

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #178; February, 2013 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830 / emahiser.christogenea.org

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and seventy-eighth monthly teaching letter and continues my fifteenth year of publication. Since WTL #137, I have been continuing a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*, and have been expanding on its seven stages ever since: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage.

THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 37: THE ESTRANGEMENT continued:

In lesson 177, I brought forward the inspiration of the book of Hosea concerning the estrangement process which eventually caused the whole house of Israel, and approximately two-thirds of the house of Judah, to be taken captive into Assyria on four different forays by various Assyrian kings. As I stated near the end of WTL #177: When all of Israel, and about two-thirds of Judah, were deported into Assyria, as a result of their Yahweh-given punishment, they found themselves within a multiracial, multicultural, cosmopolitan environment similar to New York, N.Y. of America today. The original King James Bible included the Apocrypha, where at II Esdras 13:39-45 we are given substantial evidence of why and where they went from there:

“³⁹ And whereas thou sawest that he gathered another peaceable multitude unto him; ⁴⁰ Those are the ten tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Salmanasar the king of Assyria led away captive, and he carried them over the waters and so came they into another land. ⁴¹ But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt. ⁴² That they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. ⁴³ And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river. ⁴⁴ For the most High then shewed signs for them, and held still the flood, till they were passed over. ⁴⁵ For through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half: and the same region is called Arsareth.”

From this passage I will concentrate on II Esdras 13:41-42 where it states: **“⁴¹ But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt. ⁴² That they might there keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land.”**

This is extremely important, for if Israel and the part of Judah that were taken into Assyria resolved to “**keep their statutes which they never kept in their own land**”, it would include the ten commandments, especially “**Thou shalt not commit adultery**” (*i.e.*, race-mix)! To accomplish such a goal, they would have had to do as Ezra did at Ezr. 10:2-3, 5-12:

“² **And Shechaniah the son of Jehiel, one of the sons of Elam, answered and said unto Ezra, We have trespassed against our Elohim, and have taken strange wives of the people of the land: yet now there is hope in Israel concerning this thing.** ³ **Now therefore let us make a covenant with our Elohim to put away all the wives, and such as are born of them,** according to the counsel of Yahweh, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our Elohim; and let it be done according to the law ... ⁵ **Then arose Ezra, and made the chief priests, the Levites, and all Israel, to swear that they should do according to this word. And they sware.** ⁶ **Then Ezra rose up from before the house of Elohim, and went into the chamber of Johanan the son of Eliashib: and *when* he came thither, he did eat no bread, nor drink water: for he mourned because of the transgression of them that had been carried away.** ⁷ **And they made proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem unto all the children of the captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem;** ⁸ **And that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the elders, all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away.** ⁹ **Then all the men of Judah and Benjamin gathered themselves together unto Jerusalem within three days. It was the ninth month, on the twentieth *day* of the month; and all the people sat in the street of the house of Elohim, trembling because of *this* matter, and for the great rain.** ¹⁰ **And Ezra the priest stood up, and said unto them, Ye have transgressed, and have taken strange wives, to increase the trespass of Israel.** ¹¹ **Now therefore make confession unto Yahweh Elohim of your fathers, and do his pleasure: and separate yourselves from the people of the land, and from the strange wives.** ¹² **Then all the congregation answered and said with a loud voice, As thou hast said, so must we do.”**

Inasmuch as Ezra and all his Levites, along with Judah and Benjamin resolved all this, those taken captive to Assyria could do no less! From the substantial evidence in II Esdras, we can be quite sure that these Israelite captives enforced something quite similar to what we just witnessed from the book of Ezra. While we don't have any record of how this might have been done, anthropologically, there is evidence that Caucasian blood made its way to the Indians of India, where they use the caste system to place themselves at social levels according to how much mixture (ratio of white to dark) they might be. Not only that, but there are people both in China and Japan who are almost entirely white, showing an infusion of Caucasian blood. Therefore, I can imagine a possibility that the castoff half-breeds of Israel and Judah made their way from Assyria to India, China and Japan. If such was the case, when the twelve tribes made their way into Europe, there wouldn't have been anyone of mixed-blood among them! That is why, I believe, we have the witness of II Esdras 13:39-45. And if Israel and Judah didn't

castoff the offspring of their miscegenation, they didn't "**keep their statutes**" as it is recorded they resolved to do.

