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Editorial: History, faith and ethics

Incoming governments characteristically blame their problems on the preceding administration. As incoming editor of Themesios my feelings are the reverse. Readers will doubtless join me in thanking thanks to Rev. Dr David Wenham who has edited the journal so competently for eight years. We are delighted, however, that Dr Wenham’s services to Themesios will not be lost. He joins the ranks of Associate Editors, with particular responsibility for the NT field. We are also pleased to welcome Dr David Lim to the team of International Editors. Dr Lim is Academic Dean at the Asia Theological Seminary, Manila, Philippines.

After such a lengthy period in the hands of a NT scholar, readers may be tempted to see in the decidedly OT flavour of this first issue under new management a reflection of the new editor’s field of interest. They would not be entirely mistaken, but the truth is that on this point at least I can lay most of the responsibility on the last ‘government’ for the excellent contributions I inherited.

John Bimson’s survey of the present state of historical research on the exegesis, cult and the review article on yet another History of Israel focus our thoughts on what for many theological students is one of the most difficult issues that confronts them – the historicity of the biblical narrative. What the articles show clearly is that even in the ranks of evangelical scholarship there is no standard or unambiguous ‘position’, either on the level or nature of history in accounts, while all accept as the word of God, or in the reconstruction of Israel’s history from all the available evidence. Bimson most helpfully clarifies the range of theories on the origins of Israel and in the process critiques the views of evangelical scholars who themselves criticize others. Students would do well to consult fuller developments of his own position referred to in other contributions.

This context in which we Christians value the work of the historians and learn from them even while reserving the right to disagree even radically with their presuppositions or conclusions. Bimson exposes some of the critical weaknesses in Gottwald’s reconstruction of Israel’s origins, for example, and others have rejected his ideological labelling of all the OT material to his own sociological dogma. Nevertheless, one unquestionable service Gottwald has rendered is to demonstrate the link (he would call it a structural-functional-mutual dependency) between Israel’s religious faith, especially as regards the portrayal of Yahweh, and their social, economic and political structures and ideals. To him, Yahweh was cast in a certain form as a ‘feedback servo-mechanism’ in support of their social struggle and thrust to egalitarianism. To us, it was the other way round. Israel’s remarkable economic and political transformation of Canaan, and their inability for justice and the protection of the weak, vulnerable and marginalized, were reflections of the character and demands of the God they worshipped. This was what it meant to ‘walk in the way of the LORD’ (Dt. 10:12-19). To be an Israeli, to worship Yahweh, was to be committed to certain social and personal ethical
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Editorial:
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Incoming governments characteristically blame their problems on the preceding administration. As incoming editor of Thelos my feelings are the reverse. Readers will doubtless judge whether thanks to Dr. David Wenham who has edited the journal so competently for eight years. We are delighted, however, that Dr. Wenham’s services to Thelos will not be lost. He joins the ranks of Associate Editors, with particular responsibility for the NT field. We are also pleased to welcome Dr. David Lim to the team of International Editors. Dr. Lim is Academic Director at the Asia Theological Seminary, Manila, Philippines.

After such a lengthy period in the hands of a NT scholar, readers may be tempted to see in the decidedly OT flavour of this first issue under new management a reflection of the new editor’s field of interest. They would not be entirely mistaken, but the truth is that on this point at least I can lay most of the responsibility on the last ‘government’ for the excellent contributions I inherited.

John Lim’s survey of the present state of historical research on the exegesis, interpretation and the review article on yet another History of Israel focus our thoughts on what for many theologians is one of the most difficult issues that confronts them – the historicity of the biblical narrative. What the authors show clearly is that even in the ranks of evangelical scholarship there is no standard or unimposing ‘position’, either on the level or nature of history in accordance with, or acceptable as, the word of God, or in the reconstruction of Israel’s history from all the available evidence. Bimson most helpfully classifies in chart form the bewildering range of theories on the origins of Israel and in the process critiques the views of evangelical scholars who themselves critique others. Students would do well to consult fuller developments of his own position referred to in the review article.

In this context as Christians we value the work of the historians and learn from them even while reserving the right to disagree even radically with their presuppositions or conclusions. Bimson exposes some of the critical weaknesses in Gottwald’s reconstruction of Israel’s origins, for example, and others have rejected his ideological toldoring of all the OT material to his own sociological dogma. Nevertheless, one unquestionable service Gottwald has rendered is to demonstrate the link (he would call it a structural-functional mutual dependency) between Israel’s religious faith, especially as regards the portrayal of Yahweh, and their social, economic and political structures and ideals. To him, Yahweh was cast in a certain form as a ‘feedback servo-mechanism’ in support of their social struggle and to egaliitarianism. To us, it was the other way round. Israel’s remarkable economic and political transformation of Canaan, and their inexperience for justice and the protection of the weak, vulnerable and marginalized, were reflections of the character and demands of the God they worshipped. This was what it meant to ‘walk in the way of the LORD’ (Dt. 10:12-19). To be an Israelite, to worship Yahweh, was to be committed to certain social and personal ethical
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Introduction

‘There have been only two important views of the conquest of Palestine by ancient Israel,’ wrote N.G. L. Mendenhall in 1962, in an article in which he offered a third. Since then hypotheses have proliferated, and the question of Israel’s origins has become a vastly complex one. The purpose of this article is twofold: to provide some account of the development and current standing of the main theories on offer, and to assess their relative merits. There are, of course, more theories than can be accommodated even in this overlengthy article, and many of the omitted ones are variants of those included, so that many of my comments will be applicable beyond the scope of this discussion.

The theories discussed here fall into two main groups: those which assume that Israel entered the land of Canaan from outside, and those (now the majority) which assume that Israel was to a great extent indigenous to Canaan. Those in the latter category might be expected to give a brief account of each before offering an assessment of it.

1. Hypotheses in which Israel enters Canaan from outside

1a. A 13th-century conquest

We begin with the view which adheres most closely to the biblical traditions: that the Israelite tribes entered Canaan by force, acting more or less in concert. There are, of course, a number of variants on this view in terms of the date of Israel’s entry into the land. The most noteworthy alternative to the predominant view is that Canaan was conquered by the Hittites, who advanced into the 15th century BC as implied by a straightforward reading of 1 Kings 6:1. Although this continues to be favored by a number of American evangelical scholars, and by the present writer, it has not been influential in recent decades and will not be treated in detail here. We will see below, however, that it deserves renewed attention.

The major arguments of those scholars who wish to retain the biblical picture of a more or less unified and violent conquest have long favored the theory that this event occurred in the 13th century BC. Its classic form took shape at the hands of the so-called Baltimore School, consisting primarily of W.F. Albright and his pupils J. Bright and G.E. Wright. Albright’s own excavations in the 1920s and 1930s at Bethin and Tel Beth Mirsim (which he believed to be the sites of biblical Bethel and Debir respectively) unearthed destruction levels which he associated with the traditions of the conquest. A date at the end of the LBA (Late Bronze Age), in the second half of the 13th century BC, seemed to be indicated by the pottery evidence. The excavations of Flinders.petri ell-Duweir, under the direction of J. L. Starkey, also produced a destruction layer, which Albright dated c. 1220 BC. It seems that one of the major features of the Baltimore excavations, preferred a date in the 12th century BC.

Yadin’s excavations at Hazor (1955-6) also produced evidence of a violent destruction in this case clearly datable to c. 1220 BC, thus adding a fourth major city to the list. Hence Bright was able to write in his History of Israel: ‘It may be regarded as certain that a violent irruption into the land took place late in the thirteenth century BC.’

These destruction levels were merely part of an impressive web of evidence which seemed to point to a 13th-century setting for the exodus and conquest. With the conquest set at around 1220 BC, the Exodus would have occurred (according to Nu. 14:33, etc.) forty years earlier, around 1260 BC. This places it in the reign of the pharaoh Ramesses II, in keeping with the reference in Exodus 1:11 to the enslaved Israelites building the store-cities Pithom and Raamses. Excavations at the likely site of Raamses revealed no evidence of occupation during Egypt’s Eighteenth Dynasty, effectively excluding a date before the 13th century BC for the Exodus. N. Glueck’s surface-surveys of Transjordan, undertaken chiefly in the 1930s, led to the conclusion that the region lacked any settled population between the 19th and 17th centuries BC, a conclusion that ruled out a date before the 13th century for the events of Numbers 20:14-21 and 21:21-24.

This 13th-century scenario has been adopted by several evangelical scholars. Among British evangelicals K. A. Kitchen has long been its foremost exponent. Some American evangelicals have also adopted it, though others have balked at the non-literal interpretation of 1 Kings 6:1 (discussed below) and have continued to argue for a 15th-century date.

2. Problems and methodology

The 13th-century hypothesis has never been without its problems. First of all, there are the troublesome texts of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon.

Since Kathryn Kenyon’s excavations at Jericho (1952-61) it has been widely accepted that no traces of the city attacked by Joshua and Israel are to be found in these. Kenyon’s own view was that, following the destruction of MBA (Middle Bronze Age) Jericho, around 1560 BC, the mound was deserted until a LBA town began to grow around 1400 BC. This occupation lasted only about a century, and was followed by another long period of abandonment. No evidence was found which could support the existence of a town in the second half of the 13th century BC, but in the early part of the 12th century BC (Tell es-Sultan or Tell-e-Tell, or simply Et-Tell) is another parade example of the failure of excavations to support the biblical tradition. Here the gap in occupation lasts at least a thousand years, c. 2200-1200 BC. Once again there is no city for Joshua’s forces to attack in the late 13th century. This problem was already known after the excavations of P. J. de Vaux in 1933-5, and it was hoped that the renewed excavations of 1964-72, led by J. A. Callaway, would produce some kind of solution, either by uncovering hitherto neglected evidence from the self, or by finding an alternative site for the biblical city near. These hopes came to nothing: the gap at Et-Tell was confirmed and the search for an alternative site proved fruitless. Perhaps the Prichard excavations (1956-62) at El-Jib, the site of Gibeon, provided no LBA material except some burials from the 14th century BC, leading Prichard to the conclusion that Gibeon was a small settlement during LBA II.

As early as 1965 Prichard remarked that the problems encountered at Jericho, Ai and Gibeon (ironically, the three cities whose name occur in the list of conquests) suggest that ‘we have reached an impasse on the question of supporting the traditional view of the conquest with archaeological underpinning.’

Supporters of the 13th-century conquest have not accepted this view generally, in the account of the positive evidence and offering explanations for the negative finds from Jericho, Ai and Gibeon. For example, Bright has stressed that extensive erosion makes the situation at Jericho unclear; and Wright and Yadin, following the same line, have explained the lack of LBA fortifications there in terms of the re-use of the MBA walls. In any case there was no evidence to support this theory.

Albright explained the problem of Ai by suggesting that the narrative in Joshua 8 originally referred to the taking of Ai by the Philistines in about 1260 BC, a suggestion that, in addition to the fact that in both cases the Israelites take a Canaanite city, also argues that the 13th century BC is too late for Ai.

He assumed there had been a very small settlement at Gibeon at the time of Joshua, thus explaining the virtual absence of LBA material there, and suggested that Joshua 10:27 (which speaks of Gibeon as a major city in that period) is an erronously.

There are patent weaknesses in such explanations, especially in the latter two, where the biblical tradition has to be adapted to some extent before the archaeological evidence can be said to support it (and in the case of Gibeon there is to be seen evidence for a very small settlement that has been missed). Critics now regularly levelled at the methodology of the Baltimore School, that it involves inconsistencies, circular arguments and overinterpretations of the evidence, more than not.

Those evangelical scholars who have adopted the Baltimore School’s scenario have tried to be more rigorously scientific in their defence of its weak points. Kitchen has emphasised the importance of excavated reports evoking the destruction of cities during periods of abandonment, or simply missed by the excavator when (as is usually the case) limited areas of a mound are explored. He illustrates these points with examples from the archaeology of Egypt, in which excavation has failed to produce remains from sites which are known, on the basis of textual evidence, to have been occupied at the relevant time, and that is of course a third point that 13th-century BC Jericho has been entirely eroded away, that the LBA burials at Gibeon may indicate an occupation which has been missed by the excavator, and that the site of LBA Ai still awaits discovery.

Indeed, Kitchen has repeatedly stressed that ‘absence of evidence is not evidence of absence’, i.e. that lack of excavation cannot be assumed simply because no trace of it is found. Is this approach firmer ground than that of the Baltimore School?

Kitchen is certainly right to caution against arguments from silence. However, we must ask how profound the silence is allowed to become before some notice has to be taken of it. To the old chestnuts of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon, we must also add Hebron, Arad and Zephath/Hebron, where the gaps are equally problematical. Has the evidence been eroded or missed in every one of these six cases? Perhaps it has, but as the argument is extended to every one of the relevant cites, such a conclusion seems unlikely. It has also been noted that Kitchen does not consistently apply his own dictum. He has used the lack of appropriately dated evidence for activity at Tel-moab city in Transjordan, to argue against the dating of the excursion before the 13th century BC. This line of argument has proved distinctly unworkable, for, as Kitchen points out, the excavations and excavations have overturned Glueck’s theory of a gap in occupation; and it may yet prove erroneous in the case of Ramesses too.

That, however, is not my main point. The main point is that ‘absence of evidence’ has not been allowed any significance in the cases of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon, but has been treated as ‘evidence of absence’ in the other cases mentioned.

This raises serious methodological issues, especially when placed alongside Kitchen’s treatment of 1 Kings 6:1. He correctly stresses that this verse is not in accord with ‘Ancient Oriental principles’, but this does not ultimately help his suggestion that the figure of 480 years in that verse results from a totalising of several smaller figures. As I have pointed out elsewhere, an alleged Egyptian parallel to which Kitchen appeals does not actually illustrate the process he is claiming for the Israelite scribes, but is in fact an example that the figure results from totalising lesser periods. Furthermore, the 15th-century date produced by this verse is supported by the parallel in 1 Kings 7:10, and no attempt was made to link this date with the latter date in the same way is completely unconvincing. What has happened is that Kitchen and others have found a solution for a biblical problem, and that problem has been the result for the evidence for a 13th-century date (which has been missed). Criticisms recently levelled at the
The origins of Israel in Canaan: an examination of recent theories

John J. Bimson

Dr Bimson teaches Old Testament at Trinity College, Bristol.

Introduction

'There have been only two important views of the conquest of Palestine by ancient Israel,' wrote A. E. Mendelsohn in 1962, 'in an article in which he offered a third.' Since then hypotheses have proliferated, and the question of Israel's origins has become a vastly complex one. The purpose of this article is twofold: to provide some account of the development and current standing of the main theories on offer, and to assess their relative merits. There are, of course, more theories than can be surveyed here. A number of the more significant omissions ones are variants of those included, so that many of my comments will be applicable beyond the scope of this discussion.

The theories discussed here fall into two main groups: those which assume that Israel entered the land of Canaan from outside, and those (now the majority) which assume that Israel was to a great extent indigenous to Canaan. Those in the latter category may be further subdivided into those which include a brief account of each before offering an assessment of it.

1. Hypotheses in which Israel enters Canaan from outside

a. A 13th-century conquest

We begin with the view which adheres most closely to the biblical traditions: that the Israelite tribes entered Canaan by force, acting more or less in concert. There are, of course, a number of variants on this view in terms of the date of Israel's entry into the land. The most noteworthy alternative to the near contemporary view is that put forward by M. S. Gordon in 1958, in which he proposed a date in the 15th century BC, as implied by a straightforward reading of 1 Kings 6:1. Although this continues to be favored by a number of American evangelical scholars, and by the present writer, it has not been influential in recent decades and will not be treated in detail here. We will see below, however, that it deserves renewed attention.

The major objection those scholars who wish to retain the biblical picture of a more or less unified and violent conquest have long focused the theory that this event occurred in the 13th century BC. Its classic form took shape at the hands of the so-called Baltimore School, consisting primarily of W. F. Albright and his pupils J. B. Bright and G. E. Wright. Albright's excavations in the 1920s and 1930s at Beiran and Tell Beit Mirsim (which he believed to be the sites of biblical Bethel and Deir respectively) unearthed destruction levels which he associated with the traditions of the conquest. A date at the end of the LBA (Late Bronze Age), in the second half of the 13th century BC, seemed to be indicated by the pottery evidence from the British excavations of Lachish (Tell ed-Duweir), under the direction of J. L. Starkey, also a destruction layer, which Albright dated c. 1200 BC. Other excavators, however, found that the excavators, preferred a date in the 12th century BC. Yadin's excavations at Hazor (1955-58) also produced evidence of a violent destruction in this case clearly datable to c. 1220 BC, thus adding a fourth major city to the list. Hence Bright was able to write in his 'History of Israel': "It may be regarded as certain that a violent irruption into the land took place late in the thirteenth century." These destruction levels were merely part of an impressive web of evidence which seemed to point to a 13th-century setting for the exodus and conquest. With the conquest set at around 1200 BC, the exodus would have occurred (according to Nu. 14:33, etc.) forty years earlier, around 1260 BC. This places it in the reign of the pharaoh Rameses II, in keeping with the reference in Exodus 1:11 to the enslaved Israelites building the store-cities Pithom and Raamses. Excavations at the likely site of Raamses revealed no evidence of occupation during Egypt's Eighteenth Dynasty, effectively excluding a date before the 13th century BC for the exodus. N. Glueck's surface-surveys of Transjordan, undertaken chiefly in the 1930s, led to the conclusion that the region lacked any settled occupation between the 19th and 18th centuries, a conclusion confirmed by the discoveries at Tell el-Qeiyafa, ruled out a date before the 13th century for the events of Numbers 20:14-21 and 21:1-24.

This 13th-century scenario has been adopted by several evangelical scholars. Among British evangelicals K. A. Kitchen has long been its foremost exponent. Some American evangelicals have also adopted it, though others have balked at a non-literal treatment of 1 Kings 6:1 (discussed below) and have continued to argue for a 15th-century date.

2. Methods and methodology

The 13th-century date has been without its problems. To set against Deir, Bethel, Lachish and Hazor, with their clear evidence of destruction, there are the troublesome sites of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon.

Since Kathleen Kenyon's excavations at Jericho (1952-61) it has been widely accepted that no traces of the city attacked by Joshua in the 13th century BC are present. Kenyon's own view was that, following the destruction of MBA (Middle Bronze Age) Jericho, around 1560 BC, the mound was deserted until a LBA town began to grow around 1400 BC. This occupation lasted only about a century, and was followed by another long period of abandonment. No evidence was found which could support the existence of a town in the second half of the 13th century BC. After the evacuation at Et-Tell, or simply Et-Tell) is another parade example of the failure of excavations to support the biblical tradition. Here the gap in occupation lasts at least a thousand years, c. 2200-1200 BC. Once again there is no city for Joshua's forces to attack in the late 13th century. This problem was already known after the excavations of R. M. A. Marquet-Kessous in 1933-35, who was able to argue that the renewed excavations of 1964-72, led by J. A. Callaway, would produce some kind of solution, either by uncovering hitherto neglected evidence from the site itself, or by finding an alternative site for the biblical city nearby. These hopes came to nothing; the gap at Et-Tell was confirmed and the search for an alternative site proved fruitless. As a result, T. Pritchard's excavations (1956-62) at el-Jib, the site of Gibeon, produced no LBA material except some burials from the 14th century BC, leading Pritchard to the conclusion that the city must have been destroyed by the Philistines. As early as 1965 Pritchard remarked that the problems encountered at Jericho, Ai and Gibeon (ironically, the three cities Joshua was supposed to have occupied) suggest that "we have reached an impasse on the question of supporting the traditional view of the conquest with archaeological undergirding." Supporter of the 13th-century conquest have not accepted this conclusion to the account of the destructive evidence and offering explanations for the negative finds from Jericho, Ai and Gibeon. For example, Bright has stressed that extensive erosion makes the situation at Jericho uncertain; Wright and Yadin, following the same line, have explained the lack of LBA fortifications there in terms of the re-use of the MBA wall. If there was no evidence to support this theory, Albright explained the problem of Ai by suggesting that the narrative in Joshua 8 originally referred to the taking of the city of Ai before the other cities (though the Aqhe's capture in Judg. 1, beyond the fact that in both cases the Israelites take a Canaanite city). He assumed there had been a very small settlement at Gibeon at the time of Joshua, thus explaining the virtual absence of LBA material there, and suggested that Joshua 10:27 (which speaks of Gibeon as a major city in that period) is an error.

There are patent weaknesses in such explanations, especially in the latter two, where the biblical tradition has to be adapted to some extent before the archaeological evidence can be said to support it (and in the case of Gibeon there is to be a 2200-1200 BC city which has been missed). Criticisms recently levelled at the methodology of the Baltimore School, that it involves inconsistencies, circular arguments and overinterpretations of the evidence has caused no more than a minor stir.

Those evangelical scholars who have adopted the Baltimore School's scenario have tried to be more rigorously scientific in their defence of its weak points. Kitchen has emphasized that cities have been overlooked during periods of abandonment, or simply missed by the excavator when (as is usually the case) limited areas of a mound are explored. He illustrates these points with examples from the archaeology of Egypt, in which excavation has failed to produce remains from sites which are known, on the basis of textual evidence, to have been occupied at the relevant time. In the case of Jericho Ai and Gibeon, it has been entirely eroded away, that the LBA burials at Gibeon may indicate an occupation which has been missed by the excavator, and that the site of LBA Ai still awaits discovery. Indeed, Kitchen has repeatedly stressed that 'absence of evidence is not evidence of absence', i.e. that lack of confirmation cannot be assumed simply because no trace of it is found. Is this approach on firmer ground than that of the Baltimore School?

