The Gospel According to St. Matthew) shows Jesus dropping to his knees and, without a rock, praying with face heavenward. By contrast, the six-hour made-for-television *Jesus of Nazareth* (dir. Franco Zeffirelli, 1977, UK/IT) depicts Jesus in prayer seated under an olive tree, slumped over, in obvious agony.

These films usually contain sequences related to Judas' kiss of betrayal and a disciple's severing an ear of the high priest's servant – sometimes identifying the disciple as Peter and the servant as Malchus, as does the Gospel of John. The motif from the Gospel of Luke that Jesus healed the severed ear appears in *The King of Kings*, *Jesus* (1979), and Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ* (2004, US). Perhaps of greater importance is the makeup of the arresting party, whether or not the band included both temple guards and Roman soldiers, as mentioned in the Gospel of John. Roman soldiers are identifiably present in *The Gospel of John* and *The Passion of the Christ*.

A few films visually dramatize Jesus' experience in the garden as a struggle between God and Satan. *The Life and Passion of Jesus Christ* and *Jesus* (1979), based on a variant reading often not included in modern English translations of Luke 22 : 43–44, show angelic figures strengthening Jesus in his agony. Two other films, *Jesus* (1999) and *The Passion of the Christ*, take creative leaps that extend well beyond the biblical texts by their characterizations of Satan: in the former, a smarmy guy in a designer suit, in the latter, a spooky, androgynous cowled figure.

In addition, there are movies that feature a character whose life and activity recall the gospel narratives about Jesus. Occasionally, these Christ-figures have analogous "Gethsemane" moments. Films with characters who experience such moments include: *Cool Hand Luke* (dir. Stuart Rosenburg, 1967, US), *Jésus of Montréal* (dir. Denys Arcand, 1989, CA/FR, *Jesus of Montreal*), and *Dead Man Walking* (dir. Tim Robbins, 1995, US).

Bibliography: ■ Baugh, L., *Imaging the Divine: Jesus and Christ-Figures in Film* (Kansas City, Mo. 1997). ■ Campbell, R. H./M. R. Pitts, *The Bible on Film: A Checklist, 1897–1980* (Metuchen, N.J./London 1981). ■ Tatum, W. B., *Jesus at the Movies: A History of the First Hundred Years and Beyond* (Santa Rosa, Calif. ³2012).

W. Barnes Tatum

Geuel

Geuel (MT *Gĕʾûʾēl*; LXX Γουδιηλ) represented the tribe of Gad as one of twelve Israelite spies chosen to spy out the land of Canaan (Num 13 : 15). He was among the ten spies who brought back a discouraging report about the fearsome strength of the Canaanites, causing the Israelites to refuse to obey God's command to enter the promised land (Num 13 : 32–14 : 4).

Dennis T. Olson

Gezer

Gezer (MT *Gezer*), located in the Aijalon Valley at the intersection of the Via Maris and the road leading to Jerusalem, is a 33-acre (12.1 ha) mound located 8 km south-southeast of the modern city of Ramlah. It is mentioned in Egyptian sources (*qdr*) and in Assyrian sources (*Gazri*): the annals of Thutmose III (ca. 1468 BCE), Amarna Letters (14th cent. BCE), and Merneptah's Victory Stela, and in an inscription and relief of Tiglath-pileser III (8th cent. BCE).

1. Archaeology. The site is well known due to several archaeological expeditions. Two major excavations were carried out from 1902–1909 by R. A. Stewart Macalister and from 1964–1973 by Hebrew Union College (HUC) directed by William G. Dever and Joe D. Seger. Several smaller excavations were conducted by Raymond Weill (1913, 1923), Alan Rowe (1934), and Dever (1984, 1990). Renewed excavations are currently being conducted by a team of the Tandy Institute for Archaeology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary under the direction of Steven Ortiz and Samuel Wolff.

Gezer played a prominent role in biblical archaeology with the publication of an article by Yigael Yadin (1958) arguing for a connection between the "Maccabean castle" excavated by Macalister, the six chambered gates from Hazor and Megiddo, and 1 Kgs 9 : 15. This became a classic paradigm for biblical archaeology of the 1970s and 1980s. The HUC excavations of Gezer also played an important role in New Archaeology which emphasized the separation of archaeological research from biblical research. The HUC excavations defined twenty-one major strata. While there is evidence of occupation in the Chalcolithic period and Early Bronze Age, these were meager occupations; probably local villages around the spring. There is no evidence of major occupation from Early Bronze Age III to the beginning of Middle Bronze Age II.

