Old Testament Introduction
The Bible’s Buried Secrets
Chapter 22, Jerusalem

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/ancient/bibles-buried-secrets.html>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qalTJzk4kO0>

***About the Video***

What is for the most part an exact copy of the video script follows. There are a few places where individual speakers could neither be heard nor understood: for this we apologize. Every effort was made to be precise: there were just spots that defeated us. Since this is a quote in its entirety it seemed unnecessary to mark it with quotation marks. The notation for each speaker is tedious enough: Narrator, Reader, etc. If you discover bothersome errors, please reply to this website and point them out. You may verify the script more easily by starting to replay it where the “time” stamps indicate discussion begins. The second of the above links is free from advertising and thus easier to use.

***Overview***

BBS has plunged ahead on the basis of older, disproved concepts of the history and science of writing. One error leads to another until a worn-out false conclusion is presented. Not only that, but we do not even know if Moses wrote in Cuneiform, Hieroglyphic, or paleo-Hebrew[[1]](#endnote-1): so, it is futile to insist on original dates as late as 950 BC, when writing technology was already well developed by the eighteenth, thirtieth, or even fortieth century BC. There is no technical reason why the entire book of Genesis could not have been recorded as a diary, journal, or log from 4000 BC onward in Akkadian Cuneiform[[2]](#endnote-2): in which case, Moses could not possibly be its author, he would have received it virtually intact, needing to make only minor editorial clarifications.

The neutral point of view must leave the door open for all possibilities for which there is credible evidence. The Bible is every bit as much an archaeological artifact as any other find. Moreover, each of us has the tendency to read into the Bible, that which it does not actually say[[3]](#endnote-3): so, we jump to false conclusions.[[4]](#endnote-4) Tradition is important, but its weight is easily abused. Music and poetry are not inherently traditional in nature.[[5]](#endnote-5) We cannot rewrite Genesis or Exodus from Psalms.

The idea that E originates from a Canaanite rebellion, while J is founded in a Canaanite excursion leads to internal contradictions: namely, that neither J nor E can possibly find a backdrop in Jerusalem — not to mention the fact that we must expect both J and E to coexist for centuries without comingling before being published in writing.[[6]](#endnote-6)

Jerusalem herself has tended to be more of a backdrop for religious strife than for religious peace.

Radiocarbon dating establishes a probability that the City of David dates long before David, not after him. That the City of David is actually an older Jebusite castle or fortress is in exact keeping with the Scripture in 2 Samuel 5. Too many archaeologists look to 14C as the magic bullet that resolves all dating problems; frequently the scientific and statistical implications of 14C are not understood at all.

***Script***

Jerusalem (time 57:20)

Quote:

McCarter: Surely, if there was a scribe that could write this alphabet that far away, way out in the boondocks at the extreme western [northern] boundary of the kingdom, surely if there was a scribe who could do that out there, there were scribes, much more sophisticated scribes back in the capital.[[7]](#endnote-7)

N: Could these scribes have been in the court of King David and his son Solomon? Could they have been the earliest biblical writers?[[8]](#endnote-8) In the eighteenth century, German scholars uncovered a clue to who wrote the Bible hidden in two different names for God.[[9]](#endnote-9)

Coogan: According to one account Abraham knew God by His intimate personal name, conventionally pronounced, Yahweh.

N: Passages with the name Yahweh, which in German is spelled with a J, scholars refer to as J [950 BC].

Coogan: But according to other accounts Abraham knew God simply by the most common Hebrew word for God, which is Elohim.[[10]](#endnote-10)

N: So, the two different writers became known as E [850 BC] for Elohim and J for Yahweh. Most likely based on poetry and songs passed down for generations.[[11]](#endnote-11) They both provide a version of Israel’s distant past. The stories of Abraham and the Promised Land, Moses and the Exodus.

Coogan: The earliest of these sources is the one that is known as J, which many scholars dated to the tenth century BC, the time of David [1010-970 BC] and Solomon [970-930 BC].[[12]](#endnote-12)

N: And because the backdrop for J’s version of events is the area around Jerusalem, it’s likely he lived there, perhaps in the royal courts of David and Solomon.[[13]](#endnote-13) For over a hundred years, archaeologists have searched Jerusalem for evidence of the kingdom of David. But excavating here is contentious, because Jerusalem is sacred to today’s three monotheistic religions.

Joan R. Branham:[[14]](#endnote-14) For Christians, Jesus comes in His final week to worship at the Jerusalem temple.[[15]](#endnote-15) He’s crucified. He’s buried. He’s resurrected in the city of Jerusalem.[[16]](#endnote-16) For Islam, it is the site where Mohammed comes in a sacred night journey. And today the Dome of the Rock marks that spot.[[17]](#endnote-17) In Judaism, the stories of the Hebrew Bible: of Solomon, of David, of the temples of Jerusalem; all of these took place, of course, in Jerusalem. So Jerusalem is a symbol of sacred space today, important for all three traditions.[[18]](#endnote-18)

N: Despite the difficulties, Israeli archaeologist Eilat Mazar, when digging in the most ancient part of Jerusalem, today called the City of David.

Mazar: We started excavations here, because we wanted to check and to examine the possibility that the remains of King David’s palace are here.

N: But because this area has been fought over, destroyed, and rebuilt over thousands of years it was a longshot that any biblical remains would survive. But then….

Mazar: Large walls started to appear: three meter wide, five meter wide. And then we started to go all directions. It goes from east, thirty meters to the west and you don’t see the end of it yet.

N: Such huge walls can only be part of a massive building. And Mazar believes her excavations to date, represent only twenty percent of its total size.

Mazar: Such a huge structure shows civilization and the capability of construction. It can be only one structure.

N: This huge complex may be evidence of a kingdom, but is it David’s kingdom? For these walls to be David’s palace, they would have to date to his lifetime around 1000 BC.[[19]](#endnote-19) The problem is, stone walls can never be dated on their own. Biblical archaeologists date ruins based on the pottery they find associated with those ruins. Pottery dating is based on two ideas: pottery styles evolve uniformly over time,[[20]](#endnote-20) and the further down you dig the further back in time you go.[[21]](#endnote-21) If pottery style A comes from the lowest stratum; then it is earlier than pottery style B that comes from the stratum above it. By analyzing pottery from well stratified sites, excavators are able to create what they call a relative chronology.[[22]](#endnote-22) But this chronology is floating in time without any fixed dates. To anchor this chronology William Foxwell Albright,[[23]](#endnote-23) considered the father of biblical archaeology, used events mentioned in both the Bible and Egyptian and Mesopotamian texts to assign dates to pottery styles. Albright’s chronology, slightly modified, is what Mazar uses to date her massive buildings, and what most archaeologists use today.

Mazar: What we found is a typical tenth century pottery … with burnished … you can see from inside. Together with an import, a beautiful black and red juglet. What is so important, is that this is a tenth century typical juglet.

