

Endnotes for “Recent Archaeological Discoveries that Lend Credence to the Reliability of the Scriptures,” Dr. Michael Grisanti. *Bible and Spade*, Vol. 27:1, Winter 2014.



1Ronald S. Hendel, “Is There a Biblical Archaeology?,” *BAR* 32/4 (July/August 2006) 20.

2This also recognizes the selective nature of what the Bible says that only provides part of that picture. As evangelicals we need to be cautious about overstating what a given biblical description affirms. For example, as we will develop below, in the Iron Age Jerusalem was a regionally significant city and was the center for the Israelite monarchy under David and Solomon. However, the bureaucracy of that monarchy was developing and not as impressive as it was later in parts of the Divided Monarchy.

3The primary objective of this section is not to pursue the issue of the date of the exodus from Egypt and Conquest of Canaan.

4John van Seters, “Joshua’s Campaign of Canaan and Near Eastern Historiography,” *SJOT* 1 (1990) 12.

5Manfred Görg, “Israel in Hieroglyphen,” *BN* 106 (2001) 21–27. Cf. Anthony J. Frendo, “Two Long-Lost Phoenician Inscriptions and the Emergence of Ancient Israel,” *PEQ* 134 (2002) 37–43.

6According to Hershel Shanks, James Hoffmeier and Shmuel Ahituv do not agree that the third image can be read “Israel”; “When Did Israel Begin?,” *BAR* 38/1 (January/February 2012) 61.

7These three scholars make no attempt to connect their discovery with Israel’s conquest of Canaan and issues of the historicity of that set of events.

8Lamoine F. DeVries, *Cities of the Biblical World* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997) 189.

9Michael D. Coogan, et al., eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (3d ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001) 275–76. The writer also affirms that this account in Joshua 6 “reads like a description of the later liturgical celebration of what must have been a conflict over the spring that watered the plains of Jericho” (ibid. 276).

10 John Strange, “The Book of Joshua: A Hasmonean Manifesto?” in *History and Tradition of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen* (ed. André Lemaire and Benedikt Otzen; Leiden: Brill, 1993) 141.

11 Ehud Netzer, “Jericho (Place),” *ABD* 3:724–26.

- 12 NicoloFMarchetti and Lorenzo Nigro, eds., *Quaderni di Gerico* (Rome: University of Rome, La Sapienza, 2000).
- 13 John Garstang and J.B.E. Garstang, *The Story of Jericho* (rev. ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1948) 133–53.
- 14 Kathleen Kenyon, “Jericho,” in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. Stern; New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993) 2:680 (hereafter cited as *NEAEHL*).
- 15 Kathleen M. Kenyon and Thomas A. Holland, *Excavations at Jericho* (London: British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, 1982) 3: pl. 236.
- 16 Garstang and Garstang, *Story of Jericho* 136; Kenyon, “Jericho,” in *NEAEHL*, 679–80.
- 17 Kenyon discovered six bushels of grain in one digging season; Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jericho* (London: Ernest Benn, 1957) 230.
- 18 Bryant G. Wood, “Battle over Jericho Heats Up: Dating Jericho’s Destruction: Bienkowski Is Wrong on All Counts,” *BAR* 16/5 (September/October 1990) 45, 47–49, 68–69; idem, “Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho? A New Look at the Archaeological Evidence,” 16/2 *BAR* (March/April 1990) 45–59; idem, “From Ramesses to Shiloh: Archaeological Discoveries Bearing on the Exodus–Judges Period,” in *Giving the Sense: Understanding and Using Old Testament Historical Texts* (ed. David M. Howard Jr. and Michael A. Grisanti; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2003) 256–82.
- 19 This issue is much more complicated than this paper can do justice. In general, based on pottery strata found at Megiddo, Kenyon established her pottery typology for Jericho. See K. Kenyon, “The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo,” *Levant* 1 (1969) 50–51; idem, “Palestine in the Time of the Eighteenth Dynasty,” in *CAH* (3d ed.; ed. I. Edwards et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 2.1:528–29; Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (3d ed.; New York: Praeger, 1970) 162–220.
- 20 Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* 200–202.
- 21 *Ibid.* 162–94.
- 22 *Ibid.* 198.
- 23 *Ibid.* 199–202. Figures 47 and 48 on pp. 199 and 201 provide examples of Cypriot bichrome pottery.
- 24 Kathleen M. Kenyon, “Jericho,” in *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 271.
- 25 Wood, “Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho?” 52–53; idem, “Battle over Jericho Heats Up” 49.
- 26 Wood, “Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho?” 51–52; idem, “Battle over Jericho Heats Up” 47–49.

