

Dr. Robert Vannoy, Old Testament History, Lecture 21

© 2012, Dr. Robert Vannoy and Ted Hildebrandt

Patriarchal Chronology Continued, Abraham

Review on Chronology of Patriarchal Period

We were looking at the chronology of the patriarchal period in our last session. We had traced down through the data that provides us with the information to establish the chronology and had found that in doing that there are two variables that affect the date of the patriarch period.

The first one was the 1 King 6:1 whether you take 480 years as literal years, or whether you take it as a schematic number in some way, it results in the difference between the early and the late date of the Exodus. The second variable was Exodus 12:40 which speaks of Israel being 430 years in Egypt. But, there's a textual variant there in the Septuagint where it says, "Israel was 430 years in Canaan and in Egypt." So then you get the question of which is the best interpretation. Is it that Israel was 430 years in Egypt, or that Israel was 215 years in Egypt and 215 years in Canaan prior to going to Egypt. That was the point of our discussion in the last hour. You have to divide it at 215 because of the patriarchal age is 130, 60, and 25. The 130 is the age of Jacob before going to Egypt. The 60 is the 60 years of Isaac before Esau and Jacob were born. 25 years is 25 years Abraham was in Canaan, before the birth of Isaac. So it's interesting that it does divide exactly in half the 430 if you add those figures up.

Evidence for the 430 Years, Genesis 15 and Acts 7

Now what we were doing then was looking at evidence for the 430 years, Genesis 15 and Acts 7 and population increase as factors. At the end of the hour we showed in evidence for 215 years and the primary argument there is Galatians 3:17, which says, "the law that came 430 years after the promise, and the promise was to Abraham." Now I've mentioned I think right at the close of the hour, that one way to respond to the argument that this establishes the 215 year sojourn in Egypt and 215 in Canaan, is to say that the promise was reconfirmed to Jacob, just prior to going down into Egypt. I gave you those

references, Genesis 46:3, and 35:9. So that's one way to respond to that.

On Galatians 3:17

But I wanted to mention just one other comment on that, and that was the suggestion of K.A. Kitchen. This is that same book that I mentioned in the last class hour, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, page 53, note 97. That's in your bibliography, the bottom of page 12. Kitchen says there, "Paul in Galatians 3:17, is concerned to establish one single point, that the law came long after God's covenant with Abraham. He therefore makes his point, not by laboriously calculating the actual interval between these events, but simply and incisively by citing the one well-known figure, for 430 years included within that interval." So, what he's saying is when you read Galatians 3:17 where it says, "this I say, the covenant that was confirmed before God in Christ, the law which was 430 years after cannot annul that should make the promise of no effect." He's saying that 430 years was the one well-known block of time that everyone knew about in that larger interval. So that's Kitchen's way of interpreting the appearance of that number. It's not to be concluded that the entire span of time from Abraham to Moses was 430 years.

Now he goes on and he makes another statement in connection that I think is important in connection with his view, because he says, "that Paul made use of the Septuagint interpretation of the 430 years is a gratuitous and unnecessary assumption where the wish of the modern commentary perhaps too often is father to the thought." Kitchen is not saying that Paul is following the Septuagint. He's saying what he's doing is simply citing the one well-known period of time within the larger interval 430 years. That's also a possible explanation. I think he is cautionary by saying that Paul is following the Septuagint, his support, because if Paul was citing the Septuagint, and the Septuagint does say there's only 215 years in Egypt, then what do you do with all these Genesis passages? It mentions 400 years, it seems quite clear.

On Gen. 15:16 and Exod. 6:16-20

Alright, so Galatians 3:17 is of course, the strong text in favor of the 215 year view. The Samaritan Pentateuch, as well as the Septuagint, supports that view. I've already discussed the reading of the Septuagint, which says, "the sojourning of the children of Israel while they sojourned in the land of Egypt and the land of Canaan was 430 years." The other line of argument that supports the 430 years is Genesis 15:16 and Exodus 6:16-20. Now we've already looked at Genesis 15:16, you see Genesis 15:16 says, "in the fourth generation, they shall come here again."--fourth generation. Exodus 6:16-20 says, "These were the names of the sons of Levi according to their records: Gershon, Kohath and Merari. Levi lived 137 years. The sons of Gershon, by clans, were Libni and Shimei. The sons of Kohath were Amram, Izhar, Hebron and Uzziel. Kohath lived 133 years. The sons of Merari were Mahli and Mushi. These were the clans of Levi according to their records. Amram married his father's sister Jochebed, who bore him Aaron and Moses. Amram lived 137 years." Now that's a genealogy. If you trace it out you find the structure is this: you move in verse 16 from Levi down to Kohath, and from Kohath to Amram, and from Amram to Moses. And of course, Levi has Gershon, Kohath and Merari as sons, Gershon has Libni and Shimei as sons and Merari has Mahli and Mushi. Amram has his sons: Moses and Aaron. Those are the other names that are in that sequence in Exodus 6:16-20.

