Old Testament Introduction  
The Bible’s Buried Secrets  
Chapter 24, Bubastite Portal

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

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

***About the Video***

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

***Overview***

We have examined Israel’s prominence from several perspectives. Now we examine it from the perspective of being a worthy adversary, the worthy adversary of Sheshonq Ⅰ (943-942 BC). If Israel has no prominence, no credibility for combat, why is it necessary to give political support to the north, Israel proper, sometimes called the Joseph tribes, and attack the south, Judea proper? BBS gives halfhearted support to these ideas; yet, remains unwilling to even consider biblical dates prior to 930 BC, or any dates prior to 1200 BC.[[1]](#endnote-1) BBS argues for the generic existence of David and Solomon;[[2]](#endnote-2) while failing to address the contradictory statements of some of their authorities. BBS continues to cling to the six-chambered gate hypothesis: even though they must have known that it was defeated years ago (1980).[[3]](#endnote-3)

Yes, there is “stunning convergence between the Bible and Egyptian history,” recorded on the Bubastite Portal gate at Karnak,[[4]](#endnote-4) and we are equally “stunned” by this convergence. Here is the single anchor point between the chronologies of Egypt and Israel that appears to be absolute: what was not found in 14C, seems to be here.[[5]](#endnote-5) However, we are unwilling to leave behind the sweeping implications of this convergence, and leave these implications unexamined. That being said, we are not qualified Egyptologists; our expertise is biblical, mathematical, and scientific.[[6]](#endnote-6) We have some skill at finding statistical errors and logical contradictions; still, we lack the breadth of an Egyptologist in knowing where to look for new evidence.

We do not seek either a maximalist or a minimalist solution, believing both to be flawed with dangerous biases; thus, we continue to seek the optimal solution, the neutral point of view (NPOV). We may have failed to locate Solomon’s bride or father-in-law, but at least we raised the question, while offering one possible solution, the only one we were able to find.

More pieces of the puzzle need to be found: still, we can do better with the pieces we already have. In statistical problems of any kind, more information may not be enough. More information always results in a better picture, the NPOV.

***Script***

The Bubastite Portal gate at Karnak (time 1:12:30?)

Quote:

Redford: The head fighting theme which you see on this wall commemorates a military campaign conducted by Pharaoh Shishak or Sheshonq, the founder of dynasty 22 in Egypt.[[7]](#endnote-7)

N: The Egyptian[[8]](#endnote-8) pharaoh, Shishak invades Israel, an event the Bible reports and specifically dates to five years after Solomon’s death, during the reign of his son, Rehoboam.

R: “In the fifth year of King Rehoboam, King Shishak of Egypt marched against Jerusalem and carried off the treasures of the House of YHWH and the treasures of the royal palace. He carried off everything.” — 1 Kings 14:25 and 26

Redford: The importance of this in fixing one of the earliest dates, specific dates in which Egyptian history coincides with biblical history is really startling and has to be taken note of.[[9]](#endnote-9)

N: This stunning convergence between the Bible and Egyptian history gives a firm date for the death of Solomon. Shishak’s campaign, according to the well-established Egyptian chronology dates to 925 BC. And the Bible says, Solomon dies five years earlier, which means 930 BC. This is further evidence that David and Solomon lived in the tenth century. But there’s even more hidden in these walls. These ovals with their depictions of bound captives and city walls represent places Pharaoh Shishak conquered in Israel. One of those places is Gezer, where archaeologists find the hallmark of Solomon’s building program, a six-chambered gate.[[10]](#endnote-10) Bill Dever directed the excavations in the late 1960’s.

Dever: We can actually see vivid evidence here of a destruction. Down below we have the original stone, pretty much in situ; but if you look in here you can see the stones are badly cracked; you can even see where they’re burned from the heat of a huge fire that had been built here. And up in here you can see that the fire had been so intense that the soft limestone has melted into lime, and it flows down like lava. This is vivid evidence of a destruction, and we would connect that with this well-known raid of Pharaoh Shishak.