How did the Israelites travel on their "great way to go"?: In order to find out, let's go to Hosea 12:8-10:

"⁸ And Ephraim said, Yet I am become rich, I have found me out substance: in all my labours they shall find none iniquity in me that were sin. ⁹ And I that am Yahweh thy Elohim from the land of Egypt will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feast. ¹⁰ I have also spoken by the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and used similitudes, by the ministry of the prophets."

The *New American Standard Bible* reads:

"⁸ And Ephraim said, 'Surely I have become rich, I have found wealth for myself; In all my labors they will find in me No iniquity, which *would be* sin.' ⁹ But I have been Yahweh your Elohim since the land of Egypt; I will make you live in tents again, As in the days of the appointed festival. ¹⁰ I have also spoken to the prophets, And I gave numerous visions, And through the prophets I gave parables."

As Bertrand L. Comparet explained, the Assyrians wouldn't let the Israelites build cities for fear that they would fortify them, and they might throw off Assyria's control over them. Instead, the Israelites were allowed only small wretched hovels or tents to live in. Actually, this way of living became advantageous to the Israelites, as they could mount a tent on a four-wheeled wagon (what we now call a "covered wagon") and become quite mobile. When we came to America, we were still using covered wagons on our way to populate the West. Even today, we work all week long to perfectly manicure every blade of grass in our lawn, and then pack a tent, or hook up a house-trailer or jump into a motor-home and go out somewhere and light up a barbecue, and play in a patch of weeds. In a way, the people who go camping quite often during the temperate seasons of year are keeping the Feast of Tabernacles almost on a weekly basis. It's the type of activity that keeps families together; that is, if one camps with his own kind. Surely one would not want to swim in the same swimming pool with an n-word. C-words and n-words are to be kept segregated in all social intercourse, all political intercourse, all religious intercourse, all monetary intercourse, and especially, all sexual intercourse!

What we have to understand is, where the KJV renders "tabernacles" at Hosea 12:9, it is describing tents. Christ spoke of His body as a Temple (i.e., tabernacle or tent) at John 2:18-21:

"¹⁸ Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? ¹⁹ Yahshua answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. ²⁰ Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? ²¹ But he spake of the temple of his body."

Paul speaks of the body as a temple at 1 Cor. 6:18-20:

"¹⁸ Flee fornication (i.e., race-mixing). Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication (i.e., race-mixing) sinneth against his

own body. ¹⁹ What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit *which is* in you, which ye have of Yahweh, and ye are not your own? ²⁰ For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify Yahweh in your body, and in your spirit, which are Yahweh's.

There are problems with both "temple", (Strong's Hebrew #1964) and "tent", (Strong's Hebrew #168), for they are words derived from Latin, and no writer of Biblical Scripture ever wrote in that language. Although these two Strong's numbers represent two different Hebrew words, the subjects of both are closely related. Though I have a mountain of data, both books and electronic programs, information concerning Strong's #'s 1964 & 168 are somewhat hard to come by. On the term "tabernacle", the 4-volume *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol R-Z, p. 498 clears up the matter somewhat where it states:

"TABERNACLE. ... dwelling ... to dwell. A sacred tent, a portable sanctuary, said to have been erected by Moses. It was the place at which the God of Israel revealed himself to and dwelt among his people. It also housed the ark and accompanied Israel during the wilderness period. It is stated that it was located in several places in Canaan after Israel's settlement in that land and finally was replaced by Solomon's temple" [*underlining mine*]

Ibid: p. 534: **"TEMPLE, JERUSALEM.** There were in the biblical period three successive temples in Jerusalem on the same site: [1] Solomon's, [2] Zerubbabel's, and [3] Herod's. The site is identified without question; it is that of the presently standing and justly famous Muslim shrine known as Qubbet es-Sakhra, the "Dome of the Rock" (sometimes incorrectly called the Mosque of Omar), completed in A.D. 691 ..." [*brackets and underlining mine*]

We see two important facts revealed in the above two paragraphs: (1) that the "Temple" was a replacement for the "Tabernacle" tent, and (2) There were three Temples built at Jerusalem on the same site, and all three were destroyed. Most Bible students forget to count Herod's temple as the third one. There were three; NOT two! And there will NOT be a fourth temple at Jerusalem, (Jer. 19:11)! To get a better handle on this topic, I will quote from the 3-volume *The Popular And Critical Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, pp. 1640-1641:

"TEMPLE: ... *hay-kawl'*, or *ko'desh*, sanctuary or ... *bayth-yeh-hovaier'*, house of Jehovah). The Septuagint translation usually renders ... *hay-kawl'*, 'temple,' by *oi-kos* ... but in the Apocrypha and the New Testament it is generally called *toh hee-er-on*"