Kitchen is certainly right to caution against arguments from silence. However, we must ask how profound the silence is allowed to become before some notice has to be taken of it. To the old chestnuts of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon, we must also add Hebron, Arad and Zephath/Hebron, where the gaps are equally problematic. Has the evidence been eroded or missed in every one of these six cases? Perhaps it has, but as the argument is extended it is increasingly difficult to maintain. It has also been noted that Kitchen does not consistently apply his own dictum. He has used the lack of appropriately-dated evidence for activity at Tell el-Far'ah (Transjordan) in order to argue against dating the exodus before the 13th century BC. This line of argument has proved distinctly unworkable for both Kitchen and his opponents, where recent surveys and excavations have overturned Glueck's theory of a gap in occupation; and it may yet prove erroneous in the case of Ramesses as well. That, however, is not my main point. Rather the point is that 'absence of evidence' has not been allowed any significance in the cases of Jericho, Ai and Gibeon, but has been treated as 'evidence of absence' in the other cases mentioned.

This raises serious methodological issues, especially when placed alongside Kitchen's treatment of 1 Kings 6:1. He correctly stressed that the statement of architecture in agreement with 'Ancient Oriental principles', but this does not ultimately help his suggestion that the figure of 480 years in that verse results from a totalling of several periods. As I have pointed out elsewhere, an alleged Egyptian parallel to which Kitchen appeals does not actually illustrate the process which is involved here, and does not even hint that the figures from resulting from longer periods. Furthermore, the 15th-century date produced by this verse is supported by 1 Kings 6:1, and 1 Kings 6:1 is itself consistent with this date by treating the latter figure in the same way is completely unconvincing. What has happened is that Kitchen and others have found a clearer evidential foundation for a 15th-century date than the 13th-century position could offer. It is, however, not so compelling that they have sought to re-interpret 1 Kings 6:1 and Judges 11:26 in the light of it. But at
the same time they have employed the archaeological evidence inconsistently in support of the 13th-century date. In other words, the standard evangelical argument for the 13th-century date has had a great deal of circularity to the methodology of the Baltimore School.

To be fair, however, it must be mentioned that Kitchen has offered other evidence in favour of the 13th-century date, thereby negating the claim that all the evidence for the 13th century is conjectural. 

Further difficulties raised by recent archaeology.

Three recent developments now make any defence of a 13th-century date extremely difficult. One concerns the nature of the early Jewish settlements which sprang up after the collapse of the LBA cities. Supporters of the 13th-century conquest have interpreted these as the work of the newly-arrived Israelites, but it is now acknowledged that their remains are not the work of Israelites, but of Philistines, a people with a much longer history in the region. This is significant because it suggests that the Israelites did not play a major role in the development of the region in this period. 

Secondly, in contrast to the biblical tradition, the archaeological evidence for the 13th-century Israelite conquest is not complete. The biblical tradition contains many references to the conquest, but the archaeological evidence is not as clear-cut. This makes it difficult to determine the extent of the Israelite conquest. 

Finally, the archaeological evidence suggests that the Israelites did not completely displace the Canaanites. The archaeological evidence shows that there was a mixture of Canaanite and Israelite culture in the region during the 13th century. This makes it difficult to determine the extent of the Israelite conquest. 

In conclusion, the archaeological evidence suggests that the conquest of Canaan in the 13th century was not as clear-cut as the biblical tradition suggests. The archaeological evidence suggests that there was a mixture of Canaanite and Israelite culture in the region during the 13th century. This makes it difficult to determine the extent of the Israelite conquest. 

However, it is not possible to completely dismiss the biblical tradition. The biblical tradition provides a valuable source of information about the Israelite conquest, and it is important to continue studying the biblical text and the archaeological evidence to determine the extent of the Israelite conquest.
the same time they have employed the archaeological evidence inconsistently in support of the 13th-century date. In other words, the standard evangelical argument for the 13th-century date has been based more on the method of circularity than the methodology of the Baltimore School.

To be fair, however, it must be mentioned that Kitchen has offered other evidence in favour of the 13th-century date, though his evidence is not as well developed as his Biblical reasoning. Of course, the Cairo Genizah also contains the pertinent section of the Sinai covenant and treatise texts of the late second millennium BC. But this alone is not a sufficient counterbalance to the arguments facing the 13th-century date. 7 These have recently multiplied again.

Further difficulties raised by recent archaeology
Three recent developments now make any defence of a 13th-century BC conquest extremely difficult. One concerns the nature of the early Iron Age settlement which sprang up after the collapse of the LBA cities. Supporters of the 13th-century conquest have interpreted these as the work of the newly-arrived Israelites, but is it now acknowledged that their presence does not have the same cultural implications as the late first-millennium BC renaissance in the culture of the LBA. If (as is virtually certain) these settlements are indeed the work of the Israelites, it seems unlikely that they were already in the late 13th century BC. This matter will be discussed more fully below in considering the inference theory of Israel's origins.

A second development has been the growing realization that very few cities of the LBA had any defensive walls. In the case of the well-known city of Hazor, it is now clear that 'Only a handful of settlements were surrounded by a wall during the entire period, or even during particular phases. It is clear that the LBA biblical traditions, the Biblical tradition; the Israelites were at times which were 'fortified and very big', great, and fortified up to heaven' (Nu. 13:28; Dt. 1:28; see Jos. 2:15; 6:1, 5; 7:5; 8:29, 10:20; 14:12; ec. for further references to walls and gates) simply does not fit the picture of relative material unwalled towns which has now emerged for the 13th century BC. Shortly before his death in 1985, Yadin tried to incorporate this new evidence (expressed, no doubt, by the defensive function of the biblical defence of the biblical city of Canaan. In common with other supporters of the 13th-century date, Yadin had previously assumed that Canaan was fortified at this time, a view conformed by written evidence. Constrained by Gonen's evidence to abandon this view, he subsequently suggested that the weakness of Canaan's fortifications did not render them unimportant for OT understanding. This is a picture of a swift conquest of the land: 'Dacanaa Canaan of the Bronze Age... was relatively easy prey for the highly motivated and, at times, representing an idea that was more than likely to be congenial to biblical scholars, since it supports one aspect of the biblical tradition by surrendering another. The hypothesis that the Israelites encountered towns with walls and gates.

The third discovery concerns those towns which previously seemed to provide evidence for a 'violent irruption into the land' 1200/120 BC. B. G. Wood's thorough excavation of Hazor reveals that the destructions of Bethel, Deir, Lachish and Hazor all require redating to different degrees. 13 They did not all fall at the same time, but have to be distributed among no less than three waves of destruction spanning roughly a century. The first phase occurred at the end of the LBA known as LB IB1, and should now be dated c.1210 BC. Of the places mentioned in the Bible as taken by Israel in their early stage of conquest, only Bethel was taken in the first wave. Jericho, Lachish, and Megiddo (1170/1160 BC, at the end of LB IIb (the final phase of the LBA). This included Tell Beit Mirsim (Abirh's candidate for Tel Be'er Sheva, and Bethel traditionally Bethel). However, it is now very widely agreed that the site of Debir is Khirbet Rabbd, which was not destroyed in any of these three waves of destruction. The second wave of destruction of the second wave is therefore no more than one (Bethel), and even this should probably be excluded, as there are serious problems involved in locating Bethel at Beshita. The third wave occurred at the end of the late Iron Age, at the end of Iron IAI, c.1125 BC. Of the places Israel is said to have taken, this included only Lachish.

It is clear, therefore, that either Israel's conquest of Canaan is not as historically significant as previously thought, or the evidence (are, in any case, alternative explanations), or it was a longdrawn-out affair, spanning about a century. The latter view has already been proposed by D. Ussishkin, the current excavator of Lachish. 14 Again, this latter approach to the problem is not likely to appeal to evangelical scholars, consonant with as it does important aspects of the biblical tradition.

In the light of these serious difficulties it is very unlikely that the theory of a 13th-century conquest can be rescued. Since the theory has for a long time been the favourite defence of the OT, now that it has been seriously undermined by new archaeological, it is time once again, and among scholars, to major rethink the exercise. We will return to this in the final section of this article.

1b. The infiltration theory
That Israel's constituent tribes came into Canaan elsewhere is a presupposition shared by the infiltration and conquest theories of Israel's origins. In their classic forms both theories have also focused on the 13th century BC as the time of Israel's entry point. 15 But they differ in two important respects.

While the 13th-century conquest theory, at least in its most widely held form, postulates a more or less unified movement by all or most of the Israelite tribes, the infiltration theory envisions a more diffused settlement process. The infiltration theory is 16 times in different areas. Only after the settlement of these disparate groups did they coalesce into the entity Israel. Therefore, even while the 13th-century theory of Canaanite as an initial move by the newcomers, the infiltration theory relates clashes with the Canaanites-as-cultural-evolution in the process of Israel's formation. In the view of A. Alt, we have: 'the first phase was in the first wave. It involved semi-nomadic the abandonment of agricultural existence in the hills where they were accustomed to graze their flocks each season. The central highlands of Canaan were thinly populated, so their settlement involved little or no conflict with the existing inhabitants of the land. Only when these settlers had become somewhat established, united and more numerous, did they attempt to wrench the plains away from their Canaanite neighbours. This began the phase of territorial expansion, which involved extensive armed conflict, but this did not come until the early days of the monarchy.

Alt's initial theory was supported and developed by M. Noth. Noth has proposed that the Israelites set out to attempt to reconstruct the complex process of tribal settlement. 16 More recently M. Weippert has championed the theory that Israel started its settlement on the Lachish, and I. Alt's theory of the reconstruction of the occupation of the land leaps heavily on the Alt-Noth model. 17 Among Israeli archaeologists, the late Y. Aharoni was a staunch proponent of the theory; and it is currently supported by M. Kochavi, A. Zertal and others.

Presuppositions and methodology
Although the infiltration theory does make use of specific biblical evidence, it is more generally applicable to the overall history of Israel's origins found in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. It replaces a united, military conquest with a peaceful and piecemeal process. Any theory which proposes a picture so different from the biblical one must provide a plausible explanation of how the biblical picture arose. Does the infiltration theory succeed in this respect?

The stories in Joshua 2-9 of the destruction of Canaanite cities - Leshem, Joppa, Bethel, 18 and Nohadra and folk - are identified as such by the formula 'to this day', e.g. Hos. 8:28-29. The purpose of such stories was to explain certain phenomena; and yet very broadly, the stories are a complex of general and particular narratives explaining the Israelites' share in the rich ancient history of Canaanite peoples. These stories were originally Benjamin, who is 'the son of Joseph by whom the Israelites became through the role of Gilgal (in Benjamin) as the central sanctuary of an amphitheatre of twelve tribes. The war stories of Joshua 10:15-11:15 are not limited to the tribes of Benjamin and Naphtali respectively like acquiring their 'all Israel' flavour through the formation of the amphitheory focused on a central shrine. Similarly Joshua, whose historical role was supposed to be limited to the traditions of Joshua 17:14-18 and 24:1-28 acquired the status of leader of all Israel.

This reconstruction of the formation of the tradition obviously depends heavily on the theory (depicted chiefly by Noth) of a twelve-tribe Israelite amphitheatre, and this has come under heavy criticism in recent years. 19 Without it the all Israel traditions (and, indeed, the fact of Israelite unity itself) is difficult to account for if the tribes had diverse origins.

Secondly, Alt and Noth have been accused of too readily that a narrative is unhistorical simply because it contains an 'idealized element. Rightly argued long ago that an literary form alone cannot determine the historicity or other- wise of a story. 20 B. S. Childs, C. Westermann and others have argued for a tighter definition of what they mean by 'idealized' narrative, and Childs has shown that 'idealized' elements are secondary in the conquest narratives. 21 In the light of such objections, even Weippert admits 'Any solutions to the linguistic problem cannot be possible only on the basis of external evidence. 22 That is
Subsequent surveys conducted in other parts of the hill country by a younger generation of Israeli archaeologists have reinforced the hypothesis that the process of settlement and reorganization began in the early Iron I period. They now believe that the Iron I period in Canaan could be divided into at least two phases: the early Iron I, characterized by the spread of the Canaanite culture, and the later Iron I, marked by the emergence of the first major states in the region. This new understanding challenges the traditional view that the Iron I period was a period of decline and disorganization.

The majority of these sites are villages of 1-2 acres, though a few are considerably larger. Most are not fortified, though some (e.g. Giloh, south of Jerusalem, and several Upper Galilee sites) had fortifications. The majority of the early Iron I villages display a high degree of uniformity, with similar pottery types, indicative of a subsistence economy.

Because the central highlands were the region initially colonized by the Israelite tribes, and because the hillland settlements display cultural continuity with the Iron II period, it is believed that the time of the Israelite monarchy was a formative period for the development of the Israelite nation. The majority of archaeologists have agreed with Aharoni that the Iron I settlements should be associated with the Israelites. For this reason the Iron I settlements have recently assumed a central role in the debate over the nature of Israel’s emergence in Canaan. They have (predictably) been major differences of opinion over the interpretation of these settlements.

Aharoni held firmly to the view that the Galilee settle- ments pictured in the description of the infiltrating tribes; they showed, in his view, that the conquest of Canaanite cities had been preceded by a time of peaceful infiltration. More recent studies have shown conclusively that Aharoni was wrong; the destruction of LBA Hazor preceded by some decades the earliest Iron I villages. However, these studies cannot be used to support the central idea of the infiltrating tribes hypothesis (as we have seen above) it no longer seems likely that the fall of LBA Hazor can be associated with the conquest.

Another aspect of the Iron I settlements which has emerged through more recent research is the high degree to which these settlements were connected with the LBA culture, preceding LBA, notwithstanding its relative poverty. In fact, continuity with the LBA has been observed in every individual aspect of Iron I culture: pottery, axes, daggers, knives, clothing-pins, artistic traditions, cultic objects, script, and architecture. It is also evident (as will be discussed below) that these Iron I peoples were familiar with aspects of settled life and agriculture. These facts are difficult to square with the idea that they were pastoral nomads from the desert fringes. (As noted above, they are equally difficult to square with the notion that the settlers were Israelites newly arrived.)

The evidence indicates that the Iron I settlers were people who had lived in the Jezreel Valley during the LBA. They may not have had settled sedentary communities, but they do not sit comfortably with the infiltration theory, especially as formulated by Noy.

It is appropriate to mention here another objection which has been raised to the theory: that it depends on an outdated understanding of the nature of prehistoric settlement. Mendenhall has argued that the Iron I period in Canaan as ‘land-hungry semi-nomads’ lacking after a more settled life in the cultivated agricultural countryside. This recent discovery of the Iron I settlement of Tell el-Burak in the Arabah has brought to light the Iron I settlement of Tell el-Dab’a near Jerusalem, which had been previously overlooked. This settlement was occupied from the early 13th century BC to the early 11th century BC, and it is clearly a farming community. The evidence from Tell el-Dab’a suggests that the Iron I period in Canaan was not characterized by the kind of intensive agriculture that had been typical of the LBA.

Mendenhall’s analysis has been further strengthened by the discovery of the Iron I settlement of Tell el-Dab’a, which was occupied from the early 13th century BC to the early 11th century BC. The settlement was a farming community, and it is clear that the Iron I period in Canaan was not characterized by the kind of intensive agriculture that had been typical of the LBA.

The most important new proponent of the theory is N. K. Gottwald, who has developed it along distinctive lines. He departs from Mendenhall by rejecting the Mosaic covenant and the idea of a single nation; instead, Gottwald sees the Israelite emergence from Canaanite society, and, indeed, has expressed strong doubts about the historical value of the Exodus-Sinai traditions. Also, while Mendenhall depicts the polarization of Canaanite society and the emergence of the Israelite nation as a result of the process, supplementing the ‘peasant rebellion’ model with one of ‘social revolution’, the latter ‘ebbing and flowing over two centuries’. Gottwald regards the Iron I settlements in the hill country as the work of rebel groups withdrawing to regions of least resistance. Mendenhall, on the other hand, saw the Israelites as a force physically and geographically, but politically and subjectively from the existing regimes.

Assessment
As noted above, it has been easy for critics to pick holes in Mendenhall’s original statement of the peasant revolt theory. The defences and modifications produced by newer proponents have sought not to develop any of Mendenhall’s original arguments, but to cover some of its serious weaknesses, so that criticisms which could be levelled at Mendenhall do not apply to more recent versions of the theory. I will mention only those weaknesses which the main versions have in common.

The objection raised earlier to the infiltration theory, that it fails to account for the biblical traditions, is applicable to the peasant revolt theory. Mendenhall offers the best explanation of how the biblical traditions arose, since he is able to point to a group which actually did come out of Egypt, became a coherent community and subsequently migrated to Canaan. In his view, the larger groups which later joined these arrivals identified themselves so fully with the traditions of their predecessors that the result was a People of God, whose origins remain a matter of opinion whether Israel’s Canaanite origins could have been so totally eclipsed by the notion that it was foreign to the land, but it seems highly unlikely. We must remember that Canaan is found not only in the exodus tradition, but also in the stories of the patriarchs.

Gottwald has tried to discover clues within the biblical traditions which indicate that Israel’s origins were at least in part Canaanite. He has suggested that many of the biblical narratives, such as Joshua 6-23 and 8-15, show an awareness of Canaanite traditions. But this kind of evidence cannot bear the weight which the critics place on it. All it shows is that, once it had arrived in the land, Israel assimilated certain Canaanite elements. It may, indeed, have absorbed more Canaanite groups than the traditions imply. But that is still a long way short of saying that Israel was in essence autochthonous and originated in a peasant revolt.

The traditions concerning conquered cities have been explained as arising from the rebels’ victory over the city-state rulers. For example, Joshua 12 is viewed as a list of those cities’ holdings which passed to them. But the theory does not adequately account for those narratives in which entire cities are destroyed. It would clearly have been against the rebels’ own best interests ever to have abandoned the towns once they had liberated them from the city-state rulers.

One fact which is extremely damaging for the theory is that there is no scrap of external evidence that a peasant revolt
Subsequent surveys conducted in other parts of the hill country by a younger generation of Israeli archaeologists have revealed that while the picture of the Iron IIB period as characterized by an influx of new populations throughout the land remains basically valid, it is clear that the early Iron Age saw a proliferation of small settlements in the highland regions. The total number discovered now exceeds 2,300: Dozens more occur on the Transjordanian plateau.

The majority of these sites are villages of only 1-2 acres, though a few are considerably larger. Most are unaftered, though some (e.g. Giloh, south of Jerusalem, and several Upper Galilee sites) had fortifications. The majority of the early Iron I period sites are new foundations; for example, in the centre of the country 97 of 114 Iron I sites showed no trace of Late Bronze occupation.4 The material culture of the Iron I and Iron II periods display a rich variety of pottery types, indicative of a subsistence economy.

Because the central highlands were the region initially colonized by the Israelite tribes, and because the highland settlements display cultural continuity with the Iron II period, it has been possible to trace the development of the majority of archaeologists have agreed with Aharoni that the Iron I settlements should be associated with the Israelites. For this reason the Iron I settlements have recently assumed a central role in the debate over the nature of Israel’s emergence in Canaan. There have (predictably) been major differences of opinion over the interpretation of these settlements.

Aharoni held firmly to the view that the Galilee settle- ments were founded by new populations, not by Israelites. He saw the infiltration theory; they showed, in his view, that the conquest of Canaanite cities had been preceded by a time of peaceful co-existence with the Canaanite population and that the Israelites were not the first peoples to inhabit the land. Recent studies have shown conclusively that Aharoni was wrong; the destruction of LBA Hazor preceded by some decades the earliest Iron I villages. However, these studies cannot be accepted as proving the infiltration theory (as we have seen above) it no longer seems likely that the fall of LBA Hazor can be associated with the conquest.

Another aspect of the Iron I settlements which has emerged through more recent research is the high degree to which they preserved earlier cultural traits, including the LBA, notwithstanding its relative poverty. In fact, continuity with the LBA has been observed in every individual aspect of Iron I culture: pottery, axes, daggers, tombs, clothing-pins, artistic traditions, cultic objects, scripts and architecture.5 It is also evident (as will be discussed below) that the Iron I people were familiar with aspects of settled life and agriculture. These facts are difficult to square with the idea that they were pastoral nomads from the desert fringes. (As noted above, they are equally difficult to square with the notion that the settlers were Israelites newly arrived.)

The evidence indicates that the Iron I settlers were people who had lived with the Canaanites for a long time. LBA Canaan, not people who had initially settled way away from the city-states and later had only hostile relations with them. In this view, the settlers were Canaanites, the term "Ammanamites", correspondence between Canaanite city-states and their Egyptian overlords in the 14th century BC. By assuming these terms to be synonyms, and defining them to mean someone who “has renounced any obligation to the Egyptian overlordship, living instead according to his own inclinations”, they have in turn deprived himself of his protection.6 Mendelsohn produced a radically new insight into Israelite origins: “For if the Israelites were defined by their exclusion from the Egyptian sphere of influence, it could be termed only so from the point of view of some existing, legitimate political society from which they had withdrawn.”7 The exact extent of Israelite sovereignty in Canaan is that of the late stages of the city-state system. “There was no radical displacement of population, there was no genocide, there was no large-scale driving out of population, only of royal administrators (of necessity).”8

Mendelsohn did not, however, reject entirely the historicity of the Exodus-Sinai traditions. Indeed, they play a vital role in his hypothesis. In Mendelsohn’s view, the core of the abstrusive faith was the belief and the concept of a community related to Yahweh by covenant, were brought to Canaan by a group of former slave-labour captives who had escaped from oppression in Egypt. Their material culture bore the marks of the Canaanite city-state.8 Thecox, however, has argued that the concept of the covenant community proved ‘attractive to all persons suffering under the burden of subjection to a monopoly of power’, some who therefore identified themselves with the Canaanite people and rapidly swelled their community.9 But the original nucleus of Israel was only a small group; there was no statistically important invasion of Palestine.10

Like the theories which it was intended to replace, Mendelsohn’s hypothesis was to be sought in the late 13th century BC. The reasons for fixing on this date are not at all clear, and Mendelsohn himself seems to have inherited it somewhat uncritically from the older theories.

