

HHoeh_Archaeology_and_the_Bible-30-9-77

and cities that are difficult to maintain the list yet are mentioned.

It is a privilege for me now to be such a close contact with the old Americans, how they will thus far participate in the translations of those 17,000 documents.

And I presume some of you are aware of it because it's been in all the local papers.

If not, I think you should be a little more aware of the archaeology of Syria at the present time.

What I should like to do today is now to discuss another matter.

First of all, I would draw to your attention that the Bible is in principle a revelation to man of essential knowledge.

There are aspects of the Bible which are clearer in the Bible than anywhere else because they are either unknown or nearly inaccessible to man otherwise.

There are aspects of the Bible which are not nearly as clear as they might be because the Bible is not speaking fundamentally on such a subject that may only have a passing reference.

And this is why, for instance, many prophecies are difficult to understand which are descriptive of aspects of the experience of nations in the past which were written for a purpose, for future experiences, and for our individual learning.

We would have to have an linguistic and an archaeological understanding to get a full meaning out of such books as Amos or Hosea to illustrate a point.

The Bible is not a book on nutrition but without a question impinges on it.

Now, the Bible is not in this sense a history book.

More is it, for obvious reasons, a book of archaeology that should be apparent.

If it is not in itself a history book, it certainly parallels history as close as it would any art or science.

What we learn is that the more we study different aspects of the Bible, the more we discover there may be questions which are still unanswered or conclusions that we might have come to with the Bible only that need to be re-evaluated on the basis of other information because we tend to see things in the Bible from the point of view of our own times.

We need to recognize that.

We should see it also from the point of view of the mind of God which is given to the church.

We see it sometimes also in the tradition of the church and what we need to analyze is how we acquired some of our conclusions, whether they were valid, whether they need reconsideration.

First of all, to give a background, I think we must include certain aspects of anthropology and geology in my approach to archaeology this evening.

The Church of God, the Worldwide Church of God, the Radio Church of God which was the earlier name, had prior to the founding of Ambassador College received no traditional explanation of either

anthropology or archaeology or history or geology from the Church of God's seventh day out of which this work sprang.

Now, I've addressed this question a year and a half ago nearly.

At the Big Sandy campus, and I therefore will only briefly summarize, at the Church of God seventh day organized at the beginning of the American Civil War in terms of publishing and carrying out a work was early combating some of the ideas that began to circulate as a result of Charles Darwin's first of his two publications.

But the Church of God seventh day had no school and in fact had no tradition itself going back to earlier centuries.

In fact, if we were to look at the world as distinct from the Church of God seventh day and as distinct from other branches of the Church of God before the addition of the word seventh day was added, you would discover that there has never been a tradition associated with biblical studies which has validly explained history and the developing sciences of archaeology and earlier of geology.

That is, these are indeed new sciences.

Geology going back to the 18th century and archaeology in its non-art sense of the heroic archaeology of the last century, the 19th, are there by relatively new.

What had happened is that the Bible had been misunderstood in the world and a description in Revelation chapter 3 indicates that even the Church described under the symbol of Sardis in the first verses of chapter 3 of Revelation had lost whatever basic spiritual understanding there was in terms of the government of God and the history of that government and of the angels and of man on earth.

That is, many of the things we have learned in the last 15 to 20 years were not altogether unknown but came to be basically lost.

Without any question the statement is and looking at the story that there were people who neglected and who let understanding die and necessarily at such a time the world comes up with an explosive body of data and choirs that seem to so alter our understanding of what we think the Bible says and I'm speaking here of the human race and not of the Church alone that there isn't any question theology and biblical studies was dealt a mortal blow in the last 200 years so that this has become indeed a secular world in which the great many basic ideas of the Bible have been altogether lost and unknown and assumptions have been read out of the Bible that are not actually there with conflict with men's conclusions in geology and archaeology and on this basis the Bible really has no basic role to play in the world's studies in these areas it is even a dubious look to turn to when dealing with archaeology lest one be confronted with the question are you trying to prove the Bible true the world had no explanation that would accurately explain the problems being uncovered by geologists and archaeologists the Church of God's seventh day over a hundred years ago had no explanation they had no school, there were no teachers and the individuals who might have had some learning had no way of following through to any extent on the impact of these two sciences I'm linking them together first because they can be in our approach and after it I will draw out specifically on archaeology when Mr. Armstrong came among these people he found that not a one had better education than he did except Andrew Duggar who was not an apostle but a deacon in the Church of God's seventh day but since he handled the money he was indeed the chief spokesman and functioned as an apostle in terms of the government in the Church at the time this meant that Mr. Armstrong himself came among an essentially uneducated group of people there was no

