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Biblical Theology: Past and Present

Biblical theology and biblical history are intricately woven together, forming a tightly spun tapestry. In modern academic study, biblical theology has been so identified since 1787, when Johann Philipp Gabler gave his inaugural (and seminal) lecture at the University of Altdorf as professor of theology; the English lecture title from the original Latin was “On the proper distinction between biblical and dogmatic theology and the specific objectives of each.”¹ He distinguished between two branches of theology by saying,

There is truly a biblical theology, of historical origin, conveying what the holy writers felt about divine matters; on the other hand there is a dogmatic theology of didactic origin, teaching what each theologian philosophises rationally about divine things, according to the measure of his ability or the times, age, place, sect, school, and other factors.²

One distinguishing element of biblical theology is its concern for history, whether it is in the Old Testament or the New. Old Testament theology (hereafter OTT) in much of the Western Christian academic world has normally been closely tied to the New Testament, so much so that Jewish Bible scholars have had little interest in OTT. Jon Levenson, as recently as 1985, labeled OTT “an almost exclusively Gentile affair.”³ The reality is that most evangelical academics, especially those teaching in seminaries, use a “biblical theology

²Ibid., 501.
³Jon Levenson, Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 1.
of the OT” approach. The thematic and theological connection between the Testaments (hence “biblical theology”) has also been the focus of biblical scholars and theologians from mainline traditions. John Bright (1908–1995) put it this way: “The two Testaments have to do with one and the same God, one history, one heritage, one people. Since this is so, the Christian must claim the Old Testament, as the New Testament did. . . . The unity of the Testaments within a single redemptive history must at all times be affirmed.”

No evangelical would disagree with Bright’s affirmation of the unity of the Testaments and a “single redemptive history.” In his confession we see again the centrality of history to biblical theology. It is not surprising, therefore, that in addition to writing books on Old Testament/biblical theology, Bright also wrote his enduring History of Israel, now in its fourth, and posthumous, edition.

William Foxwell Albright (1891–1971), the Johns Hopkins University archaeologist, linguist, and biblical scholar, exerted considerable influence on key players in what Brevard Childs called “the Biblical Theology Movement,” a largely North American phenomenon that, he maintains, sprang up after World War I and ended in the 1960s. While Albright himself did not write books on biblical theology per se, his students certainly did. Interestingly, John Bright dedicated his Kingdom of God “to my teacher, William Foxwell Albright,” and his History of Israel (2nd ed.) was inscribed “to the Memory of William Foxwell Albright.”

No student of Albright’s better exemplified the priority of history and archaeology to OTT than G. Ernest Wright (1909–1974), who taught at Harvard Divinity School. Like Albright, Wright was a field archaeologist and was the founding editor of the periodical Biblical Archaeologist. His classic theological work The God Who Acts has as its operating assumption that

Biblical theology is first and foremost a theology of recital, in which Biblical man confesses his faith by reciting the formative events of his history as the redemptive handiwork of God. The realism of the Bible consists in its close attention to the facts of history and of tradition because these facts are the facts of God.

---

5In addition to his The Authority of the Old Testament, see his earlier work, The Kingdom of God (Nashville: Abingdon, 1953).
He argued that one of the distinguishing features of Israel's religion, when compared with the religious traditions of her neighbors, "is the peculiar Israelite attention to historical traditions." "In Biblical Faith," Wright believed, "everything depends upon whether the central events actually occurred."10 Wright walked his talk. Trained in the field by Albright,11 he spent many years in the archaeology of Israel seeking that illusive evidence at Beitin/Bethel, Shechem, and Gezer. He was a key figure in advancing scientific methods into biblical archaeology at Shechem and Gezer.12 Late in his career, when the archaeological data did not meet his theoretical expectations, Wright became somewhat disillusioned.13

He no doubt, like many others, had placed too great a burden on archaeology, as if it could confirm any and every biblical event. As a field archaeologist myself, I am keenly aware of how little has actually survived from the ancient past, owing to natural forces, such as moisture in many forms, deflation, and earthquakes, as well as human impact in the form of later occupation (in ancient times), reusing earlier building materials, human destruction (war and burning), and modern development (urban and agricultural). Realistic expectations about what archaeology can and cannot do for biblical studies must always be kept in mind.

It is generally agreed that the biblical theology movement, with its interest in biblical history and archaeology, emerged as a more objective approach than the dominant Old Testament higher-critical approaches and sought a middle ground in early twentieth-century debates between modernists and fundamentalists (the former dismissing or minimizing the Bible and the latter taking a literalistic stance).14 Childs correctly summarized the role of archaeology in the "American form" of "biblical theology as having great interest in the study of the background of the Bible. For Old Testament studies this meant a concentration on the Ancient Near Eastern setting with a particular focus on the role of archaeology."15 Childs, however, saw cracks developing in this movement in the 1960s, and its subsequent demise late in that decade. For Childs, two blows were responsible for this downfall. First was an essay by

---

9Ibid., 39.
10Ibid., 126.
11Wright was on the 1934 staff at the initial season of work at Beitin/Bethel; see William F. Albright and James L. Kelso, The Excavation of Bethel (1934–1960), AASOR 39 (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1968), 4.
14Childs, Biblical Theology in Crisis, 17–31; Davis, Shifting Sands, 23–89.
15Childs, Biblical Theology in Crisis, 47.
Langdon Gilkey, who critiqued Wright and others for using orthodox language to describe God’s action in history but then attributing natural causes to the events.\textsuperscript{16} Gilkey’s critique actually reflects an Enlightenment-based scientific worldview that bifurcates natural and supernatural, which is antithetical to ancient worldviews in which no such dichotomy existed.

Essays by James Barr in the early 1960s Childs described as the “final blow.”\textsuperscript{17} I am not at all convinced that Childs was correct because Barr was not attacking a historical approach to theology per se. Rather he questioned those who claimed that “history” is the absolutely supreme milieu of God’s revelation.”\textsuperscript{18}

One gets the impression that the reason Childs was so quick to bury the biblical theology movement is that it afforded him the opportunity to advance his alternative, “canonical” approach.\textsuperscript{19} No doubt Childs’s canonical method has been one of the major positive methodological developments of the past forty years. In a sense, his canonical approach is biblical theology in which history is marginalized. I maintain that both approaches can work synergistically.

Despite the developments of the early 1960s and Childs’s obituary for a historically based OTT, not everyone saw the demise of historically based biblical archaeology. Roland de Vaux, the Dominican archaeologist, historian, and theologian, made the historicity of Old Testament events a matter of personal faith when he confessed in 1965, “If the historical faith of Israel is not in a certain way founded in history, this faith is erroneous and cannot command my assent.”\textsuperscript{20} In 1976 Gordon Wenham declared that “Biblical theology may be crudely described as a theology of history. This is even clearer in the Old Testament than the New. But both Testaments are primarily concerned with telling us what God has done, is doing and will do in history.”\textsuperscript{21} It is fair to say that evangelicals would side with de Vaux and Wenham, and disagree with Childs that historical approaches to OTT are passé on philosophical or theological grounds.

It is obvious, however, that since the early 1970s, when Wright passed away, historically based Old Testament theologies, except among evangelicals, have given way to more centered or canonical approaches. Nevertheless,

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 65.
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., 65–66.
\textsuperscript{19}Childs, Biblical Theology in Crisis. Part 3 is subtitled “Testing a Method.”
\textsuperscript{20}“Method in the Study of Early Hebrew History,” in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. P. Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 16.
some advocates of thematic approaches still recognize the importance of the “central events.”

Walther Eichrodt’s classic *Theology of the Old Testament*, the first German edition of which appeared in 1933, uses covenant as the unifying theme. In later editions he critiqued Wright, and even von Rad, for an “over emphasis” on history.\(^{22}\) I would agree that an OTT that relies *solely* on historical events as the main vehicle of revelation is incomplete because it minimizes or overlooks large sections of the canon, above all, creation (conspicuous by its absence in Wright’s work). Eichrodt nevertheless recognized the importance of ancient contextual data to the study of the Old Testament, opining, “No presentation of OT theology can properly be made without constant reference to its connections with the whole world of Near Eastern religions.”\(^{23}\) “OT theology,” he acknowledged, “presupposes the history of Israel.”\(^{24}\) And he spoke of the need “to have the historical principle operating side by side with the systematic in a complementary role.”\(^{25}\) Eichrodt rightly understood that the events of Bible history must be viewed through a theological lens, but they could not be marginalized.

More damaging than Childs’s critique to historically based approaches, however, was the challenge posed to traditional understandings about historiography and the historical accuracy of the Old Testament, which began in the mid-1970s.\(^{26}\) First, the historicity of the patriarchal narratives of Genesis were questioned and dismissed by Thomas Thompson and John Van Seters in two separate but nearly contemporary studies.\(^{27}\) Here began the slide toward historical minimalism that rejected the authenticity of the Joseph story, the sojourn and exodus narratives, the conquest of Canaan (a broadside on the Albright-Wright conquest model), the early monarchy, and most recently the kingships of David and Solomon.\(^{28}\) The historical conclusions of Maxwell


\(^{23}\) Ibid., 25.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., 32.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., his emphasis.