Gezer was a significant Canaanite city-state throughout the 2nd millennium BCE. The mound was initially occupied around 3500 BCE and the settlement continued to grow until it became a fortified city during the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2000–1500 BCE) when large-scale fortifications (gate, tower, glacis) were built and the "High Place" was founded. The city was destroyed (ca. 1500 BCE) and rebuilt during the Late Bronze Age when it came under Egyptian hegemony as evidenced by several palaces and residencies. The city was again destroyed in the 14th century BCE when Egypt was weak, as illustrated in the Amarna letters. An Iron Age I (ca. 1200–1000 BCE) fortified city was ex-

posed by the recent Tandy excavations. A Solomonic phase is evidenced by the construction of a six chambered monumental city gate, a so-called palace, and a casemate wall. The famous Gezer Calendar, associated with this period, is usually regarded as the earliest Hebrew inscription, though the script and the language there may just as easily be called Phoenician. This city was destroyed by Shishak (ca. 950–925), then rebuilt but later destroyed by Tiglath-pileser III (733 BCE). Subsequently, occupation of the site diminished until the 2nd century BCE when it became a Seleucid and Maccabean stronghold.

Several textual traditions have informed the discussion of the archaeology and geography of Gezer. According to the Bible, Joshua defeated the king of Gezer who was part of a Canaanite coalition (Josh 10:33). Gezer remained in Canaanite hands throughout the period of the Judges (Josh 16:10; Judg 1:29) even though it formed the boundary for Ephraim's tribal allotment (Josh 16:3) and was assigned as a Levitical city (Josh 21:21). David fought against the Philistines near Gezer (2 Sam 5:25; 1 Chr 20:4). Gezer was conquered by Egypt and given as a dowry to Solomon. Solomon fortified Gezer along with Jerusalem, Hazor, and Megiddo (1 Kgs 9:15–17).

2. Gezer and Joshua's Southern Campaign. Joshua 10 consists of three literary units coalesced into a single narrative: the anti-Gibeonite coalition (vv. 1–15), the execution of the kings of this coalition at the cave of Makkadah (vv. 16–27), and a southern campaign of the hill country and the Shephelah (vv. 28–42). Several scholars are persuaded that the southern campaign preserves the memory of an older tradition (Wright) based on the topography and logic of the itinerary. Yet the question is whether the tradition is ancient (e.g., Iron Age I), or based on a later battle (e.g., Sennacherib in 701 [2 Kgs 18:13]; Nebuchadnezzar in 586 BCE [Jer 34:7]).

3. Gezer and Its Boundaries. The biblical text is ambiguous as regards Gezer and its allotment. Gezer is a city of Ephraim (Josh 16:3, 10; Judg 1:29) and given to the Levites, specifically the non-priestly Kohathites (Josh 21:21; 1 Chr 6:67). Based on the geographical data, the biblical text also places Gezer within the boundaries of Judah (Josh 15:12) and in the tribal allotment of Dan (Josh 19:40–46). Nevertheless Gezer remained in Canaanite control (Josh 16:10; Judg 1:29). An account of a battle between David and the Philistines mentions that he struck the Philistines all the way "from Gibeon to Gezer," implying that Gezer was in Philistine territory (2 Sam 5:25).

4. Gezer and Solomon. Most exegetical and historical reconstruction has focused on the mention of Gezer in 1 Kgs 9 as a city that Solomon fortified and that was given to Solomon in a marriage alliance with Pharaoh's daughter. The text associates the building of Gezer with Hazor and Megiddo, and notes that the king of Egypt captured Gezer, burned the city, killed the Canaanites, and gave it as dowry to his daughter who was to marry Solomon. Emphasis has been placed on the archaeology of these three cities, which has distorted the literary analysis of the text. Most scholars have noted that this account is part of a section of various fragments of text associated with Solomon's statecraft, construction projects, and conscripted labor (vv. 15–28). It has been interpreted as a sort of summary statement of Solomon's activities that follows a description of Solomon's building of the temple and palace (1 Kgs 9:1–9). This is similar to other accounts of kings where a Deuteronomistic redactor provides a summary statement at the end of their reign. Most scholars note that v. 16 is parenthetical and separates an original archival list of building projects throughout the kingdom, listing projects from Hazor in the north to Tamar in the wilderness. These earlier approaches emphasized a historical-critical approach that emphasized reconstructing Solomon's building projects and corvee labor.