tradition to guide his understanding in the bulk of his reading if you are careful to observe you will discover that Mr. Hubbard Armstrong read in depth from seventh day Adventist literature on geology and from the literature the British Israel World Federation and necessary archaeology and history were involved there as early as the founding of Ambassador College the books that we used in the early days were those with the seventh day Adventists had published from about 1900 to the 1930s maybe into the 1940s but essentially prior to World War II the work was done in geology by a specific individual George McCready Price in the area of archaeology we had no text we were told certain things from Mr. Armstrong's studies basically laid out in early editions of the United States and British Commonwealth in Prophecy a copy of which some one of you in the front row I think has and that was a much sharper real short Mr. Armstrong studied of course the Bible dictionaries and the commentaries most of these commentaries were at the time of his study already 80 to 100 years old the impact of archaeology on biblical commentaries has only been valid in this present century and in fact has had its greatest impact certainly since the First World War and more recently since the second and it would not be appropriate for me at this time to list all the Bible dictionaries and commentaries that are coming out so many that most of you couldn't afford even to keep up with them and I don't eat it this means that Mr. Armstrong had no access to speak of to any material more recent than the four or five volumes set of Hastings Dictionary of the Bible which is a very fine work for its state and in some areas cannot be superseded because nothing else has been found since that would add or alter convictions what we are saying is that the body of information in archaeology and history was extremely limited at the time the college began and in a sense we were involved both in history and archaeology there was no subject like that and in geology in pioneering material now we are confronted with the fact that there was no what we would call science that we might define as creationism that is an exposition of the history of creation as given in the Bible and the account of history of human experience recorded in the Bible thus when Ambassador College started and Mr. Armstrong did not define the distinction in geology or archaeology between the pre-ademic and the ademic world he could go no further than to state that there was a world before Adam and he recognized that there was life on earth prior to the cultures that were known and defined by the books written after the turn of the century which he read in the 1920s and 30s thus as early as late as the beginning of the college the church had not defined nor has Mr. Armstrong ever put formal approval on any historic or archaeological or geological construct that had been offered by varied faculty members whether Mr. Herman, whether myself or others who had been and are teaching in these areas now I think it is advisable then to state and I think this is important for us to recognize that in reality the Bible is a book which at the present time is not being added to and in a sense represents a body of knowledge accessible to us and to all levels among us in education and church government is to keep a certain measure of discipline till we come to the unity of the faith but this faith must not be recognized as demanding that everybody have the same body of knowledge or acquire or believe in depth areas in nutrition or history or geology or anthropology or chemistry or physics or astronomy or any of the other sciences what I think we must come to recognize is that there are individuals who are competent in various areas of human knowledge who earn a living by it and who therefore are accountable to God in the manner in which they earn the living and I think that the history of human experience should point up to us that there comes a time at which Mr. Armstrong and no one in a ministerial capacity can ever go over the whole body the encyclopedic mass, the explosive mass of human knowledge and make a pronouncement on everything that you might have as a question that is the church must come to a place where it recognizes that its limits are to define what the Bible itself is telling us both in terms of the spirit of God giving insight and any sciences it may be brought to bear to give us a greater understanding of that book the degree to which any of the areas of study of human knowledge is defined in the Bible is a degree to which the church may speak about it if for instance nutrition is barely spoken of in the Bible and only certain

things are defined what the church ought to do in my estimation is to point up the principles laid out in the Bible and beyond that individuals are free to pursue their knowledge an understanding of nutrition and therapy and vitamins and enzymes and minerals or whatever the church has a right to define when a field of study has clearly gone astray and is openly and plainly contradicted by a revelation in Scripture now whether the church uses that authority right is a matter that the church will be held accountable before Christ but where there is no competence in the ministry or church government to make a decision because we are not trained nutritionists let us say then we would point up that when there is no obvious or no in the contradiction with the Bible an individual is certainly free to pursue in depth and I think this point has never been made clear thus vitamins are not defined in Scripture and therefore unless we come to some conclusion that would lead to a plain contradiction the church has no jurisdiction in making any decisions in that area and individuals are free to discuss and evaluate so long as there is a harmonious approach that is that we learn to open our minds admit when we are wrong and not to be hard headed I think we must apply then the same principle to the fields of geology and archaeology now this may be a roundabout approach but I think it is fundamental and it is the only way to resolve questions that are beyond the scope of the ministry now some time ago as I mentioned about a year and a half now I presented a statement that was emphasizing geology and emphasizing anthropology on the Big Sandy campus the need to reevaluate our previous conclusions what I would like to do now is to point up certain assumptions that we made that we all took for granted which were fundamental to our approach whether we now realize it or not this was fundamental because having grown up with certain fundamentals I know what they were the clearest fundamental in terms of history and archaeology the assumption that Genesis chapter 11 gives the origin of the multiplicity of languages and that prior to Genesis 11 or from Adam to the tower of Babel the world only spoke one language whether you think this was important whether we ever told you that is more important than any other conclusion just as one assumption on Pentecost which was never discussed was fundamental to the church's previous convictions the conclusion that Mr. Armstrong came to on Pentecost was predicated on what he never said that he was assuming that the translators rendered the word in Hebrew most accurately by the word from in English and not by some term meaning with or all having assumed that the translators made no mistake his conclusions were what the church practice was for 38 years now having concluded that languages all rose at the tower of Babel we were confronted with the fact that the culture in the Middle East that we call early bronze or its parallels witnesses the wise in written form of more than one language not to mention dialects and therefore on the basis of a theological deduction from Scripture we concluded that everything from early bronze on the basis of necessity have succeeded the tower of Babel it didn't mean that material earlier than early bronze might not also be post flood but it did mean that we were confronted with that conclusion now there will be some of you who have a knowledge of terms and some who do not I will merely state when I use the term early bronze and presumably there are certain ones of you who are here who are here because you were willing to go a little further and read on or listen and it would be unfair for me to try to explain how such terms originally arose as they did of course with studies in Denmark where the term of the bronze age and the iron age and the early and late stone age they wrote but in any case we are dealing with a sequence and the statement I am making is that the early bronze cultures the cultures of the old kingdom in Egypt and of the early dynastic in Mesopotamia were all post flood that was the assumption that was essentially derived from a reading of Genesis 11 and Hislop's The Two Babylon's and Mr. Armstrong presented this material to the church at the Feast of Tabernacles in the end of the 1940s the beginning of the 1950s at the same time we began to try to evaluate where the break between Genesis 1, 1 and 2 and 3 occur that is the world before Adam and the world after and we tried to look at the world that the geologists gave us and we created two views there was a world of pre-mammals before Adam and the world of mammals with this was not a conclusion of Mr.