\(^{26}\) In response to the reevaluation of historiography in the Old Testament, I organized a conference at Wheaton College in November 1990 as part of the McManis Lecture Series that was tied to the annual Archaeology Conference. The papers were published as *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in Its Near Eastern Context*, ed. A. R. Millard, J. K. Hoffmeier, and D. W. Baker (Winona Lake, IL: Eisenbrauns, 1994).


Miller and John Hayes in 1986 well reflect the growing skepticism toward the historical value of the Old Testament. They considered that the biblical narrative regarding early Israel—including the entrance into Egypt, twelve tribes descended from the twelve brothers, escape from Egypt, complete collections of laws and religious instructions handed down at Mt. Sinai, forty years of wandering in the wilderness, miraculous conquests of Canaan, . . .—is an artificial and theologically influenced literary construct.  

In other words, the biblical narrative was too ideologically and theologically motivated for use in reconstructing real history. Bernard Batto came to a similar conclusion: “The biblical narrative in the books of Genesis through Joshua owes more to the folkloristic tradition of the ancient Near East than the historical genre.”  

Regarding the origin of Israel in the land of Canaan, the recent sentiment has been that the Israelites were indigenous to the land and were never in Egypt, and there was no exodus, Sinai wilderness experience, or militaristic entry into Canaan. Regarding the sojourn and exodus, it is not as though some new compelling archaeological discoveries were made that led to dismissing the history of these crucial (at least to the religion of Israel and OTT) events. Rather it is the consequence of changing views of historiography, that is, the collapse of Enlightenment/scientific methods in the humanities and the rise of postmodern hermeneutics. The latter tends to view all texts, the Bible included, as purely literature and certainly not history. The titles of some recent articles well reflect the current climate, for example, Siegfried Herrmann’s “The Devaluation of the Old Testament as a Source for History” and Baruch Halpern’s “Erasing History: The Minimalist Assault on Ancient Israel.”  

---


31 For a summary of the theories of Israel’s origins, see James K. Hoffmeier, Israel in Egypt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), chaps. 1–2; William G. Dever, Who Were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From? (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).


This devaluation had immediate (and not illogical) consequences in the study of Israelite religion and OTT. Susan Niditch's 1997 book on the religion of Israel, for example, proposes that "there is, however, a way to explore the Israelite story without using the Hebrew Bible" by solely using archaeological data. Without the Bible, not surprisingly, the Egyptian and Sinai traditions are passed over in her study, as they are in most works on Israel’s religion over the past fifteen years.

Similarly a number of recent Old Testament theologies have employed alternative approaches that ignore history. Leo Perdue's 1994 OTT book *The Collapse of History* expresses the state of affairs. While Perdue is not prepared to abandon history (and historical-critical methods) altogether, he believes that "new methods for studying the Bible" are necessary, those "nurtured within a newly emerging sociopolitical ethos in the contemporary world," which would essentially make the older methods obsolete. Consequently, pluralism, feminism, liberation, and third-world theologies now set the agenda, and the events of the Old Testament can now be reinterpreted from the reader-response hermeneutic offered by postmodernism. When the exodus, for example, figures into Old Testament theologies in recent years, it is paradigmatic and can be applied to various forms of liberation theology.

To be sure, not everyone in the past twenty years has dismissed the biblical-sojourn and exodus traditions in developing their OTT. Elmer Martens utilizes Exodus 5:22–6:8 as the focus of his Old Testament theology *God's Design*, but broadens his scope to include treating creation and wisdom literature within his scheme. Within the mainline protestant tradition, Bernhard Anderson (1916–2007) in *Contours of Old Testament Theology* (1999), while embracing the concerns of Childs’s canonical approach and being sensitive to contemporary issues as identified by Perdue, nevertheless follows the historical sequence of the covenants: Noachic, Abrahamic, Sinaitic, and Davidic. Interestingly, Anderson was the annual professor at the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem (1963–1964) and dedicated his OTT book to G. Ernest Wright. In the same year that this book was published, he gave a lecture for the Biblical Archaeology Society entitled "The Relevance of Archaeology

---

to Biblical Theology.”39 These factors attest to his interest in studying OTT within its historical and Near Eastern setting.

I began this essay looking at the place of history in OTT,40 but as it has progressed, I have intentionally narrowed the historical focus to the sojourn and exodus from Egypt because these events, along with the Sinai legislation, are recognized as the most important events in Old Testament salvation history. Gerhard von Rad, even if he regarded them as “the theology of Israel’s historical traditions” rather than genuine history, as Wright maintained,41 nevertheless held that the sojourn and exodus traditions stood at the center of Israel’s creedral confessions. He described Deuteronomy 26:5–11 as an “old Credo,”42 the opening part of which affirms:

And you shall make response before the LORD your God, “A wandering Aramean was my father. And he went down into Egypt and sojourned there, few in number, and there he became a nation, great, mighty, and populous. And the Egyptians treated us harshly and humiliated us and laid on us hard labor. Then we cried to the LORD, the God of our fathers, and the LORD heard our voice and saw our affliction, our toil, and our oppression. And the LORD brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, with great deeds of terror, with signs and wonders. And he brought us into this place and gave us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey.”

It is the contention of this paper, in agreement with von Rad, Wright, and others, that the exodus and wilderness narratives are central to OTT, and that without them, the tapestry of Israel’s faith and the foundational fabric of Christianity unravels.

The Exodus and Theology

The past thirty years has seen radical shifts in how the Old Testament books from Genesis to 1 and 2 Samuel have been viewed as sources for Israel’s history, but hardest hit has been the Egypt and Sinai reports. Many in the Jewish community in North America were surprised to read that the eminent Israeli archaeologist Israel Finkelstein was questioning the biblical exodus and wilderness tradition in The Bible Unearthed. He and coauthor Neil Silberman claim that “the historical saga contained in the Bible—from Abraham’s encounter

41This is the subtitle of volume 1 of his Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).
42Ibid., 176.
with God and his journey to Canaan, to Moses’ deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage . . . [is] a brilliant product of the human imagination.”

That same year, many Jews were dismayed when Rabbi David Wolpe, from a Conservative Movement synagogue in Los Angeles, during Passover services stated, “Virtually every modern archaeologist who has investigated the story of the Exodus, with very few exceptions, agrees that the way the Bible describes the Exodus is not the way it happened, if it happened at all.”

What is disturbing about this trend is that some who identify themselves as a “new generation of evangelicals” and embrace the label “progressive evangelical” are accepting this revisionist agenda. Kenton Sparks points to the lack of evidence in Egypt for the exodus as reason to embrace the conclusions of critical scholarship that the exodus was not a major event at all. Sparks assails scholars like Kenneth Kitchen and me for being fideistic obscurantists because of our rejection of most of the methodology and conclusions of biblical criticism. There are good and objective reasons for being wary of, if not critical toward, “critical” biblical scholarship or “biblical criticism.” Perhaps most significantly, rather than being the “scientific” (wissenschaftliche) method nineteenth-century European biblical scholarship claimed it to be, it was theoretically based and often quite subjective, influenced by evolutionary theory, and lacked external checks that ancient Near Eastern sources could offer. Furthermore, there is a well-documented and unacceptable anti-Semitic element to much of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century critical biblical scholarship.

One would think that a “scientific approach” to biblical literature would result in unchanging conclusions. True enough, for decades Wellhausen’s developmental and dating scheme for the Pentateuch dominated the academe, but his source-critical scheme was at odds with the tradition-history approach of

---

43Finkelstein and Silberman, The Bible Unearthed, 7–8.
44Because of the stir Rabbi Wolpe caused, I was invited later that year (Nov. 5, 2001) to lecture about the exodus as an Egyptologist at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles (now the American Jewish University of Los Angeles) and met some people from that congregation. They expressed appreciation for my lecture and my book Israel in Egypt.
45This story was reported in the Los Angeles Times and other newspapers. The quote cited here is from an article entitled “L.A. Rabbi Creates Furor by Questioning Exodus Story,” by Tom Tugend, Jewish Telegraphic Agency (May 4, 2001).
48For a recent comprehensive study of this subject, see Anders Gerdmar, The Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder to Kittel and Bultmann (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
Gunkel, von Rad, Noth, and others.49 The nineteenth-century source-critical consensus has completely collapsed in the past thirty years, and today there is little agreement about anything.50 Consequently Rolf Rendtorff could recently write, "The Wellhausen paradigm no longer functions as a commonly accepted presupposition for Old Testament exegesis."51

Enlightenment-based critical methods of the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth century have been replaced in many cases by equally skeptical postmodern hermeneutics. Today biblical criticism is not a monolithic system, but includes a variety of approaches. Nevertheless, Sparks chides evangelical scholars for not bending the knee to critical biblical scholarship. He apparently has faith in these ever-evolving approaches to the Old Testament.

