

COMPENDIUM OF WORLD HISTORY
VOLUME 1

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of the Ambassador College
Graduate School of Theology

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

by
Herman L. Hoeh
1962
(1963-1965, 1967 Edition)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One The Modern Interpretation of History
A Radical New View
How History Is Written
Not Without Bias
A Case History
"Anything but Historical Truth"
History Involves Interpretation
The Truth about the "Historical Method"
Evidence of God Rejected as "Myth"
History Cut from Its Moorings

Chapter Two 6000 Years of History
It Is Never Safe to Assume
No "Prehistory" of Man
Cultures, Not "Ages"
Origin of the Study of History
Historians Follow the Higher Critics
Framework of History Founded on Egypt
Is Egyptian History Correct?
Distorting History

Chapter Three History Begins at Babel
History Corroborates the Bible
On To Egypt
The Chronology of Dynasty I
Shem in Egypt
Dynasty II of Thinis
Joseph and the Seven Years' Famine
The Exodus
Pharaoh of the Exodus
Dynasty IV -- The Pyramid Builders

Chapter Four The Missing Half of Egypt's History

- The Story Unfolds
- Moses the General
- History of Upper Egypt
- The Great Theban Dynasty XII
- Who Was Rameses?

Chapter Five Egypt After the Exodus

- Who Were the Invaders?
- The Great Shepherds
- Hyksos in Book of Sothis
- Amalekites after 1076

Chapter Six The Revival of Egypt

- Dynasty XVIII
- The Biblical Parallel
- Shishak Captures Jerusalem
- Who Was Zerah the Ethiopian?
- Dynasty XVIII in Manetho
- The Book of Sothis

Chapter Seven The Era of Confusion

- Egypt As It Really Was
- The Later Eighteenth Dynasty
- Manetho's Evidence
- The El-Amarna Letters
- Are the "Habiru" Hebrews?
- After El-Amarna

Chapter Eight Egypt to the Persian Conquest

- The "Israel" Inscription
- The "Thirteen Fatal Years"
- Nebuchadnezzar and Ramesses the Great
- Catching Up Loose Ends
- Dynasty XXV, the Ethiopians
- Dynasty XXVI of Sais
- Manetho's Account of Dynasty XXVI
- Book of Sothis and Dynasty XXVI
- Another Look at the Book of Sothis
- Appearance of Dynasty XXIV of Sais
- Who Was Usimare Piankhi?
- Dynasty XXIII of Tanis
- Dynasty XXII of Bubastis
- So-called Dynasty XXII
- Dynasty XXI of Tanis
- What Eratosthenes Revealed

Chapter Nine The Eclipse of Egypt

- Answer in Ezekiel
- Persian Kings of Egypt
- Egypt Rebels
- And Now Dynasty XX of Thebes

Chapter Ten It Began at Babel
Mesopotamia Rediscovered
What Archaeologists Learned
Analyzing the Sumerian King List
History Continues at Erech

Chapter Eleven Berossus and Babylonian History
Another Account of Earliest Dynasties
First Dynasty of Ur and Successors
Now Sargon of Akkad
Dynasties IV and V of Erech
The Gutti Dynasty
Three Other Dynasties
Dynasty III of Ur
Dynasty of Isin
Dynasty IV of Kish and the "400 Years"
Dynasty of Akshak
Dates of Queen Ku-Baba

Chapter Twelve Hammurabi to the Fall of Babylon
Why Hammurabi Dated Early
The Dynasty of Larsa
When Did Hammurabi Reign
Damiq-ilishu Reappears'
Nebuchadnezzar the First
Era of Nabonassar
Three Succeeding Dynasties

Chapter Thirteen History of Assyria
Later Assyrian Kings
Who Was Shalmaneser?
Predecessors of Shalmaneser III
King Pul and the Bible
Tiglath-pileser I and Thutmose III

Chapter Fourteen History of Assyria Concluded
The Kassite Dynasty
The Earliest Kassites
The First 1000 Years of Assyrian History
Analyzing the King List

Chapter Fifteen Media, India, Japan and China
The Revolts of the Medes
History of Early India
Early Indian Kings of Magadha
Scythia and the History of Japan
History of China

Chapter Sixteen Asia Minor and the West
Modern Mythology
Beginnings of History
The Proof of Language
The Proof of Race
The Kingdom of Mitanni and the Hurrians
Who Were the Hurrians?
Phrygians and Hatti

Chapter Seventeen How Greek History Was Corrupted

- Greeks Admit Homer Was Demented
- The Plot Centers on Troy
- Homer and the Lydian Kings
- Restoring Greek History
- Kings of Corinth
- The History of Athens
- The History of Sicyon
- Enter Sparta
- Who Were the Heraclidae?
- The History of Argos
- Genealogy of Danaus
- Sea Powers of Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean
- The History of Italy

Chapter Eighteen The History of Ireland

- How Confusion Arose in Irish History
- The First 1000 Years
- The Coming of the Milesians
- Did David Visit Ireland?
- Jerimiah Goes to Ireland
- The Milesian Kings
- The Throne in Scotland

Chapter Nineteen Early Britain and Western Europe

- The Enigma Solved
- Early Europe
- The Heraclidae Kings
- The Trojans and Western Europe
- The Testimony of Archaeology

Chapter Twenty The Proof of Archaeology

- Archaeology in the Aegean World
- Palestine, Syria and Archaeology
- The Coming of Israel into Palestine
- Mesopotamian Archaeology
- Northern Mesopotamia
- Egypt in Parallel

Bibliography

CHAPTER ONE

The Modern Interpretation of History

By what authority have historians left God and the Bible out of history?

This question may come as a surprise. Many are unaware that a radically new interpretation of history is being taught in schools and colleges today. It is a history of the world in which God and the supernatural are rejected.

It is impossible to believe BOTH this history AND the Bible. Both cannot be right.

The modern interpretation of world history stands in open conflict with Scripture. How did this conflict arise? When did history forget God and become confused? Why are historians so sharply divided into opposing schools over the chronological events of the ancient world?

A Radical New View

What many do not realize is that the modern world-view of history without God is a radically new interpretation of human experience. Almost no one today, it seems, has ever questioned whether this new interpretation is right. It is merely assumed to be right.

Students in particular -- and the public in general -- have been led to believe that archaeologists, historians, scientists and theologians live with full assurance and in absolute conviction that this new interpretation of HISTORY WITHOUT GOD is correct. Nothing could be farther from the truth!

One would be shocked to hear the candid admissions and private confessions of learned scholars. These men appear to write and speak with confidence. They are assumed to know the answers to history's greatest questions: how did man originate? why is man here? where is man going?

But they do not know. They have no scientific way of discovering the answers. They are only guessing! One famous historian -- Hendrik Van Loon -- dared to confess this in his book "Story of Mankind". Here are his candid words: "We live under the shadow of a gigantic question mark. What are we? Where did we come from? Whither are we bound?"

And his answer: "We still know very little but we have reached the point where (with a fair degree of accuracy) we can guess at many things."

Astounding -- but true! Yet these guesses are masquerading today as authoritative interpretations of history!

How History Is Written

Casual readers would be shocked to learn how history books are prepared. It is usually assumed that history is solely a matter of collecting factual material, judiciously evaluating it, and recording it for posterity. "Nothing could be farther from the truth," warns C. W. Ceram in "Secret of the Hittites," p. 119.

A historian is not a scribe, but a JUDGE of the evidence that is brought before him. He is his own final authority. He is not judged by, but sits in judgment of, history. Whatever evidence does not conform to the commonly accepted beliefs of the age or community in which he lives

he summarily rejects!

History, in other words, is based only on that part of evidence which agrees with the prevailing opinions of the society in which a historian lives. These may be shocking evaluations, but they are true. World-history texts prove it. Historians admit it!

"The SELECTION of sources still rests upon the discretion of the individual historian. What he chooses as relevant depends upon his conception of the period he is studying. In this the historian is limited by his own temperament and guided by the spirit of his age." So writes C. W. Ceram in the previously mentioned volume, on page 119.

Is there any wonder that different nations and peoples have divergent histories of the same events?

Not Without Bias

Take as an example the history of the Second World War. Communist historians write only those facts about the war that can be shaped to suit the aims of the Communist Party. Japanese historians view the episode at Pearl Harbor quite differently from Americans. Even in America there are two or more versions about the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor incident -- depending upon the political party with which one is affiliated!

Today many German historians are united in a conspiracy to hide the truth about the Hitler regime from the younger generation. The Nazi period is glossed over almost as if it did not exist!

And how did historians handle the events of the First World War? In the same manner. The French historians' account of the Versailles Treaty at the end of the war was diametrically opposed to the German version. Each nation chose to accept only those facts which would lend historical support to its selfish motives.

The reconstruction and interpretation of history to suit political, social, economic, religious or race prejudices is a practice of scientific historians of all nations. Much of this prejudice the writers themselves are unaware of. It is so natural to human nature that they are often convinced that their prejudices do not exist! This suppression of part of the truth is the primary reason the world has never learned the lessons of history. The secondary reason, of course, is that most individuals do not want to believe the truth of history even when it is told them.

A Case History

A remarkable episode occurred in America in 1954 when the highest court of the land was confronted with a major social issue. A noted historian had become involved in the legal aspects of the case. Here is what happened, in his own words, told to fellow historians:

"The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss

"It was not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and, above all, interpreting facts in a way to ... 'get by'"

This candid admission strikes at the heart of the problem! Many

times educators and ministers and writers of textbooks are confronted with the conflict between truth and the beliefs and ideas of the society around them. If they are to be accepted by the people, they must conform -- by altering or rejecting part of the truth!

Of course they use facts -- but how they use those facts, which facts they use, which facts they ignore or reject and the interpretation they place on the facts -- that is the crux of the problem!

Trapped in the vicious whirl of intellectual pressures like so many others, the historian admitted he was forced unwittingly to face the question of whether he would compromise his conscience. He reported to fellow historians in Washington, D. C., on December 28, 1961, that he was asked to produce "a plausible historical argument that will justify ..." a certain particular decision affecting public schools. "I was facing," he continued, "the deadly opposition between my professional integrity as a historian and" -- notice it -- "a contemporary question of values, of ideals, of policy, or partisanship and of political objectives. I suppose if a man is without scruple," he noted as a concluding thought, "this matter will not bother him, but I am frank to say that it bothered me terribly"

What an intellectual tragedy! Forced to make a decision between historical truth and the whims, the false ideas, the political partisanship of society!

"Anything but Historical Truth"

After days and nights of hard labor, a lengthy document was presented to the highest court of the land. "I am convinced now that this interpretation, which we hammered out with anything but historical truth as our objective, nonetheless contains an essential measure of historical truth," he concluded.

He was now convinced by his own arguments. This is exactly how every human mind works.

It is this same attitude of mind that has precipitated the conflict between the Bible and the new interpretation of history.

Altering history is not new to the twentieth century. It has been occurring ever since men began to write history.

In the United States, for example, there are two unharmonious versions of causes of the American Civil War. Yet these different versions are officially approved as texts in schools -- depending, of course, on the geographical area! The British account of the American Revolution of 1776 differs materially from the American version. A traitor in British eyes becomes a patriot in American histories.

One cannot peruse any major historical subject such as the Middle Ages, the Inquisition, or Church History without discovering Catholic, Protestant or agnostic bias. No Biblical subject can be read in any encyclopedia without noting the author's liberal, conservative or orthodox views. Or consider the life of Jesus. Could we think for a moment that Jew, Catholic, Protestant, Hindu or Muslim would view alike the place of Jesus in history? Or the apostle Peter? Would the Anglican version agree with the Greek Orthodox or the Roman Catholic version? Yet every historian has access to the same evidence.

History Involves Interpretation

History is not mere recording of facts. Contrary to the common idea, it is essentially interpretative. "The reconstruction of ancient history is an abstracting from the facts by means of hypothesis ...", wrote G. Ernest Wright in "The Biblical Archaeologist Reader," page 19. What occurs when the hypothesis is in error? The reconstruction of history will be in error!