Armstrong who gave no conclusion and there were no guidelines he gave we attempted to explain the history of Genesis 1 on this premise now geologists themselves have come to reevaluate the break between the so-called world of reptiles the dinosaurs and the world of the mammals afterward this is in the area of geology and I won't pursue it further but I have to mention it because if we assume that that was where the break was then we were confronted we're trying to construct the whole world of mammals from the tertiary through the quaternary two terms that parallel everything since mammals were once thought to be on earth and all this had to be pushed into the world paralleling the biblical account of Adam to Noah to the thread we made a certain assumption and we had to work with that premise now another assumption that was also fundamental was the idea that there were two destructions one caused by the sin of man and the flood and the other caused by the sin of angels hence we were looking for what would be in geology the destruction visited on the preadamic world at the time of the rebellion of the angels or their ascension we assumed that because two destructions were mentioned in the Bible and by Mr. Armstrong that we would have to explain all geology and archaeology in terms of two singular destructions thus we were looking for the flood for years and neither Mr. Herman in geology or I could come to any agreement as to where we should find it with respect to the ice ages before or after we also took for granted that the whole of geology through the destruction of the world of the dinosaurs would represent the conclusion of the preadamic world it was at this time that a science of radiocarbon dating began to be developed in Southern California elsewhere by Dr. Libby of UCLA a science that developed out of studies of the Second World War this science began to reveal that there were radiocarbon dates that could be measured back to the so-called ice ages and that there were no radiocarbon measurements previous to the late Pleistocene and we tried to explain all the geological material between Adam and the Flood without any evidence of radiocarbon dating which presented some major problems that is how come radiocarbon suddenly appears and there was no satisfactory explanation that the church could offer now whenever the church or any teachers, myself or anyone else comes upon a major problem we should recognize that maybe much of the problem lies in our previous preconceptions or assumptions radiocarbon became more and more significant and by the late 1960s they were already studying the Bissell Cone Pines and the White Mountains in eastern California near the Nevada border it became apparent that we could not neglect radiocarbon dating that no explanation the church or any of us had been able to offer on the basis of a biblical account would fit the evidence being acquired so this presented some problems that we had to recognize then we came to the conclusion that most of geology should not be attributed to the final sin of the angels but should in fact tell a story of the world from the beginning to that time just preceding the creation of man that instead of geology reflecting the conclusion it should reflect at least the whole of experience of the angels on earth and this is what I mentioned at Big Sandy on this premise we have then a grasp which is outside of the area of our study tonight a grasp of the nature of the world that the angels ruled and we discover that it differs from the world tomorrow as you will read in Isaiah 65, Isaiah 11 and Hosea I think was at 218 or something like that that the world of geology is like the world today filled with competition and strife in the whole biological realm that in fact the animal world as I have addressed to the Imperial AM congregation the animal world that is around us today will differ from the world tomorrow and therefore we see that the role of the devil today in human experience is reflecting the same kind of thinking as was reflected when he had direct control of the animal world before the making of man and thus we find that animal life before the presence of man and since are essentially parallel because they reflect the devil's role if you please in finishing the physical creation from the patterns that God initially gave the angels and we won't go any further into that but what we are concluding is the geology as a whole as a science is all pre-abamic and plays no fundamental role except in the account of Genesis 1, 1 and any parallel areas pertaining to the role of angels prior to the presence of man on earth that of course is a theological statement and

