to the remnant motif both conceptually and as it occurred in explicit verbal form in Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, Ugaritic, and Egyptian texts. Essential archaeological usage was exegetical-theological.

The two reviews in non-SDA journals both stressed the need for more serious consideration of the contributions which archaeology

---

1 Ibid., p. 20.
5 Ibid., pp. 51-58, 69-79, 82-83.
can make to biblical studies. In the former case this method would improve exegesis,¹ in the latter it would result in a less tenden-
tious form of source evaluation.²

Hasel’s major usage of archaeology as revealed in these pub-
lications appears to be exegetical and theological with occasional
shades of apologetic.

Kenneth L. Vine

Kenneth Lawrence Vine (1923- ) is probably the leading
archaeologist on the Loma Linda University campus. He completed an
M.A. at the SDA Theological Seminary in 1951 and was granted a Ph.D.
in Near Eastern Studies by the University of Michigan in 1965. Dur-
ing a six-year term as president of the Middle East College in Beirut
(1965-1971)³ he participated in a season of excavation at Ai, and
since 1972 he has assisted in the excavations at Caesarea. He is
currently the dean of the Division of Religion at Loma Linda Univer-
sity where he has served since returning from the Middle East.

In 1967 Vine wrote a two-part report⁴ for the RH on

¹Hasel argued that the author needed to engage in a more
active comparison between the ANE and biblical materials, i.e., uti-
лизing more of the potential exegetical contribution of archaeology
rather than seeing it as a rather remote background (idem, review
of Gott als Richter, p. 370).

²He saw archaeology as a corrective to the extremes of source
criticism, whereas Thompson had regarded archaeological input as
merely “ambiguous data” (idem, review of Moses and the Law, p. 222).

³He had previously served on the faculty for about twelve
years.

⁴“In Search of Biblical Ai--Part 1,” RH, January 5, 1967,
pp. 1, 4-5; “In Search of Biblical Ai--Part 2,” RH, January 12, 1967,
pp. 2-3. Vine’s participation involved the second season, since
the excavations directed by Joseph Callaway began in 1964, and
excavations at Ai (et-Tell) in which he had participated in 1966. The interest of the author was clearly oriented to solving the conundrum of the identity of the Ai captured by Joshua (Josh 7, 8) and inhabited later in the times of Isaiah (Isa 10:28) and Ezra-Nehemiah (Ezra 2:28; Neh 7:32). Since the findings only gave evidence for habitation during EB and Iron Age I, he concluded that some other site must be sought in the vicinity. Although these articles were reports, they also give hints of contextual and apologetic usage.

"The Date of the Baptism of Jesus" was the topic of Vine's M.A. thesis, but the data used in the study were almost exclusively biblical, literary, and chronological, with negligible archaeology. The purpose of the study appears to have been largely apologetic—"to establish faith" in the accuracy of Luke's chronology, and incidentally to support the accuracy of Daniel's prophecy (Dan 9:24-27).

In his Ph.D. dissertation, Vine endeavored to trace the origins of Baal worship at Ugarit. It was found that the first Baal proceeded in 1966, 1968, 1969, and 1970, with minor operations in 1971 and 1972 (see J. A. Callaway, "Ai," EAEHL 1:36-52).

1 Vine, "Biblical Ai--Part 2," p. 3. Alternatively, in conversation, Shea has suggested that this minor settlement may have been located on the lower eastern slopes where digging has not been carried out.

2 SDA Theological Seminary, 1951.

3 Two coins were considered as evidence in the investigation, but were rejected as non-genuine (ibid., pp. 12-14). Some inscriptions on the other hand did contribute clarifications (ibid., pp. 26-29).

4 Ibid., p. 29. 5 Ibid., p. 48.

temple there dated to about the end of the twenty-first century B.C., whereas Amorite immigrants were thought to have arrived from the upper Middle Euphrates in the century or so before this. It was therefore thought that Baal-Hadad had arrived in Ugarit as a result of this migration. The biblical connections in this dissertation are only indirect since Israel came into contact with various forms of Baal worship among the Canaanites centuries later.

Vine's contribution reflects some inclination to apologetic usage in his writings for SDAs, and a general interest in contextual work.

Leona G. Running

Leona Glidden Running was born in Flint, Michigan, in 1916. She graduated from Emmanuel Missionary College in 1937 with a French major, and took some French and German classwork at the University of Michigan in 1938, completed an M.A. in biblical languages at the SDA Theological Seminary in 1955, and a Ph.D. in Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins University in 1964. She gave service both as a teacher and as a secretary climaxed by her notable term in the

---

1Ibid., pp. 5, 121.  
2Ibid., pp. 141-44.  
3The descriptions of other gods and goddesses such as Asherah and Dagan, etc., likewise have a similar contribution of background knowledge for OT studies (ibid., pp. 16-76).  
4Specializing in Hebrew, Akkadian, and Syriac.  
5Including teaching French and German at Laurelwood Academy (1937-1941), working as secretary to C. L. Bauer (Pacific Union Conference Secretary-Treasurer) from 1942-1944, in the Foreign Language Division of the Voice of Prophecy (1944-1948), and as Foreign Language Secretary in the Pacific Press Publishing Branch in Brookfield,
seminary from 1955-1981, and subsequently as professor emeritus. She made three tours of the Bible Lands (1957, 1965, and 1970) and enjoyed exciting but high-pressured periods as Albright's research assistant cum secretary during his last frantic years of endeavoring to complete projects before blindness or death could overtake him.

As a participant in the 1957 Bible Lands Tour, Running gave a general report of the places visited including some archaeological descriptions. The inspirational effect of biblical context was uppermost.

Next, the author reviewed a paper-bound volume by Daniel Hämmerly Dupuy. She praised his thoroughness in bringing together comparative data from archaeology, ancient history, geography, and the biblical records in order to arrive at his various conclusions.

Illinois (1948-1949). After serving as secretary to the President of the Carolina Conference (1949-1950), and as secretary and copy editor of the Ministry (1950-1954), she was appointed to teach in the seminary in 1955.

Principally in teaching biblical Hebrew and Greek, but also offering other ANE languages and a survey course on the geography and archaeology of Bible Lands.


Idem, review of Arqueologia Biblica Paleotestamentaria desde Moisés hasta Salomón. Tomo I: Epocas de Moisés y de Josué; Tomo II: Epoca de los Jueces, in AUS 5 (1967):204-206. Running and Dupuy had studied together in the seminary and she gave him considerable
A travelogue-style description of the complete Bible Lands Tour followed the itinerary from site to site, but did not enter into detailed discussion of controverted points. A fifteenth-century Exodus was assumed, but interpretations—where given—tended to be cautious, as with the Habiru, and not specifically apologetic. Again contextual usage was the most evident.

Daniel Hämmerly Dupuy

Daniel Hämmerly Dupuy (1907-1972) was born in Switzerland but lived most of his life in South America. Since he published almost exclusively in Spanish and Portuguese for the South American sphere, his work is largely outside the scope of this survey, but the impact of his work on Latin America warrants some notice. He gained theological training at River Plate College, took further studies in Montevideo and Buenos Aires, and received his M.A. (1955) and B.D. (1956) from the SDA Theological Seminary in the USA. In 1970 Andrews University awarded him an honorary D.D. He served the denomination for forty-four years as an administrator, evangelist, teacher, and writer. Through his oral and written presentations, which especially featured archaeology, he influenced many towards faith in God and Scripture. His elegant and learned style made him particularly popular and effective with the intelligentsia. Though assistance by translating his compositions (including his M.A. and B.D. theses, see p. 390).


Ibid., p. 140.
he had not participated in excavations his wide and careful reading enabled him to accurately represent archaeological discoveries and their significance.¹

At the seminary his M.A. thesis was entitled, "An Archaeological and Topographical Investigation of Israel's Exodus Route from Egypt to Palestine,"² and his B.D. thesis was entitled "Investigation of the Historical Importance of the Roads between Egypt and Western Asia before the Assyrian Empire."³ The latter gave some emphasis to apologetics, but both were essentially contextual.

One article by Dupuy was translated and appeared in AUSS.⁴ It constituted a careful survey and analysis of the different fragments and versions of the Mesopotamian Flood Epic and concluded that although the relationships were not direct, evidence pointed to common origins in traditions which had circulated in Sumer, while the entire corpus contained reference to this great cataclysm as a major transition in the ancient world.⁵

C. Mervyn Maxwell

Cyril Mervyn Maxwell (1925- ) completed an M.A. in Church History from the SDA Theological Seminary in 1951, and a Ph.D. in

¹Biographical data was gained from "Hammerly Dupuy, Daniel," SDA Bible Encyclopedia (1976), 10:555; and Interview with Nancy J. Vyhmeister, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., March 15, 1982.

²1955. ³1956.


⁵Ibid., pp. 17-18.
history from the University of Chicago in 1966. His denominational employment has included nine years in ministerial work in California, nine years of teaching at Union College in Lincoln, Nebraska, and since 1968 teaching in the Theological Seminary at Andrews University. He was a member of the 1968 team which excavated at Heshbon, and also toured the Bible Lands in 1972.

In 1965 Maxwell wrote an article based on one by Johns substantiating from archaeology that many attacks on the Jews in OT times and in AD 70 had taken place on the Sabbath. He argued that these records of Sabbath observance continue to testify to the fact that the weekly Sabbath has not been lost but remains with a blessing for those who do not observe it with a mere outward form.

His other two articles for the period were popular reports of the 1968 Heshbon excavation in which Maxwell had participated. These were essentially reports with only a hint of chronological apologetic concerning the few fragments of LB pottery discovered at the conclusion of the season.

Earle Hilgert

Earle Hilgert (1923- ) is a NT scholar who completed an M.A. at the SDA Theological Seminary and a Ph.D. at the University

---

1 "Fragments of Time," ST, March 1965, pp. 21-23.
2 See pp. 370-71.
5 Idem, "Digging up the Past," p. 9.
of Basel. In 1970 he wrote a two-part article which was in effect an extended review of a Dutch work on the origins of the Sabbath.

The reviewer noted that the author, Meesters, had rejected attempts to see the Sabbath reflected in special days of Babylonia, and likewise observed that evidence of a regularly recurring seven-day weekly cycle had not been found at either Ugarit or Babylon, nor anywhere else in the ancient world outside of Israel.

Hilgert also wrote an article discussing theories on the origin of Sunday worship. He showed that various Dead Sea Scroll fragments had indicated that Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday had featured strongly in the religious calendar of Qumran as also in the Book of Jubilees. His conclusion was that no weekly observance of Sunday had been followed at Qumran, but that the preference which the members of certain branches of sectarian Judaism had shown for

---


5 Idem, "Sabbath (Concluded)," p. 32. Though some special seven day periods are known from these two named areas. A note of special, though incidental interest was that Meesters (according to Hilgert) referred to sixteen major scholars who since 1950 have with varying certainty championed the cause of Mosaic origin of the Decalogue--"as a result of their critical studies" (ibid., pp. 33-34).

these three weekly days may have psychologically encouraged the subsequent acceptance of Sunday as a Resurrection memorial.\(^1\)

The dissertation written by Hilgert\(^2\) also drew on archaeological information for a background to NT symbolism. Both in Egypt and Mesopotamia, the ship was portrayed as a mode of transport in the underworld or for the after-life,\(^3\) and in Greek and Roman literature a similar concept was maintained.\(^4\) In the same way the sea and great rivers played a prominent part in ancient mythology, and Hilgert showed some similarity of terminology and symbolism to both the OT and NT, but especially with the book of Revelation.\(^5\) He thus used archaeology to portray background and to some extent context of Scripture.

Hilgert's several contributions tend to use archaeology to illustrate the context of Scripture, with certain theological and general background input also evident.

Charles D. Utt

Charles Daniel Utt (1892-1969) held a B.A. from Pacific Union College and an M.A. from Boston University. In the period before his retirement he was called to editorial work for the ST. Three of his editorials were based on archaeological discoveries or discussions. Based on a preliminary announcement, he described the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 51.
\(^2\)Ship and Related Symbols.
\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 15-19. \(^4\)Ibid., pp. 19-23.
\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 43-49.
discovery of a ship found buried beside the pyramid of Khufu. He used the find as evidence for the antiquity of the concept of man’s natural immortality and argued against this concept from Scripture (and also on the basis that the boat had never been reused). The second editorial by Utt was clearly apologetic as it recounted the modern recovery of knowledge concerning the Hittites and the decipherment of their scripts. The last of these three editorials was likewise apologetic as Utt discussed the Dead Sea Scrolls and their confirmation of the reliability of the text. He also counteracted (by quoting several experts) the view of the NT as a supposed development from Essenism. Thus of the three contributions by Utt which used archaeology, two were apologetic and one was polemical-theological. All three were well informed of the relevant facts.

Orley M. Berg

Orley M. Berg (1918- ) early developed a love for evangelism and archaeology which led him to use archaeology as a special feature in evangelistic presentations. He took two classes from Horn at the seminary in 1954 and immediately began to gather and produce slides of ANE interest for evangelistic illustrations. He visited


the Middle East five times. In 1957 he was a member of the Bible Lands Tour, and in 1965 he participated in the Summer Institute of Near Eastern Civilizations which was sponsored by Hebrew Union College. The Institute involved formal classwork in Jerusalem, excavations at Gezer under G. Ernest Wright, two days in the Negev with Glueck, and general travels in Israel with Zev Vilnay.\(^1\) He has endeavored to remain well-informed over the years by subscribing to various archaeological journals.

The only \textit{TT} article by Berg\(^2\) was a report of progress and methodology in the excavation at Gezer. He gave a simple and accurate description with some emphasis on support for the Bible's accuracy.

The next article was less archaeological than geographical as the author attempted to trace the path of Israel from Goshen to Mount Sinai. His main criteria were the physical features of the land, the biblical description, and the description given by Ellen White in \textit{Patriarchs and Prophets}.\(^3\) Usage was predominantly contextual with a hint of apologetic.

Two reviews written by Berg were quite routine. In the

\(^{1}\)Berg also led a group of fifteen through the Bible lands in 1971, traveled through Greece and Turkey in a small party in 1975, and led another group of ministers through the Middle East in 1979 (Orley Berg to Lloyd A. Willis, November 2, 1981). His B.A. was from Pacific Union College and he completed an M.A. (Bible and Systematic Theology) at the seminary in 1959.

\(^{2}\)"We Dig up the Past at Gezer," \textit{TT}, June 1966, pp. 12-13, 33.

first, he was especially interested in the opinion of Albright, whom he quoted as saying that the book is "... neither fundamentalist nor liberal, but is written from a staunch theological conservative point of view." He also reviewed Leon Wood's *A Survey of Israel's History*, but warned that this conservative work contained some divergent views such as a 430-year sojourn in Egypt.

A very distinctive review by Berg attempted to assess Donovan Courville's *The Exodus Problem and Its Ramifications*. The reviewer observed the tremendous difficulties mitigating against acceptance of the theory, in particular, the gross chronological readjustments. Berg sought advice from professional archaeologists and OT specialists before outlining several specific problems in the work by Courville. The consensus was an objection to the Velikovsky-type methodology and essential thesis, the chronological equating of famine records from the Second, Fifth, and Twelfth Dynasties of Egypt, and the identification of Joseph with Mentuhotep, vizier of Sesostris I (the vizier appears to have performed many pagan duties according to his titles). The major objection mentioned, however, was chronological involving as it did the equating of such characters

---


2In *Ministry*, May 1971, p. 60.

3Cf. p. 106, for a similar view expressed by Shea.


5See Immanuel Velikovsky, *Ages in Chaos: From the Exodus to King Akhnaton* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1952; and other works by the same author).
as Thutmose III and Shishak. The book was recommended for reading only as an interesting, unproved theory.

Two little booklets written by Berg were doubtless useful in his evangelism, since they contained virtually the same material as his lectures. The first included a general lecture on biblical archaeology with specific illustrations from the recovery of the Hittite civilization, origins of alphabetic writing, and the modern recovery of Calah, Nineveh, etc. In this section, and in the subsequent chapters which dealt with Babylon and the Sinai, Berg periodically made reference to the "confirming" value of archaeology. He also referred to the generally heightened appreciation of biblical context through archaeological discoveries. The land of Egypt was featured in the second booklet. This time the three topics dealt with the pyramids, the metropolis of Thebes, and Tutankhamen. In keeping with the origin of these materials as popular lectures, it is not surprising that the style precludes technical discussion and the inclusion of controverted points of view. The author did, however, maintain essential accuracy.

Berg's overall usage shows a degree of balance between the enlightenment of biblical context, apologetics, and a certain amount of homiletic application. Apologetic for the reliability of Scripture seems to have been given more weight than the other usages.

5 Ibid., pp. 7, 13, 17, 33. 6 Ibid., p. 17.
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Donovan A. Courville completed a Ph.D. in chemistry at the University of Washington in 1946.\(^1\) Archaeology and OT history have been his special interests for many years, and it is claimed that his two-volume work on the Exodus was the result of study extending over a period of "more than fifteen years.\(^2\)

Courville appears to have been dedicated to somehow shortening the accepted time scales of the second millennium B.C., because he thought them incompatible with biblical chronology. His whole thesis seems to have developed from frustration over Kenyon's largely negative reports concerning fifteenth and fourteenth century B.C. (LB) evidences at Jericho, stimulated by a similar frustration because Egyptian records have not given clear evidence of a period of widespread devastation and national emergency in the mid-fifteenth century B.C. (the proposed biblical date for the Exodus). Much of his approach or methodology was based on that of Velikovsky,\(^3\) that

\(^1\)According to the Comprehensive Dissertation Index 1861-1972, 37 vols. (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Xerox University Microfilms, 1973), 33:951. However, the note concerning the author in his book (The Exodus Problem and Its Ramifications: A Critical Examination Of the Chronological Relationships between Israel and the Contemporary Peoples of Antiquity, 2 vols. [Loma Linda, Calif.: Challenge Books, 1971], 1:vi) mentions the date 1945 and the university as "Washington University." He also had completed a B.Th. (ministerial training) in 1922 and a B.A. in 1931 both from Emmanuel Missionary College, and an M.A. in chemistry from Indiana University in 1934. His teaching experience included fourteen years at Pacific Union College (1935-1949), and a long period in the bio-chemistry department of the School of Medicine at Loma Linda University (1949-1970; in the latter year, he retired to emeritus standing, ibid.).

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ages in Chaos: From the Exodus to King Akhnaton (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1952), pp. 5-53; cf. Idem, Worlds
ancient history has been chronologically magnified to the extent of about 600 years. The problem with Courville's writing is that his love for Scripture had led him to defend its interpretations (what he thinks it should or must mean). Thus he has attempted to vindicate Scripture by showing the "fallacies" of archaeology. To him, the "... discrepancies are so numerous and of such magnitude that they stand to challenge the very foundations of Christian beliefs that have their basis in Scriptural teachings."\(^1\) Yet, strangely, he has accepted those archaeological verdicts which suit him--as with EB destructions of Ai and Jericho which he attributed to the time of Joshua (because of the clear destruction evidences, even though this correlation meant shifting the end of EB forward by more than 600 years).\(^2\)

When Courville subsequently defended his work against

\(^1\) Ibid., 2:92.

\(^2\) Ibid., 2:93. He also found it necessary to regard Egyptian Dynasties VI, XII, and XIII as approximately concurrent (ibid., p. 90).
scholarly criticism, he made it clear that his whole purpose had been to uphold the 6000 year chronology from Creation to the present and that he was not dependent upon Velikovsky for the main idea of his book. He was adamant in rejecting 1991 B.C. as the time of commencement of the Twelfth Dynasty and claimed that the SDA Bible Commentary was in error in accepting such. The apologetic nature of both the two-volume book and this subsequent defense of its position in Ministry is equally clear.

Leslie Hardinge

Leslie Gilbert Hardinge (1912- ) has spent much of his lifetime as a religion teacher, including overseas service and some years at Washington Missionary College. As a result of his participation in the 1957 Bible Lands Tour he wrote eight articles for Ministry and RH.

Seven articles for the RH were published in 1959 in a type of homiletic diary form. Archaeological details were rather sparse, but the author endeavored to portray the biblical scene and atmosphere through the modern visit. The articles on the cedars of

1 "Reply to the Ministry Review of The Exodus Problem and its Ramifications," Ministry, November 1973, pp. 44-45. Though most SDA scholars tried to work patiently and sympathetically with Courville (including Shea, Horn, and Geraty) to point out problems in his approach, friction did result so that Horn eventually commented, "I consider his work to be of the same kind as he would judge a book written by me that deals with Biochemistry" (Horn to Willis, January 25, 1982).

Lebanon\(^1\) and the churches of Asia Minor were especially effective.\(^2\)

In his *Ministry* article on the visit to Athens,\(^3\) Hardinge quite brilliantly followed the movements of Paul across the landscape and among the buildings of the Greek capital where only relics of Paul's age now remain. The purpose here, as in the former articles, was not to contribute new archaeological facts but to attempt to restore a little of the original atmosphere.

**Don F. Neufeld**

Don Frank Neufeld (1914-1980) was a native of Canada who served as an evangelist, Bible teacher, and ultimately as an associate editor of the *RH*. Some of his studies were taken under Albright. Six of his editorials within this period either gave reports or dealt with issues concerning archaeology. In the first\(^4\) he defended the sixth-century dating of Daniel and rejected the identification of Daniel, or Danel (N.E.B. Ezek 14:14, 20; 28:3) with King Danel in the Akht legend from Ugarit.\(^5\) He also noted the


\(^5\) See ANET, pp. 149-55; and the discussion in S. B. Frost, "Daniel," *IDB* 1:761-62.
death of Glueck,\textsuperscript{1} praising his contributions and expressing the fact that SDA\textsuperscript{s} had very early shown an interest in archaeological discoveries, but he did not explain the reason for this interest. A rather similar statement noted the death of Albright,\textsuperscript{2} commenting that his activities had spanned "a period of archaeological research rich in confirmation of the historicity of the Bible." Neufeld was pleased to report the contributions of Horn and other SDA Theological Seminary faculty members at the 1971 Society of Biblical Literature meetings in Atlanta\textsuperscript{3} and observed how necessary it was for SDA\textsuperscript{s} to intelligently participate in current scholarly discussion. In 1972 there were two editorials by Neufeld first reporting\textsuperscript{4} and then expressing the scholarly skepticism and debate over the claim for Markan fragments from Qumran (especially 7Q5 much vaunted by José O'Callaghan).\textsuperscript{5} Neufeld's archaeological editorials were well


informed but were essentially reports with an occasional homiletic or apologetic thrust.

F. D. Nichol

Nichol's contributions carry over into this period to the extent that three editorials reported archaeological matters. He spoke glowingly of archaeology's successes in correcting many fantastic, higher-critical positions. In the second editorial he praised the newly published first volume of the SDA Bible Commentary for its archaeological contributions to the understanding of Bible texts. Finally he stressed the importance of OT history and archaeology's witness to its literal historicity. His usage in these editorials included apologetic and some appreciation for exegetical usage.

Robert A. Tyson

A single series of four articles in 1960 represented Robert Tyson's recollections of his 1959 visit to the Bible Lands with


5The author (born 1919) has served as a church administrator.
Horn and others. His description covered visits to Sinai, Jordan, and Israel, giving few archaeologically detailed descriptions, but especially savoring the biblical context and atmosphere.

Carl Diemann Anderson

A single contribution by Carl Diemann Anderson expressed his philosophy that God's directing hand had been strongly present throughout history. He drew together the historical strands from the Bible, archaeology, secular history, and the writings of Ellen White. Secular and archaeological sources were used—though somewhat sparsely and with inadequate footnoting—though it should be noted that the material was originally prepared for high-school use and then adapted to some extent for college work. The author was clearly dedicated to upholding biblical data, but as with the Exodus dating he seemed a little unsure of how to make the strongest position. Anderson's main concern appears to have been to illuminate

1 The Ancient World, rev. ed. (Huntsville, Alabama: Oakwood College, 1973). The author is now retired but has had wide teaching experience in SDA schools and colleges. He had an M.A. in church history from the SDA Theological Seminary (1957), and a Ph.D. in history from the American University (1960), with a dissertation which traced and analyzed the history of SDA church organization.

2 With especially heavy reliance on the latter, as indicated in the preface (ibid., p. x) and as evident throughout.

3 The tentative suggestion of 1424 B.C. (as an alternative to 1445 B.C.) as a possible date for the Exodus (ibid., pp. 101-102) was based on the concept that Hatshepsut may have rescued Moses in the first year of her reign (ca. 1504 B.C.) and therefore Moses' eighty years of preparation for his responsibility would bring the Exodus close to the date of the death of Amenhotep II (ca. 1425 B.C.). Another minor point is that it is also possible to interpret the portraits of Hatshepsut which depict her as a bearded male, not as priestly caricature (ibid., p. 97), but as reflecting her own efforts to establish and maintain her legitimacy as Pharaoh.
the Bible record with additional details, so that apologetics did not assume great importance.¹

George E. Vandeman

George Edward Vandeman (1916- ) is best known for his evangelistic work, especially via the television medium. However his interest in evangelism led him to some interest in archaeology.

In 1952 he wrote a commendation² of Thiele's book on Hebrew chronology³ which consisted largely of extracts from favorable book reviews. The article contained hints of contextual and apologetic application of Thiele's work.

Vandeman also wrote a booklet, Hammers in the Fire and What Wore the Hammers Out,⁴ in which he used archaeological discoveries to demonstrate the reliability of Scripture and God's providences in history. Finds were described in a popular, condensed style with essentially accurate details, and included such topics as the Hittite finds at Boghazköy and Karatepe,⁵ the Amarna Tablets,⁶ Belshazzar,⁷ and the Rosetta Stone.⁸ Both of these contributions of Vandeman

¹To illustrate, the description of Sargon II (ibid., pp. 152-53) contained no apologetics, though the refutation of critics by the rediscovery of the Hittites was mentioned (ibid., p. 163).
³Mysterious Numbers; cf. p. 354.
⁵Ibid., pp. 46-48. ⁶Ibid., p. 45.
⁷Ibid., p. 37. ⁸Ibid., p. 36.
used archaeological details with some apologetic purpose.

Sydney Allen

Sydney Earl Allen (1929- ) has worked as a teacher including some time in the Philippine Islands. He wrote two articles and a review which included archaeological aspects.

In the first article, he attempted to analyze and negate the main threats to conservative Christianity. Allen leaned heavily upon Albright in attempting to show that critical arguments from archaeology (with regard to the Hittites, etc.) have been wrong. Allen then tried to turn the tables on the critics, for he stated that if "the facts" could be used to "discourage belief fifty years ago, they ought to encourage belief today." Though he recognized certain advances that had come through biblical criticism, he rejected many of its conclusions and used various data including archaeology in an apologetic manner.

Allen wrote a rather similar article three years later. His argument was that Scripture or Christianity tends to be fixed, whereas science is an on-going process. Thus conflict between the two disciplines is to be expected and should not disturb the Christian, since progress in scientific knowledge eventually brings it

---

1 Sydney Allen, "With Assaults on Scriptural Doctrines Increasing: Can a Critical Thinker Be a Conservative Christian?" TT, November 1964, pp. 6-9, 28.

2 Ibid., p. 9.

3 Ibid., p. 28.

into harmony with Scripture. Allen felt that archaeology can contribute details such as of Belshazzar or as contained in the Dead Sea Scrolls which may confirm the biblical (historical) statements and demonstrate the accuracy of textual transmission. He did not specifically say what procedure he advised where archaeological finds appear to contradict Scripture (though he admitted that they had this potential), but his argument would suggest a patient "wait and see" attitude. The article was clearly apologetic in nature.

A book review by Allen advised SDA's to acquaint themselves with the facts concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls. In this way they might avoid making unsound statements.

Allen's overall approach emphasized apologetic usage of archaeology.

**Limited Contributors--SDA**

The first group here comprises those who wrote two articles during the entire period. R. A. Anderson contributed a rather homiletic feature on Masada which dealt mainly with the construction and fall of the fortress but also gave a factual description of its

1 However, while it is true that a man's knowledge of nature and its laws is ever increasing, yet the natural laws or causes involved would appear to be fixed (law of "conservation of motion," causes of poliomyelitis, etc.) even though man may have only recently discovered them. At the same time our understanding of Scripture is expanding and not static.

2 Review of Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls, by William Sanford LaSor, in Ministry, November 1957, p. 41.

3 See also p. 180.

archaeological recovery. The same author wrote a promotional type of article aiming to encourage ministers in the use of archaeology in evangelism and to utilize the archaeological data presented in *Ministry*. Harold W. Clark presented two articles in order to defend a short chronology of the OT period and to demonstrate a possible correlation of archaeological periods with the biblical record. He accepted the sequence of periods while rejecting the time scale, especially for the prehistoric periods, and noted some of the highly advanced cultures of the third millennium B.C. Both of these articles attempted scientific apologetics.