N: So has Mazar discovered the palace of David? She adds up the evidence. The building is huge. It is located in a prominent place in the oldest part of Jerusalem. And the pottery, according to Albright’s Chronology, dates to the tenth century BC, the time of David. Mazar believes she has indeed found the palace of David. But that evidence, and indeed the kingdom itself, rests on the dates associated with fragments of pottery. And some critics argue the system for dating that pottery relies too heavily on the Bible.[[24]](#endnote-24)

Finkelstein: Archaeologists in the past did not rely too heavily on the Bible, they relied only on the Bible. We have a problem in dating, how do we date in archaeology? We need an anchor from outside.[[25]](#endnote-25)

N: Today, there is a more scientific method[[26]](#endnote-26) to anchor pottery to firm dates, radiocarbon dating. It is a specialty of Elisabetta Boaretto[[27]](#endnote-27) of the Weizmann Institute.

Boaretto: the first step, is of course, investigating collecting … sticks, or seeds, or charcoal to the archaeological context.

N: If an olive seed is found at the same layer as a piece of pottery, the carbon in the seed can be used to date the pottery. When the seed dies its radioactive carbon 14 decays into stable carbon 12 at a consistent rate over time.[[28]](#endnote-28) By measuring the ratio of carbon 14 to carbon 12, Boaretto can determine the age of the olive seed, which in turn can be used to date the pottery. Boaretto has meticulously collected and analyzed hundreds of samples[[29]](#endnote-29) from over 20 sites throughout Israel.[[30]](#endnote-30) Her carbon samples date the pottery that Albright and most archaeologists associate with the time of David and Solomon [925 BC] to around 75 years later. For events so long ago, this may seem like a trivial difference. But if Boaretto is right, Mazar’s palace of David, and Tappy’s ancient Hebrew alphabet have to be re-dated. This places them in the time of the lesser known kings, Omri, Ahab, and his despised wife, Jezebel, all worshipers of the Canaanite god, Ba’al. With no writing or monumental building, suddenly the kingdom of David and Solomon is far less glorious than the Bible describes.[[31]](#endnote-31)

Finkelstein: So, David and Solomon did not rule over a big territory. It was a small chiefdom, if you wish, with just a few settlements, very poor, the population was limited, there was no manpower for big conquests, and so on and so forth.[[32]](#endnote-32)

N: This would make David a petty warlord, ruling over a chiefdom, and his royal capital, Jerusalem, nothing more than a cow town.

Finkelstein: These are the results of the radiocarbon dating. He or she who decides to ignore these results, I treat them as if arguing that the world is flat, that the earth is flat, and I cannot argue anymore.[[33]](#endnote-33)

N: But it’s not so simple. Other teams collected radiocarbon samples, following the same meticulous methodology. According to their results Mazar’s palace and Tappy’s alphabet can date to the tenth century [1000-901 BC], the time of David and Solomon. How can this discrepancy be explained? The problem is that these radiocarbon dates have a margin of error of plus or minus 30 years, about the difference between the two sides.[[34]](#endnote-34) Pottery and radiocarbon dating alone cannot determine if the kingdom of David and Solomon was as large and prosperous as described in the Bible. Fortunately, the Bible offers clues of other places to dig for evidence of this kingdom.[[35]](#endnote-35)

Unquote.

***Writers***

“Could they have been the earliest biblical writers?” No, absolutely not! When Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918)[[36]](#endnote-36) first penned the original Documentary Hypothesis, this argument might have seemed to hold water. Subsequent discovery of evidence and scholarship have proved it to be a sieve. In 1918 it may have been true that evidence for writing, especially alphabetic writing, was unknown prior to around 1000 BC. This, if it stands as the only evidence, makes the Mosaic authorship of Torah absolutely impossible. After all, if no one is writing, then Moses cannot be writing.[[37]](#endnote-37)

This idea fails for two very simple archaeological reasons. 1. Subsequent discoveries have pushed the origin of alphabetic writing well back into the eighteenth century, hundreds of years before Moses was born.[[38]](#endnote-38) Cuneiform predates even that by millennia.[[39]](#endnote-39) Hieroglyphic is older still.[[40]](#endnote-40) The BBS insistence on Tel Zayit and Tel Dan evidence, if believed, sets the scholarly study of writing back by a century or more. 2. There is no evidence disproving that Moses wrote in Cuneiform, Hieroglyphic, or even the very remotely possible paleo-Hebrew. Lacking these two pillars, no reason remains to believe that “the earliest biblical writers” suddenly appeared in 950 BC with a J writer.

The continual reassertion of such long disproved notions about the history and science of writing is not a neutral point of view. The reader can easily verify all these facts with an online computer search for any of the key words used in this section on “Writers”. Numerous scholarly articles are easily found. What “German scholars uncovered [in the eighteenth century]” or think they may have uncovered is not necessarily relevant today: especially, when subsequent research has repeatedly disproved their hypotheses.

If writing is well established hundreds of years before the fourteenth century, before the date of the Exodus, then scholarly necessity for alternative solutions no longer exists.

***Names***

The supposition that “Abraham knew God simply by the most common Hebrew word for God, which is Elohim” is exactly that, speculative supposition. We simply do not know what Abraham did or did not know about the name of God. We only know what is written in Genesis. Abraham may very well have known El, or Elohim by his name Yahweh. Adam, Noah, and Jacob may have had the same knowledge. Alternately, Abraham, et alia may not have known the name Yahweh, or even El, or Elohim for that matter. Yahweh could be an editorial note: we do not know the grammatical rules for end-noting, foot-noting, or parenthetical expression prior to the fourteenth century BC.

Most of what we do know about Abraham is written in Genesis. What we do know is that Abraham is a monotheist, who knew and spoke with God on a personal basis. We also know that Abraham is a key person in a long genealogy of others who also responded to a personal speaking relationship with God, by whatever name(s) He disclosed Himself to them. There is every reason to believe that this line of matriarchs and patriarchs did their utmost best to see that such monotheism was maintained in the family. The tragedy of family life is that children walk away from family values on a fairly regular basis.

Similarly, the supposition that Moses is the first man to know the name Yahweh is equally unfounded, as are other claims for the name’s origin, through disclosure to Jethro, Midianites, Edomites, Shasu, or any other. What we do know is written in Exodus. We are not told, and do not know, why Moses received the name Yahweh. He could have been brainwashed by the incessant barrage of Egyptian idolatry; he could have failed to understand the context, and needed reassurance that he was talking to God, and not some demon; he could even be the first person to receive the name, Yahweh: yet, all of these are conjectures: for Exodus does not stipulate any of these conditions, or their reasons. We only know that Moses asked for the name and received it.

***Tradition***

We have already showed that there is no reason for Exodus to have been “based on poetry and songs passed down for generations.” Everything about the Exodus account marks it as a sort of daily log or diary, kept up to date on a regular basis. There is neither evidence nor necessity for Exodus to be composed from other documents, and certainly not as late as 950 BC (J) or 850 BC (E). Nor is there any real explanation for why J supposedly precedes E at all, let alone by a whole century.