Mendelsohn’s thesis initially had a cool reception. Its uniqueness, he claimed, was that it was to be sought in the late 13th century BC. The reasons for fixing on this date are not at all clear, and Mendelsohn himself seems to have inherited it somewhat uncritically from the older theories.11
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took place in the late 13th century BC. There are no texts such as the Amarna letters of the previous century which refer to any Iron I settlements in Canaan. Indeed, the entire land appeared deserted archaeologically. Indeed, the archaeology of 13th-century Canaan does not support the distinction between a rural peasantry and an urban aristocracy. Finkelstein's theory of the collapse of LBA cities and growth of Iron I villages has been interpreted as evidence of the revolt, but this view faces several serious problems.

First, L. E. Stager has noted that population figures deduced from LBA and Iron I settlement patterns seem to tell against the theory: 'Given the low aggregate of the Late Bronze Age population throughout Canaan, it appears unlikely that the populations of Iron Age I and II could have been large enough to account for the total Iron Age I village population ...' Secondly, if the Iron I highland societies were born out of conflict, it is surprising that so many of them were unfortified. This implies that prevailing conditions were peaceful and that no-one contested the occupation of the highlands. Thirdly, if the Iron I villages sprang from the bedrock of the LBA, they should all lie some distance from the surviving centres of power. In fact this is not the case. Izbet Sartah lay close to the coastal plain, and a number of sites (Gilih, Tell et-Ful and Mervasseret Yerushalaim) clustered near Jerusalem, which, according to biblical tradition, remained outside Israelite control. These sites are unlike the Iron I centers of the highlands. Fourthly, as we will see below, there are strong reasons to believe that the Iron I villagers had formerly been pastoral nomads rather than farmers from the plains and valleys.

In short, the archaeological evidence suggests that the peasant's revolt theory is not an accurate account of the origins of the Canaanite societies of the end of the LBA and the beginning of the Iron Age. Indeed, one of the strongest criticisms levied at proponents of the theory is that they ignore or misapply archaeological evidence.

2b. Other theories in which Israel is indigenous to Canaan While Mendenhall's theory, even as modified by others, has won no majority support, his criticisms of traditional assumptions (especially those concerning nomadism) have provoked much thought and discussion. The recent reassessment of the claims of a significant population of pastoral nomads in LBA Palestine. Nomadic groups are notoriously difficult to detect archaeologically, but Finkelstein argues that cemeteries and burial areas away from the centres of settled population point to the existence of such groups during the LBA, and he tentatively identifies some of the sites referred to in LBA texts as such.

Like Fritz, Finkelstein explains points of continuity between the material cultures of LB and Iron I in terms of close contact between these pastoral nomads and Canaanite societies. According to Finkelstein, the start of Iron I as a response to changed economic conditions which attended the collapse of the LBA city-states. He departs from Fritz, however, in arguing that the semi-nomadic groups were indigenous to Canaan. Finkelstein suggests that their origin should be sought in the deterioration of Palestine's rural and urban systems at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, i.e. in the 16th century BC. As permanent settlements were destroyed or abandoned, a large proportion of the nomadic population became semi-nomads, and remained so until the process was reversed at the beginning of the Iron Age. While proof of this thesis is lacking, it does explain what became of Palestine's population. The collapse of the LBA, the sedentary society drastically reduced at the end of the MBA, but increased again at the start of Iron I, and the suggestion that the 'missing' population of the LBA was more securely and more securely tied to the agricultural economy, makes sense of this situation. It is not, however, the only possible explanation, as will be pointed out below.

Although Finkelstein uses the term 'Israelite' to describe the Iron I settlers, he stresses that in doing so he is simply using it as 'a terminus technicus for hilly country people in a processing, storage and exchange economy'. He does not consider that there was such a thing as Israelite identity as early as the sedentarization stage: 'The formation of the Israelite identity was a long, intricate and complex process which, in our opinion, was only well advanced by the time of the Monarchy'. We will see below that this evaluation is unacceptable, even if one shares Finkelstein's disregard for the biblical traditions as a historical source.

2bii. Callaway's theory of displaced populations from the coastal plain

The late D. J. Callaway has put forward arguments against semi-nomadic origins for the Iron I settlers, preferring to view them as Canaanite villagers displaced from the coastal plain and the Shephelah. Referring to the evidence of household cisterns at highland sites such as Tel Beth Shemesh and Khirbet ed-Tell (as many as three to each house at the latter), he points out that their location beneath walls and floors suggests that they were excavated before the houses were built, and in turn suggests that the settlers were already known to have knowledge of household cisterns, and the technology to create them, when they arrived in the highlands. He distinguishes between the inhabitants of the LBA towns and the Iron I settlers to create agricultural terraces, making possible the cultivation of the steeply sloping hillsides. He sees this ability to adapt to new environments as typical of the highland and evident for an agricultural background for the settlers. He also argues that the material remains of the LBA I villages point to a cultural background in the Shephelah and the coastal plain. Artifacts and inscribed objects are cited in support of these cultural links. In Callaway's view the Iron I settlers in the hills were refugees from population pressures. He also points to the coastal plain and Shephelah, caused by the arrival of the Philistines and other 'Sea Peoples'. These highland settlers eventually emerged as Israel. Like Finkelstein, he argues that the semi-nomadic groups were indigenous to Palestine.

Quite apart from the fact that Callaway's theory runs into many of the same difficulties as the peasant revolt theory, he has not succeeded in establishing an agricultural background for the Iron I settlers. He has not produced any evidence which cannot be accounted for in terms of close contact over a long period between semi-nomads and the settled Canaanites of the LBA. Cistern technology could have been introduced from the highlands by large numbers of people (with plasters) were used, e.g. Hazor and Taanach in the LBA. The artifacts and inscribed objects which Callaway cites as evidence of cultural rout in the lowlands could not be shown to have undergone any significant contact with the surviving cities of the coastal plain (through limited trade or transhumance) after the semi-nomads had begun to settle down. The implications of this for the highland and coastal populations are at best uncertain. Callaway assumes that the settlers brought the technology with them ready-made, but D. C. Caton-Adams's study of agricultural technology takes a different view. He argues that terracing techniques were not an essential prerequisite for cultivation in the highlands, and that it is 'much more cogent' to assume that the techniques were developed by the settlers as they sought to cope with the exigencies of their highland environment.

The economy of the Iron I villages at Khirbet ed-Tell and Khirbet Raddana, to which Callaway chiefly refers, does not help his case. Animal enclosures and domestic stables clearly indicate the importance of sheep and goats in that economy, while the areas available for cultivation were very limited. Callaway's theory relies on the assumption that the highland assumption, not a conclusion forced upon us by the evidence.

Finally, if the Iron I villagers were refugees from the coastal plain and the Shephelah, moving inland under pressure from the Philistine invasion of those regions, we would expect them to have preserved the highland way of life, immediately to the east. In fact, however, early Iron Age settlements were very sparse in that area; only about ten are known, compared with 115 in Ephraim and ninety-five in half of a family's subsistence came from its animals. Without wishing to play down the importance of dry farming in the economy, we must question Callaway's insistence that the refugees were engaged on a subsistence base of agriculture primarily and small cattle secondarily. In short, his view that the settlers were refugees from the coastal plain on the basis of very few if any assumptions, not a conclusion forced upon us by the evidence.

2biii. Lemeche's 'evolutionary Israel'

In the context of a major critique of the peasant revolt theory, N. P. Lemche has developed a more realistic view of the Israelite origins. Rejecting Israel's revolutionary beginnings, he prefers to speak of an 'evolutionary Israel'.

Lemeche is even more radical than Mendenhall and Gottwald in breaking with the biblical traditions. He considers that we cannot be so simple in our approach to the origins as to be uselessly for historical reconstruction: '... I propose that we decline to be led by the Biblical account and, as historically reliable, as historically unreliable'. In other words, that which is a source which only exceptionally can be verified by other information. His alternative reconstruction...
took place in the late 13th century BC. There are no texts such as the Amarna letters of the previous century which refer to any Iron I settlements, and therefore cannot attest archaeologically. Indeed, the archaeology of 13th-century Canaan does not support the distinction between a rural peasantry and an urban aristocracy. The theory that the collapse of LBA cities and growth of Iron I villages have been interpreted as evidence of the revolt, but this view faces serious problems.

First, L. E. Stager has noted that population figures deduced from LBA and Iron I settlement patterns seem to tell against the theory; 'Given the low aggregate of the Late Bronze Age population throughout Canaan, it appears unlikely that large population movements could have been accommodated if the Iron I settlements had been developed from LBA'. He claims that the Iron I settlements were developed from Frits' and is worth summarising briefly. Essentially Finkelstein makes four points in favour of viewing the Iron I settlements as evidence of a sedentarization process:

1. The earliest Iron I villages were established on the central plain and in the small intermontane valleys - the better areas for grazing and dry farming. Orchard agriculture only came later with the settlement centres growing up in the Ephraim hill country. This pattern of settlement indicates that the settlers had a pastoral rather than an urban or rural background.

2. The layout of many Iron I sites - typically an elliptical plan in which dwellings surrounded a central space - resembles the layout of the dovar tent encampments of nomadic groups, and may be seen as a development from them.

3. Extensive use of subterranean storage silos by the Iron I villagers is a characteristic of nomadic societies settling down, because the preservation requirement of such societies is storage space for silage.

4. Simple broodroom houses and pillared, four-room houses are developments from the bedouin-style tent, and thus indicate the nomadic antecedents of the Iron I settlers.

These arguments are not all of equal value, and the last two are particularly open to criticism. Nevertheless Finkelstein has succeeded in greatly strengthening the case for viewing the Iron I settlements as evidence for the sedentarisation of pastoral nomads. He has also made an important contribution to understanding the archaeological evidence of one of the significant populations of pastoral nomads in LBA Palestine. Nomadic groups are notoriously difficult to detect archaeologically, but Finkelstein argues that sanctuaries and cemeteries away from the centres of settled population point to the existence of such groups during the LBA, and he tentatively identifies them with the shasa/sunu referred to in LBA texts.

Like Fritz, Finkelstein explains points of continuity between the material cultures of LB and Iron I in terms of close contact between these pastoral nomads and Canaanite society. He also stresses the importance of the Iron I sedentarization of pastoral nomads at the start of Iron I as a response to changed economic conditions which affected the collapse of the LBA city-states. He departs from Fritz, however, in arguing that the semi-nomadic groups were indigenous to Canaan.

Finkelstein suggests that their origin should be sought in the deterioration of Palestine's rural and urban systems at the end of the Middle Bronze Age, i.e. in the 16th century BC. As permanent settlements were destroyed or abandoned, a large proportion of the population became semi-nomadic, and remained so until the process was reversed at the beginning of the Iron Age. While proof of this thesis is lacking, it does explain what became of Palestine's population in the collapse of LBA society, and fits well with the wider archaeological evidence, makes sense of this situation. It is not, however, the only possible explanation, as will be pointed out below.

Although Finkelstein uses the term 'Israelite' to describe the Iron I settlers, he stresses that in doing so he is simply using it as 'a terminus technicus for hill country people in a process of sedentarisation'. Does this not do violence to the idea that there was such a thing as Israelite identity as early as the sedentarisation stage? 'The formation of the Israelite identity was a long, intricate and complex process which, in our opinion was not completed until the end of the 8th century BC.' We shall see below that this evaluation is unacceptable, even if one shares Finkelstein's disregard for the biblical traditions as a historical source.

2bii. Callaway's theory of displaced populations from the coastal plain

The late Dr. Callaway1 has put forward arguments against semi-nomadic origins for the Iron I settlers, preferring to view them as Canaanite villagers displaced from the coastal plain and the Shephelah.

Referring to the 13th-century household cisterns at highland sites such as Khirbet el-Mir, el-Marjeh and Khirbet el-Tell (as many as three to each house at the latter), he points out that their location beneath walls and floors suggests that they were excavated before the houses were built, which would support the view that the settlers already possessed a working knowledge of household cisterns, and the technology to create them, when they arrived in their new homeland. Callaway also points to the adoption of Iron I settlers to create agricultural terraces, making possible the cultivation of the steeply sloping hillsides. He sees this as evidence that the Iron I settlers were not simple nomads, but had a substantial settlement background.

Callaway also argues that the material remains of the Iron I villages point to a cultural background in the Shephelah and the coastal plain, and that the megalithic artefacts and inscribed objects are cited in support of these cultural links. In Callaway's view the Iron I settlers in the hills were refugees from population pressures. He also points to the coastal plain and Shephelah, caused by the arrival of the Philistines and other 'Sea Peoples'. These highland settlers eventually emerged as Israelites, so that the movement of these people is of historical and evidence for an agricultural background for the settlers. He also argues that the material remains of the Iron I villages point to a cultural background in the Shephelah and that the megalithic artefacts and inscribed objects are cited in support of these cultural links. In Callaway's view the Iron I settlers in the hills were refugees from population pressures. He also points to the coastal plain and Shephelah, caused by the arrival of the Philistines and other 'Sea Peoples'. These highland settlers eventually emerged as Israelites, so that the movement of these people is of historical and evidence for an agricultural background for the settlers. He also argues that the material remains of the Iron I villages point to a cultural background in the Shephelah and the coastal plain, mentors, and inscription objects are cited in support of these cultural links. In Callaway's view the Iron I settlers in the hills were refugees from population pressures. He also points to the coastal plain and Shephelah, caused by the arrival of the Philistines and other 'Sea Peoples'. These highland settlers eventually emerged as Israelites, so that the movement of these people is of historical and evidence for an agricultural background for the settlers. He also argues that the material remains of the Iron I villages point to a cultural background in the Shephelah and the coastal plain, mentors, and inscription objects are cited in support of these cultural links. In Callaway's view the Iron I settlers in the hills were refugees from population pressures. He also points to the coastal plain and Shephelah, caused by the arrival of the Philistines and other 'Sea Peoples'. These highland settlers eventually emerged as Israelites, so that the movement of these people is of historical and

Finally, if the Iron I settlers were refugees from the coastal plain and the Shephelah, moving inland under pressure from the Philistine invasion of those regions, we would expect to find evidence of them having primarily colonized the highlands of Judah and Benjamin, and more immediately to the east. In fact, however, early Iron Age settlements were very sparse in that area; only about ten are known, compared with 115 in Ephraim and ninety-five in Samaria (i.e. between Jerusalem and the Jezreel Valley).

In short, Callaway's theory accounts for only a small part of the archaeological evidence and is contradicted by a large body of it.

2biii. Lenormand's 'evolutionary Israel' in the context of a major critique of the peasant revolt theory

In the context of a major critique of the peasant revolt theory, N. P. Lemche has reviewed the notion of Israelite origins. Rejecting Israel's revolutionary beginnings, he prefers to speak of an 'evolutionary Israel'11

Lemche is even more radical than Mendenhall and Gottwald in breaking with the biblical traditions. He considers it more useful to use the term 'Israel' in its later, ethnic sense, as a non-Hebrew historical, that is, as a source which only exceptionally can be verified by other information. His alternative reconstruct-
tion is based entirely on what we can deduce from archaeological materials 'of the social, economic, cultural and political structures that emerged in response to the close of the second millennium.' 11 Leemee does not wish, however, to limit his investigations to the late 13th century BC, for the Israelite state may have been formed "as a result of a prolonged process which was spread over the entire period of the Late Bronze Age (or, for that matter, an even longer period of time)." 12 After surveying the conditions and achievements of these earlier periods, he emphasizes the potential for the economic and cultural decline which marked the end of the period. Leemee offers a "working hypothesis," which may be summarized as follows:

From at least as early as the first half of the 14th century BC the central highlands were the habitation of the 'Apiru, whom he defines as "a para-social element . . . (consisting of) relatives of the people occupying the small city-states in the plains and valleys of Palestine." 13 In other words, they had once been settled agriculturists. The gradual emergence of a new phenomenon, the urban center, had taken place but did not otherwise feature in archaeological evidence for that period, because they were not sedentary at that time; they lived as "outlaw groups of freebooters." However, when new settlements appear in the highlands over a century later, at the start of the Iron Age, they are evidence of new political structures emerging among those same groups. The Iron I settlements represent a return by those groups to a sedentary, agricultural lifestyle, and the beginning of a (re)tribalization process. Israel was the end-product of that process.

Leemee's view has much in common with Finkelstein's. Both see Israel as an evolved sedentary group in the highlands, and both believe those groups had formerly been settled. However, they clearly hold different views on the origins and lifestyles of those groups. Leemee also offers a different explanation for their sedentarization. He believes that their return to an agricultural existence was not possible before the late 13th century BC, because agriculture could not be carried out in the highlands without terracing techniques and lined water-cisterns, neither of which, according to Leemee, was developed until that time. 14 This argument is complete in common with Callaway's argument discussed above) it makes wrong assumptions about both these technological innovations. However, the main controversy between Leemee and Callaway cannot be brought out below, after I have outlined one more theory of religious origins.

24v. The synthesis of Coote and Whitelam
The reconstruction put forward by R. B. Coote and K. W. Whitelam is more complex and nuanced than that of either Finkelstein or Leemee. Nevertheless, it has some features in common with both.

Like Leemee, Coote and Whitelam explicitly reject the biblical narratives as a source for the reconstruction of Israel's early history. Rather, the historian's task is "to explain the archaeological record in terms of the competing myths, history and anthropology." 15 They review an impressive range of evidence in an attempt to fulfill this task, and are to be congratulated on bringing together, for the first time, only one small part of which can be commented on here — the issue which bears most directly on the nature of Israel's origins. 16

After examining the nature and location of the Iron I settlements, they conclude that the archaeological evidence is in accordance with "a small settlement pattern, collate with such theoretical models. Rather, the origin of those settlements is to be set in the context of an economic decline which occurred at the end of the LBA, probably resulting from a breakdown of the inter-regional trade in which late Bronze Age highland urbanism was ultimately dependend. This urban economic collapse triggered a number of processes.

As the lowland urban centres declined in material prosperity, a settlement shift occurred among rural groups, including agriculturists, pastoralists, and perhaps even city dwellers, all of whom were economically dependent on the lowland cities to some extent. The development of agriculture in the highlands, which had not been economically viable during the LBA, now became an attractive option for such groups. Settlements were founded, based on a mixture of agriculture and pastoralism. Subsequently "The settlement into villages in the hitherland was given political and incipient ethnic form in the loosely federated people calling themselves Israel." 17

Thus in the reconstruction offered by Coote and Whitelam the ancestors of Israel were not exclusively peasants, bandits or pastoral nomads, but a mixture of all three, thrown together by the seismic effect of the decline in inter-regional trade. The attractiveness of such a broad synthesis is that it avoids the weaknesses of narrower approaches. It seems able to accommodate virtually all the available data (except, of course, for the biblical traditions, which are explicitly rejected on non-archaeological grounds). However, there is at least one piece of evidence which overturns all four of the theories reviewed in this section.

A major criticism of the above theories
All four of the theories outlined above, either explicitly or implicitly, give the impression that we know who the Israelites were. The theories of an entity called Israel, did not even begin to take shape until a group or groups embarked on the process of settle- ment in the highlands, as evidenced by archaeology. In other words, there was no 'Israel' before the beginning of Iron I, and perhaps not for some time afterwards.

It is well known that the earliest reference to Israel outside the Bible comes from the late 13th century BC. This occurs in Ahiram's letter to Pharaoh Merenptah (or Merneptah), inscribed on what has become known as the 'Israel stela', dating from Merenptah's reign (1213-1207 BC) as has been confirmed for Egypt's 19th Dynasty. It is the relative dating of this reference to Israel and the earliest Iron I settlements which vitiates the above theories of Israel's origins.

Until recently the beginning of the Iron Age has been very loosely dated, and has been associated with a period of around 1200 BC, in recognition that this is merely a handy, round number, and that some Iron I settlements may have been founded earlier, e.g. 1490 and 1450 BC. But the appearance of Iron I villages, is able to say: 'The date of all this activity perhaps falls towards the close of the 13th century; many are in any case from the beginning of the 12th century; and the appearance of Iron I villages is, of course, a vital clue to the appearance of these settlements.' 18

Several of the arguments put forward by the proponents of alternative views actually complement this theory. As noted above, the argument that the late Iron Age A population represents Canaan's urban culture at the end of the MBA, and to evidence for a significant semi-nomadic population during the LBA. It suggests that the change should be explained in terms of the development of the rural peasantry and the expansion of the previous urban population. An alternative hypothesis would be that invaders slaughtered or dispersed a large part of the LBA population, and that the rural peasantry who lived in this land as semi-nomads. For a variety of political and economic reasons, settlement may not have been an attractive option for those groups, until that is, the socio-economic complexion of the country was changed once again by the decline of Canaan's remaining city-states at the end of the 13th century. The lowland cities were no longer capable of defending themselves, and the inhabitants of Canaan, who were desperate to return to their land and remain in the land in the event that the city of Tyre, despite of simply because it does not fit a particular theory of Israelite origins; instead, the theorem must be adapted to fit the evidence.'