N: And if the gate was destroyed by Shishak in 925 BC; then it must have been built during the lifetime of Solomon, who died just five years earlier.

Dever: Surely this kind of monumental architecture is evidence of state formation. And if it’s in the tenth century, then Solomon.[[11]](#endnote-11)

N: Although a minority of archaeologists continue to disagree, this convergence of the Bible, Egyptian chronology, and Solomon’s gates is powerful evidence that a great kingdom existed at the time of David and Solomon, spanning all of Israel, north and south, with its capital in Jerusalem.[[12]](#endnote-12) But Jerusalem is more than a political center; it is a center of worship.

Unquote.

***NPOV***

One of the problems associated with Shishak is the variety of ways to spell his name: Shishak, Sheshonk, Sheshonq, and Shoshenq are some of the spellings of which we are aware. Subject matter experts do not seem to be agreed on the correct spelling and vocalization; so, different opinions abound, and differing reports are common: frankly, some of these opinions are so far off the beaten path, are so bizarre as to be meshuggah.[[13]](#endnote-13)

We have dealt with most of this before. “Minimalist”[[14]](#endnote-14) positions usually end up denying the existence of whatever archaeological data doesn’t suit their pet theory; frequently, their use of mathematics “does not compute”; their understanding and use of 14C statistics and technology is abominable. We all make mistakes, but when so-called subject matter experts persist in failing at addition, we begin to question their sanity.

Maximalist[[15]](#endnote-15) positions can also be misleading. We believe that maximalists tend to overstate the actual biblical or archaeological message, so that opinion is made into fact. We make this error also, so we beg your indulgence as we seek to sift through the sea of opinions.

That which we seek is the neutral point of view (NPOV), which is not as easy to find as you might think. We seek to find and consider all of the evidence, neglecting no evidence, and attempt to understand and explain that evidence without adding to it or subtracting from it. This is like solving a picture puzzle, where several pieces appear to have exactly the same cut: such pieces really differ, but only slightly. In our puzzle, the pieces are old and beat up, and several are still missing. Nevertheless, as we come closer to correct solutions, parts of the puzzle snap into focus and we know that we are on the right path. Shishak Ⅰ appears to be such a part of the puzzle. Having now sifted through what seems like worthless trivia, we now find this amazing record of Shishak at Bubastis.

***Marriage***

We have suggested that one possible solution is that Shishak Ⅰ is Solomon’s father-in-law or grand-father-in-law. There may be someone else, but the period from Osorkon the Elder to Shishak is too murky to know: we also think that Siamun is a fair suggestion, but the jury must remain out on that. One military figure stands out with the capability of destroying Gezer at the beginning of Solomon’s reign and after it.[[16]](#endnote-16) However, the reference to pharaoh may only indicate that he declared battle, not that he was the tactical field commander.

Pharaoh’s daughter is also hard to place. Neither the Bible nor known Egyptian documents specify the name of such an important queen: for surely all the biblical attention lavished on her indicates that she was the Great Royal Wife of Solomon, Queen of Israel and princess of the Ma. Two problems arise. One. It is politically inconvenient to say such things out loud, to either Israelites or to Egyptians. The Meshwesh do not appear to be troubled by such scruples: yet, now that Egypt is in their control they must cater somewhat to the scruples of the Mizraim. Two. It is difficult to find unwed Meshwesh or Mizraim princesses who would be suitable candidates for such a royal wedding, who would receive all the honor due their rank, and yet remain unidentified as queen without disgrace.

