

connection with the temple is largely a ceremonial one, and he uses the otherwise closed east-gate to enter it on certain regal occasions.

Perhaps a comparison could be made between Jesus and Moses, who was a type of Jesus. The high priest was Aaron, but his overseer was Moses. Moses did not actually carry out the offering of sacrifices, but he supervised the work of Aaron and his sons while carrying out his own work of ruling and judging the people. Remember that Moses had a special relationship with the Deity. He did not eat or drink for forty days and nights while in Mount Sinai, and when he came down from the mount his face shone like the face of the Lord Jesus Christ after the transfiguration.

A similar situation will surely apply in the millennial age. The Lord Jesus Christ sits in Jerusalem as the supreme ruler and judge of the world, while the mortal high priest, the prince, carries out or supervises the temple sacrifices. It is obvious that this work would occupy a huge

amount of time, and the Lord could not be expected to spend almost all his daily work time as the King of kings in cutting up carcasses and preparing them for sacrifice on an altar.

The nations of the world will come to Jerusalem to hear the word of Yahweh emanating from the great King who reigns from the throne of David in Mount Zion. But they will not be permitted in the temple precincts. The Law was a schoolmaster, as Paul says, to bring the people to an understanding of Christ. The sacrifices in the millennial age are a memorial of that Law and its fulfilment; they are for Israel after the flesh in the latter day, and for those Gentiles who align themselves with Israel.

The prince, then, would seem to be the latter-day equivalent of the Aaronic high priest, appointed by the Lord Jesus Christ from among the sons of Zadok (who was a descendant of Eleazar, son of Aaron) to be chief over them and to carry out the work once assigned to Aaron and the subsequent high priests of Israel.

Solomon's peaceful reign and the removal of the Amalekites*

Deborah Hurn

IN MY TWO-PART article about the Amalekites I put the case for the Amalekites being the Hyksos who ruled Egypt for a time.¹ As such they would have been dominant in the Middle East for three to four centuries. During this time of Amalekite supremacy the Israelites seem to have been the only people in the region who incessantly struggled for their independence. By their resistance they frustrated Amalek's ambitions to dominate the Levant, which may have facilitated the eventual downfall of their régime in Egypt.

Not long after, King Saul's military campaigns completed the collapse of their empire throughout the region, and removed any threat of immediate recovery. No wonder, then, that relations were so good between Solomon and Pharaoh. The Egyptians must have been very positive toward Israel for a generation or two, although they quickly took advantage of the political turmoil after Solomon's death. Just five years into the reign of Rehoboam, Shishak invaded Jerusa-

lem and plundered the king's house and the temple (1 Kgs. 14:25,26).

After the Exodus the Egyptians do not appear again in the Scriptures until the reign of King Solomon. Pharaoh made a marriage alliance with Solomon (3:1) and sold horses and chariots to Israel (10:28,29). Under a revised chronology, remains at the Timna copper mines, a few miles north of Eilat, show that Solomon and Pharaoh shared resources and technology. These are all indicators of a convalescent Egyptian economy, in which the pharaohs deemed it best to cooperate with stronger local powers and increase trade. Their first priority was to restore Egypt's fortunes after centuries of pillaging, so that the once-mighty empire could recover from oblivion. All this supports the idea that the Egyptian war of

* All quotations from the RSV.

1. "The Amalekites", [Nov. 2003, p. 423](#); [Dec. 2003, p. 459](#).

liberation from the Hyksos must have taken place before the time of Solomon.

The only mention of an Egyptian military event during Solomon's time, however, is Pharaoh's conquering of Gezer (9:16). This prominent Canaanite city on the southern border of Ephraim was only thirty kilometres (eighteen miles) from Jerusalem. This action could not have been an Egyptian offensive against Israel or a confrontation would have resulted. The exercise must have been with Solomon's consent, just as one noble may invite another to go hunting on his estate and allow him to keep the game.

Pharaoh gave the city as a dowry to his daughter, Solomon's wife. Here is another hint at Egypt's relative impoverishment, in that Pharaoh may not have had goods of sufficient value to bestow upon his daughter. Solomon was already wealthy beyond all counting, so that precious metals and livestock could not impress him. The elimination of a Canaanite stronghold in the very heart of Israel, however, was a truly useful present, especially as Solomon himself was averse to warfare.

Israel's position as a buffer between Egypt and Syria may also have safeguarded the maritime cities of Tyre and Sidon. In all the long

period of the Judges, the Israelites had made little technological progress. The transformation from desert nomads to farmers and city dwellers was a slow one. While the Israelites were dealing with enemies in their midst and their own tribal conflicts, the Zidonians' peace and development was uninterrupted. Thus their skills in timber and metalworking, shipbuilding, sailing and all the arts developed far beyond those of the Israelites (5:6; 9:26,27). There may have been some intermarriage between the tribe of Dan in the north and the people of Lebanon (2 Chron. 2:13,14). Hiram, king of Tyre, "always loved David" (1 Kgs. 5:1) and spoke of Solomon as his brother (9:13), and both kings of Israel reaped the economic benefits of his gratitude.

The great peace and prosperity of Solomon's reign was a direct result of the decline of Amalek's dominion, which had left a great power vacuum in the Middle East. Solomon, however, saw this as an act of God, and wrote to Hiram saying: "the LORD [Yahweh] my God has given me rest on every side; there is neither adversary nor misfortune" (5:4). The rise and fall of world powers can always be explained by the 'natural' processes of policy and economy, but the invisible hands of the Elohim guide them all.

Evidence for the Israelites in Assyria

Tony Benson

THE TEN-TRIBE kingdom of Israel was subject to several invasions by the Assyrians, culminating in the capture of the capital Samaria in 722 B.C., which brought the kingdom to its end. The account of these invasions in 2 Kings several times records that the Assyrians took the Israelites into captivity to various parts of the Assyrian Empire (15:29; 17:6; 18:11).

A recent article in *Biblical Archaeology Review*¹ deals with the archaeological evidence for this carrying into captivity, which is of two types. The first is the more well known: the Assyrian kings recorded the fact. 2 Kings records: "In the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-bethmaachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazer, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria" (15:29). There are a number of references in the Assyrian records to this invasion of northern Israel, which seems to have taken place in 732 B.C., and in

them it is recorded that 13,520 Israelites were taken captive and carried off to Assyria.

The end of the northern kingdom came ten years later when, after a three-year siege, Samaria was taken, probably by Sargon, though Shalmaneser started the siege. There are two similar references to this in 2 Kings, one of which says: "In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes" (17:6; cf. 18:10,11). This is referred to in two inscriptions of Sargon, who says that he carried the Israelites into captivity in Assyria and settled other people in their stead in Israel, something which 2 Kings 17 goes on to record. Some years later Sargon captured part of Media

1. "Israelites in Exile: Their Names Appear at All Levels of Assyrian Society", K. Lawson Younger Junior, *Biblical Archaeology Review*, Nov./Dec. 2003, p. 46.