We have barely tolerated the point that small sections of Genesis might possibly contain oral tradition. Genesis is not made up exclusively of “poetry and songs”: we have excellent examples of what “poetry and songs” look like in Israelite culture; the genre of Israelite “poetry and songs” is quite distinct from the genre of Genesis.[[41]](#endnote-41)

Nor is there any subject matter in surviving Israelite “poetry and songs” from which anyone might fabricate a J or an E, or a Genesis or an Exodus: the evidence seems to indicate that the “poetry and songs” derived from historical accounts and not the other way around.

Nor do J and E really “provide a version of Israel’s distant past.” Except for Genesis, the bulk of Torah refers to events that occur between 1406 and 1364 BC: hardly distant past in relationship to a pseudo-date like 950 BC. A span of four centuries is barely the scope of modern history to us, so that in 2015 AD the “distant past” might refer to a discussion of the Bronze Age or of Neanderthalensis. In 1010 BC, the Bronze Age is current events or recent news, not the “distant past”. The idea that there are two versions before us, is an invention for which the evidence is minimal.

How is it that “the backdrop for J’s version of events is [supposed to be] the area around Jerusalem,” when its contents refer to Creation; Adam, Noah, and the Flood; early developments of Akkadian, Cushite, Elamite, Mizraim, Sumerian, and other civilizations; the dispersion of peoples throughout the ancient world; as well as the rise and fall of Egypt, the world’s first true empire. Nothing about J pivots on Jerusalem: Jerusalem is a nonentity, just one of many other city-states until 1010 BC. Hazor is the premier city-state of the era. Samaria would be a better choice than Jerusalem, especially for those theoreticians who wish to pawn the idea of merger between insignificant egalitarian refugees from Egypt and Hazor in the central highlands. There is nothing in the refugee merger hypothesis that suggests Jerusalem as an objective.

How or why is it that the backdrop for J is not the Shasu of Yhw, or Midian, or Edom, or the central Canaanite highlands to the north? According to the BBS original assumptions the backdrop for E is disgruntled Canaanites from Hazor, who are only joined by migrant Canaanites, bearing J with them, at a later date. The claim of a Jerusalem backdrop fails because of numerous internal contradictions. Jerusalem and J have nothing in common.

Tradition is very important to most peoples. Here is the fascinating record of a family tradition. The incident begins with Jeremiah tempting the Rechabites who traditionally refused to live in houses or drink wine, just because their father said so. This is the stuff of which tradition is made. The Rechabites are an excellent example of Israelite tradition, none of which resembles Genesis.[[42]](#endnote-42)

The Scripture specifies which Levites will carry the Tabernacle parts, and how they fit together. But the methods of carrying and assembly, these were traditional skills passed down within the family. Yahweh merely asked that a thing be done; how the Israelites went about doing it was left to them and their tradition. J and E are not like that at all; J and E are not traditions passed down, but inventions of the human mind.

***Unanimity***

The leap to Jesus and Jerusalem is irrelevant to the point at hand. The introduction of “sacred space” in Jerusalem is supposed to provide some sort of unanimity among all peoples, and peace in the world.[[43]](#endnote-43) This is a sentiment devoid of fact. Few Christians, Islamists, or Jews are apt to find a comfortable place of cooperative relationship here. If peace were really that simple, strife in the Promised Land would have ended long ago. The ongoing strife in the Promised Land is sufficient testimony that these three religions have no common ground and no common “sacred space”. If anything, it is the “sacred space” over which they continue to fight so viciously. “Sacred space” is simply not germane to the origins of monotheism and Scripture.

***City of David***

What a delight after all this obfuscation to meet Eilat Mazar. What a breath of fresh air she is. The sheer mass of what Mazar has uncovered speaks to a highly developed and well established society. Part of the problem is that walls easily last for centuries, even millennia. Is this the personal residence of Israel’s second king? There is an excellent chance of that, just as there is an equal chance that it is also the personal residence of Israel’s last king, and every king in between; handed down through the generations; remodeled, repaired, and enlarged dozens of times. It very likely is the house and City of David, par excellence. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with Mazar’s reasoning. Still, David’s personal residential rooms may lurk, buried under many feet of rubble.

On the other hand, exactly what was dated? Specifically, two items: a potsherd and a juglet. The wall was not dated. Inherent to all construction methods and habitation sequences is the idea that the building is erected first, then people move in. Granted, the potsherd could be a piece of workman’s debris left behind from construction. The precious juglet most likely came in with a lady of the house. Usually, buildings are older than their contents; yet not always. The very old Merneptah Stele is housed in a modern museum. The point is that the chronological relationship between the juglet and the wall is tenuous. When a loitering, skulking olive seed is added to the existing relationship, the problem becomes more uncertain. Each interface between objects introduces new sources of error. The assumption that the seed dates the juglet, which dates the wall is the only relationship we have: yet it is a very dangerous one.

***Dating***

In 14C we will build on the assumption that tree rings, calibrate the 14C reading, while a standard gas calibrates the instruments, which measure an organic object, which may or may not have a chain of custody, which is measured an unreported number of times, which is given a date, which may or may not be related to the Law of Large Numbers, or the Central Limit Theorem, which is reported as fact without reporting any of the statistical controls or errors, which is used to date a piece of pottery, which may be from a site many miles away, while the relationship between the organic object and the pottery is never explained, etc.…

Moreover, the BBS description of how pottery dating works is absurd.

However, there is something fundamentally wrong with the reasoning of others as well. The hoped for objective chronology from 14C dating is unfounded.

Let’s begin with the statistical idea of half-life. It is commonly supposed that half-life is some sort of uniformitarian behavior, which provides invariably consistent results. We invite you on a road-trip.



<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Half-life#Probabilistic_nature_of_half-life>

By Sbyrnes321 - Own work, Public Domain, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=9104787>

<https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/3/3f/Halflife-sim.gif>

Unfortunately, our software will not support an active gif file so our picture is not active. If you open any of these links found immediately above, you will see the same picture as an active gif file; it is a visual demonstration of the Law of Large Numbers. The squares containing few dots do not decay uniformly; while, the squares containing many dots do decay uniformly. Radioactive decay is not uniform either; it only appears to be uniform, because of the Law of Large Numbers. The simulation (on the right of the page in the wiki link), which is a more complicated visual of a random walk, makes the point very clearly. At the statistical half-life, the number of dots in every block are not all reduced by exactly half. In fact, the block left with two dots may remain in that state for an indefinite length of time. We cannot predict statistically how individuals will ever behave. We can only predict how large numbers behave on average.

This is one reason a sample size of three is such an absurdity. We may measure the age of one seed with great precision using AMS technology. However, our statistical goal is not to measure the age of one seed. Our statistical goal is to predict the average age of seeds of that type and condition. We can only predict group, herd, or large set behavior. We cannot predict random individual behavior. Our conclusion would be that, on average, seeds of this type and condition are x years old. Now we want to use that average behavior to predict the age of the mud in which it was found, the age of the rock above it, and the age of a wall several feet away. We were on thin ice when we started with one (or three, or thirty) seed(s). Now, at last, we have entered the statistical twilight zone of ridiculous impossibility. We must have sufficient specimens to measure a credible mean and an SEM to evaluate the quality of that mean. Then we must know an intimate relationship between the test samples and the object being dated; none of which is true at Gihon for a seed, a coal chip, and a bone fragment.