Siamun does not appear to have a daughter. Indeed, we don’t know that he had any children, and his parents are not known with certainty. The parents of Psusennes Ⅱ are reported to be Pinedjem Ⅱ and Istemkheb D. His wife is unknown; he has one daughter, Maatkare B, the Great Royal Wife of Osorkon Ⅰ, who is therefore an unlikely candidate, unless remarriage after Solomon’s death is involved. Maatkare could, of course have an unidentified sister, step-sister, or even cousin. Shishak is the son of Nimlot A[[17]](#endnote-17) and Tentshepeh A. Shishak has three wives: Patareshnes,[[18]](#endnote-18) the mother of Nimlot B; Karomama A,[[19]](#endnote-19) the mother of Osorkon Ⅰ; and an unidentified wife, the mother of Iuput A and an otherwise unknown daughter, Lady Tashepenbast.[[20]](#endnote-20) Our mere suggestion is that Lady Tashepenbast could be the Great Royal Wife of Solomon, only because she is the only available candidate we could find: the title Lady may simply indicate that we are too polite to discuss the details of such an unconventional marriage. We dearly hope the scholarly community will give some greater attention to the women of this period, and attempt to solve this riddle.

***Candidates***

At our current stage of perplexity we are left with only one candidate for Solomon’s wife, Pharaoh’s daughter: namely, Lady Tashepenbast. This suggestion hangs by a mere thread, without much other evidence than that she seems to be available. Similarly, we have only one candidate with the military prowess to sack Gezer shortly after 970 BC and again in 925 BC: namely, Shishak Ⅰ. If Lady Tashepenbast is the Queen of Israel, Shishak has all the motive necessary to sack Gezer twice, especially with the way Solomon treated women. Against a united Israel an attack against Solomon may have been too risky; yet with Jeroboam Ⅰ firmly in Shishak’s pocket, Rehoboam’s power is greatly attenuated, and Judah needs to be put in its place as part of the greater agenda of reaching the Nuhašše, Anatolia, and Shankhar. Judah needs to be reminded that they are a Meshwesh vassal, a fact that Israel already embraces.

***War***

We review a list of Shishak’s conquests:

Shoshenq Ⅰ (943-922 BC): engages: Ham,[[21]](#endnote-21) Negeb, Raphia (Gaza), Beth-Tappuah,[[22]](#endnote-22) Adummim,[[23]](#endnote-23) Field of Abram,[[24]](#endnote-24) Aijalon,[[25]](#endnote-25) Aruna,[[26]](#endnote-26) Beth-Horon,[[27]](#endnote-27) Socho, Yehem, Gibeon, Hapharaim, Megiddo, Taanach, Shunem, Beth-Shan, Emeq, Rehob, Beth-Anath, Jordan, Mahanaim (Pella?), Rabbah, Kadesh, Tunip (Nuhašše or Syria), Hatti, Arzawa (Hittite in western Anatolia), Naharin (Mitanni or Assyria), Assyria, Shankhar, Beth-Olam (unknown),[[28]](#endnote-28) Hand of the King (unknown),[[29]](#endnote-29) Migdol (unknown),[[30]](#endnote-30) and Shasu.[[31]](#endnote-31)

In Wilson’s “List of Asiatic Countries,”[[32]](#endnote-32) other pharaohs reference most of Judah and Israel only generically. Until we arrive at the Valley of Jezreel and points northward, no specific information is provided. All of the specific activity takes place in Jezreel, in Nuhašše, Anatolia, and Shankhar. Shishak Ⅰ is remarkably different: one Judean city after another is listed, and the archaeological destruction of cities in the south supports the list.

We have been greatly concerned with the discussion of Israelite prominence, especially that of Judea. As a simple fact, war is very expensive. One does not go to war with a trivial adversary; one isolates trivial adversaries and moves on. Shishak takes the time and money to crush Judea precisely because Judea is a powerful and prominent adversary. Shishak dare not extend himself far to the north, leaving himself vulnerable to an attack from the rear, or to an invasion into Egypt destroying his power base. In addition he seems to have personal motives for vengeance: so, he severely cripples Judea, precisely because they are a prominent adversary with plenty of strength remaining from Solomon’s reign. Rehoboam may be an incompetent nincompoop, but that does not mean that crushing Judea is a piece of cake.