a geological statement but it means that no longer does geology have to be forced into the biblical history it totally precedes and the history of human experience is left to some time within the geological recent where the capital R recent is the latest phase of geology now when we address this area of the recent we normally think of archaeology that is the study of artifacts now there is always a borderline area we will try to focus in on the impact of archaeology in the sense of acquiring new information that has been buried that opens up an understanding that we never had before we have had to recognize that the biblical account is not in every place clear without added information that may be acquired by excavators at sites, epigraphers, ring-lists the whole field of archaeology and related sciences one of the difficult things was to come to grips with the question that was presented by Immanuel Velikovsky in the end of the 40s and the early 50s as to whether history had been misunderstood now he came at a time when many historians were clearly saying things contrary to and drawing conclusions totally unwarranted by scripture they did so because they had no intent to acknowledge what scripture had to say now there were some historians who had far greater respect for the Bible than others it was in a world in which creation, the pre-fled world, the flood, and the patriarchs of the biblical account in the first 12 chapters had all basically been rejected and you will find that all the written records, some of the finest historians never brought this part of the Bible into their experience they started with the civilization of Egypt or Mesopotamia and because of this lack of dealing with the first part of the Bible there were no small number of people, and Velikovsky happens to have been a foremost student let's say, of this particular problem it did appear to me that no small number of his challenges had serious merit especially when we were confronted with requiring that the old kingdom of Egypt the early bombs of Palestine and the early dynastic all be post-fled because they had the presence of several languages and that I said to you before was the key to the problem and Velikovsky came along with an idea of pushing later history further down in time toward us which made it possible for us to have more room for what we perceived at that time to be the post-fled world the assumption again I state was that no languages other than one existed before the flood and Velikovsky made history, moved toward us sufficiently by upwards of 500 years in some instances let's say material assigned to the Exodus, he assigned to the days of David the Solomon about a 500 year period of 480, roughly 5 centuries and that made it possible to fit the account and to attribute pharaohs mentioned in Genesis that are during the patriarchs and during Moses day to try to parallel that material with the old kingdom of Egypt the pyramid period, dynasties 3 and 4 and 5 and 6 radiocarbon in fact lent some support because many of the radiocarbon dates were the same or 3 or 4 or 5 or even 6 centuries younger than they should have been if the historians account was correct and up till the bristle-conquering studies were made radiocarbon was at knowledge to be the historian's biggest bugaboo for ever written history of the Middle East occurred it in fact lended strong support to our earlier convictions that the old kingdom and the early dynastic period were post flood then came along the bristle-conquering reevaluation of radiocarbon which meant that dates which were basically found in the immediate post flood world as we would have viewed it should have gone back 3, 4, 5 or 6 centuries and in fact the radiocarbon dates when adjusted by bristle-conquering tree analysis required that the old kingdom be pre-flood in terms of any biblical parallel much earlier and in fact basically where the historians had placed it and in fact there were several languages prior to the period that we would have assigned to the flood on the basis of the Hebrew text of the Bible that well before 3,000 years BC there must have been the presence of several languages now the first material and I will really tell you where you can find it the Applied Science Center for Archaeology of the University of Pennsylvania publishes what they call the mascot newsletter and in the August 1973 issue they dealt at length with the radiocarbon dates in reality and the Xerox of it and this is the first American presentation now I don't know if it's available at least it's available in some libraries I think I have left a Xerox in our library I only have a Xerox but it gave the analysis of radiocarbon on the basis of the bristle-conquering I visited the

laboratories in Arizona and I have to conclude that any question that is valid that there is no way to explain radiocarbon dating other than in terms of the fact that many dates that once seemed a little young were really older because the rate of radioactivity somewhere between 1500 and 2500 BC was in fact if you go back in time was rising somewhat and that the radioactivity of later centuries was less than it was in the third millennium in the beginning of the second millennium BC and that instead of things being younger than the historians had it they were older than radiocarbon was first indicated and there had to be an adjustment in the radiocarbon dating because the bristle-conquering have a record that goes back with fallen logs well before the flood and they are able to piece together the tree rings sufficiently accurately that we may conclude that with any increment of 10 which is usually what they use for measuring that we are able to discern that indeed radioactivity was higher then and therefore being higher it gives the impression that the width of that time that was on archaeological sites and buried was in fact more recent because the radioactivity was higher and therefore we have to take that into account so that if I were to take this and let us say we take a date I'll just turn to something arbitrarily here for special reasons if we take a date that is 2000 BC as it was measured initially the tree rings for such a reading would give somewhere between 2330 and 2340 BC plus or minus factor in other words upwards of three and a third to three and a half centuries older now excuse me in 1975 for those of you who would like a very inexpensive work which I know is available the university at Edinburgh published a work called radiocarbon calibration and prehistory radiocarbon calibration and prehistory and it has very fine tables and an analysis it's a total evaluation of the state of the study and a very fine analysis and tables that you can readily use the reason I recommend it for any of you who are interested is that MASCA takes the longer half-life and then transposes it this one takes the shorter half-life of radiocarbon and transposes it and the shorter half-life is used in the radiocarbon journal therefore this table will be the most convenient to use the other will require a multiplication of a small factor 1.03 for those of you who know nothing about it, you can forget it for those of you who do, that's why I'm mentioning it that is when Libby first studied radiocarbon he thought the half-life was shorter than it seems to have been, that is all, by a small amount and it is that factor that is what underlies each of these tables in any case we were confronted for the past few years with the impact of radiocarbon now if I'm stressing that and not archaeology you have to understand that we couldn't measure anything in terms of radiocarbon unless archaeology were occurring the scientific contribution that we have to work with is indeed radiocarbon which has answered questions that no other area has answered when I came to the conclusion over a year ago now that we had to evaluate it and in fact it wasn't a year and a half, it was only a half a year that I spoke to the Texas Canvas, wasn't it? Yes, I think so for this occasion but my thinking goes back a year and a half, roughly I want to correct that for those who know better I came to realize that there was something fundamentally wrong in our reconstruction in history as we had presented it in the compendium there was something fundamentally wrong in our evaluation of Genesis 11 there was something fundamentally wrong in our understanding of archaeology first I would like to set the stage now all I can do this evening is to give us a proper focus and an understanding and I'm more than happy to answer any questions that you might like to write some later time as it occurs to you we read Genesis 11 from the perspective of the 20th century we read it not from the perspective of the people living at the time of Genesis 11 now the whole earth was of one language and one speech we said, well that's the contrast to today so they must have been like this before we should have read it in terms now the whole earth, the and or now are both ways of rendering the Hebrew introductory word now the whole earth was of one language and one speech in contrast to what it had been before the flood because now we were only one family we never looked at it that way now we read in Genesis, sorry, in Deuteronomy I may or may not have it marked here quickly in any case the book of Deuteronomy refers to the time in chapter 32 verse 8 that the most high divided two the peoples of the earth, their inheritance when

