

Dr. Jeffrey Hudon, Biblical Archaeology, Session 13, Archaeology of Deuteronomy and Joshua

© 2024 Jeffrey Hudon and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Jeffrey Hudon and his teaching on Biblical Archaeology. This is session 13, Archaeology of Deuteronomy and Joshua.

The book of Deuteronomy is a series of three speeches by Moses to the children of Israel on the brink of their crossing into Canaan, the promised land.

I just want to point out the site of Moses' burial, death, death, and burial. And that's Mount Nebo. Mount Nebo is in Jordan.

It's actually just like Mount Carmel, a ridge, a long ridge that drops off into the descent into the Jordan Valley or the rift. There are actually two peaks to Mount Nebo, twin peaks. The peak to the north is the traditional site of the place where God showed Moses the Holy Land.

That was, again, visited by early pilgrims and made into a shrine very early in the fourth century, a Christian shrine, and eventually a monastery was there. And it still remains today as a very important place of pilgrimage for the, for Christians. And of course, it's Moses is also very holy to the Muslim population, as well, of course, Jewish people.

But just a little bit about Mount Nebo. It was the site was purchased by the Franciscans, a Catholic order, and excavated in the 1930s by Sylvester Saller, an American priest and archaeologist. And that was published.

And then several decades, or many decades later, an Italian architect came and rebuilt this memorial and made it much larger, with mixed results and reaction, but preserved a lot of the old Byzantine mosaics and whatnot. This is a view from Nebo, a beautiful view. And, of course, you can see the northern shore of the Dead Sea, the Kerkar, the Kerkar Har Yarden, the valley there, Jericho, and then on a clear day; this is a little hazy here, you can see the hill country and Jerusalem.

When you go to Mount Nebo, and you look from this site, you realize that you can't see everything that Moses saw. And so, there was a supernatural element to God showing Moses the Holy Land. And part of it, you can see, part of it, again, was an act of God to allow Moses to see all of the land that his people would inhabit.

Okay, the book of Joshua is, or I should say should be, just a wonderful, wonderful source for archaeologists because you've got new people moving into a land. And these new people have a different material culture. And they're doing; they're destroying cities and inhabiting these cities after they're destroyed and inhabiting the land and new villages and whatnot.

So, very early in the history of archaeological research, the book of Joshua played a very important role. The results have been, as you can expect, mixed.

There have been some highs and lows as far as finds, what has been found, and what has not been found. This is, again, a breakdown of the book of Joshua, as well as just a rough, simplified route of the conquest account in that book. Now, there were a lot of people in Canaan during this period of history, during the conquest.

And, of course, we know about the Canaanites. We know the Canaanites were in the valleys, both the Jordan Valley and, more prominently, the coastal plain. And, there were also people in the hills, distinct ethnic groups, such as what? The Perizzites, the Jebusites around Jerusalem, the Amorites, the Gergesites, and the Hivites lived, again, in the mountains.

One of the difficult archaeological tasks, which I don't think has been accomplished yet at all, is to identify these people in the archaeological record. There have been attempts to identify the Amorites as an archaeological distinctive material culture. But the others have, I think, the attempts have been pretty much in vain.

The late Bronze Period, the period of the conquest, around, let's say, 1440, or rather 1400, is generally the same type of pottery. You've got local Canaanite ware, Canaanite style pottery, and Cypriot imports or copies, local copies of Cypriot imports. And so, there's no clear differentiation between pottery in these various areas where we think these people were located.

So, can we identify a Jebusite from a Hittite, from an Amorite, from a Gergesite? At present, I think not. But hopefully at some point, we can find evidence of distinctive forms or distinctive ware that are identified with these people. Later on, in the Iron Age, especially Iron II period the later part of the Iron II period, things get very distinctive.

There are many distinctive wares that are identified with, at this point, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Judah, Israel, and so on. Now, the conquest of Canaan is an interesting archaeological question. And there are three basic historical views of how to take the book of Joshua as history.

There are many views on the conquest of Canaan and a lot of views that are variants of these three views. And I wouldn't take the time to show most of those or all of

those, but I do want to show the three main views of how to read the book of Joshua as a historical source. The first one is what's called the unified military conquest.