This is one of the chief sources of confusion among historians. Each historian interprets the facts in accordance with his own hypothesis. He ignores those facts that do not fit the hypothesis. "This is inevitable for any hypothesis," admits George E. Mendenhall; for a hypothesis "is not intended as a presentation of eternal truth" (page 38 of "Biblical History in Transition," "The Bible and the Ancient Near East"). Yet many of these hypotheses ARE passing for truth in history textbooks.

One of the clearest summaries of this modern method of historical study was presented by Dr. Alfred H. Kelly at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association on December 28, 1961. He declared: "History is art as well as fact: everyone in this room knows that the facts do not automatically arrange themselves without the historian's creative leap, which occurs in our craft as well as in the exact sciences"

It is time historians took a GENUINELY creative leap and called into question the whole basic assumption of modern historical interpretation.

The Truth about the "Historical Method"

The foundation of modern historical research is the "historical method" of study. Few laymen are aware of what it is. Even many historians are not aware of its limitations and its fallacies. The "historical method" of study is essentially a new approach to history. It is called SCIENTIFIC because it limits itself to the tools of scientific research and reasoning. It is not based on demonstrable fact. It rests on only one fundamental -- and unprovable -- hypothesis: THAT GOD HAS NEVER AND DOES NOT NOW INTERVENE IN, OR DETERMINE, THE COURSE OF HISTORY.

Let a modern exponent of this new world-view explain it: "In any case, modern science does not believe that the course of nature can be interrupted or, so to speak, perforated by supernatural powers.

"The same is true of the modern study of history, which does not take into account any intervention of God or of the devil or of demons in the course of history Modern men take it for granted that the course of nature and of history, like their own inner life and their practical life, is nowhere interrupted by intervention of supernatural powers." ("Jesus Christ and Mythology", by Rudolf Bultmann, pgs. 16-17.)

This assumption has not been and can never be proved. There are no physical tools of science by which it may be demonstrated. It remains only a hypothesis. Yet scientists and historians take it for granted as if it were true.

The modern scientific historian blindly follows the "historical method." If he did not do so, he would be cast out by his fellows. He is taught to reject everything supernatural from history texts -- EVEN WHEN EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENTION OF GOD IS RECORDED BY EYE-WITNESSES IN ANCIENT SECULAR RECORDS. He simply refuses to believe it. This is not true history or science. It is half truth and intellectual folly.

This unscientific approach is the universally required method of modern historical study in institutions of higher learning. One will find it explained, for example, in the well-known text "The Critical Method in Historical Research and Writing". The author, Homer Carey Hockett, warns his students against God and the supernatural in history. He writes: "Moreover there are some kinds of statements which are rejected even without being subjected to the usual tests. The historian must reject them when the tests he usually makes are not applicable. Such treatment is due statements reporting happenings which do not conform to the laws of nature as established by scientific methods."

Since God cannot be scientifically tested He is rejected as myth. "It requires no justification where myths ... are involved. Their summary rejection is implied in the rule that no statement can be accepted unless it can be shown to rest upon trustworthy observation." Any who recognize God does intervene in nature is automatically assumed to be untrustworthy. "If any one asserts them he must be regarded as ignorant, superstitious, the victim of hallucination, or some other form of mental aberration" (p. 62).

What does all this mean? Just this: no one wants to be accused of "ignorance," "superstition" or "mental aberration." To avoid this stigma, the student or the historian finds himself compelled to reject God and any supernatural event recorded in history. He is forced to accept ,whatever passes under the vogue of science and reject whatever is presently called "myth." No observation is accepted as trustworthy if it disagrees with the present view of the natural world in which God and the supernatural are deliberately excluded. ALL RECORDS AND EVENTS ARE REINTERPRETED to fit the fallacious and unprovable assumption that God is not in history.

The "historical method" is nothing more than a new myth -- a new superstition. Its basic assumption is not only unverified, but absolutely and irrevocably refuted by the evidence of past records and of human experience WHICH HISTORIANS KNOW THEY HAVE REJECTED OR IGNORED.

Evidence of God Rejected as "Myth"

To justify the use of the "historical method" historians have had to discard or gloss over literally thousands of ancient records which corroborate the history of the Bible. These secular records include not only carefully preserved annals and references to the patriarchs, but also accounts of every major Biblical event, including the deluge, the building of the Tower of Babel and the Exodus! They are all summarily discarded -- as is the Bible -- under the name of "myth." Many of these records and annals will be re-examined in this compendium and properly placed in their historical milieu.

But how does a historian or a theologian prove whether the Bible or a secular record is a "myth" or a "fact." The answer is, he does not prove anything. He ASSUMES.

"The beginning of Thy word is truth," declares Psalm 119:160 (trans. of Jewish Publication Society). But modern scholarship would have us assume the beginning of Scripture -- Genesis -- is untrue or "myth."

Let Rudolf Bultmann explain it. "The whole conception of the world which is presupposed in the preaching of Jesus ... is mythological i.e., ... the conception of the intervention of supernatural powers in

the course of events This conception of the world we call mythological because it is different from the conception of the world which has been formed and developed by science since its inception in ancient Greece ..." (p. 15).

It is called "myth" ONLY because it differs from pagan Greek science and its modern derivative! What modern science refuses to believe is arbitrarily and without proof designated "myth."

It is the very same hypothesis that atheistic, communistic materialists accept. Yet it is called "Christian scholarship." There is no essential difference between this Western God-rejecting skeptical scholarship and Communistic scholarship. Both reject the God who has intervened in the course of history. The former rejects Him in the name of humanistics and science; the latter in the name of atheistic materialism!

This similarity should surprise no one. For Karl Marx, the founder of atheistic Communism, was trained in the same German universities of Bonn, Berlin and Jena and by the same men who influenced Western scholars to accept the God-rejecting "historical method."

History Cut from Its Moorings

Scholarship today is in confusion -- usually dignified by the expression "learned controversy." The disagreement over the meaning of practically everything is so wide ranging, so acute, that archaeologist George E. Mendenhall wrote that it "may with perhaps less courtesy but more accuracy be called chaos"! (From "Biblical History in Transition," "The Bible and the Ancient Near East", edited by G. Ernest Wright. pp. 38, 33.)

The cause of this chaos is that historical conclusions are based not so much on authorities as on theories. There has been no true respect for the history of the Bible and for accurate secular annals. The Bible has been discounted simply because it has not been understood. Scripture has often been compared to a heap of winnowed chaff.

There is a reason the learned intellects have not understood the Bible. It is this: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind" -- or, as the margin reads: "a mind void of judgment" (Romans 1:28). And again, as Dr. Lamsa renders the Aramaic of I Corinthians 2:14: "For the material man rejects spiritual things, for they are foolishness to him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The modern interpretation of history is devoid of judgment. It is based on ignoring or disregarding the very documents and the evidence that disprove it.

Scholars and theologians therefore have read their own interpretations of secular records into the Bible. If necessary, they altered the text to accommodate a hypothesis. Even so conservative a scholar as A. T. Olmstead admitted when explaining the relationship of the Bible to history:

"This is only to say in other words that the Bible cannot be understood by itself It has become obvious that before we may claim to KNOW the Bible, we must first investigate all these varied sources and arrange their data in a general narrative. Then and only then we are ready at long last to fit the Biblical stories into ancient history." ("History, Ancient World, and the Bible -- Problems of Attitude and Method", "Journal of Near Eastern Studies", Vol. II, No.

1, January 1943.)

THERE is the root of the conflict that permeates theology, history, archaeology and related sciences. Men have rejected -- without examining the proof -- God as the source of truth. "Thy Word," declared Jesus, "is truth" (John 17:17). They have read their own interpretations into history and into the Bible. Each one follows his own human reasoning, apart from, and in opposition to, the revealed truth of God. Chaos is the result.

"But when you have the truth, everything fits"! (E. R. Punshon, "Information Received", Penguin Books, 1955.)

CHAPTER TWO

6000 Years of History

How long has Man been upon earth? Where, and through whom, did civilization originate? What about "prehistoric man"? Can the history of the Bible be reconciled with ancient history? with Egyptian and Babylonian chronology?

Historians and archaeologists are sharply divided over these questions today. Many sense something is drastically wrong with the present explanation of the ancient world. How did all this scholarly doubt arise?

It is Never Safe to Assume

Remove from a library shelf any volume on world history or ancient man and examine its opening chapters. In it will be such expressions as: "it is thought," "there appears to be some basis for believing," "it has been suggested," "it may be presumed," "one may safely assume," and "others are of the opinion" -- just to mention a few.

What do all these carefully chosen expressions really signify? Just this: that no demonstrable evidence really exists for accepting as a fact what has been written in the textbook. It is mere speculation!

The modern reconstruction of ancient history without God is almost 100% erroneous. And no wonder! It is derived from only a part of the historical sources that are available. It casts aside as "myth" factual and datable evidence of the past merely because God appeared in that evidence. without it, the modern historian is able only to theorize about the time or the place man appeared upon the earth. He cannot know. When these written records are rejected, not even archaeologists or geologists can come to the historians' aid and provide adequate dating.

Some modern writers, relying only on geological inferences, would place the appearance of man about 25,000 to 35,000 years ago. Others suggest the period is no less than 100,000 years ago. No small number of scholars assume it may be 500,000 years ago. And there are a few who place it several hundred thousand years earlier.

But how could intelligent, able men arrive at such absurdly varying figures for the origin of man and the beginnings of ancient history? They all have access, remember, to the same geological and archaeological sources of information.

The answer is, they are all interpreting geologic and archaeological evidence in accordance with their private theories. They are only guessing. They have no way of knowing.

One well-known writer phrased it this way: "We know that there is no absolute knowledge, that there are only theories, but we forget this. The better educated we are the harder we believe in axioms" (from Lincoln Steffens "Autobiography", page 816).

But we can know. The God who has intervened in history, records of whose acts we may read of in ancient sources from many nations -- that God has made known both the time and the place of origin of man. But historians, theologians and scientists alike refuse to believe it, for it leaves them no room to guess!

Before we examine these ancient secular and Biblical records, let us notice one classic illustration of the total inability of either

archaeology or geology to determine DURATION OF TIME. Take the case of the Neolithic (New Stone) colonists of Wessex, England -- near the site of famous Stonehenge. "Estimates of the length of their sojourn have been very varied, the most extreme being that of W. A. Sturge, President of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia in 1909, who confidently stated and considered that he had proved 'on irrefragable evidence' that the Neolithic period had lasted well over 200,000 years -- a grossly inaccurate estimate Five to ten generations of men, or 100-200 years, would perhaps be nearer the mark as an estimate of time ...," declared archaeologist J. F. S. Stone recently ("Wessex Before the Celts", page 51).

Why such incomprehensible variations? Because no scientific means can determine the speed with which geological deposits were laid in the past -- or how long ago the deposition occurred, or the cause. Nor can any archaeology determine accurately the rate of accumulation of human remains unless there is some contemporary written evidence!

No "Prehistory" of Man

The modern idea that man has been upon earth for more than 6000 years is predicated on the assumption that "prehistoric time" once existed. Almost everyone takes it for granted. Few have ever thought to question it.

As used by critical historians, "prehistoric time" is said to refer to earliest antiquity that is nowhere documented in written records. Is this kind of "prehistoric time" really a fact?

Turn to Genesis 1:1 for the answer. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Time is coeval with the creation, for time is measured by the movements of the created heavenly bodies. But here also is a record of what occurred at the beginning. Here is a documented account reaching back even to the beginning of time. "Prehistoric time" in this sense is therefore irreconcilable with Scripture, for there is no period of time that is not documented in the Bible.

But how did the theory of "prehistoric time" originate? Why was the idea invented? Stuart Piggott, noted British archaeologist, summarized the development of the theory in his book "Approach to Archaeology." Note carefully his wording: "The first step was the realization that non-documented antiquity could in fact exist at all: that the whole creation and the sum of human history was not in fact contained within the Biblical narrative. This was the repudiation of the theological model of the past ..." (page 53).

"Prehistory" was developed to explain the presence of man without the Bible. It is merely another facet of the "historical method" which denies the possibility of God in history.

The fallacy of "prehistory" is clearly explained in the "Encyclopedia Americana". Here is its surprising statement: "... it is no longer accurate or logical to use the term 'prehistoric,' unless it is employed to designate that vague and hypothetical period in the beginnings of human development of which there exists no positive and tangible record ..." (from "History, its rise and development".)

