

Ai and Old Testament Chronology: Who Cares?

**Archaeological Conference
Houston Baptist University
February 8, 2014**

Eugene H. Merrill, PhD (Columbia, New York City)

Independent Research Scholar in the Old Testament and in Ancient Near Eastern Studies

Introduction

The Significance of Biblical Chronology

The Establishment of a Dating System

 Inner-biblical Data

 Ancient Near Eastern Data

Historic, Contemporary, and Competing Points of View

 Pre-Enlightenment and Enlightenment Periods (ca. 1650-1800)

 The Historical-Critical Method (ca. 1800-present)

 Modern Approaches

 The Present Approach and Its Implications

 Archaeological

 Historical and Biblical

Ai and Old Testament Chronology

Anticipated Evidence and Conclusions

Conclusion

Introduction

The term “chronology” in the minds of many is redolent of images of stuffy old eccentrics deep in rumination in some musty study over trivia that have no practical relevance to everyday life and well-being. Who cares when Sennacherib laid siege to Jerusalem or when Hannibal crossed the Rubicon or when Betsy Ross sewed together the first American flag or even when Nixon left the White House in disgrace? These tidbits may be of interest to historians who write and sell books to other cranks or to professors of history who find that though their students are bored stiff learning about men and battles and dates of the long ago, they themselves are content in their own little cocoons of idiosyncrasy. Besides that, everyone has to do something to make a living.

However, all husbands (and more than a few wives) who have lost track of a birthday or wedding anniversary soon discover that if dates and the proper sequence of events “slip the mind,” suddenly chronology—if not the most important thing in the world--begins to make a

great leap upward on the scale of priorities. It *does* matter when she was born and under what circumstances and it *is* critical for him never to forget the happiest day in her life, the day she married him and now, curiously, why?

The Significance of Biblical Chronology

A common but adequate and accurate analogy to historiography is that of anatomy. Just as the human skeleton is the indispensable “framework” around and upon which the body with all its parts are suspended, so chronology is the equally indispensable framework upon or against which the flow and facts of history find proper arrangement, relationship, function, and meaning. The medical student might as well take the scattered parts of a cadaver, piece them back together randomly, and call it anatomy and physiology as for a seminarian to cut the Bible to shreds and then re-assemble it any way he chose and call the result biblical history. One would reasonably expect both to flunk and to look to some other vocation where cause and effect and temporal sequence have no intrinsic or even practical value. In short, anyone who takes the Bible seriously as the very Word of God in everything it intends to say—even about science and history—is forced to confront the chronology-history issue as one whose facets are of necessity mutually integrative and informative.

Was the Tower of Babel episode pre-Flood or afterward? Did Abraham live in the EB-MB era or Iron Age I? Are the lists of the kings of Israel and Judah accurate and do they arrange their respective reigns in the right order? Does it really matter when Joshua conquered Ai? Is it not of little or no consequence as long as one believes it really took place, as did all the other events just listed? The almost intuitive response of the reflective and logical mind is affirmative: Yes, it does matter. But then come other questions such as Why? How does the answer affect doctrine and theology? What is in it for me as a believer who wants to live a more godly everyday life if I know precisely when the battle for Ai took place, who was engaged in it, and where and why? This paper intends to address these questions and to provide evidence that the battle for Ai was waged by Israel led by Joshua, that it was against the Amorites, that it quite likely took place at a site in the so-called West Bank currently named Khirbet el-Maqatir, and that it occurred ca. 1400 B. C. Of equal importance are questions like, Why does it matter? Who really cares? The paper will conclude with proposed answers to these questions and others.

The Establishment of a Dating System

Space permits only a brief survey here of the means by which solid benchmarks have been achieved that permit the construction of a reliable chronology of the Old Testament and the ancient Near East.¹

Inner-Biblical Data

First, the Bible itself is replete with chronological data, but the dates of biblical events until the last century or so could be accessed only in a closed system in which conclusions were drawn almost exclusively by inner-biblical relationships. Thus, for example, the dates of Abraham could be determined by adding up the years of all persons and events succeeding him until the New Testament period and then working back from them. A major problem, however, was the lack of a clear chronological record connecting the end of the Old Testament period with the beginning of the more-solid dates of the New Testament. The most famous attempt to create an inner-biblical chronology was that of Archbishop Ussher of Ireland in 1650. In many respects his efforts were remarkably accurate given the absence of secular texts that later refined his system.²