he separated the sons of Adam he set the bounds according to the number ultimately that he should have of the children of Israel now certainly it doesn't exclude the idea that the word Adam could represent merely man and a division after the flood in the days of Peleg but I think it is significant that the word ish is not used or any other word but the word Adam itself which implies a division and a separation of the families of man or Adam and the pre-flood world as much as in the post-flood world and we never knew that but I have to draw the conclusion that the impact of archeology and radiocarbon now requires us to recognize that the world was divided into various human families states or nations in the pre-flood world as much as it was in the post-flood and the key to keeping any group of people separate is language that is the fundamental key no matter what your race once you speak the same language racial barriers drop once you speak different languages you can keep even peoples of the same broad racial stocks Asians, Europeans or Africans to use a generalized term separate the conclusion we are forced to is not that false religion arose only at the tower of Babel in the days of Nimrod and Samarimus as Hyslop the two Babylon's would have it the false religion continues because it is characteristic of what happens to the human mind when it is subject to the devil that languages were both in the pre-flood and post-flood world but indeed it is seemingly indicated that similar languages were given on either side depending on the human stocks but that is a subject that we would have to go into too much detail what we now come to is a fundamental and shocking reality brought to our attention anthropology, late studies in geology that is the studies of the late sequence and archaeology and that is that the family of Adam does not go back to the time that the first hominids appear on earth and that our attempt to explain homo erectus, homo neanderthalensis and other forms in terms of the Adamic pre-flood world were irrelevant and erroneous that indeed the biblical account would require if you were to set the Bible evidence here and the geological, archaeological, historic evidence here it would indicate that there were creatures very similar and in terms of the skeletal pattern highly discernible from man as we know him today but who had no writing skills I did not say there were not symbols but we would have to come to the conclusion that the biblical account implies that man has not been on earth more than about 4,000 years BC and roughly where we are today in other words man may be traced in terms of the family of Adam actually not earlier than the beginning of the fourth millennium using a round figure that all finds previous to that time previous to the cause of the Calcolithic and the rise of the early bombs cannot fall within the scope of the biblical statements for the presence of Adam on the basis of the Maseridic text and the Septuagint wouldn't vary it by more than 12 centuries anyway so that is not really relevant this means that when we begin to study the written record when we begin to study history we are indeed basically near the beginning of human experience that the ice ages and all that preceded and even several, that's incorrect even a few millennia following the ice ages were all pre-ademic and they have nothing to do with the human experience and we need to see that as characteristic of a world that we need not at this moment dwell upon that archaeology and radiocarbon require us to see instead that dynasties making up the old kingdom and making up the early dynastic period in Mesopotamia were all in the pre-flood world that the middle kingdom in Egypt and its parallel middle bronze cultures in Palestine and Mesopotamia essentially begin the post-flood world I'm using the broadest perspectives the radiocarbon dates applied to these cultures were best laid out in a recent publication February 1977 of the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research February 1977 in an article by Callaway and Weinstein titled Radiocarbon Dating of Palestine in the Early Bronze Age page 1 and extends all the way to page 16 this is by far the most up-to-date and the best presentation using whistle-compine recalibration of radiocarbon and it points up that indeed the Early Bronze cultures of Palestine as an illustration in necessarily Mesopotamian Egypt all fall within the time frame and basically recognized on the basis of the Maseridic text of the Bible that's the Hebrew Bible in which the English translations are overtaken that it all falls within the period from 4000 BC to