Herbert E. Douglass wrote an article and an editorial of archaeological interest. The latter spoke of attempts to recover Noah's ark and was apologetic in the sense that the writer spoke of the potential vindication of Scripture, should the claims of investigators ever receive confirmation. The *Ministry* article was also apologetic though emphasizing prophetic fulfillments with regard to Babylon and Nineveh. The next writer, Ernest Lloyd, also

---


6. Ibid., p. 15.

7. See also p. 174.
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contributed two strongly apologetic articles.\textsuperscript{1} In the first he quoted a number of authors, some of them rather outdated, to support his contention that archaeology confirms Scripture. In the second article he stressed the providential preservation of Egyptian tombs and artifacts, and of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For him the primary purpose of archaeology appeared to be to provide "more evidences of Bible authenticity" and to demonstrate the accuracy of biblical statements.\textsuperscript{2}

After visiting the site of Nineveh, Robert H. Pierson gave a homiletic-type description\textsuperscript{3} of the site and the surrounding area but revealed that he had not prepared adequately for the visit.\textsuperscript{4} The purpose of the article was predominantly apologetic. Leo Van Dolson wrote describing his own impressions of Palestine, giving some defense of the biblical description of its productivity.\textsuperscript{5} He also presented,\textsuperscript{6} by way of sustained simile, the parallel between

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} "The Old Book Stands," \textit{ST}, October 31, 1950, p. 16; "Digging for Truth," \textit{ST}, March 1, 1955, pp. 7, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid, p. 15.
\item \textsuperscript{4} When their driver finally suggested that they wanted to see "Nebi Yunus," Pierson recognized "Yunus" as representing Jonah, but was never able to discover whether "Nebi" indicated the tomb or the prophet (idem, "Great City," p. 24). The "black obelisk" was attributed to Shalmaneser II (rather than III), but this may have been typographical (idem, "Great City--II," p. 34).
\item \textsuperscript{5} "Palestine Today and Yesterday," \textit{ST}, October 1967, pp. 29-31.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Idem, "Hidden Treasure You May Find," \textit{ST}, April 1968, pp. 21-23.
\end{itemize}
digging for truth (Tutankhamen, the Amarna Letters, and the Dead Sea Scrolls) and "digging" in the Scriptures for hidden truth. Both articles contain some apologetic together with elements of contextual and homiletic usage.

Australian pastor Edmund A. Parker made two constructive contributions. In the first of these he warned against carelessness or dishonesty on the part of ministers concerning their archaeological statements. In his second article Parker suggested a grammatical solution to a chronological problem unsolved by Thiele and Horn. Horn had concluded that 2 Kgs 17:1 may contain a scribal error since by his reckoning it was the only passage apparently not in agreement with the overall chronological scheme propounded by him. Parker's first article actually warned against invalid


2 As well as in other aspects of their deportment. He was especially addressing the preacher in the pulpit or at the evangelistic desk and gave four examples of frequent abuse of archaeological data. These were (1) the equating of any existing ziggurat with the tower of Babel (which would be presumptive and misleading though the site of the Marduk temple in Babylon might be suggested as a likely possibility, see p. 215, n4), (2) utterance of dogmatic or unqualified statements with regard to the date of the Exodus (cf. pp. 106-107, 369), (3) application of the silt layers at Ur to the Flood of Noah (see pp. 88, 110, 165, 169), and (4) unqualified use of Garstang's reports on Jericho (cf. pp. 107-108, 122, 127, 220, 221, 258). He also advised special caution in the use of newspaper and other popular reports of archaeological discoveries. He advised special caution in the use of newspaper and other popular reports of archaeological discoveries such as various claims concerning the discovery of Noah's ark (Parker, "Intellectual Honesty," p. 22).

3 "Note on Chronology," p. 129.

4 The explanation presented by Parker has been accepted as "plausible" by Horn ("Bishop Ussher," p. 39, n. 5). Parker demonstrated
apologetics, while the latter reflects exegetical and apologetic usage even though only indirectly involving archaeology.

The next two writers each wrote two archaeological editorials for the RH. Raymond F. Cottrell briefly mentioned several new discoveries, especially in the Judean wilderness, and observed that the dual effect was to enlighten Scripture and to confirm our faith in its accuracy. He subsequently praised Albright's "conservative interpretation" of archaeological data, appreciating the trend which he saw moving in the direction of conservatism. Kenneth H. Wood explained the arguments of Cyrus Gordon in his rejection of Wellhausen's theories of pentateuchal origins. He also claimed that emphasis on Sabbath sanctity had helped maintain a high view of that translation of mlk in 2 Kgs 17:1 as "had reigned" (which was grammatically defensible) rather than as "began to reign" enabled correlation with the historical data and reconstructed chronology of Horn ("Note on Chronology," pp. 130-31).


2 The large cache of copper items referred to would appear to be that found in a cave at Nahal Mishmar (P. Bar-Adon, "The Nahal Mishmar Caves," EAEHL 3:688).


4 Kenneth H. Wood, editorial, "Wellhausen Today," RH, January 7, 1960, pp. 5-6, quoting from Cyrus H. Gordon, "Higher Critics and Forbidden Fruit," CT, November 23, 1959, pp. 3-6. One objection originated in Gordon's observation that source critics had assigned the description of the ark specifications in Genesis to the "hypothetical Priestly author" on the grounds that such facts and figures were characteristic of him. On the other hand, critics had not used the same approach when analyzing the construction of the ark in the Gilgamech Epic. Gordon likewise rejected the concept of conflation where the Pentateuch uses "Yahweh-Elohim," since he saw that at Ugarit names of deities were sometimes compounded (as with Qadish-Amr, Ibb-Nikkal, Koshar-Hasis [Wood, "Wellhausen," p. 6]).
Creation and had been a safeguard against higher criticism. Although
this editorial was apologetic, Wood's featuring of the "Ark in the
News"¹ was more a report of discussion concerning the manner in which
the ark had been waterproofed. Two items appeared in TT which were
probably both the work of editor Rodney E. Finney. The first² was
a collection of archaeological illustrations--each declaring (accord­
ing to the author) the historical and geographical accuracy of the
Bible. The only recent example cited was the discovery of the Dead
Sea Scrolls which was used to argue for single, early authorship
of Isaiah. The other article was a brief editorial reassuring con­
servative Christians in view of such evidences as the rediscovery
of the Hittites. Both articles reveal apologetic usage.

Joseph J. Battistone wrote two book reviews for AUSS.³ In
the first the author (Phillips) accepted Mosaic authorship of the
Decalogue on the basis that the Hittite covenant treaty form would
have been known to Moses. He in turn would have adapted it for the
Israelite community. The reviewer did not appear to be convinced
that the premise was justified. He was more impressed with The Rem­
nant, in which he felt that the author had successfully demonstrated
that the remnant concept is indigenous with man and can be traced
back at least to the Mesopotamian Flood traditions. A similar type

³Review of Ancient Israel's Criminal Law: A New Approach
Review of The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea
from Genesis to Isaiah, by Gerhard F. Hasel, Andrews University Mono-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of contribution was made by J. A. Buckwalter.1 He strongly recommended Pfeiffer as a "qualified" and "evangelical" scholar. Buckwalter was particularly pleased with the second work2 because it portrayed religion as built upon a primitive revelation with subsequent departure and degradation instead of following an evolutionary development.

The next group of writers contributed single, isolated topics concerning the Bible lands. Don L. Gray wrote of his impressions as an evangelist giving a little contextual application.3 The next article was a general description of scenes in Greece and Jerusalem and contained little archaeology as such.4 J. O. Iverson5 described modern Bethlehem and its traditional sites, but gave no specific archaeology. The next four items were contributed by participants in the 1957 Bible Lands Tour.6 Specht and Grove who were both


2 Ibid.


college religion teachers gave straight-forward contextual descriptions of Jerash and Petra, while Thomsen (pastor) discussed the ruins of Tyre and Sidon from a prophetic-apologetic viewpoint, and Holland (editor of TT) gave a report concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls with some mild apologetic (essentially joy over the confirmation of accurate transmission of the text). Raymond H. Hartwell wrote a brief note on "The Cities of Bashan," which did not name the site visited and could best be described as an apologetic for the statements made by Ellen White. Research on the historical context of Luke by Wilson Bishai was directed at defending the historicity of that gospel. The author stated that the purpose of his article was "... to show how archeological discoveries might be used to explain some of these problems and substantiate the Biblical record." Archaeological content for this apologetic and contextual article was mainly from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Raymond Cox drew a parallel between Egyptian temples (the temple of Isis which was earlier submerged by the Aswan Dam and the Temple of Abu Simbel which was soon to share that fate) and the human body in order to illustrate Christian temperance. Usage might be termed illustrative.

---

2 Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 435.
5 "Guarding God's Temple," ST, October 1964, pp. 30-31. The concept was based on such verses as 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 2 Cor 6:16.
A brief contextual article by Cord Kühne\(^1\) investigated the status of Syro-Palestinian vassals of Eighteenth Dynasty Egypt and concluded that they had to forgo all political activities outside their immediate territory. Desmond Ford wrote an apologetic article\(^2\) outlining the opposing views of the dating of Daniel and using data from the Dead Sea Scrolls and Aramaic orthography to defend the sixth-century dating. A general report of the 1952 Bible Conference\(^3\) included a section extolling the contributions of Horn with regard to archaeology and the Bible. The author also recalled that Horn had reviewed the "... evidences of Bible inspiration as revealed in recent archaeological discoveries..."\(^4\) In Horn's subsequent testimony which was quoted by Lee, it was observed that archaeology has given evidence of the historical accuracy of Scripture and through various manuscript discoveries has witnessed to the marvelous preservation of the text.\(^5\)

Several articles used archaeology as they discussed evolutionary issues and the indispensability of faith. Wesley Curtwright used both scholarly and popular works in demonstrating the antiquity of civilized man.\(^6\) He referred to ancient scripts and further

---


\(^3\)Frederick Lee, "Historic Bible Conference Convenes," RH, September 25, 1952, pp. 1, 8-10.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 8.

\(^5\)Ibid.

\(^6\)"Were Our Ancestors Cave Men or Supermen?" ST, May 15, 1951, pp. 3-4.
illustrated with the twelve-stringed harp complete with sounding board from ancient Ur.\(^1\) A. H. Watson\(^2\) attempted to show that application of scientific method to the Bible (through archaeology) has shown it to be historically accurate. He cited examples of outstanding scholars\(^3\) who through participation in archaeological research strengthened their faith in the historicity of Scripture. H. M. S. Richards early recognized that archaeology could give support to biblical reliability. He wrote: "These marvelous archaeological discoveries may form a basis for our faith, but they will not bring faith itself."\(^4\) He furthermore explained that to him archaeology's contribution was twofold: (1) to illuminate puzzling passages, and (2) to confirm many of the passages which have been declared "unhistorical."\(^5\) Richards read widely, but his attribution of the Nuzi Tablets to "the time of Abraham and the patriarchs" was earlier than usual if he dated Abraham to the early second millennium B.C.\(^6\) The latter three articles all showed rather strong apologetic usage, but the next two are more diverse. Russell Kranz\(^7\) mixed polemic with apologetic as he argued against evolution (by citing ancient high

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 3; cf. ANEP, p. 61.

\(^2\)"Science Dissects the Bible," ST, October 1972, pp. 22-25.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 12.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 13; cf. E. A. Speiser, "Nuzi," IDB 3:573. The latter suggests the "middle centuries of the second millennium B.C."

civilizations) and less obviously for a literal Genesis creation. Andrews University professor Richard Ritland\(^1\) explained the interest of the university in excavating at Heshbon in the light of a concern for past, present, and future. He regarded archaeology as especially helpful in bringing to life the biblical context.

A single biographical article\(^2\) portrayed Siegfried Horn as an outstanding scholar and apologist. The last part of the article contained an extended quote from Horn and included the following statements:

> Archaeology can hardly be expected to build up faith in God, but it does strengthen faith in the Word of God.

> When speaking about archaeology, you have to remember that it can only prove certain historical facts that are recorded in the Bible. Miracles cannot be proved by archaeology or any other way; they must be accepted by faith.

Two articles which were very similar\(^5\) used archaeology to confirm the fulfillment of Bible prophecies (concerning Babylon, Tyre, and Sidon) and thus to vindicate Scripture. On the other hand, the last editorial contribution of W. A. Spicer\(^6\) was more doctrinally


\(^3\) Ibid., p. 12.

\(^4\) Ibid.


\(^6\) Cf. pp. 149-54.
oriented as he illustrated the sanctity of the tithe in the ancient world.¹

A feature deserving special mention was apparently submitted in letter form as a protest against the expenditure of large sums for Bible Land tours (presumably meaning either private or group tours).² The writer quoted a statement written by Ellen White in 1896,³ but appears to have misunderstood the import of her comments.⁴

Two other types of publication should be briefly mentioned. The first includes the type of travelogue describing archaeologically or biblically motivated (at least in part) travels through Bible lands by amateurs. Examples where the Bible Lands are a major


⁴The full article shows that she wrote to counteract an over-emphasis on higher education especially of the type which sought knowledge from all other sources, but ignored or minimized the value of the revelations in Scripture. References to the Holy Land appear to have been especially directed against the false or flimsy traditions surrounding many sites especially in Jerusalem, but might also imply skepticism of archaeological results:

"Some make long journeys to Jerusalem to see the place where Christ lived and taught. They listen to traditions and tales that men have invented. . . . To expend time and labor in finding the places where Jesus worked in Jerusalem, cannot bring any real benefit to soul or body. The money would better be expended in helping those who are perishing out of Christ. In doing this work, we may be assured that we are working in Christ's lines. Human guides may point to this spot or that one as a place where Jesus made his abode, and travelers may cultivate feelings of awe and reverence in looking upon various localities, and yet they have no certain knowledge that Christ ever taught there, or that his feet ever trod the soil" (ibid., p. 113).
She proceeded to draw a contrast—don't go to the Holy Land, but rather walk in Christ's footsteps by visiting and helping the needy (ibid., p. 114). The spiritual emphasis continued in such sentences as:

"The curse rests upon Jerusalem. The Lord has obliterated those things which men would worship in and about Jerusalem, yet many hold in reverence literal objects in Palestine, while they neglect to behold Jesus as their advocate in the heaven of heavens. . . .

We should earnestly inquire, not in regard to old Jerusalem and concerning the fables that are repeated for truth, but we should turn our eyes to the loving Saviour, who ever liveth to make intercession for us. . . . Many visit Jerusalem, and go away cherishing ideas which they suppose represent the truth, while in fact they have only come in contact with fables. They publish these falsehoods as truth" (ibid.).

"The curse of God is upon Jerusalem and its surroundings, and the land is defiled under the inhabitants thereof. There is no real foundation for feelings of awe in looking upon the land of Palestine. In revering these earthly things, men clothe them with a false glory" (ibid.).

Robert Eldridge quoted some of the negative aspects of a visit to Palestine, but without including those statements concerning fables and traditions about "holy" sites and thus he failed to reproduce the original emphasis (though his article did begin by questioning whether "holy places" in Jerusalem were holy, or Palestine really a "Holy Land"—"Tour the Holy Land?" p. 9).

As further background of the 1896 article it should be mentioned that an earlier letter with some similar contents was written to another Eldridge—Captain C[llement] Eldridge, on August 12, 1894 (preserved in Ellen G. White Manuscript 140, 1901, pp. 20-31). Captain Eldridge had become an SDA administrator by the year 1887, and was prominent in "religious liberty" and publishing work until 1892 or 1893 when he joined a private publishing company in Chicago ("Eldridge, Clement," SDA Encyclopedia [1976], 10:421-22). Although he achieved much by organizing the publishing work, he had personal problems which included pride and desire for personal aggrandizement and also irresponsibility in private financial matters. Ellen White wrote to him from Australia and in answer to a letter from him expressed happiness over some positive statements which he had made and also expressed happiness (because of his former attitude) that he had withdrawn from denominational employment (publishing work at Battle Creek, White, Manuscript 40, 1901, p. 21). Throughout the letter she constantly stressed his need for a close relationship with Christ and then said:

"Who can sweep away the delusions that now exist among professed Christians? Men are making painstaking efforts to see Jerusalem, they are digging in the earth for "holy" cities, and to find inscriptions which the Lord has seen
fit to bury with the corrupted defiled inhabitants; but the Lord has not laid it upon man to search out these mysteries. We cannot find out God by searching, by seeking to understand mysterious problems. Jesus came from heaven to reveal God. He came to represent the Father. The time, the strength, the money expended in searching out these old, buried-up inscriptions, will not bring a greater knowledge than that which Christ has brought to our world. His prayer to his Father is (and I would that you would listen as for your life), 'and this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent'" (ibid., pp. 30-31).

In 1897 Captain Eldridge appears to have been less than honest in correspondence with James Edson White and W. C. White (Fritz Murray Newman, "Contributions of Captain Clement Eldridge to the Canvassing Work, Religious Liberty Promotion, and the Circumstances of His Resignation from the Review and Herald," term paper, Andrews University, 1974, pp. 29-30[Xeroxed]), and it is thought that he dropped from church membership some time after this. The testimony written to him and also that quoted by Robert M. Eldridge may be seen as stressing the need to know Christ personally by the most direct methods rather than reliance upon indirect methods where human traditions might be uppermost. The statements therefore should not be seen as condemnation of archaeological research as such, especially where the aim is to illuminate Scripture context and directly or indirectly to remove ignorant or superstitious false information concerning Palestinian sites. They may be seen as condemnation of "righteousness by works" type of pilgrimage.

Such aspects were mentioned by Leona G. Running ("Another Look at the Holy Land," RH, January 21, 1971, p. 21) in answer to Robert Eldridge's statements. She added that the more modern facilities and relatively lower costs make even a short visit of inestimable value to the minister or Bible teacher who can thereby much more accurately portray the events of Scripture and interpret many of its passages. The statements might also be viewed as parallel to Ellen White's condemnation of bicycles at a time when they had become a fad and individuals were involved in heated rivalry and were going into debt in order to buy the latest and most luxurious bicycle (Arthur L. White, Ellen G. White: Messenger to the Remnant, rev. ed. [Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1969], p. 89). So visits to the Holy Land may for many even today be an unnecessary luxury which would benefit some individuals far less than educational experiences closer home, or give less reward than involvement in social work. Discussion has continued with some decrying the costs of travel and others the commercialism in the Holy Land (as Jon Gallagher, "Born in Bethlehem," AR, December 24, 1981, p. 10), or on the other hand with some stressing the lasting benefits of a well-guided tour (as George and Martha Hoffmeister, "On Visiting the Holy Land," AR, March 18, 1982, p. 6). It is perhaps significant that several years after these comments were written during the 1890s
portion of the itinerary include Eastward Ho!, by Pearl L. Hall;\(^1\) and Twenty-One Thousand Miles of Adventure, by Goldie M. Down.\(^2\)

Naturally, technical details and controverted points of view were scarcely given. Both writers had obviously taken care to do some study before the trip and the latter was fortunate to be accompanied by a very well-read husband.\(^3\)

Margit Strom Heppenstall had the admirable objective of bringing the Bible to life for young people--helping them to feel the excitement of Bible stories by identifying with the characters and "seeing" the background and context. Two small books which have resulted\(^4\) dramatically tell the story of Naaman and the captive maid and of the rebellion of Absalom. In order to accurately portray the biblical context, the author studied such books as the SDA Bible Commentary, volume II; SDA Bible Dictionary, and a good quality Bible

Ellen White referred to Palestine (perhaps incidentally) as the "holy land"--the place where Christ had ministered ("The Great Medical Missionary," RH, June 9, 1904, p. 8; see also idem, Counsels on Health and Instructions to Medical Missionary Workers [Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1923]).

\(^1\)Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1958.

\(^2\)Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1964

\(^3\)David K. Down consistently used archaeology in his evangelistic series in Australia and India and after guiding a group of Indian pastors through the Bible Lands in 1967 he published a small book entitled, Touring Bible Lands (Dehra Dun, India: D. K. Down, n.d.).

atlas, in addition to books on specific biblical context. The author was quite successful in portraying life in Bible times as, for example, in the description of Ahab's "ivory house" and in the general description of cities, villages, and lifestyle.

We conclude this group of isolated contributions by mentioning three book reviews. The first two received especially strong praise and recommendation for their conservative, but scholarly contributions. On the other hand, de Vaux's work was praised for its thorough research but was accompanied by a warning: "Even where the reader may hold divergent views the presentation is always informative."

Lawrence T. Geraty

Lawrence T. Geraty published four articles in Ministry and one in AUSS in 1973.

The first article was a careful report of the newly claimed

---


2Heppenstall, Deborah, p. 73.

3Ibid., pp. 72-75, etc.


5Review of Ancient Israel, p. 40.

evidences for the identification of NT manuscripts from Qumran. The author cautiously examined and critically appraised each argument which had been published. He also warned against premature conclusions, and gave a detailed bibliography of the latest sources on the subject.

Geraty gave a sketch of the life and contributions of the three archaeological giants (Albright, Glueck, and de Vaux) who had died in 1971. He proceeded to evaluate a list of books relevant to archaeological and biblical studies with emphasis upon those appropriate for the church pastor. The closing sentence gave a hint of the type of impact this type of reading might have on the minister and his hearers—it would enable him "... to affirm with renewed confidence, not only that 'the Book still stands' but that it stands with new meaning."  

The next item in sequence was a two-part article which gave a thorough analysis of the Canaanite (and sometimes Israelite) cult installations of greater Palestine. The comprehensiveness of the survey which dealt with the various kinds of images and standing

---

1See p. 402.


3Ibid., p. 22.

stones as well as the "high places" which provided their setting, would greatly assist exegesis as well as providing a general context.

Geraty also contributed one of the area reports for the 1971 Heshbon excavation.¹ It was clearly a simple report, and in fact, these articles by Geraty show an emphasis upon factual reporting of new information, with an almost equal emphasis on context, supported by elements of exegesis and a trace of apologetic.

William H. Shea

William H. Shea wrote a four-part sequence for AUSS² in which he used the variations of legal titles of Babylonian and Achaemenid kings found in Babylonian economic texts as indicators of the political situation. From the pattern which emerged he produced specific clues for tracing the details of the initial portion of Persian rulership over Babylon and suggested the existence of a previously unrecognized vassal rulership over Babylon for a period of about seven months.³ Although the argument in these articles was based


³Ibid., pp. 165, 173. A long-standing practice existed for the ruler of Babylon to refer to himself as "King of Babylon," but Cyrus apparently referred to himself only as "King of Lands" during the first portion of his reign, and only part way through his first year (after his accession-year) did he assume the full title "King of Babylon."
considerably upon circumstantial and statistical evidences, a strong case was made and a number of the peculiarities of the period were explained. One may suspect apologetic motivation behind the extensive research involved in this series, but no hint was given of a relationship between Ugbaru and "Darius the Mede." The article is an example of a largely contextual study involving the type of hypothesizing necessary for progressive research. The author clearly stated that present limitations of knowledge result in tentative conclusions.¹

Writers Contributing Only to the Heshbon Project: SDA

Several SDA writers contributed articles to AUSS which dealt only with the Heshbon excavations. Since these are specialized articles they are here grouped together without detailed comment.

Gyystein LaBianca as an anthropologist reported² the animal remains (22,000 bone fragments)--both domestic and wildlife--in order to enrich the understanding of lifestyle and food patterns of the inhabitants of Heshbon and to provide clues concerning the flora

Babylon, King of Lands" (the title which continued into the reign of Xerxes--"Achaemenid Period [I]," pp. 66-67). Shea therefore postulated a vassal king ruling in Babylon during this brief period, suggesting the name of Ugbaru (or Gubaru). He was able to show that the titular gap in the reign of Cyrus approximately coincided with the suggested reign of Ugbaru, since the full title was assumed only six or seven weeks after the death of the latter (when his death is dated October 26, 538 B.C. and not a year earlier, as illustrated--"Achaemenid Period III," pp. 99-111).

¹"Achaemenid Period [I]," p. 54.
and fauna of the surrounding area. Volker Langholf described a Latin seal impression.\(^1\) Anthropologist Robert Little described both human and animal bones from the 1968 season as well as outlining the techniques used at the site.\(^2\) The next article was a pottery report jointly written by Edward Lugeneal and James Sauer.\(^3\) The sherds covered were essentially homogeneous, dating from between 700 or 650 B.C. and 500 B.C., both stratigraphically and typologically.\(^4\) Werner Vyhmeister gave a review and analysis of Heshbon as reflected in literary sources.\(^5\) Abraham Terian carried out a very exacting task by attempting the classification of seventy-eight coins from the 1968 Heshbon excavation.\(^6\) Only forty-six could be determined with any degree of certainty (because of frequent poor preservation), but the entire selection represented the period from the first

\(^1\) "A Latin Potter's Seal Impression," AUSS 7 (1969):230-31. The writer is a relative of Siegfried Horn--son of a cousin--who has continued archaeological studies and is currently teaching at the University of Hamburg. He recently returned from a two-year residence at Thessaloniki, Greece, where he had been studying Greek manuscripts at Mount Athos. While there he discovered some manuscripts which were previously unknown and unpublished upon which he is currently working (Siegfried H. Horn to Lloyd A. Willis, April 4, 1982).


\(^3\) "Seventh-Sixth Century B.C. Pottery from Area B at Heshbon," AUSS 10 (1972):21-69.

\(^4\) Ibid., pp. 62-64.

\(^5\) "The History of Heshbon from Literary Sources," AUSS 6 (1968):158-77. The same writer had already produced a B.D. thesis on the same topic at the SDA Theological Seminary a year earlier.

century B.C. to the fifteenth century A.D.\textsuperscript{1} The presence of coins as classified by century rather closely parallels the references to Heshbon in literary sources as well as the pottery classification.\textsuperscript{2}

Writers Contributing Only to the Heshbon Project: Non-SDA

Several non-SDA writers contributed articles connected with Heshbon, either because they were a part of the excavating team or because of their special expertise. Frank Moore Cross wrote on two ostraca found during the excavations.\textsuperscript{3} The first, in Aramaic script, was dated paleographically to about 500 B.C., and bore names of mixed origin--two West Semitic, one Egyptian, and one Babylonian.\textsuperscript{4} The second was also in Aramaic script from about 525 B.C. and appears to be a record of some agricultural business.\textsuperscript{5} Myriam Ayalon recorded details of a very poorly preserved ostracon bearing fragments of a few letters in early North Arabic script (probably eighth-ninth century A.D.).\textsuperscript{6} The next seven articles were area reports from

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{There was an apparent gap between the end of the eighth century (probably following the earthquake of A.D. 747, ibid., p. 159) and the late twelfth century A.D. (one poorly preserved specimen was thought to come from the twelfth century, ibid., pp. 156-57).

\footnote{Ibid., pp. 157-59. The greatest numbers were from the fourth, fifth, eighth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries (ibid., p. 157).


\footnote{Idem, "Ostracon from Heshbon," p. 228.

\footnote{Idem, "Heshbon Ostracon II," p. 131.

\footnote{"Heshbon Ostracon III," \textit{AUSS} 11 (1973):132.}

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the 1968 and 1971 seasons of excavation. The geological study of the Heshbon area which was conducted by Reuben Bullard, emphasized soil composition, and sources and types of building stone as each contributed to the choice of the site and lifestyle of Hesbon.

Non-SDA Writers--General

A two-part article by William Foxwell Albright gave his personal summary of twenty years progress in biblical archaeology. He emphasized the stabilizing of ancient chronology, the various developments based on work at Mari and Ugarit, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The article gave certain support to apologetics as well as explaining renewed interest in biblical theology. Two similar articles by Bryant Wood contained apologetic and general OT background, as well as special application of archaeology to Bible prophecies.

An evaluation of cylinder seals in the archaeological museum


4 "The Bible after Twenty Years of Archaeology--Part I," Ministry, February 1953, pp. 33-35; "The Bible after Twenty Years of Archaeology--Part II," Ministry, March 1953, pp. 21-23. In fact this was an abridged version of Albright's "Bible after Twenty Years," published in Religion and Life, see p. 16.

5 Idem, "Twenty Years--Part II," pp. 21, 23.


Specifically Nineveh and a variety of Egyptian sites (see Nah 1-3; Ezek 29:32; Jer 43:8-10; 46:13-14).
at Andrews University was written by Edith Porada. The author described the first two seals, which she judged genuine, in great detail and then applied various criteria to the remaining three—demonstrating why she rejected them as forgeries. Scenes and inscriptions in the latter contained either mistakes or incongruities.

Haifa University lecturer B. Oded analyzed and attempted to give the historical connotations of elements of a Ramses II topographical list at Karnak. He interpreted a name prefix as representing the Edomite god Qos (Assyrian Quas) claiming that the names referred to Edomite chiefs or clans. He strengthened his case by including Nineteenth Dynasty references which indicate that Egypt may have been active against Edomite tribes in southern Transjordan at that time. The editors may have included this article because of its relevance to the problems of dating the Exodus, but the article is contextual as far as any obvious classification is concerned.

A series of book reviews were contributed to AUSS by Jewish writer Zev Garber. In some cases the archaeological connections

3 The consonants appear four times as qs, and once as qt.
4 Ibid., pp. 48-50.
were rather remote, while in others archaeological data played a much more important part—mainly contextual. In each case the clearly discernible Jewish point of view is of special interest.

**Summary of Usage 1950-1973**

Looking back over this second period of our survey there are three aspects which immediately stand out. These are the large number of contributors, the domination by Horn, and the prominence of apologetic usage.

It was certainly a prolific period for SDA writing on archaeology. The total number of articles for the period was 433, including 364 regular articles, 21 rather technical reports on the Heshbon excavation (in AUSS), and 48 book reviews. These were written by ninety-two different authors, of whom seventy-seven were SDA and fifteen non-SDA. Of the SDAs, those with some claim to expertise in archaeology or OT studies would number between eight and twenty—according to the level expected. Ten of the non-SDAs contributed only in connection with their Heshbon involvement.