Concerning the exodus, Sparks asserts that the "silence of the Egyptian evidence on these matters [i.e., the Passover and exodus] is therefore an important argument against the historicity of these miracle reports."52 In the end, for Sparks, the gap between historical or archaeological evidence and the claims of the Bible leads him to opine that "original events were much less significant historically than the Bible now remembers."53

My intention in this essay is not to review the historical and archaeological data I have already amassed to show the authenticity of the Egypt-Sinai narratives in two monographs, Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996/1999) and Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Wilderness Tradition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), the latter of which Sparks has completely ignored. Here is not the place for a detailed critique of Sparks's limited grasp of Egyptian archaeology, but a few comments are in order.54

First, the delta of Egypt, within which was the land of Goshen, where the Hebrews resided, is the least excavated area of Egypt. Second, because of the moist environment of northern Egypt from millennia of annual Nile inundations, objects made from perishable materials do not survive. In fact, not a single scrap of a papyrus document has survived from the delta from pharaonic times. Only a few Roman-era papyri have been found in Tanis,

50For a summary of developments in biblical criticism of the Old Testament, see Hoffmeier, Israel in Egypt, 7–10.
51Rendtorff, "The Paradigm Is Changing," 44.
52Sparks, God's Word in Human Words, 157.
53Ibid.
54The ideas recited here were previously advanced in James K. Hoffmeier, BAR 33, no. 1 (2007): 20–41, 77.
thanks to the carbonized condition of some that were kept in clay jars (à la the Dead Sea Scrolls).\textsuperscript{55} Third, those who excavate at delta sites are normally limited in accessing lower levels from earlier history, owing to high water tables. Archaeologists who employ a costly pumping system, such as at Tell el-Dab‘a and Buto, have been able to reach earlier strata. I have seen this system at work at Dab‘a during an April 2002 visit. The scriptorium of the fifteenth-century palace was being excavated. Only clay bullae with seal impressions that once sealed papyrus documents were found, but no papyrus survived! The same was true in my own excavations at Tell el-Borg, where we discovered several mud bullae,\textsuperscript{56} and even though it is a desert setting, because of rain this area experiences, no papyrus was extant. Thus, when a biblical scholar points out that there is no Egyptian evidence to support the presence of the Hebrews in Egypt, or for the exodus, it is rash to conclude that this absence of evidence is evidence of absence.

Sparks’s willingness to make a historical declaration based on the lack of evidence is a patently obvious fallacy, the fallacy of “negative proof.” Historian David Hackett Fischer describes this approach as “an attempt to sustain a factual proposition merely by negative evidence.”\textsuperscript{57} He cogently observes, “Evidence must always be affirmative. Negative evidence is a contradiction in terms—it is no evidence at all.”\textsuperscript{58} Sparks and other revisionists are simply wrong to draw historical conclusions about the accuracy of the sojourn and exodus narratives through the fallacy of negative proof.

The reality is that historians of the ancient Near East have often accepted the witness of written documents without corroborating archaeological data. During the fall of 2010, I participated in a conference in Germany on the exodus and conquest. In a panel discussion, a distinguished German colleague repeated the mantra that there is no Egyptian evidence for the exodus, which raises questions about the historicity of the biblical tradition. I asked if he believed that Thutmose III invaded Canaan in the mid-fifteenth century BC, besieging and taking the city of Megiddo. He responded, “Of course.” Then I pointed out that this military campaign is one of the best documented reports from the ancient Near East as it is recorded both in royal sources (e.g., Annals of Thutmose III, Gebel Barkal Stela, Armant Stela, Buhen Temple


\textsuperscript{56}Two bullae with the cartouche of Horemheb (1323–1295 BC) were discovered. See James K. Hoffmeier and Jacobus van Dijk, “New Light on the Amarna Period from North Sinai,” \textit{JEA} 96 (2010).


\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., 62.
Text, Karnak Seventh Pylon Text, Karnak Toponym lists) and in private documents and biographies of officers who accompanied the king. Despite all this textual evidence (from a variety of genres of literature) for the battle of Megiddo in 1457 BC and a seven-month siege of the city (according to the Barkal Stela), I reminded him, there is still no archaeological evidence from Megiddo for the Egyptian attack! Megiddo, as it turns out, is probably the most excavated site in ancient Israel, having been investigated with regularity since 1903, and work is ongoing. This scholar was prepared to accept the claims of various Egyptian texts, although they were shaped by religious, ideological, and propagandistic agendas, despite the absence of any clear archaeological evidence to support the written claims. I concluded my observation by saying that as historians were willing to give Thutmose III's written claims the benefit of the doubt, I was prepared to do the same for the exodus narratives.

I have long advocated treating ancient texts, biblical or from elsewhere in the Near East, as "innocent until proven guilty," rather than "guilty until proven innocent." In other words, if a text, be it Egyptian, Assyrian, or Hebrew, makes a claim that X happened at location Y, or King A built a temple at site B, I accept that statement unless there is compelling evidence to the contrary. William Dever has recently commented on the blatant bias against the Bible: "How is it that the biblical texts are always approached with postmodernism's typical 'hermeneutic of suspicion,' but the non-biblical texts are taken at face value? It seems to be that the Bible is automatically held guilty unless proven innocent."

Postmodern hermeneutics, the recent rage in many circles, and equally problematic for orthodox readings of Scripture, has had its share of detractors. Jonathan Chaves, of George Washington University, recently offered a devastating critique of postmodern hermeneutics entitled "Soul and Reason in Literary Criticism: Deconstructing the Deconstructionists." This is an intriguing "no holds barred" critique of postmodern hermeneutics that cuts to the heart of the deconstructionists' agenda. Chaves argues that their approach to language is "profoundly anti-Christian" and that deconstructionists are Marxists "who are no longer satisfied to apply their leftist analysis to the actual

59 For a treatment of all Thutmose III's texts related to this campaign, see Donald B. Redford, The Wars of Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
60 Ibid., 165–84.
61 For the gist of my approach to texts and a critique of minimalists, see Israel in Egypt, chaps. 1–2 and Ancient Israel in Sinai, 20–22.
62 William Dever, What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? What Archaeology Can Tell Us About the Reality of Ancient Israel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 128.
64 Ibid., 830.
world, with its emphasis on the sphere of politics. They now apply this same worldview to literature, art, and thought itself.\textsuperscript{65} He goes on to observe that their agenda is to attack religion and social mores, and to deny that language can communicate truth and the transcendent. In the end, Chaves believes that postmodernism's hermeneutics reflects a "deep, underlying spiritual crisis" and that "only a return to God will allow a return to sanity in literary criticism, as in everything else."\textsuperscript{66} From my engagement over the past two decades with professional Old Testament scholarship through participating in the Society of Biblical Literature, hearing papers, and reading books and articles by postmodern critics, I resonate with Chaves's conclusions. Why should evangelicals, whether scholars or lay people, want to embrace a "profoundly anti-Christian" approach to reading the Bible?

Recent biblical criticism has needlessly driven a wedge between Scripture's historical claims and theology. Readers of the Bible must decide whether such a bifurcation is consistent with Christian orthodoxy in general and evangelicalism in particular. The neoorthodox alternative is not particularly helpful. While Sparks claims to have "reservations" about this option, when it comes to history and theology, that seems to be the direction he wants to take us. Reducing the exodus story to a minor event (if it occurred at all) leaves one with only the option of extracting theological or ethical lessons from the story even if it is not historical (a tenet of neoorthodoxy). Colin Brown lays bare the deficiency of this approach: "If an event such as the Exodus is seen as a paradigm of God's care for his people, the comfort and hope that the believer is exhorted to draw from it are surely ill founded if there is no corresponding historical base."\textsuperscript{67} This is clearly the argument made in Psalm 78, the focus of which are the "deeds" and "the wonders that he has done" (v. 4) in the exodus from Egypt, so that future generations

should set their hope in God

and not forget the works of God. (v. 7)

The Old Testament Scriptures do not treat the sojourn-exodus-wilderness events as trivial matters. Rather, these events stand at the heart of Israel's religious life, as evidenced by the fact that these themes are ubiquitous throughout the Old Testament itself. Clearly the biblical writers throughout the Old Testament believed that the exodus occurred as presented in the Pentateuch, for they repeatedly affirm their faith in Yahweh, who brought them out of

\textsuperscript{65}Ibid., 831.

\textsuperscript{66}Ibid., 835.

\textsuperscript{67}Brown, \textit{History and Faith: A Personal Exploration} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), 76.
Egypt, through the Sinai wilderness, and into the land, as God had promised Abraham and his offspring. Eichrodt acknowledges such an understanding.

How deeply this attitude to history was rooted in the fundamental events of the Mosaic era is shown by the part which the deliverance from Egypt and the occupation of the Holy Land play as a sort of paradigm of the divine succour, not only in the historical books, but also in the prophets and the law.⁶⁸

Similarly, the theologian Wolfhart Pannenberg noted that Yahweh was “revealed in his acts in history. At first, this idea was linked most vividly with the exodus from Egypt, which ancient Israel took as Jahweh’s primal act of salvation.”⁶⁹ In the New Testament, Paul was able to make a theological point and application for the Corinthians from the Israelite sea crossing because “these things happened to them” (1 Cor. 10:11). Simply put, if these things did not happen, there is no theological lesson!