Could words be plainer?

"Prehistoric" -- scholars now admit -- denotes nothing more than a "vague and hypothetical period ... of which there exists no positive and tangible record"!

But what of the famous periods or "ages" designated the

Palaeolithic (Old Stone), the Mesolithic (Intermediate Stone), the Neolithic (New Stone), the Chalcolithic (Stone and Copper), the Bronze and the Iron?

Cultures, Not "Ages"

These terms do not represent "ages." They are CULTURAL appellations. It is a historical deception to speak of the "Stone Age." There are only STONE CULTURES. "These names," writes William L. Langer in "An Encyclopaedia of World History", "are excellent to identify cultures, but their use to designate periods of time has led to much inaccuracy and confusion, as the dates of the cultures to which they refer differ widely in different parts of the world" (page 2).

That is, societies using iron were contemporary with other societies using bronze or only stone. Most ancient societies used stone and bronze and iron. Today one may see backward tribes with a stone culture in New Guinea, Australia, areas of India, Africa and South America side by side with highly industrialized civilizations. These tribes are not "prehistoric." They are contemporary. Throughout history they have paralleled contemporary higher cultures, not ancestral to higher cultures as anthropologists assume. Even the Bible makes special mention of some of these degenerate tribes who anciently lived in Palestine and Sinai. The reference is found in Job 30:1-8, Jewish translation:

"But now they that are younger than I have me in derision,
Whose fathers I disdained to set with the dogs of my flock
"Men in whom ripe age is perished. They are gaunt with want and
famine;
They gnaw the dry ground, in the gloom of wasteness and
desolation.
"They pluck salt-wart with wormwood;
"And the roots of the broom are their food.
"THEY ARE DRIVEN FORTH FROM THE MIDST OF MEN
"In the clefts of the valleys must they dwell,
"In holes of the earth and of the rocks.
"Among the bushes they bray;
"Under the nettles they are gathered together.
"They are children of churls, yea, CHILDREN OF IGNOBLE MEN;
"They were scourged out of the land."

No evolution here. Only degeneration. civilized man did not descend from degraded, "primitive" tribes. But degraded tribes did descend from civilized men of low birth and degenerate habits. They were anciently driven out from the Middle East with its rising civilization, only to be rediscovered in tropical forests in recent centuries!

These facts make it clear why evolutionists are forced to admit: "Evolution is in the last analysis not a matter of evidence, but a matter of inference" (from "New Views of Evolution" by George Perrigo Conger, pp. 91).

Origin of the Study of History

Now we come to the origin of the scientific study of history. The

facts are surprising. Few historians are aware of the real origin of their discipline. They generally take for granted as true the principles already laid down for them by preceding historians. Yet one of the basic rules of any scientific study is never to take anything for granted. Let us pull back the curtain on the study of history and view a plot that has eluded even the historians' keen eyes.

History as a scientific discipline may be said to have taken its rise with Lorenzo della Valla. He demonstrated that the "Donation of Constantine", on which the secular claims of the Roman Catholic Church were originally based, was a medieval forgery.

Forgery. That word became a touchstone. Soon non-catholic scholars everywhere became critical, negative, looking for spurious documents. The Middle Ages provided many rich finds.

During the same period a great revival in Classical Learning had been occurring, The popes had encouraged Catholic scholars of the Renaissance to revive the study of ancient Roman and Greek literature. In non-Catholic educational circles Classical Learning became associated with Catholicism. The inevitable occurred. Scholars who resented everything the word AUTHORITY stood for saw in the Greek and Roman Classics the symbolism of authority and tradition. Tradition would not be purged out, they reasoned, unless the Classics were also attacked and labeled as spurious.

The frontal assault began. At the close of the eighteenth century Friedrich August Wolf challenged the scholarly world with his "Prolegomena ad Homerum" (1795). The ancient Greek poet Homer -- famous for having composed the two great epics, the Iliad and the Odyssey -- did not compose either epic in its present form, charged Wolf. Homer, he reasoned, did not know how to write. The epics, he concluded, were pieced together about the seventh century from oral traditions, long after Homer lived. They were therefore unauthentic, Wolf concluded.

The floodgates of criticism were now opened wide. Thousands of youths, flocking to the German universities for their doctorates, were assigned the task of criticising classical literature. At the height of the epidemic, scarcely a single ancient work remained unimpugned as biased, untrue to fact, or unauthentic. Into the swirl of condemned poems, dramas, myths were heaved the sober histories of Herodotus, and Thucydides, the annals of the Greek city states, the Greek records of ancient Egypt, Assyria and Media. All ancient Greek and Roman history was condemned as spurious, unauthentic, fabulous, unhistorical -- because writing, said the critics, had not been known. How could the Greeks have preserved authentic histories reaching back 2000 years before the time of Christ, asked the critics, if the Greeks did not even know how to write till the seventh century before our era?

Historians Follow the Higher Critics

The historians of that day were greatly influenced by the subjective reasoning of the German Higher Critics. They accepted their verdict. Greek records prior to the seventh century disappeared from history books, or were labeled in footnotes as fabulous, or, at best, garbled.

Nearly a half century elapsed. During that period a new science arose -- archaeology. The past was being dug up. What did the excavators discover? Writing materials and documents dating more than 2000 years before the time of Christ! And in the Greek world, too!

The Greeks did know how to write after all. The critics, including

Wolf, had been wrong. The imagined illiteracy of the early Greeks was a myth. The argument that they could not have preserved their history correctly was false.

But did the new evidence make any difference to the critics or to the historians? Were they willing to reconsider their conclusions? How were the historians going to explain that the basis for rejecting Greek history had been exploded?

No answers came forth. The new evidence was greeted with silence. All who brought up the problem were ridiculed as unscientific. Decades have passed, but not once has the evidence been reconsidered. The plot to suppress the truth had succeeded till now.

There is absolutely no reason why the records preserved by the Greeks should not be reinstated in their proper place in history. Refusal to reconsider the evidence is a standing indictment against the modern naturalistic interpretation of history.

But the story does not end here.

Every year saw fresh hordes of students arrive at the German universities demanding doctoral dissertations. Johann Gottlieb Fichte had made the German educational system famous the world over. Many students from abroad were coming to study in Germany under the great literary critics. The German professors insisted that their students thresh again the old classics. But this was not research. It was mere confirmation of what had already been universally accepted. With the quantity of classical raw material strictly limited in the early nineteenth century, a new field of study had to be thought up.

A "new discovery" must be found, the critics agreed, if Germany was to maintain absolute educational domination of the world. Such a discovery necessarily meant something to attack, for assailing a commonly accepted idea always creates interest. What literature, the critics asked themselves, did people believe to be true, but which had not yet been subjected to higher criticism?

The Bible!

Protestant Germany had, since the days of Dr. Martin Luther, assumed the absolute authenticity of Scripture. What a challenge! The opening wedge of the attack had, in actuality, been made by Dr. Luther himself, for had he not denounced the epistle of James as a book of straw?

All the methodology and reasoning, once feverishly applied to classical literature, was now directed in a frontal assault on the authenticity and historicity of Scripture. The Bible, proudly announced the critics, was pieced together from tradition in much the same fashion as the ancient Greek and Roman classics had been. The extremists declared it a pious fraud.

The literature of the Old Testament was rejected as contrary to human experience. It was obviously unhistorical, they concluded, for no events of a supernatural nature were befalling any nation today -- and certainly not any German professors and students! There was no God punishing them for their attacks upon Him, as He had once punished Israel, or Egypt, or Babylon.

Historians who had heretofore acknowledged the authority of the historical record in the Old Testament were impressed with the theories of the literary scholars. Then, too, the theory of organic evolution was mushrooming. Rationalism was king. Within a few decades the entire study of history was reshaped to meet the new theories.

But how were historians to reconstruct ancient history without the Old Testament? without God? without the supernatural? with all the early classical events removed? What kind of framework would they use

to date events? History had to have some kind of chronological backbone.

Framework of History Founded on Egypt

A new reconstruction and interpretation of history without God or the supernatural, and now without Genesis, was foisted upon the world in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It first created the phantom of "prehistory", as we have already noted. To bolster their concept of "ancient man," the discoveries by travellers of savage, cannibalistic tribes in far away places were heavily called upon. It became a fad to picture "early man" in the garb of a savage.

The next step was to tie "prehistory" to modern history. What chronological means was to be used? The answer is two-fold: astronomy and the history of Egypt.

Rationalism had disposed of all supernaturalism in history. God was excluded from nature. Uniformitarianism became a basic concept. The astronomer was now called on by the historian to date the past for thousands of years on the basis of the present movement of heavenly bodies. All ancient historical records referring to supernatural movements of the heavens were rejected as mythological. Away went "Joshua's long day," and the backward decline of the sun for ten degrees in the kingship of Hezekiah. (See II Kings 20:8-11.)

From the Biblical record it would be impossible to determine the position of any solar body prior to the time of Hezekiah. But historians postulated that since God, according to their reasoning, could not intervene in the course of nature, it would be possible to date the past by calculating backward the present movements of the sun, moon and other planets, and the stars. All that was necessary, said the historians, was to discover, through archaeological means, early calendars and ancient documents that referred to positions of the sun, or moon, or the rise of the stars on certain stated calendar days. A few documents were discovered -- but, alas, they did not agree with the present movements of the heavenly body. The historians -- unwilling to admit uniformitarianism an error -- decided the mistaken numbers lay in the scribes who copied the astronomical documents. It was an easy task to change the figures on the cuneiform tablets and Egyptian papyri.

Still a problem remained. Astronomical movements repeat themselves in varying cycles. The 19-year cycle of the Hebrew calendar is an illustration. No ancient date could be determined by astronomical means unless the approximate date had already been determined by historical methods. Here is where Egypt comes on the scene.

Egypt seemed to provide the best solution. Her earliest documents were more likely to be preserved because of the warm, dry climate. Most of the monuments were above ground, unlike those in Mesopotamia. This made it a much easier task for the archaeologist. Egypt, decided the scholars, should become the historical standard of the world. Its civilization was certainly one of the oldest and earliest. Why not tie "prehistory" and modern history together through Egypt.

Now came the difficulty. Archaeology could not always determine which Egyptian monuments and which kings reigns came first. There were no buried cities, one above another, as in Mesopotamia. No stratigraphy to determine the exact order of events. The only solution was to adopt the traditional dynastic history of Egypt. It is based on the Greek versions of Manetho, an Egyptian priest and historian, who drew up the history of ancient Egypt under thirty dynasties.

The influence of Manetho on the order of events of ancient history is tremendous. This is confirmed by Sir Alan Gardiner, one of the most famous Egyptologists of the twentieth century. "That I have devoted so much discussion to what survives of Manetho ... will need no excuse for those familiar with the evolution of our science; no Egyptologist has yet been able to free himself from the shackles imposed by the native annalist's thirty Dynasties, and these are likely always to remain the essential framework of our modern expositions" ("Egypt of the Pharaohs", p. viii).

Is Egyptian History Correct?

The dynastic history of Egypt is universally assumed to be correct. NO historian thinks of questioning it. It is simply one of the assumptions he has taken for granted.

The time has come to explode this assumption! The story of how it became universally accepted over 2000 years ago is one of the most intriguing in all the annals of history. Let us roll back the centuries and discover the plot that changed history.

The historians of the last century inherited their views of history from the classical professors, for ancient history was for a long time an aspect of classical studies. The classical professors were interested in attacking LITERATURE. But they needed history for background if they were to demonstrate that early writings were merely garbled oral traditions and mythical accounts of heroes.

It suited their purpose to retain the commonly accepted view of history -- especially Homer's story of the fall of Troy. The earlier that ancient events could be placed the longer the time for oral traditions and myths to develop. The greater the likelihood for events to become garbled and untrue to fact.

Thus the framework of history remained essentially the same as it has been all through the Middle Ages.

Medieval and Modern Europe inherited its account of the past mainly through Catholic scholars and historians. Sextus Julius Africanus (early third century), Eusebius (early fourth century), and George the Monk, known as Syncellus (eighth to ninth century) contributed greatly to the transmission of ancient history. These men, together with the Jewish historian Josephus, obtained their information from earlier Greek documents long since lost. But from where did the Greek world obtain its history of Egypt? From the Egyptians.