Let’s take another example. Let’s imagine taking a large random sample, nearly 4 million of the world’s population ranked and graphed by age. Infant mortality is a problem: we have 100,000 births, 90,000 ones, 80,000 twos, 70,000 threes, and 60,000 fours. From age five to seventy-five the distribution is relatively stable at 50,000, with only ten mortalities a year. At age seventy-five the mortality rate increases rapidly, until most of the population is gone by age 85. Still we have two 86-year-olds hanging on, and one each at 87, 99, 103, 107, 114, 121, 128, and 135. We are plotting the living survivors. If we had plotted mortality on semi-log paper, we would have what the statistician refers to as a “bathtub curve”. Because we are plotting survivors, rather than mortalities our graph looks like anything but a bathtub.[[44]](#endnote-44)

Now we calculate and graph the average age, which turns out to be around 34.7 (the tall line in the middle). Then we calculate and graph the standard deviation of all the ages and we get the broad green bell curve, which we chopped off on the left because the next calculation goes negative which is impossible.

The first thing that raises our suspicions is that the nice bell curve does not look anything like real life. It could, but it doesn’t. There are graphs of real life statistics that do look like bell curves, but this is not among them. No matter, that’s not the main point. In this instance, the standard deviation tells us nothing about what the population is doing, and the average or mean age is not very helpful either. There are thousands of individuals in the infant mortality zone, people younger than 5 or 10, who are not close to “normal” random behavior; there are quite a few abnormal individuals between 60 and 75; there are even a few older than 100. We cannot use these curves to predict survivability or mortality of individuals.

Now we will calculate and graph the standard error of the mean (SEM) by dividing the standard error of the population by the square root of the population, which turns out to be a little less than 2,000. The result of this is the skinny bell curve in the middle. This curve is so skinny that we had to magnify it just to see it: it is magnified 100 times. What this standard error of the mean tells us is how much we can expect this mean to drift year after year, the uncertainty of the accuracy of the mean. If these were real statistics, not something we just conjured up for illustration purposes; and we wish to estimate the average age of the entire world population: the answer would be, at a 95% confidence interval, 43.7 years ± a little more than 1 week, or ± 8.185 days.[[45]](#endnote-45) What does this say about our 135-year-old? Absolutely nothing. What does this say about anyone of our 100,000 newborns? Absolutely nothing. When we repeat this sort of measurement year, after year, after year, we do not expect this mean to move very much. If any massive change took place it would necessarily be caused by an equally massive world scale disaster.

That radiocarbon half-life curve upon which many wish to pin their hopes begins with a standard error of the mean which is probably closer to 20 years: this turns out to be a difficult statistic to locate. So, the 95% confidence interval is probably more like ± 40 than ± 30, but we’ll give BBS the benefit of the doubt about this. We begin with Elisabetta Boaretto’s measurement(s) which are no doubt, state-of-the-art, AMS, and meticulous. But note that nobody says exactly how many samples Boaretto was allowed to take. The generic “Boaretto has meticulously collected and analyzed hundreds of samples from over 20 sites throughout Israel.” Is not very reassuring: it tells us nothing. It’s just not enough data. We would like to see 100 samples from each of 20 locations and at every clearly defined stratum in the City of David itself.[[46]](#endnote-46) Then with fear and trembling we would begin to propose a chronological map.

This is not what took place. We are not quite sure what took place. It appears that Boaretto was required to map a relationship between pottery samples and 14C measurements taken from closely associated organic materials. Considering the available Gihon reports this is like selecting three individuals from our imaginary life/mortality curve, without knowing anything else about the curve, and attempting to predict the shape of the curve, the mean of the curve, and the SEM from the curve on the basis of three individuals. If statistical behavior tells us nothing about individual behavior; I can assure you that a few individuals tell us nothing about average behavior either, or about the behavior of other individuals.

Now if a sealed jar of wheat is found in a particular stratum this works pretty well. Hundreds of samples can be taken from the single jar, and that standard error of the mean is getting very tight. We may be able to estimate without adding hardly any experimental error to our original confidence interval. There are other sources of error too, but you’re beginning to get the picture. We also know what the jar looks like and if it happens to be a piece of distinctive, identifiable pottery, we have made considerable progress.

On the other hand, if an old olive pit is found lying in the dirt[[47]](#endnote-47) three feet away from a very mundane pot, we may learn nothing of substance. Either the seed or the pot could have been displaced from different strata, and there is no necessary association between them. If only one or two readings are possible from the seed, the standard error of the mean is not helping us and the error can be quite large. That measurement and its error must also be related to the pot which has its own associated dating error: if mundane enough that error could amount to hundreds of years. Mundane clay pots are pretty much all the same: worthless for dating. Now another association must be made with the archaeological artifact, in this case a wall. Since the wall is still standing, what are we really looking for? We are looking for the date when it was first built.

Have no fear, we’re not done yet.[[48]](#endnote-48) “[Boaretto’s] carbon samples date the pottery that Albright and most archaeologists associate with the time of David and Solomon to around 75 years later [than 1000 BC].” 75 years later is 925 BC, is roughly 2875 BP. Applying the INTCAL13 calibration curve we arrive at results in the range of 3055 BP ± 12 years, or 1105 BC. Since no error figures or calibrations were reported for Boaretto’s average, we have to proceed as if none were made. Hence, there is no scientific or statistical reason to conclude that Mazar’s walls do not date from as early as 1105 ± unknown BC. From the INTCAL 04 calibration curve we got more conservative values of 3000 BP ± 30 (?), or 1050 BC, which is still 10 years before David’s birth. A date of 1050 BC could indicate that at least some of Mazar’s walls are actually the remains of the Jebusite fortress which David did not capture until 1003 BC.[[49]](#endnote-49) Once more, we caution that what has been calculated is average behavior and not the specific behavior of a single sample or other artifacts associated with it. There is no good reason to believe that this is not a Jebusite wall, which could easily be one hundred years old when David took the city.

Since we do not know what organic materials were found in the close vicinity to the Tel Zayit abjad tablet, we cannot speak to its dating. Since the tablet was found in a wall, the foundation strata of that wall must be exposed. Organic materials or other time indicators must be found in the vicinity of the foundation. Once the foundation can be dated then we know that the wall construction cannot be older than that, but it can be younger. Dating information from the City of David says absolutely nothing about a stone in a wall many miles away. Other relationships must be established, such as the identity of the quarry from which the stone was taken. If both walls were built from the same quarry stone, a date relationship could be found in that. There is no automatic dating relationship developed from 14C.

The leap to the conclusion “But if Boaretto is right, Mazar’s palace of David, and Tappy’s ancient Hebrew alphabet have to be re-dated.” Is unfounded. Such a hasty generalization is the byproduct of total ignorance of statistics and of the science of 14C. We should know better; even before a second study revises the false conclusion.

“These ***are*** the results of the radiocarbon dating. He or she who decides to” draw conclusions from them without understanding any of the mathematics or science is arguing that the world is square, and shouldn’t have begun an argument over matters of which they are fundamentally ignorant.

