

## **Dr. Robert Vannoy, Old Testament History, Lecture 19**

© 2012, Dr. Robert Vannoy, Ted Hildebrandt

### **Archaeology, Patriarchal Period**

#### Archaeology and Biblical History

We were discussing the role of archaeology in assessing historical statements in the Bible. And I wanted to emphasize two things: one, archaeological evidence is often tentative as far as the interpretation of the evidence is concerned. Actually, that was the second thing. The first thing was the fragmentary character of the results of archaeological findings.

#### Tentative Nature of Interpretation of Archaeological Data

We were in the middle of a conversation about the tentative nature of interpretation of archaeological data, and I had just introduced to you the question of Solomon's copper mine and the area by Ezion-geber and the study of the evidence by Nelson Glueck. He was looking for Solomon's seaport at Ezion-geber, which is mentioned in 1 Kings 9:26. King Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber. Glueck didn't find any evidence for that, but he found evidence of copper smelting. He came upon a building which he concluded was a smelting furnace or a refinery. In the building there were rooms that had two rows of holes in the walls. He concluded that those holes were plumes with which a draft was drawn into the room to smelt the copper ore. The location of the building was such that it received the force of the wind that came down the Arabah valley, from the north. So the building could have just been moved a bit one way or a bit the other way, and it would have had more protection; it wouldn't have received the full force of these winds. So it was concluded that it was put there to gather those winds and then direct them into these plumes for the smelting of copper ore. So he said that this was the first blast furnace in history, in the area of Ezion-geber. On your bibliography on page 11, you have two articles there by Nelson Glueck. The first one is "The Second Campaign at Ezion-geber in 1939." It was published in the *Bulletin of*

*American Society of Oriental Research* (BASOR). Here's what he said in that article: "Ezion-geber was the result of careful planning and was built as a model installation with remarkable architectural and technical skill. In fact, practically the whole town of Ezion-geber, taking into consideration place and time, was a phenomenal industrial site, without anything to compare it with in the entire history of the ancient Orient. Ezion-geber was the Pittsburgh of old Palestine, and at the same time it's the most important seaport." So, he found this building and drew that conclusion, which was then adopted in many of the handbooks on biblical archaeology confirming that Solomon's trading activity centered at Ezion-geber. This is just north of Elat, but the trading undoubtedly went to the east through the Red Sea.

So it was thought that this threw light on 1 Kings 9:26, where it says Solomon made this navy of ships at Ezion-geber. He must have traded in copper, taking copper to the south and east and then bringing it back. Look at chapter 10 of 1 Kings, verse 21: "All King Solomon's goblets were gold, and all the household articles in the Palace of the Forest of Lebanon were pure gold. Nothing was made of silver, because silver was considered of little value in Solomon's days. The king had a fleet of trading ships at sea along with the ships of Hiram. Once every three years it returned, carrying gold, silver and ivory, and apes and baboons. King Solomon was greater in riches and wisdom than all the other kings of the earth." Apparently he was trading the copper for many of these other things.

Well that may still be the case, that it was a copper trade that was involved in Ezion-geber. But what has changed is that book's original interpretation of the use of the building that he later completely modified. In the second article here, "Ezion-geber," written in 1965 and published in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, he says he and others now think now that the holes in the wall of this building are merely the result of decay or the burning of wooden beams. They were put there to set the beam into the wall. He says that that kind of construction has been found in numerous other places. In comparing that to other places that have come to light, the conclusion is quite different. He felt that the copper smelting was done in quite a different manner, in small crucibles heated on

charcoal fires that just produced small buttons of copper. This is a rather primitive method. There was copper that was produced there and he still fills in the dots himself, but nothing like this blast furnace I heard of in his original report.