27 Many other archaeological issues deserve consideration for a complete understanding of the date of Jericho's destruction. The above summary has selected only a small part of the evidence with which scholars interact.

28 Wood, "Did the Israelites Conquer Jericho?" 57.

29 Joseph A. Callaway, "Ai," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. Stern; New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993) 1:44.

30 Joseph A. Callaway, "New Evidence on the Conquest of Ai," *JBL* 87 (1968) 312.

31 Joseph A. Callaway, "Was My Excavation of Ai Worthwhile?," *BAR* 11/2 (March/April 1985) 68.

32 A. Mazar, "The Iron Age I," in *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel* (ed. A. Ben-Tor; trans. R. Greenberg; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992) 283. Cf. J. Maxwell Miller, "Archaeology and the Israelite Conquest of Canaan: Some Methodological Observations," *PEQ* 109 (1977) 89.

33 Bryant G. Wood, "The Search for Joshua's Ai," in *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History* (ed. Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray Jr.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008) 210–12.

34 *Ibid.* 230–31.

35 *Ibid.* 231–36.

36 In addition to a large number of storage vessels and sling stones found during the various dig seasons, in the 2012 dig season, 18 more were added to the growing arsenal. See Bryant Wood, "Outstanding Finds Made at Khirbet el-Maqatir: May 28–June 8, 2012," <http://www.biblearchaeology.org/post/2012/07/17/Outstanding-Finds-Made-at-Khirbet-el-Maqatir-May-28e28093June-8-2012.aspx> (accessed October 19, 2012).

37 More evidence of calcined bedrock and refired pottery was found during the 2012 dig season; Wood, "Outstanding Finds Made at Khirbet el-Maqatir: May 28–June 8, 2012."

38 Steven M. Ortiz, "The Archaeology of David and Solomon: Method or Madness?," in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith? A Critical Appraisal of Modern and Postmodern Approaches to Scripture* (ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Dennis R. Magary; Wheaton: Crossway, 2012) 497.

39 Jane Cahill, "Jerusalem in David and Solomon's Time: It Really Was a Major City in the Tenth Century B.C.E.," *BAR* 30/6 (November/December 2004) 20. Since 1992, of course, a number of other substantive excavations have been conducted as well.

40 Ortiz, "Archaeology of David and Solomon" 498. Amihai Mazar and John Camp, "The Search for History in the Bible: Will Tel Rehov Save the United Monarchy?," *BAR* 26/2 (March/April 2000) 38–48, 50–51, 75.

41 David M. Howard Jr., "History as History: The Search for Meaning," in *Giving the Sense* 45. For example, N.P. Lemche states: "I propose that we decline to be led by the Biblical account and instead regard it, like other legendary materials, as essentially ahistorical, this is, as a source which only exceptionally can be verified by other

information”; N.P. Lemche, *Early Israel: Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society Before the Monarchy* (VT Sup 37; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 415.

42Philip Davies dates most of the OT to the Persian period (In Search of “Ancient Israel” [JSOTSup 148; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992] 76) or the Hellenistic period (Niels Peter Lemche, “The Old Testament—A Hellenistic Book,” SJOT 7 [1993] 182), while Garbini and others place it in the Hasmonean period (Giovanni Garbini, *History and Ideology in Ancient Israel* [trans. John Bowden; New York: Crossroad, 1988] 132, 177–78).

43Gary N. Knoppers, “The Vanishing Solomon: The Disappearance of the United Monarchy from Recent Histories of Ancient Israel,” JBL 116 (1997) 20; William Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 23.

44Anson F. Rainey, “The ‘House of David’ and the House of the Deconstructionists,” BAR 20/6 (November/December 1994) 47.

45Baruch Halpern, “The Minimalist Assault on Ancient Israel” BR 11/6 (December 1995) 26–35.

46Niels Peter Lemche, *The Israelites in History and Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998) 166.

47P.R. Davies, *In Search of ‘Ancient Israel’* (2d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

48Giovanni Garbini, trans., Chiara Peri, *Myth and History in the Bible* (JSOT Sup 362; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003).