roughly 2500 something of that nature now there's always the plus and minus factor they have a very fine evaluation of the Egyptian material that parallels Early Bronze in Palestine and a thorough presentation bringing us all the way to the close of the Early Bronze in Palestine where we have dates that bring us into the 24th century BC and dates that take us all the way back to just before 4000 BC with a plus or minus that is a very good approximation from the 24th century to the 40th and 41st centuries BC this is the scope of that culture that we think of as the pyramid age of Egypt and it does indicate without any question and I think that if any of you have a chance who are interested this is by far the most up to date thorough and accurate presentation it would in fact agree in the sense that it puts all the sciences together and indeed I think we shall see that it resolves some of the problems we were getting into in the field of archaeology itself in sequence and stratigraphy it means that we don't have to push Early Bronze to the post flood world and Middle Bronze to the judges and Late Bronze to the kingdom and the Iron Age to try to squeeze it in because there presumably was no real difference between the Iron Age and the Persian period that might seem to have been valid as it did to me when even William Fox were all bright in his book and frustrated to explain and I even talked to Egyptian archaeologists whom I have met as to why the Persian material was practically unknown in the middle 50s the answer of course is that men had not yet found everything and I began to puzzle over this question when I dug at Ashdod in 1963 where there was clearly a significant Persian remain above the Iron Age as the Iron Age was being defined I think Ashdod was the strongest proof that I had to wrestle with for years in terms of trying to understand the problem because if that were true and the Iron Age is the kingdom and the Late Bronze is the judges I'm only speaking broadly not being absolute please and the Middle Kingdom the Middle Bronze is the patriarchal period from the flood and the Early Bronze is pre-flood if we had taken that archaeological approach then we would have in fact been flying in the face of radial carbon dating previous to its recalibration by Bristle Tone Pine and I felt it was better to hold on to that and the reconstruction and find out what the problem in archaeology was with respect to the Iron Age and the Persian and the Hellenistic as it is turned out now we have no basic disagreement between the evidence that is between the biblical information and the evidence of archaeologists in their dating of Early, Middle and Late Bronze and the Iron Age now necessarily archaeologists have fine points and we would have fine points to discuss but for the first time we are in a position to say in my estimation that there is no conflict between radial carbon in its recalibration form and the biblical account and no conflict with the parallels that is the radial carbon information derived from the finds in the Early, Middle, Late Bronze, Iron Age the Persian, the classical period earlier no conflict between archaeology and the Bible the broadest outlines which I think is very significant it means that the same God who created the world gave us the Bible the same God who is telling us of the history of the world in the Bible watched it happen on earth and the Bible account is a valid presentation that history has often overlooked biblical parallels but that we have misunderstood history because historians neglected the Bible and now that we have radial carbon to help straighten out archaeology and to give proper dating to the stratigraphy and since we have in Mesopotamia and Egypt known historic parallels with the stratigraphy that is certain straight have belonged to certain dynasties and kings and pharaohs we now can date history and this historic presentation is basically not fundamentally different from what the world has known for the past 75 years I don't think it goes back any earlier than that there were major mistakes historians were making prior to the present century in interpreting archaeology but basically we have had refinements so that every decade or every score of years has brought new information to our understanding and the archaeology of the Middle East has in fact been falling more and more into place paralleling the biblical account and we did not see this and Velikovsky did not see this and he still is laboring under the cloud of radial carbon and under the cloud of stratigraphy of the Iron Age in Palestine that we no longer need to labor under I would at this point place the flood between the old and middle kingdom of Egypt I have