And scholars that hold to this view, such as John Bright here, his history of Israel, believe the book of Joshua as generally a faithful record of events and recognize the book as historical. Now, who believes this view? You can see a lot of older scholars from previous generations, including Albright, Wright, John Bright, one of Albright's students, and Israeli scholar Yigal Yadin. So, they believe that if you can read Joshua, it is generally basically historical and a progression of campaigns and events where the Israelites came in and, within a generation, if not sooner than that, conquered what the book claims to have done or claims to have happened.

The second view, which was held initially by German scholars, most notably Albright Alt and Martin Noth, and there's Noth's history of Israel, is what we call the peaceful immigration theory. These scholars believe that the book of Joshua is a condensed version of events that happen over a much larger, longer period of time. And this, a couple of generations ago, and some still adhere to this view, has an attractive point of agreeing better with the book of Judges.

If you read Judges 1 and Joshua, it sounds like two different accounts of what actually happened when the Israelites came into the land. And again, I mentioned this before, but Albright Alt was the head of the German Archaeological Institute on Mount of Olives at the Augusta Victoria Hospital. And he would look out his window, probably drinking his coffee in the morning, and he saw the Bedouin coming, bringing their flocks up from the desert and eating the stubble after a harvest after a farmer harvested his grain.

And, of course, when that happened, the sheep and goats would deposit their manure and thus fertilize the field. So, there was kind of a give and take there between the nomadic peoples and the farmers. And he thought for a moment, or probably a lot longer than that, and determined that this is probably what happened in antiquity, is the Israelites came in as nomadic people, and they would interact with the farmers, and that's how they got along.

Of course, there would be eventually problems and conflict, and slowly but surely they became or transitioned themselves from nomadic people to farmers. The Israeli archaeologist Yohanan Aharoni agreed to this view, and initially, Israel Finkelstein as well. He's since gotten more controversial than that.

Now, the final view, which ironically is extremely popular today among most scholarship, liberal scholars, and secular scholarship, looking at this book, is what's called basically the social revolution view. Now, it's an extreme view, and it initially was written as an article by George Mendenhall in *The Biblical Archaeologist*, a scholarly publication called *The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine*. But what he believed,

what he argued, was that the Hebrews were not people coming into the land; rather, they were indigenous.

They were actually Canaanites. So, forget about the oppression. Forget about the Exodus. The Israelites themselves were actually in the land, and they were actually, you could say, Canaanites, or subject to Canaanites.

They actually revolted, creating a peasant revolt against their Canaanite overlords, and took over parts of the land. Now, Mendenhall was followed by another scholar, Norman Gottwald, who just recently passed away. He was very, very old.

He wrote a huge book called *The Tribes of Yahweh*, which was published in 1979 and was dedicated to the people of North Vietnam. He was a Marxist, so he superimposed Marxist ideology into the Book of Joshua and again saw this as a social revolution within Canaan—again, an indigenous revolt that created the Israelite people.

Now, there are a lot of different variants of this theory, but a lot of scholars hold the idea, to the idea, that the Israelites were indigenous. They didn't come from outside of Canaan. They were there the whole time and just simply overthrew the masters, or the elites, and became autonomous, so to speak.

Now, there are obviously many problems with this view and variations of it. One variation of this view I heard a few years ago at a scholarly meeting, and they believed that Egypt, during this time, because we know of the Amarna letters—we'll talk about those again in a few slides—had garrisons in Canaan. They had activities at Jaffa, Aphek, Beit Shean, and other places as well.

This one view suggests that Egyptian soldiers who actually worked at these garrisons retired, kind of like the Roman soldiers who retired during the Roman period and had their own communities. These retired and built their own settlements in the hill country, and so you've got this Egyptian connection, because they're Egyptian soldiers or Canaanite conscripts, to the Egyptian garrisons, basically building their own societies and perhaps taking over towns and cities at the same time. There's a lot of imagination with these scholars but really no biblical basis, and you almost don't know where to begin.

My own advisor, Anson Rainey, liked to say that the idea of a revolting peasant theory, the theory itself, is revolting, not the peasants. But anyway, number one, there's a very serious issue with superimposing or imposing modern-day geopolitical realities onto a biblical text. Secondly, for some strange reason, these displaced Canaanites or whatever they were, these indigenous people, all of a sudden, started building different houses.

All of a sudden, they started making different pottery and different material cultures. And they didn't continue a lot of the Canaanite traditions, but were distinctive in many ways. How do you explain that? Again, the deep-seated biblical traditions of an origin in slavery and origin in Egypt.