Everyone’s concern in this war is that Jerusalem is specifically mentioned in the Bible; yet, not at all in the Bubastite record.[[33]](#endnote-33) Many rush to the conclusion that this is a contradiction, when what is necessary is more evidence.

“And it came to pass, that in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, because they had transgressed against the Lord, with twelve hundred chariots, and thirty-thousand horsemen, and countless infantry that came from Egypt: Lubims, Sukkiims, and Ethiopians. He took the fenced cities which belonged to Judah, and came to Jerusalem.

“Then Shemaiah the prophet came to Rehoboam, and to the princes of Judah, who retreated to Jerusalem because of Shishak, and said unto them, ‘Thus the Lord says, You have forsaken me; therefore I have also forsaken you in the hand of Shishak.’

“Then the princes of Israel and the king humbled themselves saying, ‘The Lord is righteous.’

“When the Lord saw that they humbled themselves, the word of the Lord came to Shemaiah, saying, ‘They have humbled themselves; therefore I will not destroy them, but I will grant them some deliverance; and my wrath shall not be poured out on Jerusalem by the hand of Shishak. Nevertheless they shall be his servants; that they may know My service, and the service of the kingdoms of the countries.’

“So Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, and took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king’s house; he took all: he carried away also the shields of gold which Solomon had made. In place of which king Rehoboam made shields of brass, and committed them to the hands of the chief of the guard, that kept the entrance of the king’s house. When the king entered the house of the Lord, the guard came, carried them, and returned them to the guard chamber.

“When he humbled himself, the wrath of the Lord turned away from him; so that He would not destroy him completely: and things in Judah also went better [*after that*].”

What we see in this report is:

* Shishak came with massive force: one does not employ massive force against an insignificant adversary.
* Shishak crushed the fenced cities first, thus removing Rehoboam’s ability to defend himself.
* Shishak was stopped in part by Divine intervention. Jerusalem is always about prayer, not about human power.
* Judea is being forcefully reminded of their status as a vassal state. Now they are a vassal state on a short leash.
* Shishak took “all” that was in the king’s house; he did not take everything everywhere. His main purpose appears to be the humiliation of Rehoboam: not the people or the worship of Judea.
* Shishak took treasures from the Lord’s house; he did not molest the Ark, or the priests, or the Scripture.
* Shishak was appeased with bribes. It is also possible that he cut off Rehoboam’s right arm: although this could also have been appeased with money, or the expression could mean the disarming of Rehoboam’s troops.
* The appeasement methods worked; Jerusalem, and especially the temple were spared.

Shishak may have had personal reasons for not entering Jerusalem:

* Shishak may have feared Yahweh, at least in part.
* Shishak’s daughter may still be alive in Jerusalem.
* Shishak may have had grandchildren and other relatives in Jerusalem.
* The Meshwesh were politically astute and may not have wished to incite bitterness among the already defeated Judeans: there is a time and place to let one’s adversary up and sue for peace.

In any case, Shishak came with every intent, but withheld the defeat of Jerusalem, and wisely allowed himself the privilege of being appeased. There is nothing in this account concerning Jerusalem to brag about on the walls of Bubastis, so the archaeological evidence is in perfect accord with the biblical evidence.

There is nothing in Wilson’s “List of Asiatic Countries,”[[34]](#endnote-34) that suggests subsequent campaigns against Jeroboam Ⅰ. Why should there be? Jeroboam and Shishak have every reason to maintain a strong alliance between them. This keeps Judea from again getting out of hand. Instead, Shishak moves immediately against the cities in the Valley of Jezreel. These attacks seem more appropriate to strengthening Israel’s northern borders, than having anything to do with attacks against Israel. The control of the *Kinaḫḫu* requires a strong northern border. Interestingly, Shishak never moves against Hazor, which may indicate that the Danites are still in control there. In any case, Shishak is now free to move against Nuhašše, Anatolia, and Shankhar: demand treaties, make war, or whatever else may be on his royal agenda.

