



Endnotes for *Solomon and the Kings of Tyre*

Summer 2017 *Bible and Spade*

Notes

¹ André Lemaire, “‘House of David’ Restored in Moabite Inscription,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/3 (May/June 1994), pp. 30–37; Bryant G. Wood, “Bible Personages in Archaeology: Jabin, King of Hazor,” *Bible and Spade*, Summer 1995, pp. 91–92.

² Kenneth A. Kitchen, “A Possible Mention of David in the Late Tenth Century BCE, and Deity *Dod as Dead as a Dodo?” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 76 (1997), pp. 29–44; Hershel Shanks, “Has David Been Found in Egypt?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 25 (Jan–Feb 1999), pp. 34–35.

³ Thiele’s date for the fifth year of Rehoboam, and thus the invasion of Shoshenq (2 Chr 12:2), was 925 BC. However, his placing Solomon’s death after Tishri 1 of 931 BC, instead of before Tishri 1, produced problems in the reigns of Solomon through Athaliah that he apparently recognized but was never able to resolve. See Rodger C. Young, “The Parian Marble and Other Surprises from Chronologist V. Coucke,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 48 (2010), pp. 227–28, including no. 8.

⁴ For an extensive discussion of the credibility of Kitchen’s reading, see Clyde E. Billington and Bretta Grabau, “David’s Fortress at Khirbet Qeiyafa and Shoshenq’s Invasion,” *Bible and Spade* 28:3 (Summer 2015), pp. 65–68.

⁵ Niels Peter Lemche, “On Doing Sociology with Solomon,” in Lowell K. Handy, ed., *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. 312.

⁶ Michael G. Hasel, “New Excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa and the Early History of Judah,” in James Hoffmeier and Dennis Magary, eds., *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith?* (Wheaton IL: Crossway, 2012), p. 488.

⁷ Yosef Garfinkel, Katharina Streit, Saar Ganor, and Paula J. Reimer, “King David’s City at Khirbet Qeiyafa: Results of the Second Season Radiocarbon Dating Project,” *Radiocarbon* 57.5 (2015), p. 887.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Edwin R. Thiele, “The Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 3 (1944), pp. 137–86.

¹⁰ Kenneth A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1973), p. 72.

¹¹ In all of his writings on the subject, Kitchen has accepted Thiele’s date of 925 BC for the fifth year of Rehoboam. By equating this to the 20th year of Shoshenq’s campaign as celebrated on the Bubastite Portal, he refined the dates of Shoshenq I, and consequently all of the 21st and 22nd Dynasties, to a finer degree than was possible from the Egyptian data alone. It is regrettable that in one of his later writings on the subject, “How We Know When Solomon Ruled,” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 27:4 (Sept-Oct

2001) pp. 32–37, 58, Kitchen made it appear that the dates of Solomon are secure partly because of their agreement with Egyptian dates. By manipulation of the Egyptian data, Kitchen arrived at 925 BC (Thiele's date) for the synchronism of 2 Chr 12:2. But he wrote that for the Egyptian data "over a span of centuries such variations lead to discrepancies of several years," showing that in reality he regarded the biblical data as secure and precise, while the Egyptian data could not be determined that accurately. Once again, precise Egyptian dates are derived from the biblical chronology, and not vice versa.

¹² Christopher Rollston, "The Equation of Biblical Pharaoh 'Shishaq' with Pharaoh Ramesses II: A Philological and Epigraphic Dismantling of Egyptologist David Rohl's Proposal," in *Alphabets, Texts and Artifacts in the Ancient Near East: Studies Presented to Benjamin Sass, Israel Finkelstein, Christian Robin, and Thomas Römer* eds. (Paris: van Dieren, 2016), p. 378, no. 4.

¹³ Rodger C. Young, "When Did Solomon Die?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46 (2003), pp. 589–603.

¹⁴ Billington and Grabau, "David's Fortress," p. 63.

¹⁵ Josephus, *Against Apion* 1:107–108/1.17.

¹⁶ Josephus, *Antiquities* 8:55/8.2.8.

¹⁷ Young, "The Parian Marble and Other Surprises," pp. 232–36. Rodger C. Young and Andrew E. Steinmann, "Correlation of Select Classical Sources Related to the Trojan War with Assyrian and Biblical Chronologies," *Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament* 1.2 (2012), 226–27; online at <http://jesot.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/JESOT-1.2-Young-Steinmann.pdf>. See especially the argument on pages 231–32 that the records in the Parian Marble were selected from the state archives of Athens.

¹⁸ Josephus, *Antiquities* 9.283/9.14.2.