“The problem is [***not***] that these radiocarbon dates have a margin of error of plus or minus 30 years, about the difference between the two sides.” The problem is that radiocarbon dates must be subjected to corrective calibration, which is still a relatively young idea. Also the half-life used in dating is the older false half-life. Boaretto’s data cannot simply be contrasted to the work of another lab. The data need to be considered side by side, and if necessary recalibrated. This is a place for scientific experts to provide vetting and peer review of every step of the entire process. Many of the conjectures and opinions voiced here in BBS, are not those of qualified experts. They are the opinions of those who lack understanding.

The formation of conclusions based on such flawed analysis of evidence is equally ludicrous. Assertions like:

“David and Solomon did not rule over a big territory. It was a small chiefdom, if you wish, with just a few settlements, very poor, the population was limited, there was no manpower for big conquests, and so on and so forth.”

or:

“This would make David a petty warlord, ruling over a chiefdom, and his royal capital, Jerusalem, nothing more than a cow town.”[[50]](#endnote-50)

have no basis in evidence or science and are dreadfully false. None of these conclusions represents a neutral point of view.

***Conclusion***

BBS has plunged ahead on the basis of older, disproved concepts of the history and science of writing. One error leads to another until a worn-out false conclusion is presented. Not only that, but we do not even know if Moses wrote in Cuneiform, Hieroglyphic, or paleo-Hebrew[[51]](#endnote-51): so, it is futile to insist on original dates as late as 950 BC, when writing technology was already well developed by the eighteenth, thirtieth, or even fortieth century BC. There is no technical reason why the entire book of Genesis could not have been recorded as a diary, journal, or log from 4000 BC onward in Akkadian Cuneiform[[52]](#endnote-52): in which case, Moses could not possibly be its author, he would have received it virtually intact, needing to make only minor editorial clarifications.

The neutral point of view must leave the door open for all possibilities for which there is credible evidence. The Bible is every bit as much an archaeological artifact as any other find. Moreover, each of us has the tendency to read into the Bible, that which it does not actually say[[53]](#endnote-53): so, we jump to false conclusions.[[54]](#endnote-54) Tradition is important, but its weight is easily abused. Music and poetry are not inherently traditional in nature.[[55]](#endnote-55) We cannot rewrite Genesis or Exodus from Psalms.

The idea that E originates from a Canaanite rebellion, while J is founded in a Canaanite excursion leads to internal contradictions: namely, that neither J nor E can possibly find a backdrop in Jerusalem — not to mention the fact that we must expect both J and E to coexist for centuries without comingling before being published in writing.[[56]](#endnote-56)

Jerusalem herself has tended to be more of a backdrop for religious strife than for religious peace.

Radiocarbon dating establishes a probability that the City of David dates long before David, not after him. That the City of David is actually an older Jebusite castle or fortress is in exact keeping with the Scripture in 2 Samuel 5. Too many archaeologists look to 14C as the magic bullet that resolves all dating problems; frequently the scientific and statistical implications of 14C are not understood at all.

[[57]](#endnote-57)

1. At present, paleo-Hebrew presents only the dimmest of hopes. There are alphabetic languages claimed to exist as early as 1406 BC; however, closer examination shows that these appear to be primarily pictographic, so it would take a very fast talking expert to convince us that these are truly alphabetic. Even if such proof is forthcoming, there does not appear to be any contact point with Israelites in that era. This leaves us with all evidence indicating the invention of paleo-Hebrew around 1000 BC or later, four-hundred years after Moses. This simply means that Torah and Joshua through 1 Samuel are not originally Hebrew; they are obviously something else: there are several other excellent candidates, led by Akkadian Cuneiform. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. There are several other possibilities. Akkadian Cuneiform is only the present front runner. An archive of important family details could have been recorded on Akkadian Cuneiform tablets and kept in a treasure box.

Alternatively, Moses may have been able to collect this information from diligent research in ancient libraries, or other resources. As the child of pharaoh, Moses had access to the best education and libraries in the world as it then was.

Other alternatives are conceivable. The lone alternative that is inconceivable is that Moses received the whole as oral tradition. You cannot imagine the tax collector claiming, “I have your tax records from my predecessor’s oral tradition and you owe Nimrod one hundred sheep, fifty goats, and three camels. Also, you failed to file oral birth and death certificates last year, so our oral census statistics are now in error.”