In summary, it is clear from Merenptah's inscription that Israelites inhabited the highlands at the beginning of Iron I. Other evidence from within the OT itself points to the same conclusion. Kitchen has repeatedly put forward arguments demonstrating that the form of the Sinai covenant must go back to the second millennium BC; 19 and several scholars have argued for the pre-monarchic origins of much early Hebrew poetry, essentially demonstrating the great antiquity of such poetological evidence. The traditions of Israel's early history cannot be cavalierly relegated to an exile or other late date in the way that Lecme, Coote and Whitelam and others have stated.

Conclusion: scope for an alternative view
Both internal and external evidence requires that we treat with greater respect Israel's traditions concerning her origins and early history. There is now enough evidence to support a broad, historical, archaeological and cultural context in which the traditions concerning the exodus, wilderness wanderings and conquest can retain their integrity. Many evangelical scholars have long believed that the 13th century BC provides such a context. As we noted earlier in this article, it now seems very unlikely that it does. It is then an alternative.

I have argued in detail elsewhere 20 for a return to the 15th century BC, grounded by the OT's internal chronology (I Ki. 6:1; Jdg. 11:26). Some of the reasons for rejecting this date (such as the alleged gap in occupation in Transjordan) have disappeared. The surviving 12th century evidence, as has already been shown, is too late to have been supposed. One major difficulty for the 15th-century date has been the apparent absence of evidence for a violent conquest. The five arguments, given in response, to the claim that the showing evidence is probably provided by the fall of Canaan's fortified cities at the close of the MBA. 21, would I think, go far to make the evidence for the destruction of Canaan's cities at the end of the 13th century, by incomparable severity. In this context, all the other evidence for the exodus and similar times is strong.

Several views that all this activity perhaps falls towards the close of the 13th century; many are in any case from the beginning of the 12th century; and the appearance of Iron I villages, is able to say: 'The date of all

3 For detailed references see ibid., pp. 44-46. Ibid., 6. T. M. O'Neill, 'Talmud, 'in D. Winton Thomas (ed.), Archaeology and Old Testament Study (Oxford: OUP, 1967), pp. 302. (Tufnell's view was supported by more recent work: D. W. Ussishkin, ibid., c. n. 40.)
After examining the nature and location of the Iron I settlements, they conclude that the archaeological evidence is in line with the biblical narrative, which implies a collapse of the Iron I theories. Rather, the origin of those settlements is to be set in the context of an economic decline which occurred at the end of the LBA, probably resulting from a breakdown of the inter-regional trade on which later urban development in the whole of the Late Bronze Age (or, for that matter, an even longer period of time). After surveying the conditions and variables determining the growth and functioning of the economy and economic decline which marked the end of the period, Lemche offers a "working hypothesis", which may be summarized as follows:

At least from as early as the first half of the 14th century BC, the central highlands were the habitat of the 'Apiru, whom he defines as a "para-social element...[consisting of] relations...in the form of the small city-states in the plains and valleys of Palestine". In other words, they had once been settled agriculturalists. The geographic area is arid, but not otherwise the same. But the sites but did not otherwise feature in archaeological evidence for that period, because they were not sedentary at that time; they lived as "outlaw groups of freebooters". However, when new settlements appear in the highlands over a century later, at the start of the Iron Age, they are evidence of new political structures emerging among those same groups. The Iron I settlements represent a return by those groups to a settled, agricultural lifestyle, and the beginning of a "transformation process. The Israel was the end-product of that process.

Lemche’s view has much in common with Finkelstein’s. Both see Israel as an emerging sedentarized group in the highlands, and both believe those groups had formerly been settled. However, they clearly hold different views on the origins and lifestyles of those groups. Lemche also offers a different explanation for their sedentarization. He believes that their return to an agricultural existence was not possible before the late 13th century BC, because agriculture could not be carried out in the highlands without terracing techniques and lined water-cisterns, neither of which, according to Lemche, was developed until that time. This view is complete with Callaway’s argument discussed above it makes wrong assumptions about both these technological innovations. However, the more we discover about the highlands, the more we never that the highlands could be brought out, below after I have outlined one more theory of their origins.

After examining the nature and location of the Iron I settlements, they conclude that the archaeological evidence is in line with the biblical narrative, which implies a collapse of the Iron I theories. Rather, the origin of those settlements is to be set in the context of an economic decline which occurred at the end of the LBA, probably resulting from a breakdown of the inter-regional trade on which later urban development in the whole of the Late Bronze Age (or, for that matter, an even longer period of time). After surveying the conditions and variables determining the growth and functioning of the economy and economic decline which marked the end of the period, Lemche offers a "working hypothesis", which may be summarized as follows:

At least from as early as the first half of the 14th century BC, the central highlands were the habitat of the 'Apiru, whom he defines as a "para-social element...[consisting of] relations...in the form of the small city-states in the plains and valleys of Palestine". In other words, they had once been settled agriculturalists. The geographic area is arid, but not otherwise the same. But the sites but did not otherwise feature in archaeological evidence for that period, because they were not sedentary at that time; they lived as "outlaw groups of freebooters". However, when new settlements appear in the highlands over a century later, at the start of the Iron Age, they are evidence of new political structures emerging among those same groups. The Iron I settlements represent a return by those groups to a settled, agricultural lifestyle, and the beginning of a "transformation process. The Israel was the end-product of that process.

Lemche’s view has much in common with Finkelstein’s. Both see Israel as an emerging sedentarized group in the highlands, and both believe those groups had formerly been settled. However, they clearly hold different views on the origins and lifestyles of those groups. Lemche also offers a different explanation for their sedentarization. He believes that their return to an agricultural existence was not possible before the late 13th century BC, because agriculture could not be carried out in the highlands without terracing techniques and lined water-cisterns, neither of which, according to Lemche, was developed until that time. This view is complete with Callaway’s argument discussed above it makes wrong assumptions about both these technological innovations. However, the more we discover about the highlands, the more we never that the highlands could be brought out, below after I have outlined one more theory of their origins.

The reconstruction offered by Coote and Whitleam the ancestors of Israel were not exclusively peasants, bandits or pastoral nomads, but a mixture of all three, thrown together by the seismic effect of the decline in inter-regional trade. The attractiveness of such a broad synthesis is that it avoids the weaknesses of narrower approaches. It seems able to accommodate virtually all the available data, except, of course, for the biblical traditions, which are explicitely rejected on methodological grounds by Lemche, but see, however, that there is at least one piece of evidence which overtrusts all four of the theories reviewed in this section.

A major criticism of the above theories

All four of the theories outlined above, either explicitly or implicitly, give us a picture that we have to account for as an entity called Israel. Israel did not even begin to take shape until a group or groups embarked on the process of settle- ment in the highlands, as evidenced by archaeology. In other words, there was no 'Israel' before the beginning of Iron I, and perhaps not for some time afterwards.

It is well known that the earliest reference to Israel outside the Bible comes from the late 13th century BC. This occurs in the Egyptian sculptural reliefs of the pharaoh Merenptah (or Merenephtah), inscribed on what has become known as the 'Israel stela', dating from Merenptah’s campaign of 1212 BC as has been noted by a number of other Egypt’s 19th Dynasty. It is the relative dating of this reference to Israel and the earliest Iron I settlements which vitiate the above theories of Israel’s origins.

Until recently the beginning of the Iron Age has been very badly understood, and there are many references to a collapse of around 1200 BC, in recognition that this is merely a haphazard, round number, and that some Iron I settlements may have been established as early as the late 13th century BC, perhaps the appearance of Iron I villages, is able to say: 'The date of all this activity perhaps falls towards the close of the 13th century; many are in any case from the beginning of the 12th century BC, and strongly influenced by their contemporaries in the area of the appearance of the Tyrian Iron Villages'. For a time this view was held, only one small part of which can be commented on here — the phenomenon which bears most directly on the nature of Israel's origins.'

The archaeological evidence indicates that the Israelite tribes were not the only groups to settle in the highlands. Other groups, including Amalekites and Edomites, lived in the area as semi-nomads. For a variety of political and economic reasons, settlements may not have been an attractive option for some groups. Nevertheless, the Iron Age II period witnessed a significant increase in population and economic activity in the region. The evidence suggests that the Iron Age II period marks the end of the period of settlement and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Biblical Israelites.

Conclusions:

The archaeological evidence indicates that the Israelite tribes were not the only groups to settle in the highlands. Other groups, including Amalekites and Edomites, lived in the area as semi-nomads. For a variety of political and economic reasons, settlements may not have been an attractive option for some groups. Nevertheless, the Iron Age II period witnessed a significant increase in population and economic activity in the region. The evidence suggests that the Iron Age II period marks the end of the period of settlement and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Biblical Israelites.

Several of the arguments put forward by the proponents of alternative views actually complement this theory. As noted, the Iron Age II period marks the end of the period of settlement and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Biblical Israelites. The archaeological evidence indicates that the Israelite tribes were not the only groups to settle in the highlands. Other groups, including Amalekites and Edomites, lived in the area as semi-nomads. For a variety of political and economic reasons, settlements may not have been an attractive option for some groups. Nevertheless, the Iron Age II period witnessed a significant increase in population and economic activity in the region. The evidence suggests that the Iron Age II period marks the end of the period of settlement and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Biblical Israelites. The archaeological evidence indicates that the Israelite tribes were not the only groups to settle in the highlands. Other groups, including Amalekites and Edomites, lived in the area as semi-nomads. For a variety of political and economic reasons, settlements may not have been an attractive option for some groups. Nevertheless, the Iron Age II period witnessed a significant increase in population and economic activity in the region. The evidence suggests that the Iron Age II period marks the end of the period of settlement and the beginning of a new era in the history of the Biblical Israelites.
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Prosperity theology and the faith movement

Robert Jackson

The author serves as curate in St Augustine’s, Bromley Common, England. His interest in theology first arose out of his earlier studies for a B.A in Business Studies.

Several years ago, the author’s thesis ‘Christian Faith and Company Culture’ was criticized for not dealing with the argument that it would be impossible to improve the bottom line unless something P.M. is happening. The author believes the criticism was justified, and he is now working on a new thesis to improve the bottom line.

The faith movement is a significant phenomenon in contemporary Christianity. It is not only a reflection of the church’s desire to be relevant in the modern world but also a response to the challenges of globalization and urbanization. The movement has grown rapidly in recent years, and many churches have adopted some of its practices, such as charismatic prayer, prophecy, and healing.

The movement has also been criticized for its emphasis on personal success and material wealth. Many followers of the faith movement believe that their financial success is evidence of their faith in God’s provision and their commitment to the church. However, others see this emphasis on material wealth as a form of idolatry and a departure from biblical values.

The author argues that the faith movement is not a new phenomenon but has its roots in the charismatic movement of the 1920s and 1930s. The movement has also been influenced by the prosperity theology of the 1950s and 1960s, which taught that God would provide for His faithful followers.

The author believes that the faith movement has the potential to bring about positive change in society, but it must be handled with care. It is important to ensure that the movement does not become a source of division or a means to an end. The movement should be focused on the spread of the gospel and the spiritual growth of its followers, rather than on personal success or material wealth.

The author concludes that the faith movement is a complex phenomenon that requires careful study and evaluation. It is up to Christians to discern the true nature of the movement and to ensure that it remains true to the teachings of the Bible.

The origins of prosperity theology

An American, Daniel Burn, conducted a piece of research which is extremely illuminating in establishing the origins of prosperity theology. His first move is to establish Kenneth E. Hagin as the father of the faith movement. Kenneth Hagin Jr. is quoted as saying of his father: ‘Almost every major faith ministry of the United States has been influenced by his ministry. ’

Then, from correspondence with the major leaders within the movement, McConnell shows that Hagin Jr. is not merely boosting his father’s ego. These leaders do in fact openly acknowledge Hagin as the human source of their inspiration, the fount of their teaching. As one of the men involved, Kenneth Copeland, Frederick Price and Charlie Capps.

But, if Hagin is the father of the faith movement, then he is not the author of its teaching. Hagin’s claim that the new teaching was given to him personally by Jesus through a series of visions during the 1950s does not match the evidence uncovered by McConnell. He places side by side several passages from the works of both Hagin and a man named Robert L. Deutrom. The author believes that what Hagin has done is that Hagin has directly plagiarized Kenyon. The word-for-word uniformity of the two men is beyond the bounds of coincidence, and it is clear from the context that these passages are merely representative ones drawn from just eight books: ‘Many more could be cited.’ All of Hagin’s work post-dates Kenyon’s, who in fact died in 1948. Therefore McConnell surmises:

We need to realize that prosperity theology is a movement which is not only a reflection of the church’s desire to be relevant in the modern world but also a response to the challenges of globalization and urbanization. The movement has grown rapidly in recent years, and many churches have adopted some of its practices, such as charismatic prayer, prophecy, and healing.

The movement has also been criticized for its emphasis on personal success and material wealth. Many followers of the faith movement believe that their financial success is evidence of their faith in God’s provision and their commitment to the church. However, others see this emphasis on material wealth as a form of idolatry and a departure from biblical values.

The author argues that the faith movement is not a new phenomenon but has its roots in the charismatic movement of the 1920s and 1930s. The movement has also been influenced by the prosperity theology of the 1950s and 1960s, which taught that God would provide for His faithful followers.

The author believes that the faith movement has the potential to bring about positive change in society, but it must be handled with care. It is important to ensure that the movement does not become a source of division or a means to an end. The movement should be focused on the spread of the gospel and the spiritual growth of its followers, rather than on personal success or material wealth.

The author concludes that the faith movement is a complex phenomenon that requires careful study and evaluation. It is up to Christians to discern the true nature of the movement and to ensure that it remains true to the teachings of the Bible.

The origins of prosperity theology

An American, Daniel Burn, conducted a piece of research which is extremely illuminating in establishing the origins of prosperity theology. His first move is to establish Kenneth E. Hagin as the father of the faith movement. Kenneth Hagin Jr. is quoted as saying of his father: ‘Almost every major faith ministry of the United States has been influenced by his ministry.’

Then, from correspondence with the major leaders within the movement, McConnell shows that Hagin Jr. is not merely boosting his father’s ego. These leaders do in fact openly acknowledge Hagin as the human source of their inspiration, the fount of their teaching. As one of the men involved, Kenneth Copeland, Frederick Price and Charlie Capps.

But, if Hagin is the father of the faith movement, then he is not the author of its teaching. Hagin’s claim that the new teaching was given to him personally by Jesus through a series of visions during the 1950s does not match the evidence uncovered by McConnell. He places side by side several passages from the works of both Hagin and a man named Robert L. Deutrom. The author believes that what Hagin has done is that Hagin has directly plagiarized Kenyon. The word-for-word uniformity of the two men is beyond the bounds of coincidence, and it is clear from the context that these passages are merely representative ones drawn from just eight books: ‘Many more could be cited’. All of Hagin’s work post-dates Kenyon’s, who in fact died in 1948. Therefore McConnell surmises:

We need to realize that prosperity theology is a movement which is not only a reflection of the church’s desire to be relevant in the modern world but also a response to the challenges of globalization and urbanization. The movement has grown rapidly in recent years, and many churches have adopted some of its practices, such as charismatic prayer, prophecy, and healing.

The movement has also been criticized for its emphasis on personal success and material wealth. Many followers of the faith movement believe that their financial success is evidence of their faith in God’s provision and their commitment to the church. However, others see this emphasis on material wealth as a form of idolatry and a departure from biblical values.

The author argues that the faith movement is not a new phenomenon but has its roots in the charismatic movement of the 1920s and 1930s. The movement has also been influenced by the prosperity theology of the 1950s and 1960s, which taught that God would provide for His faithful followers.

The author believes that the faith movement has the potential to bring about positive change in society, but it must be handled with care. It is important to ensure that the movement does not become a source of division or a means to an end. The movement should be focused on the spread of the gospel and the spiritual growth of its followers, rather than on personal success or material wealth.

The author concludes that the faith movement is a complex phenomenon that requires careful study and evaluation. It is up to Christians to discern the true nature of the movement and to ensure that it remains true to the teachings of the Bible.
Prosperity theology and the faith movement

Robert Jackson

The author serves as curate in St Augustine’s, Bromley Common, England. His interest in the subject arose out of his earlier studies for a B.A in Business Studies.

Several years ago, the author’s thesis on ‘Christian Faith and Company Culture’ was criticized for not dealing with the argument that a church is not as important as the individual. The author responded that the church was a community, and that the individual is required to hold it together. Since then, however, this teaching has become well known in Britain, and together with its related догmas, forms a part of the religious life increasingly taught and accepted around the world. Its birthplace is the Southern States of America, and the spread around the world seems to have been effected via two distinct routes. On the one hand, there are individuals who have travelled from America to establish new churches which preach this distinctive gospel. On the other hand, this gospel has been adopted by some established churches of the Christian tradition.

It is the purpose of this article to trace the origins of this expanding world-wide movement and to deal with some of its tenets. I choose to call this particular corpus of beliefs ‘prosperity theology,’ and the movement which adheres to its faith movement. Neither of these titles is original to me, nor are they the only ones which are used, but what I mean by these two should be apparent.

The origins of prosperity theology

An American, Daniel McConnell, has conducted a piece of research which is extremely illuminating in establishing the origins of prosperity theology. His first move is to establish Kenneth E. Hagin as the father of the faith movement. Kenneth Hagin Jr. is quoted as writing of his father: ‘Almost every major faith ministry of the United States has been influenced by his ministry.’ Then, from correspondence with the major leaders within the movement, McConnell shows that Hagin Jr. is not merely boosting his father’s ego. These leaders in fact openly acknowledge Hagin as the human source of their inspiration, the fount of their teaching. But what is the role of the men like Kenneth Copeland, Frederick Price and Charlie Capps?

But, if Hagin is the father of the faith movement, then he is not the author of its teaching. Hagin’s claim that the new teaching was given to him personally by Jesus through a series of visions during the 1950s does not match the evidence uncovered by McConnell. He places side by side several passages from the works of both Hagin and a man named John G. Lake, and shows that the literal wording of each is that Hagin has directly plagiarized Lake. The word-for-word uniformity of the two men is beyond the bounds of coincidence, and so it must be the case that these two men are merely representative ones drawn from just eight books: ‘Many more could be cited.’ All of Hagin’s work post-dates Kenyon’s, who in fact died in 1948. Therefore McConnell surmises:

> Whereas Hagin appears to have copied only occasionally from sources other than Kenyon, he has plagiarized Kenyon both repeatedly and exactly. It is highly unlikely that he could not have known that the very doctrines that have made Kenneth Hagin and the Faith movement such a distinctive and powerful force within the current charismatic movement are all plagiarized from E. W. Kenyon.

Having isolated Kenyon as the source of prosperity theology, McConnell has one final surprise up his sleeve—that E. W. Kenyon was not a Pentecostal. Even though he may have influenced many of the post-war Pentecostal healers, the dominating influence on his theology is in fact the metaphysical cults which abounded at the turn of the century. He actually wrote that the Pentecostal movement was as destructive as it was instructive. Kenyon attended the Emerson College of Oratory in Boston, Mass., during the last decade of the nineteenth century, a college which was at the time immersed in the metaphysical cults, and the underlying New Thought: That influence of the metaphysical cults is clearly visible in his work, and while he claims to remain a resolutely Christian, and indeed explicitly refutes elements of the metaphysical cults, yet he simultaneously, often in the same breath as his rebuke, asserts the foundational beliefs of these cults. Ern Baxter remembers that Kenyon spoke very positively of Key to the Scriptures by Mary Baker Eddy (the mother of Christian Science), and that he claimed that there was a lot that could be learnt from her.

It is clear from merely the titles of Kenyon’s books that his was a polemical aim directed against the established churches with all its recognized doctrines and beliefs. His arguments were based on a dualistic interpretation of the world. He argues that the one world is caused by the other, that the visible world is only an illusion of the invisible world. He maintains that the invisible world is determined by the physical world, and that the physical universe is the result of the spiritual world. This dualistic view is then extended to include the Christian faith, which he sees as being based on the same dualistic principles. He also maintains that the Christian faith is based on the same dualistic principles, and that the Christian faith is based on the same dualistic principles.

Deuteronomy also provides important passages for the prosperity theologians. Both Norval Hayes and Peter Grenn draw on this passage from Deuteronomy 8:18. ‘Blessed are you, O Lord, who only do good. We have seen your righteousness in the work you have done for us.’ Deuteronomy contains the terms of the old covenant with Israel, in which he was promised, amongst other things, prosperity in the land of his possession. The land of his possession is a symbol of the land of promise. The land of promise is a symbol of the land of promise.

One additional passage is Malachi 3:12 which deals with the payment of the tithe, and from which are extracted the rules for the church. Charles Capps, for instance, claims that the Church is right to refer to the disciples as ‘staff’, and that Jesus was responsible for their physical well-being. Finally, I would like to ask Peter Grenn what he thinks is needed to take care of ‘tithing’ in first-century Palestine.