And there are many other arguments as well. So, there are a lot of problems, and any person with a high view of scripture simply could not ascribe to this social revolution theory. But again, I say it now and explain it now because it is out there, and it's currently very, very popular, an indigenous origin for these people.

Now, my own advisor, Israeli advisor Anson Rainey, wrote a very good article, both a popular version and a scholarly version, arguing for linguistic evidence as well as pottery evidence showing that the origin of the Israelites was to the east of Jordan, that they came across. They were trans-Jordanian, and that shows again that they were not indigenous but outside of Canaan, and they were newcomers. So, those are the three general views that are out there.

Now, let's look at the archaeological evidence for the conquest. Again, since the very early days of archaeology, in fact, in the late 18th century, Charles Warren, our British military engineer who excavated and studied Jerusalem, did a few soundings at the site of Old Testament Jericho, Tell el-Sultan. And there's no question that this was ancient Jericho because of Elisha's spring and a continuous occupation there around that spring throughout history.

You've got clear indications this was ancient Jericho. And that was followed by another British scholar, actually three British scholars in a row; John Garstang excavated Jericho in the 1930s. And not well published, he published a series of reports in the Liverpool Journal.

But he argued that he found the collapsed walls from Joshua's time. And you can see here an artist's rendition of what was uncovered here. Two walls, an upper wall, and a lower, perhaps semi-revetment wall.

He claimed that he found these walls collapsed and argued that proof of Joshua's conquest had been found. And all was well and good. By the way, he wrote a book, Joshua and Judges, which was an important work back in the 1930s as well.

But 20 years later, younger, another British archaeologist by the name of Kathleen Kenyon, as we've mentioned before, came with new techniques and new ideas to Jericho. She spent several seasons in the 1950s excavating this site. It looks like the surface of the moon here, with so much excavation and digging from so many different expeditions.

But Kenyon dug. One of the places she dug was this large trench here. She was going to determine the history of this site by excavating stratigraphic, very carefully excavating stratigraphically down, and seeing all the different levels. Again, the stratum or the strata and be able to identify and recreate the history of the city.

Well, come to find out, her conclusions basically stated that Jericho, in the late Bronze Age, there was virtually nothing there. There was no city to conquer for Joshua to conquer. There was a major middle Bronze City, say 200 years earlier, but nothing in the late Bronze Period.

There's been a lot of stories. I've heard a lot of stories about Kenyon and her excavations. One thing we mentioned before is she was an agnostic and also very anti-Semitic.

So, she did not have a great desire to prove biblical accounts. That doesn't necessarily mean she tried to disprove them, but she was not really sympathetic to the Bible, nor to the Hebrew or Jewish people. She never finished her excavation reports.

She published the first two volumes, and the final three volumes were published after her death. But even during her excavations, she was visited by Olga Tufnel, another British woman who was an archaeologist working at Lachish.

And Olga Tufnell said, oh my gosh, I'm seeing all this late Bronze pottery. And Kenyon says, my dear Olga, this is not late Bronze. This is middle Bronze. Olga Tufnell was supposedly excavating the same type of pottery at Lachish, but in her excavation, they recognized it as late Bronze pottery.

In other words, pottery from the period of the Exodus. Now, Kenyon did find late Bronze houses, she found late Bronze tombs, but she just simply said there wasn't a city there at the time of Joshua. Very interesting.

Now she found fabulous finds. She found a Neolithic tower and wall and all sorts of early tombs--fabulous finds. Her dispatches were published by the Telegraph and various news outlets in England and the United States and were highly respected, too.

She was very respected by her peers at this time. But she just simply drew a negative as far as finding strong evidence for destruction by Joshua.

Now, what did she do with Garstang's data? Well, Garstang apparently misdated his remains, which were apparently much earlier. So, what do we make of this? Well, number one, everything here, except for the Neolithic tower, was generally mud brick. And Jericho, after Joshua's destruction, was apparently uninhabited.

You remember the curse of Jericho in scripture. And so, the top stratum, the late Bronze city, probably a lot of it was destroyed and just simply disappeared from exposure to the elements and from erosion and whatnot over the centuries. The second issue is the fact that there simply could not have been an empty city here at the time of Joshua, with one of the most powerful springs in the entire Holy Land right at its base, Elisha Spring.

It's unthinkable that people don't live here all the time. And there was a city here, there's no doubt about it. It just hasn't been clearly identified archaeologically.