Now the question is do you link Genesis 14 which says four generations, with Exodus 6, there are four generations, Levi, Kohath, Amram and Moses, that would seem to fit with 215 years better than 400 years. A generation is not normally 100 years, but you see, the problem is that there are a number of problems. One of the problems is also in Genesis 15 it doesn't normally say four generations, it says 400 years. So that that *d'or* there or "generation" could well be the way I explained before, a period of about 100 years. So it would be about 400 years.

Now Kitchen also discusses this matter, and he says of the statement in verse 20, that, "Amram took Jochebed, his father's sister in marriage, and she bore him Aaron and

Moses.” He says, “the statement that Jochebed bore to Amram, Aaron and Moses in Exodus 6:20 does not prove immediate descent.” We’re back to that same issue of language that’s used in biblical genealogies. And his view is: “Exodus 6:16-20 is not a full genealogy but only gives the tribe, Levi; the clan, Kohath; and the family group, Amram by Jochebed to which Moses and Aaron belonged.” So that Amram and Jochebed are not be understood as the actual parents. It is the family group of Amram and Jochebed out of which Moses comes. Now if that’s the case, and I think Kitchen is on pretty solid ground when he suggests that, if that’s the case, we don’t know what the names of the immediate parents of Moses were. They are not mentioned in the Exodus narrative, which earlier in the Exodus narrative where Moses is hidden in the bulrushes and so forth, and names aren’t given there.

Now, there’s another factor that I think pretty well confirms that this is a proper understanding, and that is, the Amramites, that is, this group of descendants of Amram are already quite numerous at the time of the Exodus. Look at Numbers 3:27 and 28, “To Kohath belonged the clans of the Amramites, Izharites, Hebronites and Uzzielites; these were the Kohathite clans.” See that’s all the descents of Amram and Jochebed. “The number of all the males a month old or more was 8,600. The Kohathites were responsible for the care of the sanctuary.” 8,600 in the time of the Exodus, so, I think you’re talking more than one generation, you have to be. Although, at the same time, I want to say, there are problems with these census figures, and I want to discuss that whole issue later. But it seems to me that you can’t simply say Genesis 15:16 says four generations, Exodus 6 goes Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, therefore that fits better as four generations, and that fits better with 215 years, and use that as an argument to establish the 215. It’s more complex than that.

Vannoy’s Conclusions: 430 Years

So I think all things considered, we’re better to stick with the Masoretic text with the 430 years. We’re better to understand the Galatians passage, even in the way Kitchen does, by citing the one main figure within the larger span, or as indicating the promise to

Abraham as reconfirmed with Jacob the law was 430 years after that. Question or comments? This is not a simple problem, there are a lot of angles to this.

Well, I think the arguments for the 430 are mainly Genesis 15:13;15:16, Acts 7:6-7 and the population increase. Okay, we were looking under the difficulties with the biblical data. First, I said it is difficult to specify this 1 King 6:1, 480 years thing. Secondly, 430 years, which is what we've just been discussing.

Genesis 14 Argument

Thirdly, which would really be c. under 2. "we don't have any extra-biblical evidence to identify any of the contemporaries of Abraham mentioned in Genesis." Now what comes into view there, and we'll discuss this a bit more later, is chapter 14 in particular, because in 14, you have that coalition of kings that comes and attacks and captures Lot. Abraham pursues them, and there are a number of kings of a number of countries mentioned in Genesis 14. If we knew from extra-biblical evidence that "oh here's so and so" then we could date him from say Mesopotamian records or something, it would help to give a link to the time of Abraham. We don't have anything like that, however.