strong convictions where it belongs in Mesopotamia but I would prefer to withhold it until I am convinced where the parallel is with respect to the kingdom of Nimrod the Nimrod built Kala and Akkad attempted to build Babel and Erech and there is interestingly historically placed a famous man in history who built Erech and Akkad and who got in trouble over building Babylon and who built Nipuro whom the Jews say is Kala they may be right they may be wrong there is no proof one way or another but it is interesting that in the very century that we are expecting to find a hero named Nimrod we find a ruler in Mesopotamia whose real name we don't know we only know his throne name which meant the legitimate king his real name is never given in the literature but before I draw any public conclusion on that some of you might already have drawn a conclusion from what I have said if you know history you know whom I mean but I will leave that to be something for the future until I am settled on it it is premature at this point in time though the dynasty and this hero the most important figure in history would seem to parallel when we expect to find the son of Kush in Mesopotamia what I never knew is that indeed there could be languages both before and after the flood that God could give to people and very probably since Noah's family intermarried in three different occasions we would very likely find that the languages of the wives even though they all could speak the same language but if Noah is very possible that there was a significant knowledge of other languages within the family even though one was used we are not told about it but anyone who has had the experience of the Jews knows that it is very difficult to find a Jew who doesn't know more than one language because they have gone from here to there I think it is a privilege myself to have at least access to other languages in written or spoken form and any person who has such an opportunity to train children should do so the compendium therefore will need to be reevaluated both in its archeological and in the geological sense and in the historic framework that many areas that might have seemed as they did in a number of cases to be remarkable parallels are to be treated as just what they appeared to be remarkable parallels but do not indeed prove it without sufficient evidence and radiocarbon and stratigraphic sequence in archeological finds in the Middle East prove that some of these possibilities some of the clear possibilities are not sufficiently well founded whether this is an indication how often there are repetitions in history of human experience and human behavior we will have to see we certainly know that certain nations in Europe tend to play one role after the other again and again and I think maybe things that we thought of as parallels may indeed not have had to be they are merely similarities now a whole new area needs reconsideration once there is a complete reconstruction of Egypt such as Valikovsky had given that is no longer valid then I think we must look and re-examine all of the history that we have been given in these areas where reconstruction seems necessary there are areas of the world where traditional literature outside of the realm of history and not subject to the rigorous archeological proofs need no reconstruction because they stand on their own and is now a question to see whether the traditional literary material for instance of Ireland of Scotland, the Pictish Chronicle for instance or of other parts of Europe or Asia or China and the Chinese archeology is really falling marvellously into place I think it's one of the best areas in all the world because China has a history that is extremely accurate I won't define it any further and sufficiently accurate and in radiocarbon dating I think is a marvellous parallel for that part of the world we won't go into that any further but if we have to reconstruct the whole of history essentially in the form in which we have been given it by historians and what we need to do then is find out whether there are biblical parallels historians don't understand many parts of the Bible now historians do understand some parts of the Bible but we didn't and this brings up the final and most critical area I want to mention that the church has never spoken on a framework of history officially at Mr Armstrong's level I have felt free to speak in terms of the history classes and what I have been teaching as a subject but I am now of the conclusion that we have to completely re-evaluate the date of the flood the date of the exodus the date of the entry into Palestine or Canaan and the date of Solomon on the basis of material that has been coming to light

since the close of the last century and even till very recently I think one of the most recent contributions was one made in 1969 alright I'll have an announcement here at the close, thank you once history had to be restructured again in the form in which it had come down under the disciplines of history, archaeology and linguistics with now the addition of calibration then some of the supporting information that we have had with respect to the fundamental dates such as I have given that have never been official but have been broadly evaluated these dates need to be reconsidered I have carefully gone over the material that is in the biblical archaeologist reader number two I'm just giving now certain particular articles of special note it is the tenth article pertaining to the time from Chalmers of the Great to Nebuchadnezzar written by William Howell the parallel between Assyria and Israel that is a very valuable work then another valuable work to draw to your attention by a seventh day Adventist Edward Artile which I have been familiar for years The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings by Edward Artile, T-H-I-E-L-E and a very nice updated work The Ancient Near East by William Howell and William Simpson it is possible now to face the reality that the traditional idea of understanding the chronology of Judah and of Israel in the form of the pattern that Archbishop Usher gave us which has been extant among biblical students for upwards of three centuries and which has basically been laid aside by all modern archaeologists that that framework which I have generally used which concentrated on Judah and left gaps in the history of Israel in the period of Jeroboam II and in the period of Hoshia the king of Israel that that is an error and in fact the evidence would appear based on the time period that 40 or 41 years needs to be shortened from the time of the building of Solomon's temple as I had viewed it to the destruction of Jerusalem and that the date of the destruction of Jerusalem is not the traditional date that the church literature has cited which came from the British Israel World Federation rather than from the Bible and didn't come from updated material that the date of the fall of Jerusalem is to be evaluated on the basis of the Bible parallels with the Babylonian Chronicle which was edited by Mr. Wiseman of the British Museum and first published in 1956 after all the Bible has no chronology after Zedekiah's time that is consistent it was never meant to there are only fragments it links up with the history of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar what I assumed is that you could work from the time of Zedekiah and Nebuchadnezzar and work back strictly with the biblical material through the Assyrian period but the evidence now is and I would like to state it clearly that beginning with the days of Ahab we have parallels with Ahab and Jehu and Joash and Jehovah has and Menahem and Pika and Hoshia and all of these kings are mentioned in a series of Assyrian documents that go back to the 9th century BC and these Assyrian documents are linked to the Babylonian and the Babylonian history has been accurately known all along especially through Tommy's Canon back to 747 and the Assyrian literature discovered by archaeology that was unknown before archaeology and the Babylonian was known that the Assyrian material is in agreement with the Babylonian period parallels and that it is further supported by the enigmatic which is no longer enigmatic that is the clear evidence of an eclipse in 763 BC witnessed at Nineveh in June in the month of Simeon I think it was June 9 I don't remember that accurately but with this and with the fact that the lengths of reigns of the Assyrian kings are given and that every single year had an official title emu Li-Mirel-I-M-M-U is the transcription into English like the Greek eponym that the Assyrian record is accurate all the way back to Chalmonezer III, the great and that indeed the biblical parallels must now be re-evaluated and in so doing 40 to 41 years must be cut out of the chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah and there were no gaps in the history of Israel but for practical purposes Thiele's reconstruction is valid though I do not agree with every fine point of it nor do most scholars Thiele was also trying to support a Seventh Day Adventist opinion which I won't go into here but he was nevertheless working at the University of Chicago and he was forced to come to this conclusion on the basis of the evidence that he had and his presentation in my estimation is the best that was first published in 1951 but it never made sense