More recently still, in 1972 a man named Beno Rothenberg (it's the entry at the bottom of page 11) wrote this book, *Timnah: the Valley of the Biblical Copper Mine*. He concludes on the basis of excavations in the same area that mining activity was restricted to the 14<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. Now if you reflect on that for a minute, that means that Solomon wasn't involved in copper trading at all, because 14<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> centuries would be Mosaic era, not the time of Solomon. Rothenberg says there is no evidence whatsoever of any copper mining and smelting activities in the western Arabah later than the 12<sup>th</sup> century B. C., until the renewal of the industry in the Roman period. So from the 12<sup>th</sup> century to the Roman period he said there was no activity in copper smelting. However, look at J. Bimson's article: (that's about the middle of page 11) "King Solomon's Mines? A Reassessment of the Finds in the Arabah"—*Tyndale Bulletin* 1981. Bimson interacts with Rothenberg's material. And in that article that's listed there, he makes a case for his own conclusion, and I'll quote him, he says, "The attribution of mining and smelting activity in Arabah in Solomon's time has been dismissed too readily. In the reassessment of the history of mining in the Arabah, the radiocarbon dates now demand [that] Solomonic activity contends most strongly for a place."

Now, I'm not going to try to settle the question of whether Solomon was engaged in copper smelting or wasn't; it gets to be a very technical discussion. What I'm trying to illustrate here is this question of the tentative nature of the interpretation of archaeological data. We've got Glueck coming on strong and then changing his position and then Rothenberg comes in with a totally different position, Bimson comes in with one that restores the idea that Solomon was there, and there's just a lot of room for debate as to how to understand what the evidence is. That's often the case with archaeological findings. These two things help to provide a perspective: the fragmentary nature of the evidence, number one, so we don't conclude something that's suspect simply because it's not corroborated, and secondly, the tentative nature of the interpretation of the evidence

in many cases. It depends on the case, but in something like a building with holes in the wall, you're making conjectures. And with that kind of evidence you have to be very careful. Archaeological research, like any other human endeavor, is subject to error. Archaeologists can make mistakes.

I don't think Glueck was under pressure. I think that the kind of structure that was there, at least from my understanding of the evidence, was found not to exist in other places and so he thought it was a unique structure initially. It proved not to be so and that was really a key in his whole theory. I don't think it was just pressure from other people. In that instance you know you have to be there particularly with people with a bias against biblical trustworthiness and so forth. That was about the same time that Glueck's second article came out, right about that time in 1965. From what I've read there seems to be general agreement that the building was not a smelting furnace. There is also a section in Egypt and a section in Jordan that comes in there – they all come in there right together and you can be in each of those three countries within a matter of a mile or so probably at the most. I think we should appreciate and utilize the light that archeology throws on Scripture, because it's done much to illuminate the Scripture and help us to understand the cultural background to the Old Testament much better today than we did before the findings of archeological research. There is a lot of value and we should appreciate and utilize that. But we need to keep in mind its incompleteness and the tentative nature of many of its findings and be careful in the way in which we say reading it proves or disproves the Bible.

Archaeological Resources: BAR ...

Let's go on to Roman numeral V. I would highly recommend reading journals on biblical archeology. There are several publications, but I would recommend reading *Biblical Archeology Review*. I don't know if you are familiar with that but the *Bible Review* is published by the same people that publish this. They came out with that *Biblical Archeological Review* and it was quite successful because it is quite an attractive publication it has diagrams, more color pictures, a popular kind of text, and inserts and

subjects not too often addressed. From a very conservative perspective that's the problem, but it's an enormous source of information about what's going on archeologically and in the Near East so I think it is a good thing to read now. I think they had a good thing going so they came out with the *Bible Review*, which is not just archeology – it has to do with discussion of biblical interpretation and history in general, and in theology. The slant is quite liberal but it's done in an attractive, very readable kind of way. *Biblical Archeology Review* is a newer publication as compared to the *Biblical Archeologist*. The *Biblical Archeologist* goes way back and for years was the standard for biblical archeology. It was a more technical publication. Its format was not so attractive: it used to be published without many pictures and in black and white. For the average layperson it was not just something you pick up and read. When the *Biblical Archeology Review* started coming out, it about whipped out the *Biblical Archeologist* until they revamped their style. They've come up with a style that's much more like the *Biblical Archeology Review*, although still not quite as popular and it's still more technical. But those two are certainly worthwhile magazines: the *Biblical Archeologist* and the *Biblical Archeology Review*.

This one had something to keep your eye on. I had this in my brief case because of this article on biblical maps. How reliable they are sort of relates to what we're discussing in a way: it gets back to site identification. You read in the Bible that such and such happened in a certain place and that place has gone out of existence. There are a plethora of tells and mounds. The question is, what mound do you identify as that biblical site? How do you go about doing that? This article points out that there are a lot of tentative conclusions in that area.