Ancient Near Eastern Data

Commencing in the mid-Nineteenth Century, a flurry of archaeological excavation took place throughout the Middle East, particularly in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Thousands of inscriptions came to light, including many of chronological significance.³ Most famous for Old Testament purposes is the (Assyrian) Eponym Canon which lists all the names of years between 910-649 B. C. The reliability of the dates of kings and events in these years has been put on solid ground thanks to the discovery of the occurrence of an eclipse of the sun over Nineveh in 763 B. C., a date recovered with exactness by astronomical calculations.⁴ Many of these texts make reference to Israel and Judah and their respective rulers, thus tying the latter into the Assyrian Canon and thereby bringing a high degree of certainty to the Old Testament dates of the early Divided Monarchy as late as the reign of Manasseh of Judah (696-642). In addition to the

¹ See especially the important works by Edwin R. Thiele, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965; Jack Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998; Andrew Steinmann, *From Abraham to Paul: A Biblical Chronology*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2011.

² On Ussher and his chronology, see Eugene H. Merrill, "Chronology," *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Ed. T. Desmond Alexander and David W. Baker. Downers Gove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003, pp. 113-122.

³ Joel Drinkard, *Benchmarks in Time and Cultures: An Introduction to the History and Methodology of Syro-Palestinian Archaeology*. Atjanta: Scholars, 1988; *One Hundred Years of American Archaeology in the Middle East*. Ed. Douglas R. Clark and Victor H. Matthews. Boston: ASOR, 2003. For classical "eye-witness" accounts by the excavator, see Austen H. Layard, *The Monuments of Nineveh*. London: John Murray, 1849; and *A Popular Account of the Discoveries at Nineveh*. New York: J. C. Derby, 1854.

⁴ For a good rendition of the Eponym, see *The Context of Scripture*. Volume One. Ed. W. W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger. Leiden: Brill, pp. 465-466. Its importance for the history of both Assyria and Israel is evident in its many citations in *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Second ed. Vol. III/Part 2, Ed. John Boardman, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 73, 75, 83, 85, 97, 105, 143, 322-23, 325-26, 338-39.

Assyrian material, many other sources of chronological value have been unearthed, further establishing a sound biblical chronology. Among these are king lists that trace the lines of pharaohs from 3000 B. C. to the age of the Achaemedids (ca. 550 B. C.).⁵

Historic, Contemporary, and Competing Points of View

Pre-Enlightenment and Enlightenment Periods (ca. 1650-1800)

Pre-Enlightenment considerations of the Conquest and its details, including the question of Ai, were essentially faith-driven; that is, the Bible presented these narratives as historical fact and there was no perceived need for anyone to prove their actuality or even to work out a system of dating. Israel had left Egypt through a miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, wandered in the Sinai for 40 years, and then invaded and eventually occupied Canaan under Joshua's leadership. "The Bible said it, I believe it, and that settles it!" To the contrary, the ascendancy of Rationalism attendant to the Enlightenment viewed things differently: The miraculous, it was said, cannot (and therefore did not) occur, the story of the Conquest was essentially legend and myth, and the overthrow of Ai, whether historically verifiable or not, was of little or no moment.⁶ It followed, then, that chronology played no important role, and that the location of Ai could never be determined, nor did it matter.

The Historical-Critical Method (ca. 1800-present)

The so-called "Historical-Critical" method--an offspring of Rationalism--and its method of doing biblical scholarship rejects virtually all traditional understandings of the Old Testament, especially its credibility as historiography. Thus, whether the conquest, including that of Ai, even took place at all is considered moot.⁷ More important to the rationalistic school is not the historicity of biblical accounts, but why and under what circumstances they were composed in the first place, i. e., their Sitz im Leben. What matters is "truth", not facts, as though the two can be separated. Israel's recollection and theologizing of the past, not the Bible's own assertion by divine revelation as to what really happened in Israel's earliest years, is considered what matters most.

Modern Approaches

⁵ These are the Karnak List, the Abydos List, the Sakkara King List, and (most important) the Turin Canon; cf. *COS II*, 2000, pp. 461-470; James B. Pritchard, Ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955, pp. 227-321.

⁶ An important history of Rationalism and its impact on biblical faith and scholarship to this day is that of William Manchester, *A World Lit only by Fire*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1992.

⁷ A recent history of the method is that of Eugene H. Merrill, Mark F. Rooker, and Michael A. Grisanti, *The World and the Word: An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Nashville: B&H, 2011, pp. 130-136.