49Niels P. Lemche, *The Israelites in History and Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998).

50John Van Seters, *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (repr. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997); idem, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009).

51Thomas L. Thompson, *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past* (London: J. Cape, 1999); idem, *Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).

52David Ord and Robert Coote (minimalists) contend that “[m]any biblical stories are like Animal Farm. They are true, though not historically accurate or factual. They are concerned with proclaiming a message, not with providing us with a chronology of events from the history of Israel or the life of Jesus of Nazareth. We must learn to read them not as history but as message.” David R. Ord and Robert B. Coote, *Is the Bible Really True?* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994) 33, cf. 120.

53Davies writes, “I doubt whether the term ‘Deuteronomistic History’ should continue to be used by scholars as if it were a fact instead of a theory” (Davies, In Search of “Ancient Israel” 131; cf. Lemche, “The Old Testament—A Hellenistic Book?” 163–93).

54Philip Davies “suspects that the figure of King David is about as historical as King Arthur” (“House of David” Built on Sand: The Sins of the Biblical Maximizers,” *BAR* 20/4 [July/August 1994] 55; cf. idem, “The Search for History in the Bible—What Separates a Minimalist from a Maximalist? Not Much,” *BAR* 26/2 [March/April 2000] 72). Cf. Philip R. Davies, *In Search of “Ancient Israel”* 16–48; Margaret M. Gelinias, “United Monarchy—Divided Monarchy: Fact of Fiction?” in *The Pitcher Is Broken: Memorial Essays for Gösta W. Ahlström* (ed. Steven Holloway and Lowell K. Handy; *JSOT Sup* 190; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 227–37; Thomas L. Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written and Archaeological Sources (Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East, 4; Leiden: Brill, 1994)* 306–7.

55David Ussishkin, “Solomon’s Jerusalem: The Text and the Facts on the Ground,” in *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period* (ed. Andrew Vaughn and Ann Killebrew; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003) 112.

56Margreet Steiner, “It’s Not There: Archaeology Proves a Negative,” *BAR* 24/4 (July/August 1998) 33.

57Steiner, “It’s Not There” 27.

58Ortiz, “Archaeology of David and Solomon” 497–98.

59A. Biran and J. Naveh, Avraham Biran and Joseph Naveh, “An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan,” *IEJ* 43/2–3 (1993) 81–98; idem, “The Tel Dan Inscription: A New Fragment,” *IEJ* 45 (1995) 1–18.

60Biran and Naveh, “Aramaic Stele Fragment” 93, 95–96.

61Knoppers, “Vanishing Solomon” 36.

62Lemche that the “House of David” reference in the Tel Dan inscription only indicates the Judah existed. It does not prove that David was historical, that he ever lived, or that he ever ruled southern Palestine. It is only “circumstantial evidence” for David’s existence. Niels Peter Lemche, *The Old Testament between Theology and History: A Critical Survey* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008) 115.

63Cartledge, 1 & 2 Samuel, 9.

64Dever has expended great energy in excoriating the minimalists for the absolute rejection of numerous archaeological discoveries that he regards as compelling evidence for the credibility of various persons and customs found in the Bible. For example, see Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know?* 124–56; idem, “Save Us from Postmodern Malarkey,” *BAR* 26/2 (March/April 2000) 28–35, 68–69.

65Israel Finkelstein, “Digging for the Truth: Archaeology and the Bible,” in *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel* (ed. Brian B. Smith; Archaeology and Biblical Studies 17; Atlanta: SBL, 2007) 10–12. It should be noted that by “conservatives” Finkelstein does not refer to evangelicals, but to scholars of the Albright school like William G. Dever and Nelson Glueck. For others he includes in this “conservative” category, see *ibid.*, 200. In that bibliography, Kenneth Kitchen and

the contributors to *The Future of Biblical Archaeology* are labeled as “ultra-conservative.”

66Israel Finkelstein, “The Date of the Philistine Settlement in Canaan,” *TA* 22 (1995) 213–39; idem, “The Archaeology of the United Monarchy: An Alternative View,” *Levant* 28 (1996) 177–87.

67Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, *David and Solomon: In Search of the Bible’s Sacred Kings and the Roots of the Western Tradition* (New York: Free Press, 2006) 80.

68Ibid., 80.

69Ibid. 94, 122–23.

70Ibid. 96–97.

71Ibid. 159–61.