Sojourn, Exodus, and Wilderness Themes in the Old Testament

Archaeology has, to date, not been able to “prove” the historicity of the book of Exodus, though the authenticity of many of its claims has been shown to be credible. As a historian and archaeologist, I accept its historicity because of the way these narratives are used throughout the Bible in so many different ways. What follows, though not an exhaustive list, is an overview of some of the ways the exodus and wilderness narratives shape the religion of later Israel. Most of the references within the Torah itself are not cited, but only those that connect a particular religious institution, law, or event. Each category introduced here could be expounded in detail and expanded to article- or monograph-length studies.

Divine Self-Disclosure

“I am the LORD your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt” is a formula used frequently when God discloses himself to his people (Ex. 20:2; Lev. 19:36; 25:34, 55⁷⁰; 26:23; Num. 15:41; Deut. 5:6; Ps. 81:10; Hos. 12:9; 13:4⁷¹). It has been shown that this introductory formula was used in the ancient Near East as a way for kings to publicize their accomplishments.⁷² God appears to Abraham saying, “I am the LORD who brought you out from Ur

---

⁷⁰V. 55 offers a slight variation on the order of the formula.
⁷¹The Hosea references do not employ the clause “who brought you out,” and hence are a variation on the longer form.
of the Chaldeans” (Gen. 15:7). Before the exodus, God introduces himself to Moses: “I am the LORD. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob…” (Ex. 6:2–3). A few verses later he says, “I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians” (6:6). In the first part, the introduction, as in the first occurrence of the formula in Genesis 15:6, God associates himself with what he has previously done. Exodus 6 uses an interesting variation, speaking of what Yahweh will do (waw + 1st com. sing. hiphil perf.). After the exodus, not surprisingly, the deliverance is typically spoken of in the past tense (1st com. sing. hiphil perf.).

The corollary of this expression is that Moses describes the Israelites as “your people, whom you brought up out of the land of Egypt” (Ex. 32:7, 11). When King Balak of Moab sent messengers to procure the services of Balaam the prophet, the Israelites were described by the clause “a people has come out of Egypt” (Num. 22:5, 11).

The phenomenon of identifying an ethnic group and their bond with their deity (or deities) in terms of a particular event is not attested among Israel’s neighbors. The link between Israel and the exodus is unique and is recognized by religionists and theologians. Rainer Albertz maintains that “the liberation from Egypt” resulted in more than just “the relationship with God as such but the special tie to the god Yahweh.”73 Rendtorff takes this connection a step further, believing that the expression “I will be your God and you shall be my people” is “the covenant formula,” which expresses God’s relationship and solidarity with Israel as his covenant people.74 It is noteworthy that the first occurrence of the expression is found in Exodus 6:7 in anticipation of the departure from Egypt: “I will take you to be my people, and I will be your God, and you shall know that I am the LORD your God, who has brought you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.” In a sense, every time “my people” occurs in the Old Testament, it is a reminder to Israel that they are God’s people, liberated by him from slavery in Egypt, and now bound to him by the Sinaitic covenant, to which we turn next.

The Historical Prologue to the Sinaitic Covenant

In 1931 the Orientalist Viktor Korošec studied a group of Hittite treaties, offering some analysis of their structure. He was the first to recognize their six-part structure. In 1955 George Mendenhall discovered the structural par-

allel between the ancient treaty formula on the Hittite tablets, which date to the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, and Exodus 20–24, leading him to write, “It is very difficult to escape the conclusion that this narrative rests upon traditions which go back to the period when the treaty form was still alive.” These treaties begin with the preamble in which the maker of the treaty, the lord or suzerain, introduced himself by name, followed by the second point, the historical prologue. The importance of this prologue was that it provided the historical rationale for the treaty, namely, what the great king had done for his vassal or servant. Here is an example from the first two sections of a treaty between Suppiluliuma of Hatti (i.e., the Hittite) and his subject Sharrupshi of Nuhashshi (Aleppo):

Preamble/Title
Thus says My Majesty Suppiluliuma, Great King, King of Hatti, Hero.76

Historical Prologue
When the king of the land of Mittanni sought to kill Sharrupshi, and the king of the land of Mittanni entered the land of Nuhashshi together with his infantry levies and his chariots, and when he oppressed (?) him, Sharrupshi sent his messenger to the King of Hatti, saying: “I am the subject of the King of Hatti, Save me!” And I, My Majesty, sent infantry and chariots to his aid, and they drove the king of the land of Mittanni, together with his troops and his chariots out of the land of Nuhashshi.77

Here we see the circumstances that prompted Sharrupshi to call on his superpower neighbor to aid him against the invasion of his territory by Mittanni in northern Mesopotamia. Suppiluliuma summarizes the foregoing by saying “and I, [the] Great King, was not silent in regard to that matter, but I went to the aid of Sharrupshi.”78 Because the Hittite king had delivered Nuhashshi of the Mittannian invasion, Sharrupshi was obliged to become the subject or servant of Suppiluliuma, and the treaty was the legal means by which the relationship was formalized.

Exodus 20:1–2b follows the same pattern, albeit in much briefer form.

Preamble/Title
And God spoke all these words saying, I am the LORD your God (20:1–2a)

75 George Mendenhall, “Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition,” BA 17, no. 3 (1954): 32.
76 Gary Beckman, Hittite Diplomatic Texts (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 54.
77 This is from the treaty between Suppiluliuma I the Hittite and Tette of Nuhashshi. Translation in Beckman, Hittite Diplomatic Texts, 54–55.
78 Ibid.
**Historical Prologue**

who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery. (20:2b)

Just as the people of Nuhashshi were bound to Suppiluliuma, and a list of treaty stipulations or laws (the third part of the covenant formula) followed to govern the relationship, so too because God delivered Israel from its servitude in Egypt, Israel would now become Yahweh’s people by the Sinaic covenant (treaty), which carried with it laws or stipulations. Notice that after the brief historical prologue in Exodus 20:2b, the laws begin immediately.

Because the historical prologue plays such a vitally important role in establishing the basis for the treaty, one might logically conclude that an actual historical event (or events) is reflected in the prologue. Consequently, Delbert Hillers, in his study of biblical treaties or covenants, argues that historical prologues were not stereotypical, because each treaty had its own set of circumstances; inasmuch as it provided the rationale for the obligation, “it had to be substantially accurate.”\(^\text{79}\) If not, there was no reason to be bound to the treaty obligations.

The book of Deuteronomy, in the minds of some scholars, rather than being a pious forgery of the period of Josiah (à la the “orthodox” view of critical scholarship), is the record of a covenant-renewal ceremony at the end of the wilderness period, before the death of Moses and the entry into Canaan.\(^\text{80}\) Deuteronomy’s historical prologue (Deut. 1:6–3:29) traces the history of God’s dealings with Israel from the departure from Mount Sinai to the arrival in Moab. Because of this particular focus, the exodus is assumed from the previous Sinaic covenant. The historical prologue of the renewal ceremony at the end of Joshua’s life, on the other hand, does reflect back on the exodus and wilderness period.

Jacob and his children went down to Egypt. And I sent Moses and Aaron, and I plagued Egypt with what I did in the midst of it, and afterward I brought you out. Then I brought your fathers out of Egypt, and you came to the sea. And the Egyptians pursued your fathers with chariots and horsemen to the Red Sea. And when they cried to the LORD, he put darkness between you and the Egyptians and made the sea come upon them and cover them; and your eyes saw what I did in Egypt. And you lived in the wilderness a long time. Then I

---


brought you to the land of the Amorites, who lived on the other side of the Jordan. (Josh. 24:4b–8a)

The sojourn-exodus-wilderness story stands at the heart of Israel’s covenant with the Lord and her creeds. Then, too, some of Israel’s laws find their roots in the Egypt experience.

**Legal Matters**

Law codes from Mesopotamia have long been studied as parallel legal material with biblical law. While many interesting parallels exist, one feature of Hebrew law not encountered in the Mesopotamian laws is that some biblical statutes include the specific historical event that created the precedent, for example, the sojourn and exodus. The following are other examples in which the sojourn and exodus are offered as the rationale for particular laws.

In ancient Israel, a family member, out of a sense of familial obligation, was encouraged to redeem a relative who was in debt (Lev. 25:46–54). But the ultimate reason for redeeming a family member was the divine precedent set by God, who redeemed Israel from Egypt, as Leviticus 25:55 notes: “For it is to me that the people of Israel are servants. They are my servants whom I brought out of the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God.” In dealing with the release of slaves after their maximum six-year term of service was completed, the Israelites were encouraged to provide generously for the liberated individuals, for “You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God redeemed you; therefore I command you this today” (Deut. 15:15).