The advent of modern archaeological method, concomitant with renewed interest in the Old Testament in the latter 19th century, led to a rash of excavations in the Holy Land including a search for the location of biblical Ai.⁸ Jericho had been identified with es-Sultan by Charles Warren as early as 1868, so it was logical to look for the next location in the biblical narrative, namely, Ai. Tentative steps were taken by William F. Albright and others, but the most important and decisive work was by Joseph Callaway beginning in 1964. Callaway, influenced by the Arabic name for the site, called the place of choice et-Tell, literally “the ruin.” The Hebrew name Ai (U~y) also means “ruin,” thus lending support to Callaway’s proposal. This location has become almost enshrined as the proper place for ancient Ai, mainly because Callaway correctly concluded that no evidence exists as to its being occupied between EB II (2400 B. C.) and the beginning of the Iron I period ca. 1200 B. C.⁹ This seems at first glance to prove conclusively that the Conquest must have taken place at 1200 or later.

The Present Approach: Archaeological

In 1979 David Livingston, dissatisfied with Callaway’s identification of Ai with et-Tell, undertook excavations at Khirbet Nisya, just outside Beitin in the so-called West Bank.¹⁰ After several years of disappointment by the lack of confirming finds, the Associates for Biblical Research, under Bryant Wood, resumed the search in 1995 at a site one kilometer west of et-Tell, a place known to the residents there as Khirbet el-Maqatir.¹¹ Fair-minded visitors to the site who have studied carefully the account of Ai’s place in the Conquest record of Joshua 7-8 can hardly doubt that its immediate and more distant setting is by far more compatible with the biblical description than is et-Tell or any other suggested place.¹² Moreover, excavation thus far has yielded unmistakable evidence of occupation there nearly throughout the biblical period and as late as the Byzantine era. Especially significant is the massive amount of LB (1550-1200 B. C.) pottery; wide and finely constructed gateways and walls; deposits of ash; and sling-stones, arrow heads, and other items associated with a fortification under attack. The 2013 season uncovered the most convincing evidence of all so far: an Egyptian scarab from the 18th Dynasty (ca. 1550-1450 B. C.).¹³ The pharaohs included in this period would have included Amenhotep I (1546-1526), Thutmose I (1526-1512), Thutmose II (1512-1504), Thutmose III

⁸ For a brief history and critique of the so-called biblical archaeology movement, see William G. Dever, *Archaeology and Biblical Studies: Retrospects and Prospects*. Evanston, IL: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1974.

⁹ Joseph A. Callaway, “Excavating Ai (et-Tell): 1964-1972,” BA 39/1 (1976): 18-30; *The Early Bronze Age Citadel and Lower City at Ai (et-Tell)*. Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980.

¹⁰ David Livingston, “Location of Biblical Bethel and Ai Reconsidered,” WThJ 33 (1970): 20-44.

¹¹ The name of the site appears to be related to the (Hebrew) root *qtr*, “to burn incense.”

¹² For a catalog of all the criteria required by the biblical text and that comport with Maqatir’s location and setting, see Bryant Wood, “Researching Ai,” Bible and Spade 22/3 (2009): 75-78.

¹³ Bryant G. Wood, “The Remarkable 2013 Season at Khirbet el-Maqatir,” Bible and Spade 26/4 (2013): 91-93.

(1504-1450), and probably Amenhotep II (1450-1425).¹⁴ In short, based on the evidence collected to this point, Maqatir gives every appearance of being ancient Ai.

The major objection raised by late-date adherents, however, is precisely the very fact that the principal diagnostic findings are from the LB period, thus enhancing the so-called “Early Date” for Joshua’s Conquest as opposed to the “Late Date” of Calloway and the majority of scholars allegedly supported archaeologically by et-Tell. The upshot is that if Wood’s dates and analyses hold up, the Conquest must be dated at 1400 rather than 1200. At this point, a domino effect takes place. For at least 75 years a near consensus—even in Neo-Conservative circles—has posited that the exodus, if historical at all, occurred no earlier than 1250 B. C.¹⁵ The OT itself, moreover, insists that the Conquest was 40 years later than the Exodus, hence, ca. 1210-1200, so modern criticism has hailed et-Tell as a confirmation of that set of events. On the other hand, if the Exodus took place at ca. 1440, as the Masoretic chronology as a whole demands, the Conquest must be dated at 1400, precisely the period favored by the Maqatir excavations.