***Dates***

Since the Bubastite record establishes 925 BC as a relatively firm date, as such archaeological matter go, it also brings other things into focus.

* It provides the absolute and objective means of dating that 14C and pottery dating can never give.
* It firmly establishes the superiority of provenance over all other dating methods.
* The beauty of the Karnak Portal gate and all monuments is that their provenance is written on them.
* If 925 BC is a relatively firm date, then dates calculated backward and forward from 925 BC are equally firm: we need only know if ascension or non-ascension dating is being used. The dates after Shishak will quickly merge with the dates of other nations: Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.[[35]](#endnote-35) Dates before Shishak are as trustworthy as the “after” dates; they are just not as well supported. Even so, the biblical record has proved itself trustworthy at many points. So if 925 BC for Shishak…. Why not 970-930 BC for Solomon? Why not 1010-970 BC for David? Why not 1050-1010 BC for Saul? Why not 1406 BCfor the Exodus? Many have attacked this chronology with circumstantial subjective arguments; yet, none have disproved it. Most of these circumstantial subjective arguments have been debunked years ago.

***Conclusion***

We have examined Israel’s prominence from several perspectives. Now we examine it from the perspective of being a worthy adversary, the worthy adversary of Sheshonq Ⅰ (943-942 BC). If Israel has no prominence, no credibility for combat, why is it necessary to give political support to the north, Israel proper, sometimes called the Joseph tribes, and attack the south, Judea proper? BBS gives halfhearted support to these ideas; yet, remains unwilling to even consider biblical dates prior to 930 BC, or any dates prior to 1200 BC.[[36]](#endnote-36) BBS argues for the generic existence of David and Solomon;[[37]](#endnote-37) while failing to address the contradictory statements of some of their authorities. BBS continues to cling to the six-chambered gate hypothesis: even though they must have known that it was defeated years ago (1980).[[38]](#endnote-38)

Yes, there is “stunning convergence between the Bible and Egyptian history,” recorded on the Bubastite Portal gate at Karnak,[[39]](#endnote-39) and we are equally “stunned” by this convergence. Here is the single anchor point between the chronologies of Egypt and Israel that appears to be absolute: what was not found in 14C, seems to be here.[[40]](#endnote-40) However, we are unwilling to leave behind the sweeping implications of this convergence, and leave these implications unexamined. That being said, we are not qualified Egyptologists; our expertise is biblical, mathematical, and scientific.[[41]](#endnote-41) We have some skill at finding statistical errors and logical contradictions; still, we lack the breadth of an Egyptologist in knowing where to look for new evidence.

We do not seek either a maximalist or a minimalist solution, believing both to be flawed with dangerous biases; thus, we continue to seek the optimal solution, the neutral point of view (NPOV). We may have failed to locate Solomon’s bride or father-in-law, but at least we raised the question, while offering one possible solution, the only one we were able to find.

More pieces of the puzzle need to be found: still, we can do better with the pieces we already have. In statistical problems of any kind, more information may not be enough. More information always results in a better picture, the NPOV.

[[42]](#endnote-42)

1. Merneptah [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. We have been left with the strong impression, as far as BBS is concerned, that neither David or Solomon are real people, that Israel is a petty fiefdom located in the central highlands, led by a petty chief who may or may not have been lucky enough to wrestle Jerusalem from the Jebusites. In total opposition to any such notion of pettiness, Sheshonq Ⅰ now comes with considerable force and details of his Canaanite/Israelite campaigns, which cannot be waged against a phantom adversary. None of Sheshonq’s predecessors left record of this much military involvement this far south. The only way to escape the conclusion that Sheshonq faces a credible post-Solomonic force is to deny that Shishak and Sheshonq are the same person: enabling the 925 BC date to be shifted for Rehoboam or Sheshonq or both, thus removing any trace of convergence with Solomon, Rehoboam’s father and immediate predecessor. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. 1980, Ussishkin, David, “Was the ‘Solomonic’ City Gate at Megiddo Built by King Solomon?” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 239 (Summer, 1980), pp. 1-18 (JSTOR)