The framework of all history, in simple terms, is derived ultimately from Egypt -- particularly through the writings of Manetho.

"In the arrangement of ... Egyptian materials within a framework of consecutive dynasties, all modern historians are dependent upon an ancient predecessor. This was an Egyptian priest and writer Manetho who lived under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.). Manetho was born at Sebennytus (now Samannud) in the Delta. Eventually he rose to be high priest in the temple at Heliopolis. Berossos of Babylon," continues Finegan, "was practically a contemporary, and the two priests became rivals in the proclamation of the antiquity and greatness of their respective lands." (From "Light from the Ancient Past", by Jack Finegan, pp. 65-66.)

In Manetho's time this spirit of competition reached a climax. Egypt and Babylonia were vying with each other for influence over the Greek-speaking world. Each sought to be known as the founder of

civilization, of cultural and religious institutions, of political unity. Vanity was coupled in both by a deep sense of inferiority, for both were peoples subject to the Greeks. To rise above that feeling, each claimed to be the first people of earth, not alone in the sense of civilization, but in the sense of time.

Distorting History

To justify their claims to antiquity, Manetho and Berossos utilized their early records, the king lists of the various cities, and cleverly marshalled them together in consecutive order. Manetho summarized the history of Egypt under the rule of thirty dynasties, or ruling houses, from the royal cities of Abydos, Memphis, Elephantine, Heracleopolis, Xoïs, Thebes, Tanis, Bubastis, Sais and other cities. The history of the royal families of each city was drawn up to make it appear that only one city at a time dominated Egypt, and that Egypt was, from its beginning, under the government of only one ruler at a time. The result was that Egypt appeared to be extremely ancient and the first land to establish unity -- thousands of years before the Greek city-states were united. It was a fraud!

The internal details of the reigns of the kings of the various dynasties were scrupulously correct -- they had to be to make the history look valid -- but the order in which the dynasties appeared was a historic lie. Manetho cleverly told the history of the ruling families of each city, then attached them end to end to make Egypt appear the oldest and earliest unified nation on earth.

Egypt was a confederation. Its several kings exercised authority under the most powerful who was called Pharaoh. The word "Pharaoh" means the Great House -- as there were also lesser houses ruling.

Even the Bible preserves an account of more than one king in Egypt at the same time: "Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us," said the Arameans, "the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians" (II Kings 7:6).

Like Egypt, the land of Assyria also had more than one king at the same time: "At that time did king Ahaz send unto the kings of Assyria to help him" (II Chronicles 28:16). Historians falsely charge these verses are untrue to fact.

As an example of the strength of a great confederation, one may name Germany. Few are really aware that the German Empire, like the ancient Egyptian Empire, was a confederation governed by several kings even at the time of World War I. The supreme ruler was of the Prussian House of Hohenzollern, William II (1888-1918). Ruling with him in the German Confederation were Frederick Augustus III (1904-1918), king of Saxony; William II (1891-1918), king of Wuerttemberg; Louis III (1913-1918), king of Bavaria; and Ernest Augustus (1913-1918), duke of Brunswick. All lost their thrones in November of 1918.

To return to the theme of the story. Succeeding chapters of this compendium will now demonstrate how the true history of Egypt may be restored. Never before has the history of the ancient world been made clear as it will now be.

CHAPTER THREE

History Begins at Babel

The restoration of history begins with this chapter. It has taken years of research to recover all the vital pieces of evidence needed to tell the full story. The assumptions of historians and archaeologists had first to be cleared away. The most difficult part, however, was the recovery of rejected evidence -- much of it published over 100 years ago.

At last the restoration of the framework of history was complete for Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Greece, Media. All the records went back to one momentous event.

The event? The building of the City and Tower of Babel! The beginning of the civilization of this world! It commenced as an act of rebellion against the Government of God. It began with the establishment of the Government of Man. And just as one might expect, all the ancient nations began to reckon their kings from this event.

History Corroborates the Bible

The Biblical account of the City and the Tower of Babel may be found in Genesis 11:1-9. In the Jewish Publication Society translation we read:

And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar: and they dwelt there. And they said one to another: 'Come, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly.' And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. And they said: 'Come, let us build us a city, and a tower, with its top in heaven, and let us make us a name: lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.' And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said: 'Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language: and this is what they begin to do: and now nothing will be withholden from them, which they purpose to do. Come, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.' So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth and they left off to build the city. Therefore was the name of it called Babel: because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

The most complete secular record is that found in the Akkadian Creation Epic. It is reproduced in "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", by James B. Pritchard, pages 68-69. This account, like most from ancient pagan sources, is encrusted with myth. But that does not nullify the basic historical evidence contained in the epic. Following are extracts, freely translated, from the Epic of Creation concerning the building of the City and the Tower of Babel. A vague recollection of the Supreme God is discernable.

"'Now, O lord, thou who hast caused our deliverance,

What shall be our homage to thee?
Let us build a shrine'
Brightly glowed his features, like the day:
'Like that of lofty Babylon, whose building you have
requested,
Let its brickwork be fashioned. You shall name it "The
Sanctuary"'
For one whole year they molded the bricks.
When the second year arrived,
They raised high the shrine equaling a great height.
Having built a stage-tower a great height,
They set up in it an abode for Marduk, Enlil, and Ea.
"This is Babylon, the place that is your home' ...'"

The account in Genesis describes exactly what is given here -- the building of a Tower, or religious edifice, and of a City.

The epic then continues with the establishment of human government. At this point the document is fragmentary, but a father and a son are clearly spoken of:

"He set up a throne
Another in
'Verily, most exalted is the son
His sovereignty is surpassing
May he shepherd the human race."

The Biblical account reveals who these two individuals were. Cush, the father, and Nimrod, the son. "And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel ..." (Genesis 10:8, 10).

With the reign of Cush and of Nimrod the history of civilization begins. At this point commences also the chronology of Egypt, of Assyria, of Babylonia and of the whole Near East.

The exact date of this event was preserved down to Roman times. For Velleius Paterculus cites from Aemilius Sura, in his "Roman History", book I, section VI, the following: "Between this time (when Rome conquered Philip, king of Macedonia) and the beginning of the reign of Ninus (Nimrod) king of the Assyrians, who was the first to hold world power, lies an interval of 1995 years." Philip was conquered in 197. (All dates in this compendium which are not otherwise designated are understood to be before the present era, commonly, though mistakenly, written "B.C.") Nimrod, therefore, began his sole reign in 2192. It followed a joint reign with his father Cush for 62 years, according to Julius Africanus. That places the overthrow of Babel 2254 years before the present era. The two previous years, according to the Epic of Creation, had been spent in erecting Babel. The building of the Tower may therefore be dated 2256-2254. The Bible does not specifically date this event. But it does confirm the general period: "And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided ..." (Genesis 10:25).

Certainly the most spectacular confirmation of this date may be found in the history of China. For the Chinese begin their authentic history also 2254 years before the present era. This is no coincidence. China's first king was "black." His eyes shown with "double brightness." That is, theologically, "demon possessed." They called him Shun, and his father's name is spelled variously Chusou or Kusou -- that is, Cush. In his days lived a very famous woman whose name may be

translated as either "the mother of the king of the west," or the "queen mother of the west " (See the "Annals of the Bamboo Books," "The Chinese Classics", by James Legge, vol. III, part I, pages 114-115.)

Before presenting the chronological history of China -- which has been preserved without alteration since the Tower of Babel, let us trace in the West the story of these heroes who founded Babel. No story of history is so unusual, so filled with the unexpected.

On to Egypt

The tombs of all the famous heroes who founded Babel are located in Egypt. Egypt early became the second center of civilization. One can now easily understand why both Babylonians and Egyptians claimed to be the first people in the world -- claimed their civilization and their religious customs were the earliest. In Egypt we now trace the history of what occurred immediately after Babel.

Egyptian history opens with Dynasty I. Its capital was Thisis in Upper Egypt. The names of the first four rulers of Dynasty I are Menes, Athothis, Kenkenes and Uenephes. The spelling of the names is from the Greek of Manetho. The early Egyptian forms vary slightly. Who were these famous individuals?

Let the Egyptians themselves provide the answer. Athothis, Egypt's second king, was Osiris. The tomb of Athothis at Abydos was "the sepulchre of the god Osiris, and, as such, became the shrine to which millions of pilgrims made their way," declared Arthur Weigall in "A History of the Pharaohs", vol. I, page 111. The Egyptian god Osiris was the Baal of the Phoenicians, the Marduk of the Babylonians, the Tammuz of the Semites, the Nimrod of the Bible.

The Cairo fragment of the Annals of Dynasties I-V preserves a name of the mother of Athothis. She is Hept, meaning "the veiled one." This is a designation of Isis, the mother and wife of Osiris. The Assyrians called Isis or Hept Ishtar or Semiramis. In Scripture she is called Ashtoreth. This woman was originally the queen of Meni. Egypt's first king. She became Athothis' queen and wife after the planned death of Meni. Here is confirmation of the age-old tradition that Nimrod married his own mother. Later. Athothis himself was slain in the 28th year of his reign, according to Plutarch.

The father of Athothis, and Egypt's first king, was Meni or Mena -- Menes in Greek. His name means "The Establisher" ("History of Ancient Egypt", vol. II, p. 26, by George Rawlinson), or "The Everlasting" (Waddell's "Manetho", p. 215) Menes was the first to ESTABLISH himself as king in place of the Everlasting God. Since Menes was the father of Athothis (Nimrod), he is the Cush of the Bible. "And Cush begot Nimrod, he began to be a mighty one in the earth" (Gen. 10:8).

The third name in the first dynasty is Kenkenes, a Greek form of Kenken, meaning "The Terrible." He was born, according to Egyptian tradition, after the death of Osiris. His mother placed him on the throne. She claimed he was the reincarnation of Osiris, or Athothis; hence he is at times called Athothis, or Itit in early fragments. (These various names may be found in Sir Alan Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs" and in Weigall's "A History of the Pharaohs") He was also named Horus, the son of Isis.

Everyone of these famous men of old had many names. Of Nimrod, we read in the Epic of Creation:

"As for us, by however many names we call him, he is our god'
Let us then proclaim his fifty names"

Listed fourth in Dynasty I is Unephes. This king was a woman! She called herself Henneit, meaning "Neit is victorious." Neit is the Egyptian form of the Greek Athena. She also called herself Hept, which means "the veiled one," as already noted. This evidence clearly means that the wife of Meni, or Cush, was the mother and later the wife of Nimrod, and later still the mother of Kenkenes or Horus.

Years later, she even propositioned her own son Horus, called Gilgamesh in Babylonian tradition, as we read in the following extracts from the Epic of Gilgamesh:

"When Gilgamesh had put on his tiara,
Glorious Ishtar raised an eye at the beauty of Gilgamesh:
'Come, Gilgamesh, be thou my lover!
Do but grant me of thy fruit.
Thou shalt be my husband and I will be thy wife'.
Gilgamesh opened his mouth to speak,
Thou art but a brazier which goes out in the cold;
A back door which does not keep out blast and .windstorm;
Pitch which soils its bearers; A waterskin which soaks
through its bearer;
A shoe which pinches the foot of its owner!
Which lover didst thou love forever?
Come and I will name for thee thy lovers:
Of (the story of Cush is broken from the cuneiform
tablet)
for Tammuz, the lover of thy youth,
Thou hast ordained wailing year after year.
them."

(Consult Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", pages 83-84.
Compare the account of Tammuz with Ezekiel 8:14.)

The Chronology of Dynasty I

Now we are ready to build the chronology of Egypt and of all ancient history from its beginning. Without a knowledge of who these rulers of Dynasty I are, it would be impossible to make sense of the following lengths of reign. The various pieces of information came originally from a full-length account by Manetho. The abstractors each told only part of the full story. No one list is complete in itself, but taken together -- in the same way the Bible ought to be studied -- every chronological fact makes sense.