Another theory, another explanation, I should say, to explain Kenyon's negative view, was that the middle Bronze Age walls, again predating Joshua by about 100, 200 years, were reused and remained in use during the time of Joshua. And the destruction of those actually represents the destruction of the city under the Israelites. So, there are different ways of dealing with Jericho.

It's a fascinating issue. It's currently being excavated by an Italian expedition. Lorenzo Nigro is leading a group there.

He tends to want to work with the earlier periods, focusing on the EB and Early Bronze periods. But Jericho, again, remains kind of an enigma. I don't think it creates a serious problem for archaeology vis-à-vis the Bible because of these points that I've raised and others as well.

Now, other believing Christian archaeologists have tried to change the dating of the pottery or tweak things here and there with varying degrees of success or failure. But I don't think Jericho poses a problem. You'd like to find the beautiful Late Bronze walls collapsed and whatnot to agree with the text.

But I think there's nothing here that would dismiss or discredit the biblical text. It's just non-evidence instead of negative evidence, so to speak. So, again, Jericho creates an ongoing series of questions.

Now, if you look at the house of Rahab, as described in the book of Joshua, Rahab lived on the wall. And now we notice the two walls. There was a revetment wall and then a main wall.

She could have lived between those. Or what could have been described in the book of Joshua is actually a casemate room. Many walls during biblical times, city walls, were actually two parallel rows of walls close together with rooms inside the walls.

And this is a, again, a picture of Khirbet Qeiyafa, an early iron two casemate walls. And these had doorways for access. Now, why did they build this? Well, if there was

a threat if an enemy approached the city and there was a threat, they would fill these rooms up with rubble, making an extra thick wall.

But during times of peace, they would use this space for storage or living quarters or whatever. And so, Rahab's house could have been in a casemate, or it could have been between a revetment and another wall. Here's another casemate wall there on the top of Hazor, dating to the time of Solomon.

We also know, I should point out too that I didn't mention on the last slide, that we know that the conquest of Jericho happened in the spring, because, again, the spies were hidden in the flax harvest. And that happens in the spring. So, we know that the time of year.

Now these were taken, I believe by, these are storage jars with burned grain inside. And these are taken at Jericho, I believe by Garstang's excavation. Now, could have been Kenyans, but they could have been Garstang's as well.

The important thing here is that if an enemy destroyed the city and set it on fire, they would take all the grain and all the items they could use with them. Now we know Jericho was the first fruit. It was dedicated to the Lord.

So, everything was destroyed. This from Jericho suggests that it was from the hand of Joshua and the children of Israel because the grain was burned. It was not taken as war booty or plunder to be eaten by the victors.

So, again, lots of small pieces of evidence seem to align with Scripture, even though Kenyan and some of her disciples say there simply wasn't enough there to call a city at the time of Joshua. Okay, the next city that the Israelites took after some setbacks or setback was the city of Ai. Now, unlike Jericho, which is down in the Jordan Valley, the lowest city and oldest city on earth, Ai was up in the hill country.

And so, they had to climb up into the hill country to get to the next Canaanite city. And we know the account, the Israelites were defeated because of Achan's sin. That was taken care of, and then the Israelites were victorious.

And the king of Ai was, I think, killed and buried in rubble at the gate of the city. Ai presents a more serious problem for archaeology because there simply is no evidence of the Late Bronze Occupation. So, let's unpack this a little bit.

Ai was excavated first by a Jewish lady in the 1930s. It's kind of a sad story. She excavated there and died, unfortunately.

John Garstang, who also excavated Jericho, dug a couple of trenches at Ai. He wrote a report, but the pottery claimed to have found Late Bronze pottery. That pottery was not found.

And then we come to the 1960s. A Kenyan student, a man by the name of Joseph Calloway, he was a Baptist minister and a professor at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, began a large expedition of Baptist archaeologists to the site of Et-Tel, which was identified as a site of Ai. Et-Tel means, again, the mound or ruined mound.

Ai means ruined in Hebrew. So, the Arabic, even though it sounds differently, is the same term. It seems geographically to be east of Bethel and has all the earmarks of being the site of Ai.

So, Calloway excavated Ai from 1964 to 1972. And he did not find any Late Bronze pottery or evidence of occupation. Now, how do you deal with this? Well, there's three, maybe several possibilities.

One, Et-Tel, this site, is not biblical Ai. We got it wrong. There's another site that has Late Bronze evidence or evidence of destruction during that time.