As to site identification, we are going to discuss this later when we get to Joshua and particularly with the site of Ai. It's when Joshua went up there with the Achan sin and the Israelites were defeated. Then eventually they took Ai, but the archeologists who have excavated that mound say that it wasn't occupied during the time of Joshua. The whole thing about the occupation is confused and probably is a story about the conquest of Bethel, because Bethel was occupied during that time and Ai wasn't, according to the

archeologists. We'll discuss this in more detail later. I'm inclined to believe that it's a case of mistaken site identification. The place that they are assuming is Ai is not Ai. There have been proposals for alternate sites, and in this article on biblical maps I'm kind of going far afield, again to highlight the tentative nature of archeological findings.

This fellow discusses the site of tell Heshbon. He says Heshbon is mentioned in Numbers and that archeological work there has shown that tell Heshbon poses a dilemma for those who take the biblical account of the conquest essentially at face value. They date the conquest as being in the Late Bronze Age, but the archeology doesn't confirm that. Then he comments that many scholars who have taken seriously the results of literary critical studies of Numbers 21- 30 over the past century were not surprised with the archeological findings of Tell Heshbon. While literary critics haven't always agreed on details, they have unanimously concluded that the narrative portion of Numbers 21-30 belong to a late largely editorial strain. The poem quoted in this section belongs to the Israelite conquest of the late Jordan kingdom. In other words, literary analysis of the passage had already raised doubts regarding its reliability for historical reconstruction. The archeological excavation simply confirmed those doubts. Now you see, you get into the dual problem of literary critical analysis combined with archeological analysis, both being negative in this case. But then his next paragraph is what interests me, because he says it is true that literary analysis requires some degree of subjective judgment. Admittedly it is disconcerting when different literary critics working with the same text reach different conclusions, as often happens. You don't have to read very far into literature to find that.

But then he says, "I'm not at all convinced that analyzing an ancient text with the message of source, form, historical, and traditional criticism is any more or less subjective than excavating a fifteen-foot square on a hill. Both approaches involve carefully worked out procedures designed to ensure objectivity, yet both require judgmental decisions at almost every step of the way." In other words, the point is, when you're doing literary criticism or archeological work, there are subjective judgments at every step and you can't avoid them. He says, "Were it possible for different

archeological teams to re-excavate the same section of a hill again and again over a period of a century, and if the director did not always have the final word in the excavation reports, I suspect that the pattern of general agreement would be about the same as it has been with literary critical research and the Bible in the past century.” In other words, every time you do it you’re going to come up with a different conclusion – it depends on who the director is. It depends on how you make those judgments.

With academic work, that principle is hard to exclude. You come to something looking for something, and because you’re looking for something that organizes the way you look at the thing and what your conclusions are, what the evidence is, and how you fit things together, it’s something you’ll always have to struggle with. You have to struggle with it in your theology and in putting Scripture together. You come looking for proof for this or that or the other thing, and you’ll most likely find it.

## V. Genesis 11:27-Genesis 50

### Genesis 11:27 Division

Let’s go on to the patriarchal period, Genesis 11:27 to Genesis 50. This is a new major section. First, let me just comment on the dividing point at Genesis 11:27, where you have that statement we talked about earlier: “Now these are the generations of,” and “here now these are the generations of Terah,” and that phrase “these are the generations of.” We mentioned the first phrase occurs ten times through the book of Genesis, and it’s a major dividing point. Now it appears to begin this new section. What we’re interested in and what follows is not so much about before it, but about what comes forth out of it. It’s about Abraham. So you come to the narrowing down at this point of biblical history, because prior to Genesis 11:27 we’ve had a history of all mankind. You start with Adam, you move up to the flood and with Noah, you start over again. Out of the three sons of Noah the whole earth was populated, but from this point on we have the history of a particular family that has been chosen by God to be given his revelation and through whom to carry on his work of revelation and redemption. So that universal period here gives way to the particularistic period. It’s the third time, really, that God begins with a

family. He did it with Adam, he did it with Noah, and now out of all the families he selected Abraham.