Now Kitchen says in a general way that Genesis 14 with that coalition of kings fits the political pattern in Mesopotamia for the period 2000 to 1750 B.C., but not before or after. It fits the political patterns in Mesopotamia with the alliances of small city-state kings, for the period 2000 to 1750 B.C., but not before or after. So to that degree we can say Abraham fits approximately 2000 to 1750 B.C. but you can't nail it down. So the point is that the difficulty with the chronology are these two factors plus no extra-biblical evidence really doesn't help us much.

Early/Late Date of the Exodus

3. on your outline. Here are the variables we've already discussed but just by way of review. The variables are two: early/late of the Exodus. You have an early date for the Exodus, that's 1446 B.C., if you take the late date for the Exodus, 1290 B.C. The other

variable is whether you follow the Masoretic text or the Septuagint on the length of Israel in Canaan and Egypt. If you follow the Masoretic text, that means that 1446 is plus 645 years. 430 plus 215 equals 645. So you simply add 645, you get 2091 B.C. for the entrance of Abraham into Canaan. If you follow Septuagint, you get 1876 B.C., that's adding just 430, from 215 in Egypt with 215 in Canaan.

But if you start with the late date of the Exodus, usually about 1290, sometimes it's 1260, or somewhere in that period. If you follow the Masoretic text tradition, plus 645 gives you 1935 B.C. and Septuagint reading gives you 1720 B.C. You see well the range then ultimately becomes from 2091 down to 1720 B.C, depending on the variables you follow. That's why Schultz says at the beginning of his discussion of the chronology of the patriarchs that the thing is not 100% certain, although he favors now the earlier date, which I would favor too. It seems to me the weight of the evidence goes to the early date of the Exodus, I'll discuss that later, and the reasons for it, and for the Masoretic text reading as well. Questions or comments?

D. Abraham

1. Abraham as a Historical Figure

Abraham's Geographical Journey

Let's move ahead then to D. on your outline, which is: "Abraham." We're discussing the patriarchal period, and under Abraham, 1. "Abraham as a historical figure." I'm going to discuss first Abraham as a historical figure, and then pick up and discuss Abraham as our spiritual father. But first, just a look at Abraham as a historical figure, and small a. is: "General outline of his geographical movements." When we go back to Genesis 11:28, you read, "Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity in Ur of the Chaldeans." Then in verse 31 "Terah took Abraham his son and Lot the son of Haran, his son's son, they went from the land of the Chaldeans to go into the land of Canaan. And they came unto Haran and dwelt there." So, he's born in Ur of the Chaldeans, most students of this section of Genesis understand Ur of the Chaldeans to be Ur in southern Mesopotamia, Ur that was excavated by Leon Wooley. You read about

that southern Ur in Finegan. The third dynasty of Ur dates 2070 to 1960 B.C. so you see that's right about the time of Abraham. The third dynasty of Ur was that neo-Sumerian period, which Finegan discussed on page 39 and following. They went from Ur to Haran and you read in Genesis 11:31 that "they came unto Haran and dwelt there." Now Ur is down here, move up the Euphrates past Babylon, past Mari up to Haran way up there in the north. Some now find the reference to Ur of the Chaldeans to refer to a northern Ur north-east of Haran, although there is a debate on this new suggested location.

In Genesis 12:1 the Lord tells Abraham to get out of that country from the kindred of his father's house. You read in 12:4 that Abraham departed out of Haran and then in 12:6, "Abraham passed through the place of the land unto the place of Shechem, under the oak of Moreh and the Canaanites were then in the land." So he moves from there down past Damascus into the area of Shechem, in Genesis 12:6. In Genesis 12:8 it says, "he removed from there unto a mountain in the east of Bethel," See Bethel and Ai are a bit south of Shechem. "Bethel on the west and Ai on the east, and there he built him an altar." Then in verse 9, "he journeyed going toward the Negev," that is further south, and then you read in verse 10, "there was a famine in the land, Abram went down into Egypt and sojourned there." So he goes all the way down into Egypt. Then in Genesis 13:1, Abraham went up out of Egypt, he and his wife and all that he had, Lot with him into the Negev. Verse 3 says, he went from his journeys from the Negev to Bethel, at the place of his beginning, between Bethel and Ai. And then verse 18 says, "Abraham moved his tents and came and dwelt by the oaks of Mamre which is in Hebron and he built there an altar to the LORD." So basically you have his movement from Ur of the Chaldees up to Haran, down to Egypt, back up into Canaan, with a number of sites in Canaan mentioned: Shechem, Ai, Bethel, Hebron, and Mamre. Now that's quite a journey. That would be quite a journey even today with modern transportation. So Abraham was one who traveled a lot.