Some scholars (Knauf; Neimann) have used a source critical approach influenced by Israel Finkelstein's Low Chronology theory, and have associated v. 15 with an insertion of northern cities into archival texts about Solomon, which reflects a theological idealism uniting north and south traditions. Hence the text reflects a later idealized Deuteronomistic creation and is not necessarily based on archival texts.

A recent approach by William Schniedewind posits that the original list was a long archival description that included vv. 15 and 17–18. A later Deuteronomistic literary shaping provides the overarching themes of Solomon's failure to uphold the Deuteronomic law of the prohibitions in the law of the king (e.g., gold, horse, and foreign wives) that dates to the Josianic period.

5. Hellenistic and Maccabean Gezer. The last occupation at Gezer was during the Hellenistic period. Various references in 1 Maccabees note that Gazara was a Syrian outpost of the Seleucid dynasty (1 Macc 9:52). Jonathan's brother and successor won national independence from Demetrius II. He besieged the fortress of Gezer and won. He expelled the inhabitants with loyal "keepers of the law" and placed John (Hyrcanus) in charge of the new Jewish garrison (1 Macc 13:41).

All major excavations have exposed a well-developed town plan of Gezer during the Hellenistic period. Most of the occupation appears to be on the east slope of the western hill to the eastern hill. There is also evidence of a Jewish household where a possible mikveh was found.

During this period, several Gezer boundary stones have been found. These are bilingual inscrip-

tions with Alkios (private name) written in Greek, and "the boundary of Gezer" written facing the inscription in Hebrew. To date there are twelve inscriptions, the most recent one was found by the Gezer survey project. These inscriptions illustrate (1) the multi-ethnic population, (2) the impact of Hellenization, and (3) the division between public and private fields. It is also possible that they reflect the influence of the Maccabeans and their concern for Jewish fields observing Torah principles of agriculture found in the Pentateuch.

Bibliography: ■ Albright, W. F., "The Gezer Calendar," *BASOR* 92 (1943) 16–26. ■ Dever, W. G., *Gezer II: Report of the 1967–70 Seasons in Fields I and II* (Jerusalem 1974). ■ Dever, W. G., "Late Bronze Age and Solomonic Defenses at Gezer: New Evidence," *BASOR* 262 (1986) 9–34. ■ Dever, W. G./R. W. Younker, "Tell Gezer, 1990," *IEJ* 41 (1990) 282–86. ■ Dever, W. G. et al., *Gezer I: Preliminary Report of the 1964–66 Seasons* (Jerusalem 1970). ■ Dever, W. G. et al., *Gezer IV: The 1969–71 Seasons in Field VI, the "Acropolis"* (Jerusalem 1986). ■ Finkelstein, I., "Gezer Revisited and Revised," *TA* 19 (2002) 262–96. ■ Fritz, V., "Solomon and Gezer," in *Confronting the Past: Archaeological and Historical Essays on Ancient Israel*, FS W. G. Dever (ed. S. Gitin et al.; Winona Lake, Ind. 2006) 303–07. ■ Gitin, S., *Gezer III: A Ceramic Typology of the Late Iron II, Persian and Hellenistic Periods at Tell Gezer* (Jerusalem 1990). ■ Kempinski, A., "Gezer: Re-Excavating Ancient Sites in Israel – Review Article," *IEJ* 43 (1993) 174–80. ■ Knauf, A., "Solomon at Megiddo?," in *The Land that I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of J. Maxwell Miller* (ed. J. A. Dearman/M. P. Graham; JSOTSup 343; Sheffield 2001) 119–43. ■ Macalister, R. A. S., *The Excavation of Gezer, 1902–1905 and 1907–1909*, vol. 1–3 (London 1912). ■ Maeir, A. M., *Bronze and Iron Age Tombs at Tel Gezer, Israel: Finds from Raymond-Charles Weill's Excavations in 1914 and 1921* (BAR 1206; Oxford 2004). ■ Neimann, H. M., "Megiddo and Solomon: A Biblical Investigation in Relation to Archaeology," *TA* 27 (2000) 61–74. ■ Ortiz, S. M./S. R. Wolff, "Guarding the Border to Jerusalem: The Iron Age City of Gezer," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 75/1 (2012) 4–19. ■ Reich, R., "Archaeological Evidence of the Jewish Population of Hasmonean Gezer," *IEJ* 31/1 (1981) 48–52. ■ Reich, R./B. Brandl, "Gezer Under Assyrian Rule," *PEQ* 117/1 (1985) 41–54. ■ Schniedewind, W. M., "Excavating the Text of 1 Kings 9," in *Historical Biblical Archaeology and the Future: The New Pragmatism* (ed. T. E. Levy; London 2010) 241–49. ■ Seger, J. D. et al., *Gezer V: The Field 1 Caves* (Jerusalem 1988). ■ Seger, J. D., *Gezer VII: The Middle Bronze and Later Fortifications in Fields II, IV, and VIII* (Winona Lake, Ind. 2013). ■ Wright, G. E., "The Literary and Historical Problem of Joshua 10 and Judges 1," *JNES* 5 (1946) 109. ■ Yadin, Y., "Solomon's City Wall and Gate at Gezer," *IEJ* 8 (1958) 80–86.