"1. Solomon's Temple. (1) Conception. After the Israelites had exchanged their nomadic life for a life in permanent habitations, it was becoming that they should exchange also their movable sanctuary or tabernacle for a temple. There elapsed, however, after the conquest of Palestine, several centuries during which the sanctuary continued movable, although the nation became more and more stationary. It appears that the first who planned the erection of a stone-built sanctuary was David (1 Chron. xxviii:12, 19), who, when he was inhabiting his house of cedar, and God had given him rest from all his enemies (2 Sam. vii:12; 1 Chron. xvii:1-14; xxviii:1 sq.), meditated the design of building a temple in which the ark of God might be placed, instead of being deposited 'within curtains,' or in a tent, as hitherto. This design was at first encouraged

by the prophet Nathan; but he was afterwards instructed to tell David that such a work was less appropriate for him, who had been a warrior from his youth, and had shed much blood, than for his son, who should enjoy in prosperity and peace the rewards of his father's victories (1 Chron. xxii:8). Nevertheless, the design itself was highly approved as a token of proper feelings towards the Divine King (2 Sam. vii:1-12; 1 Chron. xvii:1-14; xxviii)."

Ibid. pp. 1626-1627: "**TABERNACLE:** ... (Heb. ... *o' hel mo-ade'*, tent of assembly, from a root, to fix or appoint time and place of meeting)" ... "**1. Names.** Kimchi explains the name thus: '*And thus was called the o'-hel-mo-ade, because the Israelites were assembled and congregated there, and also because he (Jehovah) met there with Moses,*' etc. It is from the Hebrew word meaning *tent of testimony*, or to witness. The Septuagint almost constantly uses the phrase, *tent of testimony*. The Vulgate has *tabernaculum fæderis, tent of the covenant*. With this rendering agrees Luther's *Stiftshutte*. The Chaldee and Syrian translators have, *tent of festival*."

Other Hebrew terms are: "**1. Soke**, Heb. ... *sook-kaw'*, both from *saw-kak'*, to *entwine*, are used to denote a booth, a hut (Lev. xxiii:34; Ps. lxxvi:2; Job xxxvi:29; Is. iv:6; Amos ix:11; Zech, xiv:16). **2. Sik-kooth'**, employed to denote an *idolatrous* booth which the worshipers of idols constructed in their honor, as was the tabernacle of the covenant in honor of Jehovah (Amos v:26).

"The Greek terms for tabernacle are: (1) *Skaynay'* ..., any structure made of skin, cloth, green boughs, etc. (Matt, xvii:4; Mark ix:5; Luke, ix:33, John vii:2; Heb. xi:9, etc.): The 'tabernacle of Moloch' (Acts vii:43; comp. Amos v:26), was a portable shrine, in which was carried the image of the god. (2) *Skay'no-mah* ... , used of the tabernacle, etc. **2. Three Tabernacles:** We may distinguish in the Old Testament three sacred tabernacles:

"**(1) The Ante-Sinaitic**, which was probably the dwelling of Moses, and was placed by the camp of the Israelites in the desert, for the transaction of public business (Exod. xxxiii:7). **(2) The Sinaitic Tabernacle.** The *Ante-Sinaitic* tabernacle, which had served for the transaction of public business probably from the beginning of the Exodus, was superseded by the *Sinaitic*: this was constructed by Bezaleel and Aholiab as a portable mansion house, guildhall, and cathedral, and set up on the first day of the first month in the second year after leaving Egypt. Of this alone we have accurate descriptions. Philo (*Opera; ii, p. 146*) calls it *transported temple*, and Josephus' (*Antiq. iii, 6, 1*), *a portable traveling temple*. It is also sometimes called 'temple' (1 Sam. i:9, iii:3). **(3) The Davidic Tabernacle** was erected by David in Jerusalem for the reception of the ark (2 Sam. vi:17), while the old tabernacle remained to the days of Solomon at Gibeon, together with the brazen altar, as the place where sacrifices were offered (1 Chron. xvi:39, and 2 Chron. i:3).

"**3. Of the Principal Tabernacle:** The second of these sacred tents is, as the most important, called the tabernacle *par excellence*. Moses was commanded by Jehovah to have it erected in the Arabian desert, by voluntary contributions of the Israelites, who carried it about with them in their migrations until the conquest of Canaan, when it remained stationary for longer periods in various towns of Palestine."