### Authenticity of the Patriarchal Accounts

I want to discuss the authenticity of the patriarchal accounts. In the early part of this century in critical circles the patriarchs were considered just really legendary personalities, four personifications of tribes, not really individuals, certainly not historical persons. That's the result of Wellhausen's approach and the people who followed him. There's been somewhat of a reversal in that kind of negative attitude. There's more confidence today generally in the historicity of the patriarchal narratives than there was in the early part of this century. Just compare these two statements – I take one from Wellhausen himself where he says, “We attain historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but only to the time when the stories about them arose in the Israelite people. We don't learn anything about the patriarchal time, we learn something about time when Israel was in the exile.” He says this later age is unconsciously projected back in its inner and outward features into antiquity, and is reflected there like a glorified mirage. We learn nothing of historical value about patriarchal times from the patriarchal narratives. Rather, it tells us something about the time in which it was written, not something about the time that it allegedly records.

Contrast that kind of attitude with John Bright, who has written a volume that's probably a standard history of Israel and is used in main line denominational seminaries, *The History of Israel*, third edition. John Bright was a professor of Old Testament at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. You can read this book with a lot of profit; he was a student of William F. Albright. He's not an evangelical scholar but he's much more conservative in his attitudes than German scholars are generally, and certainly much more so than Wellhausen. So when he comes to this question on the patriarchs, on pg. 92 of his third edition, he says, “The evidence so far induced gives us every right to affirm that the patriarchal narratives are firmly based in history. But must we stop there? Must we regard the patriarchs as but the reflection of impersonal clan movements? Not at all.



Although we cannot undertake to reconstruct the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we may confidently believe that they were actual historical individuals.” Now he’s not going to say that the patriarchal accounts are totally reliable historically, but he does come a long way from Wellhausen and say that we can confidently assert they were historical individuals. Now that more positive attitude has been widespread, particularly in this country, even among critical scholars for the last 25 years or so.

#### Minimalist Approach to Patriarchal History: Thompson and Van Seters

But interestingly enough, in quite recent times it’s been challenged again. In other words, there have been those who want to turn the clock back to the old Wellhausen kind of position. On your bibliography there are two volumes whose authors you should at least know the names of. T.L Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives*, published in New York and Berlin 1974. J. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition*, Yale University press 1975. Now those two books were written independently and from somewhat different perspectives, but both of them in essence challenge this more positive attitude toward the historicity of the patriarchs, and they are major books.

Thompson argues that all Bright’s evidence for historicity of the patriarchal narratives is based largely on circumstantial evidence, and it’s not convincing to him. On page 328 of his volume, Thompson says, “Salvation history did not happen. It is a literary form which has its own historical context. The Bible does not mention a historical Abraham.” Those are radical statements. You can read the reviews for books like this. It’s a rather good thing to do; generally there was a rather good response. In the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, which is the standard journal for American scholarly circles and biblical studies, the reviewer who was a Jewish scholar said, “The purpose of the book is to review the central arguments that are held by biblical scholars, in favor of the historicity of the patriarchs in Genesis. In my opinion Thompson’s review is tantamount to a complete refutation to these arguments.” In other words, you might say all Bright and Albright and people like that having more positive things, Thompson comes and attacks the evidence on which that is based. This Jewish scholar says, “It is tantamount

to a refutation of those arguments,” and turns the clock back really to the skepticism of the earlier position. In the standard journal in England, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, which is published in either Oxford or Cambridge, J.A. Emerton says, “He has not proved that the Patriarchs did not exist, but he has shown that the substantial historicity of the traditions about them have been accepted too easily by many scholars. It is possible that Thompson’s work will introduce a new stage in the study of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.” Beware, there is a new challenge. I think the jury is still out on which way things are going to move. Are people going to follow Thompson and van Seters back towards the much more skeptical position? Or are things going to remain more in the line of Bright, or even Albright, with evangelical influence or even a more positive attitude than that? I don’t know, I think it remains to be seen.