b. Genesis 14

1. Abraham as Wealthy

Now b. on your sheet, under “Abraham as a historical figure” is Genesis 14. I already made reference to that. It is rather a remarkable chapter. The first thing that we notice about it is that it is unusual because it is the only record of a military activity of the part of the patriarch. Even though Abraham you might think was somewhat of a nomad, he moves from Ur of the Chaldees up to Haran, down to Egypt and back. We shouldn’t view him as a poor person. Someone who was just on his donkey going along the trail, because he was a very rich man. That’s indicated in chapter 13 verse 2 where it says, “Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold.” And down in verse 6, when you get to that dispute between Abraham and Lot, we read, “the land was not able to bear them, that they might dwell together because their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together.” They apparently had many herds and flocks, and he was a very rich man. Probably a wealthy businessman in cattle.

He had numerous servants. You read in chapter 12 verse 5, “Abraham took Sarai his wife, and Lot, his brother’s son, and all their substance that they had gathered and the souls he gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan.” “The souls that they had gotten in Haran,” were undoubtedly servants. Apparently he had numerous servants. You read in Genesis 13:7 that there was strife between the herdsman of Abraham’s cattle and the herdsmen of Lot’s cattle.

So Abraham and Lot had servants, many of them served as shepherds undoubtedly, but those servants could act in a military way if necessary, and that’s what happened when they were attacked by this coalition of kings and Lot is kidnapped. You read in verse 14, chapter 14, “when Abraham had heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own house, 318, and pursued them to Dan.” So you have the number given there of 318 servants, they were apparently trained to fight and they went out to rescue Lot. So you see Abraham from a different perspective than we normally think of him in chapter 14.

2. Genesis 14 – Gives Us the Names of Many Kings

The second thing about Genesis 14 that is quite remarkable and different is that it gives us the names of many kings, and the places they ruled and the names of the places of the number of battles. You begin the chapter with the statement “At this time Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Kedorlaomer king of Elam and Tidal king of Goiim went to war against Bera king of Sodom, Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar). All these latter kings joined forces in the Valley of Siddim (the Salt Sea). For twelve years they had been subject to Kedorlaomer, but in the thirteenth year they rebelled. In the fourteenth year, Kedorlaomer and the kings allied with him went out and defeated the Rephaites in Ashteroth Karnaim, the Zuzites in Ham, the Emites in Shaveh Kiriathaim” and so forth. It’s always been an interest to historians: Who are these people?

There have been a lot of discussion about the first man there, Amraphel king of Shinar and it used to be that many tried to identify him with Hammurabi. There’s some slight resemblance between the name Hammurabi and Amraphel. Shinar seems to be Babylon so it would fit in that respect. But more recent evidence for the dating of Hammurabi makes it, I think, unlikely. Hammurabi is pretty firmly dated now around 1700 B.C. I mean 1728 to 1686 B.C. So I’d say approximately 1700 B.C. The way in which the dating of that has come about, is from those Mari letters, where there was correspondence from Hammurabi and Zimri Lim, the king of Mari. Hammurabi eventually defeated Zimri Lim but there used to be thought that Hammurabi was earlier, but now it’s pretty well fixed that he’s about 1700 B.C.

1700 B.C. would be late for Abraham, unless you’re going to take the late date of the Exodus. E. Spieser’s *Genesis Anchor Bible Commentary*, he discusses Amraphel on page 107 and he says, “linguistically, there’s no way to relate the names Amraphel and Hammurabi.” Spieser says the final “L” in Amraphel would have to be an error for a Y for Hammurabi--the final L and the Y. The initial *aleph* is a mistake for ‘*ayin*, Amraphel has an *aleph*, and Hammaruabi, an equivalent of a ‘*ayin*. *Aleph* and ‘*ayin* don’t sound a

lot different to us, but in some of these languages, they are quite different. So what Spieser is pointing out, is that linguistically, you really can't very well make a case for connecting the two names. But that means we don't know who Amraphel was because there isn't any extra-biblical evidence on who he was. Again, that doesn't mean we should be suspicious about the historical credibility of Genesis 14. I'll get back to that whole business of the fragmentary nature of archeological findings. Genesis 14 is an interesting chapter because it has all those names. Maybe someday, you know like these Ebla finds, maybe somebody will come up with tablets with reference to these people and places that at the present we don't know anything about.