Horn's phenomenal contribution to the period (56% of the

---

1. As with the review of Exile and Restoration, p. 174.
2. As in the review of Religion in Ancient History, pp. 70-71, where selected aspects of ANE religions (as archaeologically revealed) are quite prominent.
3. The names of Roger S. Boraas and Lenel G. Moulds are included in these figures though their names were not considered separately since they only wrote articles jointly with Horn.
regular articles, 14% of the AUSS Heshbon reports, and 40% of the book reviews) both numerically and in terms of influence cannot be overstressed. His material was always well-informed, was up to date, and revealed a broad scholastic base, consistent studious effort, and outstanding linguistic ability. He laid the foundation (with some indebtedness to Lynn Wood) for future SDA involvement in archaeology and gained widespread acceptance and responsibility for SDAs in archaeological circles. His conservative stance and inclination to apologetics (mentioned below) undoubtedly placed limits on his relationship with some scholars.¹

The apologetic aspect was evident throughout this period, and most writers included some elements, but it was most prominent in the writings of non-experts such as Roy F. Cottrell and Emmerson (more evident than in his earlier writings). In terms of the overall percentages of apologetic, TT had 59 percent (65% counting those with minor or barely apparent apologetic intent), ST had 78 percent (85%), RH had 42 percent (47%), Ministry 50 percent (63%), and AUSS 13 percent (27%), making an overall apologetic count of 47 percent (54%).² The missionary periodicals in particular, and to some extent Ministry, were strongly weighted in this direction. On the other hand, the AUSS articles written primarily for scholarly and non-SDA

¹ Perhaps reflected in the rather derogatory letter to the editor of BAR (December 1977, p. 46) by M. Sigmund Shapiro, to which Horn replied ("Siegfried Horn Replies," BAR, December 1977, pp. 47-48) with admirable restraint.

² The 21 technical reports on Heshbon which appeared in AUSS and the 48 book reviews are not included in these figures, but if the AUSS reports were included the results would still amount to 44% (51%).
readers were muted with regard to apologetics and the categorization of its articles given here has at times been based rather subjectively on what appeared to be the intention of the author.\(^1\) This kind of apologetic (as in AUSS) which was strongly blended with contextual illumination is certainly a necessary part of biblical studies and the investigative process, but the conspicuous and amateur apologetics of such writers as Roy F. Cottrell tended to undermine the position of Scripture. They appealed to "scientific proofs" while avoiding those archaeological discoveries which appear to be out of harmony with Scripture or some of its interpretations. Similarly Courville by his revolutionary and highly motivated approach, and with his leaps of logic, appears to have expressed some insecurity as well as lack of scholarly method. Horn made a significant contribution to apologetics with almost half of his articles, particularly those in TT and Ministry inclined in that direction, but perhaps even he at times overplayed the apologetic element. Generally speaking, the professionally trained (in archaeology and OT studies) writers were careful to maintain a balance in their presentations,\(^2\) so that apologetics were not uppermost, but the mentality of ministry and laity seems to have called for repeated defense and confirmation. Horn catered to and perhaps encouraged this outlook,

\(^1\)In illustrate, the four AUSS articles by Shea in 1971-1972 (see p. 424) were judged as indirect or non-obvious apologetic because although they contained no apologetic statement, they appear to prepare the way for explanation of the identity of Darius the Mede (that he should be identified with Gubaru--the general, and not Gubaru the later governor).

\(^2\)Particularly evident in AUSS and in articles published by SDAs in non-SDA periodicals.
since his own contacts with critical scholars and theories had apparently placed him on the defensive. The increasing availability of data with biblical apologetic potential led him to combat the unwarranted statements of critics and gave an apologetic bent to his work.\textsuperscript{1} Since Horn's influence was so extensive, it is not surprising to see the entire period categorized as one of apologetic thrust.

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{1}Although his background or starting point as well as his theological stance was very different, Albright moved in somewhat the same direction (see p.17).
\end{quote}
Our third and last period, though shorter, represents a significant transition. As Horn switched to administrative work and then retired, his direct and major contributions dwindled. On the other hand the number of well-qualified writers had increased so that no single figure dominated the stage as in period II. To a considerable degree this flowering of interest and qualified writing was a direct result of Horn's own career in teaching and writing, since the majority of new contributors had been either taught by Horn or stimulated by his articles in denominational periodicals. However, other professors and universities had also influenced these younger scholars as well as Horn, and the emerging contributors therefore represent a wider spectrum of attitudes and specialized interests than had been evident earlier. To some extent these younger scholars were less on the defensive, perhaps from the reduced influence of extreme source criticism, and therefore a more pragmatic and more multifaceted approach is apparent. By this we mean there were wider interests which were not as much dominated by apologetic pursuits and issues.

Again the number of archaeological articles per year increased, from twelve in the first period, and eighteen in the second, to
twenty-eight in the final period. Some, but not all, of the increase was due to an escalation in articles on Heshbon as the excavations wound to a close.  

The order for considering names for this period follows the number of articles published (disregarding book reviews). On this basis the most prominent names are L. T. Geraty (28 including one each jointly with Horn and Shea), W. H. Shea (14 including one jointly with Geraty), L. G. Herr (12), S. H. Horn (12 including one each jointly with Geraty and Boraas), P. F. Bork (9), O. M. Berg (7), and Ø. S. LaBianca (6). It is significant that in this last period all of the leading contributors were well qualified with the exception of Berg, who had at least some archaeological training and experience. All of these men had participated in excavations in greater Palestine.

Lawrence T. Geraty  

Lawrence Thomas Geraty (1940- ), though born in California, grew up in Burma, China, Hong Kong, and Lebanon. He did his college work in France, England, and U.S.A., with a B.A. (theology major, history minor) issued by Pacific Union College in 1962. He gained an M.A. in Religion (OT) in 1963 and a B.D. in 1965, both from Andrews University. In 1972 Geraty received a Ph.D. in OT and Syro-Palestinian archaeology (with distinction) from Harvard.

---

1Twenty-six per year if book reviews are omitted.
2In AUSS the seventy archaeological articles (excluding eleven reviews) included fifty-seven (81%) devoted to Heshbon, giving Heshbon 70 percent of the AUSS archaeological features for the period.
3See pp. 394-95.
University.¹ His primary contribution in denominational employ has been teaching at Andrews University (since 1972),² but also included pastoral work in the Southeastern California Conference of SDAs.³ Archaeological fieldwork has included excavation at Gezer (1968, 1969), Karm el-Wiz (1971), Khirbet el-Kom (1971),⁴ and at Heshbon (1968-1978) and the Amman Airport (1976) in Jordan. He was the director of the Heshbon excavations in 1974 and 1976, and senior advisor of the joint American Center of Oriental Research/Baptist Bible College Excavation of North Church at Tell Hesban, Jordan (1978). Geraty has received numerous awards and scholarships and is a member of ten archaeological or closely related societies.⁵ His keen analytic mind and meticulous approach to studies have greatly assisted SDAs (particularly ministers and ministerial trainees) in grasping the essentials of biblical archaeology and understanding its broad impact.⁶

¹His professors included G. Ernest Wright, Frank Moore Cross, Jr., Thorkild Jacobsen, William L. Moran, Thomas O. Lambdin, N. B. Millet, Yigael Yadin, and Paul Riemann.

²Professor of Archaeology and History of Antiquity since 1980.

³1962-1966 (including a period of sponsored study), and also a period as Assistant Publishing Director in Central California Conference (1962).

⁴He gained considerable experience during the year (1970-1971) when he served as Thayer Fellow at the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem.

⁵Including administrative responsibility in the Archaeological Institute of America, ASOR, the Biblical Archaeology Society, and the Society of Biblical Literature (Midwest Region).

⁶Principal biographical sources for this sketch were "Curriculum Vitae for Lawrence Thomas Geraty," Andrews University [1981]; "Archaeology, Biblical," SDA Encyclopedia (1976), 10:64.
Geraty's articles in the RH include semi-popular reports on the Heshbon excavations. In 1974 he wrote a series of four for this purpose. In the first he gave a compact survey of the original aims and the results achieved in the first four seasons of excavations. The increasing specialization among the staff (multi-disciplinary approach) was reflected in the second report, as was the consequently slower pace in actual removal of the soil and the improved restoration of the ancient context. The third report constituted a tour of the site and some of its environs. After pinpointing the main features of each area, the author puzzled over the question of the location of Sihon's city (since the earliest stratified remains were from Iron I, especially in Area B). His strongest suggestion was that the site had been moved in the period of the Judges. The final article described some of the objects found, especially from tombs, with the consequent enlightenment of our understanding of the lifestyle of the respective inhabitants of Heshbon. Each of the articles


3In 1973 and 1974 a survey of the area within a radius of six miles of the tell at Heshbon had revealed 125 other archaeological sites. One of these, Umm es-Sarab, had been excavated in 1974, but though Bronze Age sherds were found, only Early Roman and Byzantine periods showed in stratified deposits (idem, "Heshbon, 1974:3," p. 9).

4Ibid., p. 11.

was essentially a report, with only the third raising some query as to the true location of LB Heshbon—but not expressing any apologetic objective.

The first RH report on the discoveries at Tell Mardikh was jointly written by Geraty and Shea. Though details were still sparse, great optimism on the significance of the texts was expressed, and it was thought that there would be a clarification or "confirmation of the broad outlines of ancient Near Eastern chronology." This was confirmation in the sense of clarification of a period of history, but there was some apologetic in statements indicating the presence of Creation and Flood stories at Ebla, and especially in the report of an early law code—so that the antiquity of Biblical law is vindicated and we see it in the context of its time." Likewise it was asserted that this was a discovery which would "certainly strengthen our faith in His Word." At the same time the broad benefits to biblical studies, especially Semitic linguistics, were noted.

The last two RH articles by Geraty were a report on the 1976 campaign and reflections on the lasting results of the excavations

3 Ibid., p. 7.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid. Especially since it was an early Semitic language related to Hebrew but written in a cuneiform script where pronunciation was known (whereas Hebrew was originally written in a consonantal script).
as a whole. Special mention was made of the new scientific approaches used, including environmental and ethnographic research as well as that aimed at geological, zoological, botanical, and meteorological analysis of the ancient environment. The lasting results of the excavations which were explained amounted mainly to personal inter-relationships between people and appreciation and respect for biblical and ancient historical data. Both articles were reports, the latter somewhat reflective.

Of the two articles by Geraty in Ministry for 1974, the first, jointly authored with Horn, was a report on the 1973 season at Heshbon and contained little that was different from the RH reports. The second article gave some analyses and recommendations of books relating to archaeology. The types of books included represent a broad selection of scholarship with some diversity of viewpoint and an occasional warning to compare a certain volume with a more "conservative" work.

There were seven articles by Geraty in 1975. The first two were updates on Heshbon, describing the 1974 season in close

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
parallel to the RH articles but with the second article giving greater emphasis to the historical periods as revealed by the strata in each area dug. These were simply factual reports. The next article constituted a report of the lectures given at the 1974 Society of Biblical Literature/ASOR meetings held in Washington, D.C. Of special significance were reports of proto-Sinaitic alphabetic representations on stone jars from the final destruction of MB Gezer and statements of Frank M. Cross, Jr., supporting the "traditional dating of the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah" in the light of the Samaria papyri. This report contained some hints of apologetic. A supplementary article explained that "Ararat" is a general term applied to a political unit or state from the ninth to the sixth centuries B.C., and even in Gen 8:4, since the word "mountains" (plural) occurs, it was suggested that it would be wise to avoid dogmatic application to Mount Agri Dagh. Two more articles gave evaluations of recent archaeological books. The primary emphasis in the selection of books appears to have been to give reports of recent archaeological excavation and research, and to provide effective contextual tools (geographical, historical, etc.). Noteworthy here were comments on Albright's The Archaeology of

---

2Ibid., p. 36.  
3Ibid., p. 37; cf. p. 244.
Palestine and the Bible (reprinted), where Geraty referred to the author's attacks upon critical views of the OT (mentioning that Albright "abhored inner literary and historical reconstructions without the controls of external data").¹ He also strongly recommended the third edition of the monumental *Cambridge Ancient History*. The final article for the year² was a thorough listing of places and museum items to see on an extensive Bible Lands tour. No details or evaluations of the validity of such sites as the Last Supper Room or the Tomb of David could be given in this outline tour guide which was based upon the 1975 Seminary Bible Lands Study Tour.

Several important news items were reported jointly by Geraty and G. A. Keough in 1976.³ They included the announcement of the discovery of a cartouche of Narmer⁴ dated to early in the third millennium B.C. at Arad, and a trilingual cuneiform tablet from Aphek/Antipatris.⁵ These items and others were essentially of contextual interest. A second article⁶ continued the series on new

¹Ibid., p. 37.
⁴Actually a serekh (using a vertical rectangular frame) as depicted by Ruth Amiran ("An Egyptian Jar Fragment with the Name of Narmer from Arad," *IEJ* 24 [1974]:4-12; and idem, "The Narmer Jar Fragment from Arad: An Addendum," *IEJ* 26 [1976]:45-46).
books by reporting significant publications from 1975. The strongest recommendation was given to the four volume \textit{EAEHL} set which had just begun to appear, while a more cautious statement was made concerning \textit{Abraham in History and Tradition}, by John Van Seters.\footnote{New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975.} Geraty noted Van Seters’ rejection of the traditional views of Genesis and the patriarchs and suggested that—"Since Van Seters is a well-informed and careful critic, his evidence and arguments will have to be dealt with."\footnote{Geraty, "New Books [1976]," p. 37.} The latter is the only apologetic note (or call for apologetics) in this book survey.

\textit{Ministry} carried three articles by Geraty in 1977, two pertaining to Heshbon,\footnote{"The 1976 Excavations at Biblical Heshbon," Ministry, March 1977, pp. 34-37; \textit{"The 1976 Excavations at Biblical Heshbon-Part 2,"} Ministry, May 1977, pp. 39-42.} the other being a general update on biblical archaeology.\footnote{"Archaeological Update from Syria, Israel, and Jordan," Ministry, February 1977, pp. 35-37.} In the latter, which reported the lectures given at the joint ASOR-Society of Biblical Literature meetings held in St. Louis, Missouri in 1976, some of the early excitement over the Ebla Tablets was reflected. Geraty quoted Freedman concerning the possible relationship between Ebrum and the biblical Eber,\footnote{Ibid., pp. 35-36.} and the report given by \textit{Time}, which stated that the parallels in personal names constituted ". . . the best evidence to date that some of the people described in the Old Testament actually existed."\footnote{"A New 'Third World'," \textit{Time}, October 18, 1976, p. 63.} Geraty's
own summary was a little more cautious:

Scholars came away from the St. Louis meetings convinced that a knowledge of this Eblaite civilization, since it apparently concerned the background of the people of the Old Testament, will be indispensable for any future serious study of the Bible. The publication of the documents from Tell Mardikh in a series of volumes is eagerly awaited.\(^1\)

After comments on other discoveries, including the Balaam inscription from Deir Alla,\(^2\) Geraty concluded by saying,

\[\ldots\] it is becoming increasingly evident that whatever editing the books of the Bible underwent it was of minor consequence for their content. Most of the important details such as persons, places, time, and sociological setting are still authentic for the period concerned, and many of them may now be correlated with the archeological data.\(^3\)

This article might be characterized as reporting, with muted apologetic. The Heshbon reports were similar to those given in the RH articles but emphasized the sequence of occupations and gave special attention to the checks made for earlier than Iron Age I habitation, concluding that the pre-Judges Heshbon had apparently been on another site.\(^4\) These were essentially reports with perhaps implied apologetic.

Probably the coordination of publishing the final reports on Heshbon was responsible for some reduction in writing for Ministry. Geraty wrote three articles for the last three years of our period.\(^5\) He recommended BAR as a stimulating, well-informed periodical,

\[\ldots\]

\(^1\)"Syria, Israel, and Jordan," p. 36.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 36-37.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 37.
especially enumerating its contributions to the understanding of specific texts and also the more general contextual articles. The 1979 item was a report of the previous year's ASOR/Society of Biblical Literature meeting in New Orleans. In the light of reports given (especially one by Shea), it was emphasized that a fifteenth-century Exodus is becoming more archaeologically defensible. The final Ministry article marked the centenary of the discovery of the Siloam Tunnel inscription. Though the writer described the four water systems connected with the Gihon Spring and also gave a variety of explanations for the irregular course of Hezekiah's tunnel, the various unknown elements were treated without dogmatic interpretation. The article best fits the category of a contextual approach.

The four AUSS articles all deal with Heshbon. The first was a specialized-area report from the 1973 campaign and the second (jointly authored with Boraas) was a preliminary report of the 1974 campaign. These were factual reports of goals and specific


2 See p. 253.

3 Geraty, "New Thinking," p. 20. The merits and rivalries of different approaches and methods in archaeology were also discussed at some length (ibid., p. 21).


5 "Warren's" shaft and tunnel; two separate canals which lead southward from the spring; and "Hezekiah's Tunnel" (ibid.).


accomplishments. A brief note was sufficient to describe a broken ostracon found during the 1974 season. It bears only two Greek letters (es) preceded by a portion of a third and appears to date to about the fourth century A.D. The final article was to some extent a summary and conclusion to the series of campaigns at Heshbon.

Two books were published jointly by Geraty and Boraas, but since they consist of reprints from AUSS articles dealing with Heshbon, they do not need separate coverage. Geraty's Ph.D. dissertation (though unpublished) forms a third volume for brief consideration. During his residence in Jerusalem, eight ostraca were discovered at Khirbet el-Kom in the Shephelah. The script of four (numbers 1, 2, 4, and 5) was Aramaic but suggested to be Edomite in language, while a fifth (number 6) was in Greek. Another (number 3) was a nine-line bilingual Greek-Edomite text with a double date in the sixth year of an unnamed king (suggested to be Ptolemy II Philadelphus—hence the date 277 B.C.). Two more Aramaic

---

5 See p. 436 n. 4.
6 Geraty, "Third Century Ostraca," pp. 82-82. The bilingual text identifies a money-lender named Qos-yada and his Greek client.
ostraca from the late fourth century B.C. were found in a different context but were poorly preserved. The contents and apparent language of the ostraca give primary support to the concept of Edomite presence or control in Southern Judah in the early third century B.C. Usage here is essentially to report but also to provide background or context for the NT and intertestamental periods. There was also an exegetical suggestion that the word kapelos (as "moneylender") may reflect on the meaning of the word in Isa 1:22 (LXX) and in 2 Cor 2:17.

Geraty's articles in non-SDA journals included two on the dissertation topic. Another inscription type article featured the name "Joseph son of Haggai" on an ossuary from Karm el-Wiz (north of Jerusalem). Usage was to report and indirectly to give NT context. There was also a review of Avigad's Archaeological Discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem: Second Temple Period. The work reviewed was actually an Israel Museum catalogue for the Second Temple period especially featuring finds from the three outstanding houses which had overlooked the Temple Mount and were excavated by Avigad between 1969 and 1976.

1 Ibid., p. 89. 2 Ibid., p. 92.
5 In BA 42 (1979):127.
A sequence of articles by Geraty\(^1\) in different periodicals successively described the progress of the excavations under his direction at Heshbon. Since they parallel the articles already analyzed and reveal the same type of specialized and rather objective reporting, they are merely listed here in approximate chronological order. Either direct or indirect contextual usage is also apparent from time to time.

It is perhaps too early to judge Geraty's predominant interests since so much of his time has been involved with the Heshbon excavations which in a sense he inherited. However, his involvement in promoting the new excavations at Tell Jalul (commencing in June 1983) bespeaks considerable enthusiasm for field work, while he has also pushed towards early completion of the final publication of the Heshbon excavations.

Another emphasis clearly discernible in his publications is the desire to help produce or promote a well-informed ministry. He has shown concern that pastors not only know the Bible's content but that they also know its original meaning as illuminated by historical and cultural context. His emphasis on newly available books and

reports from scholarly meetings has served to underline the importance of utilizing current scholarship. In giving this kind of emphasis Geraty has not avoided materials of apologetic importance, but for him apologetics are by no means a major element of his work.

Geraty's approach may be best gauged by looking at additional articles by him. They suggest that his archaeological usage for biblical studies first calls for a detailed and serious examination of the text of Scripture and grappling with the biblical data which may frequently lead to more than one possible interpretation. This kind of thorough work is followed by a survey of archaeological input on the subject. The archaeological data may give decisive or more often suggestive support to one of these interpretations. It is in this sense that he uses the word archaeological "control." It is not an absolute control, but a significant force in deciding or influencing the choice or preference with regard to interpretations of Scripture. For example, with regard to the question of Canaanite or ANE influence

---

1 For example his "Archeological Update from Syria, Israel, and Jordan," pp. 35-37; see p. 442.

2 For these purposes the Bible, while clearly accepted as divinely inspired may also be examined as a document with human origins--distinctive authorship, wide variety of symbolism, local context, etc.

3 See Lawrence T. Geraty, "Archaeology and the Bible--Their Current Symbiosis," Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI [n.d.]. (Typewritten.)

4 The text itself remains primary while the interpretations which will include subjective elements, "... may be tested by the critically sifted evidence provided by archaeology" (ibid., p. 13).
on the Hebrew temple, he first noted that Scripture mentions Canaanite professional assistance in the project (1 Kgs 5:18; 7:13-14) and then stated his procedure: "I propose to look first at the biblical data and then compare them with the archaeological record of Israel's neighbors."¹ Even Geraty's article on chronology² with which some conservative SDAs would have difficulties did not depart from this basic approach. He indicated that the Genesis genealogies may be interpreted as having gaps, of highlighting important characters, and of stressing genealogical connections or descent rather than aiming to give an exact chronology. The archaeology in the article explained the basis of Egyptian chronology³ (to demonstrate a reasonably firm time scale for comparison with the biblical outline)⁴ and showed that the Bible has demonstrable omissions in the later genealogical lists.⁵ Consequently, where archaeology appears to give evidence of a longer period between the Flood and Abraham than genealogies for that period would indicate, the solution might lie in unknown omissions from those genealogies also. Thus he stated that the total time

---


³Ibid., pp. 8-9.

⁴In a more precise manner Assyrian chronological data was used by Thiele and Horn in unravelling the chronology of the Hebrew Kings; see pp. 351, 288.

from Creation to the Flood, and from the Flood to Christ might not be 4,004 years as calculated by Ussher, but an undisclosed period of perhaps several more thousand post-Flood years (according to interpretations of data from, for instance, Jericho). At the same time Geraty emphasized that since archaeological data must also be interpreted and are very incomplete and often biased in their testimony, they must be used with caution.

There are three ways in which Geraty sees archaeology making an important contribution to biblical studies. Perhaps the most crucial is its contribution to biblical interpretation or exegesis. He has seen this in terms of both the establishment of the most reliable text (especially through the Dead Sea Scrolls) and by way of clarifying the meaning of words and phrases. The second contribution concerns enlightenment of context, the life situation, customs, contemporary legal codes, etc. Finally he has emphasized that archaeology can illustrate specific historical events or data. The effect of this illustration may be two-fold: to confirm what critics have doubted (thus a limited apologetic use) and to supplement or complement with additional details (as illustrating the extent of Hebrew apostasies from the temple at Arad, or the inscriptions at Kuntillet Ajrud).

It would seem that part of Geraty's reluctance to use archaeology apologetically to the extent of many other SDA writers

\[1\text{Ibid., p. 16.}\]  \[2\text{Idem, "Symbiosis," pp. 6-8.}\]
\[3\text{Ibid., pp. 13-14.}\]  \[4\text{Ibid., pp. 14-15.}\]
\[5\text{Ibid., pp. 15-17.}\]
may be explainable on the ground that apologetic effort has often been misdirected at "proving" personal or even widely held interpretations (such as Woolley's Flood strata, Noah's ark on the Mount Ararat, or premature claims re Ebla). In such cases, if other more conclusive archaeological data come to light which contradict the former data (or interpretation), the effect may actually be to undermine confidence in Scripture. Thus his concern is for judicious use of archaeology, especially for apologetic purposes (the confirmation of historical events and details contained in Scripture or [we might call it] the secular endorsement of historical events contained in Scripture).

There are two additional contributions by Geraty which should be noted here. Though unpublished, his "Symbiosis" article indicated strong support for the Albright concept of "biblical archaeology." Thus he stated that the disciplines of Near-Eastern archaeology and biblical studies 'belong together in a divinity school curriculum and that by virtue of content "one or the other or both will inevitably suffer if [they are] separated."¹ Hence the title of the article signified emphasis on mutual benefit. Geraty illustrated the way in which each discipline has contributed to the other, while also acknowledging that on occasion Scripture has contributed to incorrect archaeological conclusions² and archaeology has at times encouraged incorrect interpretations of Scripture.³

²Ibid., pp. 9-10, including Garstang's Jericho walls interpretation, and Glueck's interpretation of Ezion-geber.
³Ibid., pp. 8-9, including Woolley's flood at Ur and attempts to trace the tribe of Benjamin to Northern Mesopotamia on the basis
It was also under Geraty's direction (1974 and following) that the expanded technological and truly multidisciplinary approach to the Heshbon excavation was developed. This fact may be demonstrated by comparing the type of reports for the early campaigns before 1974\(^1\) and those for the subsequent period.\(^2\)

William H. Shea

William Henry Shea was born in Upland, California in 1932. His baccalaureate degree and studies from La Sierra College\(^3\) (1954) included a Religion major, History minor, and pre-medical requirements. He completed an M.D. degree from the Medical School of Loma Linda University in 1958 and spent two years in internship and surgery residency in the Los Angeles area. During the period from 1960-1972, seven years were spent in mission service in Central America (Nicaragua and Trinidad).\(^4\) In 1966 he commenced work on an M.A. degree in Assyriology at Harvard Graduate School.\(^5\) In 1972 he of Benu-Jamina in the Mari texts (see James Muilenburg, "The Birth of Benjamin," JBL 75 [1956]:194-201).

\(^1\)Which went as far as zooarchaeology and anthropology.

\(^2\)Where coverage expanded to reports of geological investigation, molluscs, flora, general flotation results, and larger scale anthropological and zooarchaeological studies (see pp. 521-23).

\(^3\)Now Loma Linda University.

\(^4\)From 1960-1963 he was staff physician and part-time medical director of the La Trinidad Hospital Adventista, and after a second year of surgery residency at White Memorial Hospital in Los Angeles in 1964, he served as staff physician and medical director at Port-of-Spain Community Hospital, Trinidad, West Indies from 1964-1966, 1970-1972.

\(^5\)M.A. degree unfinished, but M.A. thesis published in AUSS 1971-1972, see p. 424. These articles and other material were developed and rewritten with biblical connections and arguments.
joined the faculty of Andrews University. There he taught part-time until 1976, in which year he completed his Ph.D. from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures of the University of Michigan. His major emphasis was in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History. His dissertation was entitled: "Famines in the Early History of Egypt and Syro-Palestine."1 Shea has taught full-time in the Seminary since 1976, serving as chairman of the Old Testament Department since 1981.2 His field experience in archaeology has included two seasons at Gezer (1966, 1967) and a season at Heshbon (1971).

Shea is an avid reader, a creative thinker, and a prolific writer. In this third period, in addition to a substantial contribution to SDA periodicals, he has published more archaeological articles in non-SDA journals than any other SDA writer for this period.3 His single RH article for this period was jointly authored with Geraty,4 and he wrote nine articles for Ministry and five for AUSS.


1 Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 77-8035, 1976.


3 Excluding book reviews in which he was exceeded by Dennis Pardee and S. H. Horn.

4 See p. 438.
The first two articles in Ministry\(^1\) were directed at answering the somewhat inflated claims of those who had been searching for Noah's ark on Mt. Ararat. The first might be classified as polemical or even "anti-apologetic,\(^2\)" since it demonstrates the false basis of the conclusion that Noah's ark must have landed on this specific mountain (Agri Dagh), a conclusion which some writers were using apologetically in connection with certain debatable "finds." The second was essentially an evaluation of certain films and books on the supposed recovery of Noah's ark. After demonstrating methodological weaknesses and factual errors in these reports, Shea concluded: "Fortunately, the Christian's faith in Christ and Creationism need not depend upon the recovery of the ark from the mountains of eastern Turkey, interesting and significant as such a discovery might be.\(^3\)

Shea wrote four Ministry articles in 1979\(^4\) and of these, the first three concerned contextual enlightenment of the OT (period of the Israelite and Judean monarchies) from Assyrian records. The battle of Qarqar was featured first as the author explained its omission from the Bible record on the basis that it occurred in


\(^2\)In the sense that the approach and data were not valid apologetics or were an abuse of apologetics.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 37.

Syria, which being more remote would have affected Israel less than battles with Syria which were fought in Gilead (1 Kgs 22). An interpretation of Hos 10:14-15 was given in the second article where contacts between Shalmaneser III and Jehu were thought to have included an incident where Jehu paid tribute on Mt. Carmel. The article which followed also contained an exegetical element since it identified Adad-nirari III as the "savior of Israel" in 2 Kgs 13:5. The fourth article for the year described progress and controversy over the publication of the Ebla tablets. The report was cautious and mentioned Pettinato's retraction of his earlier (reported) claim concerning the "cities of the plain." He admitted only the claim to have found the names of "Sodom" and "Gomorrah," but stated that these names had been found on more than one text.