   <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1356752> [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bubastite\_Portal

   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shishak#Biblical\_narrative

   http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Karnak/feature/BubastitePortal

   http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Karnak/feature/ShoshenqICourt

   https://www.revolvy.com/main/index.php?s=Bubastite%20Portal

   http://www.touregypt.net/featurestories/karnak2.htm

   https://oi.uchicago.edu/research/publications/oip/reliefs-and-inscriptions-karnak-volume-iii-bubastite-portal

   Must read resource:

   https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/oip74.pdf [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. The University of Chicago disagrees that the dating of Sheshonq Ⅰ can be absolute in any way. Still, a lot of research has taken place since this article was written. We know of no other so striking a convergence: certainly not found among the BBS evidence. ibid [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. The author is a graduate engineer (BSME), graduate theologian (ThM), with advanced studies in business, statistics, ANOVA, exponential equations, experimental design, failure mechanics and mechanisms, computer technology, as well as a broad range of experience in military, civil and military manufacturing and design, fluid mechanics, thermodynamics, CAD, quality control, precision measurements, testing, technical research, technical writing, pastoral ministry, missions, teaching, and more; registered as an EIT in the State of Oklahoma, previously registered as a QE and as an RE with ASQ. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. We might have a spirited debate over whether or not Osorkon the Elder is the real founder of the twenty-second dynasty.

   <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shoshenq_I>

   <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shishak>

   <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bubastite_Portal>

   <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartouche> [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Meshwesh or Ma [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. This one artifact and its attendant dating is so significant that it is worth more than all pottery and radiocarbon dating put together. It shows that nothing else compares with dated written records, what antique lovers call provenance. This find linked with 1 Kings 14:25-26, fixes the provenance of David and Solomon, so that even events that long precede them are firmly fixed in place. Not even Mazar’s palace, or Ben-Tor’s six-chambered gates bear such importance either for verification or for precision of dating. This one artifact alone provides the external scientific control required by Finkelstein and others for biblical dating; the very external scientific control which 14C dating fails to provide with any real accuracy. From this point we can date forward through the Israelite and Judean kings to 722 BC (the fall of Samaria) and 586 BC (the fall of Jerusalem). Since Edwin R. Thiele cracked, *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*, there has been little difficulty in handling these dates (from 925 to 586 BC). The dates from 586 BC on are also firm, being confirmed from Assyrian, Greek, and Roman records. Few dare to dispute these dates. That being said, we can also date from this point backwards with considerable confidence, until the period of the Judges, which was largely ignored by *The Bible’s Buried Secrets*. The period of the Judges is of such great turmoil that it is impossible to date with great certainty, even though it is possible to date with great precision. This, however, is not an overwhelming obstacle: for the Bible provides a control date for Moses in 1 Kings 6:1 that may link to either Exodus 12:2 (most likely) or Deuteronomy 34:7-8 (less likely). The 1 Kings 6:1 text has two variant readings: 440 years (LXX), or 480 years (MT). This places the leadership of Moses, the Exodus, and the writing of Torah either between 1406 and 1366 BC (LXX) or between 1446 and 1406 BC (MT). That being said the Septuagint dates compress the Judges dates even farther. There is no good reason to reject the historicity of Moses, the Exodus, or the writing of Torah, or date any of them later than 1366 BC. The argument from ignorance or silence is no argument at all. After the Exodus, two years are added for the Transjordan campaigns (1366-1364 BC); placing the Jordan crossing and Jericho at 1364 BC; fixing the rest of Joshua’s actions between 1364 and 1354 BC.

   This note was first written a while ago. Since that time we have proposed an outline of Israelite chronology based on the Septuagint. We are now convinced that the Septuagint data represents a better, older Hebrew text than MT: hence, the present revisions to this note.