In the Ebla tablets, one of the initial reports was that there was a reference to five cities that are mentioned in Genesis 14, and not just five cities, but they were in precisely the same order that they were mentioned in Genesis 14. That caused, a fellow named David Noel Freedman, who was so struck by that it caused him to propose that the patriarchal period ought to be pushed back to about 2300, way back earlier, to coincide with the Ebla tablets. It's kind of a radical proposal on the basis of five names being mentioned in the same order in the Ebla tablets. Those texts still haven't been published, those five names and the order of them. It was information from a lecture or something, of one of these people who did have the information or access to the tablets gave. It since has been disputed by one of the other people who has access to the tablets that this fellow really had misread some of the symbols and that these cities weren't named in that same order. I forgot which ones were correct, but that whole issue at this point is something that's elusive, because you can't get at the material and it has gotten somewhat political with the Syrian government. But apparently in the Ebla tablets, some of these cities are mentioned—Sodom, for example.

Customs are circumstantial evidence, in the sense that the kinds of ideas that are reflected in the laws of Hammurabi in some instances, but more particularly in the Nuzi documents, with slave adoption, marriage rights, inheritance rights, things like that seem to be very similar to the customs that we find reflected in the patriarchal narratives, but Nuzi is later, about 1400-1500 B.C. It's later, so it's circumstantial evidence, it doesn't

prove a lot. But the fact it's later is not terribly significant, I don't think, because customs like that tend to be traditional things that don't change that much over a period of 200 or 300 or even 500 years.

Kedorlaomer is the other name here that's often talked about, the interesting thing is, we know that name to be really be Elamite, Kedorlaomer king of the Elam because we have found similar names in Elamite texts. Not exactly this one, but Kedor or Chedor, the first part of it, means "servant." And "laomar" is an Elamite goddess "Laomer." So it's really a servant of this goddess, is the meaning of the name, and it fits what is known about early Elamite texts.

318 Servants Discussion

I wasn't planning to discuss the issue of the size, 318 servants that often question that. I tend to think the thing parallels those Amarna letters, which admittedly are sometime later, but those letters from Canaanite city-state kings to the Egyptian Pharaoh about 1400 B.C. You have there in some of the Amarna letters, references to troop contingencies of very small sizes, which would be very similar to this. I think I've read to you earlier, that Gunkel said that it was ridiculous, or something to that affect. You can't believe that a world-conquering army of just 318 men could defeat this coalition of Mesopotamian kings. But I think what you have to do is put it in the context. These were not empires, like say the Egypt empire, the Mesopotamia empire, or later Assyria and Babylon. These were small city-state kings and they probably came on a marauding kind of trip down through Canaan, attacking other small towns and trying to plunder it. 318 men in that kind of a context can be quite a force. But it's still a legitimate question to ask: how does this fit with what we know about military movements of that time? It's not incongruent with what we know, and it's really the people who say it is incongruent, that don't understand the situation of that time, with respect of size of military troops.

C. Abraham and the Philistines – Anachronism?

Now let's go on to C. B. was "Genesis 14." C. is: "Abraham and the Philistines."

The question of Abraham and the Philistines is found in Genesis 21:32 where you read, “Thus they made a covenant at Beersheba but then Abimelech rose up and Phicol the captain of his hosts and returned into the land of the Philistines.” And verse 34 says, “Abraham sojourned in the Philistine’s land many days.” So in the conclusion of chapter 21 you have the dispute between Abimelech and Abraham over the use of a well, you have a reference made to the Philistines.

Here I would say most commentators say you have an anachronism. What’s an anachronism? That is something incongruous in the time in which it is placed in the text, and what is said is this must be written by somebody later, who knew about Philistines when the Philistines were a menace in the land of Canaan. But Philistines didn’t exist in the time of Abraham, so it is anachronistic. Usually the point is made that the Philistines did not arrive in Canaan until about 1200 B.C., which is long after Abraham’s time (ca. 2000 B.C.). Their arrival is usually associated with the attack on Egypt by the sea-peoples that was repulsed. Usually it’s thought that the Philistines came from Crete and came from the Mediterranean and attacked Egypt. Then they settled on the southern coast of the land of Canaan, and became the group of people we know of by the time of David and Saul.