As the reader can clearly see, by-and-large the principal difference between “temple”, (Strong’s Hebrew #1964) and “tabernacle”, (Strong’s Hebrew #168) is that a “tabernacle” is a moveable sanctuary, while a “temple” is an immovable sanctuary. It is also evident that the pagans have their “temples” and “tabernacles” to their false gods, and that the twelve tribes of Israel had “tabernacles” and “temples” to our One True Elohim, Yahweh.

THE MENTION OF A “KING JAREB” CREATES A CHRONOLOGICAL PROBLEM AT HOSEA 5:13 & 10:6:

Hos. 5:13: **“When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent to king Jareb: yet could he not heal you, nor cure you of your wound.”**

Hos. 10:6: **“It shall be also carried unto Assyria for a present to king Jareb: Ephraim shall receive shame, and Israel shall be ashamed of his own counsel.”**

In my research for this lesson, I was following the outline of an article entitled “The Prophet Hosea” that Howard B. Rand had written in his *Destiny Magazine*, August, 1954 Yearbook p. 270, where he stated: “Jareb is thought by some to be an epithet applied by Hosea here in Chapter 10:6 to the King of Assyria. In a footnote in *The Companion Bible*, reference is made to Professor Sayce’s Higher Criticism and Monuments (pp. 416-417), where it is stated that Jareb may be the birth name of the usurper Sargon II, the successor of Shalmaneser”

Not trusting *The Companion Bible*, references, and knowing it had something to do with archaeology, I decided to search the Internet, typing in “King Jareb, Assyrian Monuments”, and after opening a few websites I finally hit pay-dirt at: <http://nabataea.net/solhez.html>

The following excerpts from will serve as a critical review:

“... CONTACT WITH JAREB KING OF ASSYRIA: From the time of Ben-hadad II of Damascus and the first mention of Jehu upon the Assyrian monuments down to the early part of the reign of Jeroboam II there is no real difficulty in paralleling the Assyrian records with the Scripture account, as we have now seen, provided the Assyrian dates are raised eight years.

“Also we saw before, that after 738 B.C. there were no difficulties in the parallel chronologies. But in the interval, after the death of Shalmaneser IV, between 781 and 738 B.C., the chronological problems are plentiful.

“The Bible chronology just here is unquestionably longer than the Assyrian eponym lists. By some authorities there is a difference of as much as fifty-one years, and they have argued that many years have been omitted from the Assyrian lists. If there was an omission – and it seems necessary to believe this is so – our shorter Bible chronology makes it only eight years (certainly not over twelve years), and a small omission such as this would be less noticeable on the monuments than one of fifty years.

“It is indeed remarkable that just where an omission in the Assyrian yearly eponym names has been suggested, the Scriptures should twice mention an Assyrian king whose name has not yet been found in any inscription.

“Hosea in the latter years of the reign of Jeroboam II., 804-763 B.C., says: *‘When Ephraim (the northern kingdom of Israel) saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent to king Jareb: yet could he not heal you, nor cure you of your wound’* (Hosea v 13), and again he prophesies that Israel’s idol god *‘shall be also carried to Assyria for a present to king Jareb’* (Hosea x 6). Some able scholars have maintained that the translation in these passages might be *‘the hostile king’* instead of *‘king Jareb,’* but if the translation of both the King James Version and the Revised is correct we have a very interesting confirmation of an omission in the Assyrian records; and this king’s reign would serve to fill the gap left in the Assyrian dates by the longer chronology of the Bible. With this alteration, the king list for Assyria, from Shalmaneser IV to Tiglath-pileser IV will be as follows:

“Shalmaneser IV	791-781	B.C.
Ashur-dan III	781-772	B.C.
Jareb (?)	772-764	B.C.
Adad-nirari IV	764-754	B.C.
Ashur-nirari V	754-745	B.C.
Tiglath-pileser IV	745-727	B.C.”

[Note: However it must be noted, that according to at least one copy of The Assyrian King List, Ashur-dan III ruled for eighteen years, and not for ten. Therefore Jareb may well be a Biblical nickname given to this king, which is William Finck’s interpretation from his own commentary on Hosea. This list is found on pp. 564-566 of Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, J. Pritchard ed., Princeton Univ. Press, 1969. Because of fragmentary records and other difficulties, an exact chronology of the period which satisfies all issues is difficult to determine. - WRF] ... (back to article):

“CONTACTS OF MENAHEM OF ISRAEL WITH PUL OR TIGLATH-PILESER IV: Menahem, king of Israel, reigned for nearly ten and a half years, 762-751 B.C. At some time within these ten years, Scripture tells us, *‘Pul the king of Assyria came against the land: and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand ... So the king of Assyria turned back, and stayed not there in the land’* (II Kings 25:19, 20). Thus we see that Menahem and Pul were contemporaries for a part of their reigns at least. When we turn to compare this account with the Assyrian records we find both agreement and difference; agreement of records, but apparent difference in chronology.