72Ibid. 282–84. Finkelstein and Silberman focus on Tell el-Kheleifah, a site 15 miles north of Elath and contend that there is no evidence of copper mining there. However, the narratives describing Solomon’s reign do not name where he mined copper. See the below section dealing with Khirbet en-Nahas, further to the northeast.

73Robert Draper, “David and Solomon, Kings of Controversy,” *National Geographic* 218/6 (December 2010) 85.

74Finkelstein and Silberman, *David and Solomon* 50–53.

75Ibid. 98–106.

76Ibid. 112.

77Ibid. 90.

78Ibid. 87.

79Ibid. 154–77. The biblical account of the Queen of Sheba’s visit to Solomon is “an anachronistic seventh-century set piece meant to legitimize the participation of Judah in the lucrative Arabian trade” (ibid. 171).

80Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origins of Its Sacred Texts* (New York: Free Press, 2001) 143.

81Dever, *What Did the Biblical Writers Know?* 56.

82Of course, this belief is not at all the same as an evangelical acceptance of the historical reliability of the biblical narratives as a whole.

83Yigael Yadin, “Solomon’s City Wall and Gate at Gezer,” *IEJ* 8 (1958) 80–86.

84Ortiz, “Archaeology of David and Solomon”499. Ammon Ben Tor’s recent excavations at Hazor confirm Yadin’s conclusions concerning the six-chambered gate structure at Hazor; A. Ben-Tor, “Hazor and the Archaeology of the Tenth Century,” *IEJ* 48 (1998) 1–37; idem, “Excavating Hazor: Solomon’s City Rises from the Ashes,” *BAR* 25/2 (March/April 1999) 26–37, 60.

85Amihai Mazar, "Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative: The Case of the United Monarchy," in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* (ed. R. G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann; BZAW 405; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010) 51–52. In another article, he writes that he believes that "the Bible has reserved data taken from early written documents and oral traditions based on a long-lived common memory, although these early traditions were dressed in literary and sometimes mythological clothing, and were inserted into the later Israelite historiographic narrative, with its substantial theological and ideological mantle. Archaeology can help to uncover the historical kernels in the biblical traditions in those cases where they survived, *but it is also capable of invalidating the historicity of those texts, as in the case of the conquest narratives*" (emphasis added); A. Mazar, "Israeli Archaeology: Achievements and the Current State of Research," *Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 29 (2011) 20.

86Three articles in the same issue of *BAR* provide an accessible survey of the debate concerning the existence of Jerusalem: Steiner, "It's Not There" 26–30, 32–33, 62–63; Jane Cahill, "It Is There: The Archaeological Evidence Proves It," *BAR* 24 (July/August 2004) 34–36, 38–41; Nadav Na'aman, "It Is There: Ancient Texts Prove It," *BAR* 24 (July/August 2004) 42–44.

87Steiner, "It's Not There" 26–30, 32–33, 62–63.

88Nadav Na'aman, "Cow Town or Royal Capital? Evidence for Iron Age Jerusalem," *BAR* 23/4 (July/August 1997) 43–47, 67; Cahill, "It Is There" 36. Cf. Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem* (London: Ernest Benn, 1974) 94.

89Alan R. Millard, "David and Solomon's Jerusalem: Do the Bible and Archaeology Disagree," in *Israel: Ancient Kingdom or Late Invention?* (ed. Daniel I. Block; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2009) 198.

90Kathleen Kenyon, *Digging up Jerusalem* (London: Ernest Benn, 1974) 92, 98–106, 114; Yigal Shiloh, "The City of David, 1987–1983," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem April 1984* (ed. A. Biran et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985) 453–54; Eilat Mazar, "Did I Find King David's Palace?," *BAR* 32/1 (January/February 2006) 16–27, 70.

91Jane M. Cahill, "Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy: The Archaeological Evidence," in *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period* (ed. Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew; Atlanta: SBL, 2003) 76.

92Cahill, "Jerusalem in David and Solomon's Time" 21.

93R.A.S. MacAlister and J. Garrow Duncan, *Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, Jerusalem 1923–1925* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1926) 51–55; Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem* 192–93; Yigal Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David: Vol. I: 1978–1982: Interim Report of the First Five Seasons* (Qedem 19; Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, 1984)

15–17, 26–27; Eilat Mazar, *Preliminary Report on the City of David Excavation 2005 at the Visitors Center Area* (Jerusalem: Shalem, 2007) esp. 52–66.