The neutral point of view leaves the door open for all serious possibilities; only striving to balance probabilities. The smallest crumb of truth can lead to astounding breakthroughs in human knowledge. No stone left unturned must remain our watchword. The price of freedom remains, and always will be, eternal vigilance. We must guard that which God has entrusted to us: “Hastening to keep watch over the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Ephesians 4:3).” [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Primarily through anachronistic errors. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Pseudo-scientists do great damage to truth when they discard certain biblical evidence because they do not like that evidence, or its implications, which do not fit their current reigning fads, or pet hypotheses. Inerrantists do no better in insisting on the inerrancy of the MT, or in throwing out scientific evidence because it does not fit a treasured theology. Neither side can bring itself to admit that the evidence has been interpreted incorrectly; thus, truth is not found, because of unwillingness to change: something is more valuable than truth to such individuals, no matter which side of the debate they happen to favor. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. According to some philosophical perspectives the value of both poetry and music rests in their creativity and ever fresh novelty: this is the diametrical opposite of tradition. The recitation of classics by rote, without any sense of becoming caught up with them and enraptured in them, simply murders what they in fact are: they are classics, precisely because they are eternally so creative, so fresh, so novel that even their repetition snatches away our imaginations into unlimited ever new ideas and thoughts. Tradition that chains the God created mind of man is an evil thing. Tradition that breathes life into us is beautiful. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. The fundamental problem remains, we just don’t have enough evidence. After nearly an hour of video, we have found at best a few crumbs of information, which were very poorly interpreted, and presented in such a way as to shill for a hidden agenda. Over three thousand years have passed, what did we expect to find? Not much! We are delighted with the crumbs we have found. “Time beats high mountain down.” — Bilbo Baggins in, *The Hobbit*. Three thousand years is a long time to leave precious evidence laying around. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. This leaps to the dangerous assumption that such a capital exists. We are being led to believe that an unlikely merger between poverty stricken Canaanite refugees from Hazor (the E tribes), with equally poverty stricken Canaanite refugees from Egypt (the J tribes), form an egalitarian society, with the military prowess and strength to overthrow a Jebusite fortress, establish a sophisticated cultural center, that spawns artifacts left in remote locations such as Tel Dan and Tel Zayit. Before we jump to such an absurd conclusion, we should require these inventive prognosticators to explain how our egalitarian merger society based in the central highlands not far from Samaria, transitioned into a polished civilization in Jerusalem, yet, delayed publication of either J or E for another fifty to one-hundred-fifty years or more. One side of this kerfuffle insists that the City of David has been found, while the other side is equally insistent that the City of David has not been found. All of this larger-than-life house of cards is built on the name David, found on a remote rock, which supposedly proves a non-biblical association between David and Jerusalem. Meanwhile, we cannot make up our collective “scientific” minds whether this David is a petty egalitarian tribal chief or an emperor greater than pharaoh. The video’s working hypothesis has never demonstrated that such a capital even exists; it plays on our residual biblical memories to borrow a capital from biblical lore, without admitting biblical evidence into the court. Foul! [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Absolutely not! This is the whole point of the many proofs we offered. The probabilities involved in this question are so small as to be a practical zero. Can pigs fly? Of course, it might be made possible: but it is not very likely. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. We know far more today than German scholars knew in the eighteenth century. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. It should be clear that Elohim is simply the plural form of El, which is the name previously assigned to the principal Canaanite deity, according to the hypothesis being presented in the video. Is there evidence that either of the forms El or Elohim were in use in Canaanite Hazor circa 1400-1200 BC? Is the form Yahweh attested in Canaanite Egypt around 1406 BC? [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Isn’t it strange, then, that there are no remaining evidences of such J and E ballads. Surely, such ballads would have outlasted the writing of Scripture. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. It is difficult to understand how J can possibly precede E; since E represents Elohim; which, in turn is the plural of El; who is characterized as the principal Canaanite deity. If the Israelites are evolved Canaanites; and if J is a later insertion derived from the Shasu: then it seems necessary that E precedes J by centuries, and that the E text is the basic text into which J is written. Thus the first supposition of all Documentary Hypotheses falls flat. The writing of J into E is exactly what we would expect if Moses actually met with Yahweh at the burning bush and made written records of their conversations. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Eau contraire, according to the story line, an insignificant handful of Canaanites departed from Egypt around 1200 BC, as many as two centuries after the rebellious poor of Hazor staged their Spartacian revolt around 1400 BC and fled for the hills of the central highlands bringing the E word with them. These migrant Egyptians picked up the J word along the way; joining with the E tribes in the central highlands; nevertheless, merging without blending their E and J words for another two-hundred-years until the J word was finally recorded around 950 BC. The E word would remain intact for another century until it too was recorded around 850 BC. Meanwhile, these nondescript egalitarian ne’er-do-wells suddenly amass a significant military force in the central highlands, launching a successful military attack for no good reason at all against the well-known Jebusite stronghold around 1000 BC. For no good reason, this Jerusalem becomes their cult center; when, in fact, Samaria would have been the far more appropriate choice. Now, a Jerusalem thread is combined with the J word so that suddenly, out of nowhere, Jerusalem becomes important to the custodians of the J word. The E word will not drift into town for another hundred years or so. Rubbish! [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Joan R. Branham, Professor of Art History at Providence College, no other bibliography with no special qualifications in archaeology. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. “Jesus comes in His final week to [be worshipped] at the Jerusalem temple.” The triumphal entry, known as Palm Sunday, is a declaration of Deity in the midst of His people. His crucifixion, burial, and resurrection take place outside the city: Jerusalem is a cursed city. He comes to be God, and to represent the Father in the midst of His people, bringing Himself as the Word of God, the living presentation of the Law of God.

“Jesus comes in His final week to [be the living sacrifice offered] at the Jerusalem temple.” He makes Himself the lost son, the lost sheep that must be found and carried home on His own shoulders. He makes Himself the innocent sacrifice that must die. He tramples down death by death.

“Jesus comes in His final week to [conquer sin, death, and the grave] at the Jerusalem temple.” ΙΣ ΧΣ ΝΙΚΑ.

Branham simply fails to understand the message of Christianity, if she believes that, “Jesus comes in His final week to worship at the Jerusalem temple.” This implies that some rite of worship is His primary purpose; which is, in part, true; yet, it demeans the full scope of His being and intent: because His actions are not mere ritual, but living certainty. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. Branham has managed to hit all the Evangelical hot buttons in a single sentence. Little does she realize that Evangelicals comprise less than 25% of the world’s Christians. If Jerusalem is the lever that will bring lasting world peace, it is a strange way to deploy that lever, by ignoring the sensitivities of 75% of the worlds Christian audience. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. Jerusalem is hardly the principal cult center of Islam; anybody who knows anything about Islam should know that.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jerusalem_in_Islam>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isra_and_Mi%27raj> [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. This claim is held in opposition to the words of Jesus, one of these founders, replacing all such cities and sacred spaces with a simple meal of bread and wine (John 4:20-24; John 6:27-58). Yes, Jerusalem is important; but, it is not the cult center of Christian worship. Christian worship has no commonality with either the worship of Islam, or the worship of Judaism. Acts 2:30 makes it abundantly clear that the throne of David is no longer on earth. Making Jerusalem into such a cult center is absolutely forbidden to Christianity.

The attempt to paste together three fundamentally antagonistic religions around an idolatrous cult center and sacred space is a nonstarter. We shall have to look elsewhere for a world peace solution. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. Be specific. 1000 BC is an absurdity. Soon we will deal with Shishak I and we will know that Solomon is dated to exactly 970-930 BC, David is dated to exactly 1010-970 BC, and that David captures Jerusalem in 1003 BC.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phenomenon\_(film)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phenomenon_%28film%29) [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. Yet we have already seen this notion contradicted: for the egalitarian Israelite society is supposed to have used plain and simple, mundane pottery, at a time after they had overwhelmed the Canaanite city-states, where more artistic pottery was in common use. This is the exact opposite of the pottery dating construct, which also flies in the face of the fact that wealthy people can afford nice expensive things, while the poor are always limited to the mundane.

Another flaw in pottery dating is the fact that people tend to cherish the nice expensive things and keep them for centuries: distorting the chronological meaning. An ancient exquisite pottery piece may be found in either an older or a newer architectural setting: it is dangerous to simply jump to the conclusion that the ages of artifact and architecture are necessarily similar. So, there are pitfalls to pottery dating for both the exquisite as well as the mundane. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. This idea is also readily contradicted. In sites, such as Tells where the site is abandoned and left undisturbed for millennia, this could obviously be true: yet, if and only if, scavengers had not ever picked over the site, removing important artifacts. In more important sites, where the land was very valuable, where the site was not abandoned; yet, as soon as one culture left (a sort of urban flight phenomenon), another took its place, so that the transition was in fact seamless: any hope of a stratified chronology would be lost due to the prevailing use. In such important sites, stratification would not begin until the last inhabitants made their final departure. A prominent city, such as Hazor, might be, and probably was, continuously inhabited from before 1400 to 722 or 586 BC and beyond. In such a case, chronological stratification would only take place where “slum” neighborhoods were abandoned, or possibly used for waste disposal. Yet, even garbage dumps may be subjected to the incessant activity of scavengers: both animal and human. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. This whole presentation of pottery dating is so oversimplified as to be nonsensical. This is not how pottery dating works. For an accurate presentation of how pottery or artifact dating works, it is hard to improve on the “Antiques Roadshow” TV series. One only needs to watch for a few hours to realize that provenance trumps everything else, and important artifacts are dated from specific sophisticated aspects of art and manufacture which may identify an object to the specific craftsman who made it and the city where it was made. The art, which decorates the pottery makes all the difference in the world for dating purposes. Ordinary mundane pottery has been made throughout history and is virtually worthless for dating purposes. On the other hand, the find of a piece of Mycenaean pottery may establish standardized dates throughout the entire Mediterranean world. Scarabs and cartouches are also useful for dating, especially if they are marked with a particular pharaoh’s identity. In later eras, coins will become dating artifacts.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mycenaean_Greece>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mycenaean_pottery>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scarab\_(artifact)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scarab_%28artifact%29)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartouche>