“Tiglath-pileser IV of Assyria, is called *‘Pulu’* by the Babylonians, and thus the Pul of the Bible seems clearly to be the same as Tiglath-pileser. In the palace of Tiglath-pileser IV at Nimroud, a number of inscriptions have been found, one of which apparently confirms the view that Menahem and Tiglath-pileser were contemporaries. The name of the king is broken away at the beginning of this inscribed wall tablet, but as it came from the palace of Tiglath-pileser IV it has been ascribed to him with the rest of the inscriptions from the palace. Esar-haddon, who reigned half a century later, began to remodel this palace for his own use, and the inscribed wall tablets suffered much at his hands. He evidently intended to erase the inscriptions they bore,

preparatory to displaying on them records of his own exploits and wars, but his death stopped this destructive work and saved many of the original records from complete oblivion. (Barton: *Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 424)

“While the particular tablet referred to above is much defaced, yet on it are plainly read, among those who paid tribute to Assyria, two names well known to us from the Scriptures, ‘*Resin of Damascus*’ and ‘*Menahem of Samaria*.’ (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 316; Barton: *Archeology and the Bible*, pp. 424-425)

“This confirms the Biblical record in stating that Menahem paid tribute to the king of Assyria, and remembering that Tiglath-pileser IV was also known as Pulu, we have only what we might have expected. But the moment we begin to look at the dates difficulties arise to face us, for Menahem died in 751 B.C., six years before Tiglath-pileser took his seat on the throne of Assyria in 745 B.C., as recorded in the eponym canon. (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 234) And beside this, Assyriologists have ascribed the payment of tribute, recorded in this inscription, to the campaign Tiglath-pileser is known to have made into the west in 738 B.C., thirteen years after Menahem’s death, and which campaign, as we have already mentioned, fits with the one the Bible speaks of as occurring in the reign of Pekah (II Kings 25:29). Clearly we must reconsider the accepted chronologies here just to discover the real truth of the matter. We have no ground to question the accuracy of either the Bible account as it has come down to us through the centuries, or of the Assyrian tablets recovered from the dust of many years; the trouble is far more likely to be in the way we have used these records, and the dates we have ascribed to them. Let us therefore look at some of the proposed ways of getting rid of the difficulty.

“It has been contended that the Biblical Pul is not the same as Tiglath-pileser, and I Chronicles 5:26 has been quoted to support this; it reads, ‘*And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria*.’ This would indicate two persons, but others have maintained that the passage should be translated, ‘*the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, even the spirit of Tigath-pilneser*.’ If the Biblical Pul should be a different person to Tiglath-pileser (and we do not know that he was the only king to be also named Pul) it would relieve the problem from the Scripture side, but quite fails to shed any light on what we find in the inscriptions. It still does not make Menahem’s reign as late as 738 B.C. when he is supposed to have paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser IV.

“Some have arbitrarily overlapped the reigns of the Israelite kings to bring Menahem down to 738 B.C. But this rude attempt to force the Bible into agreement with our construction of Assyrian chronology has many objections to face. There is nothing in the Scriptures to indicate that Menahem’s reign overlapped that of Pekah. Secondly, such overlapping throws the chronology and history of Judah into the utmost confusion. Also the relation of the Bible chronology to the Egyptian dates is seriously disturbed. And, finally, such over-lapping is not in harmony with the earlier contacts between Israel and Assyria.

“Instead of arbitrarily overlapping the reigns of the kings of Israel, which method only lands us into more difficulties than we had before, let us turn to the Assyrian inscriptions to see if they can have any other construction placed upon them.

“The eponym list fixes the accession of Tiglath-pileser as ‘*on the thirteenth day of the month of Iyyar*’ (April-May) in 745 B.C. following a revolt in 746 B.C. (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, pp. 234 ... 308; Barton: *Archeology and the Bible*, p. 424) Previous to this his name appears to have been Pulu, but he adopted the time-honoured name of Tiglath-pileser when he ascended the throne. (Barton: *Archeology and the Bible*, pp. 65-66) Neither was he of the royal line. It may not be without significance that the Bible gives the name of the Assyrian king who invaded Israel in Menahem’s reign as Pul instead of Tiglath-Pileser which is used uniformly elsewhere in the Book of Kings. Is it therefore possible that Tiglath-pileser or Pul made this invasion before the year 745 B.C.?