In 1980 the sequence on Assyria and the Hebrews was concluded with three more articles. Shea used Assyrian and Babylonian records to reconstruct the history of Israelite decline, emphasizing the part which Assyria played in the associated events. Thus on the basis of the Babylonian Chronicle, he favors the view that Shalmaneser V was still on the throne at the fall of Samaria, though Sargon II

4 Since he weakened Damascus, thus enabling Israel to re-assert itself (2 Kgs 13:24-25).  
6 Ibid., p. 30.  
was likely a general in the army and may have deserved credit for the event. A problem-solving article gave two additional supports for the disputed "two-campaign" explanation of Sennacherib's conflict with Hezekiah. The new evidences came from two recently joined fragments recognized as belonging to the "letter to God" form, which Shea presented in his typical closely reasoned style. In the final article of the sequence, he portrayed Assyria under Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, and the last Assyrian kings, while stressing the biblical points of contact. He made it clear that Manasseh had no excuse for his religious innovations since it is now evident that the Assyrians did not interfere with the worship of subjugated people. The last three articles all provided background and context for Scripture.

A single article in AUSS for 1966 constituted an answer

1Idem, "Last Years," p. 28.
2Shea, "One Invasion?" pp. 26-28; see also pp. 267-69 and 2 Kgs 18-19.
3Cf. Nadav Naaman, "Sennacherib's 'Letter to God' on His Campaign to Judah," BASOR 214 (1974):25-39. Shea reasoned that Gath and Ekron are the two Philistine cities which were close enough to the named Azekah to qualify as the missing name in this broken inscription. However, as Gath had apparently ceased to exist, it would seem that Ekron was the city which had been annexed by Hezekiah (according to the "Letter to God" text). However, since that is not the situation at Ekron in 701 B.C., the inscription would appear to refer to a later campaign. In addition, the god addressed is Anshar, an old Babylonian god who was not named in Sennacherib inscriptions until after the conquest of Babylon in 689 B.C. Therefore the campaign mentioned in the "Letter to God" would appear to be a second campaign dating between 689 B.C. (fall of Babylon) and 686 B.C. (death of Hezekiah). Shea suggested 688 B.C. as the most likely date for the campaign ("One Invasion or Two?" p. 28).
5Ibid., p. 25.
to the essential arguments which have been made against the historicity of the book of Esther. Shea was able to show by comparing classical sources with the text of Esther that it is quite possible to fit the chronology and details of Est 1 and 2 into the rather sparse historical record of the period between 481 B.C. (after which Xerxes left on the Greek campaign in May 480 B.C.) and 479 B.C. (Xerxes returned to Susa in September of 479 B.C.). Shea was thus able to demonstrate the possibility of linguistically equating Vashti with Amestris (Xerxes' queen in the classical records) and also of fitting Esther into the gap in the record of Amestris from Xerxes' seventh to his twelfth years. "This silence at least allows a place in Persian history for Esther although it does not prove that she occupied it," Shea said. Furthermore, he was able to show abandonment of Samaria and a destruction level at Shechem from about this time which might reflect fighting in the provinces—where Jews were located—as mentioned in Est 9:16. After answering several minor arguments, the writer summarized his own evaluation: "This does not prove Esther to be essentially historical, but it does open the door to that possibility to a great extent, and future arguments against its historicity should be based upon more historical merit.

1Ibid., p. 233.  
2Ibid., pp. 238-39.  
3Ibid., pp. 240-41.  
than these.\textsuperscript{1} The article may be characterized as an apologetic treatise (with considerable contextual data) which aimed at demonstrating that the book should be given a fair hearing. Its historicity is distinctly possible when viewed within the type of framework which we can now construct.\textsuperscript{2}

Another cautiously apologetic article\textsuperscript{3} examined the Mesopotamian Adapa story,\textsuperscript{4} defining its similarities to the biblical story of Adam. Shea suggested reasons why the story of Adam might be considered as antecedent to Adapa, if one accepts a common origin. One of the reasons was that the name Adapa appears to be a secondary development of the name Adam.\textsuperscript{5} The writer demonstrated that Adapa was regarded as belonging to the first (significant) generation of mankind.\textsuperscript{6} In a brief article in the same year,\textsuperscript{7} Shea

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. 246.
\item See also Shea's forthcoming series in Ministry, "Esther and History, I"; "Esther and History, II"; "Esther and History, III."
\item Suggested by Shea to be epic rather than myth because of the centrality of the human character in spite of the mythical elements (ibid., p. 28).
\item Ibid., pp. 37-39, 41. In a more recent discussion of the topic Niels-Erik Andreasen ("Adam and Adapa: Two Anthropological Characters," AUSS 19 [1981]:179-94) accepted some etymological relationship between the two names (ibid., p. 182), saw both characters as primal and representative men (ibid., pp. 188-89), and noted other similarities in the stories, but maintained that a contrastive element was perhaps even more significant (ibid., pp. 187-94). Andreasen did not stress that these are two divergent versions of an original, but that they represent two different characterizations of man, each appropriate to its cultural milieu.
\item Ibid., pp. 36-37, 41.
\end{enumerate}
suggested an alternate reconstruction and translation of Ostracon II from Heshbon. He interpreted it as a document concerning commercial travel from Byblos (Gebel) to Succoth in the Jordan Valley. The purpose of the article was to report research.1

Shea gave a largely negative appraisal of a recent work on Hebrew history.2 Defining his own stance along the lines of the Albright school's "historico-archaeological positivist approach," Shea classified the work under review with the German school. Concerning the period from Abraham to the Judges he wondered "... why scholars in this school even bother to write the history of this period, since [according to them] there is no history."3 On the other hand, he was able to identify somewhat more closely with some of the views given concerning the subsequent periods.4

Shea's discussion of the calendars in use at Ebla5 first described Pettinato's progress in translation and explanation of the chronological systems in use during two successive periods at Ebla. He noted that Pettinato had proposed that the Old Calendar featured the progressive stages of the agricultural year, whereas the New

---

1 Ibid., pp. 121-22.
3 Ibid., p. 416.
4 Though he noted such elements as the dismissal of the book of Esther as mainly "propaganda" with little historical value, and the rejection of Cross' recent defence of the traditional Ezra-Nehemiah sequence (ibid., cf. Frank Moore Cross, "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration," JBL 94 [1975]:4-18).
Calendar had a religious orientation since it included feasts associated with the names of various deities.\(^1\) Shea proceeded to endorse and further substantiate this observation by proposing several additional and alternative interpretations for the month names in the Old Calendar in connection with the agricultural program.\(^2\) We may classify this work as a research report with some contextual and background import.

Although apologetic enquiry probably lay behind the choice of Shea's dissertation topic,\(^3\) the treatment is clearly a controlled enquiry into Near Eastern (Egypt and greater Palestine) famine records within the context of, and in pursuit of, details concerning biblical famines. The writer pointed out that famines have two essential causes, climatic and human (warfare, civil strife, or mismanagement), and that both of these factors appear in records of the ANE. Shea first examined the Egyptian famine records beginning with the Fifth Dynasty, grouping them according to their apparent causes. He then looked at the situation in Syro-Palestine,

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 131.

\(^2\) The two subsequent articles gave similar enlightenment for the New Calendar (idem, "The Calendars of Ebla--Part II: The New Calendar," AUSS 19 [1981]:59-69) and used the success in finding Hebrew cognates for the majority of these names as proof of the Semitic rather than Sumerian origin of the calendars, as well as raising some intriguing questions and giving some creative interpretations based on the Ebla calendars (idem, "The Calendars of Ebla--Part III: Conclusion," AUSS 19 [1981]:115-26). A single example is the indication that the change of calendars may have resulted from adverse climatic patterns leading to increased religious fervor as a method of increasing rainfall and restoring declining productivity (ibid., p. 120).

\(^3\) Famines in the Early History of Egypt and Syro-Palestine, see p. 453.
especially where famines were mentioned in the patriarchal narratives to see if the time-setting of these two sources might coincide. This necessitated giving some attention to patriarchal dating, including a short discussion of the Exodus dating,¹ and, for purposes of his research, Shea appeared to accept the popular thirteenth-century dating. After mentioning the two opinions on the duration of Israel's residence in Egypt (approximately two centuries or four centuries), he decided to leave the attempt at specific dating of the patriarchal period² and proceed to compare famine records on the basis of the comparative archaeological approach of Albright which saw Abraham in MBI (twentieth century) and Isaac in MBIIA (nineteenth century B.C.). With this approach he was able to speak of a possible famine correlation with Abraham but none with Isaac,³ while the Jacob-Joseph period (on that time-scale) did have some famine indications.⁴

Among Shea's contributions to non-SDA journals were two articles and three book reviews in 1976. The first article⁵ briefly discussed claims concerning the discovery of Noah's ark and made a tentative statement concerning an alternate location for the ark. Instead of the commonly accepted site on Agri Dagh, the author

³Ibid., pp. 140-63.
⁴Ibid., pp. 163-83. Subsequently Shea has favored the longer chronology (with a fifteenth-century Exodus) which would see Abraham in Palestine at the beginning of the twenty-first century B.C., and he then saw famine correlations for Abraham and Isaac, with some hints of famine in the time of Joseph (cf. idem, "Exodus Notes," p. 16x, see pp. 313-14).
suggested further consideration of an ark-shaped formation in the Tendurek mountains about thirty miles to the southwest.\(^1\) Although no directly apologetic statement was made and the approach showed caution, the classification of the article would be apologetic. The other article\(^2\) pursued details concerning a king named Adon in an Aramaic papyrus.\(^3\) By process of elimination, Shea chose Aphek in the plain of Sharon as the relevant named city in the papyrus and left undetermined the neighboring home city of Adon. He then analyzed the data in the Babylonian Chronicle and suggested linking the name Aphek from the papyrus with the besieged city whose name was missing (broken off) from the portion of the chronicle tablet dealing with the year 603 B.C. The purpose of the article was to restore context. Shea gave a rather negative assessment of Yeivin's book on the Conquest,\(^4\) though he felt the section dealing with the Merneptah Stele was excellent and that the interpretation of the Exodus as having occurred under Akhnaten was moving in the right direction.\(^5\) Shea was very appreciative of Oren's publication:

\(^1\)Since the shape and dimensions of the clay formation correlate closely with the biblical specifications, Shea felt that it might represent the final resting place of the ark, from which the building materials had been removed or had decayed. He suggested that further scientific investigation was necessary before a more definite verdict could be given (ibid., p. 94).


\(^3\)Cf. pp. 271-72.


\(^5\)By placing it in the fourteenth century instead of in the thirteenth century B.C. However, the author saw the Conquest as a complex process stretching from the time of the Judges to the eighth century B.C. (ibid.).
The Northern Cemetery of Beth Shan, though he did find the further proliferation of terminology for the transitional period EBIV--MBI as unfortunate. A work on the chronology of Ramses II was also favorably received. The reviewer was particularly happy with the reference source on the dated inscriptions of Ramses II constituted by chapter 2, and he noted that the hint of disorder in Egypt prior to the twenty-first year of Ramses would be of interest to those who date the Exodus in the thirteenth century.

Five articles published from Shea's pen in 1977 demonstrate the breadth of his interest and expertise. The first was a reprint from AUSS dealing with Mesopotamian traditions, and the other four dealt with topics concerning Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, and Assyria. The article on the Egyptian canal has been described earlier. The

9 See p. 130.
canal was attributed by Shea to Amenemhet I of the Twelfth Dynasty, but was apparently rejuvenated during the Eighteenth Dynasty (late) and used during the Nineteenth Dynasty as part of a defense system or for the control of troublesome Asiatics.\(^1\) The purpose of writing appears to have been the general enlightenment of the ANE context and probably was directed towards this specific topic because of both biblical and non-biblical references to contact between Asiatics and Egyptians in this area. Shea offered a new interpretation of the Samaria Ostraca\(^2\) by demonstrating that the dates for the first group appear to represent years nine and ten of Menahem (740, 739 B.C.). The second group were then regarded as representing the fifteenth year of Pekah, counting his years from the commencement of a rival rule in Gilead and extending through the reigns of Menahem and Pekahiah. Shea saw the ostraca as receipts for taxes paid to officials of the king, possibly in the period of economic crisis following the payment of tribute to Tiglath-pileser III.\(^3\) The article was basically contextual. The next article analyzed the "Spatula Inscription,"\(^4\) giving a new reconstruction of the text\(^5\) to a new translation which portrayed the inscription as a receipt and statement which completely absolved the former debtor. In a very broad sense the article contributed to Israelite context.

\(^1\)Shea, "Eastern Canal," pp. 33-34, 38.
\(^2\)"Samaria Ostraca," pp. 17-23. \(^3\)Ibid., p. 23.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 166. For the previous diverse opinions on the text and translation of this inscription first released in photographic form in 1937, see the various footnotes of the article.
Shea appraised Assyrian chronology as presented by Thiele and concluded that overlooking the accession year of Shalmaneser III had resulted in an error of one year in the accession date for Adad-nirari III and all of his predecessors. Thus the Battle of Qarqar would be dated to 854 B.C. rather than 853 B.C. Again the effect of this article is contextual enlightenment.

The following year Shea wrote another chronological article especially concerning the reign of Jehoash of Israel and his foe Adad-nirari III. Shea attempted to correlate the various sources for Adad-nirari III and concluded that the Sabaa and Rimah stelae were describing the same campaign. His Assyrian chronology gave a lapse of thirty-six years from the eighteenth year of Shalmaneser III to the fifth year of Adad-nirari III (i.e., from 841-805 B.C.) which appeared to be seven or eight years out of keeping with the chronology of Judah and Israel. He proposed subtracting seven

---


2 Based on calibration of the Eponym Lists with the King Lists (Shea, "Battle of Qarqar," p. 241), and thereby showing preference for the longer recension of the Eponym List which gave an additional eponymy for Adad-nirari III when compared with three copies of a shorter recension (ibid., p. 240).

3 However, John A. Brinkman ("A Further Note on the Date of the Battle of Qarqar and Neo-Assyrian Chronology," JCS 30 [1978]: 173-75) has shown that when additional evidence is considered (two eponym lists from Sultantepe), the balance of likelihood remains with the former dating of 853 B.C. for the famous battle (ibid., p. 175). Shea now acknowledges the year 853 B.C. as correct (W. H. Shea, interview at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, May 13, 1982).


5 Ibid., p. 107.
years allowed for Athaliah, but, in fact, already attributed to her grandson Joash of Judah. He also suggested that the word "seven" had been added to the record concerning Jehoahaz. The article was an attempt to rectify and therefore illuminate the context of the monarchy as described in 2 Kgs 10-13. A jar handle from LB Tell Halif which bore an hieratic sign for "shekel" and some numerical representations was interpreted by Shea. He suggested that this practise of using the hieratic sign to represent "shekel" (as also seen on Israelite weights of the eighth century B.C.) might have been passed to the Israelites from Canaanite practice. The article appears to be essentially contextual. Concerning the Siran inscription on the bronze bottle of Amminadab, Shea proposed that it be interpreted as a typically egocentric royal drinking song (poem) with wine itself as the subject of the second part of a chiasm. In the final article for the year Shea proposed a revision of Thiele's chronology for Menahem, seeing his payment of tribute to Tiglath-pileser III as having occurred in 740 rather than 743 B.C. The latter two articles are both contextual though the former was more peripherally so.

1 Ibid., p. 113.
Again in 1979 Shea added his contribution to several controversial discussions. He interpreted the Melqart Stele at Aleppo as having been erected by Ben-Hadad II as an expression of gratitude for victory (proposed) by the western allies over Shalmaneser III at Qarqar in 853 B.C. In the process of making these observations, he proposed the identity of Ben-Hadad II with Adad-'Ira, and especially from the biblical data the distinction of Ben-Hadad I from Ben-Hadad II. The Amman Citadel Inscription was seen not as a dedicatory-building inscription so much as a statement of reassurance by the god Milkom, who claimed to have given the city its strong natural defenses and shown its people how to utilize them against their enemies. The reference to enemies "from the West" was seen as an allusion to Israel. Another pair of articles involving chronological issues concluded his publications for the year. In the first, Shea argued that the time involved in travel from Babylon (and the fact that the army had been located there for the preceding nine months) indicated a "lightning like strike" at

1 Idem, "The Kings of the Melqart Stela," Maarav 1 (Spring 1979):159-76. He suggested that the Assyrians were probably not victors as they claimed since they campaigned no further to the south, did not return for four years, and when they did return took four campaigns (849, 848, 845, and 841 B.C.) to undermine the power of Damascus (ibid., pp. 172-73).
2 Ibid., pp. 170-71.
4 Ibid., p. 18.
the Judean capital.\textsuperscript{1} The maximum length of the siege of Jerusalem would have been two months and this precludes any lengthy siege and destruction of Lachish at this time. Consequently, there is no basis for a destruction of Lachish at this time and the Level III destruction is therefore better identified as the work of Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{2}

The last article for the year observed that the transition from MB IIC to LB I in Palestine depends upon correlation with Egyptian chronology and is not clear. There appears to be no conclusive evidence for linking the destruction of various sites (Jericho, Tell Beit Mirsim, Megiddo, Beth-Zur, Tell el-Ajjul, Tell el-Farah North, Beth-shean, Hazor and Shechem) with the Egyptians.\textsuperscript{3} As a consequence, the chronological and typological correlations for this transitional period need new attention and clarification, and causes for the destruction levels need to be found. One may sense that Shea wondered if the Israelite destructions under Joshua might have been an alternative explanation, but there is no statement of such a possibility and the article stands with the previous three as essentially contextual.

\textsuperscript{1}Idem, "Destruction of Lachish III," p. 114; using details from the Nebuchadnezzar Chronicle.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 116 n. 15 explained why other kings do not appear to be acceptable causes of this destruction.

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., pp. 2-3. The Egyptian method of attack on fortified Palestinian cities, as with Sharuhen and Megiddo, was primarily besiegement with famine as the applied force. With this method destruction of the city was much less likely and Tell Farah South (if accepted as Sharuhen) gave no indication of destruction at this time. With Megiddo, the circumstances of Thutmose III's victory there show that destruction of the city by Egypt would have been self-defeating (the inhabitants came forth pleading and promising perpetual subservience).
A single book review in 1980 marks Shea's final contribution for this period. He regarded John Bimson's Redating the Exodus and Conquest\(^1\) as a constructive attempt to re-evaluate the data and though revolutionary, worthy of a careful reading and some further investigation.

Looking at Shea's type of contribution we note that his apologetic articles were cautious in statement and comprised only a small percentage of his work. His inventiveness has suggested many new ideas and new approaches which have given some very valuable illumination of problem areas. On the other hand, he has most frequently written on topics which indicate a broad contextual interest in the ANE from the perspective of Scripture with occasional articles more specifically exegetical. His most outstanding written contributions might be described as his creative approach and enquiry into problem areas and his persistent pursuit of the reconstruction and correct interpretation of damaged or controversial ANE texts. His desire to examine all evidence combined with his novel approach has led to some conjectural chronological or interpretational views, but these were normally stated tentatively as hypotheses since they were often dealing with areas where facts were sparse. Thus Shea frequently attempted to reconstruct from our modern perspective what appears to have been the most likely ancient eventuality. There are times when such possibilities could be more broadly stated to include other possibilities,\(^2\) but usually he was

\(^1\)In CBQ 42 (1980):88-90.

\(^2\)As in his article on "Menahem and Tiglath-pileser," where he noted that for the year 743 B.C.---"it seems unlikely that Tiglath-pileser would have had sufficient time to march his army so far..."
careful to lay out all of the possible situations and then show which he favored and why. This would qualify as necessary constructive investigation.

Larry G. Herr

Larry Gene Herr (1946- ) completed a B.A. degree at Andrews University in 1970, and following post-graduate work at the University of Basel (1970-1971), he received a Ph.D. degree in Near Eastern Languages and Literature from Harvard in 1977. His archaeological field experience included three seasons at Heshbon (1971, and as field supervisor 1974, 1976), a season each at Gezer (1972), Tell el-Hesi (1973), and Carthage (1976), and as Director of the Amman Airport Project in 1976. Since 1978 he has taught at the SDA Theological Seminary (Far-East) in Caloocan City, Philippines.¹

Herr wrote a total of twelve articles for our selected SDA periodicals for this period. Nine appeared in Ministry and three in AUSS. There were also three articles in non-SDA journals.

In the 1966 Ministry, Herr's two articles² represent his interest in the practice of child sacrifice in the ANE. He was able to demonstrate from classical sources and archaeological discoveries south as Israel that year," etc. (ibid., p. 43). Yet it is possible that he did manage to do it anyway, or perhaps a strong and fast-moving expeditionary force was sent and was adequate to intimidate Menahem. At least it would appear that more details are needed to warrant rejecting chronological solutions which appear to fit the situation very well.

¹Biographical details were mainly from "Larry Gene Herr, Curriculum Vitae," Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

on various Punic sites that child sacrifice had been practiced rather extensively, especially in the closing centuries of the first millennium B.C. and covertly until about A.D. 200 (though officially banned by the Romans).\(^1\) He felt that this indicated the likelihood of Canaanite and Phoenician child sacrifice, although excavation in Phoenicia/Palestine is still needed to confirm its practice there.\(^2\) He proceeded to examine the biblical data relative to child sacrifice and concluded that the practice had been rather common in Israel and even Judah until the time of Josiah's reform.\(^3\) The articles reflect a combined contextual and exegetical usage.

In 1977 Herr disclosed some of the discoveries made during his doctoral research. He described the nature and use of seals and the manner in which they came into vogue in the eighth-seventh


\(^2\) The first major breakthrough has come at Sarafand (Sarepta, Zarephath) in Lebanon (Phoenicia). James B. Pritchard (Recovering Sarepta, A Phoenician City [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978], pp. 104-08) reported the discovery (made during excavations by the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania) of an ivory plaque bearing a dedicatory inscription to Tanit and Ashtart. It had apparently adorned a statue or image which was dedicated to these two goddesses. Pritchard interpreted the inscription as indicating that both goddesses were worshipped at the same shrine as also at Carthage. In addition, he felt that the plaque pointed to a Phoenician origin for Tanit and the associated practice of child sacrifice. He was able to report a number of probable literary links between Tanit and Phoenicia as well as Phoenician occurrences of the "sign of Tanit" commonly found at Carthage (ibid., pp. 107-08).

\(^3\) Herr, "Child Sacrifice and the Bible," p. 16. He connected the Punic name mulk (child sacrifice) with the Hebrew word molek as indicating the same kind of sacrifice, but distinguished it from the Ammorite god Milcom (1 Kgs 11:5, 33; 2 Kgs 23:13, and suggested it also for 1 Kgs 11:7 instead of the reading "Molech"--ibid., pp. 15-16).
century period in Palestine. The description fits well into contextual usage. Herr's second article for the year discussed the discovery of five ancient (late second millennium B.C.) sites located along the eastern side of the Arabah. The heavy layers of ash, the number of cities and their proximity to the Dead Sea, as well as their approximate time of destruction encouraged the author to suggest identifying them with the long lost "cities of the plain." There was no directly apologetic statement, but Herr did say that the existence of the cities "... can no longer be questioned even by the most skeptical scholar since one of the tablets from ... Tell Mardikh ... contains in a list of tributary cities the names of Sodom and Gomorrah." The article gave some suggested contextual assistance for the patriarchal period.

Three articles featuring Palestinian archaeology appeared in Ministry under Herr's name during 1978. He first described the recent disclosures concerning the Herodian city of Jerusalem, being especially impressed by the massive stone construction in the Temple platform, which formed a grand stairway for ascent to the

2"Have the Genesis 'Cities of the Plain' Been Discovered?" Ministry, September 1977, pp. 10-12.
3Ibid., p. 12. This statement is still awaiting confirmation, but the subsequent excavations of Rast and Schaub at Bab edh-Dhra and Numeira are continuing to underline the possible identification suggested by Herr.
5One corner stone measured 4 feet high, by 6 feet wide, and
Temple. The huge deposits of rubble testifying to the thoroughness of the A.D. 70 destruction were also most striking. The article used the archaeological discoveries both contextually and apologetically. Herr also made an analysis of the various temple ruins discovered in Syro-Palestine to see which appear to be closest to the description of Solomon's Temple.¹ He concluded that the closest parallel was the one uncovered at Tell Tainat in northern Syria from about a century after the time of Solomon. However, he also noted some strong similarities in the Arad Temple, but claimed that Aharoni had overstressed the similarities with Solomon's layout.² Herr claimed that the various temple discoveries have remarkably confirmed the biblical record, but the contextual element was at least equally as important as the apologetic.

Another article stressing confirmation³ dealt with Yadin's remarkable excavation at Hazor which revealed a Solomonic type gate and casemate walls plus the confirmation of his prediction that the same would be found at Gezer in the area which he indicated. Both matched similar gateway structures already discovered at Megiddo. Although Yadin dated the stables (or storerooms) at Megiddo to Ahab's time, he did uncover the identical type of casemate walls had a length of 36 feet. It was estimated to weigh 200 tons (idem, "Recent Excavations," p. 35).

¹"Temples and Altars," pp. 21-22.

²However, Herr attributed the final destruction to the Babylonians, stating that it had escaped the reform of Josiah (ibid., p. 22), whereas Aharoni claimed that the temple was destroyed by Josiah and deliberately cut through by a casemate wall ("Inscriptions and Temple," p. 26; cf. idem, "Arad," EAEHL 1:86).

there and linked them with the Solomonic gate. He could thus state that the gates and walls at the three cities "... very strongly reflect the genius of one architectural conception, thus harmonizing remarkably with 1 Kgs 9:15," and obviously Herr heartily agreed.¹

Herr used the discoveries at the ancient city of Beersheba to reconstruct the lifestyle of an eighth century Hebrew town.² He included such aspects as the style of dwellings, employment, food items, and various city facilities. The aim was clearly contextual in this article and partly so, combined with apologetic purpose in the next.³ Three seals⁴ which appear to name biblical personalities have been found. One reads—"Belonging to Berechiah, the son of Neriah, the scribe" (cf. Jer 36:4), the next reads "Belonging to Jerahmeel, the son of the king" (cf. Jer 36:26, RSV), and the third reads "Belonging to Seraiah [the son of] Neriah" (cf. Jer 51:59-64). Thus Herr wrote that these seals now "provide excellent documentation for the historicity of the narrative portions of Jeremiah's book."⁵

¹Ibid., p. 27.
⁴Actually two are "bullae" or clay seal impressions.
⁵Ibid., p. 27. He also noted that paleography has now progressed to the stage where two seals bearing the names of Manasseh and Jehoahaz, each described as "son of the king," appear as if they date to the pre-throne period of these kings of Judah (ibid.).
The three articles by Herr in AUSS\textsuperscript{1} were all specialized area reports from Heshbon. The usage indicates straight-forward reporting of the excavations in Area D on the south slope of the tell, plus an area (G.5) which was newly opened in the valley east of the tell in order to check on a surface depression.\textsuperscript{2}

Herr's Ph.D. dissertation at Harvard was a broadly contextual type of work involving a systematization of the inscribed seals known from Palestine and the surrounding areas.\textsuperscript{3} The approach followed was to work from the known—using paleography from larger inscriptions and beginning with seals whose provenance, chronological context, or linguistic affinity were known, to the unknown, whereby other seals could be classified and incorporated in a continuum for the various national script traditions (Aramaic, Ammonite, Hebrew, Moabite, Edomite, and Phoenician).\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{2}The latter project revealed a reservoir which had been in use during Byzantine and Ayyubid/Mamluk periods (idem, "Area G.5," p. 107).


\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 2. It was observed that the use of seals appears to have been developed by Arameans in the late ninth century and became very popular in Palestine in the eighth and seventh centuries. Since the practice of owning and using seals appears to be related to affluence and independence, it tended to fade away in the north after the Assyrian conquest and in the south after the Babylonian conquest. There was some resurgence of usage in Judea and Phoenicia in the Persian period (ibid., p. 191). In a review of this book, Joseph Naveh (in BASOR 239 [1980]:75-76) described the work as in some ways superficial and in need of a careful revision to correct errors and to increase reliability of seal and language classification. He also felt that use of secondary literature was inadequate.
Herr wrote an article for ADAJ describing a salvage excavation in the vicinity of the LB "temple" at Amman Airport.\(^1\) Burned fragments of human bones as well as LB sherds found associated with a pile of stones near the "temple" led the author to suggest a crematorial function for the rock-pile. He also felt that the "temple" might have been used for rituals associated with burials. This was a report with some remote contextual contribution, in the sense that it threw some light on cultural practices among Israel's neighbors from the approximate period of the Exodus.

Two articles by Herr were published in BASOR for 1980. Both developed from his dissertation research. The first\(^2\) gave an analysis of the script developments for the different language groups in Iron Age Transjordan. The second article was a more technical presentation of the seals with biblical connections,\(^3\) but with less emphasis on those connections and no apologetic statement.\(^4\) Both articles could therefore be described as contributing to OT context, but they were essentially reports of research.

\(^1\)"The Amman Airport Excavations, 1976," ADAJ 21 (1976): 109-11. This operation did not involve the "temple" itself which had been excavated already (see J. B. Hennessy, "Excavations of a Late Bronze Age Temple at Amman," PEQ 98 [1966]:155-62), but the surrounding area, much of which was about to be covered by asphalt.