	Africanus	Eusebius	Eusebius (Armenian Version)
	Years	Years	Years
1 Menes (Cush)	62	60	30
2 Athothis (Nimrod)	57	27	25
3 Kenkenes (Horus or			

Gilgamesh)	31	39	39
4 Uenephes (Ishtar or Isis)	23	42	42

Eratosthenes gives 62 for Menes and 59 for Athothis.

The immediate comment that all modern historians give, is that the list is corrupt. But they have no proof. They have never assembled these figures to tell the full story. Remember, the full account of what really occurred is lost in Manetho's original work. (A few facts have been reclaimed by archaeology.) Each of the abstractors of Manetho told only part of the story. Like the writers of the four gospels, each viewed what he saw in history from a different perspective. What was important to one, did not appear as important to another. It is time scholarship had a little more respect for the documents they purport to handle so judiciously.

The numbers in this list, as in almost all ancient history and also the Bible, are calendar years. That explains why they are whole figures. The immediate years after the building of Babel are assigned to Cush, although his son Nimrod reigned jointly with him.

The account begins with the reign of Cush or Menes. He began to reign in Shinar, not in Egypt. He came to Egypt where he spent his last 30 years. Cush or Menes ruled altogether 62 years, after which Nimrod began his sole rule of 25 years. Nimrod settled in Egypt 60 years after the building of Babel, and reigned two years jointly with his father. His total reign in Egypt was therefore 27 years. Plutarch records that Osiris (Nimrod) had to flee Egypt at the end of 27 years. He was executed in the summer in his 28th year by Shem, in the month of Tammuz, the 17th day according to ancient tradition.

These events may thus be clearly dated as follows:

Menes (Cush)	60	2254-2194 (reign prior to coming of Nimrod)
Athothis (Nisrod)	27	2194-2167 (total reign in Egypt)
		-or-
Menes (Cush)	62	2254-2192 (total reign of Cush)
Athothis (Nimrod)	25	2192-2167 (sole reign in Egypt)

Cush came to Egypt about 2222 and united Upper and Lower Egypt under his supreme authority for 30 years -- 2222-2192. This marks the beginning of Cushite, or Ethiopian, settlement in Africa. Cush, at the time of death, may have been nearly 170 years of age.

Josephus confirms this restoration of history in "Antiquities" book VIII, chapter vi, sect. 2: "All the kings from Menes, who built Memphis, ... until Solomon ... was more than one thousand three hundred years."

In 2167 Nimrod (Athothis) fled to Italy and was slain there. At the flight of Nimrod, his mother-wife Uenephes also had to flee -- tradition states to the Delta. At this point some continued to reckon after the era of Nimrod or Athothis, since he had no male heir. Others reckoned time after his mother-wife who went into hiding. Thirty years passed. Now see how Manetho's figures fit!

It was about 57 years after Nimrod had come to Egypt. Suddenly his

widow Uenephes or Isis reappears with a son -- Kenkenes or Horus. Four years later -- 59 years after the death of Menes or Cush, she associates the son with her on the throne of Egypt. Isis or Uenephes thus temporarily triumphs over those who were responsible for the execution of Nimrod.

Eight years later -- 42 years after the death of Nimrod -- the son Horus becomes supreme ruler as his mother turns over to him the reins of government. Horus or Kenkenes reigned altogether 39 years, alone for 31 years. Uenephes therefore reigned, after her return from exile, for 12 years (four years alone and eight years with her son). Afterward she returned to the throne again for 11 years following the departure of Horus for Babylonia, making a total of 23 years. (In Babylon Horus received the name Gilgamesh.) Thus every figure of Manetho, preserved from antiquity, fits.

This information may therefore be summarized as follows:

Athothis (Nimrod)	57	2194-2137 (years from Nimrod's coming into Egypt to return of Isis)
Uenephes (Ishtar)	12	2137-2125
Kenkenes (Horus)	31	2125-2094 (sole reign of Horus)
Uenephes -- 11 years more,		2094-2083, making a total of 23.

-or-

Athothis (Nimrod)	27	2194-2167 (total reign in Egypt)
Uenephes (Ishtar)	42	2167-2125 (years from flight of Nimrod to sole reign of Horus)
Kenkenes (Horus)	31	2125-2094

-or-

Athothis (Nimrod)	59	2192-2133 (years from the death of Cush to reign of Horus)
Kenkenes (Horus)	39	2133-2094 (total reign of Horus)

It is immediately noticeable that Horus or Gilgamesh left Egypt exactly 100 years after Nimrod left Babylonia to come to Egypt -- 2194-2094. This figure has important significance when we come to comparing Egyptian history with that of the land of Shinar or Sumer, in Mesopotamia.

Shem in Egypt

The first book of Manetho lists four more kings in Dynasty I. Among them is Shem. All classical records agree as to the length of reign. The reconstructed Cairo fragment of the Palermo stone gives different figures, but the same total -- indicating there were contemporary reigns, during which more than one ruler shared the throne. A Biblical parallel to this may be observed in the case of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram in Judah (II Kings 8:16).

The figures appear as follows:

	Manetho		Palermo Stone Restored	
5 Usaphais	20	2083-2063	34	2083-2049
6 Miebis	26	2063-2037	19	2049-2030
7 Semempses	18	2037-2019	9	2030-2021
8 Bieneches	26	2019-1993	28	2021-1993

The total length of Dynasty I is 261 years -- 2254-1993.

The seventh king is especially significant. His original name in the Egyptian records is Semsem -- meaning the Great Sem or Shem. In the New Testament Greek, Shem is spelled Sem (Luke 3:36). The hieroglyphics representing Shem depict him in Asiatic, not Egyptian, dress. He appears as an old man with a long beard in priestly garb. Old indeed he was. About 430 years old!

Shem left Egypt in 2019 or one year before the death of Noah in 2018 which was 350 years after the Flood Shem probably heard that Noah was approaching death in 2019.

Now consider Miebis, the sixth king, and predecessor of Semsem. His tomb was defaced by Semsem. A later section, in volume II, will reveal Miebis to be Osiris II. He was slain by Semsem. The Egyptians called him Typhon. He was the "father" or ancestor of "Judah and Jerusalem," records Plutarch.

Dynasty II of Thisis

The kings of the second dynasty were comparatively insignificant. Other and more powerful rulers were dominating Egypt at this time -- ever since the days of Shem, but who they were will be disclosed only after the chronology of the first eight dynasties is firmly established. The change from Dynasty I to II at this point in history will also become apparent, once we begin to examine parallel dynasties who fought over the possession of Abydos and Thisis.

The first four rulers of Dynasty II:

Names in Manetho	Names in King lists	Years of Reign	Dates
1 Boethos	Bedjau	38	1993-1955
2 Kaiechos	Kakau	39	1955-1916
3 Binothris	Banutjeren	47	1916-1869
4 Tlas	Wadjnas	17	1869-1852

The fragment of the Palermo Stone agrees with this total.

In the reign of Binothris "it was decided that women might hold the kingly office," wrote Manetho. This legal decision accounts for the bifurcation of the dynasty within two generations. Manetho's abstractors list both branches of the dynasty in successive order, giving the false impression that one followed the other. This is the

very same technique Manetho employed in listing contemporary dynasties. The Turin Papyrus and the Palermo Stone provide the information missing from Manetho. Once again all the evidence must be considered, including Manetho.

The fifth king listed by Manetho and the monuments was Sethenes (Sendi in the King-lists). He reigned altogether for 41 years -- 1852-1811. The Palermo stone provides the added fact that he associated others with him after his 37th year. His sole reign was 37 years -- 1852-1815.

At this point he associated Chaires and Sesochris with him on the throne. Sesochris -- the eighth in Manetho's list -- was succeeded by Cheneres -- the ninth in Manetho. Their reigns:

Names in Manetho	Names in King-lists	Years of Reign In Manetho	Dates
5 Sethenes	Sendi	37 (or 41)	1852-1815 (or 1852-1811)
8 Sesochris	Neferkaseker	48	1815-1767
9 Cheneres	--	30	1767-1737

Parallel with Sesochris was Chaires, who reigned for 17 years. His successor was Nephercheres (Neferkare in the King-lists). Manetho gives him a total reign of 25 years, but the Palermo Stone and the Turin Papyrus indicate he was removed from the kingship by Sesochris after a reign of only 15 years. The Turin Papyrus preserves the record that Sesochris replaced him for 8 years. Following the usurpation by Sesochris, Nephercheres returned to the throne for 10 more years completing 25 years of reign. He was succeeded by Necherophes, the first king listed by Manetho for Dynasty III of Memphis. In chart form this information appears thus:

Names in Manetho	Years of Reign	Dates
6 Chaires	17	1815-1798
7 Nephercheres	15	1798-1783
8 Sesochris (Neferkaseker)	8	1783-1775
7 Nephercheres	10	1775-1765
Necherophes (reigns in Memphis)	28	1765-1737

The Turin Papyrus indicates that the return to power of Nephercheres was facilitated by another prince of royal blood who shared the throne. Though Manetho does not list him, he and his successor appear in the King-lists and in the Turin Papyrus as follows:

Names in King-lists and Turin Papyrus	Years of Reign	Dates
Hudjefa	11	1775-1764
Beby (Bebty)	27	1764-1737

Thus every date from each document is accounted for. The total length of Dynasty II is 256 years -- 1993-1737, Altogether 517 years had elapsed since human government was established after the deluge.

Joseph and the Seven-Years' Famine

It has been necessary to name kings not associated with Biblical events in order to establish the proper date for Dynasty III. This dynasty is one of the most important in all Egyptian history. In it are the records of Joseph's rulership and of the seven years' famine. This dynasty is usually mistakenly placed over a thousand years too early! But before proceeding, we must examine the Turin Papyrus for a most significant summary date.

The Turin Papyrus contains the following entry after Dynasty VIII: "Kings since Menes, their kingdoms and years: 949 years: kingless years: 6. Total, 955." (See Gardiner's Royal Canon of Turin.) It also lists 181 years for Dynasty VI. The known length of Dynasty III is 74 years, of Dynasty IV, 123; of Dynasty V, 140; of Dynasty VIII, 140. And remember, Dynasty I and Dynasty II totaled 517 years. Yet the total for the entire period is only 955 years. There is no other possible explanation than that certain of these dynasties reigned parallel with each other. Joseph will be found listed in two of them!

To return to Dynasty III -- the first dynasty of the city of Memphis. The Turin Papyrus, together with the restored Palermo Stone, provides the complete regnal years of the five successive kings who dominated the dynasty. The name Zoser, the first ruler of the dynasty is also spelled Djoser.

Names of Kings in King-lists	Name in Manetho	Reigns in Turin Canon	Dates
Zoser-za (Netjrikhe)	Tosorthros	19	1737-1718
Nebka (of the royal line of Beby)		19	1718-1699
Zoser-teti	Tosertasis	6	1699-1693
Nebkare		6	1693-1687
Huny		24	1687-1663

The end of a seven-year's famine occurred at the close of year 18 of Zoser I (end of winter 1719). No other seven-years' famine is reported during the entire history of the Pharaohs. This is the Biblical seven-years' famine under Joseph. It is at the right time.

An account of the calamity is to be found on the rocks of the island of Sehel, at the First Cataract. A modern translation of it may be found in "Biblical Archaeology" by G. Ernest Wright, page 56. The account reads:

"Year 18 I was in distress on the Great Throne, and those who are in the palace were in Heart's affliction from a very great evil, since the Nile had not come in my time

for a space of seven years. Grain was scant, fruits were dried up, and everything which they eat was short The infant was wailing; the youth was waiting; the heart of the old man was in sorrow The courtiers were in need. The temples were shut up Everything was found empty." (Translation by J. A. Wilson in "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", edited by J. B. Pritchard, page 31.)

But where does Joseph appear in this period? The answer is found in Dynasty III and Dynasty IV of Manetho. He appears under the name Suphis (or Souphis or Saophis) -- different Greek spellings from Manetho's abstractors. Joseph in Hebrew, it should be noted, is not pronounced with an English "J" sound, but with a "Y" sound. In Manetho's Egyptian transcription of the name only the consonents "s" and "ph" appear -- hence the Greek Souphis or its variant forms. Eratosthenes wrote that the Egyptians had designated Suphis as a "money-getter" or "trafficker" (Fragment 17, "Manetho", by W. G. Waddell, page 219).