Now, some scholars, and we'll see some slides on this, have located Ai at different sites, Khirbet el-Muqatir, Khirbet Nisya, but those have problems as well, in my opinion. And I think we need to tackle this head-on and say, okay, how do we answer this? Well, the second possibility is the Bible got it wrong. That the biblical writers created a story they saw these massive ruins on this site and created a story to explain why the ruins are there.

And that the biblical account of the conquest of Ai is a myth, a legend, not history. And a lot of people follow that. Albright and others suggested, well, it was actually Bethel that they were talking about, not Ai because Bethel seems to have Late Bronze destruction.

That's another possibility. A possibility that I like was one suggested by several scholars, most notably by Alan Millard in the 1980s. Now, here's a picture of Joel Calloway and him at Ai, and here's a picture of the site, some LB walls, very impressive LB walls, a temple, and defensive walls dating back to the period of the Patriarchs.

Now, Calloway wrote an article at the end of his career that was published in *Biblical Archaeology Review*, entitled, *Was My Excavation at Ai Worthwhile?* And sadly, Calloway took that second answer to the problem. He said, well, the Bible got this wrong. This simply didn't take place, and we just have to look at this story as a story, not as a historical account.

He was a devout Christian, but he took what he believed was science, strong science that showed that there was absolutely no evidence of anything here from the Late Bronze period. It must not have happened. There were just simply no houses, no walls, no nothing he could date.

Now, later on, he did find two strata of an Israelite Iron I village above the Early Bronze remains. And for a time, he thought, well, maybe the early, the first stratum of this early Iron Age village was the Canaanite city, but that didn't work out as well. So, he ended his career kind of on a sad note.

He just wasn't able to come to terms with, you know, the negative evidence. But Alan Millard, as I mentioned before, wrote a very brief account of how he believes in understanding this, this issue, this crux. First of all, I and Ettl, as we know, mean ruin.

So, if you read the account, the Israelites attacked the ruin. It's literally what the Bible says. Moreover, Calloway and the other archaeologists who excavated found that the Early Bronze remains, again, this is maybe 500, 600, or 700 years earlier than the Exodus, were very well preserved and massive.

How much better preserved would they have been 3,000 years earlier? Or more than that, more like 3,400 years earlier. So, he argues, Alan Millard argues, that the site of I was actually a makeshift redoubt, a makeshift citadel or stockade for the surrounding Canaanite populations to retreat to, to defend themselves against this Israelite incursion. And that, to me, nicely, very well answers the question of the problem of I. It was not occupied during the Late Bronze Period, but it was used as a makeshift citadel, fortress, and redoubt for Canaanites, perhaps from Bethel, perhaps from surrounding towns and cities.

And that was their kind of their last stand, their keep or redoubt, I should say, against attack. And, of course, that failed, and the Israelites wiped them out at that site. So now, next year, next season, or in 10 years, the evidence may point a different way.

But I think Alan Millard's, and again, this has been proposed by others as well, offers the best example or best response to the problem of I. Now, the next big city that the Israelites attacked was the city of Hazor. Here, the evidence is clear that there was destruction. In fact, there were two destructions: an earlier destruction and a later destruction.

So, whether you have an early date or a late date exodus, you're, you are covered here apparently at Hazor. Hazor was, again, the first major excavation that the Israelis' archaeological community did themselves. And it was led by the director, Yigal Yadin, Yigal Yadin, again, a former Israeli general in the War of Independence.

And this was all, this was basically the classroom for all of the second generation of Israeli archaeologists. And incredible, amazing discoveries were made. And wherever Yadin dug, there was a lot of press and a lot of coverage by the media because, for whatever reason, he knew where to dig.

And he was, he had a special gift for digging and finding very, very amazing artifacts, discoveries and temples and whatnot. And more than that, Yadin had a wonderful way of presenting his finds to the public, both Israeli and foreign. He spoke fluent English as well as Hebrew and could add a lot of drama to his finds.

And, and, and make him very, very an exciting adventure when he related these both in speeches. And I might add for those of us now in his books. Now a little bit about Hazor.

Hazor was a huge Canaanite city, head of all those kingdoms, as we'll see in a moment here. This is, again, a top plan of the entire site. We've got another picture coming up.

The top upper city there were two cities here, the lower city and the upper city. The upper city was about 20 acres, which was a very large city at the time of the biblical period of the late Bronze Period. However, the lower city has 180 acres.