\(^4\)No attempt was made to link Berechiah with the Baruch of Jer 36:4, and in fact the date here suggested by Herr—"toward the end of the mid 7th-century horizon" (from paleography) would appear to be a little early for the biblical person.
Herr's archaeological usage in the SDA periodicals (discounting the Heshbon reports) shows about 50 percent containing some apologetic. The non-SDA articles (for scholarly journals, as also the Heshbon reports in AUSS) contain none.

Siegfried H. Horn

For this third period Horn's RH articles numbered only five. The first two were reports on the 1973 season at Heshbon. The wording reflected some disappointment over the failure to detect significant early remains but hinted at biblical connections by speaking of the Iron Age II wall fragments as probably coming from the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah who had mentioned Heshbon. There was more excitement in the second article which reported the discovery of ostraca, an Ayyubid-Mamluk bath-house, and what appeared to be part of a large pool which might be related to Cant 7:4. These descriptions contained contextual usage.

Two articles in 1978 contained possible enlightenment of biblical details. In Saudi Arabia the mining area of Madh adh-Dahab is now estimated to have anciently produced perhaps thirty-one metric tons of gold. It may be the long sought Ophir of Solomon's day, but


2Isa 15:4; 16:8, 9; Jer 48:2-45; 49:3.

texts are needed to confirm such identifications. On the other hand, at Deir Alla in the Jordan Valley a fascinating but fragmentary text concerning Balaam the "seer" has been found.¹ The text includes portions of a vision, a list of curses, and a reaction from the prophet's hearers. It would appear that certain traditions concerning this Bible character had remained near the area of his activity for centuries, since the Aramaic text was dated to about 700 B.C.² Neither of these articles pursued their apologetic potential and both were mainly contextual.³

Horn wrote a single article in the AR for 1979⁴ which was very similar to his article about crucifixion methods of seven years earlier.⁵ This later version was considerably more homiletic, with similar contextual details.

For Ministry Horn wrote a strong recommendation of the biography of Albright in 1976⁶ and an apologetic article on the book of Daniel in 1978.⁷ A fragmentary text which referred to

³The title of the former article is certainly suggestive of apologetics.
⁴"Archeology Illuminates Crucifixion Methods," AR, April 12, 1979, pp. 4-8.
Nebuchadnezzar was described by Horn and using appropriate restraint he suggested that it might refer to Nebuchadnezzar's madness.1

Two additional articles appeared in 1980,2 but the first was much longer constituting a "supplement," while the second was a reprint from the RH.3 In the supplement Horn commented on the rising tempo of excavation in Palestine and of an accompanying increase in public interest which has made archaeology of special importance to evangelists and pastors. He then surveyed the discoveries of the previous decade (and a few from earlier) describing those which had impressed him as being the most significant for illuminating the Scriptures, filling gaps in our knowledge of biblical history and which indicate the Bible's historical claims.4 Most of the discoveries presented had been reported in individual articles during the decade, but Horn drew them together and demonstrated their accumulative significance. General context and background were given the major emphasis. These two foregoing articles were mainly reports.

In AUSS, two book reviews were submitted by Horn in 1974.5

---

1Irrational behavior and an unfavorable attitude to the temple Esagila seem as though they are being ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar (ibid., p. 40).


3Cf. p. 238.

4Horn, "New in Archaeology," p. 16B. This article was probably the result of Horn's work in updating the SDA Bible Dictionary.

5Histoire ancienne d'Israel: des origines a l'installation en Canaan, by Roland de Vaux, in AUSS 12 (1974):66-67; and The
He praised de Vaux's early Israelite history for its thoroughness and noted the author's position as medial to Noth and Bright, though closer to the latter. The book on the search for Noah's ark was considered rather negatively since Horn felt that the author was perpetuating emotional non-objective aspects through much of his presentation. Horn reasoned that it was time for a scientifically controlled investigation under a team of objective scholars. The latter view opposed unjustifiable apologetics.

The next five years saw several diverse contributions. Boraas and Horn jointly presented a report of the 1973 Heshbon campaign, summarizing the achievements and calling for further excavation in view of unanswered questions. The life story of Albright, as told by colleague Leona Running and D. N. Freedman, was marked as an outstanding biography, but a brief guide to the history of Egypt and the Near Eastern world was dismissed as unsatisfactory because it tried to do too much in too little space. An intriguingly isolated scarab from an Early Roman tomb at Heshbon was dated by Horn to the Nineteenth or possibly to the Twentieth century.

---


Dynasty. Horn was almost lavish in praising a survey work on the history of Shechem, but he did point out some areas of weakness. He observed that the author had rejected Noth's interpretation of Shechem as the center of an amphictyony, but he noted that it was not therefore necessary to reject Josh 24 as a whole (as had the author). A jointly authored companion volume surveyed the area around Shechem combining various sources of information. The last book review praised Martin Hengel's recent publication on crucifixion, but Horn expressed the wish that the author had discussed other common questions about the method used and its effects.

In an article honoring Thiele, Horn summarized the chronological chaos of the early Christian era, the systematization which began with the suggested B.C.-A.D. system of Dionysius Exiguus, and the more recent refinements which culminated in the solutions of Thiele (for the period of the Hebrew kings). Horn's own solutions were so much in agreement with those of Thiele that


6 Horn, "Ussher to Thiele," p. 41.

7 See pp. 266-67.
he had no difficulty in paying tribute to the latter's increasingly accepted system, and in effect defending the biblical text.

Further satisfaction over progress in the understanding of OT chronology was expressed by Horn in the thirty-six page booklet, *Biblical Archaeology after 30 Years* (1948-1978). The booklet paralleled his *Ministry Supplement*, though covering a longer period and in effect summarizing the most outstanding attainments of biblical archaeology during his own active career in the discipline. Other areas which he stressed included the improved understanding of early alphabetic writing, the increased rate of recovery of texts from Palestine, and helpful new light on the NT era. He also gave an excellent summary view of the Dead Sea Scroll discoveries and of successes in excavating various biblical cities. Of particular interest was a section on Ebla, which was associated with substantiation of the patriarchal record. However, this section was written with appropriate caution noting that the discoveries were too recent for proper evaluation and the texts themselves were still to be published. The closing comments indicated strong interest on the part of the author in the continuing process

1 Horn, "Ussher to Thiele," p. 40 n. 31.


3 See p. 479. 4 Horn, "After 30 Years," pp. 6-10.

5 Ibid., pp. 10-14, especially evident with Ammonite texts. 6 Ibid., pp. 32-35. 7 Ibid., pp. 14-19.

8 Ibid., pp. 22-32. 9 Ibid., pp. 19-22.
of illuminating Scripture (apparently both contextual and specifically exegetical) and also joy over the kind of discoveries which have supported the reliability of the OT text, the early availability of a simple system of writing and that have shown that "... many historical details of the Old and New Testament stories are historically reliable."^1

Horn's articles in non-SDA periodicals for this third period were mainly book reviews. Exceptions included a reprint from a RH^2 and some dialogue in BAR^3 concerning the Exodus and Exodus dating. In the two features in BAR, Horn defended the fifteenth-century dating without dogmatism, admitting that the thirteenth-century dating also has some points worth considering. He also defended the Israelite crossing at the north of the Gulf of Suez,^4 and he appeared to agree that the number of Israelites involved in the Exodus was many fewer than the number apparently indicated in Exod 12:37, Num 1:45-46, etc.^5 There were also two general reports on the Heshbon excavations of the 1973 season,^6 and a summary article

---

^1 Ibid., p. 35.


^5 Ibid., p. 24. For his explanation of the texts see ibid., p. 24 n. *, where he observed that eleph can mean "thousand," or "family," "tribe," etc.

concerning the first two seasons of excavation with the background of Heshbon which appeared in *EAEHL*.  

The first reviews covered general books on biblical archaeology by a journalist ("readable," but not "penetrating") and by archaeologist Kenyon. The latter work was seen to be thorough on architecture remains but disappointing in other areas. In another review, Horn praised Bright's *History of Israel* (second edition) for its thorough and rather conservative workmanship and noted with some satisfaction the retention of such elements as the two-campaign theory of Sennacherib's attacks upon Hezekiah. A regional study of the portion of Transjordan which had been inhabited by Israelite tribes left Horn disappointed because it failed to utilize significant archaeological information. Two reviews involving Canaanite religion were written by Horn in 1979. The first discussed a recent work which gathered together all that was currently known of the god Rešep, who was worshipped in Canaan and Ugarit as well as most of the fringe of the Mediterranean. A

---

more general survey of metal figures from Syro-Palestine\(^1\) contained
the intriguing fact, referred to in the review, that male deities
out-numbered female in a ratio of 5:3, and considerably more if the
exceptional numbers from Byblos are included, for at that site the
ratio was about 1200 male to 38 female figurines.

The final group of reviews featured Egyptian archaeology
and the influence of Egyptian culture. William Ward's *Egypt and
the East Mediterranean World 2200-1900 B.C.*\(^2\) was regarded as extremely
valuable for the illumination it gave to Egyptian foreign relations
in this relatively dark age. Horn agreed with the author in placing
the lamentations of Ipuwer in the First Intermediate Period rather
than in the Thirteenth Dynasty, as maintained by Van Seters.\(^3\)

Egypt's early cultural influence on Asia was the subject of the next
review.\(^4\) Horn agreed with the author (against Albright) that the
proto-Sinaitic script had originated during the Twelfth Dynasty.

The last two reviews\(^5\) dealt with scarabs and other Egyptian objects
(or imitations). The first gave a useful corpus of royal scarabs

\(^1\)Idem, review of *Canaanite Gods in Metal: An Archaeological
Study of Ancient Syro-Palestinian Figurines*, by Ora Negbi, in *JNES*


\(^3\)John Van Seters, *The Hyksos: A New Investigation* (New Haven,

\(^4\)Siegfried H. Horn, review of *The Impact of Egypt on Canaan:
Iconographical and Related Studies*, by Raphael Giveon, in *JNES* 39

\(^5\)Idem, view of *Corpus du scarabé égyptien*, vol. 1, *Les
scarabées royaux*, by Fouad S. Matouk, in *JNES* 33 (1974):263-84;
Idem, review of *Fouilles de Kition*, vol. 2, *Objets égyptiens et
egyptisants: scarabées, amulettes et figurines en pâte de verre et
but regretfully omitted backs and sides. The second depicted scarabs and other Egyptian-type objects found at Kition (Kedi) on the southeastern coast of Cyprus.

An overview of Horn's contribution in this final period could be misleading since the volume of his writing was much less. However, there are indications of a widening of interests and a reduction of apologetic elements as he perhaps considered passing such responsibilities to others. Articles containing any apologetic amounted to only about 25 percent, and the tendency seems to have been to more general and contextual interests. In the non-SDA periodicals too he reached out to some areas only remotely connected with biblical interests. On the other hand the perspective of his advancing age enabled excellent overviews of the accomplishments of former decades including apologetic achievements.

Paul F. Bork

Paul F. Bork was born in Brazil in 1924. He graduated from Pacific Union College with a B.A. (Theology) in 1950 and completed an M.A. in history (1952) and an M.Div. (1960) from Andrews University. In 1971 he was awarded a Ph.D. from California Graduate School of Theology in Glendale. He has undertaken further classwork under Jack Finegan (Pacific School of Religion, California), William Dever and Nelson Glueck (Hebrew Union College, Jerusalem), and Peter Parr (London University). Field experience has included volunteer excavation at Gezer (1971, 1973), Saqqara (1971), Jerusalem (1976, 1978). Apart from the extensive task of revising the SDA Bible Dictionary (see p. 288).
1979), and Hierapolis, Turkey (1976). Bork has worked as a minister\(^1\) and as a teacher,\(^2\) more recently as Professor of Religion (Hebrew, History, and Archaeology) at Pacific Union College.\(^3\) He has visited most countries of the Middle East and also Mexico and Guatemala in pursuit of archaeological interests.\(^4\)

After a study tour in which he followed the general travel route of Abraham, Bork wrote a series of five articles\(^5\) recording his impressions. The portrayal of sites and cities was in popular style without an abundance of archaeological detail, but attempted some reconstruction of Abraham's visits to such sites as Nippur, Babylon, Haran, Damascus, and Shechem. All articles were essentially contextual in nature, though the third contained a short apologetic thrust on the witness of the Nuzi Tablets.\(^6\) The articles were perhaps a little simplistic in avoiding anything controversial, such as the fact that the location of biblical Ai is still debated.\(^7\)


\(^2\)Teacher of Religion and German at Loma Linda Academy (1960-1967).

\(^3\)In this department since 1967.

\(^4\)Paul F. Bork, Curriculum Vitae, 1980; and Paul F. Bork to Lloyd Willis, December 2, 1981.

\(^5\)"Ur of the Chaldees," RH, February 6, 1975, pp. 4-5; "In the Footsteps of Abraham--2: From Ur to Baghdad," RH, February 13, 1975, pp. 6-7; "In the Footsteps of Abraham--3: From Baghdad to Haran," RH, February 20, 1975, pp. 11-12; "In the Footsteps of Abraham--4: From Haran to Canaan and Egypt," RH, February 27, 1975, pp. 8-10; "In the Footsteps of Abraham--5: In the Promised Land," RH, March 6, 1975, pp. 11-12.

\(^6\)"Baghdad to Haran," p. 11.

\(^7\)"Canaan to Egypt," p. 10; though admittedly excavations were still in progress at et-Tell when Bork visited in 1972.
Another article\(^1\) dealt with the Queen of Sheba and the suspected location of her home at Marib in Yemen. The details of the early Sabeans and their trade as currently known were interestingly and accurately portrayed.\(^2\) The article appears to be mainly contextual, perhaps with implied apologetic.

Three diverse articles have appeared in \textit{Ministry}\(^3\) under Bork's name. The first discussed the prophetic significance of the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, stressing a dual effect of archaeology in enlightening Scripture and defending its authenticity.\(^4\) The history of Hierapolis parallels that of Laodicea, but its ruins are relatively intact, so Bork used them to reconstruct the context of the NT church of Laodicea.\(^5\) Finally a description of the King's Highway served to give background enlightenment for both the OT and the NT.\(^6\)

Bork's book \textit{The World of Moses}\(^7\) is a semi-popular description of the Egyptian context of Moses (with suggested connections with Hatshepsut and a 1446 B.C. Exodus) which takes up many side issues.

---


\(^{2}\) Except that in commenting on the myrrh trade he described Hatshepsut's [mortuary] temple as being located "at Deir el-Bahri in the Valley of the Queens," whereas in fact Deir el-Bahri is to the northeast of the Valley of the Queens.


such as the Mosaic authorship and the inspiration of the Pentateuch. Directly apologetic statements are rare, but the author did write concerning the discovery of ancient law codes and with reference to the laws of Moses that

Nothing could have done more to confirm the patriarchal account than their discovery. . . . The stories which Wellhausen suggested were mere projections of writers "back into hoary antiquity" or a "transfigured mirage" now become confirmed reality.¹

Bork also gave a consistent contextual emphasis in this work but did not deal with such problems as the question of the non-appearance of archaeological evidence for Philistines in the patriarchal period.²

The emphasis of Bork as a whole has tended towards simple contextual enlightenment with occasional apologetic statements interspersed. His style is interesting and he has included much helpful data.³ However, by ignoring some of the more controversial and less biblically supportive aspects he has not clarified some of these more obscure issues.

¹Ibid., p. 87.

²He did state that we know very little about Philistine history and culture but claimed that this situation had been alleviated somewhat by the excavation of Amihay Mazar ("A Philistine Temple at Tell Qasile," BA 36 [1973]:42-48); however, the latter spoke of settlements which began in the twelfth century B.C. (ibid., p. 42), whereas Bork had been speaking of the Abrahamic period in the first half of the second millennium. To then quote a 1914 source (R. A. Stewart Macalister, The Philistines: Their History and Civilization [London: Oxford University Press, 1914], p. 79) on the state of our knowledge of the Philistines was hardly helpful (see Bork, World of Moses, p. 108).

³His concern to make the OT and its characters both vivid and real for the modern reader is most commendable.
Orley M. Berg

Berg's continued interest in archaeology produced articles from far-flung areas. The first two\(^1\) contained both apologetic and contextual usage of archaeology. He rehearsed the details of the dramatic recovery of knowledge of the Hittites, and in the second article retold the story of the Cyrus Cylinder as a confirmation of Scripture.\(^2\) A series on the seven churches of Revelation\(^3\) contained archaeological elements in order to help visualize the churches and their circumstances and occasionally for exegetical assistance. There were three archaeological book reviews by Berg.\(^4\) He gave a simple recommendation of Bork's book on Moses and he also felt that even the layman would enjoy the work on Layard. Kitchen's book was seen as a helpful answer to higher criticism, though Berg seemed a little tentative about the author's approach which looked at all the sources rather than simply trying to prove or disprove the Bible.


\(^2\) Ibid., being essentially a reprint of idem, Wonders of Archaeology, pp. 39-42. Written originally for an evangelistic-type audience he did not give much detail concerning the way in which the Dead Sea Scrolls validate the prophecy of Isaiah (who wrote concerning Cyrus--idem, "Cyrus Cylinder," p. 25).


The last two articles by Berg contained significant apologetic. Concerning Isa 20:1-2 he showed that "archeology has provided three distinct points of confirmation..." for the historical accuracy of this passage. He therefore proceeded to give emphasis to a dual archaeological usage:

The spade has been rightly called the handmaiden of the Bible. Because of the work of the archeologists we can read our Bibles in the context of the culture of the times and with added confidence in its reliability. (Emphasis supplied.)

In the article dealing with Nebuchadnezzar, the author used the historical accuracy of the biblical record concerning that king (as illustrated archaeologically) to promote faith in the entire book of Daniel including its prophecies.

Berg's writings have shown practical and evangelistic type concerns. His details have been somewhat limited in breadth and depth, but they were reasonably up to date and accurate.

Gerhard F. Hasel

Hasel wrote two articles on the book of Daniel for Ministry and both had a clear apologetic intent—supporting a sixth-century origin of the book. He referred to other archaeological discoveries


2Berg, "Inscribed Stones," p. 25. These were the identification of Sargon II. Ashdod, the name of the city attacked; and the proper term "Tartan" for the Assyrian commanding officer (ibid., pp. 24-25).

3Ibid., p. 25.


as well, but concentrated upon the evidences from Qumran. He men-
tioned fragments of eight different manuscripts of Daniel found in
Caves I, IV, and VI, in addition to 4Q Flor (Florilegium) which
refers to "Daniel the prophet" and quotes from Daniel in its treatise
concerning the Messiah. Hasel also quoted the opinion of Frank
Cross who regarded one of the Daniel manuscripts (from Cave IV,
unpublished) as showing a more striking antiquity than the oldest
Qumran documents (4Q Sam\textsuperscript{b} and 4Q Jer\textsuperscript{a}) which he dated to about the
last quarter of the third century, B.C.\textsuperscript{2} However, Cross did not
mean that the Daniel fragments were older than the Samuel and Jer-
miah MSS, but that they were very close to the autograph of Daniel
whose composition he placed about fifty years earlier (time of
Antiochus). Hasel appears to have misunderstood the statement of
Cross as he applied it apologetically. In the second article,
Hasel followed the argument that orthographic, morphological, and
syntactical development would place the Aramaic of Daniel earlier
than the Job Targum, which in turn is older than the Genesis
Aprocr yarn.\textsuperscript{3} He then discussed the various opinions on the dating
of the two latter documents, siding with those who place the Job
Targum in the third or second century, B.C. He did this on the
basis that others who disagree are placing it later on the pre-
supposition of a fixed second-century dating for Daniel.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1}Idem, "Daniel Survives," p. 9.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 10, cf. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient
Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, NJ:
Doubleday and Co., 1958), p. 33; idem, "The Oldest Manuscripts from
Qumran," \textit{JBL} 74 (1955); see also idem, "Cave of Qumran," p. 86.

\textsuperscript{3}Hasel, "Aramaic of Daniel," p. 13. \textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
Two AUSS articles dealt with issues concerning the first part of Genesis. Hasel took up the exegetical problem of explaining the plural "let us" in Gen 1:26. The first possibility considered was a "Mythological Interpretation" which suggested the idea of "counseling in a divine assembly" as seen in several ANE epics (as Enuma elish, and the Atrahasis Epic). He rejected this interpretation and ultimately suggested a "Plural of Fullness" concept. In the second article, Hasel stressed the many contrasts between the genealogies of Gen 5, 11, and the Sumerian King Lists. He showed that the fact that there was a sequence of names intercepted by a flood was the only close (but superficial) similarity. Hasel was thus endeavoring to use archaeological data to correct overdrawn parallels, and we might regard this as a form of apologetic for the distinctiveness of Genesis.

One more article in AUSS was contextual in nature with some help also given to exegesis. Hasel was able to demonstrate from the cuneiform sources, and especially from the newly published Harran

---


2That is by appealing to the more recently discovered, rather diverse, recensions (ibid., pp. 362-63, 372-73).

3This latter article (and the former one to a lesser degree) is a typical example of Hasel's argument that the ANE "parallels" can often be equally enlightening as they are used to define contrasts rather than similarities with regard to biblical material (cf. p. 381). This is certainly a valid point and a necessary corrective for the type of approach seen in the pan-Babylonian school, etc. (see p. 43).

4Gerhard F. Hasel, "The First and Third Years of Belshazzar (Dan. 7:1; 8:1)," AUSS 15 (1977):153-68.
stelae, \(^1\) that Nabonidus stayed in Tema for ten years, and that these years were from his sixth to his sixteenth (550/549--October 25, 540 B.C.). \(^2\) Thus, the reign of Belshazzar can be dated from 550/549 to 539 B.C., and Dan 7:1 can be linked with 550/549 and Dan 8:1 with 548/547 B.C. \(^3\)

In a paper originally presented at the North American Division Bible Conference in 1974, \(^4\) Hasel outlined principles for the interpretation of the Bible. As he wrote of the literal meanings of words, he warned against the injudicious use of comparative philology and stressed that "context is the final determiner [of] whether or not a recovered meaning applies in a given text." \(^5\)

The extent and limits of his dependence upon archaeology for enlightenment of the biblical text he stated as follows:

The world of the Bible is the ancient Near East whose geography, history and culture has been uncovered in many respects by archaeology. Humanly speaking, the Bible has


\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 166-67.


a share in the context of the ancient Near East in both space and time. While this is true, the Bible is still not on the same par as its surrounding religions and cultures. Both the OT and the NT share in the unique biblical context. Biblical religion is the ground for the unique content of Scripture. Biblical writers expressed the divinely inspired thoughts in the words of normal languages. . . . This recognition inevitably leads to the principle that while biblical terms can be enlightened by cognate languages, the recovered meaning must prove to be in harmony with the immediate linguistic context in the Bible and the larger context of the biblical message as a whole. This principle is aimed at avoiding a reading of elements of one cultural setting into another. It safeguards against distorting the total picture and provides means for recognizing the subtle but crucial differences.1

Thus Hasel rejected any relationship between tehom (deep) in Gen 1:2 with Tiamat in Enuma elish on both philological and phenomenological grounds.2 On the other hand, Semitic cognates to the Hebrew dor suggest the primary meaning of "duration" or "lifetime," rather than simply "generation," thus allowing a meaningful translation of Gen 15:13, 16. We would classify this usage of archaeologically recovered materials as exegetical.

Hasel's non-SDA articles include some with archaeological significance. The first was a rewritten discussion of the cosmology of Gen 1 with the same thrust as in the earlier form.3 Another exegetical article4 was based on the phrase "the saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:18,22,25,27). Hasel made it clear that there are cognates from Ugarit, Tyre, Mari, etc., which use the common Semitic root qds in various forms to indicate both heavenly

---

1Ibid.  2Ibid., p. 17.  

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
and earthly beings. Furthermore, a similar usage occurs in later extra-canonical Jewish writings so that it cannot be stated that a shift in meanings had come about by the time of Daniel.

Book reviews by Hasel included three in Bibl Or.¹ As far as Hasel was concerned, Clifford made too much of the similarities between the religious concepts of Israel and its neighbors. Thus Hasel observed that "single parallel terms, concepts, or motifs must not be torn out of their religio-cultural moorings and treated in isolation from the total conception of the context in which they are found."² In this way he felt that Clifford had ignored the subtle distinctions between the concepts and practices of Israel and its polytheistic neighbors. In the second review Hasel noted that Kircher's sixty-year-old dissertation (now published) needs archaeological supplementation to show the sacral significance of wine in the ANE (apart from Graeco-Roman practices which were covered adequately). Hasel also acknowledged that Thompson's book on the patriarchs had perhaps shown that too much had been claimed by way of ANE parallels to the patriarchal period, but he pointed out that Thompson too had been excessively negative through his tradition-historical presuppositions.

An important contribution has been made by Hasel in applying ANE context and philology to exegesis of Scripture. At the same


² Hasel, review of Cosmic Mountain, p. 115.
time, he observes that many times it is the major contrasts and the fine distinctions which are of greatest import in appreciating Israel in its near-eastern context. Apart from his exegetical contributions, though also to some extent including them, he used archaeology with more frequent apologetic purpose than earlier. When evident, this apologetic usually pointed in the direction of special conservative or SDA interests as in defense of creationism or of the sixth-century origin of the book of Daniel. His writings in non-SDA publications were not dissimilar. His wide reading has kept him abreast of contemporary archaeological developments.

Dennis Pardee

Dennis Graham Pardee was born in Portland, Oregon, in 1942. His baccalaureate degree (French major) marked the culmination of classwork at Pacific Union College and at the French Adventist Seminary, Collonges-sous-Saleve, France. His M.A. equivalent (License) was earned at the same seminary in 1968. After returning to U.S.A., Pardee studied at the University of Chicago receiving a Ph.D. in 1974 from the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations. His dissertation was entitled "The Preposition in Ugaritic." Since 1972 he has taught North-west Semitic languages at the University of Chicago.

In keeping with his linguistic interests, Pardee's two Ministry articles dealt with inscriptions and ancient texts. He described the discovery of the archive at Mari and mentioned

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the first direct letter known to have been written by a prophet (rather than by an intermediary). He explained that neither the parallel names (persons and places) from Mari, nor the similar customs from Nuzi constitute proof for the dating of the patriarchs, and in that sense, Thompson is right\(^1\) since

If we were secular historians writing a history of Syria-Palestine in the early second millennium, we could not categorically assert that the patriarchs were historical personages--simply because the Bible is the only document that refers to them (one of the dicta of historical research is *testis unus testis nullus* ["one witness only is no witness at all"]). However, even secular historians can assert that the patriarchs may well have been historical persons, because so much in the rest of the Bible has proven true to the findings of historical research of the last century.\(^2\)

He continued by arguing that from a religious viewpoint we may state

... that the patriarchal narratives were, in any case, written as theological statements emphasizing God's love and care. The presence or absence of extra-Biblical evidence corroborating the existence of the personages to whom these divine characteristics were revealed has very little to do with the attitude of faith that accepts these statements as of eternal worth. (To the extent that evidence is required for such an attitude of faith, one would have to say that the evidence for the historicity of the Bible with reference to later periods is sufficient.)\(^3\)

Pardee concluded by indicating that since we don't have proof concerning the patriarchs, we should at least be grateful for the vast number of discoveries which enliven the Genesis narrative. We would classify this article as contextual with a reasoned statement on faith and apologetics.

---

\(^1\)See p. 38, but he observed that Thompson's argument against the historicity of the patriarchs is based upon silence (Pardee, "Mari Archives," p. 37).