However, as mentioned above, there are passages in the NT which do support the claim of the faith movement, namely that if you give, then you will receive more than your
The needs today are tremendous. We're talking in millions and millions of dollars for the spreading of the good news of Jesus, and satellite television is just one aspect... so millions of pounds are going to be needed to see that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God.7

5. Matthew completes the argument:

Our aim is in to be like Christ, to spread the gospel, to share his love with our needy world in a deterritorial way. Our financial prosperity will finance its happening... Money is needed to make it happen.

Thus, the gospel requires very large amounts of financial backing to be effective in drawing people to Christ, a stance which is controversial to say the least. Although Paul insisted that the full-time Christian worker was entitled to be paid, there is some debate as to what form of remuneration was actually made a collection for alms and not evangelism, which as Paul and the apostles demonstrated, requires an active Spirit working through willing servants rather than ‘big bucks’.

What therefore are we to make of the OT, and the fact that it seems to count God’s adequacy in anything else? Does this mean that God does not want all Christians to be rich? In the first place, the OT must be used with extreme caution because, as Deuteronomy 18:8 says, the promises contained therein refer to the terms of the old covenant which was made with the sons of Abraham at a time when such sonship depended on physical descent. In other words, the covenant people of God in the OT are a particular ethnic group who were chosen by God. This reality is much more apparent if we read 2 Corinthians 10:17/18. Also Paul, in the words of C. K. Barrett, is ‘not so crude a thinker as to mean that the Christian is always assured of the ability to live a better life out of the new life of the spirit, as if there have to be no longer are the people of the covenant distinguishable by nationality, and this renders inappropriate many of the promises made to the state of God, just as it does to many of the regulations laid down for her way of life.

Jacques Ellul notes that in the majority of OT references to the rich, they are found to be under God’s condemnation. Therefore he concludes that wealth was not a blessing in itself, but rather a tangible sign of the blessing, and as such, a sacrament which was apt for four reasons:

First, it implied the freedom of election.

Secondly, the fact that wealth is used as the sign implies that the covenant people are handed over to God, who chooses those to whom he deems fit, that content not to restrict himself to the provision of daily bread, God gives wealth which gives rise to luxury, comfort, and ease.

Thirdly, it has a role in the final judgment. In Isaiah 60:4ff.

Fourthly, the role of the heavenly Jerusalem is to be present in our midst through this wealth. This also acts as a test of the true Christian, and we can see the Bible lays an emphasis on charitable giving, it lays the emphasis on giving to finance mission. Gaunt states:

Wealth, well suited to bringing the gift of the Promised Land to mind, is certainly not suited to reminding us of the gift of the child who does not have adequate sign, therefore we find a stripping of its true value. God thus puts an end to the sign’s ambiguity, wealth is no longer a sacrament because ‘God chose what is least in the world to shame the strong’ (1 Cor. 1:27). In Christ God chooses the poor as the ultimate formative value and makes it adequate to the one who is undertaking.8

While some of the points that Ellul raises are not without their problems, his actual conclusion is matched by that of Thomas Schmidt who avoids the sacramental language of Ellul, he introduces the means of acquiesce on an equal footing.

The OT declares that wealth is a confirmation of God’s covenant with his people, e.g., 1:6:12-20. This is a reminder that among the stipulations of the covenant are the justice imperative and the demand that man acknowledge God as the sole source of power. The OT devalues wealth acquired in violation of these stipulations.9

In fact if ‘Bible’ were substituted for ‘OT’, this statement would apply out of place in a prosperity theology publication. But Schmidt believes, as Ellul does, that Jesus changed all this. Schmidt’s thesis is based on the synoptic gospels and he is struck by the repeated references of Jesus’ followers either giving up everything to follow him, or being instructed to do so. In Mark for example, ‘the commands in 8:34; 10:21; the statements in 10:28; 12:44, and the narrative account in 10:21 reveal a patterned or formalized theological devaluation of wealth.’ It is impossible here to go into the details of Schmidt’s work, but its well argued conclusion:

‘hostility to wealth exists independently of socio-economic circumstances as a fundamental religious-ethical tenet consistently expressed in the Synoptics’.10

The NT’s account of the life and teaching of Jesus simply does not support the contention that God wants all his children to be materially rich, since such wealth would then be a blessing. This is not consistent with Jesus who is to be found stating, both in his sayings and his actions, that the kingdom of heaven is for the poor and that there is no future comfort for the rich who have apparently already received their consolation. Furthermore, Jesus and the gospels never actually state that the rich man was unrighteous, but nevertheless he is to be found in a revered situation. Footnotes page 196.

It is interesting to note that in the parable of the wedding banquet, the Jews are represented by the wealthy, and the Gentiles by the poor (Mt. 22:1-14).

Teaching on healing

When the Bible talks about suffering, that doesn’t mean ‘sickness’. We have no business suffering sickness and disease, because Jesus redeemed us from that.11

The grounds for believing this particular truth ‘fall, broadly speaking, into three categories – Jesus’ example, the recorded activities of the apostles, and the substance of the atonement, that:

(i) Jesus’ teaching and example

The reason why all things are made faithful by healing will reconcile that Jesus in his earthly life healed all those who came to him to be healed. Matthew 4:23 demonstrates that

that Jesus healed all manner of diseases. Mark 1:32 further elaborates this truth, so making this divine healing available to anyone who is sick with faith. But in this kingdom today after all, Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

This is a strong argument and yet it is not without its problems for example the healing of Bethsaida (John 6:1-12), 5:1-9, none of the other inferred who gathered around him asked Jesus to heal them? Perhaps it is just conceivable that John did not record those who were healed, but highly unlikely given the rest of the pericope (10:15).

(ii) Apostolic healing activities

After his ascension he sent out his disciples to preach the gospel, and he endowed them with the power to heal. In Acts 3:1-8 Luke tells of Peter and John healing the cripple at the pool of Bethesda, and how the apostles performing miraculous signs and wonders, healing many (5:1-16). Philip did likewise in Samaria (8:4-8), and finally Paul is God to the extent that everybody agrees, they come into contact with him could heal a cripple (19:11ff).

It is clear, though, that sometimes those prayed for were not healed. There is the case of Timothy who, in 1 Timothy 5:23, is instructed by Paul to take a little wine for his stomach condition. Then in 2 Timothy 4:20, Trophimus is described as having been left sick in Miletus. There is even Paul himself, in 2 Corinthians 11:33, the Gallatians in the first place because he was ill (Gal. 4:13f).

(iii) Healing as a consequence of the atonement

This argument is made in Romans 5:1-11. ‘Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows... and by his wounds we are healed’, and then calls upon Matthew 8:16f. to show how this prophecy was fulfilled in the person of Jesus: When evening came many, who were demon-possessed were brought to him, and he drove out the spirits with a word and healed all who were sick. This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: “He took up our infirmities and carried our diseases.” This latter passage demonstrates that healing is part of the work of the atonement carried out by Jesus. They are the cross and the fact itself is central to the faith movement for which healing is as automatic as the forgiveness of sins.

John Wimber, in his book Power Healing, includes a chapter in which he argues why divine healing is not always granted. In it, he usefully lists a number of theologians who disagree on whether healing is in the atonement. If it is accepted that it is not in the atonement, then we need no further in refuting the above statement. However, if it is included in the atonement, and I believe that it is, who is going to pay for sins? Dr. Stephen Carson finds Matthew 8:16f. as convincing as the prosperity theologians on this matter, but he writes that:

From the perspective of the NT writers, the Cross is the basis for all benefits. In the cross the power bestowed on Jesus holds good today because all, Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

Hence, though forgiveness is immediate in the present time, the fact that healing is not always granted can be explained in that
gift in return. What is crucial however is the motivation of the giver, and not the certainty of material abundance by way of divine recompense. One must believe that God makes his people rich so that they can give away lots of money; after all, God cannot ask a man to give $500 if he has not already made a substantial deposit in heaven. Hence, one must read God’s books on money in the statement that God wants all Christians to be rich, and the reason for this is not only that it can be given away. Profit means that God also wants Christianity to enjoy being wealthy.  

Yet by walking in God’s financial plan, you can have the $5,000 automobile, wear the $100 suit, and buy the $100 designer shoes. God does not care. He wants His kids to look good.

Michael Bassett takes this one step further and says:

If you want a nice watch, why don’t you give one away and be expected to replace it? (I don’t want it for you.) Why don’t you sow for one, then you can be expected for a new car?  

Sacrificial giving is not a concept that they seem to embrace: ‘you cannot give away much when your own needs are not met. You cannot do it when you are struggling themselves to pay your electric bill.’ Wilful poverty is seen as a ‘denial of all that Christ has won through his death,’ and the ignorance of this fact which prevents financial endowment, as tragic. ‘Surely the Christian who is supplied by either Jesus in Luke 6:38 is comfortable with the attitudes expressed on the chapter. Then Mark 10:17:?’ Also Paul, in the words of C. K. Barrett, ‘is not so crude a thinker as to mean that the Christian is always assured of his next meal, but it is a statement that he will be able to act charitably towards others – he knew in his own experience (2 Cor. 11:23-33; Phil. 4:12) that this was not true.’

Thus, it can be powerfully argued that God does not wish all Christians to be materially rich, and yet it is an oft-observed fact that when a poor person becomes a follower of Christ, his poverty disappears. John Wesley wrote:

I do not see how it is possible in the nature of things for any revival of religion to continue for long. For religion must necessarily produce wealth, and we cannot secure these benefits without riches. But as riches increase, so will pride, anger, and love of the world in all its branches.

Wesley’s solution was to give away as much as possible and build himself a fortune. Nevertheless, he suffered from which item of expenditure is a justifiable necessity and which is a luxury? Wesley’s policy in this matter was to avoid raising his standard of living for himself, while at the same time increasing the income of the poor. This is surely more in keeping with Jesus’ teaching than the teaching of the prosperity theologians whose chapter titles are likely to be rather paradoxical. So perhaps it was not a matter of not content to restrict himself to the provision of daily bread, God gives wealth which gives rise to luxury, comfort, and ease.

First, it implied the freedom of election. Secondly, the fact that wealth is used as the sign implies that the Church of Jesus Christ is a church of the rich. And this is not without danger. If it is not seen to be a church of the rich, if it is not seen to be a church of the poor, it will suffer from a lack of confidence and a lack of wealth. It is through this process that the Church of Jesus Christ can be brought into the heavenly Jerusalem. Thus, human accomplishment has a place in the final eschatological plan.

Fourthly, the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem is to be present in our midst through this wealth. This also acts as a counterbalance to the idea that all a man’s wealth is for himself and a way to give power to God.”

Elull however believes that wealth was not a permanent sacrament and continues:

Wealth, well suited to bringing the gift of the Promised Land to men, is certainly not suited to reminding us of the gift of Christian salvation. This is the inherent inadequacy of money; therefore we find a strike through its true value. God thus puts an end to the sign’s ambiguity. Wealth no longer has its sacramental because ‘God chose what was least in the world to shame the strong’ (1 Cor. 2:7). In Christ God chooses the poor as his people, and his supreme vicarious value makes it adequate to the task of being the undertaking.

While some of the points that Elull raises are not without their problems, his actual conclusion is matched by that of Thomas Schmidt who avoids the sacramental language of Elull, introduces the means of achieving on being important.

The OT declares that wealth is a confirmation of God’s covenant with his people, e.g. Deuteronomy 28:1-9. Among the stipulations of the covenant is the justice imperative and the demand that man acknowledge God as the sole source of power. Deuteronomy 28:14 reflects the idea that OT devalues wealth accrued in violation of these stipulations.

In fact if ‘Bible’ were substituted for ‘OT’, this statement would read as follows: ‘out of place in a prosperity theology, publication. But Schmidt believes, as Elull does, that Jesus changed all this. Schmidt’s thesis is based on the synoptic gospels and he is struck by the repeated assertions of Jesus’ followers either giving up everything to follow him, or being instructed to do so. In Mark for example, ‘the commands in 8:34; 10:21, the statements in 10:28; 12:44, and the narrative approach of 10:18 reveal a patterned or formulaic theological devaluation of wealth.’ It is impossible here to go into the details of Schmidt’s work, but its well argued conclusion that宝

‘hostility to wealth exists independently of socio-economic conditions as a fundamental religious-ethical tenet consistently expressed in the Synoptic accounts’

The NT’s account of the wealth of Jesus simply does not support the contention that God wants all his children to be materially rich, since such wealth would then be a blessing. This is consistent with Jesus who is found stating, both Matthew 6:24, ‘the kingdom of heaven is for the poor and that there is no future comfort for the rich who have apparently already received theirs.’ Matthew 16:26: ‘whoever loves his life will lose it, and whoever hates his life for the sake of Me shall have it.’ Mark 8:34: ‘whoever will receive Me will receive My word, and My word will receive him.’ And Matthew 18:3: ‘it is more blessed to give than to receive’.

But this is clearly not the teaching of Jesus. Lazarus never actually states that the rich man was unrighteous, but nevertheless he is to be found in a reversed situation, footstool. Footnote 38 is interesting to note that in the parable of the wedding banquet, the Jews are represented by the wealthy, and the Gentiles by the poor (Mt. 22:1-14).

Teaching on healing

When the Bible talks about suffering, that doesn’t mean ‘sickness.’ We have no business suffering sickness and disease, because Jesus redeemed us from that.  

The grounds for believing this particular ‘truth’ fail, broadly speaking, into three categories – Jesus’ example, the recorded activities of the apostles, and the substance of the atonement.

(i) Jesus’ teaching and example

The reason why the Bible talks so faithfully about healing is that Jesus in his earthly life healed all those who came to him to be healed. Matthew 4:23 demonstrates that Jesus healed all manner of diseases. Mark 1:32 further elaborates this truth, so making this divine healing available to anyone who was in need of help, had a disease, or was under the threat of disease today because after all, Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

This is a strong argument and yet it is not without its problems. Acts 3:1-8 tells of Peter and John healing the cripple at the gate of the temple. This healing is drawn to the apostles performing miraculous signs and wonders, healing many (5:12-16). Philip did likewise in Samarias (8:4-8), and finally Paul is God to the extent that everyone who came into contact with him could be healed (19:11).

It is clear, though, that sometimes those prayed for were not healed. There is the case of Timothy who, in 1 Timothy 5:23, is instructed by Paul to take a little wine for his stomach condition. Then in 2 Timothy 4:20, Trophimus is described as having been left sick in Miletus. There is even Paul himself, who, wrote the Galatians in the first place because he was ill (Gal. 4:13).

(ii) Apostolic healing activities

After his resurrection, he sent out his disciples to preach the gospel, and he endowed them with the power to heal. In Acts 3:1-8 Luke tells of Peter and John healing the cripple at the gate of the temple. This healing is drawn to the apostles performing miraculous signs and wonders, healing many (5:12-16). Philip did likewise in Samarias (8:4-8), and finally Paul is God to the extent that everyone who came into contact with him could be healed (19:11).

(iii) Healing as a consequence of the atonement

This argument is put forward by John 53:44: ‘Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows . . . and by his wounds we are healed’, and then calls upon Matthew 8:16: to show how this prophecy was fulfilled in the person of Jesus: When evening came, many who were demon-possessed were brought to him, and he drove out the spirits with a word and healed all who were sick. This was to fulfill what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah: ‘He took up our infirmities and carried our diseases.’ This latter passage demonstrates that healing is part of the work of the atonement carried out by Jesus. As a result the cross and this fact is central to the faith movement for which healing is as automatic as the forgiveness of sins.  

John Wimber, in his book Power Healing, includes a chapter on healing titled ‘Why divine healing is not always granted. In it, he usefully lists a number of theologians who disagree on whether healing is in the atonement.’ If it is accepted that it is not in the atonement, then we need to look no further in refuting the above statement. However, if it is included in the atonement, and I believe that it is, why is it not observed? Does John Stott agree? Carson finds Matthew 8:16: as convincing as the propriety theologians on this matter, but he writes that:

‘From the perspective of the NT writers, the Cross is the basis for all benevolence. The New Testament expresses in its heart’s desire that all such benefits can be secured at the present time on demand, any more than we have the right and power to demand our resurrection body before it is given to us.’

Hence, though forgiveness is instant in the present time, the fact that healing is not always granted can be explained in that
while we are the new covenant people, yet we possess earthly and sinful bodies. When healing does take place, it is a clash between the outward body of the kingdom, it is a sign that God is supreme, and it is a portent of things to come. When healing does not take place, it shows that the new is not yet the perfect. The soul that previously died and that until then, even Christians must face having to live in the domain of the evil one.

In the meantime, the faith movement has to deny that sickness can lead to premature death, and Price elaborates on this scriptural expectation in Luke 7:11-16, the raising of the widow's son. He continues:

This young man was too young to die. Do you know that in the accounts that we have in the Bible of Jesus raising the dead He always raised young people? Did you ever think about that?

Your minimum days should be seventy years, that's just the bare minimum. You ought to live to be at least 120 years of age. That's the Bible. God out of His mouth — in the Old Testament — said the number of your days shall be 120 years.

I didn't write it.

God said it. The minimum ought to be 70 years, and you shouldn't go out with sickness or disease then.

The dualistic foundation of prosperity theology

It is a Christian system which has hovered around Christianity from the very beginning. This involves a belief in two mutually exclusive realms — the spiritual realm, which is for the believer, and the material realm, which is for the unbeliever. In the New Testament, this is under the governance of the supreme God, and is the proper domain for the people. The latter is ruled over by its own god, and is in eternal conflict with the former. All people start in the material realm, and the common aim in life is to aspire to the spiritual one, an aspiration that can only be satisfied with the aid of some outside agent from the spiritual realm. This system can be found in other cultures in the first few centuries AD, many of whom took Jesus Christ as the outside agent of salvation. They were strongly rebuffed by the church and became known by the title Gnostic. The faith movement today stands condemned by many of being Gnostic due to its dualism, but whether a dualistic foundation is entirely wrong, or whether the outworks of doctrine do have some wide divergences, not least in the attitude to material things. Nevertheless, there are some marked similarities between the two.

Kenyon is thoroughly dualistic in his separation of revelation knowledge and sense knowledge. The former is to do with the spirit and comes from the Spirit of God. The latter is worldly and is not only inferior to, but inhibits the development of the former. Sense knowledge comes from the five senses and is so limited to the physical environment. It is totally opposed to the things taught by revelation knowledge which is to be gleaned from the Bible. Kenyon displays a characteristic tone of pride in his writings, and he denies that Peter and John knew the full details of eternal life.

Price echoes Kenyon when he too speaks of two kinds of knowledge — faith knowledge and sense knowledge — which clash. He is critical of the Church's tendency since the Reformation to ignore the heart of the New Testament — the need to know the nature of God. He writes, "Satan is the God of the world, the one who can affect you. It doesn't care if you have a physical ailment or a spiritual one, and that is the one that defines an encounter of life." Here is surely a hint of the demarcation of the ancient Gnostics. Satan is indeed the prince of the world but he has his own agenda. He does not care if you have a physical ailment or a spiritual one, and the one that defines an encounter of life.

The ancient Gnostics believed that man was spirit trapped in a physical body and their latter-day counterparts are no different. "You are not living in a physical body, writes Price, "and Hagan concedes:"

The real man is the spirit. The spirit operates through the soul: the intellect, sensibilities, and will. And the soul operates through the body.

The implications of such dualism can be frightening; in the case of divine healing they can be fatal. Because all diseases are physical manifestations of spiritual ailments, the former will be resolved after the latter have been dealt with — a deception of the devil so as to trick and therefore to be denied. Price writes:

Remember you are healed by faith, and not by sight. Faith is the evidence of healing — not the fact that the cancer has left your body. Your contre-jour, between the time that you pray and claim your healing until it is seen in your body, is what causes it to come. .. Now you are healed by faith. If you try to see it, you are in trouble. Your problem is physical, not spiritual. If you are in pain, nausea, lumps, etc. This is where your confession comes in. YOU MUST CONFESSION THE WORD OF GOD IN THE FACE OF EVERY SYMPTOM AND EVERY PAIN. This is faith versus sense knowledge.1

Bryan Jones writes in a similar vein...

Someone may feel ill, seek and receive prayer for healing, but because they still feel ill conclude that God has not worked on their behalf. Faith is not acting in conjunction with feeling. Faith acts against the evidence which is in your heart.

Denying physical symptoms in the belief that this will demonstrate the faith which in turn works the healing can be deadly. Andrew Brandon tells of the tragic and unnecessary death of a Cornish pastor who delayed seeking medical attention for an ailment which is only curable if treated during its early stages — he died! There is also the chilling story of Larry Parker in We Let Our Son Die (Harvest House, 1991). This woman had already been praying for a miracle for years before her husband had been prayed for by a faith evangelist. He and his wife even believed that it was merely Satan's deception when Wesley, their son, was taken ill. They were convicted of child abuse and involuntary manslaughter.

Another consequence of this dualism is a belief in the nature of the Christian who, once baptized in the Spirit, becomes independent of the Church and hence of the need to board the nature of God. The worrying aspect of this is that it usherers in a grading of Christians. Kenyon talks of Christians who have given up to sense knowledge, and those who are still refining their lives on revelation knowledge; both are saved, but the latter are superior — a clearly divisive dogma.