Just for fun,

<http://www.artyfactory.com/egyptian_art/egyptian_hieroglyphs/hieroglyphs.htm> [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. William Foxwell (and Ruth) Albright (1891-1971), American archaeologist, biblical scholar, philologist, and ceramics expert with Johns Hopkins University and American Schools of Oriental Research. Works: Tell el-Fûl (1922: Gibeah), Tell Beit Mirsim (1933–1936), theory of ceramic pottery dating.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_F._Albright> [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. This lengthy and simplistic discussion of pottery dating is just setting up a straw man to be knocked down by the mythology of supposed 14C superiority. We will see that 14C, far from being the once hoped for absolute standard of chronology, is fraught with multiple technological problems, including, but not limited to: sample selection, statistical analysis, falsely assumed dating interrelationships, and more. If anything, the kerfuffle over 14C has increased dating uncertainties, in the present state of the art. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. To date, 14C has failed to provide such a necessary anchor. 14C dating has subjectivity issues all its own. Still, 14C dating has increased our knowledge base, but it needs to be held in balance with other knowledge.

Also the claim, “This dates that,” is dangerous. What we should have said is, “No evidence was found that contradicts a 1003 BC date.” Or we might have said, “The available 14C evidence is consistent with expectations for objects from 1003 BC.” [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. This method may be more scientific, but it is not necessarily more accurate. 14C is not a magic bullet. No dating method is superior to provenance; and no analysis is superior to people who are willing to think. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. Elisabetta Boaretto, 14C researcher with Weizmann Institute, no other bibliography with no other special qualifications in archaeology. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Unfortunately, carbon 14 is not generated at a consistent rate over time. Nor does it really decay at a constant rate over time: it is random behavior, so that we do not know when or why one molecule decays, while another does not decay. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. This is far too small a sample set. That being said, organic materials are not often found on archaeological sites, because they have decayed to nothing long, long ago. Even when the conditions are ripe for the preservation of organic objects, as soon as the site is disturbed the object crumbles to dust before the archaeologist’s startled eyes. Many artifacts of relatively recent discovery are already gone. Preservation of artifacts has its own complicated and detailed technology. As small as this sample set is, it may represent 100% of the organic objects available at that time. 14C methods cannot be applied where no organic materials exist. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. This amounts to perhaps five or ten samples per site, in sites that likely have more than one age strata and more than one period of development. To detect and evaluate a base we would like to see as many as one hundred samples from each representative area. In a site with multiple strata and developments we would like to see a thousand samples. In complicated and complex sites, we would like to see many more.

In spite of these grandiose claims of original research, we have yet to locate a single scholarly publication of methods, measurements, analysis, coming from Weizmann Institute or Boaretto. Ostensibly, copies may be purchased from the University of Arizona: they are not publicly available as a service. Research was limited to the sub-foundation area of the Gihon Spring. According to 2 Chronicles 32:30 this work was engineered by Hezekiah (739-687 BC) to the west side of the City of David.

MT is corrupted at 2 Chronicles 32:30 or the Chronicler got his compass directions reversed. The Gihon we identify is east of the City of David: else, we have completely misidentified the geographical locations. LXX has “south.” Let’s not lose sight of the important distinction here; Gihon is clearly separate from the City of David and outside it’s walls when Hezekiah undertook his building project. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. We are being led to believe that massive statistical samples were taken. This may be, in fact, the case; yet, it is certainly strange that such massive studies have not made it into significant scientific journals. After hours of internet searching University of Arizona was willing to sell a paper for $35, while Research Gate refused access to their site. What did turn up in internet search were numerous pop-science articles, and a few abstracts, none of which contained data or evidence reports, or scientific analysis. Boaretto, no doubt, faithfully completed the necessary AMS tests: we have no reason to question her technical qualifications for AMS operation. However, her archaeological and statistical qualifications are less well known.

From the popular reports and abstracts it appears that the City of David was not examined. A tower associated with the Gihon Spring was studied. 2 Chronicles 32:30 suggests that this could be an engineering work undertaken by Hezekiah (739-687 BC). The evidence examined seems to consist of and seems limited to a bone fragment, a coal chip, and a legume seed or olive pit all found in sediment below the Gihon structure.

MT is corrupted at 2 Chronicles 32:30 or the Chronicler got his compass directions reversed. The Gihon we identify is east of the City of David: else, we have completely misidentified the geographical locations. LXX has “south.” Let’s not lose sight of the important distinction here; Gihon is clearly separate from the City of David and outside it’s walls when Hezekiah undertook his building project.

We are being asked to believe that articles possibly sequestered in a rodent burrow, discovered long after the rodent found nicer habitation, long after evidence of rodent tunnels collapsed, are somehow relevant to the Gihon structure. No, we’re not joking. If investigators tunneled in the sediment to find specimens, the risk of deposit by animal migration is at least equally great; not to mention hydraulic migration. There are no reports of these artifacts being found in sealed containers, or otherwise embedded in the structure to prevent migration or contamination.

Next, we are being asked to believe that three small articles constitute a reliable statistical sample; when in fact one-hundred articles would be required to begin any statistical prediction.

We are also being asked to associate these artifacts with the sediment (which must date from creation), from the sediment to the Gihon structure, and from the Gihon structure to the City of David which is clearly west of Gihon. Obviously, this evidence is no threat to the dating of Hezekiah’s engineering work. Nor is it any challenge to the labors of Manasseh (709-643 BC) at Gihon (2 Chronicles 33:14). Neither does such evidence tell us anything about the age or architect of the City of David, which is of sufficient distance to be completely distinct from Gihon in age and construction.

Moreover, we are being asked to accept a statistic that reports no BP date, no standard deviation, no method of conversion, no instrument calibration, and no dendrochronological calibration of the BP date. Supposedly this results in a date in the neighborhood of 925 BC, seventy-five years too late for David, and roughly equivalent to a 2875 ± ??? BP date. However, according to INTCAL 04, this equates to a 3000 calibrated BP date, or about 1050 BC, ten years before David was born.

Finally, we are being asked to evaluate sediment which is by definition a migration phenomenon. It appears that we have established the likelihood that this sediment has been in place since around 1050 BC; of course, this overlooks the possibility that the sediment and artifacts moved in together: what, you don’t believe that sediment cannot move around and beneath large rocks in a flowing spring bed. Inconceivable!