\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid.
main Hebrew inscriptions (and the Moabite Stone inscription) which have been found in Palestine. The article was essentially contextual and especially emphasized the enlightenment that has been given by these inscriptions for the period 625-586 B.C.¹

The two AUSS articles² parallel those in Ministry and show approximately the same usage. The one featuring Mari used the same approach but gave more details than in the Ministry article and concluded by expressing the hope that more parallels of place and personal names would be forthcoming from such new sources as the archives at Tell Mardikh.³ The second article was more general, being essentially an introduction to the study of Hebrew inscriptions, but with a second section also dealing with the spectrum of materials from ancient Ammon, Moab, and Edom. The Hebrew sources are much more limited in number, form, etc., but although they have not supplied us with dates and rulers' names they have nevertheless furnished us with "a great deal of raw data for the auxiliary areas of linguistics, onomastics, topography, and, to a degree, social structure."⁴ Pardee claimed that the Hebrew texts which have been found point to the fact that the OT "must be considered seriously as a source for the history of Palestine . . ." even though they have not settled the

debate between the various schools over the historicity or "facticity" of the OT narratives.¹

Pardee's articles in non-SDA journals mostly involved linguistic issues, but the following contained significant archaeological elements. He reported the publication of a new Ugaritic letter² and developed his own commentary which especially emphasized the biblical parallel (lexical parallel) between a portion of the text and the biblical manner of anointing with oil.³ Describing an ostracon from Yavneh Yam (Mesad Hashavyahu),⁴ he favored its interpretation as a judicial plea for the return of the suppliant's garment which had been taken when he ceased working.⁵ In a brief note⁶ on the same ostracon he discussed and rejected an alternate translation of a small portion of the inscription.⁷ He also wrote

¹Ibid.
³Ibid., p. 16. The closest parallels cited were with 1 Sam 10:1 and 2 Kgs 9:3,6.
⁵Pardee preferred to regard šbt as referring to "stopping work" whether derived from the root šbt or yšb, rather than identifying it as a reference to any kind of sabbath (ibid., p. 44). In contrast Horn saw the word in its context as the "Sabbath" (After 30 Years, p. 11, but see also p. 241).
⁷Victor Sasson ("An Unrecognized Juridical Term in the Yabneh-Yam Lawsuit and in an Unnoticed Biblical Parallel," BASOR 232 [1978]:57-63) had suggested "confirm" or "vindicate" rather than Pardee's suggestion of a more obsequious request from the plaintiff.
a note emending the Aqht text¹ and a lengthy guide for the use of
the newly revised Canaanite Myths and Legends,² by J. C. L. Gibson.
Pardee's comparative study of Hebrew and Aramaic epistolography³
was hampered by the relatively small body of Hebrew letters and the
fact that all the pre-Christian Hebrew letters were written on
ostraca and consequently were probably abbreviated. In a kind of
exegetical study for ZAW, Pardee gave comparative linguistic and
conceptual backing from the ANE for the translation of Job 20:14
as "serpents' venom."⁴

The types of books reviewed by Pardee extended his coverage
to include more of the specifically biblical topics, but linguistics
and related areas remained his predominant interest. He partici­
pated in the Thompson-Van Seters discussion with two reviews.⁵
Pardee admitted the validity of the two major points made by
Thompson—that neither the concept of Abraham as a donkey-caravaneer
nor the overriding emphasis on Nuzi parallels was justifiable, but
he called for further intensive study of all ancient sources as the
debate would continue. He also found that Van Seters was not

⁵Dennis Pardee, review of The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham, by Thomas L.
altogether convincing, accusing him of selectivity in the choice of evidences for dating the text. While agreeing with many of his criticisms, Pardee felt that Van Seters needed much more evidence for his thesis—partly because he had given no explanation for the origin of such widespread stories about such an outstanding (reputed) ancestor. The Anchor Bible volume on the Song of Songs was praised by Pardee for its wide use of ANE literature, especially the Baal/Anath imagery from Ugarit, but the reviewer did not accept the funerary-feast setting for the composition and would have liked more commentary by the author himself rather than a thorough presentation of the history of interpretation. Pardee rejected the artificially drawn parallel between sacred prostitution in Mesopotamia and Isa 7:14, as well as other elements of Brunet's work on Isaiah, but he praised the balanced use of ANE comparative materials in the Anchor Bible commentary on Ruth. When he received Solomon's New Men, by Heaton, Pardee was somewhat horrified at the return to "pan-Egyptianism," since the writer maintained that Israel was almost completely dependent on Egypt for its culture. On the other hand, the book entitled Serpent Symbolism in the Old


Testament, by Joines\(^1\) was seen to be helpful in its considerable enrichment from the ANE stressing as it did that the serpent was anciently the symbol of life and fertility. A composite work in honor of Jacob Myers\(^2\) contained some commendable archaeological materials, but Pardee’s predominant interests lay with linguistic works such as the next two concerning Ugarit.\(^3\) He regarded these Ras Shamra Parallels volumes as very valuable, but marred by some of Dahood’s judgmental errors and some lack of unity and consistency. A more caustic criticism of Dahood’s school (expressed in such terms as "uncritical" and "unanalytical") was directed at Northwest Semitic Philology and the Hebrew Fragments of Ben Sira, by Tadeuz Penar.\(^4\) In contrast, Pardee characterized the work of Lemaire\(^5\) on Hebrew ostraca as reliable, reasonable, and showing restraint.

A final selection of Pardee’s book reviews for the period features works on Aramaic inscriptions and on Qumran materials. He regarded as mediocre the second volume of Gibson’s Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions\(^6\) because of dubious new interpretations and

\(^1\)Dennis Pardee, review in JNES 36 (1977):318.


suggested readings. The Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla, edited by Hoftijzer and van der Kooij,\(^1\) Pardee recommended for its thorough workmanship on this very fragmentary Balaam inscription. Pardee seemed impressed with Sokoloff's The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI\(^2\) for both its detailed linguistic analysis and also its dating arguments.\(^3\) Finally the reviewer gave praise with some reservation for the English translation of Kutscher's work on IQIsa\(^4\) for its "collection, analysis, and classification of variant readings," while deploring pointing errors and lack of indexes.

Pardee shows evidence of careful, critical thought in his evaluations of ANE texts and archaeological data and has tended to emphasize the need for faith in acceptance of the earlier biblical records. He has nevertheless given some backing for their historicity on the grounds of the demonstrated historical reliability of later OT records. He seems to value archaeology for its contextual contribution (evident through much of his non-SDA writing too) but also for its historical substantiation, wherever that is clearly demonstrated. For the patriarchs, he was content thus far to say that they have brought the "Genesis narratives to life,"\(^5\) which appears to mean more vivid but not necessarily more believable.

This is certainly a safe and defensible position, and undoubtedly the entire biblical record must be accepted ultimately by faith. However, it would seem that the cumulative evidences and illustrations which complement the patriarchal narratives could be taken even more positively. Perhaps he has been more impressed by the kind of arguments Thompson and Van Seters present than is realized. Pardee's linguistic expertise would suggest potential for exegetical writing, but his interests thus far have been concentrated more on the ANE texts themselves.

James J. C. Cox

James John Charles Cox completed a Ph.D. in NT Studies from Harvard in 1973. He made a tour of the Near East and excavated at Heshbon in 1974, and in 1977-1978 he was Professor at the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem. He has taught in the NT department at Andrews University since 1965, though at this writing he has taken a three-year leave of absence to serve as president of Avondale College in Australia.

Cox described the inscription from Caesarea which names Pilate,\(^1\) and observed that while the NT writers frequently use the more general term hegemôn (governor, Matt 10:18, etc.), the technical Latin equivalent would have been præfectus as in the inscription. He quoted Samuel Sandmel as saying that we still lack "direct corroboration" for Pilate,\(^2\) noting that this "direct corroboration" had


now been found. A few months later he wrote a similar article with reference to the recovery of "Nazareth," mentioning the "empirical evidence" now available to favor the view that NT writers were historically reliable in their claims for Nazareth. The third article appeared in **AUSS** as a descriptive analysis of an amphora handle found at Heshbon in 1974. He concluded that the vessel had been manufactured on the island of Rhodes between about 220-180 B.C. and used to export wine to Esbus. Usage was remotely contextual.

Cox saw the potential of archaeology for confirming historical details from the Bible but did not make any involved statement of his concept of the relationship of archaeology and apologetics.

**D. A. Courville**

In further support of his chronological theories and reinterpretations of ancient history, Courville wrote several more articles during this period. Jericho was used as a prime support for his theory, but the article was poorly written with several internal contradictions. He indicated that there was absolutely no evidence of habitation on the mound from 2100-1400 B.C. and ridiculed the idea that 700 years of stratification could have been eroded away, but on the same page he quoted G. Ernest Wright as saying that if

---

4. Thus denying the existence of any MB settlement on the mound.
there had been a town fortification in Joshua's day, it must have been a re-use of the last MB defenses.\(^1\) Courville supported his own theory that the EBIII walls were in fact those of Joshua's time by referring to Kenyon's concept that their destruction marked a dramatic cultural change (her Amorite hypothesis, but Courville's Israelite habitation), but he did not take into account denials of significant cultural change as made by Thompson,\(^2\) nor the fact that Scripture seems to indicate no substantial rehabilitation for several centuries.\(^3\)

The same method of juggling context and chronology persisted in the next article\(^4\) where the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties were regarded as contemporaneous (to correlate two famine records), and Joseph was identified with a King Yufni of the Thirteenth Dynasty\(^5\) and Mentuhotep vizier of Sesostris I of the Twelfth Dynasty. A subsequent article\(^6\) continued in the same line, repeating much from Courville's book *The Exodus Problem*, and making the

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 13, though he said that no specific evidence for such re-use had been found. (See G. Ernest Wright, "Archaeological News and Views," *BA* 16 [1953]:67-68.)

\(^2\)See pp. 35-36.

\(^3\)Josh 6:26; cf. 2 Sam 10:5 (the name was in use in the time of David), 1 Kgs 16:34 (the city itself was rebuilt in the time of Ahab).


\(^5\)Though Courville referred to him as a subruler or high official (ibid., p. 8).

\(^6\)Idem, "The Exodus: Fact or Legend?" *ST*, April 1978, pp. 16-21, 27.
Sixth, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Dynasties virtually contemporaneous.\textsuperscript{1}

In a two-part sequence on chronology of the Hebrew kings,\textsuperscript{2} Courville challenged Thiele's reconstruction and proposed a twenty-four-year backward extension of all early Israelite chronology. The latter was based on a single general statement by Ellen White.\textsuperscript{3} He also rejected a number of Assyrian synchronisms in forming his own system, yet he stated that his approach was "... to start with the most secure points that archeology has to offer and work from there into areas of question and of lesser security, always maintaining a recognition of the authority of inspiration as standing above popular opinions relative to interpretations of obscure source materials."\textsuperscript{4}

It would seem that in his zeal to defend inspiration, Courville not only took a very narrow—even unrealistic—view of inspiration but actually did exactly what he appeared to be warning against--

\textsuperscript{1}He stated that he had a similar interpretation of the Ipuwer and Ermitage papyri (as the Exodus context) to Velikovsky, "not because of any general acceptance of others of his views, but because this is the only place in the history of Egypt that provides the proper background" (ibid., p. 21). In fact, Courville had given portions of A. H. Gardiner's translation as quoted by Velikovsky, and the latter had quoted very selectively (for example see on the Ermitage Papyrus, Velikovsky, Ages in Chaos, pp. 45-47, cf. Alan H. Gardiner, "New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt—II: Pap. Petersburg 11168, recto," JEA 1 [1914]: 101-05).


\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 8. In a brief responding note, Warren Johns ("Taking Exception: Courville Chronology Critiqued," AR, November 9, 1978, p. 10) pointed out the danger of misusing single, isolated statements by Ellen White or any other writer.

\textsuperscript{4}Idem, "Chronological Problem," p. 6.
defense of "opinions relative to interpretations." Each of his five articles mentioned here was essentially apologetic, but in every case it was an apologetic for a distinctive interpretation which is clearly more prone to abuse than an apologetic for a principle or broadly based scriptural teaching. Of more significance here is the fact that his expectations of archaeology remained unrealistic. If archaeology did not produce the proof or consistent picture which he expected, then either Scripture was wrong (which he certainly rejected) or the whole of ancient history as we know it had to be reshuffled to correlate some similar archaeological record with the specific biblical event. This is an unjustifiable form of apologetic which ignores the incompleteness and acknowledged biases of the archaeological record.

Edwin R. Thiele

Thiele reacted vigorously to Courville's articles. He defended his own system on the basis that the Assyrian records and synchronisms had actually provided the fixed points around which

---

1 By nature archaeology cannot normally tell a complete story and even inscriptions frequently show national bias (especially Egyptian and Assyrian, whereas Babylonian and Hittite records are generally more factual).

2 A defense of Courville's chronology and methodology was written by Rodney Mill ("More on the Exodus Problem," Ministry, July 1974, p. 13). He felt that SDA scholars were bowing to the undue authority of "experts" by accepting current widely held chronology, which he referred to as "an impossibly alien structure." He drew a strict dichotomy between either acceptance of Courville's chronology, or acceptance of the OT as simply a "hodgepodge of myths and legends" with no historical reliability.

the biblical data could be constructed. In another article\(^1\) he defended the chronological details of the system which dated the reign of Nebuchadnezzar to 605-562 B.C., especially emphasizing the chronological reliability of Ptolemy's Canon.\(^2\) The former article was apologetic; the latter more polemical.

In a final article\(^3\) and in a booklet\(^4\) Thiele continued to defend the position of basic reliability of the Hebrew chronology in conjunction with contemporary Assyrian and Babylonian records. At the heart of the specific dating was the span of 152 years from the sixth year of Shalmaneser III at Qarqar in 853 B.C. to the third campaign of Sennacherib in 701 B.C., that is, from the year of Ahab's death to the fourteenth year of Hezekiah.\(^5\)

The two non-SDA articles for this period\(^6\) constituted a


\(^2\)He particularly defended the accession date for Nebuchadnezzar as 605 B.C. in the face of discussion with Jehovah's Witnesses whose emphasis on 1914 is linked to an accession date for Nebuchadnezzar in 607 B.C. (ibid., p. 17). He went into much more detail in a private letter (Edward R. Thiele to Doug Mason, February 24, 1978, E. R. Thiele File, Heritage Room, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI) in response to a brief feature in the Scientific American (October 1977), pp. 77-81.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 30.

\(^6\)Idem, "Coregencies and Overlapping Reigns among the Hebrew Kings," JBL 93 (1974):174-200; idem, "An Additional Chronological Note on 'Yaw, Son of 'Omri'," BASOR 222 (1976):19-23. In the latter article he additionally noted that whether "Yaw" is identified with Jehoram or Jehu, the system is not upset since they both reigned in the year 841 B.C. when Shalmaneser III received tribute (Black Obelisk).
defense of his chronological system and of the antiquity of its data in the Hebrew text. Thiele's essential position of the reliability of chronology because of the reliability of Scripture as demonstrated by the ANF records remained unchanged throughout his long period of writing.

Julia Neuffer

Neuffer contributed two chronological articles to the Ministry for this period. One was a review of Anstey's Chronology of the Old Testament, reprinted from the 1913 original and therefore thoroughly out of date. It was noted that the author used a long chronology for Israel with interregnal gaps for Judah, rather than coregencies. The article which Neuffer wrote in 1978 was a defense of Ptolemy's chronological (as opposed to his astronomical) data, since she stated that the length of every reign given in the Canon from Nabonassar (747 B.C.) to Alexander the Great "... is corroborated by one or more of a series of ancient documents..." The article was apologetic in the sense of defending the biblical chronology which had been considerably clarified by the Canon of Ptolemy. In a further, more detailed article in AUSS, Neuffer illustrated the harmony between Ptolemy and the recovered ANE records stating also her personal feeling that Ptolemy had had access to

1 In Ministry, September 1977, p. 31.
2 "Must We Revise Old Testament Chronology?" Ministry, October 1978, pp. 22-23.
3 Ibid., p. 22.
complete chronological lists "handed down from his predecessors in Egypt." Each of these articles may be seen as apologetic in the sense of defending the biblical chronology which had been considerably clarified by the Canon of Ptolemy.

Leona G. Running

In a Ministry article and in the biography jointly written with Freedman, Running portrayed significant aspects of the life of William F. Albright. In the article, emphasis was upon Albright's changing views of patriarchal early Hebrew history where he became increasingly more conservative (even his theological positions were considerably modified from those of his student days). This depiction of his metamorphosis from higher critic to moderate may therefore be regarded as somewhat apologetic. The book was purely biographical telling the story of his outstanding talents and accomplishments.

Another biographical article featured the life and contribution of Kathleen Kenyon. Included among her many accomplishments presented here were her publications, her clarification of early habitation areas in Jerusalem, her excavations at Jericho, and perhaps most far-reaching, her introduction of the so-called "Wheeler-

---

1Ibid., p. 45.
5To some extent a reintroduction of Reisner's method (see p. 58).
Kenyon" method of stratified excavation on a grid plan. The article was purely a biographical report.

**Limited Contributors--SDA**

W. L. Emmerson contributed a single apologetic article for this period. It was especially significant that this article appeared in the centennial year of the *ST* and emphasized the accomplishments of biblical archaeology during the century just past. The author claimed that Christians had been fighting to defend the authenticity and trustworthiness of the Bible and he then quoted Frederick Kenyon as stating that the defensive attitude was the result of the late nineteenth-century Darwinian and higher critical attacks on Scripture which had been defeated so that it was now the critics who were behind the times.

Kenneth Vine gave a general portrayal of archaeological confirmations of Scripture, using the data accurately, though it was only the information from Caesarea (where he had worked) which was of recent date. An article by Carl Tuland has already been covered since it also appeared in *JBL*, though it was rewritten in simpler form and with more overt apologetic slant for *Ministry*. Siegfried Schwantes used a variety of arguments as he endeavored to contradict the view of de Vaux that the day was reckoned by the

---

2.Ibid., p. 12.
Israelites from morning to morning, and that evening-to-evening reckoning only commenced under Babylonian influence during the exile. To illustrate, Schwantes showed that even in the Mesopotamian epic literature the terms "day and night," and "night and day" were at times reversed and apparently had no relationship to the manner of recording a day. There was some parochial apologetic in this article.

Don Neufeld wrote an editorial in which he focused attention on the Ebla discoveries as a confirmation of the historical accuracy of Genesis, claiming that critical scholars have had to give ground step by step as finds of biblical significance have appeared. Subsequently, in a full article he argued that even if a city were built on the site or among the ruins of Babylon, the prophecies of Isa 13 and Jer 50 would not necessarily be invalidated—the ancient political and cultural entity of Babylon has gone. Both articles were defending Scripture.

An article on Palestinian lamps by Eugenia Nitowski dealt

---


2Schwantes, "From Morning to Morning?" pp. 36-37. The article is a good example of the difficulty of dialogue between those with divergent presuppositions (de Vaux dismissed Exod 12:18 and Lev 23:32 as belonging to the "final redaction of the Pentateuch," Social Institutions, p. 182).


5"Discovering the 'Secrets' of Early Church Lamps," Ministry, November 1977, pp. 23-24. The author completed a Ph.D. at the
mainly with the Byzantine period showing that Christianity became somewhat influenced by Eastern mystery cults, but a second article, \(^1\) jointly written with James Kritzeck, was of more biblical significance. It described the clearing of an Early Roman-Late Roman tomb with a rolling-stone entrance. Both of these articles would be best described as making indirect contextual contributions. Udo Worschech composed a defense for a peaceful Israelite settlement in the Negev in the thirteenth century B.C., after earlier sites in the hill country had already been settled. \(^2\) The identification of Tell Masos as Hormah is becoming accepted, but the claimed LB evidences need strengthening if his thesis is to stand. \(^3\)

Two reviews by Strand\(^4\) and Battistone\(^5\) were both very positive, the latter noting that Brueggemann and Wolff had made a concerted effort to bridge the gap between university and church by emphasizing a kerygmatic approach to the OT. George E. Rice wrote a description and preliminary evaluation of the Temple Scroll, University of Notre Dame in 1979 with a dissertation entitled "Reconstructing the Tomb of Christ from Archaeological and Literary Sources."


\(^3\) See Yohanan Aharoni, "Nothing Early and Nothing Late: Rewriting Israel's Conquest," BA 39 (1976):59, 66-67, and for Aharoni's alternative interpretation, see ibid., pp. 73-74.


arguing against Yadin's suggestion that there is a close relationship between the scroll and Christian origins. This was basically a report with a minor polemical element.

In his book *The Battle over Genesis*, Harold W. Clark made reference to some of the religious elements from the ANE as demonstrated from archaeology. In particular he spoke of the worship of fertility gods in Canaan, Egypt, Babylon, and Greece, especially by way of the annual cycle of seasons. He explained that through these forms and concepts the original story of creation was lost and perverted. A smaller booklet by Robert E. Edwards used archaeological information in a simple but essentially accurate manner to restore some of the OT context, particularly for the patriarchal period. He quoted from several respected and up-to-date authors such as Kramer, G. E. Wright, and Pfeiffer.

Niels-Erik Andreasen wrote an article which analyzed the opinions which have been expressed concerning the historicity of Gen 14. He suggested that there are two general positions. The first viewed this chapter as containing at least a genuine historical memory of an invasion of Palestine by four foreign monarchs or their

---

3 Ibid., pp. 24-28.
representatives. The other regarded Gen 14 as a first millennium midrash without "discernible historical veracity." After discussing evidence for small-scale missions of different types--trade, diplomacy, etc. (accompanied by military escorts)--from the early second millennium B.C., he appeared to favor an expedition of this type as an appropriate model for Gen 14. Usage was predominantly contextual with apologetic overtones.

The next group of limited contributors may be generally described as not professionally qualified for archaeological writing, though some were clearly knowledgeable in the area. Stan Hudson made a brief survey of coins from Palestine and some of the surrounding countries for the biblical period. His article was reprinted in the Bible and Spade, constituting an informative and contextual report. A non-technical tour of the main interest spots in the vicinity of Jerusalem was presented by Robert G. Wearner. Seminary student Delmer Johnson described alternate interpretations of the crucifixion data in Horn's article. The next article contained apologetic for the early origin of the Pentateuch combined

1 Ibid., pp. 59-60.
2 "Coins of the Bible," Ministry, July 1980, pp. 26-28. The first coins reported came from Lydia (about 640 B.C.), while the first known Hebrew coins come from the Persian period (fifth and fourth centuries B.C.) and bear the name Yehud in Aramaic (ibid., p. 26).
4 "A Trek around Jerusalem," AR, December 27, 1979, pp. 3-5.
with contextual illumination of the second millennium B.C. treaty types of the ANE. John Oaklands suggested that proposed parallels between ancient covenants and those of Scripture do contain true parallels, but that there are some elements as with the ten commandments which are quite distinctive. In an editorial based on his visit to Egypt, Lawrence Maxwell defended the biblical concepts of life and death against those portrayed in the Egyptian monuments. A brief article explained that in the ANE to free servants without giving them presents was to invite an evil omen, and thus Israel was not deceptive at the Exodus but was reminding the Egyptians of the custom or obligation. The article showed shades of indirect apologetic as well as contextual enlightenment. Dennis Clark told of the way in which Orley Berg used archaeology both to attract evanglistic audiences and to continue as an aid in evangelism. The article gave the impression that archaeology could at first provide biblical context and setting and later be used for illustration in doctrinal discussions, but the main emphasis was upon the evanglistic method. A rather innovative article by Leonard Brand.

1 "Grant, Treaty, and Covenant," Ministry, July 1974, pp. 24-25. This perceptive article noted that the decalogue does not fit at least three of the elements of the Hittite suzerain-vassal treaty format.


demonstrated the difficulties and pitfalls of reconstructions. He spoke of both "archaeological history" and "earth history" (paleontology and geology) with an archaeological-type sustained illustration, but his thrust was especially directed at the evolutionary theory. The usage could be termed illustrative, apologetic, and polemical.

One final book of a general nature may be mentioned here. Lois M. Parker wrote a children's book to a rather similar in style to those of Margit Heppenstall. It was an attempt to place the beginnings of the Exodus period in a realistic Egyptian context in a manner that would interest children.

Writers Contributing Only to the Heshbon Project--SDA

Several SDA contributed articles on Heshbon and not on other topics during this last period and they are grouped together here and treated rather briefly. A few were general, but others were much more technical with the AUSS articles all being essentially technical reports.

Marilyn Thomsen gave two general reports looking back on


2Cf. p. 421.

3She portrayed Thutmose III as the Pharaoh of the Exodus and stated that his son Amenhotep II was absent in Syria at the time of the ten plagues. She also gave a variety of other historical and cultural details by way of contextual restoration.

the virtually completed project. She emphasized that the objective of the excavation had been to make an honest evaluation of the data and that on those grounds no information helpful for dating the Exodus had been found, and the city of the Judges period would appear to have been on another site, but that if this really were the Heshbon of the monarchy period, the large reservoir on the tell was certainly one of the biblical "pools of Heshbon."¹ Douglas Waterhouse reported on the work of a survey team which successfully traced a portion of the Roman road connecting Jerusalem and Esbus, as well as surveyed Wadi Hesban.² With Robert Ibach he reported the same project in more detail and with a good accompanying map in AUSS.³ Technical area reports were given by Michael Blaine⁴ and James Stirling.⁵ Stirling also wrote two reports on the analyses of human skeletal remains from both the tell and the tombs.⁶ Studies

¹ Ibid., pp. 607.
⁵ "Heshbon 1974: Areas E, F, and G.10," AUSS 14 (1976): 101-06. Stirling also wrote a very interesting but unpublished M.A. thesis entitled "A Survey of Some Arguments Advanced by Bible Critics of the Early Nineteenth Century and of Archaeological Evidence Refuting Them" (SDA Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., 1955). In this work the writer emphasized the need for accuracy in using archaeological data for apologetics, and personally applied his criteria by demonstrating the overthrow of critical arguments which (1) doubted the availability of a simple script in the time of Moses, (2) refused to accept the existence of an ancient Hittite nation, and (3) attempted to show the non-historicity of the book of Daniel.
of the geological features and soil components at Heshbon\(^1\) and of
the modern bird population\(^2\) were carried out by members of the team.
John Reeves reported the discovery of a rare double-spouted lamp
in a tomb at Heshbon and discussed the closest parallels to this
find.\(^3\)

Six articles by Øystein Sakala LaBianca (with others) all
featured either anthropological or environmental studies. The
first two dealt with the slaughtering practices (for domestic con-
sumption) of the villages in ancient times\(^4\) and an ethnographic
survey of the modern village.\(^5\) An article jointly authored by
LaBianca and Patricia Crawford featured the modern flora of the
region,\(^6\) and a second article\(^7\) described the results of flotation
sampling. According to an analysis of bones from an underground
installation, the domestic animals of the Early Roman period included

\(^1\)Harold E. James, Jr., "Geological Study at Tell Hesban,

\(^2\)Merling K. Alomia, "Notes on the Present Avifauna of Hes-

\(^3\)"Parallels to a Rare, Double-Spouted Early Roman Oil Lamp

\(^4\)Øystein Sakala LaBianca and Asta Sakala LaBianca, "Heshbon

\(^5\)Øystein Sakala LaBianca, "The Village of Hesban: An
Ethnographic Preliminary Report," \textit{AUSS} 14 (1976):189-200. It is of
interest that the village traditions place the origin of "the big
family" to Saudi Arabia apparently in the nineteenth century (ibid.,
p. 193).

\(^6\)"The Flora of Hesban: A Preliminary Report," \textit{AUSS} 14
(1976):177-84.

\(^7\)Patricia Crawford, Øystein Sakala LaBianca, and Robert B.
a predominance of chickens, sheep, goats, and cattle, with several large mammals such as the camel, donkey, horse, and pig also represented. LaBianca's last article was a general conclusion from the preceding surveys and included recognition of wide variations in life-style of ancient inhabitants apart from the clear evidence of sheep-goat exploitation. These articles are typical of the approach of the "new archaeology" as applied at Heshbon.

The last three articles in this category were written by Abraham Terian concerning the coin discoveries from the Heshbon excavations 1971-1976. The number of coins found increased from the previously reported 78 in 1968 to 395 by the conclusion of the 1976 season. The most significant individual finds were a fine bronze coin (Elagabalus, A.D. 218-222), the oldest coin found at Heshbon (Ptolemy III Euergetes, 246-221 B.C.), and a single Abbasid coin (Abu Muhammad Ali al-Muktafi, A.D. 902-908). The occupational history originally outlined from the 1968 selection of coins remained essentially unchanged.

4 Ibid., p. 173; cf. p. 426
6 Ibid., p. 136.
8 Ibid., p. 178; cf. p. 426.
Writers Contributing Only to the Heshbon Project--Non-SDA

As in the previous period, a number of non-SDAs reported on excavations or analyzed discoveries from Heshbon. Patricia Crawford gave an analysis of the types of molluscs found at Heshbon, but she felt that the numbers were not sufficient to provide conclusive information. A preliminary bone report included analysis of wild animals found at Heshbon. Twenty-four species of mammals were represented (the range included lions, badgers, hyenas, and a variety of deer, ibex, etc.) and also thirty-three non-domestic bird species (including ostriches). The mythical story of Prometheus was represented on a bone plaque ascribed stratigraphically and stylistically to the early Byzantine period. The author of the report suggested that the object had originated in an Alexandrian workshop. Sidney Goldstein from the Corning Museum of Glass wrote a preliminary report on glass fragments from Heshbon which he dated from Late Hellenistic to Ayyubid/Mamluk periods. Robert Ibach described the continued archaeological survey of the region around Heshbon.

---

1 See p. 427.
with the survey which showed very little occupation of the area in the MB and LB periods.\(^1\) Ibach also wrote one of the area reports,\(^2\) as well as giving a description of a very systematic surface sherdling of the tell and slopes of Jalul.\(^3\) The promise of substantial MB and LB, as well as Iron Age I settlement on the site was seen as justification for commencement of excavation in the near future.\(^4\) Frank Moore Cross gave two reports concerning the discovery of Ammorite ostraca.\(^5\) The longest text (Ostracon IV) was interpreted by Cross as a list of goods distributed by the king’s steward,\(^6\) and the other one of significant interest (Ostracon XI) appears to be an inventory of some kind.\(^7\) Bastiaan Van Elderen reported a Greek ostracon from the second or first century B.C., but although about thirty-five letters are traceable, the ostracon appears to be doodling.\(^8\) The remaining articles on Heshbon by non-

\(^1\)Only two large sites upon the plateau (Tell el-Umeiri and Tell Jalul) had “Middle and Late Bronze pottery firmly attested” (ibid., p. 213).

\(^2\)“Area G.8 (Umm es-Sarab),” \textit{AUSS} 14 (1976):113-17.


\(^4\)To have commenced in June 1982 (under the auspices of Andrews University and the Near East Institute and Archaeological Foundation, but postponed because of disturbed conditions in the Middle East).


\(^7\)Idem, “Heshbon Ostracon XI,” p. 147.

SDAs were all technical area reports which are simply listed here for reference and completeness. They cover the excavations of seasons 1973, 1974, and 1976.