Israelites were not to mistreat or oppress sojourners or aliens (גָּרִים), “for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt” (Ex. 22:21), and “you know the heart of a sojourner, for you were sojourners in the land of Egypt” (Ex. 23:9). Not only should the alien not be wronged, but “you shall love him as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt” (Lev. 19:34; similarly see Lev. 25:42; Deut. 24:17–18).

Military laws are recorded in Deuteronomy 20:1–20. The passage begins with the reminder, “When you go out to war against your enemies, and see horses and chariots and an army larger than your own, you shall not be afraid of them, for the Lord your God is with you, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt” (Deut. 20:1). The point seems to be that Israel has experienced God’s strong arm defeating Pharaoh’s powerful army and chariotry; therefore, when going to war, they need only trust God and follow his directives.
Religious Festivals, Observances, and Rites

Religious rituals are reenactments or repetitions of sacred moments or events, behind which stands an archetype; and, as Mircea Eliade observes, "reality is acquired solely through repetition or participation; everything which lacks an exemplary model is 'meaningless,' i.e., lacks reality." According to Eliade's phenomenological method, each religious holy day or festival "represents the reactualization of a sacred event that took place in a mythical past, 'in the beginning.'" For Israel the two principal archetypes are creation and God's salvific deliverance from Egypt.

Passover (pesah) and unleavened bread (maṣṣōt) are the ultimate "reactualization of a sacred event." While they are connected festivals in later times, they may have originated as separate observances, the former being pastoral and the latter being connected to agriculture. Passover is associated with the tenth and final plague, in which a lamb or kid is sacrificed, and blood is painted on the doorposts of the homes of the Hebrews to avoid divine judgment (Ex. 12:1–13). Immediately after the Passover ritual meal is introduced, the text continues, "And you shall observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread, for on this very day I brought your hosts out of the land of Egypt" (12:17). Moses then instructs the people, "Remember this day in which you came out of Egypt, out of the house of slavery" (Ex. 13:3), and he continues:

You shall tell your son on that day, "It is because of what the LORD did for me when I came out of Egypt." And it shall be to you as a sign on your hand and as a memorial between your eyes, that the law of the LORD may be in your mouth. For with a strong hand the LORD has brought you out of Egypt. You shall therefore keep this statute at its appointed time from year to year. (13:8–10)

Pesah and maṣṣōt have no other explanation for their origin than the exodus from Egypt (cf. Ex. 23:15; 34:18; Deut. 16:1–6). The feast of booths (sukkōt) is related to the feast of ingathering (qāṣîr). Leviticus 23:42–43, however, connects this otherwise agricultural occasion to the exodus because the people lived in temporary dwellings after leaving Egypt: "You shall dwell in booths for seven days. All native Israelites shall dwell in booths, that your generations may know that I made the people of Israel dwell in booths when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God." Presenting the first

---

82 Ibid., 34.
fruits was a part of the harvest celebrations. When the instructions are given in Deuteronomy 26:1–5, Moses introduces the words of the above-mentioned “old credo” of von Rad: “A wandering Aramean . . . .” Once again, the sojourn and exodus are linked to an agricultural festival. It is unclear on what other occasions this confession was recited.

The Sabbath arises from creation as an observance of the seventh day, when God’s work was completed (Gen. 2:1–3). In the covenant stipulations of Exodus 20, the fourth commandment, “Remember the Sabbath day” (20:8), includes mention of its association with creation (20:11). In covenant renewal in the plains of Moab in Deuteronomy 5, resting on the seventh day is again commanded, as in Exodus 20. Missing in the Deuteronomy passage, however, is any reference to creation; rather the salvation from Egypt is cited: “You shall remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out from there with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. Therefore the Lord your God commanded you to keep the Sabbath day” (5:15).

Consecration of the firstborn of all Israel is mentioned in Numbers 8:17–18 and is tied to the slaying of the firstborn of Egypt in the Passover event. Likewise, the Levites are set aside for service in the sanctuary: “For all the firstborn among the people of Israel are mine, both of man and of beast. On the day that I struck down all the firstborn in the land of Egypt I consecrated them for myself, and I have taken the Levites instead of all the firstborn among the people of Israel” (8:17–18). The status of the Levites is treated in more detail in Numbers 3, and again the connection to the Passover serves as the basis.

And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, “Behold, I have taken the Levites from among the people of Israel instead of every firstborn who opens the womb among the people of Israel. The Levites shall be mine, for all the firstborn are mine. On the day that I struck down all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, I consecrated for my own all the firstborn in Israel, both of man and of beast. They shall be mine: I am the Lord.” (Num. 3:11–13)

The consecration (or redemption) of the firstborn is actually first encountered in Exodus 13:1, 11–16. Moses explains for future generations this practice (and the consecration of firstborn livestock).

And when in time to come your son asks you, “What does this mean?” you shall say to him, “By a strong hand the Lord brought us out of Egypt, from the house of slavery. For when Pharaoh stubbornly refused to let us go, the Lord killed all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both the firstborn of man and the firstborn of animals. Therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all the males that first open the womb, but all the firstborn of my sons I redeem.” It shall be as a mark
on your hand or frontlets between your eyes, for by a strong hand the LORD brought us out of Egypt. (13:14–16)

Israel’s sanctuary, first the tabernacle and then the Jerusalem temple, was to contain memorials of the exodus-wilderness period. First, the stone copies with the laws of Sinai were to be placed in the ark of the covenant (Ex. 25:16), in keeping with the “Deposition” or fourth part of the previously introduced “covenant formula,” in which the copies of treaty texts were placed in the sanctuary of the recipient of a treaty. When the “Book of the Law” (i.e., Deuteronomy) was completed by Moses, it too was placed in the ark of the covenant: “Take this Book of the Law and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of the LORD your God, that it may be there for a witness against you” (Deut. 31:26). Centuries later, when Solomon’s temple was dedicated, the ark of the covenant was transferred to the new sanctuary (1 Kings 8:4). The ark is described as having in it the “two tablets that Moses put there at Horeb, where the LORD made a covenant with the people of Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt” (8:9).

Manna was a mysterious food provision for the Hebrews in Sinai. When it first appeared, Moses passed on the divine instruction that some manna be set aside and placed in the sanctuary.

“Let an omer of it be kept throughout your generations, so that they may see the bread with which I fed you in the wilderness, when I brought you out of the land of Egypt.” And Moses said to Aaron, “Take a jar, and put an omer of manna in it, and place it before the LORD to be kept throughout your generations.” (Ex. 16:32b–33)

Apostasy in Israel was turning to other deities and spurning Yahweh, who brought the people out of Egypt. This theme, which will be dealt with more in the prophets section below, is first encountered in Deuteronomy 13:1–5. This passage anticipates false prophets who would lead the people to worship other gods, and it spells out the severe punishment to be meted out on such a provocateur: “That prophet or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he has taught rebellion against the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt and redeemed you out of the house of slavery,

---

85The following is written in the treaty between Suppiluliuma of Hatti and Sattiwa of Mittanni and records that copies of the treaty are deposited in the sanctuaries of both parties, lord and subject: “A duplicate of this tablet is deposited before the Sun-goddess of Arinna . . . and in the land of Mittanni a duplicate is deposited before the Storm-god. . . .” Beckman, Hittite Diplomatic Texts, 46.
86Emphasis mine. The absence of the “Books of the Law” and bowl with manna in 1 Kings 8:9 might be explained by it being “empty” when the Philistines captured it in Eli’s day (cf. 1 Sam. 6:3–5); i.e., these items had been removed and not redeposited after the ark was returned to Israel.
to make you leave the way in which the Lord your God commanded you to walk" (13:5). Similarly at the dedication of the temple, God appeared again to Solomon and warned that departure from his commandments (i.e., Sinai covenant stipulations) would lead to the desolation of the temple (1 Kings 9:1–8). When the ruined temple was seen by passersby, they would explain the calamity by stating that the Israelites “abandoned the Lord their God who brought their fathers out of the land of Egypt and laid hold on other gods and worshiped them and served them” (9:9).

The earliest example of apostasy was the golden-calf incident at Mount Sinai. Aaron introduced the image, saying, “These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you out of the land of Egypt” (Ex. 32:4). Throughout this episode Moses was regularly denounced by the disgruntled people as “this Moses, the man who brought us up out of the land Egypt” (32:1, 23). This classic story of apostasy, which is called a “great sin” (32:21, 30, 31), becomes the tragic prototype for the golden-calf sanctuaries of King Jeroboam I at Bethel and Dan. At their dedication Jeroboam declared to the people: “You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Behold your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt” (1 Kings 12:28). Here the use of the expression “who brought you up out of the land of Egypt” indicates that so deeply ingrained in the northern Israelites was the belief that Yahweh had brought the Hebrews out of Egypt, that this new cult (be it Yahwistic or otherwise) was associated with the exodus event in order to gain legitimacy.

Lastly, when David proposed to the prophet Nathan that he build a temple for Yahweh, the prophet received a “word” from Yahweh (2 Sam. 7:2–4).