And that was just unthinkable, the size of how big that was. When Garstang did some excavations there, too, briefly, he thought that this was some sort of chariot park or mustering field. He simply could not understand or believe that it was an urban city, but it was during the late Bronze Period.

Huge, huge. And we'll see here a better picture of the site. Here's the upper city, which kind of looks like a Coke bottle with a kind of bent top, a bent rim, and a lip.

And then the lower city, again, is this huge area here, adjacent to the upper city. So when Yadin and his team began excavating, they excavated both the upper city and did probes in the lower city and found out, no, this isn't a mustering field or a chariot park. This has temples, houses, and walls.

And it was, it was a huge, huge city. So, when, again, when Joshua claims that Hazor was the head chief Canaanite city, head of all those kingdoms, it was, it was, it was a huge, huge city. And so, Joshua and the children of Israel went up there and destroyed Hazor.

Again, there are clearly evidences for that. Here's an orthostat from the Canaanite level at Hazor, a lion here depicted. You can see the palace wall, Canaanite.

So, you've got just this incredible amount of archaeological data, an ash layer between that, those two soil layers, and an orthostat or offering table knocked over. And now, Yadin claimed that that was literally knocked over during the destruction of Israelite destruction. So, Canaan, again, Jericho, again, has kind of a neutral site as far as evidence.

Ai is, is generally negative evidence unless you understand Millard's suggestion. But Hazor is just a rousing positive example of archaeology, again collaborating and confirming the biblical account. But I think when you look at those three cities in retrospect, you can see, again, the issue with archaeology as a whole.

Archaeology has limitations, and it can't prove everything you want to define. It can't show you everything you want to find or prove certain biblical accounts. It does show evidence.

It does, again, give sometimes proof or near proof as it does at Hazor. Other times it doesn't help too much. So that's, again, one of the limitations of the science.

Now, in the 1980s, an Israeli archaeologist we've mentioned before, Adam Zertal, did a survey of the hill country of Ephraim. It's around Samaria. And actually, six volumes of that survey have been published now in English, and a tremendous job by him.

He passed away, unfortunately. But during that survey, he was surveying Mount Ebal and found what he believed was an altar, an early Iron Age altar with lots of pottery and lots of bones from sacrifices, and a ramp going up to the altar.

And so he preliminarily published that and received a lot of criticism from other archaeologists who said that this was not an altar at all. It's a watchtower. And Anson Rainey was, in particular, very, very critical of Zertal's findings.

Zertal, by the way, spoke here at Andrews University many years ago. Most recently, Ralph Hawkins, a graduate of Andrews University, wrote a book on the Mount Ebal structure and argues with Zertal that it is an altar from the time of Joshua, indeed, by inference, Joshua's altar. Again, this is mentioned in Joshua chapter 8. So that theory, I've heard Ralph give talks on this at scholarly conferences and receive some criticism for his views.

But again, there are two schools of thought or two camps. One believes this could be the altar, and others, again, still hold to the fact that this is a watchtower. This is a map of the Southern Campaign against the Canaanite Coalition of Kings.

And again, the day the sun stood still. And some of these cities do have LB destructions. Some do not.

So again, the results there are mixed as well. Now, Joshua also gives a lot of boundary descriptions that are for the different tribes. And Joshua 15, of course, does Judah.

We already talked about the Wilderness District of Judah in a different lecture. And this is, again, very helpful archaeologically for archaeological study to find and excavate some of these cities and see when they existed. And that helps date this list.

And there are different scholars who date this list at different times. I believe it was updated periodically. The list that appears in Joshua in the text now was an updated list from the period of the monarchy, probably after Solomon, maybe during the time of Hezekiah, or perhaps even later.

Here's a picture of Zertal again with Mount Gerizim in the background and the famous picture of the mounts of Ebal and Gerizim and the city of Shechem, now Nablus, in the center. And so, before his death, Joshua appealed to the entire nation. You can see the natural amphitheater there.

Topography makes that an ideal place. He appealed to the entire nation in the last parts of Joshua, the last few lines of Joshua, to stay faithful to the Lord. As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.

While Joshua and the elders were alive, they did. However, after Joshua's death, things fell apart—unfortunately, very rapidly.

Thank you very much.

This is Dr. Jeffrey Hudon and his teaching on Biblical Archaeology. This is session 13, Archaeology of Deuteronomy and Joshua.