Dynasty III in Manetho is made up of many rulers which do not appear in the Turin Papyrus. Only the two Djosers appear in each list, and in each case the full length of reign is preserved in Manetho. These otherwise unknown rulers are accounted fiction by modern historians. Had they only looked in the Bible they would have found one of them in the person of Joseph.

Names in Manetho	Name in King-lists	Length of Reign	Dates
1 Necherophes (previously mentioned at end of Dynasty II)		28	1765-1737
2 Tosorthros	Djoser-za	29	1737-1708
3 Tureis		7	1708-1701
4 Mesochris		17	1701-1684
5 Souphis (Joseph)		16	1684-1668

In Dynasty IV Suphis or Joseph is given 66 years by Manetho. This makes it clear that Dynasty IV -- a foreign dynasty -- parallels Dynasty III. The two records together tell the full story. Only the latter portion of Joseph's reign is preserved in the list of rulers in Dynasty III. The entire period of Joseph's public service is contained in the parallel account. The 66 years of Joseph's public service cover the years 1734-1668. Compare this date with Zoser's seven years of famine. The famine ended in 1719 after the rise in Upper Egypt of the new Nile during the summer of 1720 in Zoser's 18th year. The famine thus extends in Egypt from the spring of 1726 to the spring of 1719 (Jacob came to Egypt in the summer of 1725, after the harvest had failed two years in Palestine) The seven harvests of great abundance were during the years 1733-1727. Joseph, according to the Bible, came to power in 1734, the year before the beginning of the seven years of

prosperity. And 1734 is the very date for the commencement of Joseph's public office, as listed in the fourth dynasty! Joseph was 30 years of age upon entering his service (Gen. 41:46). He thus served till 96 years of age, and died at 110 (50:26).

But Manetho's account does not end here. There are yet four kings that complete the dynasty. These kings parallel, in part, those already mentioned, and whose reign is preserved in the Turin Papyrus.

Names in Manetho Dynasty III	Names in Turin Canon and King- list	Length of Reign in	Dates
6 Tosertasis	Djoser-teti or Teti	19	1699-1680
7 Aches		42	1680-1638
8 Sephuris	Sahure	30	1638-1608
9 Kerpheres		26	1608-1582

In summary, the third dynasty is divided at times into two or three branches -- just as was the second dynasty. The government under this dynasty was centered at Memphis. Not every ruler was of the same rank, of course, but all exercised royal power (Genesis 41:39-44).

Although Dynasty IV, in which Joseph's and Job's long reigns are recorded, is parallel with these events, it is better to restore it after the fifth and sixth dynasties are presented.

The Exodus

In Manetho, Dynasty V is designated as from Elephantine -- far away to the south, in Upper Egypt on the borders of Nubia. Although Manetho lists nine kings in the dynasty, he plainly states that there were only "eight kings from Elephantine." This mystery has never been solved by historians. Their explanation is that the records are incorrect. Not so. There were only eight kings from Elephantine, because Sefhres, the second in the list, was of the Memphis line and had already appeared as Sephuris in the third dynasty. He is the key to the proper dating of Dynasty V. Though from Elephantine, the government was usually centered near Memphis. The Turin Papyrus and the restored Palermo Stone give us the following summary:

Names in Manetho	Names in King-lists & Canon of Turin	Years of Reign in Turin Canon and Palermo Stone	Dates
1 Usercheres	Userkaf	7	1627-1620
2 Sefhres (mentioned in Dynasty III as Sephuris)	Sahure	12	1620-1608
3 Nephcheres	Neferirkare	21	1608-1587
4 Sisires	Shepseskare	7	1587-1580

5 Cheres	Khaneferre	17	1580-1563
6 Rathures	Niuserre	11	1563-1552
7 Mencheres	Menkauhor	8	1552-1544
8 Tancheres	Djedkare	28	1544-1516
9 Onnos	Unis (Unas)	30	1516-1486

With Unis the dynasty comes to a catastrophic end. (He was a contemporary of the Pharaoh who perished at the Red Sea.) The king died the night of the Passover. Unis was a firstborn' He was also a cannibal! After Moses left Egypt, he commenced the frightful practice of eating the firstborn of his enemies. That is one of the reasons God slew the firstborn of Egypt. From the pyramid-tomb of Unis one may read this horrible account of his life, his blasphemous claims, and his deeds.

"Behold, Unas hath arrived at the height of heaven Ra is on one side and Horus is on the other, and Unas is between them Unas hath weighed his word with the hidden god who hath no name, on the day of hacking in pieces the firstborn Unas devoureth men He ... cutteth off hairy scalps ... the cordmaster hath bound them for slaughter. Khonsu the slayer of ... hath cut their throats and drawn out their inward parts, for it was he whom Unas sent to drive them in: and Shesem hath cut them in pieces and boiled their members in his blazing cauldrons. Unas hath eaten their words of power, and he hath swallowed their spirits; the great ones among them serve for his meal at daybreak, the lesser serve for his meal at eventide, and the least among them serve for his meal at night. The old gods and the old goddesses become fuel for his furnace. The mighty ones in heaven shoot out fire under the cauldrons which are heaped up with the haunches of the firstborn; and he that maketh those who live in heaven to revolve around Unas hath shot into the cauldrons the haunches of their women of the gods in visible form. UNAS IS THE FIRSTBORN OF THE FIRSTBORN existence is ... and the offerings made unto him are more than those made unto the gods ..." (from E. A. Wallis Budge's "A History of Egypt", vol. II, pages 83-88.) Compare King Unis and his blasphemous claims with II Thessalonians 2:3-4. A remarkable analogy.

Manetho adds details to this dynasty missing from the Turin Canon. His figures for length of reign clearly illustrate that several kings of Dynasty V reigned jointly as with almost every previous royal line. From Manetho's abstractors the following table may be drawn up:

Name in Manetho	Length of Reign	Dates
1 Usercheres	28	1648-1620
2 Sefhres	13	1620-1607
3 Nephcheres	20	1607-1587

(The reign of Usercheres in the Turin Papyrus does not begin until 1627, after the end of its Dynasty IV, though he had previously been reigning.)

4 Sisires	7	1587-1580
5 Cheres	20	1580-1560

At this point the line of Elephantine divides into two branches. After year 17 of Cheres, Rathures came to power for 44 years and was succeeded by Unis.

6 Rathures	44	1563-1519
9 Onnos (Unis)	33	1519-1486

After the 20-year reign of Cheres, Tancheres came to power also for 44 years, with Unis as his successor as follows:

8 Tancheres	44	1560-1516
9 Onnos (Unis)	30 in Turin Canon	1516-1486

For a total period of 9 years Mencheres shared in the government, giving rise to three parallel reigns. Subdivisions of government as here illustrated were quite typical of the ancient world. An example that might be cited is the government of the later Roman Empire when subdivided into two parts, each under two emperors.

Pharaoh of the Exodus

Now for the sixth dynasty. To determine its chronological place in history, we must first establish the end of Dynasty VIII. Dynasty VIII, located at Memphis, was a very weak period -- under foreign dominion, as will later be established. It lasted a total of 140 years. Many of the names of its kings have been found, but no regnal dates for any individual kings can be determined. (Consult Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 437.) This dynasty concludes the 955 years from the beginning of the government of Menes or Cush at Babel, according to the Turin Canon. Its dates are therefore 1439-1299.

It was preceded by 6 kingless years, extending from 1445-1439. This period corresponds with Joshua's conquest of Goshen to the Nile (Joshua 10:41 and 11:16). Sometimes these six kingless years are attached to Dynasty VI; on other occasions the period is attached to Dynasty VIII. During this period of six kingless years occurs the ephemeral seventh dynasty. Africanus records that it comprised a kind of council with 70 kings exercising authority for 70 days. Eusebius declares there were 5 kings who ruled for 75 days. Little else is known of the period.

Dynasty VI of Memphis immediately preceded this period. It lasted 181 years -- 1626-1445. The following chart is determined from archaeological evidence and the Turin Canon.

Names in Manetho	Names in Turin Canon and King-	Length of Reign	Dates
------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	-------

lists

1	Othoes	Teti	13	1626-1613
		Userkare (a usurper)	6	1613-1607
2	Phios	Piopi	20	1607-1587
3	Menthusuphis	Merenre	6	1587-1581
4	Phiops	Neferkare	94	1581-1487
5	Menthesuphis	Merenre-Antyemzaef	1	1487-1486
6	Nitocris	Nitokerty	12	1486-1474
	(Manetho ends his list here)	Neferka, the younger	20	1474-1454
		Nufe	2	1454-1452
		Kakare (Ibi)	4	1452-1448
		(name missing)	2	1448-1446
		(name missing)	1	1446-1445

Manetho assigns to Othoes 30 years, at the end of which time he was assassinated by his bodyguard, His total reign extended from 1643-1613. Manetho's second king Phios is assigned 53 years: 1613-1560. He reigned jointly during the early years of his young son Pepi the Great (Phiops Neferkare) Menthusuphis is assigned by Manetho 7 years, and archaeological finds indicate he reigned a year jointly with his young brother before he died (1581-1580).

Compare these dates with those of Dynasty V for the Exodus. Dynasty V ended at 1486 with the death of the magician-king (Unis is called Jannes in II Timothy 3:8.) In Dynasty VI king Merenre II also dies in 1486, after only one year's reign. He was succeeded by his wife Nitocris, then by his son Neferka "the younger." Neferka's older brother, the firstborn, died at the Passover. No trace of him has been found. Compare this with Exodus 2:23, "And it came to pass in the course of those many days that the king of Egypt died." This king is Neferkare -- more commonly called Pepi II -- who reigned the longest in all Egyptian history. He came to the throne at 6 years of age and died at 100. Then God calls Moses. To Moses he declared: "Go, return into Egypt: for all the men are dead that sought thy life" (Exodus 4:19). Merenre II was now reigning -- the Pharaoh whom Moses and Aaron met and who perished in the Red Sea. At this juncture in history Egypt collapsed. Foreign invaders enter the land -- but who they were and where they came from must wait until all the previous dynasties before the Exodus are determined.

Dynasty IV -- the Pyramid Builders

To return to the story of Joseph. Parallel with Dynasty III of Memphis, was Dynasty IV, "eight kings of Memphis belonging to a different line." This dynasty includes such famous names as Cheops,

Chephren and Mycerinus -- to use the names made familiar by Herodotus. The list of kings of the fourth dynasty in the Turin Canon and on the Palermo Stone differs from Manetho after Cheops. The result, no doubt, of the tragic plague that came upon Cheops (Job). The Palermo Stone and the Turin Canon begin Dynasty IV 123 years before Dynasty V. That means it commenced the 24-year reign of Snefru in 1750. The following dates are from Turin Canon and restored Palermo Stone.

Name in King-lists and on Turin Papyrus	Length of Reign	Dates
Snefru	24	1750-1726
Khufwey (Cheops)	23	1726-1703

(According to Herodotus, the Great Pyramid took 20 years to build, much of it during the time of the seven-years' famine when labor was available. The loss of authority after 23 years appears to correspond with the plague on Job. At this point the death of several of the sons of Cheops is recorded at the tombs near Gizeh) Continuing:

Radjedef	8	1703-1695
Khafre	27	1695-1668
Hardjedef	7	1668-1661
Baufre	28	1661-1633
Shepseskaf	4	1633-1629
(name missing)	2	1629-1627

At this point this branch of the dynasty was succeeded by the kings of Dynasty V, from Elephantine.

The following is the information preserved by Manetho who begins the dynasty five years earlier than does the Turin Canon. (Note that Cheops is designated as Job. See May 1958 "Good News", p. 3.)