Go and tell my servant David, “Thus says the Lord: Would you build me a house to dwell in? I have not lived in a house since the day I brought up the people of Israel from Egypt to this day, but I have been moving about in a tent for my dwelling. In all places where I have moved with all the people of Israel, did I speak a word with any of the judges of Israel, whom I commanded to shepherd my people Israel, saying, ‘Why have you not built me a house of cedar?’” (7:5–7)

Not only is the departure from Egypt mentioned, but here it is specifically used as a chronological benchmark (limiyôm) (see below). The point is that God’s glory accompanied the Hebrews when they left Egypt (Ex. 14:17–20) and dwelt with his people in the desert sanctuary (Ex. 40:34–38), and then through the period of the Judges to the present day, making a fixed sanctuary unnecessary. As with the various religious feasts, observances, and practices reviewed in this section, the exodus and wilderness theophanies played an important role in Israelite hymnody in Israel’s sanctuaries.
Hymnody

In the previous section, we saw that at the heart of many of Israel’s religious institutions is the exodus-wilderness tradition. So it is fitting that Israel’s hymnody and liturgy refer frequently to these foundational events. Sometimes the references are overt, while in other cases, echoes suffice for the hearer to know to what a given hymn was referring.

The Song of Moses (or Song of the Sea) (Ex. 15:1–18) and the Song of Miriam (15:21) are placed in the exodus narrative immediately following the crossing of the sea and the triumph over the Egyptian army and chariotry. While there has been much scholarly discussion about the relationship between the former song and the shorter one, which borrows the opening lines of the former, Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman (among others) have argued persuasively that these songs, along with the Song of Deborah (Judges 5), are “genuinely archaic” in their poetic structure and orthography, dating as early as the twelfth century BC, based on comparative study with Ugaritic poetry.87 Exodus 15:4 celebrates the casting of Pharaoh’s chariots into the sea: “His chosen officers were sunk in the Red Sea.”

The setting of the Song of Deborah is the aftermath of Israel’s victory over the Canaanite oppressors under the leadership of Barak the judge and Deborah the prophetess. Israel’s victory in the narrative passage in Judges 4 is likened to God’s leading Israel, after the Sinai theophany, through Edom in order to take the Promised Land:

\[
\text{LORD, when you went out from Seir,} \\
\text{when you marched from the region of Edom,} \\
\text{the earth trembled} \\
\text{and the heavens dropped,} \\
\text{yes, the clouds dropped water.} \\
\text{The mountains quaked before the \text{LORD,}} \\
\text{even Sinai before the \text{LORD, the God of Israel. (Judg. 5:4–5)}}
\]

The same theme of Yahweh’s coming from Sinai also occurs in the blessings of Moses in Deuteronomy 33:2. The literary analysis and comparative study by Cross and Freeman lead them to offer a date before the eleventh century BC for this song.88 These three early songs each refer to aspects of the exodus

or wilderness tradition, indicating that these foundational events were not some late inventions from the imagination of biblical poets.

The songs in the Psalter likewise deal with exodus and wilderness themes. They are framed in terms of God’s “deeds” and “works.” Several psalms are lengthy and detailed, rehearsing many aspects of the exodus and wilderness episodes of God’s salvific acts as evidence of Yahweh’s sovereign protection and guidance for the people throughout its history. Psalms 78, 105, and 106 belong to this category, with the first two even reciting most of the ten plagues. These are sufficiently known and require no further comment. Shorter references to the exodus and wilderness motifs are tucked into various psalms. Here are some examples.

Come and see what God has done:
    he is awesome in his deeds . . . .
He turned the sea into dry land;
    they passed through the river on foot. (Ps. 66:5–6)

Another allusion to the events of Exodus 14 appears in Psalm 74.

    God my King is from of old,
    working salvation in the midst of the earth.
    You divided the seas by your might. (vv. 12–13)

Along the same line, Psalm 76:6 hints at the victory over the Egyptian chariotry.

    At your rebuke, O God of Jacob,
    both rider and horse lay stunned.”

Psalm 77 remembers the deeds and works of Yahweh. “When the waters saw you, O God,” verse 16 proclaims, “they were afraid.” The hymn ends with these words:

    Your way was through the sea,
    your path through the great waters;
    yet your footprints were unseen.
    You led your people like a flock
    by the hand of Moses and Aaron. (77:19–20)

---

89This psalm appears to associate the Chaoskampf motif with God’s controlling the Sea of Reeds for the Israelites to flee Egypt. See Marvin Tate, Psalms 51–100 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 254.
90The language alludes to the Songs of Moses and Miriam.
Psalm 81 begins by referring to the celebration of religious festivals that were decreed “when [God] went out over the land of Egypt” (v. 5), an allusion to the Passover. “I tested you at Meribah” is a reference to the people’s rebellion at Meribah and Massah in the wilderness (Ex. 17:7; Num. 20:2, 13). And Psalm 81:10 recites the well-known formula,

I am the LORD your God,  
who brought you up out of the land of Egypt.

The Massah and Meribah rebellion is mentioned again in Psalm 95:8, as well as the “forty years” in the wilderness (v. 10). Moses and Aaron are referred to as God’s priests in Psalm 99:6, and the following verse mentions the “pillar of the cloud” through which God spoke to the people.

Psalm 114 opens with the words,

When Israel went out from Egypt,  
the house of Jacob from a people of strange language . . . .  
The sea looked and fled;  
Jordan turned back. (vv. 1, 3)

It ends by describing Yahweh as the one “who turns the rock into a pool of water” (114:8). The latter harks back to the wilderness episodes in which divinely produced water flowed from the rock, and it explains the origins of the names Massah and Meribah (Ex. 17:1–8; Num. 20:2–13).

Psalm 68:8 recalls God’s presence with his people in Sinai and the awesome theophany.

The earth quaked, the heavens poured down rain,  
before God, the One of Sinai.

Israel is likened to a vine that God brought out of Egypt and planted (in Canaan) in Psalm 80:8.

Finally, exodus themes are found in Psalms 135 and 136. The former refers to the death of the firstborn of Egypt (135:8), as does the latter (136:10). Psalm 136 also proclaims God’s covenant loyalty (ḥesed), as evidenced by his overthrowing “Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea” (v. 15) and leading his people through the wilderness (v. 16).

The preponderance of exodus and wilderness allusions in these psalms demonstrates that these saving acts were focal points of Israelite worship. These data clearly complement the religious festivals reviewed above, and in some cases may have been sung in conjunction with holy days.
Prophetic Literature

The prophets of ancient Israel are generally considered covenant enforcers who are often portrayed as bringing a lawsuit (רְלוֹ) against God’s recidivist covenant violator Israel. Servant, son, and wife motifs are often used to symbolize this relationship. Because the covenant was made with Israel after its departure from Egypt in Sinai, the exodus and wilderness episodes are regularly mentioned.

We begin with some examples in Judges and Samuel of prophets speaking. An unnamed prophet proclaims God’s word after the people call out for deliverance from the invasion of the Midianites in Judges 6.

The LORD sent a prophet to the people of Israel. And he said to them, “Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel: I led you up from Egypt and brought you out of the house of slavery. And I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians and from the hand of all who oppressed you, and drove them out before you and gave you their land. And I said to you, ‘I am the LORD your God; you shall not fear the gods of the Amorites in whose land you dwell.’ But you have not obeyed my voice.” (6:8–10)

Another anonymous “man of God” prophesies to Eli the priest, reminding him that his priestly authority came from divine appointment in Egypt: “Did I indeed reveal myself to the house of your father when they were in Egypt subject to the house of Pharaoh? Did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest, to go up to my altar, to burn incense?” (1 Sam. 2:27–28). These rhetorical questions require an emphatic yes answer.

Citations of exodus- and wilderness-related events abound in the literary prophets. Only a selection is offered here. In Hosea we read,

When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son. (Hos. 11:1)

Later on, God speaks again: “I am the LORD your God from the land of Egypt” (12:9), an expression repeated in 13:4. This introduction is followed by,

It was I who knew you in the wilderness, in a land of drought. (13:5)

The leadership of Moses in the exodus is implied in the statement, “By a prophet the LORD brought Israel up from Egypt” (12:13).

91For uses of рلو in this manner, see Isa. 3:13; 12:1; 49:25; 57:16; Hos. 4:1, 4; 12:3; Mic. 6:1–2.
Amos, Hosea’s eighth-century colleague, uses similar language, speaking of Israel as “the whole family that I brought up out of the land of Egypt” (Amos 3:1). Israel’s origin is likened to that of two of her neighbors.

Did not I bring up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir? (9:7)

Jeremiah also mentions the Philistines as originating in Caphtor (Jer. 47:4), which is identified with Crete.\textsuperscript{22} It would be inexplicable for the prophet (and his audience) to know the origins of the Philistines and Arameans but be wrong about Israel’s origin!

Another contemporary, Micah, encapsulates the entire exodus-wilderness story in a short pericope that is a part of the so-called *rib* formula or covenant lawsuit.\textsuperscript{93}

For I brought you up from the land of Egypt and redeemed you from the house of slavery, and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.