¹⁹ Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.112/1.17.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1.113–126/1.17,18.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1.156–159/1.21.

²² Pompeius Trogus, 18.6.9.

²³ J. Liver, "The Chronology of Tyre at the Beginning of the First Millennium B.C.," *Israel Exploration Journal* 3 (1953), pp. 113–20; J.M. Peñuela, "La Inscripción Asiria IM 55644 y la cronología de los reyes de Tiro," *Sefarad* 14 (1954), pp. 1–39; E. Lipiński, "Ba'li-ma'zer II and the Chronology of Tyre," *Rivista degli studi orientali* 45 (1970), pp. 56–65; Frank M. Cross Jr., "An Interpretation of the Nora Stone," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 208 (1972), pp. 13–19; Alberto R. Green, "David's Relations with Hiram: Biblical and Josephan Evidence for Tyrian Chronology," in Carol L. Meyers, ed., *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (Philadelphia PA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1983), pp. 373–91. William H. Barnes, *Studies in the Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel* (Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1991); Young and Steinmann, "Correlation," pp. 224–25.

²⁴ Peñuela, "La Inscripción Asiria," pp. 29–30, no. 167.

²⁵ Pompeius Trogus, 18.6.9.

²⁶ Young and Steinmann, "Correlation."

²⁷ Cross, "Interpretation of the Nora Stone," p. 18.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid, 17 no. 11.

³⁰ Barnes, *Studies*, pp. 38–45.

³¹ Josephus, *Against Apion* 1:108/1:17, 1:126/1.18.

³² Cross, “Interpretation of the Nora Stone,” p. 17 note 11; Barnes, *Studies*, p. 31.

³³ Also, the argument is made in Young and Steinmann, “Correlations,” that, as with Zakar-Baal of Byblos (see footnote 38), the date of interest to Tyrian accountants would have been when they shipped the dressed stone and rafts of logs to Israel, not the date on which the customer started using the material. Log rafts would not be launched into the Mediterranean in the winter or early spring, but in the summer previous to the laying of the foundation. 1 Chronicles 28, 29:1–8 and 2 Chronicles 2 relate the extensive gathering of materials before construction began on the Temple.

³⁴ Rodger C. Young, “Three Verifications of Thiele’s Date for the Beginning of the Divided Kingdom,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 45 (2007), pp. 163–89.

³⁵ Josephus, *Antiquities* 8.62/8.3.1.

³⁶ H. Jacob Katzenstein, *The History of Tyre from the Beginning of the Second Millenium [sic] B.C.E. until the Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in 538 B.C.E.* (Jerusalem: Goldberg’s Press, 1973), pp. 79–80. A second edition of this book in 1997 had only five changes, four of them related to the naming of a further Tyrian king named Milkiram in a proposal by A. Lemaire.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 81.

³⁸ In spite of this evidence that Katzenstein gives for the Tyrian source of Josephus’s citations, it is very puzzling that he rejects the historicity of any citation connecting Tyre with the building of Solomon’s Temple. On pages 82 and 83, he expresses the opinion that Josephus invented these connections. “We cannot accept Rowton’s suggestion that the building of Solomon’s Temple was mentioned in the official archives of Tyre... There is no legitimate connection between the founding of Tyre and the building of the temple in Jerusalem.” But the interest in keeping such records by Phoenician merchant-princes is well illustrated in the story of the Egyptian Wen-Amon and Zakar-Baal, prince of Byblos, that took place about a century before the time of Hiram (*ANET*, 27a). Zakar-Baal retrieved scrolls from his archives to show to Wen-Amon the business transactions between his (Zakar-Baal’s) ancestors and the pharaohs of Egypt. One of the commodities that Zakar-Baal wanted from Egypt was 500 rolls of parchment, for which the main use was probably to record more of the state business. If Tyre had sent great quantities of dressed stone and cedar to aid in the construction of Solomon’s temple, then it can be assured that an inventory of what was sent, and what was received in exchange, would have been recorded in the city’s archives.

Katzenstein’s skepticism in this matter seems strange indeed, since there are several passages in *Antiquities* and *Against Apion* that refer explicitly, and at considerable length, to this subject, all purported to come from Tyrian records. Why then this prejudice against the historicity of these passages? Was it because they substantiate the biblical account, and acceptance by the academy requires that scholars must somewhere demonstrate that they are not to be reckoned among those who seek to verify the Bible?

³⁹ Young, “Parian Marble and Other Surprises,” pp. 232–38. See my translation of Coucke’s article at <http://www.rcyoung.org/articles/coucke.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Josephus, *Antiquities* 10.146/10.8.4.