Names in Manetho	Names in King-lists	Length of Reign	Dates
1 Soris	Snofru or Snefru	29	1755-1726
2 Suphis (Cheops or Job)	Khufwey	63	1726-1663
3 Suphis (Joseph)	---	66	1734-1668
4 Mencheres	Menkaure	63	1668-1605
Parallel with Mycerinus were the following:			
5 Ratoises	---	25	1668-1643
6 Bicheris	---	22	1643-1621

7 Sebecheres	---	7	1621-1614
8 Thampthis	---	9	1614-1605

Herodotus tells us that according to Egyptian tradition there were 150 years between the beginning of the dynasty and the end of the life of Mycerinug, 1755-1605. Manetho's account appears senseless to historians because they have assumed there were no other kings than those whose records they have found through archaeology. It is often the men who were least important in their own age whose tombs or monuments have been recovered, while the individuals who loomed large at the time have vanished completely.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Missing Half of Egypt's History

Who was the daughter of Pharaoh who adopted Moses? Where is Moses mentioned in the story of Egypt? Who was that Ramses whose land Jacob was given to dwell in? Which Pharaoh took Sarai from Abram?

Thus far only half the story of Egypt before the Exodus has been told. The first eight dynasties have told of the royal lines from Abydos or Thinis and of Memphis and Elephantine. Memphis, as most are aware, was the ancient capital of Lower Egypt. Who were the kings of Upper Egypt during this period? And of the Delta and of Middle Egypt?

The Story Unfolds

The Bible is not a history textbook. It is a guide book. Without it nothing important in ancient history can be rightly understood. But this does not mean all ancient history is recorded in the Bible. Scripture is the starting point of study. It opens up solutions to secular records that otherwise would be misunderstood. This is especially true of Egypt's history.

Josephus, the Jewish historian of the first century of our era, wrote in his "Antiquities" of the life of Moses before he fled Egypt at age 40. Just prior to the flight of Moses, the Egyptians had been overrun by the Ethiopians from the south. This is the famous period of the Ethiopian Wars. Josephus records Moses' part in them. "The Egyptians, under this sad oppression, betook themselves to their oracles and prophecies; and when God had given them this counsel, to make use of Moses the Hebrew, and take his assistance, the king commanded his daughter to produce him, that he might be the general of their army." (Book II, chapter x, part 2.)

Moses' generalship is carefully recorded by Josephus in the entire chapter. The final victory was gained at the city of Saba (later Meroe), where the daughter of the Ethiopians -- Tharbis -- turned over the city as the price of her marriage to Moses. (Is this the beginning of the story in Numbers 12:1?)

"Now the Egyptians," continues Josephus in the next chapter, "after they had been preserved by Moses ... told the king he ought to be slain. The king ... also ... was ready to undertake to kill Moses; but when he (Moses) had learned beforehand what plots there were against him, he ... took his flight through the deserts, and where his enemies could not suspect he would travel."

Moses, it must be remembered, was heir to a throne in Egypt. The ruling Pharaoh had a daughter, but no grandchildren. Josephus explains Moses' peculiar position at the end of chapter ix of book II. "If Moses had been slain (after his adoption), there was no one, either akin or adopted, that had any oracle on his side for pretending to the crown of Egypt."

Here are the needed clues. A dynasty in which Moses is General, and one which was broken at the very point in history that Moses fled. Is there such a dynasty -- one which also exercised jurisdiction in the northeastern Delta where Israel dwelt and Moses was found?

Indeed there is just such a dynasty -- Dynasty XIII of Thebes!

The total length of this dynasty, according to Africanus' and Eusebius' epitomes from Manetho, was 453 years, under 60 rulers. But

the version of Barbarus provides a missing detail from Manetho. It reveals that for a time the court was not only at Thebes, but at Bubastis in the Delta for the first 153 years. (See Alfred Schoene's edition of "Eusebius", page 214.)

Moses the General

In the Turin Canon catalogue of kings of the thirteenth dynasty, listed number 17, is "The General," with the throne name of Semenkhhkare. (Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 440; and Weigall's "History of the Pharaohs", pages 136, 151-152.) The Egyptian word for "the General" was Mermeshoi. Not in all dynastic history does this title appear again as the personal name of a ruler of Egypt. This General was Moses as will be demonstrated by a comparison with contemporary history. Two beautiful large granite statues of Mermeshoi -- the General -- have been found in the Delta at Tanis. They are of excellent workmanship.

When Moses was made General or Commander of the Troops, he automatically inherited royal authority, as did Joseph before him. Only KINGS could have the supreme command of the army. That explains his appearance in this list. Before the rise to power of this famous General, the thirteenth dynasty was of Asiatic blood. Its kings at times bore the epithet "the Asiatic." There was consequently no basic prejudice in adopting the Hebrew child Moses into the family. (See Volume II, chapter II of the revised "Cambridge Ancient History", 1962)

The sixteenth king listed in the Turin Canon -- just before "the General" -- was Userkare Khendjer -- the latter being an un-Egyptian personal name. He ruled over the Delta as well as Upper Egypt. A pyramid of his has been found at South Saqqara. No descendant of his is known to have succeeded to the throne. Though nothing more is known of this man's family, every evidence points to him as the Pharaoh whose daughter is mentioned in the book of Exodus. Within a few years the influence of this dynasty in the eastern Delta ceased.

The kings of this period often have their names associated with King Neferkare on royal seals. This name is that of Pepi the Great. Here is the final proof that these rulers of Dynasty XIII were contemporary with the last great Pharaoh of the sixth dynasty of Memphis! More than one name on a scarab has puzzled many historians, who view Egypt as ruled generally by only one king at a time. But literally hundreds of such seals have been found. They are generally treated with discreet silence, for the implication of these seals would revolutionize the history of Egypt! (See "The Sceptre of Egypt", by William C. Hayes, Volume I, page 342.)

About 40 years after the reign of the General, Egypt collapsed. With the reign of the 25th king of the dynasty, nearly all contemporary evidence ceases. Foreigners invade the country. This period is summarized by Sir Alan Gardiner by the dismal words: "... darkness descends upon the historical scene, leaving discernible in the twilight little beyond royal names ..." (page 155 of "Egypt of the Pharaohs").

No internal dates for this dynasty are now available. But the history of this and preceding dynasties of Thebes can be restored. Take the evidence of Barbarus, which gives the dynasty, while centered in the Delta, 153 years. Place this date in the 41st year before the collapse of Egypt in 1486. The 41st year before 1486 brings us to 1527. (This is when Moses is nearly 40 years old during the war with Ethiopia. When Moses is forty, in 1526 he flees Egypt.) The beginning

of the dynasty was then 153 years before this, or in 1680. There were only two dynasties of Thebes before this time -- the eleventh and the twelfth. Dynasty XI ruled 143 years; the famous Dynasty XII for 212 calendar years. Add these figures up and one reaches 2035 -- the reign of Shem!

Now the story of Shem is clear. Shem came into Egypt to divide the country up into various kingships, in order to prevent the rise to power of one unified kingdom over the entire world.

But Shem did more than found a new kingship at Thebes -- he also established a kingship at Heracleopolis, south of Memphis. Manetho's Dynasty IX -- the first of two dynasties to be established in Heracleopolis -- ruled 409 years. It is exactly 409 years from 2035 to 1626, the date at which Dynasty VI of Memphis began.

The historians' fiction of an Old and a Middle Kingdom -- under Memphis, and then Thebes -- is completely demolished by these facts of history. It is, rather, the story of the kings of Memphis in Lower Egypt and the kings of Thebes in Upper Egypt ruling in a great confederacy.

History of Upper Egypt

Now, to tell the history of the kingships of Thebes and Heracleopolis which paralleled the dynasties of Thisis and Memphis and, later Elephantine. The city of Thebes, like Thisis during the second dynasty, was a small semi-independent kingdom that steadily rose to power. From archaeology the Turin Canon and monuments, the entire 143 years of the Dynasty XI can be restored as follows.

Names	Length of Reign together	Dates
Mentuhotpe, Hereditary Prince and Sehertowe Inyotef	16	2035-2019
Wahankh Inyotef	49	2019-1970
Nakhtnebtetpnufe Inyotef	8	1970-1962
Nebhepetre Mentuhotpe	51	1962-1911
Sankhkare Mentuhotpe	12	1911-1899
Nebtowerre Mentuhotpe and others	7 years of near anarchy	1899-1892

In the days of Wahankh Inyotef a tragic war broke out in Egypt between the rulers of Heracleopolis and Thebes over control of the city of Thisis (Abydos). In this struggle the first dynasty of Thisis collapsed, and a new dynasty arose in 1993. It is interesting to note that Wahankh came to power in the year (2019) that Shem ceased to reign in Thisis. It appears that with his departure war convulsed Egypt. Once these dynasties are properly placed the whole of Egypt's ancient history makes sense -- to the very year! Since the restoration, in this compendium, must proceed solidly step by step, the events cannot be told here in logical order until the chronological position of the dynasties is positively determined. It is advisable that the lists of dynasties already given be continuously consulted.

Before we can proceed further with the story, a chart of the two dynasties of Heracleopolis and of Dynasty XI of Thebes is needed. The meaning of this chart will become apparent with the development of the story of Thebes. The figures for the length of the Heracleopolitan dynasties are falsely labeled spurious -- by historians. Now consider Dynasty XI of Thebes.

Theban Dynasty XI -- 143 years -- 2035-1892
First conquest of Heracleopolis, ninth year of Nebhepetre
Mentuhotpe -- 1954
Final conquest of Heracleopolis and union of all Egypt 100 years
after founding of dynasty -- 1935
Years of dominion over all Egypt: 43 -- 1935-1892

Dynasty IX at Heracleopolis appears in Manetho thus:
Length of rule: 409 years -- 2035-1626 -- to Dynasty VI of Memphis
Length of power: 100 years -- 2035-1935

Dynasty X at Heracleopolis appears in Manetho thus:
Length of rule: 204 years -- 1954-1750 -- to Dynasty IV of Memphis
Length of rule: 185 years -- 1935-1750 -- to Dynasty IV of Memphis

The preceding outline is explained by these facts. Three dynasties contended for the control of Egypt after Thebes obtained control of Thisis and subordinated its second dynasty.

In the ninth year of Nebhepetre Mentuhotpe -- the Pharaoh to whose harem Sarah was brought -- a great war was fought over the city of Heracleopolis. So small was Egypt's population in those days that only 60 men were lost by the Thebans in their attack. This and many other evidences clearly indicate that the eleventh dynasty was one of the earliest in Egypt. This ninth year was 1954-53. This date is very significant. Barbarus, the Latin writer, designated Dynasty X of Heracleopolis as lasting 204 years. (In this account a note of caution should be observed. As Manetho listed the dynasties of Egypt, the only two dynasties of Heracleopolis were labeled Dynasty IX and Dynasty X. In any final history textbook Manetho's numbering should be discarded. and each city's dynasties should be renumbered from the beginning. Thus these two dynasties were not IX and X of Heracleopolis, but I and II of Heracleopolis.) There were exactly 204 years between 1954, when the dynasty was founded, and 1750 when Snefru brought the fourth dynasty to power at Memphis.

Thus every major event in the history of the Theban kings is reflected in the history of Heracleopolis.

This does not mean that Dynasty IX ceased. It continued 409 years to the beginning of Dynasty VI, as already mentioned. The war with Heracleopolis continued intermittently until the 100th year of the Theban dynasty 1935. In that year Egypt was completely united under Mentuhotpe. This date, too, is significant. Although Africanus gives the length of Dynasty IX as 409 years, Eusebius gives it only 100 years. Since it was founded in 2035, its hundred years extended to 1935 as did that of Thebes. Thus one may see that instead of these figures being corrupt and unhistorical records, each tells only part of the whole story.

Already it has been noted that Dynasty X of Heracleopolis lasted 204 years. But Africanus and Eusebius state that its period of dominion was 185. It was exactly 185 years also from 1935 to 1750. The difference between these figures is 19 -- the same as between the years

1954 and 1935 in the reign of Mentuhotpe. Also Africanus and Eusebius both state that Dynasty XI of Thebes extended its rule over Egypt 43 years. From 1935 to the end of the dynasty in 1892 is exactly 43 years. All this is simple arithmetic that historians have not solved in 2000 years!

Few of the names of the Heracleopolitan dynasties have been preserved. Nor has any internal dating been preserved in any records. With the addition of the twelfth dynasty at Thebes, the following chart illustrates the order of dynasties in this early period.

