

There is a problem with Tyre which I I don't think is unsurmountable, but you can be sure when you get a good Christian evidence, you can be sure the devil is going to try to undermine it in some way.

In the case of Tyre it is the old Greek tradition that attaches to a place on the mainland which they called paleo-Tyre or Old Tyre. According to this tradition it was when Nebuchadnezzar besieged and took it that a few of the people escaped to the island, and then Alexander the Great came over to the island == Alexander the Great in order to capture the island built a causeway ~~and~~ out there and it is a Scriptural prediction that they will take of thy stones and thy timber and thy dust and put them in the midst of the water. It is made about Tyre and no other place in describing the dismantling the place on the mainland, and the moving out there. It is tremendous evidence.

But the scholars in ancient history are just about unanimous with the belief that there never was any Tyre on the mainland. That there -- that it always was on the island. They will even present some arguments for that. But how did that name get started there? It did not come from the Bible. And as I mentioned to Dr. Speiser, you read in Ezekiel how he says that with Nebuchadnezzar's attack there would be the great dust and the noise of the horses attacking. That could not be the description of an attack upon an island!

I said, How could that fit with the idea that there was no city on the mainland? Well, he said, It's so close to where Ezekiel just a few miles up the coast, he certainly would know what he was talking about.

So I think that argument can be answered, but that's what they say. One of the best evidence I've known from archaeology was what Gleuck brought out about the discovery at Ezion-Geber. I had a talk on Solomon I often used to give about Solomon's stables, and Ezion-Geber, and Solomon's blast furnace. Now they practically all say, It was not Solomon at all; it was Ahab that built those stables. I don't know how you can prove that. That is, you could prove -- if everybody said it was Ahab and you found something that was definitely from Solomon's ~~time~~ time that proves you are wrong.

But you say it's Solomon's time and you don't have writing and somebody says it's Ahab, how are you going to prove it one way or the other? It seems to me that unless there is some evidence I'm not familiar with and I'm not -- I have not worked into that a lot in recent years, it's my guess that that is just the attempt of the unbelievers to evade the evidence. The same with the blast furnace. What Gleuck gave was very very convincing. But unfortunately Gleuck never published his material! He published several popular books, but his material about his excavation, etc., he never published, before he died. And about 10 years ago they came out with evidence it was not a