Non-SDA Writers—General

A number of non-SDA writers, most of them having good friends who were SDAs, contributed articles to SDA periodicals during this period.

Anson F. Rainey is a former conservative Christian who converted to Judaism. He is an associate professor in the Department


4 It seems likely that his articles in Eternity were admired and acquired for publication by Orley Berg. They were edited for Ministry by L. T. Geraty. The three which were used in Ministry appeared first under Rainey's name as—"Archaeology's Stones Aren't Always Bread," Eternity, March 1975, pp. 46-47; "Putting the Bible on the Map," Eternity, April 1975, pp. 47-48; and "Biblical Debir: How the Experts Missed It," Eternity, May 1975, pp. 49-50.
of Near Eastern Languages at Tel Aviv University. Rainey's first article in *Ministry* gave a brief survey of the history of biblical archaeology before proceeding to emphasize the need for caution in avoiding sensationalism in archaeology. The succeeding article stressed the contextual and exegetical enrichment which come from a careful use of archaeology in conjunction with physical geography, philology (study of ancient texts), and toponymy (study of place names). The last article in this sequence demonstrated how close correlation of biblical study and archaeology can give mutual enlightenment as illustrated by the identification of Khirbet Rabud with Debir. Taken together, these articles emphasized the importance of archaeology's contextual and exegetical contribution.

A number of isolated articles have been published in the last several years. Suzanne Singer is a Jewess whose literary talents led to her appointment as assistant editor of *BAR* in 1977. Her article in *Ministry* was a reprint from *BAR* which described the discovery of evidences concerning the 588-586 B.C. siege of Jerusalem. Four arrowheads (one of them distinctively Scythian) were found by Avigad in ash at the base of an Israelite tower which had

---

guarded Jerusalem against Nebuchadnezzar's attacks. The article was mainly a report. Clifford A. Wilson is also a writer and his article in TT\textsuperscript{1} was actually an adaptation from his Rocks, Relics, and Biblical Reliability.\textsuperscript{2} The author gave some useful perspectives on archaeological usage which were presumably acceptable to SDA's. He noted the limits—archaeology cannot "prove" the Bible which is "primarily a book of spiritual assertions" whose "'proof' is beyond history."\textsuperscript{3} Its historical reliability which has been rather well demonstrated does not prove the factual nature of its miracles or its spiritual truths. Those are not demonstratable by proofs of a "material" nature. However, the historical material—seen through archaeology to be of remarkable integrity—is penned by the same men who witnessed and recorded the miracles and elaborated on spiritual realities. It is reasonable to believe that they would be as reliable in those areas as they are in the areas now subject to investigation by archaeology.\textsuperscript{4}

Thus Wilson spoke of archaeology as generally supporting biblical accuracy, as well as giving additional information, but he also admitted that there are problem areas where it is difficult to reconcile the two sources. Yet, he observed that with the passage of time these problems had frequently disappeared.\textsuperscript{5} The emphasis of the article was upon a reasonable use of apologetics. Paul Maier, professor of history in Western Michigan University gave a basic description of the Ebla discoveries and spoke of significant \textsuperscript{1}"What Impact Does Modern Archaeology Have on the Biblical Record?" TT, February 1979, pp. 21-25.
\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 25.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 21.
biblical correlations but warned that no official translation had yet been published.\(^1\)

Two of the last contributors have friends on the Andrews University campus and have worked in the Siegfried Horn Archaeological Museum. Valerie Fargo has been a doctoral student at the University of Chicago and also a participant in the Tell el-Hesi excavations. She wrote an analysis of "The Early Bronze Age Pottery in the Andrews University Archaeological Museum."\(^2\) Elizabeth Platt wrote two exegetical articles on Isa 3:18-23.\(^3\) She used archaeological finds to illustrate and enlighten translation of this passage and concluded that the prophet spoke against the adornment of women and men who were boastfully wearing the insignia of high office.\(^4\) The final article was written by freelance journalist Joan Andre Moore.\(^5\) She stated in precise manner the methods and goals of biblical archaeologists and the relationship of their work to Scripture.

No practicing Christian needs "proof" of the Bible, for faith in and knowledge of the Bible are founded on irrevocable commitment to God. But for many people in our troubled times whose faith cannot stand on its own merit security comes in knowing that an ancient wall, a city, or a manuscript can be produced that suggests the Bible is true after all. Nor is


\(^2\)AUSS 15 (1977):127-34.


\(^4\)This was a departure from the usual interpretation that the prophet was simply inveighing against feminine jewelry (ibid., pp. 189-93).

\(^5\)"The Tale of a Typical Tell," TT, February 1977, pp. 3-5.
it the purpose of the Biblical archaeologist to "prove." His search rather, is to discover, and his ultimate aim is not "proof" but "truth."  

She concluded by saying that archaeology illuminates the historical setting of the biblical events emphasizing God's proximity to man in all his extremities and thus in a sense illuminating for us the character of God himself.  

Summary of Usage 1974-1980

The most striking features of the third period were a drop in apologetic emphasis (with associated widening of interests), a preponderance of articles on Heshbon in AUSS, and an increase in the number of archaeologically qualified SDA writers.

The total number of articles for the period was 198, including 16 book reviews. Of the 182 regular articles 57 of those appearing in AUSS were devoted to Heshbon reports, analyses, etc., leaving 125 articles as the corpus to be examined. Calculating from the latter figure, 43 (34%) contained a clear apologetic element, and an additional eight (raising the figure to 41%) indirect or barely apparent apologetic. Thus the apologetic element had definitely declined during the third period, and if the Heshbon reports in AUSS should be included, the apologetic percentage would be even lower at about 24 percent (28% including the less obvious elements). The two missionary periodicals (ST, TT) declined in archaeological content to a total of only eight articles (TT 2, and ST 6) and these

1Ibid., p. 5.  
2Ibid.  
3See the comparative statistics on pp. 434-435.
were all apologetic (with one ST article being only indirectly so). This decline in number of articles in the missionary periodicals was significant in reducing the apologetic element over-all. ¹ However, while the percentage of apologetic was almost 100 percent for those few articles which did appear in ST and TT,² the opposite trend is apparent from Ministry and RH/AR. The latter dropped to seven apologetic articles out of 28 (25%), with one also containing a less obvious element (making 29%) of apologetic. Ministry, which in Period II had contained 50 percent (64% with the less obvious) apologetic, in this period dropped to 32 percent (39%).

Omitting the Heshbon AUSS articles and book reviews, the emphasis in usage for this period was considerably contextual. It should be remembered, however, that this is according to a rather broad definition of "context."³ Thus about 50 percent of the articles surveyed could be described as having contextual enlightenment as a major goal, while about 30 percent may be categorized as being basically reports of investigations or discoveries. Articles with an exegetical or polemical emphasis numbered about 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively, with only very minor elements of about 2 percent each referring to homiletic or illustrative usage.⁴

¹ Since apologetics were most apparent in these two periodicals during the previous period (see p. 431).
² A prominent element being three apologetic articles in ST by Courville, which in turn discouraged participation in ST by archaeologically qualified writers (according to a conversation with L. T. Geraty).
³ In fact all of the Heshbon articles could have been included as contextual in a very broad sense.
⁴ Including apologetic usage the total by these divisions comes to about 130 percent because a number of articles have more than one major element.
The scholarly journal AUS$ certainly gave its primary archaeological space to Heshbon reports during this period. Of the 70 regular articles, 57 were devoted to Heshbon and its environs, though there was a rise in at least indirect apologetic with five of the remaining 13 showing detectable elements.

The third distinctive feature for the period was a major contributing factor in the two features just mentioned. Of the 47 SDA writers who contributed during this seven-year period, about half may be considered as writing within the range of their professional expertise (at least an M.A. in archaeology, or a branch of biblical studies such as OT or NT, or in some specialized area for field work such as anthropology or geology).

One may say by way of conclusion that even though no single writer dominated the scene from 1974-1980, a new trend emerged. The movement is away from heavy emphasis on apologetics and in the direction of diversified studies which ultimately contribute to context, some more directly than others. The same general trend is evident in the interests pursued at Heshbon and in the breadth of subjects covered by SDAs in their publications in non-SDA journals.

1 Cf. p. 435, n. 2.

2 This is not to say that many of the others were not also competent, but the statement is made to emphasize the greatly increased professional training of a large number of those who did write in the area of biblical archaeology. There were also articles by twenty-five non-SDA writers for the period, but most of these (all but seven) were dealing only with Heshbon topics. These totals include one SDA (G. A. Keough) and one non-SDA (James Kritzkeck) who wrote only a single article each jointly with Geraty and Nitowski, respectively.

3 As, for example, Pardee's linguistic and related articles.
It might be said that by 1980 SDA s had, in some sense at least, caught up with the Albright school. For Albright apologetics were appropriate but never predominant, and the breadth of interest in anything that might contribute however remotely to the understanding or historical reconstruction of ANE history or culture and therefore to the context of Scripture was a valid part of biblical archaeology. At the same time SDA s were also ahead of the Albright school in the sense that throughout their history they have held to a strong concept of the historicity of Scripture, a position towards which Albright moved. \(^1\) Now that they were spending less time in proving that historicity and more on reconstructing its context and, hopefully, also on exeging its specific messages, the scope of potential accomplishment was exciting.

\(^1\) It was this type of presupposition which led both Thiele and Horn to persevere with the chronological data of the Hebrew monarchies until they were successful.
In chapter II we have viewed the trends in biblical archaeology since about 1937 especially in North America and as focused in the Albright school and some of its more divergent "offspring." This description formed a contextual backdrop for the examination of SDA usage of archaeology in its North American literature for the same period. The latter proceeded writer by writer within the framework of three periods which matched the greatest publishing activity of the major SDA contributors. We proceed now to further analyze the leading qualified SDA writers in terms of their major and distinctive contributions as a key to the summarizing of SDA usage for the period. At the same time we also examine their interaction with and similarities to the contemporary biblical archaeological developments in North America.

**SDA Usage: Main Contributors**

**Lynn Wood**

It may be said that Wood\(^1\) personally set a high standard for SDA writers as far as responsible usage of archaeology was concerned. His repeated opposition to the sensationalism and inaccuracy of some reports of the "discovery" and search for Noah's ark is a prominent

\(^1\)See also pp. 82-104, 349-50.
example, and one article\(^1\) was specifically devoted to an appeal for legitimate usage. His practice was to base his writings only on serious and reliable sources, and where he had to deviate from this pattern because of the non-availability of a more official archaeological source, he issued a call for more adequate publication of the data as soon as possible. That specific report\(^2\) concerned George Cameron's study of the Behistun Rock inscription and Wood was decidedly careful to give a factual report. While showing care in sources and general accuracy, Wood nevertheless (according to the emphasis of his articles) saw apologetics as the most important contribution of archaeology, and it was only in his articles published in non-SDA journals that this element was not apparent. He felt that dissemination of accurate archaeological information to ministers and teachers would definitely have the effect of increasing faith.\(^3\) It cannot be said that there was a reduction in the use of apologetic in the writings of Wood as compared to the pre-1937 period, but his learning and dedication to accuracy made his apologetic statements worthy of attention.

Wood did not have the privilege of studying under Albright\(^4\) and his use of apologetic was stronger than that of Albright and devoted to a more conservative position. He also reacted more strongly against and rejected a greater proportion of the source critical theories than did Albright. Apparently Wood kept abreast of current scholarship including the various reports concerning the

\(^1\)See pp. 90-91.  \(^2\)See p. 93.  \(^3\)See p. 95.  \(^4\)Though they were acquainted and Albright appreciated Wood's chronological work.
Dead Sea Scroll discoveries and he quoted and agreed with Albright's evaluations and dating. Likewise his earlier association with Glueck and others in Jerusalem appears to have given him much satisfaction and direction in his thinking. Wood's publications being mainly on the popular level in SDA periodicals probably did not reach the members of the Albright school, but Albright was impressed by Wood's chronological work on the Kahun Papyri. In the same issue of BASOR as that in which Wood's article appeared, the Johns Hopkins scholar began using Wood's suggested "fixed" dates for the Twelfth Dynasty with some confidence. Thus he mentioned the close of that dynasty [as also its commencement] as "now apparently fixed by Wood."\(^1\)

It is a pity that Wood could not have written more on the scholarly level since with his undoubted ability he could have made a much wider contribution. Probably the SDA milieu of the 1940s--a somewhat isolationist attitude together with suspicion of advanced scholarship--kept him from contributing more to non-SDA journals. Although he maintained a high percentage of apologetic in his SDA publications, the proficiency level of SDA articles in general was considerably lifted by his contributions. We presume that he was caused some embarrassment by some of the misguided statements of some of his less trained associate writers.\(^2\)

\(^1\)W. F. Albright, "An Indirect Synchronism between Egypt and Mesopotamia, Cir. 1730 B.C.," BASOR 99 (1945):15, cf. ibid., p. 12 n. 16.

\(^2\)Such as W. A. Spicer (see p. 152), Roy F. Cottrell (see pp. 158-59), and T. G. Bunch (see pp. 164-65).
Edwin R. Thiele

In the publications of Thiele¹ there are two prominent elements. He appears to have been gradually drawn by his success in chronology away from more general topics with a contextual approach and some strongly apologetic elements, towards the explicitly chronological which often contained only implied apologetic. In his articles of both types he worked with the presupposition of biblical reliability. This serious approach to the OT text helped him to find (in the chronological line) solutions which others had not found. In the non-chronological area, his presuppositions were accompanied by some seemingly unjustified assumptions which led him to rule out alternatives which might otherwise have been considered acceptable. His reading appears to have been quite wide and probably led to his acceptance of the identification of the Habiru with the invading Hebrews. It was perhaps also the origin of his acceptance of somewhat naturalistic explanations of the Exodus miracles, though he presumably proposed a divine control and timing for these events. In spite of this rather fundamental approach to Scripture, Thiele eventually ascribed his final difficult passages to "scribal error."²

Thiele showed great respect for other scholars including even "higher critics," but in the area of chronology he had a running debate with Albright. The latter accepted certain aspects of Thiele's works,³ but insisted on retaining much of his own system while describing Thiele's work as involving "far too much mechanical

¹See also pp. 104-18, 350-56, 509-11.
²Mysterious Numbers, pp. 135-40.
³See p. 117 n. 2.
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juggling of figures." Thiele in turn thought that Albright's system was dependent upon "violent adjustments." On the other hand many of Thiele's views were in harmony with and possibly at times were derived from publications of the Albright school. Although John Bright used Albright's chronological system he occasionally made reference to Thiele's alternate system, and Cross appears now to hold dates that are identical with a large part of Thiele's system.

Thiele's use of Scripture and archaeological data constitute an important contribution to OT chronology. Although arguments against portions of his reconstructions still appear, the work overall has become increasingly popular and is referred to in the IDB Supplement as "the most probable reconstruction." Although his motivation throughout his publications is undoubtedly partly apologetic, his reconstructions are at least equally concerned with the restoration of context, and it might be said that his ultimate influence has been in the direction of promoting indirect apologetic.

---

1 W. F. Albright, "New Light from Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah," BASOR 130 (1953):9 n. 25.

2 See p. 98; and Thiele, Mysterious Numbers, pp. 60-62.


4 He has given the dates 971-932 B.C. for the reign of Solomon, and thereby agreed with Thiele's system for the years 931-853 B.C. (Frank Moore Cross, "An Interpretation of the Nora Stone," BASOR 208 [1972]:17). However, he did not mention Thiele's name, and appears to have derived his dates from his own revision of Tyrian chronology (ibid.).

Siegfried H. Horn

The vast array of material published in different forms by Horn has made a thorough investigation of his written work somewhat encyclopedic. In fact that term is most applicable to one who has been thorough in his mastery of divergent areas and has personally written and revised the major portion of a large Bible dictionary. Horn's most outstanding accomplishments and the trend of his writing is given earlier. He may be said to be the closest SDA parallel to Albright. He possessed the organized mind, retentive memory, linguistic ability, rigid self discipline, and dedication to the defense and enlightenment of Scripture which would enable him to walk in the shadow of his former Johns Hopkins professor. However, their relationship to Scripture was different. Albright described himself as a former extreme radical and he only gradually came to the position where he threw off those extremes and began to defend the Bible, and to an increasing degree its historicity and its text. He became more moderate, but never a conservative. On the other hand Horn grew up with a conservative attitude to Scripture which he essentially maintained. For him defense of conservative views and interpretations became a way of life and he has been happy to be known as one who has contributed substantially to apologetics. He has stated that his goals have included attempting to prove the

---

1 See pp. 182-85, 191-341, 477-86.
3 See pp. 147, 237-39, 276; and we must emphasize his large contribution to the illumination of context.
4 See pp. 15, 23.
5 Horn to Willis, January 25, 1982.
historical statements of Scripture as well as the reliability of the text of the Bible,¹ while at the same time maintaining that archaeological discoveries were not the basis of his faith. Rather, they substantiated his faith in the reliability of the Bible.²

In practice Horn was normally very careful to maintain legitimate usage of archaeology for apologetic purposes and one of his earliest articles warned against abuse of the discipline.³ The main question, therefore, would concern the degree of usage. About 46 percent of his articles have a significant apologetic emphasis, with another 6 percent containing apologetic implications. There was some parochial emphasis on topics such as the Sabbath and in special defense of the book of Daniel, but the larger proportion of his apologetics was directed at defense of typical conservative positions especially as they had been attacked by critics. Perhaps the key word which occurs with regularity in his writings is "confirms" and its occurrence in the title of one of his books⁴ appears to epitomize his attitude. Stressing the positive, he rarely discussed the finds whose interpretations with regard to Scripture remain problematic.⁵

Though defending a considerably more conservative view of

¹See pp. 194, 208, 212, 225-29.            ²Ibid.
³See p. 183. His care is demonstrated by the fact that few major articles or concepts have had to be withdrawn or thoroughly revised. His support for Glueck's early interpretation of Ezion-geber and Garstang's interpretation of Jericho are notable, but understandable exceptions (see pp. 112, 283, 292, cf. pp. 198, 258).
⁴The Spade Confirms the Book.
⁵For one place where he did so, see p. 207.
Scripture, Horn's apologetic usage of archaeology was more frequent but somewhat similar to that of Albright. Albright appreciated Horn's broad grasp of the whole range of ANE archaeology and in reviews of two of his books noted Horn's up to date knowledge of the discipline. He also mentioned his industry and expertise giving high praise especially to his work on the SDA Bible Commentary. John Bright also quoted and agreed with Horn in supporting the two campaign theory of Sennacherib against Judah. In turn, because Horn agreed rather closely with the Albright school on the historicity of the pentateuchal narrative concerning the patriarchs he was able to use some of the arguments of that school in opposing more radical positions. It should also be added that his considerable use of contextual data (which parallels his apologetic usage) including some that was quite remote from the Bible was also similar to that of Albright in particular.

As has been stated Horn's influence on the development of SDA interest and expertise in archaeology has been immense. Without that influence it is unlikely that this relatively small denomination would have progressed to the present rather sophisticated participation in the discipline.

---

1 See p. 17.
3 Ibid.
4 History of Israel, 3rd ed., p. 298.
Gerhard F. Hasel

Among SDA writers Hasel has used archaeology in greater degree for theological and exegetical purposes than any other. This does not mean that archaeology forms a major element in his writing, since his interests and background are more theological, but from time to time his writing has indicated a significant relationship between archaeological evidences and biblical data. In this way he has illuminated several specific passages and themes. Apologetic is rather regular in a broad selection of his work but it has usually been of a less direct type or directed specifically at answering certain higher critical arguments. He is emphatically opposed to an approach which makes faith in the reliability or historicity of Scripture dependent upon archaeology.

Hasel's relationship with the Albright school would be best described as indirect. He would accept many of the positions of the school and particularly its emphasis upon the historicity of the patriarchal narratives, but he would be sharply distinguished theologically with a more conservative position on revelation. This view which places stress upon the uniqueness of the OT has clearly contributed to his appreciation for contrasts as well as parallels between Scripture and the ANE context. The latter aspect together with his exegetical applications of archaeology are of greatest significance for this study.

---

1 See pp. 381-85, 491-97.

2 Such as the second-century dating of the book of Daniel (see p. 492).
Lawrence T. Geraty

In the more recent period Geraty has maintained the scholarly thrust of Horn, while diverting attention to some degree from apologetics.\(^1\) Analysis of his own articles reveals four which contained only rather mild apologetic, while his emphasis was more on the restoration of context in both the broad and more specific senses. His work at Heshbon, especially by way of the interdisciplinary approach tended to emphasize the rather broad elements of OT and NT context. Nevertheless, his comment on the book by Van Seters (Abraham in History and Tradition), that the arguments and evidence of this "well-informed and careful critic . . . will have to be dealt with,"\(^2\) indicate that he saw the need for preparation of careful answers in instances where scholarly attacks have been made upon clear biblical positions. In other words, he saw an appropriate place for apologetics, but it was a considerably less prominent place than that proposed by Horn. It would seem that he aimed not so much to prove or confirm the historicity of narratives and details as to give them an unbiased hearing,\(^3\) which he believed would show the reasonableness of their historicity in the emerging archaeological picture.

Since Geraty received his training under G. Ernest Wright, it is not surprising to find him well acquainted with and considerably in agreement with the positions of the Albright school. This

\(^1\)A detailed statement of Geraty's distinctive contributions and emphases has been given earlier, pp. 435-52; see also pp. 422-24.

\(^2\)See p. 442.

\(^3\)This appears from a broad synthesis of his publications.
statement would apply especially to the historicity of the patriarchs
though like Horn he upheld a fifteenth-century dating for the
Exodus.¹ He staunchly supported Albright's position on the legiti-
macy of maintaining the discipline of biblical archaeology as opposed
to Dever's demands for separation.² Even in his promotion of the
multidisciplinary form of excavation Geraty was in effect pro-
moting the trend which had been developing within the ranks of the
Albright school. Thus Geraty has maintained many links with the
Albright school in his promotion of scholarly participation in
archaeological interests and projects by SDAs.

William H. Shea

The prolific writing of Shea indicates a constant search
for enlightenment of contextual details of the biblical narratives,
especially in areas where historical lacunae have led to critical
questioning or rejection of the biblical data.³ This approach is
obviously also apologetic. Shea was normally both cautious and
non-dogmatic in his apologetic statements, and in fact warned
against abuse of apologetics.⁴ His interests have frequently been
directed towards poetic structure in Scripture,⁵ but he has also

¹Including a thorough presentation of arguments for the two
main alternatives in a paper presented to Wright at Harvard
(Lawrence T. Geraty, "The Archaeology of Thirteenth-Century Palestine
with a Suggestion as to Its Historical Meaning," Harvard University,
1967). (Typewritten.)


³For further analysis and evaluation of his approach see
pp. 452-70, see also 424-25.

⁴See p. 454.

⁵As in William H. Shea, "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods
given helpful assistance to more conventional exegesis (where archaeology was more significant). What might be referred to as Shea's exploratory investigation of ancient history has enriched our knowledge of the periods of Cyrus and Esther especially as well as illuminating ancient calendary practices and making significant apologetic contributions.

Shea studied under G. Ernest Wright at Harvard and under Mendenhall at the University of Michigan. His comparative parallels and historical exploration are somewhat reminiscent of the approach and contributions of Albright, though his attitude to Scripture is much more conservative. Shea's support for the two-campaign theory concerning Sennacherib further strengthened the position of Horn and Bright, and illustrates the manner in which he repeatedly underlined the historicity of the OT.

Larry G. Herr

Among the articles by Herr there were only two which gave much emphasis to apologetic content though several others contained minor elements. His predominant usage has been contextual—the sites to the south-east of the Dead Sea, Solomonic ruins, a seventh-century Israelite town, the question of child-sacrifice in the ANE, etc. He applied his special knowledge of seals by describing the in Dan 9:25, "AUS 18 (1980):59-63; and idem, "The Qinah Structure of the Book of Lamentations," Biblica 60 (1979):103-07.

1See pp. 456-59. 2See pp. 424-25.
3See pp. 456-57. 4See pp. 459-60.
5See pp. 267-69. 6See pp. 470-77.
daily life of the Hebrews and in documenting the narratives of Jeremiah.\(^1\) It is perhaps too early to characterize Herr's approach very fully, but it seems clear that he has already established a pattern of very cautious apologetic usage.

During the period of his study at Harvard Herr worked with such Albright scholars as G. E. Wright, F. M. Cross, and T. O. Lambdin. His blend of caution and enthusiasm in his writing probably reflects the attitude of these mentors.

**Dennis Pardee**

Pardee has not written extensively in SDA periodicals but those four articles which appeared between 1977 and 1979 indicated his special interest and expertise in linguistic studies.\(^2\) His perspective as an SDA OT scholar teaching at the Oriental Institute would seem to be slightly different from one working at an SDA institution. At least there was no apologetic as such even in the articles which he did write for *Ministry* and *AUS*, and he has perhaps been able to develop his specialized linguistic interest more readily there than would have been possible with the more general demands at an SDA institution oriented toward specific ministerial training. The closest he came to apologetics was his statement concerning Mari and the patriarchs\(^3\) which included a reaction to T. L. Thompson\(^4\) and gave the opinion that patriarchal narratives being theological statements are accepted by faith. At the same time he felt that they could also be justifiably accepted by those

\(^1\)See pp. 472-74.

\(^2\)See pp. 497-505.

\(^3\)See pp. 497-98.

\(^4\)Cf. pp. 31-38.
who wanted evidence on the basis of the demonstrated reliability of
the OT for later periods. Looking at the broader selection of his
non-SDA publications it is apparent that his contribution has been
primarily in the description and analysis of ancient texts (con-
textual), but with some exegetical potential also realized.

Though studying in Chicago where Albright's influence was
considerably less, Pardee's view of the historicity of the patriarchs
appears to parallel that of Albright and his reactions to Thompson
were somewhat similar to those of Bright. ¹

Other Writers

The remaining SDA writers represent a broad spectrum from
those who were well trained but wrote little, to those without
specific archaeological or OT training. Two of the most prolific
of those without professional training for writing on archaeology
may be taken as representatives.

W. L. Emmerson ² wrote carefully and portrayed a broad picture
of the Bible lands in their modern setting giving periodic attention
to items of archaeological and biblical interest. On the other hand
he also made a moderately strong use of apologetic with just over
half of his articles ³ containing some apologetic and many of these
including rather strong statements concerning archaeology "proving"
the Bible true. He warned against careless use of archaeology in
reporting, stated that archaeology can only show that "faith is

¹See p. 501; cf. Bright, History of Israel, 3rd ed.,
pp. 73-77.


³Thirty-nine of a total of seventy-five.
eminently reasonable," but did not comment on the intrinsic limitations of archaeology, or advise on procedure where there are apparent contradictions between the testimony of Scripture and archaeology concerning a certain event or historical fact. Emerson's position here was very reasonable as far as he went, though the strength of his apologetic statements increased in his later writing. As a magazine editor and intelligent traveler in the Middle East, Emerson was well informed on most of the basic issues involving archaeology and was able to present them accurately.

On the other extreme Roy F. Cottrell, with a less adequate background but admirable enthusiasm, attempted to enlighten and substantiate Scripture. Because he lacked training and depth of reading, he made a number of factual errors including some which were repeated from time to time. He quoted from reputable writers like Koldewey, and A. H. Sayce, but at times resorted to others who were far less reliable. Cottrell wrote twenty-five articles with about twenty of them containing significant apologetic. He felt that archaeology had providentially provided discoveries for the "era of skepticism" in order to "confirm the records of Inspiration."\(^4\)

SDA Usage: Main Trends

The Relationship between Education and Apologetic

It is clear that advanced training in archaeology and OT studies has affected the usage of archaeology in SDA publications.


\(^3\)Especially H. Rimmer, cf. p. 356 n. 5.

\(^4\)Cottrell, "Our Grand Old Bible No. 1," p. 8.
To begin with it may be stated that in the first period only a small proportion of the articles written were by those with archaeological training, whereas in the second and third periods trained writers predominated. The result showed improved accuracy and greater breadth of coverage, while reports of discoveries were increasingly up-to-date.

It may be stated that writers with less advanced education tended to use more apologetic than those with advanced qualifications and to frame the apologetic in stronger terminology. One might expect that higher education even in areas unrelated to archaeology might encourage greater caution in the use of apologetic and this is probably generally true though not in the case of Courville.

Decline in Apologetic Usage

The high frequency of apologetic usage did not change dramatically in the period following the year 1937, but a very gradual change may be demonstrated. Comparison of the percentage of articles containing apologetic for the three periods indicates a general reduction in apologetic emphasis which continued throughout the overall period. From 1937-1949 58 percent of the articles contained apologetic (64% if indirect or minor elements are included), while from 1950-1973 the figure had dropped to 47 percent (54%), and from 1974-1980 it had fallen to 34 percent (41%).

It is significant that the apologetic element fell in the second period even though Horn continued to regard such an element

\[1\] If the technical Heshbon reports in AUSS are included, the figure falls further to 44 percent (51%) for 1950-1973, and 24 percent (28%) for 1974-1980 (cf. pp. 431 n. 2, 529 n. 3).
as very important. Almost half of his articles for the period (which he dominated) contained significant apologetic. On the other hand, he himself wrote numerous articles such as those on the seven churches of Asia Minor which had little connection with apologetics. In the third period the decline in apologetic usage was even more marked particularly as the large input in Ministry under the guidance of Geraty emphasized a broad array of interests and information. It would appear that focus on the Heshbon excavations may have contributed to the broadened awareness of archaeology's scope and interest thus placing apologetics in better perspective for writers and also readers.