to me until I came to be aware of the total impact of all of the sciences and the fact that one after another name and proper sequence of these kings are known now it does mean therefore that the traditional date we used to cite for the fall of Babylon sorry the fall of Jerusalem to Babylon needs a slight readjustment the slight readjustment needed for the fall of Samaria is also required that it is possible as I have done this past week in one reason why I haven't been seen during the afternoons I do think it is possible to even go beyond what Mr. Thiele gave and things that he could not in fact explain are explainable I don't know why he overlooked one or two things but he introduced problems that didn't have to be there he assumed the Bible was an error when in fact it was not in one or two places but she didn't have to assume if he had taken the premise that he had before and worked at it more thoroughly I think he could have arrived at the answer as well it is possible to take all of the biblical data and not to lay aside two things which he did and to come up with a conclusion that is an agreement with the historians for the fall of Samaria of Jerusalem and it does mean that we are not at this moment on the brink of 6,000 years of experience of human history nor does it mean that Jesus Christ must lay till 6,000 years up nor does it mean that he has any requirement to come before the question of when 6,000 years of human experience as recorded in the Bible are up and the question of when God should choose to intervene when man would annihilate himself are two related but not fixed factors I would like to state that that any re-evaluation of the history of man in 6,000 years of human experience cannot be altered by presumed prophetic conclusions when God has never spoken of 6,000 he's only spoken of the Sabbath and the 1,000 and left the other as a parallel but not as limiting him if man should come to the place where human life would be annihilated before 6,000 years God would have to intervene but there is no doubt in my mind that the reconstruction of it in the latest edition of the compendium in terms of the biblical parallel and I never went into the history of Israel and Judah there but I only alluded to it that that has to be dropped and if we were to take Thiele's information that is he summarized it as good as anybody but you can get it elsewhere and William Howell follows it basically and I agree having examined Albright's work having examined Thiele's material I think he is holding to all the basic evidence that is at hand that archaeology has uncovered in the Mesopotamian region and that the exodus from the date that I had concluded of 1487 has to be dropped in any case on the basis of this reconstruction by 41 years and the crossing of the Jordan similarly a part of it by 41 and the last part by 40 but I won't have to explain it to you it merely means that indeed there is a significant period of time to be cut out and that we are not on the immediate threshold of a close of 6,000 years of human experience what this knowledge is what it would have meant if we had come upon it and understood it as Thiele did in the 1950s what the nature of our work might have been I don't know even my conclusions that it would have been in this decade that such a period of time would have ended I was shall I say subject to reprimand in the early 50s for even entertaining such an idea that 6,000 years could be so far removed well I think people go through experiences and I've tried to deal with it historically without imposing prophecy on the basis of what it appeared that God had revealed to the church some of this is slightly an error now interestingly enough if you read all the account of what Sargon says in his second year you will find some interesting parallels with the 2,520 years and 1800 AD if you see what Nebuchadnezzar required in 604 after Jerusalem came under the jurisdiction of the Babylonians but before which the kings had not done fealty it doesn't appear that we have necessarily lost parallels prophetically that seemed to have been required on the basis of Leviticus chapter 26 that it would be a mistake to assume that we're not Israel merely because the fall of Jerusalem or the fall of Samaria must be slightly altered you need to read the whole picture when the story actually ends when the final revolts are put down and I think the whole picture will come out quite interesting it does mean we must correct things we may have to reevaluate where we were placing prophetic dates with respect to a historic event but I have not found any reason to doubt the uniqueness of some of the statements of Leviticus 26 I believe that it is possible to

proceed now with a whole new view of the Bible and a realization as to why things are dragging on in the world they may come to a climax soon but remember even our understanding of the fall of Babylon in 539 to the general of Silas in the summer in October when Silas marched in himself the doubt doesn't bring us to anything nearer than 1982 and I think we have to recognize that there's no reason to believe that Babylon should end by 1982 but it could I suspect it means that the final Babylon won't arise in its beginning of ultimate arms until that time but we will say that is a historic matter yet to be evaluated by prophetic events the date of the fall of Babylon is without a doubt the date of the fall of Jerusalem now should be without a doubt the date of the fall of Samaria is without a doubt the problem of Jerusalem is whether a spring or autumn calendar was involved and I think that indeed the spring calendar of Jeremiah gives the answer to the question I won't take more time for many of you I have scratched what would be dry ground and you have nothing to plant in it I will say that I'm more than happy to discuss or to write anything that I can know as a guideline and for any of you who are interested in the source material in English the ancient Near Eastern texts edited by Pritchard I have the third edition with a supplement as my own copy is a very expensive but most valuable item better looked at in a library and something like The Ancient Near East by William Hallow a paperback \$1.6.50 probably the same is as suitable as anything at the moment and then of course there's always the Bible never forget that see you tomorrow morning for those of you who meet here and I hope all of you who meet in the auditorium have a fine session tomorrow morning as well