<https://www.haaretz.com/jewish/archaeology/.premium-1.753858>

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317369952_Absolute_Dating_of_the_Gihon_Spring_Fortifications_Jerusalem> [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
32. If “there was no manpower for big conquests” how exactly did David or other Israelites, or merged Canaanites manage to take the Jebusite stronghold, better known as Jerusalem? [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
33. “These are [NOT] the results of the radiocarbon dating. These are the delusions of an individual who does not understand the science. [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
34. The profound problem, easily overlooked here, is not that Boaretto or her successors did their work inadequately or poorly and thus arrived at different results. The problem is the meagerness of the sample size. In mapping an idea where millions of samples would not be too many, only a few hundred were found and tested. Not every site yields organic remains that may be associated with distinct architectural features, so the map is left with un-plotted holes in it. A few hundred samples would only be sufficient for a single small site. Moreover, buildings tend to remain in use for decades, even centuries. The City of David, most likely provided the space for the additions and remodeling of all his successors.

This is not simply a problem of margin of error, especially since no margin of error was ever reported; nor any of the other crucial scientific details. [↑](#endnote-ref-34)
35. How ironic, since we have lost sight of the trail of evidence here at Jerusalem, that we should have to return to the Bible to get our bearings again. [↑](#endnote-ref-35)
36. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius_Wellhausen> [↑](#endnote-ref-36)
37. Subsequent investigations have revealed that such evidence may not be truly alphabetic as at first believed. Moreover, there does not appear to be any tangency between this evidence and the Israelites. Akkadian Cuneiform and other possibilities stand firm. [↑](#endnote-ref-37)
38. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phoenician_alphabet>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proto-Sinaitic_script> [↑](#endnote-ref-38)
39. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuneiform> [↑](#endnote-ref-39)
40. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian_hieroglyphs> [↑](#endnote-ref-40)
41. This is easily and simply tested by reading any English translation of Genesis and Psalms, comparing them with each other. [↑](#endnote-ref-41)
42. Jeremiah 35:12-19 [↑](#endnote-ref-42)
43. Sacred space, as it is envisioned here, borders on the blasphemous and idolatrous. [↑](#endnote-ref-43)
44. The technical difference is that we are graphing the number of lives. A bathtub curve graphs the mortalities: thus, it is high at both ends and low in the middle, forming a bathtub shape. Also, a bathtub curve is graphed on ln paper, to make the tub bottom look flat: the bottom of the tub is actually an exponential curve. There are several other differences with a bathtub curve that are not germane to the point at hand, which is that neither the mean nor the standard error of the mean have anything to say about the behavior of individuals. [↑](#endnote-ref-44)
45. The only requirement is that our four-million individuals must be selected at random. This is the problem with political polling, it is incredibly easy to introduce a non-random bias into the poll: one year in polling notoriety, a telephone poll was conducted; when, too late, it was realized that large segments of the population did not have phones at all… before the party-line, crank-on-the-large-box-on-the-wall telephone era. How easy is it to unintentionally introduce a non-random bias into a sample set of three individual items? [↑](#endnote-ref-45)
46. A set of 100 samples, at 20 locations, with a minimum of 10 well-ordered strata, amounts to a total set of 100 x 20 x 10, or 20,000 samples. What we have is one tiny seed, a coal chip, and a bone fragment. Figure. [↑](#endnote-ref-46)
47. More specifically, it was found in sediment; which, by definition, has not yet stratified into rock. Sediment, in and of itself, has no certain stratified structure. [↑](#endnote-ref-47)
48. <http://www.radiocarbon.com/tree-ring-calibration.htm>

<http://sciencecourseware.org/VirtualDating/files/RC_6.php>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radiocarbon_dating>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Calibration_of_radiocarbon_dates>

<http://calib.qub.ac.uk/calib/>

<http://c14.arch.ox.ac.uk/embed.php?File=oxcal.html> [↑](#endnote-ref-48)
49. 2 Samuel 5:6-10 [↑](#endnote-ref-49)
50. The reference to “cow town” is actually insulting. [↑](#endnote-ref-50)
51. At present, paleo-Hebrew presents only the dimmest of hopes. There are alphabetic languages claimed to exist as early as 1406 BC; however, closer examination shows that these appear to be primarily pictographic, so it would take a very fast talking expert to convince us that these are truly alphabetic. Even if such proof is forthcoming, there does not appear to be any contact point with Israelites in that era. This leaves us with all evidence indicating the invention of paleo-Hebrew around 1000 BC or later, four-hundred years after Moses. This simply means that Torah and Joshua through 1 Samuel are not originally Hebrew; they are obviously something else: there are several other excellent candidates, led by Akkadian Cuneiform. [↑](#endnote-ref-51)
52. There are several other possibilities. Akkadian Cuneiform is only the present front runner. An archive of important family details could have been recorded on Akkadian Cuneiform tablets and kept in a treasure box.

Alternatively, Moses may have been able to collect this information from diligent research in ancient libraries, or other resources. As the child of pharaoh, Moses had access to the best education and libraries in the world as it then was.

Other alternatives are conceivable. The lone alternative that is inconceivable is that Moses received the whole as oral tradition. You cannot imagine the tax collector claiming, “I have your tax records from my predecessor’s oral tradition and you owe Nimrod one hundred sheep, fifty goats, and three camels. Also, you failed to file oral birth and death certificates last year, so our oral census statistics are now in error.”

The neutral point of view leaves the door open for all serious possibilities; only striving to balance probabilities. The smallest crumb of truth can lead to astounding breakthroughs in human knowledge. No stone left unturned must remain our watchword. The price of freedom remains, and always will be, eternal vigilance. We must guard that which God has entrusted to us: “Hastening to keep watch over the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Ephesians 4:3).” [↑](#endnote-ref-52)
53. Primarily through anachronistic errors. [↑](#endnote-ref-53)
54. Pseudo-scientists do great damage to truth when they discard certain biblical evidence because they do not like that evidence, or its implications, which do not fit their current reigning fads, or pet hypotheses. Inerrantists do no better in insisting on the inerrancy of the MT, or in throwing out scientific evidence because it does not fit a treasured theology. Neither side can bring itself to admit that the evidence has been interpreted incorrectly; thus, truth is not found, because of unwillingness to change: something is more valuable than truth to such individuals, no matter which side of the debate they happen to favor. [↑](#endnote-ref-54)
55. According to some philosophical perspectives the value of both poetry and music rests in their creativity and ever fresh novelty: this is the diametrical opposite of tradition. The recitation of classics by rote, without any sense of becoming caught up with them and enraptured in them, simply murders what they in fact are: they are classics, precisely because they are eternally so creative, so fresh, so novel that even their repetition snatches away our imaginations into unlimited ever new ideas and thoughts. Tradition that chains the God created mind of man is an evil thing. Tradition that breathes life into us is beautiful. [↑](#endnote-ref-55)
56. The fundamental problem remains, we just don’t have enough evidence. After nearly an hour of video, we have found at best a few crumbs of information, which were very poorly interpreted, and presented in such a way as to shill for a hidden agenda. Over three thousand years have passed, what did we expect to find? Not much! We are delighted with the crumbs we have found. “Time beats high mountain down.” — Bilbo Baggins in, *The Hobbit*. Three thousand years is a long time to leave precious evidence laying around. [↑](#endnote-ref-56)
57. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-57)