   <https://www.swrktec.org/old-testament-introduction>, Chapter 21, Tel Dan Stele, “Israelites”, page 11 of 28, or screen 19-21 of 47

   <http://swantec-oti.blogspot.com/2015/07/bbs-tel-dan-stele.html> “Israelites”

   <http://swantec-oti.blogspot.com/2015/07/bbs-bubastite-portal.html> [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Solomon may have built the six-chambered gate at Gezer, but it is hardly a hallmark, since it was used in at least four other cities. The Megiddo six-chambered gate is almost certainly not Solomon’s, since it was built after his reign, possibly by Jeroboam Ⅰ. At least two other six-chambered gates cannot be attributed to Solomon. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Considering the larger BBS context, this is a mammoth concession for Dever to make. This is the exact opposite of the direction in which Finkelstein seems to be going. Dever is maintaining a standard chronology, while Finkelstein is pursuing an ultra-low chronology. It also places constraints on the hypothetical central highland merger between the J Canaanites and the E Canaanites, which decrease the probability of such a merger ever taking place. Why would the Gezer Canaanites be adversarial to the merged highland Canaanites? Dever’s position tends to support the development of the united monarch of Israel, exactly the way the Bible says it developed: not centered in the central highlands, rather out of the more southerly Judean mountains. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. This conclusion was never in doubt. Still, “gates” is incorrect. There is only one certain gate: for the destruction of Gezer, possibly by Siamun (986-967 BC) or by Shoshenq Ⅰ (943-922 BC) before and Shoshenq Ⅰ after Solomon’s construction in Gezer, establishes the date. The fact that the gate itself is burned shows that it is included in this time period. Shoshenq’s ascension date (943 BC) in relationship to Solomon’s ascension date (970 BC) is not a real problem: for “Prior to his reign, Shoshenq Ⅰ had been the Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian Army, and chief advisor to his predecessor Psusennes II (967-943 BC).” Considering the Meshwesh view of leadership, and the realities of Meshwesh power structure, it may be more correct to conclude that Psusennes II and Shoshenq Ⅰ were really co-regnant and Shoshenq’s complete regnal term in office was 967-922 BC or even earlier: during which time Psusennes II was largely a puppet.

    <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shoshenq_I#Origins_and_family>

    So the gates are not “evidence that a great kingdom existed” at all. The real evidence that “a great kingdom” exists is found in the Israelite-Meshwesh alliance, which brings all of *Kinaḫḫu* territories under Meshwesh control. In terms of earthly politics, Solomon is now a Meshwesh vassal. In terms of Glory and wisdom Shoshenq is the servant of Solomon. Solomon has become the shepherd-king, priest, and prophet to the world.

    Solomon has already made Jeroboam Ⅰ, vice-gerent over the Joseph or northern tribes (1 Kings 11:28). However, Jeroboam’s real political mentor is Shoshenq (1 Kings 11:40).

    A real physical indication of Israel’s greatness is found in international hacksilber trade, which market was evidently dominated by Israel and Phoenicia.

    <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarshish> [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. <http://www.britannica.com/biography/Sheshonk-I>

    <http://www.touregypt.net/featurestories/sheshonq1.htm>

    <http://ancientneareast.org/tag/sheshonq-i/>

    <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shoshenq_I> [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Minimalist, whatever that means; minimalist is not a carefully defined term, so it is mostly thrown around like an archaeological buzzword. A minimalist is an extremely skeptical person. Thank God for skeptics, they force the careful sifting and evaluation of evidence. However, extreme skeptics are prone to throwing out biblical evidence that they don’t like: this is not NPOV. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. Another undefined archaeological buzzword. A maximalist is an extremely gullible person, particularly concerning pet issues of biblical interpretation. Maximalists have a propensity for throwing out scientific evidence they don’t like: this is not NPOV either. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
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