The Present Approach: Historical and Biblical

The domino does not stop with the question of the dating of Ai alone. Granting acceptance of the data in canonically preceding texts, principally the genealogical numbers of Genesis, the entire era of the great Patriarchs must also be shifted back so that Abraham is no longer a denizen of the MB (1800-1500) period but of the EB-MB (2200-1800). The whole realm of Evangelical scholarship, our concern at this juncture, must then stop defending the indefensible connection of the Patriarchs with Dynasty 12 Egypt (ca. 2000-1730), an Israelite sojourn under the Hyksos (1730-1570), servitude under the Thutmossides and Amarna kings (1570-1320), a Mosaic exodus in the Ramesside era (ca. 1320-1150), and a Conquest in the Amarna Age (ca. 1400-1350 B. C.). See Table I.

Table I: Masoretic Text Dates of Major Persons and Events Preceding a 1400 B. C. Conquest

1. Seven-year Conquest (1406-1400; Deut 1:3; Josh 14:7-10)
2. Forty-year Sinai wandering (1446-1406; Num 14:33-34; Deut 1:3)
3. Exodus occurred in 1446 (1 Kgs 6:1; Judg 11:26)
4. Egyptian sojourn of 430 years (1876-1446; Exod 12:40)

¹⁴ According to the early date held here, Moses, who was born in 1526, was contemporary to Thutmosis III (reigned 1504-1450), Amenhotep II, the pharaoh of the Exodus (r. 1450-1425), Thutmosis IV (r. 1425-1417), and even Amenhotep III (1417-1379), the pharaoh of the Conquest. Thus Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, p. 58.

¹⁵ See, for example, the arguments for a late date by as eminent a scholar as K. A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, pp. 310-312. See also James Hoffmeier, “What Is the Biblical Date for the Exodus?: A Response to Bryant Wood,” JETS 50 (2007): 225-247; Bryant G. Wood, “The Biblical Date for the Exodus is 1446 B. C.: A Response to James Hoffmeier,” JETS 50 (2007): 249-258.

5. Jacob's descent to Egypt (1876, when he was 130 years old; Gen 47:9)
6. Jacob's lifespan (147 years: 2006-1859; Gen 47:28; cf. 25:26)
7. Isaac's lifespan (2066-1886; Gen 35:28)
8. Abraham's lifespan (2166-1991; Gen 25:7; cf. 17:17; 18:14)

Inner-biblical testimony supporting an early conquest rests primarily on two passages: 1 Kings 6:1 and Judges 11:26. The former states in no uncertain terms that Solomon laid the foundations of the great temple in Jerusalem in his fourth year, that is, in 967/66, that year being precisely 480 years after the Exodus. Since Solomon's reign began indisputably in 971 B. C., basic arithmetic yields an Exodus date of 1447/46. It follows that the Conquest commenced ca. 1406 since it followed 40 years of Israel's sojourn in the Sinai deserts. Judges 11:26 affirms this date in Jephthah's statement to the king of Ammon to the effect that the Ammonites had 300 years in which to contest Israel's occupation of the Transjordan so why should it now be an issue? The Transjordan had been conquered by Moses and Israel before the Canaanite campaigns began, thus as early as 1406. Again, 300 years prior to 1106, the date of Jephthah's judgeship, yields 1447/46.¹⁶

As to the 480 year figure, since no major textual evidence exists to challenge the MT,¹⁷ some conservative scholars, in an attempt to bolster a late date for the exodus, propose that it is an artificial number consisting of 12 generations of 40 years each, the 40 representing an ideal generation. In reality, it is argued, a generation is closer to 25 years; hence, 12 such periods would yield a 300 year span between the exodus and the laying of the foundations of the Solomonic temple or a date for the exodus of ca. 1266 B. C. (966+300).¹⁸ K. A. Kitchen has disposed of the 300 year embarrassment by dismissing it as the wild guess of an ignorant old man, namely, Jephthah.¹⁹ *Ad hominem* of this sort, even against an ancient, hardly bespeaks objectivity and seems at best to be an evasion of the implications of the text. Moreover, the sleight of hand of arbitrarily factoring 480 into multiples of 40 and 12 is a marriage of convenience. Nothing *in the text* itself suggests anything but a serious attempt by the author of Kings to spell out precisely when the temple was begun. His purpose was not to date the Exodus but to use it as a chronological benchmark by which to correlate other dates. In other words, the exodus date seems to have been recognized by the community as firm and standard. This seems to preclude the possibility that a "manufactured" or manipulated number would be employed as a point of chronological departure.