There is, just for your own information, a volume of essays written on this issue, written by evangelical scholars. There’s one on your sheet, with Miller and Wiseman as editors, *Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives*. It’s quite recent and there are a lot of good articles in that book, which interact with van Seters and T. L. Thompson. So there is a lot of discussion going on right now. I might just say as an aside on T.L. Thompson, see that book was published in what? 1974. It must have been about 1975, I was in here one evening up in the library and a student came to me and said he had just been talking to somebody in another part of the library who has studied Old Testament in Tubingen, and I thought I would go meet the fellow, so I did. I went and talked with him and we had an interesting conversation. I found out his name was T.L. Thompson, but at that point the book had just been published and I didn’t know who he was, you know. The name didn’t mean anything to me, he had just come in to this area from studying in Germany, and this book was his dissertation. His wife had a position in Temple University and they were living in a trailer park. T.L. Thompson’s name didn’t mean a thing to me until about a year later, maybe not even that much later. Maybe about a month or so later I became aware of his book and then you know later than that there were stories coming out of this book and I realized who he was. He really did write a significant and important book, whether you agree with it or not, but he was using our library for his own research. I

think he and his wife work at the University of North Carolina or somewhere like that. They weren't in this area very long.

### Nuzi, Mari and Other Early Texts and the Patriarchal Period

Well to get back to where I started, there has been a reversal of the section of this attempt to turn back to a more critical stance by Thompson and van Seters. Generally there have been this reversal and that reversal towards a more positive attitude towards the historicity of the patriarchs, which are really due to archeological research, just from thousands of texts that have been discovered that date at approximately the same time as the Patriarchal Narratives, and they have thrown a lot of light on the period. Let me just with respect to those texts sort of review for you the major collections. The major bodies of text are first the Nuzu and Mari texts about the 18th century B.C. Mari is on the Euphrates River, a bit north of Babylon. It was excavated shortly before World War II by the French and the city was a major power of its time in about 1700 B.C. Now the patriarchal period, Abraham's time, was about 2000 B.C. So we're right down from a couple hundred years after that, about the same time as Jacob. So it was a major power of its day before it fell to Hammurabi in a battle. About 20,000 tablets were found in the palace, and among them you have texts that have correspondence between Hammurabi and Zimri Lim and other kings. You also have texts on the techniques of divination. One of their techniques was to examine the livers and entrails of sacrificial animals and depending on the configuration of the animals of the shape of the liver, that kind of thing had a certain meaning or significance. There are a number of mentions of the city of Nahor, which was the home of Rebekah in the Patriarchal Narratives.

So you have that group of texts, and then you have the Cappadocian texts, which are found in the eastern corner of Asia Minor and date from the 19<sup>th</sup> century B.C. They come from colonies of Assyrian merchants, who were carrying on a trade with the people of Asia Minor and who had settlements on the outsides of towns there.

The third group is the Nuzi texts, and they come a bit later in the 15<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

They reflect the customs of the Hurrian population around the area of Nuzi in the East Tigris area in about the 15<sup>th</sup> century. You read in Finegan pages 65, 67 these Nuzi texts, which include discussion of such things as slave adoption laws, marriage contracts, inheritance rights and customs of that sort, which correspond rather closely with similar customs that are reflected in the patriarchal narratives.

Fourth are the Ras Shamrah texts, 15<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, Finegan 171-174. They were discovered in 1929 on the coast of Syria, modern day Lebanon, a place called Ugarit. They are written in a cuneiform script. Cuneiform is a kind of writing that involves pressing a stylus into clay to make markings. They are written in a cuneiform script but it's a Semitic alphabetic language. And the language was unknown before these texts were discovered in 1929, when it was deciphered and found to be a Semitic language rather closely related to Biblical Hebrew. So the study of Ugaritic became a new study, and the linguistic studies of some of these texts have thrown light on certain grammatical features as well as vocabulary problems in Hebrew, because they are related languages.

The fifth group is the Execration texts, which come from Egypt in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. and illustrate how Pharaoh sought to bring magical powers to bear on his enemies. The way in which that was done was by inscribing imprecations or curses on bowls, and then the bowls would be smashed. Sometimes those imprecations were written on clay figurines of bound captives. But in those inscriptions there are a lot of places mentioned up in the land of Canaan that give an idea of the extent of the Egyptian sphere of influence up into the land of Canaan in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.