At first sight, because this process is said to involve the 'baptism of the Spirit', the heresy is shrouded in mystery. But Paul Sanclot's School of the Word study on Living in the Anointing raises the veil. Like many Pentecostals, he believes that all 'baptism in the Spirit' believers must speak in tongues to verify their baptism, but more importantly, he argues that such a believer also receives divine power on a permanent basis. He argues in the following stages: allowing you to borrow my car occasionally and my giving you the keys to the same car and saying: "Use it any time you like." "Thus, we have the power to perform signs (oracles) — especially the tangible one superior to his non-tongue-speaking, non-miracle-performing counterpart. This means that faith alone is sufficient and that the tangible and relating faith to being the means of providing the tangible. A Christian who becomes ill and is not healed has not faith denied him. A Christian whose business goes to the wall has his faith destroyed because it was dependent on business success. How an oppressed Christian in Albania views himself in these terms is unbelievable. How can these Christians who have lost their hope, their crops destroyed by drought, is on the brink of starvation.

Finally, there is one extreme outworking of this dualism which is taught by many prosperity theologians. Because the spiritual has priority over the flesh, the death of Christ on the cross cannot end our spiritual separation from God. Price argues that if this were not the case, then the death of one of the dependent and non-dependent models would be that 'when His blood was poured out, it did not atone'. The belief is that it was Christ's three-day spell in hell which culminated in a spiritual death that finally effected the atonement.1

Positive confession

What is it you want to get from God? If you want healing, then sow healing seed. If you want a miracle, sow some miracle seed! If you want to be unafraid, then sow some seeds along this line. If you want deliverance from fear, hate, fear, and loneliness, then get the assurance that you are what you claim to be in your heart.

"Name it and claim it and 'believe it and receive it' are phrases that trip off the tongue and they have become the catchphrase of the leaders of this 'lot-machine' concept of positive confession. The idea is that you find the appropriate texts in the Bible, sow them in your heart, and then claim the thing that you want and which they offer. By behaving as if that which you want is true, you can demonstrate the faith which will invariably be rewarded. This attitude colours the faith movement's teaching on confession of sin. Whereas our Lord taught us to pray daily 'This is my body, this is the cup', the argy-bargy of the healing, and the avariciousness of the spirit.

When you confess your weakness and your disease you are openly confessing that the Word of God is not true and that God has failed to make it so. The believer who is always confessing his sins is saying that life is building weakness, failure, and sin into his consciousness.

Thus he argues that God requires a positive confession that as Christians we are 'not only clothed in the Righteousness of Christ but actually partakers of His Righteousness. This is a photo of our present walk with Christ'.

A girl with whom I worked in Bradford told me that the reason why she had left her evangelical Anglican church was because she was not always sure whether or not she was in the right place. She had once, while in Bradford that confession of sins in church was wrong. Because she was in Christ, she knew instantly when she had sinned. And she was therefore able to confess to them again in church was not only otiose, but also highly negative in that it focused attention on the devil's power in her life, thus hindering the work of the Spirit.

The faith movement today

The faith movement is well established in America. In 1979 Hagan's son-in-law, Doyle Harrison, founded the International Convention of Faith Churches and Ministers (ICFCM) which has a number of ministers. The following officers include all the leaders of the faith movement in America. The ICFCM has over a hundred member churches, and more than 700 ministers. The ministers themselves have to have passed through rigorous tests, and are required to maintain professional ethics, and tenets of faith of the Rhema Ministerial Association (RMA) in addition to the ICFCM. The Faith Church Ministries, Inc. The Hagan connection continues and Doyle Harrison is also the president of Harrison House, which is the faith movement's major publishing company.

In Britain, the faith movement is similarly structured and is beginning to gain a sense of permanency. If Hagan was the central figure of the movement in America, then Bryn Jones fulfils that role in Britain. He is described as 'the founder and driving force behind Harvestime Fellowship, Restoration Magazine, the Digt and the School of the Word, Word to the World, Dalies Television, and the International Christian Leadership Programme'. Writing in 1985 in the British Bible Training Center, an organization that has covered between 15,000 and 18,000 members plus children, in addition to several thousand who, while interested, remained in their own churches. The two most interesting numbers were virtually a paré with the Elim Pentecostals. He adds that these people are well organized, and led by powerful leaders who have a sound financial backing.

In South Africa, Ray and Lynda McCauley, 1979 graduates of Hagan's Rhema Bible Training Center, have founded Rhema Ministries South Africa. This organization is already a large property owner and employs many people. It has a training centre turning out 300 graduates per year, and a television station, Reach Africa, broadcasting 6 days a week, 9 hours daily, mondly. Elsewhere prosperity theology is preached, amongst other places, in Scandinavia, where Stanley Sjöberg has recently become the first humble advocate of the teaching in Sweden, and in India where various Britons have established churches, and Argentina where Orvil Swindoll operates.
while we are the new covenant people, yet we possess earthly and sinful bodies. When healing does take place, it is a reflection of the reign of God in the kingdom, it is a sign that God is supreme, and it is a portent of things to come. When healing does not take place, it shows that the new covenant is not yet the consummation of the Old Testament. And until that time, even Christians must face having to live in the domain of the evil one.

In the meantime, the faith movement has to deny that sickness can lead to premature death, and Price elaborates on Jesus' experiences with the paralytic at Lake 7:1-16, the raising of the widow's son. He continues:

This young man was too young to die. Do you know that in the accounts that we have in the Bible of Jesus raising the dead He always raised young people? Did you ever think about that?

Your minimum days should be seventy years, that's just the bare minimum. You ought to live to be at least 120 years of age. That's the Bible. God out of His mouth -- in the Old Testament -- said the number of your days shall be 120 years.

I didn't write it.

God said it. The minimum ought to be 70 years, and you shouldn't go out with sickness or disease then.11

The dualistic foundation of prosperity theology

It's primarily a system which has homosexuality with Christianity from the very beginning. This involves a belief in two mutually exclusive realms -- the spiritual and the carnal. The former is under the governance of the supreme God, and the proper domain for people. The latter is ruled over by its own god, and is in eternal conflict with the former. All people start in the material realm, and the common aim in life is to aspire to the spiritual one, an aspiration that can only be satisfied with the aid of some outside agent from the spiritual realm. This system is but one example of the reality in the first few centuries AD, many of whom took Jesus Christ as the outside agent of salvation. They were strongly rebutted by the early church and became known by the title Gnostic. The faith movement today stands condemned by many of being Gnostic due to its dualism,12 but whether a dualistic foundation is entwined with the Gnostics or not, the outrunings of doctrine do have some wide divergences, not least in the attitude to material things. Nevertheless, there are some marked similarities between the two.

Kenyon is thoroughly dualistic in his separation of revelation knowledge and sense knowledge.13 The former is to do with the spirit and comes from the Spirit of God. The latter is worldly and is not only inferior to, but inhibits the development of the former. Sense knowledge comes from the five senses and is so limited to the physical environment. It is totally opposed to the things taught by revelation knowledge which is to be gleaned from the Bible. Kenyon displays a lack of knowledge of the Bible as he named Marcon who championed Paul while omitting Matthew, Mark and John from his canon. Kenyon argues that revelation knowledge comes from the writing of the apostles and he denies that Peter and John knew the full details of eternal life.

Price echoes Kenyon when he too speaks of two kinds of knowledge -- faith knowledge and sense knowledge -- which clash. He also points out that since Christians should not believe in every encounter of life.14 He is surely a hint of the demise of the ancient Gnostics. Satan is indeed the prince of the world but He is the Son. He does not live in the world. He rules the world, but for only as long as God chooses to let him. He is not the God of the world, he does not order the seasons. Neither does he have control over the rain which the Lord makes to fall on the righteous and the unrighteous alike. He is the polluter, not the fount of goodness. Christians have long been convinced that the hand of God can be seen in creation and to a large extent is officially termed natural theology to be a valuable aid to faith, revealing the glory of God through his handwork.

The ancient Gnostics believed that man was spirit trapped in a physical body and their latter-day counterparts are no different. You are not alive in a physical body, writes Price,15 and Hagan concedes:

The real man is the spirit. The spirit operates through the soul: the intellect, sensibilities, and will. And the soul operates through the body. The real you (your spirit) and your soul live in a physical body.

The implications of such dualism can be frightening; in the case of divine healing they can be fatal. Because all diseases are physical manifestations of spiritual ailments, the former cannot be healed unless the latter have been dealt with -- a deception of the devil so now he speaks and therefore to be denied. Price writes:

Remember you are healed by faith, and not by sight. Faith is the evidence of healing -- not the fact that the cancer has left your body. Faith is the confidence, the time between the time you pray and grace your healing until it is seen in your body, is what causes it to come. Now you have as much faith as a mustard seed, and if you pray with your faith, you shall receive your healing, addictions, pain, nausea, jumpy, etc. This is where your confession comes in. YOU MUST CONFESSION THE WORD OF GOD IN THE FACE OF EVERY SYMPTOM AND EVERY PAIN. This is faith versus sense knowledge.16

Bryon Jones writes in a similar vein . . .

Some people may feel ill, seek and receive prayer for healing, but because they still feel ill conclude that God has not worked on their behalf. Faith is not acting in conjunction with feeling. Faith acts in accordance with God's Word, without regard to the situation.

Denying physical symptoms in the belief that this will demonstrate the faith which in turn works the healing can be deadly. Andrew Brandon tells of the tragic and unnecessary death of a Cornish pastor who delayed seeking medical attention for an ailment which is only curable if treated during its early stages -- he died!17 There is also the chilling story of Larry Parker in We Let Our Son Die (Harvest House, 1976). Larry had been in a car accident and was asked by his doctors to give up smoking. He refused, and had been prayed for by a faith evangelist. He and his wife even believed that it was merely Satan's deception when Wesley, their youngest son of 9 years, was killed by a car. They were convicted of child abuse and involuntary manslaughter.

Another consequence of this dualism is a belief in the nature of the Christian who, once baptized in the Spirit, becomes a completely consecrated being since he has already board the nature of God. The worryng aspect of this is that it ushers in a grading of Christians. Kenyon talks of Christians who have come out to serve God and those who who live their lives on revelation knowledge; both are saved, but the latter are superior -- a clearly divisive dogma.

At first sight, because this process is said to involve the 'baptism of the Spirit', the heresy is shrouded behind many layers of the Spirit. But Paul Scanlon's School of the Word study on Living in the Anointing raises the veil. Like many Pentecostals, he believes that all 'baptized in the Spirit' believers must speak in tongues to verify their baptism, but more importantly, he argues that such a believer also receives divine power on a permanent basis. This is a more specific and objective view allowing you to borrow my car occasionally and give you the keys to the same car and saying: "Use it any time you like." Thus, we have the second level of those who are in all things (especially the tangible ones) superior to his non-tongue-speaking, non-miracle-performing counterpart. This means that faith which is made to depend on the tangible, thus placing the tangible at a premium and relegating faith to being the means of providing the tangible. A Christian who becomes ill and is not healed has not faith defeated him. A Christian whose businesses go to the wall has his faith destroyed because it was dependent on business success. How an oppressed Christian in Albania views himself in these terms is unanswerable. But it is clear that such Christians, whose crops are destroyed by drought, is on the brink of starvation.

Finally, there is one extreme outlook of this dualism which is taught by many prosperity theologians. Because the spirit is without form and will, the death of Christ on the cross cannot end our spiritual separation from God. Price argues that if this were not the case, then the death of one of the physical body would have to mean that 'when His blood was poured out, it did not atone'. The belief is that it was Christ's three-day spell in hell which culminated in a spiritual death that finally effected the atonement.18

Positive confession

What is it you want to get from God? If you want healing, then sow healing seed. If you want a miracle, sow some miracle seed! If you want to be unafraid, then sow some seeds along this line. If you want deliverance from sin, then sow the Word of God! If you want, then get the evidence of it where you are living in your heart.

"Name it and claim it" and 'Believe it and receive it" are phrases that trip off the tongue and they have become the catchphrases of those who seek faith or 'belief-mechanic' concept of positive confession. The idea is that you find the appropriate texts in the Bible, sow them in your heart, and then claim the thing that you want and which they offer. By behaving as if that your will was God's will you can and will demonstrate the faith which will invariably be rewarded.

This attitude colours the faith movement's teaching on confession of sin. Whereas our Lord taught us to pray daily for forgiveness of sin (Matthew 6:12), the faith movement argues that to confess the sin which has failed to make it good... The believer who is always confessing his sins is paying for his building weakness, failure, sin and into his consciousness.19

Thus he argues that God requires a positive confession that as Christians we are 'not only clothed in the Righteousness of Christ but actually partakers of His Righteousness. This is a photo of our present walk with Christ'.

A girl with whom I worked in Bradford told me that the reason why she had left her evangelical Anglican church was because they seemed to have a problem with grace. She added that it was her first time Bradford that confession of sins in church was wrong. Because she was in Christ, she knew instantly when she had sinned and would ask for forgiveness there and then. She also confessed that she now has to confess them again in church was not only otiose, but also highly negative in that it focused attention on the devil's power in her life, thus hindering the work of the Spirit.

The faith movement today

The faith movement is well established in America. In 1979 Hagan's son-in-law, Doyle Harrison, founded the International Convention of Faith Churches and Ministers (ICFPCM) and is the focusing officer includes all the leaders of the faith movement in America. The IFCPCM has over a hundred member churches, and more than 700 ministers. The ministers themselves have to have passed through rigorous training and tests. Harrison also speaks at schools and colleges. Harrison must swear an affidavit submitting to the constitution, ethics, and tenets of the faith. The Rhema Ministerial Association (RMA) has over 600 members in the United States. The RMA Ministries, Inc. The Hagan connection and Doyle Harrison is also the president of Harrison House, which is the faith movement's major publishing company.

In Britain, the faith movement is similarly structured and is beginning to gain a sense of permanency. If Hagan is the central figure of the movement in America, then Bryn Jones fulfils that role in Britain. He is described as 'the founder and driving force behind Harvestime Fellowship, Restoration magazine, the Dawn and the School of the Word, Word to the World, Dales Television, and the International Christian Leadership Programme'. Writing in 1985, E. S. Williams, director of the School of the Word, estimated that there were over 5,000 leaders and members of some kind in the movement, occupying a vast amount of church time. In 1990, the School of the Word, Word to the World, Dales Television, and the Ecumenical Christian Leadership Programme were fully operating and the School of the Word volunteer organization had covered between 15,000 and 18,000 members plus children, in addition to several thousand who, while interested, remained in their own churches. The School of the Word membership numbers were virtually a part with the Elim Pentecostals. He adds that these people are well organized, and led by powerful leaders who have a sound financial backing.20

In South Africa, Ray and Lynda McCauley, 1979 graduates of Hagan's Bible Training Center, have founded a large property owner and employs many people. It has a training centre turning out 300 graduates per year, and a television channel broadcasting weekly. Also monthly. Elsewhere prosperity theology is preached, amongst other places, in Scandinavia, where Stanley Sjoberg has been particularly influential. In Argentina and India where various Britons have established churches, and Argentina where Orvi Swindoll operates.
In Britain, as in America, the faith movement is placing an emphasis on televangelism. Much money has been collected for this movement of Television Preachers, a strategic gambit for the chance to hitch a ride on the wave of satellite television. They have already produced thirty-eight programmes, entertained by Cliff Richard, which have been broadcast across Europe from the Oslo base of New World.

While the faith movement in Britain increases in size, influence and in its sense of permanency, yet it seems unlikely to have any greater effect upon the natural way that it appears to have done in the States. The reasons are cultural. In his celebrated religious history of America, Sidney Ahlstrom nonchalantly mentioned that nine tenths of all the people were commonly acknowledged that those who suffered did so because of their sin and so were responsible for their own ills. Thus he justified the Protestant work ethics which saw wealth as a sign of election, and which dominated Calvinistic America. Thus, John D. Rockefeller judged his wealth to be a divine reward for his faith, and Andrew Carnegie wrote a book titled Gospel of Wealth. In spite of their scandalous business practices, there seems to be no doubting their sincerity. For a nation made up of individuals who believed that they had been elected by God, it was natural to assume that God would bless the nation in a special way, raising her up to dominate world politics. In 'God we trust' is therefore not so much a statement of fact as a claim to God's blessing. Thus, national and personal wealth have always been acknowledged as signs of God's blessing in America, which, as we saw, makes for a nation who is interested in a taxi, a taboos area, especially when it abundantly. People love to be outraged when the Mirror newspaper publishes lists of Britain's top earners, and while things are gradually changing, it is still considered unsophisticated to want wealth. Hence, S. Matthew has to write:

We need not ashamed of our wealth or try to hide it. Don't be embarrassed about God's blessing — give it away.

In spite of this, the preaching of the gospel of wealth is driving some people to believe that there is a way that it is right and responsible for splitting the faith movement's church in Bath.

Another big difference is that in America, all fundamentalist denominations including the faith movement are soaked in nationalistic fervour. America being seen as God's mighty instrument in proclaiming his gospel to all nations. The following prayer illustrates this point:

Father, in Jesus' name we pray your wisdom will come to our president, his advisors, senators, representatives, all other government and business leaders. We pray for the economy of the United States and for the prosperity of this country. Father, we remind you this day that:

This country has always given to those in need and has never hidden her wealth from the world.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in allowing full freedom for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in that her citizens, more than the citizens of any other country, have moved on over the world for the gospel.

This country's economic system has given to the gospel the equivalent of millions of dollars by exempting property used in the proclamation of the gospel from property taxes, by exempting the income of organizations which preach the gospel from income tax, and by exempting the property and offerings of God's people from income taxes.

Furthermore, the prosperity of this country has generated billions of dollars to be used in the spread of the gospel, and the conversion of the unconverted to Christ. One third of the income of financing the evangelization of the world in this generation.

We therefore boldly agree, according to Matthew 18:19, that, in Jesus' name, the United States economy will experience a rapid and rapid growth.

That research and technology will make sudden and dramatic breakthroughs;

That energy and dependence on foreign nations will come to an end and that the flow of dollars to heathen nations for oil will collapse.

That the crippling effects of inflation will be reversed and that the United States dollar will regain strength and honour in the world;

That communication capabilities will expand to the point that the entire world can be reached with the gospel message);

That believers all over the United States will receive the revelation of God's plan for prosperity and will give in abundance to the effective ministries for Jesus Christ in the earth.

For we pray as you have commanded us in 1 Chronicles 16:30: 'behold this is God's house.' And let us together deliver from the heirs, that we may give thanks to thy holy name, and glory in thy praise.

Reports are also filtering through on to our television screens of some of the churches' projects. Below, two examples highlight the Christian mission societies in Central America and the US Foreign Office, the latter seeing the former as a potent US force in an area where the rise of anti-US socialism is a constant headache. Ironically, in Britain where one of the churches is a major part of the establishment, fundamentalism does not seem to inspire nationalism.

In the light of these transatlantic developments it will be interesting to see if the faith movement sees the next few years. For example, how will they explain the growing public talk to televangelism? Will they be willing to finance it as Americans do? Will the traditionally reserved British character be able to take such a thing? One should add that the faith movement demands, this is the only way forward?

Conclusion

In the end, prosperity theology is fallacy and fraud, and those who preach according to its tenets are surely guilty of being the teachers whom men gather around themselves to 'say what their rich ears want to hear' (2 Tim. 4). Not only do they preach an un biblical gospel, but, and perhaps most signficantly, they do not preach the uncomplimentary message of Christ crucified, the one unifying factor of all Christian churches in the Church of the Americas. One cover of all Hagan's books is written the following: 'Mark 11:23 and 24 keynote Kenneth E. Hagan's life and ministry'. Look them up, and then compare them with what you read with what Kenneth E. Hagan McGraw writes in this book, The Enigma of the Cross:

The cross continually raises questions for the church, which dares to call itself 'Christian' after the one who was crucified and rose again, and yet seems to prefer to look for the grounds of its identity and relevance elsewhere than in the crucified Christ.

Perhaps the sheer attractiveness and ease of it all should be enough to set alarm bells ringing because after all, Jesus taught that only the narrow path leads to life.


In Britain, as in America, the faith movement is placing an emphasis on televangelism. Much money has been collected for this movement of Televangelism, not only to enable the people for the chance to hitch a ride on the wave of satellite television. They have already produced thirty-eight programmes, entertainers like Cliff Richard, which have been broadcast across Europe from the Oslo base of New World.

While the faith movement in Britain increases in size, influence and in its sense of permanency, yet it seems unlikely that its faith will make their nation what it appears to have done in the States. The reasons are cultural. In his celebrated religious history of America, Sidney Ahlstrom noted that the nineteenth century was commonly acknowledged that those who suffered did so because of their sin and so were responsible for their own plight. Thus, in his view, the Protestant work ethic which saw wealth as a sign of election, and which dominated Calvinistic America. Thus, John D. Rockefeller judged his wealth to be a divine reward for his faith, and Andrew Carnegie wrote a book devoted to it. In spite of their scandalous business practices, there seems to be no doubting their sincerity. For a nation made up of individuals who believed that they had been elected by God, it was natural to assume that God would bless the nation in a special way, raising her up to dominate world politics. 'In God we trust' is therefore not so much a statement of fact as a claim to God's blessing. Thus, national and personal wealth have always been acknowledged as signs of God's blessing in America, while here in Britain wealth remains a taboo area, especially when it abounds. People love to be outraged when the Mirror newspaper publishes lists of Britain's top earners, and while things are gradually changing, it is still considered unsophisticated to 'earn' wealth. Hence, Smith has written:

We need not ashamed of our wealth or try to hide it...Don't be embarrassed about our God's blessing - welcome it.

In spite of this, the preaching of the gospel of wealth is driving some people. Again, it is what is it that is responsible for splitting the faith movement's church. In Bath.