The impetus behind the resort to factoring 480 is a reading of archaeological data that seem to demand a 13th-12th century date. Besides the assumption that the place name Rameses in

¹⁶ For support of this date for Jephthah's tenure, see Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 167-169, 190-192.

¹⁷ With the exception of L, **G** reads 440 for 480, but the difference does not affect the overall argument, except it weakens the "factoring" solution by having only 11 generations of 40 years each rather than the desired 12.

¹⁸ This was proposed somewhat tentatively by R.K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969, pp. 315-325.

¹⁹ Kenneth A. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003

Exodus 1:11 attests to an exodus in the Ramesside era, evidence of massive destruction and sociological disruption in Canaan in the Iron I period seems by “late daters” to be explained best by the biblical Conquest. However, two textual factors nullify this interpretation:

1. Moses’ instruction to Joshua on the eve of the Conquest was that he must refrain from destroying the sub-structures of Canaanite cities, leaving them intact to be occupied by the victorious Israelites (Deut 6:10-11; 19:1), a plan that came to fruition under Joshua (Josh 24:11-13). Thus, no evidence exists of major, wide-spread destruction in the first half of the 14th century (1400-1350). Places here and there that appear to be exceptions can well be explained by the chaotic disruptions attested to in the Amarna Letters, the provenance of which is roughly 1380-1340 B. C.²⁰

2. The dates asserted by opponents of the early Conquest (1250-1100) square nicely with the dates of the judges of Israel who contended with enemies that did considerable damage to the land before they were defeated and routed. First, the Canaanite King Jabin of Hazor “strongly” (B\$]”Zq>) oppressed Israel for 20 years (ca. 1240-1220) until Deborah and Barak drove them out (Judg 4:3), but not before they had forced the Israelites into hiding and brought ordinary life to a standstill (Judg 5:6-7). From ca. 1187-1180 the Midianites invaded from the east, forcing the Israelites to abandon their homes and to take refuge in dens and caves (Judg 6:2). They then destroyed Israel’s farmlands and livestock (6:4-5) until Israel was “brought very low” (w~Y!DD~l. . .<\$A)D; v. 6), a situation that most likely implies destruction of properties.

The mushrooming of the construction of the famous “four-room” houses of this period could be explained by Israel’s rebuilding of dwellings after the terrible days of the judges. Found in both the Transjordan and Canaan—and even in South Egypt—these unique structures can clearly be linked to Israel both before and after the Conquest.²¹

Ai and Old Testament Chronology

The importance of Kh. el-Maqater is now self-evident, for the Conquest began with its destruction following of that of Jericho. The record shows that only Jericho, Ai, and Hazor were placed under j@r#<; the remaining cities of Canaan were to remain intact with only their occupants put to the sword (Josh 6:17, 21, 24; 8:1-28, 24, 26, 28; 11:11, 13). Wood has demonstrated clearly that Jericho fell in the LB period and the evidence is still strong that

²⁰ These exceptional disruptions and destruction were very likely at the hands of the various trouble-makers in Canaan in the Amarna Period. See Moshe Greenberg, *The iab/piru*. New Haven: AOS, 1955, pp. 70-76.

²¹ For the four-room house in general, see Gary A. Byers, “Living Like a Judge,” *Bible and Spade* 26/4 (2013): 94-97. For the idea that destruction of the EI period can be explained by the ravagings of the times of the judges, see Eugene H. Merrill, “Palestinian Archaeology and the Date of the Conquest: Do Tells Tell Tales?” *GTJ* 3 (1982): 107-121.

Hazor also was destroyed at this time.²² However, Ai was not laid waste at that time if it is to be identified with et-Tell. On the other hand, el-Maqatir was beyond doubt thriving in the LB period until it too was destroyed in a time frame compatible with the early Conquest date of 1400. The evidence so far indicates that it was rebuilt and continued to be occupied in the Iron Age and even beyond into Roman and Byzantine times.

Conclusion

Though no inscription or other hard data have so far been found to identify el-Maqatir with LB Ai with absolute certainty, pottery and other chronological markers seem to point in that direction. If the identification can be solidified, the early Conquest and Exodus dates will find strong confirmation and thus will follow compelling evidence to put the whole matter of pre-Monarchic biblical chronology on an even sounder footing. Thus, in answer to the question, Does Ai matter? It certainly does!

An e-copy of this paper may be obtained through the following address:

Eugene H. Merrill, PhD
Independent Research Scholar
ehainesmerrill@aol.com

²² Bryant G. Wood, "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho? A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence," BAR 16/2 (1990):44-58.