Analysis of Apologetic by Periodical

An overview of the SDA periodical articles containing significant archaeology from 1937-1980 reveals a total of 638 regular articles, plus 78 specialized reports on Heshbon in AUSS and 71 book reviews. Of the 638 regular articles the heaviest representation was in the RH (24%), ST (162), and Ministry (147). The other two periodicals have almost equal totals (AUSS--43 articles; TT--44), but in fact AUSS which commenced only in 1963 contained a much higher concentration of archaeological interest since it contained the 78 Heshbon reports and many reviews in addition to the 43 general articles.

The two missionary magazines (ST and TT) were the most consistent in using archaeology apologetically, with the ST somewhat lower. Largely because many of Emmerson's articles were non-apologetic.

1 Largely because many of Emmerson's articles were non-apologetic.
was highest in the third period, the actual number of articles which they contained during that period was very small.\footnote{See p. 529.} The high apologetic content in these two periodicals is explainable on the basis that the purpose of the magazines was to stir interest and awaken faith among non-Christians as well as to encourage and instruct practicing Christians. In the RH there was a marked decline in apologetics from 66 percent (77\% with indirect or less obvious elements), to 42 percent (47\%) in period 2, and to 25 percent (29\%) in period 3. As a general church paper the RH endeavored to keep the membership well-informed and therefore its first and second period apologetic emphasis appears to be a direct carry-over from the defensiveness evident before 1937. The same kind of decline in apologetic emphasis is evident in Ministry where the first period contained 63 percent, the second 50 percent (64\%), and the third 32 percent (39\%). However, in this case the number of articles on archaeological topics had climbed dramatically since during the first two periods the average number of articles had been only about 2 per year, whereas in the third period it was almost 11 per year. The reduced apologetic element in Ministry must be largely attributed to Geraty whose approach included apologetic but relegated it to a diminished role. Varied topics still contained ample instruction for ministers to stimulate their study and guide them in the choice of current literature. Similar conservative positions were upheld, but the widening of recommended reading together with the competence of the articles encouraged a balanced
view and an appreciation of alternative viewpoints. In AUSS none of the apologetic elements was very direct and percentages for the two periods during which the journal was printed remained rather low at 12 percent (24%), and 38 percent. In keeping with the nature of the journal, articles took up problematic issues in scholarly style, or made interpretive or contextual suggestions and reconstructions.

Variations in Archaeological Usage

Both Hasel and Andreasen have used an approach which emphasizes contrasts as much as comparisons. These contrasts may be between ANE customs, beliefs, and legal or literary statements, and the somewhat comparable biblical details. The effect of this approach is to underline the distinctiveness of the OT, while observing its harmony with the ANE context. The writers have shown that parallels often fall short and that the distinctiveness which remains may be of even more significance than the parallel. The purpose of articles of this type was essentially contextual but with obvious apologetic ramifications.

Another approach may still be regarded as a form of apologetic but involved a very broad historical or contextual survey. Where tried, as by Shea, this approach has been especially fruitful. It may involve an historical question concerning a whole book such as Esther, or apply to major issues in a book such as illumination of the possible identity of "Darius the Mede" in Daniel. Because of its direct effect upon the explanation of passages of

---

1 See pp. 381, 456, 494-95, 496.
2 See pp. 456-58.
3 See pp. 424-25, 453.
Scripture this approach borders on the one immediately following.

A number of SDA writers have used archaeology to assist in the exegesis of a passage or a difficult verse of Scripture. Some of these applications by such men as Hasel, Horn, and Shea were written as articles\(^1\) while others appeared in the SDA Bible Commentary\(^2\). However, this type of usage constitutes a very small percentage of SDA application of archaeological knowledge. This is one area in which SDA writers could make a much larger contribution. Further undertakings of this nature especially by trained exegetes with a fundamental archaeological knowledge are to be encouraged. This would be in keeping with the appeal of Albright for more concentrated efforts in exegesis.\(^3\) As noted by Kelm\(^4\) evidences from archaeology may be especially helpful for interpreting the OT text since the OT was written within the context of historical and cultural developments stretching over a long period of time. An area in which SDAs could profitably combine exegetical and apologetic work with a contemporary challenge is the patriarchal period. A detailed examination of verses describing the patriarchal life and

---

\(^{1}\)See pp. 220 (Horn), 455 (Shea), 382, 494-95 (Hasel).

\(^{2}\)See pp. 293, 312 (Horn).

\(^{3}\)See p. 17.

\(^{4}\)Role of Archaeology, p. 182; and similarly noted by Hans Walter Wolff ("The Interpretation of the Old Testament--IV: The Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," trans. Keith Crim, Interpretation 15 [1961]:443), "... a method of exposition is to be sought for, that seeks with all available means to understand the text in its historical context, and is concerned to eliminate arbitrary interpretations." Wolff hastened to add that we must also recognize that in a sense Israel was "a stranger in its environment" (ibid., p. 445). Thus the scope of exegetical work must include considerable emphasis upon the historical and cultural enlightenment made possible by archaeology while also bearing in mind the distinctiveness of the Hebrews and of OT religion (cf. p. 551).
travel in Canaan could be very profitably combined with a careful study of the EB IV--MBI and related settlement evidences, as well as with a study of the Thompson-Van Seters arguments.¹

Topical Emphases

Certain archaeological and related topics have reappeared with some regularity in SDA literature between 1937 and 1980. Because of their strong interest in apologetics SDA writers have frequently referred to the Dead Sea Scrolls, the modern discovery of the Hittite civilization, Jericho (mainly featuring Garstang's work before Kenyon's extensive work), and a variety of topics connected with the book of Daniel (Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, Nebuchadnezzar, and Aramaic). Closely allied to this interest has been a featuring of both context and fulfillment of OT and NT prophecies (Babylon, Tyre, the Seven Churches of Revelation, etc.). While some of these topics were approached with originality, other aspects were repeated with little that was fresh. The main parochial emphasis was placed upon the Sabbath as it was stressed that its origin was not (or had not been demonstrated to be) Babylonian. Of wider interest was the repeated reference to the perversity of higher criticism with regular examples of its weaknesses or errors.

In the area of chronology SDAs have probably made their most profound and enduring contribution. Much of the motivation for this endeavor has clear apologetic roots, especially aimed at confirming the accuracy of OT chronology and sometimes specifically at defending

¹See pp. 31-41.
the view of a 4000 year period from Creation to the time of Christ. Vandeman, however, linked SDA interest in chronology with the denomination's historical origins as connected with prophetic time periods.\(^1\) The truth probably combines these factors, but irrespective of the motivation an examination of SDA chronological contributions (mostly quite closely related to archaeology) is impressive. Lynn Wood set the tone with his research on the Twelfth Dynasty of Egypt and even though some qualification of his process of attaining the respective dates was necessary, his conclusion has remained valid.

Thiele's interpretation or reconstruction of the chronology of the Hebrew monarchy was foundational with considerable refinement subsequently contributed by Horn and Shea. Widespread acceptance has followed. Wood and Horn were jointly responsible for illumination of chronological details of the post-exilic period and the Jewish calendar, while a special study of Ptolemy's canon was undertaken by Neuffer (also Horn and Thiele). Detailed work has also been carried out on very short-scale periods such as the early reign of Belshazzar (Hasel), and the first part of the reign of Cyrus (Shea). Horn contributed both material and motivation to the publication of the Assyrian King List which helped substantiate a firm chronology for the first half of the first millennium B.C.

The considerable pre-occupation with chronology may appear to indicate lack of balance,\(^2\) but has probably helped develop a broad


\(^2\)When G. E. Wright was presented with a chronological treatise by an SDA (Shea) for an OT theology class, Wright is reported to have reacted by saying, "Can't you Adventists think of anything except chronology?"
perspective in OT studies for SDAs. It also constitutes an expression
of the denomination's confidence in the essential reliability of OT
details.

The Exodus is another topic in which chronology has been
vitally important for SDAs. In fact the amount of discussion in
SDA literature concerning the dating of the Exodus indicates that
this topic could have been discussed at length in the inter-
relationships between SDAs and the Albright school since the
Albright school also took a definite position on the subject
(though different from the position of most SDAs). There is no
official SDA position, but Horn and Thiele and most of those writing
since about 1950 have defended a mid-fifteenth century date (with
variations of only four or five years between Horn, Thiele and
Shea). Hence the basic SDA trust in the reliability of the
historicity of the OT and its specifically chronological statements
(especially 1 Kgs 6:1) has encouraged SDAs in adherence to the
fifteenth-century dating of the Exodus and in the presentation of
evidences for this view.

1 The Albright school favoring variations of a thirteenth-
century interpretation.

2 Wood apparently favored a sixteenth-century date (cf. p. 96).

3 The most complete definition of Horn's position (with the
Exodus in "about 1445") occurs in the SDA Bible Dictionary (1979),
averages "Exodus" (pp. 348-51) and "Chronology" (pp. 207-23). Shea's
most complete published statement is given in "Exodus, Date of the,"
He has refined the date to 1450 B.C. on the basis of the death of
Thutmose III in March 1450 B.C., and of coregencies between Thutmose
III and Amenhotep II, and (possibly) David and Solomon (see also
pp. 131 n. 6, 106 n. 1, 164 n. 5, 221 n. 1, 461 n. 4). Thiele commonly used the date 1446 B.C. (Biblical Backgrounds, pp. 47-48;
Ancient World, pp. 42-43).
A similar type of emphasis exists with regard to the patriarchal narratives and their chronology. Throughout the period SDA articles appeared defending and describing the personage and context of Abraham and other patriarchs. The tendency has been to follow the short chronology which sees Israel as residing in Egypt for 215 years, but Shea and apparently Emerson have been inclined towards the longer chronology. The difference is a matter of interpretation with a different context explainable for each, but basic historicity is maintained throughout.

Accuracy and Endurance of SDA Views

The number of less-qualified contributors on archaeology has dropped appreciably and the process of qualified checking of articles prior to publication (especially in Ministry) has been improved. Thus the elimination of erroneous opinions, speculations, and sensationalism has been greatly facilitated, and responsible work appears with regularity. It is significant that most references to the search for Noah's ark from throughout the 1937-1980 period consisted of, or contained warnings against abuse of the facts or sensationalism.

Those SDA writers with specific training in archaeology or biblical studies have generally been very careful to maintain accuracy in their usage of archaeological data. Where views have had to be retracted in the light of new evidence (as with Kenyon's new excavations which commenced at Jericho in 1952, and Glueck's

1 With a residence of 430 years in Egypt (cf. pp. 106-07).
reinterpretation of Eziongeber), it was done promptly and frankly by Horn. Scholarly work has appeared in many of the SDA articles in AUSS and non-SDA journals. These encompass the chronological work of Thiele, Horn, and Shea who might be described as on the cutting-edge of advancement in that area especially as it pertains to the Hebrew monarchy. Significant interpretations of inscriptions have also been written by Horn, Shea, and Geraty, in addition to linguistic and exegetical work notably by Pardee. The many excavation reports and general articles on Heshbon as well as those by Horn on Shechem were worthwhile additions to the knowledge of greater Palestine and were well suited to the level of the different periodicals.

It should be borne in mind that the first three substantial contributors to archaeological writing among SDAs (Wood, Thiele, and Horn) were men who came to their archaeological work (at least professionally) only as a kind of second career after having spent years in more general overseas denominational employment. This augurs well for the future of SDA involvement in archaeological projects and writing since most of the younger writers have been able to go into specialized studies at an earlier age.

It is to be hoped that the recent trend towards reduced apologetics, and the slight rise in exegetical work are harbingers of even further responsible extensions of SDA involvement in archaeological work. The establishment of an archaeological institute at Andrews University should further promote these ends.
Fieldwork and Publication

It is rather remarkable that the relatively small SDA denomination has made a disproportionately large contribution to field archaeology when compared with the majority of conservative Protestant denominations. In fact, the number of conservative scholars involved in field archaeology has usually been small. There have been notable exceptions such as Melvin Grove Kyle (Tell Beit Mirsim), James Kelso (Bethel, Gibeah, Jericho), Jerry Vardaman (Machaerus), James A. Callaway (Ai), Joseph P. Free (Tell Dothan), W. L. Reed and W. M. Morton (Dibon), and George L. Kelm (Tel Batash-Timniah), but generally it has been more liberal or secular interests and scholars connected with large universities which have dominated the field. The interest and participation of SDA is therefore rather striking. The roots of this archaeological interest may be best explainable on the dual grounds of a fundamental emphasis upon the importance of Scripture (and therefore upon any aid for comprehending its meaning), and a somewhat defensive outlook originating in small beginnings at a time of phenomenal religious debate.

In recent years the trend in New World archaeology has emphasized cultural change and diversity more than historical reconstruction and reflections of this may be detected in the wider search of the "new archaeology," or multidisciplinary approach in the Middle East. However, in the excavations at Heshbon it would seem that a good balance was maintained between the more direct biblical and historical interests, and those which contribute in a
much more general way to the knowledge of the life-style and environment of the ANE peoples. The wider interest was also maintained through the careful treatment of the post-biblical periods at Heshbon.

The pattern of careful recording and prompt publication of excavation reports was established by Horn during his period of responsibility at Heshbon. Geraty has maintained a similar program and thus enabled the projection of new excavations.

By digging at sites whose early history is completely unknown (as at Tell Jalul) SDAs will be making a very worthwhile contribution to OT context with only very general presuppositions. Thus they may fulfill the ideal of Dever who steadfastly refuses to theorize or predict what he might find in an excavation, simply answering questioners that he will find "whatever is there."¹

SDA Usage: In Conclusion

Before concluding we should clarify the apologetic concept. The term "apologetic" can be applied to a broad range of defensive usage. (1) Sometimes apologetics consist of defense of positions based on poorly defined presuppositions. (2) Apologetics may also defend interpretations of Scripture which have not been established or need further research. (3) At other times they may be directed at answering significant arguments by critics. (4) They may also be directed towards broad historical reconstructions in order to illuminate areas where doubts of historicity have been raised. It is the first two types which have often abused archaeological data.

¹Dever, Archaeology and Biblical Studies, p. 5.
The third type, especially as applied to published materials by notable critics may be very positive, contributing modification, clarification, and at times refutation by means of scholarly research. Likewise in the fourth type of apologetic there is a blending with contextual application which is positive and appropriate. Contextual reconstructions and illumination may serve a general apologetic purpose by showing the reality or historicity of various OT narratives and the setting of the OT literature as a whole.

It is clear that the emphasis upon apologetics in SDA archaeological writing has declined. The decline is largely in the less desirable elements of apologetic. This decline also shows a shift in emphasis which is healthy in several respects: It recognizes that (1) archaeology should not be the basis of faith,\(^1\) (2) when interpretations used in defense of Scripture are demonstrated to be wrong (as at Jericho and Ezion-geber) it may tend to destroy faith, (3) apologetic has often been more sensational than factual, and (4) there are other usages which are extremely fruitful (widened contextual and exegetical applications) which could receive more emphasis.

We can also generally state that care and responsibility, as well as knowledge and authority in usage have increased during the 1937-1980 period. A parallel increase in exegetical and broadened contextual usage is also apparent during the period studied. When viewed within the framework of greatly increased SDA interest in biblical archaeology the significance of these trends is multiplied.

\(^1\)Because archaeology is interpretive in nature apparent contradictions are inevitable, and the Christian can then be left in a quandary. Faith should be in God and Scripture.
The average number of articles per year in the selected periodicals more than doubled during the period,\(^1\) while the number of archaeologically qualified writers climbed from two or three early in the period,\(^2\) to a total of more than a score of writers with specialized training in archaeology or associated fields by 1980.

Archaeology will continue to be of great significance in biblical studies as it prepares the way for, and leads to, better understanding of the biblical text and thereby ultimately to a better modern-day application of the message of the text. In order to attain this result the allied exegetical and contextual usages need to be utilized to full advantage. This does not mean that apologetics should be completely neglected. There is a legitimate place for apologetic usage of archaeology. Archaeology can give a strong witness to the reliability of biblical history and of the reliability of the transmission of the biblical text. However, it is much more theologically sound to base one's faith in the statements of Scripture (internal evidence), in the internal harmony, in the spiritual impact (personal experiential effect), and in the prophetic witness of Scripture than to base faith in Scripture upon evidence from archaeology. Archaeological data, by their nature, require considerable interpretation. Archaeological evidences are usually incomplete. The reconstructions which archaeology makes possible are often biased

\(^1\)See pp. 434-35.

\(^2\)Lynn Wood, Thiele, and Lindsjo, but of these only the first two became productive writers.
and misleading because of the chance factors involved in preservation and recovery.\(^1\)

There are thus two extremes to be avoided if archaeology is to be used in a fruitful and trustworthy manner. It must be used carefully to avoid claiming too much or misrepresenting the facts. The armchair and pulpit archaeologists have sometimes done great harm by sensational extension of possible theories into so-called "facts." Enthusiastic, but at times poorly-informed writers must share responsibility for these abuses since in ignorance they have sometimes spawned such perversions of facts. Because of this, Dever, against his personal preference for the interesting and innovative, has stated that he would rather have cold, clinical, and technical descriptions of archaeological field operations and objects than to trust many of the historians and biblical scholars. The latter might simply "... publish archaeological reports where fact and fancy are so intertangled that the evidence is forever obscured."\(^2\)

But the archaeological data must be interpreted and applied and the contribution of archaeology must not be minimized. As summarized by G. L. Kelm:

The results of archaeological activity literally have revolutionized our understanding of the traditions, customs, and

\(^1\)Factors governing preservation of a site (or object) are numerous, but include the type of destruction or decay, the type of building materials used, the moisture or saline content of the soil, and the proximity of later habitation (hence likelihood of interference, and removal of materials from the site). Recovery of that which lies hidden in a mound will vary according to the method of excavation and its application, and also according to the choices made concerning which portions of the tell to include in the excavation.

events recorded in the Bible. Israel now is more clearly seen within the context of its Near Eastern neighbors. The historicity and reliability of the biblical texts have been substantially corroborated by archaeological finds which have illustrated, explained, informed, supplemented, illuminated, and even corrected misconceptions in broadening our knowledge of the past.¹

We reiterate that archaeological data must be utilized to full advantage but with recognition that many of archaeology's conclusions must be regarded as tentative. It is the broad witness to scriptural historicity which cannot be controverted. Individual issues and interpretations will be controverted from time to time, but a century and a half of discovery and research has shown the essential reliability of the historical, geographic, and cultural details when relevant excavation or discovery has occurred. This is a substantial witness and may be legitimately emphasized. However the primary force of apologetic usage of archaeology should be directed towards the non-Christian and the semi-agnostic whose faith in Scripture is minimal. It can thus provide a confidence in, and interest with regard to Scripture, which may lead to detailed examination of Scripture. The convicting and convincing power of the Spirit will then work through Scripture to produce faith as a spiritual response.²

While it is true that the focus of archaeological testimony to Scripture may rest on the unbeliever, we also recognize that the human faith experience is never static. For this reason the general

²Rom 10:17, cf. Prescott's insightful comments cited on pp. 77-78.
witness of archaeology to the historical reliability of Scripture will continue to serve as a reassurance even for the Christian whose faith in God and Scripture is essentially strong. Yet the deeper understanding of the Word made possible through other applications of archaeological knowledge offers even richer rewards for the Christian. It is therefore with satisfaction that we note a more controlled and restricted use of archaeological apologetics, and a strengthening of exegetical and contextual usage of archaeology by SDAs in the years leading to the present.
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Horn: RH, Nov. 16, 1961, pp. 2-4.

Archaeology, Museums
Horn: Ministry, Jan. 1958, pp. 8-10.

Archaeology, 25 Years

Archko
Lindsjo: Ministry, Jul. 1948, p. 18.

Ark, Noah's
Geraty: Ministry, May 1975, p. 25.
Shea: Ministry, May 1975, pp. 24-25.

Artaxerxes I

Artemis

Ashdod

Ashurbanipal
Allen: ST, Jan. 9, 1940, pp. 6-7, 14.

Asiatic Slaves
Horn: JNES 16 (1957): 207-211.

ASOR, SBL Report

Assyria
Bunch: ST, Oct. 8, 1940, pp. 8-9, 14-15.

Astronomy
Amadon: Ministry, Mar. 1944, pp. 11-14.
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Atlas, Bible
Horn: Ministry, May 1957, p. 38.

Augustus Caesar

Avigad, N. (b.r.)

Avi-Yonah, M. (b.r.)
Horn: AUSS 6 (1968): 204-207.

Baal

Bab edh-Dhra

Babel, Tower of
Horn: RH, Mar. 11, 1954, pp. 4-6.

Babylon
ST, Jan. 9, 1940, pp. 8-10.
Watchman, Nov. 1940, pp. 12, 17-18.
RH, Mar. 11, 1954, pp. 4-6.
RH, Mar. 18, 1954, pp. 5-6.
ST, Jan. 25, 1955, pp. 8-9, 15.


Babylonia
Babylonian Captivity

Babylonian Chronicle

Babylonian Flood Epic
   RH, Mar. 15, 1956, pp. 5-7.

Babylonian King Lists
   Horn: Ministry, Jun. 1957, pp. 4-8.

Babylonian Siege of Jerusalem

Babylonian Vassal King

Babylonian: View of Sun
   Spicer: RH, Oct. 9, 1941, pp. 9, 10.

Background of Bible

Bagatti, B. (b.r.)
   Horn: Bibl Or 30 (1973): 262-263.

Balaam

Balatah
   Gilbert: ST, Nov. 8, 1938, pp. 6-7, 14.
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Bar Kochba

Barth, C.F. (b.r.)
Baruch

Bashan
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Beersheba
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RH, Dec. 12, 1957, pp. 4-6.

Behistun Rock
Bunch: ST, Oct. 1, 1940, pp. 8-9, 11.
Spicer: RH, Aug. 31, 1944, pp. 3-4.

Belshazzar

Belshazzar, Banquet Hall of
Horn: RH, Mar. 18, 1954, pp. 5-6.
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Emmerson: ST, Aug. 12, 1947, pp. 6-7, 11.
Horn: RH, Apr. 8, 1954, pp. 4-5.
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Berenice

Bethel

Beth-haccerem
ST, Apr. 1968, pp. 29-30.
Bethlehem

Beth-shean

Beth-shean, Cemetery

Beth-Shearim

Beth-shemesh
Gilbert: ST, Nov. 8, 1938, pp. 6-7, 14.

Bible Lands

Bible Lands Tour

Bible, Scientific

Bimson, J.J. (b.r.)

Birds

Birs Nimrud
Horn: RH, Mar. 11, 1954, pp. 4-6.

Black Obelisk

Blessings

Bodmer Papyri
Horn: TT, Nov. 1959, pp. 4-7, 15.
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Bonwick, James (b.r.)
Buckwalter: Ministry, Nov. 1957, p. 38.

Books, Archaeological
Ministry, Aug. 1975, pp. 36-37.

Bork (b.r.)
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Borsch, F.H. (b.r.)

Botta
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Bream, H.N.; Heini, R.D.; and Moore, C.A. (b.r.)
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Ackerman: Ministry, Mar. 1945, p. 11.
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British Museum
Horn: Ministry, Jan. 1958, pp. 8-10.
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Horn: TT, May 1956, pp. 7-10.
Brueggemann, W. (b.r.)

Brunet, G. (b.r.)

Byblos

Byblos Spatula Inscription

Caesarea

Calah
Horn: ST, Jan. 11, 1955, pp. 8-9, 14.
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Calendars

Calendar, Jewish
Ministry, Mar. 1944, pp. 11-14.

Camels
Horn: Ministry, May 1953, pp. 38-41.

Campbell, E.F., Jr. (b.r.)

Canaan
Bork: RH, Feb. 27, 1975, pp. 8-10.
RH, Mar. 6, 1975, pp. 11-12.

Canaanites
Canaanite God  

Canaanite Gods  
Horn: JNES 38 (1979): 141-143.

Canaanite Myths and Legends  
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Canal, Red Sea  

Carley, K.W. (b.r.)  

Carmel, Mt.  

Cartledge, S. (b.r.)  

Cedars  

Christ, Jerusalem of His Time  

Christianity, Uniqueness  

Chronology  
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Thiele: Ministry, Aug. 1941, pp. 7-8.
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Chronology (Courville)
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Clerc, G. et al (b.r.)

Clifford, R.J. (b.r.)

Climate
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Codex Sinaiticus
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Conquest

Conquest of Canaan
Emmerson: ST, Jul. 20, 1948, pp. 10-11, 15.

Conservatism

Conservatism Justified?
Allen: TT, Nov. 1964, pp. 6-9, 28.

Contradictions

Copper-mining
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Copper Scrolls

Coregencies

Courville (advert.)
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Courville, D. A. (b.r.)

Courville - see also "Chronology (Courville)."
Covenant
Horn: Bibl Or 23 (1966): 74-75.
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Creation, ANE
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Emmerson: RH, Aug. 20, 1953, pp. 4-5.

Credo
Horn: Bibl Or 23 (1966): 74-75.
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RH, Jul. 23, 1953, pp. 4-6.
Horn: RH, Nov. 27, 1952, pp. 3-4.
Thiele: Ministry, Feb. 1941, pp. 7-8, 44.
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Critics Converted
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Crowfoot, J.W. (b.r.)

Crucifixion
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Crucifixion Date

Cultural Development

Cuneiform Tablet
Horn: RH, Jun. 6, 1957, pp. 4-6.
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Cyprus, Archaeology of

Cyrus

Cyrus Cylinder

Damascus
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Daniel
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Day, time of Beginning
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Ministry, Jan. 1979, pp. 8-11.
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Death, Egyptian Concept
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Death, Life After
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Debir
Rainey: Ministry, Mar. 1979, p. 27.
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Deir Alla, Tell.

Delitzsch, Friedrich
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Documentary Hypothesis
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Dolmen
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Edomites
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Edomite Inscriptions
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ST, Apr. 8, 1954, pp. 4-5.
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Egypt, High Civilization
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Egypt, Plagues
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Egyptian Religion
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Egyptian Vassals
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Elephantine Papyri
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Elijah

Elkab

En-Gedi
Enoch, Book of
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RH, Apr. 17, 1958, pp. 3-5.

Esdraelon, Valley
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RH, Apr. 12, 1956, pp. 6-7, 24-25.
ST, Jul. 1959, pp. 21-22.

Ethnography
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Emerson: Ministry, Apr. 1939, pp. 9-10, 45.
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Exile

Exodus
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RH, Mar. 29, 1956, pp. 5-7.
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Ezra-Nehemiah Dating

Faith
Emmerson: Ministry, Apr. 1939, pp. 9-10, 45.
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Fall of Man
Wood: Ministry, May 1940, pp. 16-18, 46.

Famine

Famine, Effects
Fiery Furnace
Horn: RH, Mar. 18, 1954, pp. 5-6.

Finegan, J. (b.r.)
Horn: Ministry, Sep. 1953, p. 42.

Fisher, L.R. (b.r.)

Flood
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Flood, Babylonian

Flood Epics
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Flood Evidences

Flood Stories
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Flood, Ur
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Flotation

Frank, H.T. (b.r.)
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Haynes: Ministry, Oct. 1951, p. 49.

Freedman, D.N. (b.r.)

Fulco, W.J. (b.r.)
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ST, Jul. 27, 1937, pp. 8-10.

Galilee, Lake of
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Gamper, A. (b.r.)

Garstang, J. (b.r.)

Gath

Gaza

Genealogy
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AUSS 6 (1968): 204-207.

Geography, Palestine

Geology

Geology, Heshbon

Gerasa

Gerizim, Mt.
RH, Apr. 15, 1965, pp. 4-5.

Geshem
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Gilbert: *ST*, Nov. 8, 1938. pp. 6-7, 14.

Gibeah

Gibeon

Gibson, J.C.L. (b.r.)

Gilead

Giveon, R. (b.r.)

Gladstone, William

Glueck, N.

Golgotha
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Gordon, C.H. (b.r.)
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Harrison, R.K. (b.r.)
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Hatshepsut
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Hayes, W.C. (b.r.)
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TT, Nov. 1959, pp. 4-7, 15.
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Hebrew Kings
Parker: AUSS 6 (1968): 129-133.
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Hebron

Helck, W. (b.r.)
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Hengel, M. (b.r.)
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Heshbon, 1968
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Heshbon, 1972
   RH, Mar. 21, 1974, pp. 4-6.
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Heshbon Glass
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Hezekiah

Hezekiah's Tunnel

Hierapolis

High Place
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Hippopotamus

History
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Holtz, A. (b.r.)
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Hormah

Horn, Siegfried H.
Horn, S. H., Retirement
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ST, Dec. 17, 1940, p. 5.
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Isaiah Scroll

Israel

Israel, History
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Israel, Origins

Israeli Culture
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Jesus, Historical
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Jonah

Jordan
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Judicial Plea
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Kingship in Israel
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La Sor, William S. (b.r.)
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Madeba
Horn: ST, Apr. 1957, pp. 21-23.
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Thiele: Ministry, Nov. 1939, p. 39.

Masada
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Menahem

Merneptah Stele
Mesopotamia  

Methodology  
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Pan-Egyptianism
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  ST, Nov. 11, 1952, pp. 8-10, 15.
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