Another big difference is that in America, all fundamentalist denominations including the faith movement are soaked in nationalistic fervour, America being seen as God's mighty instrument in proclaiming his gospel to all nations. The following prayer illustrates this point:

Father, in Jesus' name we pray your wisdom will come to our president, his advisors, senators, representatives, all other government and business leaders. We pray for the economy of the United States and for the prosperity of this country. Father, we remind you this day that:

This country has always been given to those in need and has never hidden her reputation as a country of philanthropy.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in allowing full freedom for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in that her citizens, more than the citizens of any other country, have moved out over the world for the faith.

This country's economic system has given to the gospel the equivalent of millions of dollars by exempting property used in the proclamation of the gospel from property taxes, by exempting the income of organizations which preach the gospel from income tax, and by granting the faith the right to offer people of God's profit from income taxes.

Furthermore, the prosperity of this country has generated billions of dollars to be used in the spread of the gospel, and the conversion of other countries for the one, that is the greatest one of financing the evangelization of the world in this generation.

We therefore boldly agree, according to Matthew 18:19, that, in Jesus' name, the United States economy will experience a revival that will be a sign of the end of the world that will appear to have done in the States. The reasons are cultural. In his celebrated religious history of America, Sidney Ahlstrom noted that the nineteenth century was commonly acknowledged that those who suffered did so because of their sin and so were responsible for their own plight. Thus, in his view, the Protestant work ethic which saw wealth as a sign of election, and which dominated Calvinistic America. Thus, John D. Rockefeller judged his wealth to be a divine reward for his faith, and Andrew Carnegie wrote a book devoted to it. In spite of their scandalous business practices, there seems to be no doubting their sincerity. For a nation made up of individuals who believed that they had been elected by God, it was natural to assume that God would bless the nation in a special way, raising her up to dominate world politics. 'In God we trust' is therefore not so much a statement of fact as a claim to God's blessing. Thus, national and personal wealth have always been acknowledged as signs of God's blessing in America, while here in Britain wealth remains a taboo area, especially when it abounds. People love to be outraged when the Mirror newspaper publishes lists of Britain's top earners, and while things are gradually changing, it is still considered unsophisticated to 'earn' wealth. Hence, Smith has written:

We need not ashamed of our wealth or try to hide it...Don't be embarrassed about our God's blessing - welcome it.

In spite of this, the preaching of the gospel of wealth is driving some people. Again, it is what is it that is responsible for splitting the faith movement's church. In Bath.

Another big difference is that in America, all fundamentalist denominations including the faith movement are soaked in nationalistic fervour, America being seen as God's mighty instrument in proclaiming his gospel to all nations. The following prayer illustrates this point:

Father, in Jesus' name we pray your wisdom will come to our president, his advisors, senators, representatives, all other government and business leaders. We pray for the economy of the United States and for the prosperity of this country. Father, we remind you this day that:

This country has always been given to those in need and has never hidden her reputation as a country of philanthropy.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in allowing full freedom for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in that her citizens, more than the citizens of any other country, have moved out over the world for the faith.

This country's economic system has given to the gospel the equivalent of millions of dollars by exempting property used in the proclamation of the gospel from property taxes, by exempting the income of organizations which preach the gospel from income tax, and by granting the faith the right to offer people of God's profit from income taxes.

Furthermore, the prosperity of this country has generated billions of dollars to be used in the spread of the gospel, and the conversion of other countries for the one, that is the greatest one of financing the evangelization of the world in this generation.

We therefore boldly agree, according to Matthew 18:19, that, in Jesus' name, the United States economy will experience a revival that will be a sign of the end of the world that will appear to have done in the States. The reasons are cultural. In his celebrated religious history of America, Sidney Ahlstrom noted that the nineteenth century was commonly acknowledged that those who suffered did so because of their sin and so were responsible for their own plight. Thus, in his view, the Protestant work ethic which saw wealth as a sign of election, and which dominated Calvinistic America. Thus, John D. Rockefeller judged his wealth to be a divine reward for his faith, and Andrew Carnegie wrote a book devoted to it. In spite of their scandalous business practices, there seems to be no doubting their sincerity. For a nation made up of individuals who believed that they had been elected by God, it was natural to assume that God would bless the nation in a special way, raising her up to dominate world politics. 'In God we trust' is therefore not so much a statement of fact as a claim to God's blessing. Thus, national and personal wealth have always been acknowledged as signs of God's blessing in America, while here in Britain wealth remains a taboo area, especially when it abounds. People love to be outraged when the Mirror newspaper publishes lists of Britain's top earners, and while things are gradually changing, it is still considered unsophisticated to 'earn' wealth. Hence, Smith has written:

We need not ashamed of our wealth or try to hide it...Don't be embarrassed about our God's blessing - welcome it.

In spite of this, the preaching of the gospel of wealth is driving some people. Again, it is what is it that is responsible for splitting the faith movement's church. In Bath.

Another big difference is that in America, all fundamentalist denominations including the faith movement are soaked in nationalistic fervour, America being seen as God's mighty instrument in proclaiming his gospel to all nations. The following prayer illustrates this point:

Father, in Jesus' name we pray your wisdom will come to our president, his advisors, senators, representatives, all other government and business leaders. We pray for the economy of the United States and for the prosperity of this country. Father, we remind you this day that:

This country has always been given to those in need and has never hidden her reputation as a country of philanthropy.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in allowing full freedom for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in that her citizens, more than the citizens of any other country, have moved out over the world for the faith.

This country's economic system has given to the gospel the equivalent of millions of dollars by exempting property used in the proclamation of the gospel from property taxes, by exempting the income of organizations which preach the gospel from income tax, and by granting the faith the right to offer people of God's profit from income taxes.

Furthermore, the prosperity of this country has generated billions of dollars to be used in the spread of the gospel, and the conversion of other countries for the one, that is the greatest one of financing the evangelization of the world in this generation.

We therefore boldly agree, according to Matthew 18:19, that, in Jesus' name, the United States economy will experience a revival that will be a sign of the end of the world that will appear to have done in the States. The reasons are cultural. In his celebrated religious history of America, Sidney Ahlstrom noted that the nineteenth century was commonly acknowledged that those who suffered did so because of their sin and so were responsible for their own plight. Thus, in his view, the Protestant work ethic which saw wealth as a sign of election, and which dominated Calvinistic America. Thus, John D. Rockefeller judged his wealth to be a divine reward for his faith, and Andrew Carnegie wrote a book devoted to it. In spite of their scandalous business practices, there seems to be no doubting their sincerity. For a nation made up of individuals who believed that they had been elected by God, it was natural to assume that God would bless the nation in a special way, raising her up to dominate world politics. 'In God we trust' is therefore not so much a statement of fact as a claim to God's blessing. Thus, national and personal wealth have always been acknowledged as signs of God's blessing in America, while here in Britain wealth remains a taboo area, especially when it abounds. People love to be outraged when the Mirror newspaper publishes lists of Britain's top earners, and while things are gradually changing, it is still considered unsophisticated to 'earn' wealth. Hence, Smith has written:

We need not ashamed of our wealth or try to hide it...Don't be embarrassed about our God's blessing - welcome it.

In spite of this, the preaching of the gospel of wealth is driving some people. Again, it is what is it that is responsible for splitting the faith movement's church. In Bath.

Another big difference is that in America, all fundamentalist denominations including the faith movement are soaked in nationalistic fervour, America being seen as God's mighty instrument in proclaiming his gospel to all nations. The following prayer illustrates this point:

Father, in Jesus' name we pray your wisdom will come to our president, his advisors, senators, representatives, all other government and business leaders. We pray for the economy of the United States and for the prosperity of this country. Father, we remind you this day that:

This country has always been given to those in need and has never hidden her reputation as a country of philanthropy.

This country has given to the furthest of the gospel in allowing full freedom for preaching, teaching, and evangelizing.
In his 1977 essay on 'The History of the Study of Israelite and Judaean History' J. H. Hayes isolated four major 'current approaches' to the writing of ancient Israel's history. The first was the conservative/orthodox/traditional approach, presupposing a 'supernatural origin' and inerrancy of the original text of Scripture. This approach 'works primarily from the extrabiblical text', supplying the illustrative and supportive material drawn from extra-biblical texts and archaeological data. A second approach is archaeological, particularly associated with W. F. Albright and his pupils. Albright assumed the basic reliability of the OT traditions and believed that archaeological evidence could support the history written against unnecessary dependency upon literary, philosophical, or fundamentalist hypotheses. Hayes notes, however, that 'there are a few archaeologists who would not share this methodology'. A third approach is via tradition history, this approach associated with names such as G. von Rad and M. Noth, presupposed the late writing down of traditions which were subsequently redacted into the present books of the OT. Among Noth's distinctive contributions to Israelite historiography was the suggestion that the tribal union was modelled on the Greek anachrony. A fourth approach utilizes the use of socio-economic categories to illuminate ancient Israelite society. Associated initially with G. E. Mendenhall and made widely available in the monumental study by N. G. W. Gutt, proponents of this approach 'seek to reconstruct the economic and social structure of ancient Israel and to relate it to the life within Canaan, in a popular movement that sought a new way of life free from the existing oppressive social structures. Hayes concluding paragraph recognized that some contemporary histories of Israel 'cannot be said to be dominated by this liberal theology but were more eclectic'. When, nine years later, Hayes co-wrote a History with J. M. Miller, his comment would accurately describe their own work. The importance of their history may be gauged by the fact that the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament devoted half an issue to it, providing a platform for different scholarly evaluations and then a response by Miller.

A little over a decade later we have a new History: H. Shanks (ed.), Ancient Israel. A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple. Like the Miller-Hayes volume, this work is the result of a collaborative effort. However, while Miller-Hayes represents the work of just two scholars the Shanks volume presents contributions from a team of eight, all but one North American. Like Miller-Hayes it is 'eclectic': no attempt has been made to impose a uniform approach between contributors.

How does the new work measure up in terms of accessibility and accuracy? We are delighted to be able to offer readers two different assessments. One is from a long-time contributor, Kenneth A. Kitchen, Professor of Epigraphy at the University of Liverpool. Professor Kitchen is well known for his trenchant contributions to OT study; see e.g. Ancient Orient and Old Testament and The Bible in Its World: The Bible and Archaeology Today. Twenty-eight years ago he provided TSB readers with a minutely detailed review of Bright's History.1 The other is from Dr Richard ("Rick") Hess who reviewed G. J. Wenham's Word Commentary on Genesis 1-15 in the April 1989 issue. Dr Hess lectures in Old Testament at BIU, Glazier, and has worked on the Tyndale House Genesis 1-11 Project and the (Sheffield) Hebrew Dictionary Project. He has a major work on the Amarna Correspondence in press and is completing a monograph on Personal Names in Genesis 1-11.

Their differing assessments of the Shanks volume indicate something of the range of an evangelical response to the ongoing question of how to write the history of ancient Israel. David Debey Reviews editor.


6 Hayes in Miller-Hayes (p. 65).

7 G. D. Dever; see W. G. Dever and W. M. Clark, 'The Patriarchal Traditions', in Hayes-Miller (1977), pp. 70-120. An example of a recent article which attempts to work from archaeology to a form of history is the comprehensive catalogue (p. 14) in N. P. Lemche, Ancient Israel. A New History of Israelite Society (Sheffield Academic Press, 1987). The resulting picture is questionable. Another recent History, ostensibly written with the use of all available (archeological and historical, as well as textual) is G. Garbini, History and Ideology in Ancient Israel (London: SCM, 1988); but see also A. R. Millar's review in Themelios, April 1989, p. 105.


21 The 11 articles of L. K. Bird, The Bible and Archaeology Today. Twenty-eight years ago he provided TSB readers with a minutely detailed review of Bright's History. The other is from Dr Richard ("Rick") Hess who reviewed G. J. Wenham's Word Commentary on Genesis 1-15 in the April 1989 issue. Dr Hess lectures in Old Testament at BIU, Glazier, and has worked on the Tyndale House Genesis 1-11 Project and the (Sheffield) Hebrew Dictionary Project. He has a major work on the Amarna Correspondence in press and is completing a monograph on Personal Names in Genesis 1-11.

22 Their differing assessments of the Shanks volume indicate something of the range of an evangelical response to the ongoing question of how to write the history of ancient Israel. David Debey Reviews editor.

23 The Economists, 16 May 1987.


In his 1977 essay on "The History of the Study of Israelites and Judean History," J. H. Hayes isolated four major "current approaches" to the writing of ancient Israel's history. The first was the conservative/orthodox/traditional approach that presupposed the 'supernatural origin' and inerrancy of the original text of Scripture. This approach 'works primarily from the text,' he added, 'supplying with illustrative and supportive material drawn from extra-biblical texts and archaeological data.'

A second approach is archaeological, particularly associated with W. F. Albright and his pupils. Albright, he noted, assumed relatively little of the OT traditions and believed that archaeological evidence could throw light on 'unnecessary dependency upon literary, philosophical, or fundamentally hypotheses.' Hayes notes, however, that there are 'few archaeologists who would not share his methodological approach.'

A third approach is via tradition history. This approach, associated with names such as G. von Rad and M. Noth, he concluded, has presupposed the late writing down of traditions which were subsequently redacted into the present books of the OT. Among Noth's distinctive contributions to Israelite historiography was the suggestion that the tribal union was modelled on the Greek amphictyony.

A fourth approach involves the use of socio-economic categories to illuminate ancient Israelite society. Associated initially with G. E. Mendenhall, and made widely available in the monumental study by N. Gottwald, proponents of this approach, he concluded, are looking for a new way of life free from the existing oppressive social structures.

Hayes' concluding paragraph recognized that some contemporary histories of Israel 'cannot be said to be dominated by a relative theology, but were more eclectic.' When, nine years later, Hayes wrote a History of Old Testament Studies with J. M. Miller, he noted that "Archaeology is an essential tool for understanding the historical and social background of ancient Israel. The list of things that archaeology has contributed to our knowledge of ancient Israel is a long one. More than anything else, archaeology has enabled us to see Israel in a new light, to appreciate the complexity of its culture and society, and to understand its place in the larger context of the ancient Near East."
in the early 2nd millennium BC. We possess: (1 & 2) Zebubam, two men named so in an Old Babylonian wage-list; (3) Zabibum and (4) Zabum in the Moabite Stone; (5) Zebubim in a Sumerian List of Gods in Transjordan, c. 1800 BC; earliest Excavation texts (40); and (6) Zabibam in the name of a Moabite warrior in the Transjordanian area. Zabibam clearly dates the Sinaï/Arabian Moab to the 14th/13th centuries BC. Zabibam is also found in the list of Moabite officials in the tabernacle in the Late Bronze Age, using the name in Arabic and its traditional Egyptian spelling. As Sarna stresses, we have no explicit proof of the Moabite origin of this name. (3) The evidence is not, however, evidence and its overall assessment that the trans- cendental idea of a Zabibam in the Egyptian religious texts is believed to represent the same person as Zabibam in the Old Testament is strongly commented upon.

3. The Settlement in Canaan, is by the late J. A. Callaway. Its main value is the presentation of the views of a large number of scholars on Israel's 'conquest' and settlement in Canaan. Callaway reviews the various views with regard to how the Israelite population in Canaan transformed in recent years. Callaway reviews the views of Yadin and Mazar, who ascribed a large part of the conquest to the Canaanites (mainly peaceful infiltration by nomads), and of Mendenhall and Gottwald (seeking origins in a 'peaceful revolt' within Canaan), and presents various other views of scholars, including the books of Joshua and Judges, which, as Callaway says (55), the impression given by 'a casual reading of those narratives. A casual reading is precisely what scholar or student should not be inducing in, if they want valid results. Only careful, observant study of the texts and the historical background, as given in my book, Arabic: 'Jesus' world' (pp. 13)), can shed light on the population and cultivators. These are skills that the Hebrews already had as patriarchal clans (cf. Genesis), and still had on their exodus from Egypt (cf. Ex 9, 6-7; 10, 24-29, 12-13, for the Hebrews' livestock) and which, in the Canaanite context, may have been in the hands of the more distant, as well as the Canaanites. All of this fit together better than might be gleaned from this chapter. Callaway knew his Palestinian archaeology, but his use of that and the biblical data leave a lot to be desired.

4. 'The United Monarchy', by André Lemaire, covers Saul's reign. His description of Saul as a man of courage and of his role in the creation of an organized military, as part of an organized state and organization of architecture is limited to a summary list of sites (p. 91) in which the contribution of Saul to the development of a united monarchy is not mentioned. He alludes to the significant contribution of Saul's wars to David is merely unsubstantiated speculation. These fulfillings are important, but they are not sufficient to create a fully organized state. Half of Lemaire's account is devoted to Saul's military and administrative role and the Egyptian architectural structures in the administration not understood. Again, Hadad of Edom (p. 103 and 9) has nothing to do with Amur (Hadad as a deity is common among all the West Semitic groups. Additional data in Chronicles is needlessly dismissed, whereas we know that Chronicles actually presents a different picture of the previous period. For example, for example (Tukiten of Egyptian sources). Nor are these the only weaknesses.

5. 'The Divided Monarchy' (Judah and Israel), is by S. H. Horn, who provides a reasonable, straightforward account of the history of Israel and Judah. A major contribution of this chapter is to explain the nature of the monarchy as it evolved from a tribal structure to a centralized administration. Separated from the obvious mentions of the Moabite Stone, Hezekiah's 'storehouse of gold' (2 Kings 25:13), and the various Egyptian references, the use of archaeological and external data is rather sparse. Throughout, one glaring fault is that this author is the author of twenty-five to thirty years out of date on matters relating to Egypt. He treats as the last word on the subject (p. 248, n. 1) 'Zimri's impossible view' that the Amarna tablets have been left by the Pharaoh Shoshenq I (Shishak), several other treatments have been offered since this time, and the proper archaeological interpretations of the terms by this reviewer. The Samarii oracles may be evidence of Amen's 'household', although a later date has been suggested. On pp. 135-136 it is claimed that the site of Gath has been the capital of Gooden's 'Ammon' (known) in the late 19th century absolute): So is a king, over the city of Sei, and most probably Ossu, in the modern town of Sana. The site of Sana, the site of two Palestinian campaigns by Sennacherib (now rejected by virtually all competent authorities), is not the right interpretation of the biblical data. The simple fact remains that our present account in Isaiah and kings was cast into present form after 612 BC, as it records the death of Sennacherib. By that time, however, the older history was a tradition which is hence referred to as 'king' in all contexts, including earlier ones, just as we would say 'Queen Elizabeth II was born in 1926', although she was actually born in 1901. The attempt to date the death of Sennacherib fifteen years ago and again three years since, as Horn's ignorance is meaningless, may be the result of a typographic error (or years too low (typographic error). The mess over Egyptian data impacts the reader.

6. 'Exile and Return', by P. J. Purvis, gives a quite good survey of Judah under neo-Babylonian and Persian imperial rule. Useful and complex.

7. 'The Age of Hellenism', by L. C. J. A. S. and Chapter, 194, is a survey of the period from 330 BC to 63 BC. The reviewer is impressed by the ideas through the period of the Ptolemies, Seleucids and Hasmoneans, of Herod and the Romans to AD 70. Both authors give vivid and easily accessible accounts of the political developments as well as the indispensable historical and political events. One advantage of this book is that it is not a review: either never makes even the slightest reference to the role of the neighbouring and powerful kingdom of the Nabataean (inhabitors of rose-red Petra) in this period. The notes and an index close the volume.

The whole book is prefaced by H. Shanks' introduction, largely an enthusiastic 'blurb' for his brain-child. He makes a good case for the立项, since there is very little in the book that suggests that the further back one goes in the Bible (especially beyond anastolic works like Kings), the less reliable the biblical record becomes, and the less correlation there is with external material. This means that the information is important, as it is not just information based on imprecise, or even misleading, on the several Egyptian connections. And the importance, therefore, is simply reinterpreted, with the emphasis being placed on the earlier 'original' date. This is a commendable work produced and readable book for the role in editor of the editors. Since it cannot be recommended as a textbook or reference work, the flaws are too serious.

A. K. Kitchen.
in the early 2nd millennium BC. We possess: (1 & 2) Zibamun, two men who seem to be named in an Old Babylonian wage-list (3) Zabium and (4) Zabium.1 In the Akkadian literary tradition, the early Shu-Su in Transjordan, c. 1800 BC (earlier Excavation texts [60]); and (5) Zabium).2 The latter is mentioned in the Amarna letters at the end of the site of Tell el-Far'ah. Such Sinaï names are not always the product of geographical indications.3

3. The Settlement in Canaan, as is best attempted by the Sinaï tradition, is inexcusably misleading. His treatment of this name (Abraham, Asher, etc.) is almost as bad, and equally misleading.

Matters are better in the legal/social sphere. Again, following Thompson and Thompson,4 the Sinaï tradition (e.g. the Hurrian fantasies, based on mistaken use of Nuzi data) (p. 14). Again, he admits that good background material is available from Old Babylonian sources, although he notes (p. 15) that "the majority of the best surviving documents are in the hands of private scholars, yet they are ignored. Even in Hebrew, Sinaï is far more metaphorical than literal." His authoritativeness in the treatment of this name is inexcusably misleading. His treatment of Abraham, Asher, etc., is almost as bad, and equally misleading.

In the legal/social sphere. Again, following Thompson and Thompson,5 the Sinaï tradition (e.g. the Hurrian fantasies, based on mistaken use of Nuzi data) is inexcusably misleading. His treatment of this name (Abraham, Asher, etc.) is almost as bad, and equally misleading.