94MacAlister dated this structure to the Jebusite period while Shiloh and Mazar date it to the beginning of Iron Age II, the tenth century. Shiloh wrote: “We assume that it served as a sort of huge supporting wall for a superstructure rising at the top of the eastern slope, at the northern end of the hill of the City of David” (*Excavations at the City of David* 27).

95Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) 59, pl. 20 on 46.

96Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David* 27. Cf. Yigal Shiloh, *The Proto-Aeolic Capitals and Israelite Ashlar Masonry* (Qedem 11; Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, 1984) 10–11, 14–25, 88–91.

97Mazar, *Preliminary Report on the City of David Excavation* 63; Mazar, “Did I Find King David’s Palace?” 25–26. Amihai Mazar points out that the Stepped Stone Structure and the Large Stone Structure are bonded and that the pottery found by all three excavations (Kenyon, Shiloh, and E. Mazar) is homogenous and uncontaminated. Consequently, A. Mazar concludes that the Iron Age I pottery is as close as it can be to the construction date of this large architectural complex. A. Mazar, “Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative” 41.

98Mazar, “Did I Find King David’s Palace?” 18–20. See Todd Bolen, “Identifying King David’s Palace: Mazar’s Flawed Reading of the Biblical Text,” *Bible and Interpretation*, <http://www.bibleinterp.com/opeds/ident357928.shtml> (accessed November 11, 2012), for a helpful critique of Mazar’s attempt to use 2 Samuel 7 to establish her identification of the Large Stone Structure as David’s palace.

99A. Mazar, “Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative” 45.

100A. Faust, “Did Eilat Mazar Find David’s Palace?,” *BAR* 38/5 (September/October 2012) 51–52.

101Jane M. Cahill and David Tarler, “Response,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, June–July 1990* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993) 626.

102Cahill, “Jerusalem at the Time of the United Monarchy” 73.

103David H. Fischer, *Historians’ Fallacies: Toward Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970) 62.

104Michael G. Hasel, “New Excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa and the Early History of Judah,” in *Do Historical Matters Matter to Faith?* 487.

105Mazar, “Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative” 49.

106Hasel, “New Excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa and the Early History of Judah” 490.

107In his essay (*ibid.* 488–96), Hasel offers ten ways that the discoveries at Khirbet Qeiyafa contribute to our understanding of the tenth century BC and the identification and emergence of Judah. For additional potential areas of contribution, see Yosef

Garfinkel, Saar Ganor, and Michael Hasel, "The Contribution of Khirbet Qeiyafa to Our Understanding of the Iron Age Period," *Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 28 (2010) 43–52.

108Hasel, "New Excavations at Khirbet Qeiyafa" 490.

109Ibid. 488–89. Hasel points out that the survey conducted by Tel Aviv University identified hardly any early Iron II sites in the Shephelah or the Hill Country, creating the false impression that Judah and the Shephelah was a relatively empty land during the tenth and ninth centuries BC (ibid. 489).

110Ibid. 491.

111Ibid. 488.

112Ibid. 490.

113Ibid. 492.

114For just a handful of sources dealing with the linguistic issues, see Haggai Misgav, Yosef Garfinkel, and Saar Ganor, "The Ostrakon," in *Khirbet Qeiyafa Vol. 1: Excavation Report 2007–2008* (ed. Yosef Garfinkel and Saar Ganor; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2009) 243–57; Emile Peuch, "L'Ostrakon de Khirbet Qeiyafa et les débuts de la royauté en Israël," *RB* 117 (2010) 162–84; Gershon Galil, "The Hebrew Inscription from Khirbet Qeiyafa/Neta'im, Script, Language, Literature and History," *UF* 41 (2009) 193–242; Gerard Leval, "Ancient Inscription Refers to Birth of Israelite Monarchy," *BAR* 38/3 (May/June 2012) 41–43, 70.

115Gary A. Rendsburg, "Review of Ron E. Tappy and P. Kyle McCarter, eds., *Literate Culture and Tenth Century Canaan*," *BASOR* 359 (2010) 89.

116Levin identifies Khirbet Qeiyafa with Saul's fortified camp (ma'gal—1 Sam 17:20); Y. Levin, "The Identification of Khirbet Qeiyafa: A New Suggestion," *BASOR* 367 (August 2012) 81–84. Levin makes no conclusions about the historicity of the event or Saul based on his identification of the settlement.