Steven M. Ortiz and Sam Wolff

al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid

Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (1056–1111), perhaps Sunnī Islam's most famous theologian, was born in Ṭūs in north eastern Iran, but was also active in Baghdad and elsewhere before returning to his home region in his final years. Griffel (23–25) argues for 1056 as his year of birth rather than the traditional 1058. Al-Ghazālī wrote on theology, legal theory, Sufism, and philosophy, but despite his extensive literary output and his living through the time of the First Crusade, he makes relatively few references to the Bible, Judaism, or Christianity. He largely ignores the traditional polemics undertaken by many Muslim theologians, including his teacher al-Juwaynī (d. 1085), perhaps because he regarded issues relating to unbelievers as irrelevant to his principal concerns of spiritual experience and moral improvement (Lazarus-Yafeh 1975: 451).

Al-Ghazālī sometimes cites the Bible in general terms. For example, he notes that the Islamic injunction to command the right and forbid the wrong is also found in "the Torah" (Lazarus-Yafeh 1992: 24). His treatment of sayings of Jesus sometimes reflects the canonical Gospels, especially the Sermon on the Mount, without actually quoting from them. However, he often draws on apocryphal gospels and other traditions (Jomier; Khalidi: 164–87).

Al-Ghazālī rejects certain elements of the Bible. First, he denies the validity of previous scriptures as sources of law for Muslims, arguing that qurʾānic exhortations to follow these scriptures refer to their basic principles, rather than any matters of detail (Friedmann: 24). Secondly, he rejects distinctive Christian doctrines which conflict with Islam, including the crucifixion, on the grounds that reports about these beliefs are not properly transmitted (Whittingham 2005: 210–11). This is one example which indicates that al-Ghazālī's stance towards the Bible should not be taken as an acceptance of the biblical text and a rejection only of Jewish or Christian interpretations of it.

This view of al-Ghazālī's stance towards the biblical text can be supported despite the evidence of *Al-radd al-jamīl li-ilāhiyyat ʿĪsā bi-ṣarīḥ al-Injīl* (The fitting refutation of the divinity of Jesus according to what is evident in the Gospel), a work often attributed to al-Ghazālī. This work is unusual in the context of Muslim engagement with the Bible, since it relies on extensive use of NT passages to affirm the Islamic portrayal of Jesus as a prophet who is in no way divine. Scholars differ over whether it should be attributed to al-Ghazālī (Reynolds is sceptical, El-Kaisy Friemuth more positive), but the detailed investigation of Christian thought and scriptures in *Al-radd* contrasts sharply with everything else in al-Ghazālī's known works. Furthermore, whether the author of *Al-radd* actually accepts the biblical text is questionable, despite extensive reliance on it (Whittingham 2011). The use of biblical passages in this work probably derives from the author recognizing the tactical benefit of basing an argument on the opponent's sources, rather than from a genuine acceptance of those sources.

The figure of Jesus occurs over forty times in al-Ghazālī's greatest work, the *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn* (The Revival of the Religious Sciences). This is the