Now the critics say the story was written later, it was taken for granted at a later time, that the Philistines were always there. I’ve brought, I think in the last class hour, or the one before, John Bright’s book *The History of Israel*, the 3rd edition. John Bright says on page 82 of that book, that the reference to the Philistines is an anachronism, and he says “although there were contacts with the Aegean lands throughout this period, the Philistines themselves arrived much later.” Now what can we say about that? It’s on page 12 of the notes, there’s the answer by Joseph Free, *Archeology and Bible History*. In Free’s book page 65-66, he discusses the problem of the Philistines, Joseph Free was a professor at Wheaton college for years. He did a lot of archeological work in Palestine, in fact he personally bought the ground on which tell of Dothan was located. So I think he or his family or foundation or whatever owns the Dothan tell and he excavated there for a long period of time. Wheaton College has a lot of the artifacts from Dothan. But in any

case, he wrote this book, which is a good handbook, on the Bible and archeology. He says on page 65, “Some liberals have held that this reference of Abraham’s having dealings with the Philistines in the year 2000 is a mistake since Philistines came in about the year 1200. Burrows of Yale said ‘we have seen that the Philistine came in to Palestine in the early Iron Age, not far from 1200. It is quite impossible to date Abraham and Isaac as late as this, yet the book of Genesis represents both as having dealings with the Philistines and the king Abimelech.’” Burrows says that this may be explained as a convenient and harmless anachronism and concludes ‘at any rate, and the mistake that we have come upon is undoubtedly a mistake.’” Free’s comment is that “this type of supposed contradiction is often used by liberals to support their statement that the Bible has problems and even direct contradictions in many cases.” But Free says, “there’s actually no contradiction, the whole argument is based on silence. As yet there is inconclusive archeological evidence that’s been unearthed showing that there were Philistines in Palestine in 2000 B.C. It’s entirely possible, however, that they were in Palestine at this early date, and that their numbers were increased by other Philistines from the Aegean by about 1200. This last influx is demonstrated by the archeological discoveries. It is entirely possible that we shall find archeological evidence of earlier Philistines in Canaan. In any event, so many other confirmations of Scripture passages, have been found that it is ill-advised to press an argument from silence when one insists that there could have been no Philistines in Palestine at this time.”

You see, that is an illustration of that very kind of thing that we talked about earlier concluding the biblical statement as suspect, because it is not confirmed by archeological evidence. Whether we will ever uncover archeological evidence of the Philistines in 2000 B.C. in the southern coastal area of Canaan, is an open question. Maybe we will, maybe we won’t. But I think we need not feel that we have to conclude that the biblical material is suspect simply because we do not have that kind of archeological confirmation. Any questions on that?

I might just say that if you go over to Exodus 13:17, and you have the statement there that, “God led them at the time of the Exodus, not through the land of the

Philistines, although that was near, for God said ‘lest the people repent when they see war and return to Egypt.’” The implication of Exodus 13:17 is that Philistines were strong in that coastal area in the time of Exodus. Now if you hold the early date of Exodus which is around 1400 B.C., you’re still prior to the time when there’s evidence for Philistines being in Southern Canaan, which is around 1200 B.C. So it’s not just the problem with Abraham and Isaac, but I think that our response to that should be archeological evidence is fragmentary, it doesn’t really establish the case.

Well apparently in that coastal area where the Philistines were located, they have found the evidence of occupation about 1200, but they haven’t found evidence of occupation earlier than that. That could depend a lot on what kind of an occupation it was, what kind of culture they had and how they lived. There can be a lot of variables, they just haven’t found evidence of earlier Philistine settlements there.

Sometimes you don’t know where to dig. See if you have the long term site that built up these tells then site identification is pretty easy, but if you don’t have a long term site, who knows where they were. They could be anywhere.

Okay, we’ll pick that up tomorrow.

Transcribed by Madeleine Berner
Rough and final edit by Ted Hildebrandt
Re-narrated by Ted Hildebrandt