O my people, remember what Balak king of Moab devised, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered him, and what happened from Shittim to Gilgal, that you may know the righteous acts of the LORD. (Mic. 6:4–5)

Commenting on this passage, Gerhard Maier observes that history runs very briefly through the Exodus from Egypt, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Balak, Balaam, Shittim, and Gilgal—in the chronological sequence found in the Pentateuch, incidentally—and speaks of God’s actions encountered by Israel at each of these stages in its history, without needing to clarify any elements of this history.\textsuperscript{94}

Isaiah also employs exodus motifs in his preaching. In Isaiah 10:5 Assyria is likened to the “rod of my anger,” and the staff is associated with Yahweh’s rod that “struck Midian at the rock of Oreb” (i.e., killed the Midianite chief


Oreb by Gideon in Judg. 7:25), the same staff that would be stretched over the sea, "as he did in Egypt" (Isa. 10:26).

One of the developing themes in the prophets is to use the exodus from Egypt as the archetype for the return of Israelites from Assyrian captivity or Judeans from Babylonian exile. Isaiah employs this when he anticipates the day in which

there will be a highway from Assyria
for the remnant that remains of his people,
as there was for Israel
when they came up from the land of Egypt. (11:16)

Jeremiah likens the Judeans who survive the fall of Jerusalem or the exile to those who "found grace in the wilderness" (Jer. 31:2). "Grace" (ḥēn) is applied to the survivors of the golden-calf episode (Ex. 33:12–13, 16–17).

One could easily write a monograph of Jeremiah's use of the exodus and wilderness themes in his messages. A few examples will suffice. Jeremiah contrasts Israel's faithfulness as a bride in the wilderness (2:2b) with the present situation where the people do not say,

Where is the LORD
who brought us up from the land of Egypt, who led us in the wilderness . . . ? (2:6)

In his celebrated temple sermon, the prophet stresses the principle of obedience rather than sacrifice by announcing, "In the day that I brought them out of Egypt, I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices" (7:22). And he reminds his audience that he has sent prophets to drive home this point: "From the day that your fathers came out of the land of Egypt to this day, I have persistently sent all my servants the prophets to them, day after day" (7:25).

When the prophet speaks of violating the covenant and its commandments, he reminds his people that this occurred when "I commanded your fathers when I brought them out of the land of Egypt" (11:4; see also 11:7). The oath formula apparently used by the people, when evoking the name of their deity was "as the LORD lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt" (16:14). This historical memory, the prophet anticipates, will be replaced with a new oath formula to reflect God's rescue of the Jews from Mesopotamia: "As the LORD lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the north country and out of all the countries where he had driven them" (16:15).
Jeremiah's "new covenant" will not be like the covenant made with their ancestors when they came out of Egypt (31:31–32; see also 34:13). In the prophet's prayer in the "Book of Consolation" he recalls "signs and wonders in the land of Egypt" (32:20–21).

Exilic and postexilic prophets also appeal to the exodus tradition. Ezekiel uses the marriage motif to describe the relationship between Yahweh and Israel that was legalized with the covenant (cf. Ezekiel 16). Yahweh made himself "known" to them in bringing them out of Egypt and into the wilderness, where he gave his laws (20:5–10), but his bride violated his laws and went "whoring" after other gods (20:22–31). Israel's bent toward idolatry (spiritual infidelity) is even traced back to "the land of Egypt" (23:19, 27).

Daniel's prayer in Babylon mentions not obeying the commandments "written in the Law of Moses" (Dan. 9:13); the people had failed the "LORD our God, who brought [his] people out of the land of Egypt" (9:15). Haggai in the Persian period mentions the "covenant that I made with you when you came out of Egypt" (Hag. 2:5).

From the earliest prophets, to those from the end of the Old Testament period, the exodus and wilderness history, and especially the Sinaitic covenant, are constant themes. And it was the violation of that ancient treaty with God that accounted for the calamities they were encountering from the Assyrian through Persian periods.

**Statements of Non-Israelites**

It might be unexpected to find that non-Israelites confess their faith in the God of Israel because of the exodus from Egypt. The first in this category is Jethro, the Midianite priest and father-in-law of Moses. When he meets up with Moses and the Israelites by Mount Sinai and learns of the deliverance of the Hebrews (Ex. 18:5–9), he affirms, "Blessed be the LORD, who has delivered you out of the hand of the Egyptians and out of the hand of Pharaoh and has delivered the people from under the hand of the Egyptians. Now I know that the LORD is greater than all gods, because in this affair they dealt arrogantly with the people" (18:10–11). As mentioned previously, King Balak of Moab sent messengers to Balaam (of Amaw in Syria) who referred to the Israelites as a people new to the area: "A people has come out of Egypt" (Num. 22:5, 11). In one of his discourses, Balaam confesses,

God brings them out of Egypt
and is for them like the horns of the wild ox. (Num. 23:22)

This same statement about Israel is repeated in the third discourse (Num. 24:8).
A third case of faith by a foreigner is that of Rahab of Jericho. Upon receiving the Hebrew spies, she admits that she and the people of the land have heard of the wonders of the exodus: "I know that the LORD has given you the land, and that the fear of you has fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land melt away before you. For we have heard how the LORD dried up the water of the Red Sea before you when you came out of Egypt" (Josh. 2:9–10).

Another example is slightly different, but quite revealing. In the battle of Ebenezer, the Philistines panic when they hear the cheering and shouting of the Israelite armies as the ark of the covenant is carried into their camp. First Samuel 4:6–8 reports:

And when they learned that the ark of the LORD had come to the camp, the Philistines were afraid, for they said, "A god has come into the camp." And they said, "Woe to us! For nothing like this has happened before. Woe to us! Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods? These are the gods who struck the Egyptians with every sort of plague in the wilderness."

This reading suggests that while the Philistines were familiar with the exodus story, they had a garbled version of the events, as the "plagues" did not strike the Egyptians in the wilderness. Alternatively, the LXX reading "and in the wilderness" may better preserve the original reading.55

This fear notwithstanding, the Philistines rally, defeat Israel, and seize the ark in a battle near Aphek (1 Sam. 4:9–11). But the Philistines' war trophy backfires as the cult image of Dagon at Ashdod topples over in the presence of the ark of Yahweh (5:1–4), and the men are hit with a plague of tumors (5:9). This embarrassment prompts the Philistines to return the ark. Their "priests and diviners" (6:2) advise that the political leaders include gold images of tumors and mice—still an obscure act—to give glory to the God of Israel (6:5). The advisors then ask: "Why should you harden your hearts as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their hearts?" (6:6).

Thus we have two cases of the Philistines recalling details from the exodus story. Such knowledge may have been transmitted by Israelites in the Shephelah, where they recounted their national story to their Philistine neighbors.

**Chronological Benchmark**

The exodus from Egypt, because it was a founding national event, served as a chronological benchmark or anchoring point in subsequent periods. First

---

55David Tsumara, *The First Book of Samuel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 194, offers a good review of different interpretations and readings of this text.
of all, the exodus event, memorialized by Passover, served as the beginning of the religious calendar (cf. Ex. 12:1–2). Especially in the Torah, noteworthy events are dated from the departure from Egypt.

In the wilderness itinerary, two early stops are dated. In the first, “they set out from Elim, and all the congregation of the people of Israel came to the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after they had departed from the land of Egypt” (Ex. 16:1); then, “On the third new moon after the people of Israel had gone out of the land of Egypt, on that day they came into the wilderness of Sinai” (Ex. 19:1). The book of Numbers begins with a chronological datum: “The LORD spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the tent of meeting, on the first day of the second month, in the second year after they had come out of the land of Egypt (Num. 1:1). This is followed by the dating of an oracle reminding the people of the proper date to celebrate Passover: “And the LORD spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the first month of the second year after they had come out of the land of Egypt, saying, ‘Let the people of Israel keep the Passover at its appointed time’” (Num. 9:1–2). Aaron the priest is reported to have died “in the fortieth year after the people of Israel had come out of the land of Egypt, on the first day of the fifth month” (Num. 33:38). Then Deuteronomy 1 dates the arrival of the Israelites in the land of Moab to the “fortieth year, on the first day of the eleventh month” (1:3); the departure from Egypt is understood.

The ghastly rape, murder, and dismemberment of a Levite’s concubine is viewed as an unparalleled shocking occurrence. People respond by saying, “Such a thing has never happened or been seen from the day that the people of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt until this day” (Judg. 19:30). Put another way, for the entirety of the nation’s history, “such a thing has never happened.”

A similar usage occurs in 1 Samuel 8:8, where the propensity of the people to rebel against God is described as spanning their entire history: “According to all the deeds that they have done, from the day I [God] brought them up out of Egypt even to this day, forsaking me and serving other gods, so they are also doing to you [Samuel].”