#### Ebla Texts

And then sixth, the Ebla texts, about the 24<sup>th</sup> century B.C.. If you want to read something about this, I don't have it in the bibliography but K. A. Kitchen has a book *The Bible in its World: The Bible and Archeology Today*. There's a chapter on Ebla, and Ebla of course is something that's rather recent and there's not a whole lot that can be said about it, because very little if anything's been published from the Ebla texts yet. Let me

just tell you a little bit about them. They were found at a place called Tel Mardikh, which is to the north and west of Beirut, present day Syria. The mound that was excavated there was identified as Ebla in 1968. There was a mound that had been there, of course, for centuries and nobody knew exactly what it was. It was identified in 1968 as a place called Ebla and in 1975 seventeen thousand cuneiform tablets were found in a ruin of a palace. It was determined that the palace was destroyed in about 2250 BC. This would be a couple centuries before the patriarchal period. Now some have said that this is the greatest archeological find of the century. There have been a lot of superlative things said about the significance and importance of the Ebla tablets. The tablets reveal an empire that dominated much of the Middle East in that time, about 24<sup>th</sup> century B.C., that was previously unknown. It was a major empire. Among the texts, cities and personal names that are found in the Bible appear on the tablets, including places like Sodom and Gomorrah and names like Eber and Abraham. Not that the Abraham there is the same as the Abraham in the Bible, but the name of the individual Abraham does occur. Besides administrative texts, governmental kinds of things, it is said that there are literary texts including myths of creation and the flood, hymns and treaty texts, and all sorts of material like that. Not all of it's been published, and access to it is very limited. The people who have access are very careful not to get the Syrian government turned against them, as there's too much biblical connection to the Jewish antecedents that's involved in the study of these things so they're not saying much. And it's hard to know when that may change. It may take a long time. The people with access to the texts seem to be downplaying the relation of the texts to the Old Testament, probably for political reasons. But, just by way of conclusion, from this body of materials, there's a lot of material, it has become apparent that patriarchal customs, as described in Genesis, are close to those reflected in the texts of the second millennium B.C. The way people went about them is reflected in the patriarchal narratives. And secondly, and this might even be more important, early Hebrew names fit in a class of names known to have been current in Mesopotamian Palestine in the second Millennium B.C., and particularly the early part of that.

## Patriarchal Names

Now on that note, let me read to you from Bright, his *History of Israel*, page 77 and 78. “The names in the patriarchal narratives fit perfectly in a class known to have been current in both Mesopotamia and Palestine in the second millennia. For example, the names of the patriarchs themselves, Jacob occurs in an 18<sup>th</sup> century text from upper Mesopotamia. The name Abram is known from the Babylonian text from the first dynasty, possibly from the Execration texts. Although the name Issac is not instanced and Joseph not apparently so, both are of a thoroughly characteristic early type. Further, the names Nahor and Terah and the names of the sons of Jacob and Benjamin appear in the Mari texts. The name Zebulun occurs in the Execration text. Gad and Dan are known from Mari. Ishmael and perhaps Levi occur in Mari. Asher and Issachar are found in 18<sup>th</sup> century Egyptian lists.” And then he says, “To this must be added the Ebla texts where, so we are told, numerous personal names from the Bible are found: Eber Abram, Ishmael, Saul, David, Israel, as well as others. Now,” he concludes, “to be sure in none of these cases do we even probably have the mention of biblical patriarchs. But the profusion of such names in contemporary texts shows clearly that upper Mesopotamia and Northern Syria did in fact contain a population akin to Israel’s ancestors in the Middle Bronze Age and centuries before. This both reinforces confidence in the antiquity of the tradition and adds verisimilitude to the Bible’s assertion that Israel’s ancestors had migrated from this general area.” But then a significant statement is, “The names are of an early type. They certainly are not characteristic of later Israelite nomenclature.” In other words, later Israelite nomenclature means that this stuff was written in the Exile.

He says, “None of the names are of patriarchs themselves and very few of the names of those concerned with them ever occur as proper names in Israel again throughout the biblical period.” I mean, you don’t run across Abraham later on in Scripture. So he says, “The patriarchal narratives in this respect are most authentic.” So it’s that kind of thing that Allan MacRae talks about, the direct and the indirect kind of

corroborations. This is indirect, not direct. But in that general kind of way, the patriarchal narratives fit in the time in which they represent themselves to be.

Transcribed by Laura King and Derek Skeen, Ruben Cabrera, Dave Fogg, Ben Watts, Kate Tortland  
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt  
Final edit by Emily MacAdam  
Re-narrated by Ted Hildebrandt