117I. Finkelstein originally identified Qeiyafa as a Canaanite city ("A Great United Monarchy? Archaeological and Historical Perspectives," in *One God—One Cult—One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives* 17–19. However, in a more recent article Finkelstein and A. Fantalkin contend that the settlement was occupied by northern Israelites ("Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Unsensational Archaeological and Historical Interpretation," *TA* 29 [2012] 52–54). This goes along with their belief that the northern kingdom developed before the southern kingdom.

118Nadav Na'aman, "Khirbet Qeiyafa in Context," *UF* 42 (2010) 497–526.

119Mazar, "Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative" 49.

120This place name means "ruins of copper" in Arabic.

121Thomas E. Levy and Mohammad Najjar, "Edom & Copper: The Emergence of Ancient Israel's Rival," *BAR* 32/4 (July/August 2004) 26.

122Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2001) 68.

123Ibid. 40.

124Levy and Najjar, "Edom and Copper" 27.

125Ibid. 26.

126Nelson Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1970) 67–73. Glueck (ibid. 73) concluded that, based on the pottery fragments he found, the most important periods of mining activity were during and after the reign of Solomon.

127J. R. Bartlett, *Edom and the Edomites* (*JSOT Sup* 77; Sheffield: *JSOT*, 1989) 213.

128Piotr Bienkowski, "The Edomites: The Archaeological Evidence from Transjordan," in *You Shall Not Abhor an Edomite for He Is Your Brother: Edom and Seir in History and Tradition* (*Archaeology and Biblical Studies* 3; ed. Diana V. Edelman; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) 44. This king is mentioned on Prism B of Esarhaddon (c. 673–672 BC) and in a description of the first campaign of Ashurbanipal (c. 667 BC). Although he argues for this late dating of Edom as an organized society, he does mention evidence unpublished in 1995 that pointed to the possibility of a tenth-century BC dating for charcoal samples taken from various mining sites in the area of Khirbet en-Nahas (ibid. 45–46).

129Levy and Najjar, "Edom and Copper" 32.

130Ibid. 32–33. The twelfth-century BC date for the earliest layers of their dig is confirmed by the discovery of an Egyptian scarab from the earliest level of a worker's building that had a radiocarbon date of twelfth or eleventh century BC (ibid. 33). For a fuller treatment of the radiocarbon evidence, see Thomas E. Levy and others, "Reassessing the Chronology of Biblical Edom" 869–77, and Thomas E. Levy and others, "High-Precision Radiocarbon Dating and Historical Biblical Archaeology in Southern Jordan," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105/483 (October 28, 2008) 16461–65.

131Four-chambered gates in Israel generally preceded the peak of Solomon's reign in the middle of the tenth century BC when he installed six-chambered gates as part of refortifying strategic Israelite cities (1 Kgs 9:15–19).

132Thomas E. Levy and others, "Reassessing the Chronology of Biblical Edom: New Excavations and 14C dates from Khirbat en-Nahas (Jordan)," *Antiquity* 78/302 (December 2004) 874–76.

133Draper, "David and Solomon, Kings of Controversy" 84. Cf. Levy and others, "High-Precision Radiocarbon Dating" 16462.

134Levy and Najjar, "Edom and Copper" 26.

135In other words, Edom was able to construct major buildings, defend itself with strong fortifications, and create a technologically sophisticated organization to draw copper from ore, and probably able to field an army; Levy and Najjar, “Edom and Copper” 35.

136Levy and Najjar, “Edom and Copper” 35.

137Excavations that have been conducted southwest of Khirbet en-Nahas (Timna) have come to conclusions that are quite similar to the ones offered by Levy and Najjar. See E. Ben-Yosef, R. Shaar, L. Tauxe, and H. Ron, “A New Chronological Framework for Iron Age Copper Production at Timna (Israel),” *BASOR* 367 (August 2012) 31–71.

138In an interview conducted by National Geographic, Finkelstein rejects a tenth-century dating for Khirbet en-Nahas without evidence. He compares the fortress at the copper mines with eighth-century Assyrian fortresses built in Israel. He regards the carbon dating of various items at Khirbet en-Nahas as meaningless (Draper, “David and Solomon, Kings of Controversy” 87).

139DeVries, *Cities of the Biblical World* 190.

140Draper, “David and Solomon, Kings of Controversy” 87.