The beginning of the construction of Solomon’s temple is dated to “the four hundred and eightieth year after the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon’s reign” (1 Kings 6:1). This reference is unique. We see that the regnal dating system was introduced with the monarchy (i.e., dating events to the year of a king’s reign), while the exodus event remained a meaningful benchmark. Biblical scholars have long debated how the 480-year figure should be interpreted, whether literally or symbolically
(i.e., $12 \times 40$, thus 12 generations). I have recently suggested that the figure might be a *Distanzangaben*. This literary phenomenon is used in Assyrian texts, where large blocks of time are mentioned (e.g., 720 or 760 years) to connect a current temple building or renovation with the original construction. Regardless of which of these three interpretations is correct, all assume the exodus as the foundational event that serves as the chronological anchor for present dating purposes.

**Historical Retrospective**

Historical retrospectives are a recognized genre in which a figure, often a king late in his reign, recalls his earlier achievements, usually in the form of a speech recorded on a stela or temple, typically with a political (or religious) agenda in mind.

As the Israelites approach Mount Sinai, they are attacked by the Amalekites, a nomadic desert people, and a battle ensues (Ex. 17:8–16). The end of the narrative anticipates transgenerational war with Amalek. This bitter memory is appealed to in Deuteronomy 25:17–19.

Remember what Amalek did to you on the way as you came out of Egypt, how he attacked you on the way when you were faint and weary, and cut off your tail, those who were lagging behind you, and he did not fear God. Therefore . . . you shall blot out the memory of Amalek from under heaven; you shall not forget.

During the reign of Israel’s first king, Saul (ca. 1030–1010 BC), Samuel speaks a prophetic word giving license for the armies of Israel to wipe out Amalek: “Thus says the LORD of hosts, ‘I have noted what Amalek did to Israel in opposing them on the way when they came up out of Egypt’” (1 Sam. 15:2). Saul warns another nomadic people, the Kenites (i.e., the Midianite relatives of Moses) to separate themselves from the vile Amalekites so as not to be harmed, since “you showed kindness to all the people of Israel when they came up out of Egypt” (15:6).

Moses uses a retrospective in his communication to the king of Edom when asking for permission to transit through his territory. He recalls the

---


97 Ibid., 237–39.

98 I am following Redford’s understanding of “retrospective” (Redford, *Wars of Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III*, 158, 242). This is similar to Van Seter’s category of “political use of the past,” which is well documented in Hittite texts (see John Van Seters, *In Search of History* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983], 114–18).
sojourn in Egypt, the oppressive treatment the Hebrews experienced, and God's deliverance.

You know all the hardship that we have met: how our fathers went down to Egypt, and we lived in Egypt a long time. And the Egyptians dealt harshly with us and our fathers. And when we cried to the LORD, he heard our voice and sent an angel and brought us out of Egypt. And here we are in Kadesh, a city on the edge of your territory. Please let us pass through your land. (Num. 20:14–17)

The reason the Moabites and Ammonites are not welcome in Israel’s sanctuary is “because they did not meet you with bread and with water on the way, when you came out of Egypt” (Deut. 23:4).

Within the covenant curses of Deuteronomy, violators can expect to be struck with boils (ṣêḥîn), which of course are the same malady mentioned in the sixth Egyptian plague (Ex. 9:9–10). Another curse mentions “all the diseases of Egypt” (Deut. 28:60). Curses are a part of all ancient treaty texts in all periods, but only in the Hebrew Bible are curses connected to specific earlier events. In addition to the exodus plagues, the fate of covenant violators includes an overthrow “like that of Sodom and Gomorrah” (Deut. 29:23), another allusion to an earlier biblical event (Gen. 19:24–28).

A number of retrospectives are found in the Judges cycle. When Gideon is called to save his people from the Midianites, he expresses his hope that God will display “his wonderful deeds that our fathers recounted to us, saying, 'Did not the LORD bring us up from Egypt?'” (Judg. 6:13). The subject of Israel's arrival in the Transjordan arises when Judge Jephthah tries to settle a territorial dispute with the Ammonites (11:13–16). The local king begins this retrospective, saying, “Because Israel on coming up from Egypt took away my land, from the Arnon to the Jabbok and to the Jordan; now therefore restore it peaceably” (11:13). Jephthah in the following verses recounts the travel from Egypt to Moab: “Israel did not take away the land of Moab or the land of the Ammonites, but when they came up from Egypt, Israel went through the wilderness to the Red Sea and came to Kadesh” (11:15–16).

When Saul is acclaimed the king at Mizpah, Samuel offers a historical retrospective to place this event in its proper context. He begins by proclaiming, “I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians and from the hand of all the kingdoms that were oppressing you”

---

99 A review of ten treaties in Beckman's volume (Hittite Diplomatic Texts, 29, 33, 40, 48, 52, 64, 69, 86, 92, 112) shows none to be connected to some past plague or calamity.
(1 Sam. 10:18). After Saul defeats the Ammonites, who attacked Jabesh-Gilead, Samuel rallies the people at Gilgal to “renew the kingdom” (11:14). Here too he brings historical perspective to his speech to the nation.

The Lord is witness, who appointed Moses and Aaron and brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt. Now therefore stand still that I may plead with you before the Lord concerning all the righteous deeds of the Lord that he performed for you and for your fathers. When Jacob went into Egypt, and the Egyptians oppressed them, then your fathers cried out to the Lord and the Lord sent Moses and Aaron, who brought your fathers out of Egypt and made them dwell in this place. (12:6–8)

In each of the examples cited here, the retrospective of the nation’s history typically begins with the exodus from Egypt, which may include references to the wilderness experience.

Conclusion

Biblical theology has employed history as the foundation to its theological task for over two centuries in Western academe. Indeed there have been important corrective measures taken by biblical theologians who have rightly recognized that history should not be used as the exclusive means of revelation and divine activity for their theology. Here Barr was right. For those who today wish to minimize history in relationship to faith and theology because some critics of the Bible question the historicity of certain Old Testament events, the exodus in particular, it is worth noting what Barr said in the same 1962 essay.

There really is a Heilsgeschichte, a series of events set within the place of human life and in historical sequence, through which God has especially revealed himself. I would not doubt that we have been generally right in saying that this can be taken as the central theme of the Bible, that it forms the main link between Old and New Testaments, and that its presence and importance marks biblical faith off clearly from other religions.

I have focused here on the exodus and wilderness episodes since they have been foundational to theology and faith, and because biblical minimalists now reject the historical worth of the Bible’s claim regarding these events. Indeed, archaeological evidence does not exist that “proves” the historicity

\[100\text{He distinguishes between theme and organizing principle.}\]
\[101\text{Barr, “Revelation through History,” 10.}\]
of the exodus and wilderness narratives, but the absence of evidence cannot
disprove their historicity. Indirect evidence from Egypt demonstrates that these
foundational events are plausible, and the Egyptian background to the narra-
tives is unquestionable. The biblical evidence for the exodus and wilderness
periods reviewed above so overwhelmingly supports the historicity of these
events that the priests, prophets, psalmists, people of Israel, and foreigners
believed these events occurred, and consequently they celebrated festivals, sang
songs, dated events, and observed laws that assumed that Yahweh’s salvation
from Egypt was authentic.

If orthodox Christian faith based on the Bible does not require its
foundational events to be real and historical, one must ask, Why have
anti-Christian polemics for nearly two thousand years—from the sec-
don-century Gnostics and philosophers to Enlightenment philosophers,
as well as their followers in German and other continental higher critics
and recent postmodern hermeneutics102—been so obsessed with under-
mining the Bible’s historicity and accuracy, along with ridiculing the
supernatural? Obviously they think historicity matters, and in their mind
if the Bible is shown to be inaccurate and filled with errors, its message
is invalidated. There is no better illustration of the deleterious effect of
“critical” scholarship on Christianity than the shrinking church in Europe
and North America.103

Meanwhile, the church in the Southern Hemisphere is exploding and
vibrant.104 Philip Jenkins, in his penetrating book The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity (2002), offers some extremely cogent
observations about the direction of the Southern (Hemisphere) church as
compared with her older sister in the North that progressive evangelicals
should consider before insisting that we bow at the altar of Wellhausen and
his successors in Western academe. The impact of secular Enlightenment
thought birthed in the eighteenth century is still with us. It has attacked
Scripture and its central doctrines: “The Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the
existence of hell, all fell into disfavor, while critical Bible scholarship under-
mined the familiar bases of faith.”105 The questions that have so troubled

102For a historical treatment of some of the key figures in the history of criticism, see R. K. Harrison,
Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 3–62; and Baruch Halpern,
103Conveniently reviewed in Philip Jenkins, The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Chris-
104See David Barrett, George Kurian, and Todd Johnson, World Christian Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. (New
York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Philip Jenkins, The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible
in the Global South (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); and Jenkins, The Next Christendom.
Western Christendom (and dragged it down!) are irrelevant to the dynamic and exploding Southern Hemisphere. “From this point of view,” Jenkins concludes, “the churches that are doing best in the world as a whole are the ones that stand farthest from Western liberal orthodoxies, and we should learn from their success.”

106 Ibid., 14.