Callaway draws upon the considerable amount of new data about late 2nd millennium traditions (p. 73) that appear to reveal a significant influence of tradition of the hill country of Canaan . . . at the end of the 15th century BC. We have seen that the Sinaï tradition (e.g. the Hurrian fantasies, based on mistaken use of Nuzi data) is inexcusably misleading. His treatment of this name (Abraham, Asher, etc.) is almost as bad, and equally misleading.
Do we need another history of Israel?

Herzl Shanks has provided the teacher and student with a well-informed and lucid study of the history of Israel. His sales pitch in the introduction argues for an affirmative to a history of the Jewish people, and it is not easy to disagree. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read. As to the first book, the title is well within the American (more specifically American Jewish) tradition of "Israel in the Bible" and "Bible in the World." It is well within the bounds of the biblical and historical interpretations. Those who seek the defection of the Talmud and the Bible will not find it in this book. The author is careful to examine the question of the authenticity of the Bible and to reflect on the credibility of the biblical narrative. In this kind it is not only the two versions co-existing at the time of the Bible, but also that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi texts. The book is comprehensive and it is interesting and fun to read.
Do we need another history of Israel?

Hershel Shanks has provided the teacher and student with a well informed, current and honest view of the history of Israel.

He takes the position that the arguments for a two-state solution are not convincing and that the establishment of a Jewish state is a reasonable alternative, given the historical facts and the current geopolitical situation.

He also argues that the notion of a 'two-state solution' is flawed because it perpetuates the idea of the 'Biblical narrative' and the 'Palestinian narrative' as mutually exclusive and incompatible.

He further states that the establishment of a Jewish state would provide a secure and stable environment for the Jewish people and would be in the best interests of both Israelis and Palestinians.

Overall, this book offers a thought-provoking and insightful analysis of the history of Israel and provides valuable insights for students and educators alike.


This is the first of a two volume set (second volume published in 2002). Watts is one of the premier scholars of the book of Isaiah, as the division at Isaiah 33 indicates, does not present a conventional approach.

The 'canonical' approach is essentially a logical and methodical study of the text, focusing on the literary, historical and cultural context of the prophetic literature. The 'canonical' approach is useful in understanding the theological perspectives of the different sections of the book.

Watts' approach, on the other hand, is more interpretative and seeks to understand the text in its historical context. He argues that Isaiah's prophecies were written to address contemporary issues and that understanding these issues is essential to interpreting the text.

Watts' work is particularly valuable for those interested in the historical and cultural context of the prophetic literature and for those interested in understanding the theological perspectives of the different sections of the book.

Peter Ackroyd was formerly Samuel Davidson Professor of Old Testament at London University. Perhaps known best for his commentaries on Job and Jeremiah, he is the author of some wide-ranging commentaries, including The Bible. His 1987 book is one of the more ambitious works in the SCM series, which is essentially a series of ‘ ApplicationDbContext' volumes. The book is divided into nine parts, each part having a distinct theme, but all parts being interconnected and building towards a coherent whole. The theme of the book is the ‘sermon' as a way of interpreting the biblical text, and the focus is on the relationship between the text and the sermon as a form of religious discourse.

The book begins with an introduction, which sets out the main themes and objectives of the book. The first part of the book, ‘The Sermon as a Genre', explores the nature and function of the sermon, and its role in the religious life of the community. The second part, ‘The Sermon and the Bible', examines the relationship between the sermon and the biblical text, and the ways in which sermons can be used to interpret and understand the Bible. The third part, ‘The Sermon and the Church', looks at the role of the sermon in the life of the church, and the ways in which it shapes the church's identity and mission.

The other parts of the book cover various aspects of sermons, including their history, their relationship with other forms of religious discourse, and their role in the life of the church. The book concludes with a summary of the main themes and conclusions, and an appendix on the use of the Bible in the contemporary church.

This is a comprehensive and well-written book, which covers a wide range of topics in a clear and accessible way. It is a valuable resource for anyone interested in the study of sermons, and it is recommended for students, scholars, and practitioners alike.

31


For those who are interested in the Sermon on the Mount (SWM), this book is an important contribution to the study of this text. It is written by a noted biblical scholar and theologian, and it offers a fresh perspective on the meaning and application of the Sermon on the Mount.

Lapide's book is a reading of the SM 'by Jewish eyes through Hebrew lenses' (p. 11). The author, an orthodox Jew, is one of a number of Jewish scholars who have shown a keen interest in re-reading the SM from a Jewish perspective. This is a scholarly and well-researched work, and it is a welcome addition to the literature on the SM.

Vaughn's book is a theological interpretation of the SM, which he sees as a program for action. He argues that the SM was not simply a set of ethical precepts, but a means of personal transformation and social change. The book is written in a clear and accessible style, and it is well-organized and easy to follow.

Both books are important contributions to the study of the SM, and they offer different perspectives on its meaning and application. They are recommended for anyone interested in the SM, whether they are scholars, students, or general readers.
Professor Ackroyd throughout this time: continuity within the religious tradition of the OT. It contents the book, the first deals with continuity and discontinuity. In the book, a few scholars are interested in which the book. The final part of the book, a few scholars are interested in which the book took to contain the same. At different times in Israel's history there have been periods of change and times where change was perceived between certain aspects of their faith and their traditions. This section relates their received traditions to new situations that arise. This is one of the central questions to which Professor Ackroyd provides some answers.

The second part of the book is entitled 'Aspects of the Prophetic Tradition'. It concentrates on the book of Isaiah, chapters 1-2 and 36-39, with special attention to the way the material is slanted in the direction it is taken. The third part of the book, for well over a decade, contains four essays that relate to the canon: 'A judgment narrative in the formation of the biblical story', 'Lamentations and Chronicles: An Approach to Amos 7:9-17' (which suggests that the first story of Amos's conversation with Amaziah is a part of a longer narrative concerning the judgment of the Northern Kingdom', and 'A Judgement of Jeremiah: A canonical Text'. The Epilogue, the only essay in the collection, is entitled 'The Old Testament Religious Tradition: Unity and Change'. Professor Ackroyd attempts to look at what happens in the Old Testament as a religious society, while living through changing circumstances. He concludes: 'However much we may hope or believe that we are maintaining the past, even recovering the primitive, we are in fact making the adjustments without which faith ceases to be real.'

It is not an easy book to read. The style is concise and the reader is obliged quite frequently to refer to biblical references and to weigh carefully what is said. It will be more difficult, too, for evangelical writers who do not accept his presuppositions. For instance, they may feel that he assumes a large body of editors at work on the OT books, and do not make any attempt to see how the text has been shaped. However, this is a book that can be read in a fresh and informed editor as uninspired, there is a great deal to be learned from this.

Mike Butterworth, Oak Hill College.

Lapide, with one eye on first-century Judaism and the other on the SM, reconstructs the Jewish context of Jesus. The work is divided into six parts.

In the first part of the book, Lapide bestows the call 'preaching' on what Lapide calls the 'preaching' (Mt 5:12; 17:20). Several are indicative of Jewish terms and practices such as 'parable', 'dunamis', 'the temple', 'sabbath', 'the son of man', 'the kingdom', and 'the image of perfection' (6:1-7). In this portion of the book, Jesus outlines the need for a renewal in everyday life. Finally, the fourth part of the book deals with the remaining portion of the SM (7:27-9:28) under the title of 'Final teachings'. Here, Lapide moves from the ethical writings of Jesus to other works, this one as well as strategies with how to understand the 'argumentative' discourses in Jesus' teachings.

Lapide's book reads like an extended sermon. In fact this genre might be dubbed 'philosophical devotional exegesis'. Without doubt this is his primary purpose: he is attempting to make Jesus relevant to the modern Christian reader. Lapide is a well known and respected theologian, being a philosophy professor. That in itself makes the book interesting. The book is written as if Lapide were preaching an extended sermon, using biblical interpretation. The Bible is too important to leave its interpretation solely to inerrantists. Theology is necessary. In this book, the text contains a number of obvious errors which could have been avoided with a more careful handling of the text. For example, commenting on Mt 5:3, Lapide makes a point on the future tense of the verb when in reality it is present. Both lapide and the author of the SM like all previous books on the topic. Neither is definitive, but each makes a contribution toward that goal. Many insights can be gleaned from both, but Lapide's book is by far the more interesting. He brings significant in the process of understanding Jesus's powerful message contained in the SM and is highly recommended.

David J. Fark, Centro de Entrenamiento de los Hermanos Mennonitas, Montevideo, Uruguay.

This is a revision of an Aberdeen PhD first submitted in 1982. As such it is a rewritten and expanded version of a text that has been used in the school, focusing particular questions which he wishes to raise. In the 1982 text, he adopts a more detailed analysis of the focused text citations, or allusions, their tradition-historic, their hermeneutics (the relation of Lucan contextual meaning to the Jewish reference text in which it is applied), and the reductional purpose of the use of the OT citations or allusions. In this revised text, he seeks to make use of the framework of Luke-Acts as a whole (and hence Bock's analysis follows): Logos and Polemics: The NT in its context: Late Judaism. Lucan: 1:1-2:34; Acts 2:5-7; 15, rather than analysing by literary source or by type of UT usage). The wide scope of Bock's study makes this a significant contribution to the study of Luke's theology. It is a long text but is well written. It is also a text, but also a wood in which it is still easy to become lost for the purpose of the study.

Perhaps it is the sheer breadth of scope of the enterprise which is chiefly responsible for some of the weaknesses of the text. The original introduction contains some problematic discussions of some important themes that 'in your [Abraham's] name' is Acts 3:25 refers to the Jewish 'Christ' not to the Roman 'Christ'; indeed Jervell makes no appearance either in bibliography or index); (ii) places where opposing arguments appear to be less than fair; and (iii) limited space and patience which is far from inadequate, for example, the style of the book's strengths and weaknesses are absolute rather than comparative. The book's handling of the reviewer's own positions at almost every part; (iv) some very strained argument (e.g. that used to assist the Father-Son relation is not a crucial or emphasising a chapter on the Christology and its contribution to the Inquisition), and to justify the claim that the inclusion of Is.
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of the focus of the whole from an Isanian Servant Christology to a regal messianism (one), and (2) what appears to the right of Thursday. A slightly modern god is in the Mosaic of the Messiah. The passages for study are drawn from the texts written after Christianity, which separate cases involving Jewish and rabbinic Jewish writings and from the NT. It is assumed that those who use the book will need some fairly elementary instruction on the basic theologies of these two bodies of literature. The reader is likely to find the comments on the chosen gospel passages brief and unemphatic (and, for at least a few, may expect to find the Jewish material more valuable.

Rabbinic literature is a notoriously difficult and treasureous area for the non-specialist to explore, and not a few OT scholars have been rightly chided for ill-informed or simplistic use of Jewish background. With the growing awareness of the importance of the reader to the task of the rabbis, this is perhaps not surprising. The concluding chapter is therefore aimed at a reader who is essentially a New Testament student, whether in an academic or a church setting. The rabbis' approach to literary reconstruction, the nature of the book of the rabbis, and its relationship to the style of the gospels, is of course a matter of discussion and debate. It is hoped that this brief survey will be of some use to the student who wishes to approach the rabbis' work with some understanding of the context in which they lived and worked.

Dick France, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.

Dr Wiederburn, who lectures in NT in the University of St Andrews, has a wide experience of research, the kind of research which would be worthy of an ESR or similar degree. His book is a work of considerable erudition and command of the field, critical analysis of modern scholarship, and discussion of areas unfamiliar to many students. It is not, therefore, likely to be easy reading for the non-specialist. Instead, it is a clear and useful introduction to the study of the rabbis, even for the student who is not particularly interested in the rabbis themselves. The book is, indeed, an excellent introduction to the rabbis, and a clear and useful guide to the study of them.

The theme, broadly speaking, is the possible influence of the Mysteries upon Pauline theology. Wiederburn argues that the Mysteries were a component part of the early Christian community, and that there was a common theology to them, and he claims that some of the early Christian writers were influenced by them. Hence the possibility of influence on early Christians (such as the Corinthian church) and on Paul himself from ideas originally at home in the Mysteries. The particular area in which such influences have been seen is that of Christian baptism, with the associated ideas of union with Christ, sharing in his death and resurrection, and living in the Spirit. There is a widespread view that when we read of believers sharing now in Christ's resurrection (Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:12; 1:3) this idea is derived from that of the Mysteries. Wiederburn argues against this view in five ways. First, he shows that the NT does not use the term 'in Christ' as a keyword for resurrection but only of sharing in death. Second, the Corinthians who did not believe in a future resurrection are sometimes held to believe in shared participation in a Mysteries-like group. Third (2 Tim. 2:18), but Wiederburn argues that this is an unlikely interpretation. That which was done in the Mysteries is not said to be done in the physical body in contemporary Judaism and Hellenism. This deconstruction of the idea was due to reinterpretation of Christian ideas.

Wiederburn enquires in detail whether the idea of the Mysteries as a group body in which one was not only saved but in which one was already lived a life of resurrection was gained in these religions. He shows that hope rested on the Mysteries which promised immortality. On the other hand, he finds a more plausible explanation of the Christian understanding in terms of Jewish ideas which suggested some linkage to the idea of messianic expectation and involved some kind of anticipation of the future, but this was through proclamation of what Christ had done rather than through any kind of ritual re-enactment of it.

Wiederburn concludes that the idea of the Mysteries, especially in the lively forms current in Corinth? Wiederburn does some links here to Graeco-Roman ecstatical experiences, particularity in prophecy, but again the main background is Jewish. It was a sign of spiritual life, not of anything that amounted to resurrection.

Nevertheless, despite this massive criticism of the concept of the Mysteries is important, Wiederburn, who develops a book that must have spoken in terms that made sense to the Jewish. He argues that the NT readers in the ancient world, particularly in terms of the word is found both in the Jewish and the Christian NT. The book is based on the study of the original Greek text and the general stock of ideas available to them.

How then, do the ideas that Wiederburn so readily raises with in the Mysteries a similar kind of statement in Eph. 3:10, 12, in particular in view of the way in which the idea of the Mysteries has been widely and broadly firmly established as a description of the nature of salvation.

The scholarly caution with which this book is written and the care with which it presents the interpretation of the argument as a whole. In his concluding Wiederburn claims "the study of the Mysteries in Pauline studies, the interpretation of Paul's doctrine of union with Christ as derivative from the mystery cults of his day. It would be wrong to pursue the argument, to be sure, to present the reader it seems that Wiederburn has not merely raised a warning signal, but gone very effectively sealed off this cul de sac.

Wiederburn has also solved the problem of what exactly the Corinthians meant by their denial of the future resurrection. Where I find him not altogether persuasive is in his denial that he could be read as referring to a sense of being alive from the dead. I am not entirely convinced by Wiederburn's attempt to play down this parallelism. Nor is it clear that he can bring his argument to a close. For if dying with Christ cannot be derived from the Mysteries, neither can be raised with Christ.

There is room for more work on the question of the origin of the phrase 'in Christ', which Wiederburn explains in terms of the representative figure of the past with whom his descendents are linked and of their position as the faithful ones of God. The book does not deal with the questions about the significance of the phrase 'in Christ'. Some suggestions on this problem in two essays, 'The Body of Christ and

Some Christians enjoy being sceptical about Christian belief, and perhaps it is not surprising that the editor of SCM Press should be one of them. Books he has published naturally feature prominently among the sources from which he builds up a case against, not only traditional Christianity but also the natural world, while the experiments of the Club of Rome and the environmental movement are discussed in a few pages. What Wengst has published in this book is a fascinating collection of essays that he has written for a contemporary audience. It is interesting to note that the essays are all published under the title "Pax Romana"—one of the most important concepts in the study of Roman history.

Wengst begins by discussing the idea of peace in Roman society, particularly as it relates to the Pax Romana. He argues that peace was not just a matter of military conquest, but also of economic and social stability. He cites examples from Roman history to illustrate this point, such as the Roman Empire's ability to maintain order and stability despite the challenges it faced.

Wengst then moves on to discuss the concept of peace in the New Testament, particularly as it relates to the mission of Jesus. He argues that the message of Jesus was one of peace, and that this was central to his teaching. He cites examples from the New Testament to illustrate this point, such as Jesus' message of reconciliation and forgiveness.

Wengst goes on to discuss the role of the Church in promoting peace, both in the Roman Empire and in the modern world. He argues that the Church has a special role to play in promoting peace, and that it is essential for the Church to be involved in promoting peace in the world today.

Overall, Wengst's book is a fascinating exploration of the concept of peace in Roman society and in the New Testament. It is well-researched and well-written, and is a valuable contribution to the ongoing conversation about the role of the Church in promoting peace in the world today.
Some Christians enjoy being sceptical about Christian belief, and perhaps it is not surprising that the editor of SCM Press should be one of them. Books he has published naturally feature prominently among the sources from which he builds up a case against, not only traditional Christianity but also in the narrow sense, but also the religious beliefs and practices of all other religions.

His book has taken account of the kinds of difficulties he raises but not of the real advantages of Christian faith. Without questioning the conclusions of his book, it has not been possible to clarify some of these questions - by, for example, Pannenberg, Moltmann, Sobrino, even a casual reader, is left wondering about the possibility of thinking about Jesus not as a teacher.
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Editorial:
Theology with a mission

Think of a doctrine. Double it with variant interpretations. Divide by denominational distinctions. Add some technical jargon. Five per cent of the people who come across this doctrine you first thought of, and what are you left with? Probably the sum of the average theological student’s awareness of the relation between his theological study and the mission of the church. He is hardly to be blamed for this, since western theology at least has been carried on for centuries with little or no direct relation to it.

It was not always thus. In the early centuries of the church the cutting edge of theology was defined by the church’s mission. How was the gospel to be lived and witnessed to in hostile and religiously plural environments? How was the nature and work of Jesus to be defined and defended in changing social and intellectual contexts? The controversies and definitions that emerged from this were not the academic and irrelevant theology of popular misconception but the intellectual cutting edge of the church’s struggle for identity, survival and growth – i.e. its mission.

The New Testament itself is essentially a theology of mission. Why else are its first four volumes called ‘Gospels’? It emerged as the community of Jesus staked their claim, and were compelled to defend it, that he was the Messiah, and therefore the fulfillment of God’s mission in and through Israel. Was such a claim, and the mission that it had launched, compatible with the Scriptures? It was the success of the Gentile mission, with the theological problem of whether and on what terms Gentiles could be fitted into the hitherto Jewish people of God, which generated some of the most profound theological controversy and argumentation in the church itself and the documents of the New Testament. The missiological debate touched the doctrine of God and his purpose for Israel and the nations, Christology, the meaning of salvation and justification, the status for Christians of the Mosaic covenant and its law, exegesis and the significance of the present age.

In medieval Christianized Europe theology turned upon itself, while in the period of the Reformation and after, it was devoted largely to reflecting and encoding the convictions that emerged in the convulsions of the church. With some notable exceptions, such as the Moravians, no theology of mission was needed because no mission was happening in the Protestant world – a fact commented upon by the Counter Reformation (whose missionary endeavours preceded Protestant missions by two centuries) as a reason why the Protestant churches could not be counted as part of the true church: they had no mission.

Now that Protestant missions have been going for a couple of centuries, is our theology any better? The lack of integration between the two is still disturbing. Recalling my own student days, it was certainly not the case that those who studied theology were the ones who were most interested in mission; personally I am sure that I was not. ‘Missiology’ was not even a word I remember hearing until long after my undergraduate theological studies. A recent report by the British Religious and Theological Studies Fellowship indicates that, in a questionnaire concerning where students thought RTSF should be developing its resources, only 5% ticked ‘Missio Awareness’. So little is mission on the agenda of theological students or teachers, that at a recent gathering of scholars, historians, and practitioners convened to establish a British Association of Mission Studies it was argued, not wholly in jest, that the aims of such a group should be the subversion of traditional theology by a healthy injection of missiology. Is there any discipline within the broad field of theological study which is not missiological in either its roots, or its implications? Like ethics, missiology has a remarkable fertilizing and integrating dynamic when it is allowed to influence the agenda and the perspective of any theological issue.

Many North American seminaries have more prominent courses, professorships and ‘schools’ in missiology. But the question is sometimes raised in other parts of the world among recipients of the fruit of all this whether more attention is paid to the pragmatic than to the theological, to strategies of mission rather than the perplexing issues that mission raises for us in today’s world, ‘getting the job done’ rather than reflecting on what it is we are doing and why. There were two great consultations on mission in 1969: the Lausanne II conference in Manila, and the World Council of Churches conference in San Antonio. The evangelical Lausanne took as its theme ‘Proclaim Christ Until He Comes’, while the ecumenical San Antonio considered, ‘Your Will Be Done – The Whole Church in Christ’s Way’. It could be said that the latter title raises a more profound missiological agenda, whereas Lausanne was more absorbed with methodology. For in spite of its subtitle (‘The Whole Church taking the Whole Gospel to the Whole World’), Lausanne did not grapple seriously, for example, with ecclesiology – i.e. what doctrine of the whole church do evangelicals have in relation to mission?

Yet Lausanne II was itself the proof of the factor which makes the integration of missiology and theology imperative – the global nature of the church. It is a welcome sign therefore, that last year the Association of Theological Schools in North America adopted ‘globalization’ as a major emphasis for the 1990s – meaning the desire to set the study of theology firmly in the context of the global church and its mission; the hope that ‘missiology can break loose from the straightjacket of being just one discipline competing for students and recognition alongside so many others. Instead it can become the field which provides that interdisciplinary focus that the new global theological education requires.’ Such was the hope also of the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910! How long before it is a reality?