“Now it is a fact that the eponym list does record two western campaigns that would fit with the date of Menahem’s reign, 762-751 B.C. The first one was in 755 B.C., ‘*against the land of Hadrach*’ (connected with Damascus in Zechariah 4:1), and again the next year, 754 B.C., ‘*against the land of Arpadda*’ (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, pp. 233-234) The former one came the closest to Israel. The date of this campaign against Hadrach would be the sixth or seventh year of Menahem, but as yet we have no indication that Pulu had any connection with this expedition. Turning again to Tiglath-pileser’s account of the western wars of 734-732 B.C., we read his words: ‘*[Bit-Khumria] (i.e., Israel) all of whose cities, on my former campaigns I had added [to my territory] ... into captivity had carried.*’ (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 319) If Tiglath-pileser had added these cities of Israel to his territory on his ‘*former campaigns*,’ then he must have invaded Israel at least twice before this. One of these two times would be the western campaign of 738 B.C., which as previously remarked is evidently the one referred to in II Kings 15:29. But the eponym list before this records no other western campaign reaching as far as Israel until we come back to the one against Hadrach in 755 B.C.

“Is this the date when he made the earlier of those ‘*former campaigns*’ against Israel?

“It is here especially interesting to note that both the Scriptures and the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser or Pul (granting that the two names belong to but one person) agree in this important fact, that this king of Assyria made three campaigns against Israel. Both sources agree the first was during the reign of Menahem of Israel. Both again agree the third was that which saw the siege and fall of Damascus, 733-732 B.C. Both once more agree in regard to the second campaign: Tiglath-pileser referring back to it states that all of these cities of Israel he had then taken, and ‘*... into captivity had carried, [and] had left for him (for Pekah the king) Samaria alone*’ (Rogers: *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 319) while the Bible records: ‘*In the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria*’ (II Kings 15:29). Truly, but ‘*Samaria alone*’ was left to Pekah their king!

“The agreement that there were three invasions is perfect, our difficulty lies in determining the correct date for the first invasion. It should be remarked that the same

tablet which bears the name of Menahem, also speaks of 'Azariah of Ja'udi' and it is still not perfectly clear if this is not Uzziah (Azariah III) of Judah

“SUMMARY OF HISTORICAL CONTACTS: Having now gone over the points of historical contact of the Assyrians with the Hebrews, and of the Hebrews with the Egyptians, within the period we undertook to deal with, we find that while there are some difficulties, on the whole there is remarkable agreement. For instance, apart from historical contacts with Assyria, if we had no Assyrian records, we would have no difficulty in placing the Scripture history side by side with the Egyptian chronology and linking every point of contact together with great ease.

“From the mention of Shishak in Solomon’s time, 958 B.C., to the appearance of Tirhakah in 701 B.C. is, in the Bible, 257 years, exactly the same interval as given in Breasted’s Egyptian Chronology, 945-688 B.C., and the intervening points of contact are also spaced to harmonize perfectly. This should not be overlooked, for it shows we are on firm ground. Each source of chronological data mutually confirms the other.

“Again, turning to the Assyrian records, as already mentioned more than once, after 738 B.C. there is perfect harmony with the Scripture chronology. The earlier contacts with Assyria also agree if we are willing to raise the Assyrian dates by eight years, and to fill the gap left in the eponym canon with Jareb king of Assyria, twice mentioned by Hosea [*which, as has been explained, may not be necessary - WRF*]; and this leaves the mention of Menahem by Tiglath-pileser IV as the only serious difficulty remaining. We have tried to find a solution to that also. But even so, we find much confirmatory data, and regardless of whether one prefers to accept the chronology of the Bible or the commonly used Assyrian dates, they are compelled to acknowledge the other source of chronological material as not only important, but possessing a high degree of reliability”

If upon studying these excerpts as a critical review you do not fully grasp them, put them on the back burner until you have time to do them justice. I hope you caught the sentence, **“It shall be also carried unto Assyria for a present to king Jareb ...”** (Hos. 10:6). This was one or both of the golden calves that Jeroboam had set up in Bethel and in Dan. Surely, Ephraim was taught a humiliating lesson!