Thinis

Dynasty I -- 261 years -- 2254-1993
 Dynasty II -- 256 years -- 1993-1737

Memphis

Dynasty III -- 74 years -- 1737-1663

Thebes

Dynasty XI -- 143 years -- 2035-1892
 Dynasty XII -- 212 years -- 1892-1680
 Dynasty XIII -- 453 years -- 1680-1227

Heracleopolis

Dynasty IX -- 100 years -- 2035-1935
 Dynasty X -- 185 years -- 1935-1750

Memphis

Dynasty IV -- 123 years -- 1750-1627
 Dynasty V -- 140 years -- 1627-1486

Heracleopolis

Dynasty IX -- 409 years -- 2035-1626

Memphis

Dynasty VI -- 181 years -- 1626-1445
 Dynasty VII and 6 kingless years 1445-1439
 Dynasty VIII -- 140 years -- 1439-1299

The Great Theban Dynasty XII

With the restoration of Dynasty XII of Thebes -- the second dynasty to rule in Thebes -- the history of early Egypt to the Exodus will be nearly complete.

The lengths of reigns of Dynasty XII are firmly established, though they have come down in several forms due to the practice of associating successors on the throne prior to death of predecessor, or of dating from designation as heir to the throne. In each case the total is 212 calendar years -- 1892-1680.

Names in Manetho	Personal Names	Length of Reign based on the Monuments	Dates
Ammenemes	Amenemhe I	20	1892-1872

Sesonchosis	Senwosre I	42	1872-1830
Ammanemes	Amenemhe II	32	1830-1798
(No name given)	Senwosre II	19	1798-1779
Sesostris	Senwosre III	38	1779-1741
Lachares (Lamares)	Amenemhe III	49	1741-1692
Ameres	(No name given)		
Ammenemes	Amenemhe IV	9	1692-1683
Scemiophris	Sebeknofru	3	1683-1680

(Dynasty XIII of Thebes follows.)

The Canon of Turin reckoned the first three kings' reigns differently, but the total again is the same. Amenemhe I is given 29 years (1892-1863). Senwosre I is given 45 years (1863-1818). Amenemhe II is given 20 years (1818-1798). These various datings, when taken together, illustrate the full tenure of public office.

Manetho's figures, as they have come down to us, tell another part of the story not contained in these records. His account deletes one king and adds another, beside referring to a rule of twelve. Manetho records that Amenemhe ruled 16 years during the close of the eleventh dynasty. His 30 years of rule after the close of seven years' anarchy is not recorded by Manethos abstractors.

Name in Manetho	Length of Reign from Manetho	Dates
Ammenemes	16	1908-1892
	(30)	(1892-1862)
Sesonchosis	46	1862-1816
Ammanemes	38	1816-1778
Sesostris	48	1778-1730
Lamares	8	1730-1722
"Others" during Dodecarchy, or rule of twelve.	22	1722-1700
Ameres	8	1700-1692
Ammenemes	8	1692-1684
Scemiophris	4	1684-1680

In late Ptolemaic times a document was written on the temple wall

at Edfu concerning a great war that occurred in the 363rd year of the era of Menes. Menes was crowned in 2254. The 363rd year is 1892. It was in this year that the climax of seven years of near anarchy was ended and the power or hegemony of Thebes was re-established over all Egypt. This same event is also recorded on the Palermo stone in the 363rd year of the kingdom.

Sesostris III was one of the greatest conquerors in early Egyptian history. Manetho records that "in nine years he subdued the whole of Asia, and Europe as far as Thrace ..." Asia, of course, refers to Asia Minor and the Near East only. But our interest in this dynasty centers rather on Amenemhe III, the Pharaoh who dominated all Egypt in Joseph's day. Egyptian history rarely records a man who exerted so much energy in a positive direction. Under him Lake Moeris was developed in the Fayyum for the storage of water. He was responsible for the construction of a long canal, a kind of secondary river, along the Nile to Lake Moeris. It is named to this day the Bahr Yusuf -- the River of Joseph! The famed Labyrinth was also erected under his rule. He associated, during the middle of his reign twelve rulers with him, called the Dodecarchy. Were these the brothers of Joseph? Amenemhe III took special efforts to measure the rise of the Nile. (Volume II of "A History of the Pharaohs", by Weigall.)

Before closing this period of history, it is important that one take notice of two facts that are at times misunderstood about this dynasty. Most historians date this dynasty to specific years "B.C." by astronomical methods. To do so they have recourse to altering certain readings in the documents they use. Further, historians neglect the fact that even the Egyptians state in their records that the courses of the heavens have on occasion changed. The Egyptian calendar does not determine the chronology of the time, but the proper historical restoration of the dynasties will instead enable the honest historian to determine the changes that have taken place in the Egyptian calendar.

The second problem is the stated length of the Dynasty XII in the Turin Canon. The figure is "213 years, 1 month, 17 days." The total length of the dynasty was only 212 calendar years. The last ruler -- Sebeknofru reigned for "3 years 10 months, 24 days." The last 10 months, together with about 3 months of the last year of Dynasty XI, when Amenemhe obtained control of Egypt prior to New Year, are added to 212 years to make 213. But the last 10 months of Sebeknofru's reign became the first year of Dynasty XIII. Hence it is not counted to Dynasty XII when calculated in sequence. (See page 71 of Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs".)

Who Was Rameses?

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in reconciling the Bible has been the reference in Genesis to the land of Rameses (Genesis 47:11). It has been assumed either that the book of Genesis was a late document which inserted the name of Rameses in place of some lost original name, or that the name is original and the account of the Exodus took place after Rameses and not in the manner described in the Bible. Neither of these explanations is correct.

Long before Rameses the Great was born, there were several kings, not known by modern historians, with some form of the name Rameses. The record of these kings of the Delta, foolishly rejected by all historians today, is the key to this enigma in the Bible. The names are

preserved by Syncellus in the Book of Sothis. A list of them may be found in Waddell's "Manetho", page 235.

This line of kings begins with "Mestram" -- the Mizraim of the Bible, from whom the Egyptians descended. Many early commentators thought this Mestram was the same person as Menes, and have therefore inserted Menes' name as an explanation of Mestram. But this is not so. Mestram founded a dynasty at Zoan in the Delta entirely separate from that of Cush and Nimrod. Among these rulers is a Rameses who lived in the days of Joseph and the fourth dynasty. Many historians have been puzzled by the fact that the name of Rameses should appear on so many of the building blocks that went into the early buildings of the third and fourth dynasties. Their mistaken explanation is that the later Rameses had his servants take time out to carve his name on all these stones. It never occurred to them that there might actually have been a Rameses who assisted in the erection of these fabulous monuments of a by-gone era.

As the history of Egypt is gradually reconstructed, the Book of Sothis will play an ever more prominent part in it. Syncellus believed the book to be a genuine list of kings from Manetho. It names many otherwise unknown kings, and places the known dynasties in the correct order. For this reason the book has been rejected for centuries as a fictitious account of Pharaonic Egypt. The Book of Sothis is one of the most important proofs of the true order of kings as presented in this restoration of Egyptian history.

The kings in the Book of Sothis continue to the coming of the Persians in 525, but they will not all be listed in this compendium until their proper place in history. Following are the kings from the book of Sothis to the year 1299.

Names of Kings from Book of Sothis	Length of Reign	Dates
1. Mestram	35	2254-2219
2. Kourodes	63	2219-2156
3. Aristarchos	34	2156-2122
4. Spanios	36	2122-2086
5,6. Two others unrecorded	72	2086-2014
7. Osiropis	23	2014-1991
8. Sesonchosis	49	1991-1942
9. Amenemes	29	1942-1913
10. Amasis	2	1913-1911
11. Acesephthres	13	1911-1898
12. Anchoreus	9	1898-1889
13. Armiyses	4	1889-1885

14. Chamois	12	1885-1873
15. Miamus	14	1873-1859
16. Amesesis	65	1859-1794
17. Uses	50	1794-1741
18. Rameses	29	1744-1715
19. Ramesomenes	15	1715-1700
20. Usimare	31	1700-1669
21. Ramesseseos	23	1669-1646
22. Ramessameno	19	1646-1627
23. Ramesse Iubasse	39	1627-1588
24. Ramesse Uaphru	29	1588-1559
25. Concharis	6	1559-1553
4 kings of Tanis	254	1553-1299

The fifth year of Concharis is the 700th year from Mestram. Because of this statement, most commentators alter the length of reign of Concharis from 6 to 5. ("Chronological Antiquities", by John Jackson, Vol. II, page 150.) The correct figure is 6. Following Concharis were four other kings of Tanis, names not preserved, who reigned during the succeeding 254 years. Add to the 700 the last year of Concharis, plus 254 and the total is 955. This is exactly the same figure which the Turin Papyrus gives for the end of the eighth dynasty of Memphis. Both these lists are historical. They come from the same original sources. Such a figure as 955 to end an era is preposterous on the basis of coincidence. This list of Tanite (Zoan) kings is historical.

Only one dynasty remains to be discussed before the coming of the Shepherd Kings. That is Dynasty XIV of Xoïs in the Delta. Its 76 kings lasted 484 years. It is known to be parallel with Dynasty XIII of Thebes. It commenced at the end of Dynasty III of Memphis, in 1663, following the reign of Huny and the departure of Job or Cheops in the same year, and ended in 1179. Africanus states that the dynasty exercised power for 184 years, but this covers only the time to the usurpation of power by the Shepherd kings. Few names have been preserved complete, and no regnal years are available. A complete list of the fragmentary names is printed in Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs", pages 441-442.

With this chapter the restoration of Egyptian history to the Exodus closes.

CHAPTER FIVE

Egypt After the Exodus

Numerous catastrophic events befell Egypt at the time of the Exodus. A frightful destruction of its national wealth; loss of two million people used as slaves; the death of its most powerful rulers.

All public building ceases. Historians have looked vainly for this sign of the Exodus sometime in the great eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties of Thebes. They have never found it. And no wonder. The Exodus occurred at the end of the fifth dynasty, and during the sixth, thirteenth and fourteenth! Every one of these dynasties preserves the record of the calamity.

After the Exodus an invasion of the Delta occurred, a natural consequence of Israel evacuating the territory. The story of the Exodus and of this invasion is recounted in the "Admonitions of Ipu-wer." A recent translation by John A. Wilson, of this early document may be found in Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", pages 441-444.

Who Were the Invaders?

The Egyptian priest Manetho wrote a full account of this great event. Much of his material has been preserved by Josephus. It is found in "Against Apion", book I, chapter 14, parts 73-92.

Manetho began his report by admitting, "... for what cause I know not, a blast of God smote us; and unexpectedly, from the regions of the East, invaders of obscure race marched in confidence of victory against our land. By main force they easily seized it without striking a blow, and having overpowered the rulers of the land, they burned our cities ruthlessly, razed to the ground the temples of the gods, and treated all the natives with a cruel hostility, massacring some and leading into slavery the wives and children of others. Finally they appointed a king of one of their number whose name was Salatis. He had his seat at Memphis, levying tribute from Upper and Lower Egypt, and always leaving garrisons behind in the most advantageous positions."

The name Salitis comes from a Semitic root meaning prince. It is the root of the word Sultan. These invaders came from the East. They must have passed to Egypt from Sinai. They made Egyptians slaves. Does the Bible speak of such a people who suddenly gained the dominance of this part of the world? Indeed, the Edomite Amalekites!

As late as the days of King Saul the Egyptians were still partly subject to these people. In I Samuel 30:11-13 appears this account: "And they found an Egyptian in the field And David said unto him, To whom belongest thou? and whence art thou? And he said, I am a young man of Egypt, servant to an Amalekite; and my master left me, because three days ago I fell sick."

In the time of Moses, shortly after the Exodus, Balaam spoke of Amalek in these terms: "And when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek the first of nations: but his latter end shall be that he perish forever" (Numbers 24:20). "The first of nations" is not a matter of time, but of position and rank. The Amalekites were a nation late to arrive, since they stemmed from Esau. But they were suddenly plummeted to greatness by seizing the Delta at the Exodus.

The first people to attack the children of Israel in Sinai were

the Amalekites. "Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel in Rephidim" (Exodus 17:8). Had not God intervened on behalf of Israel, the Amalekites would have gained a great victory.

From 1486 to 1076 the Amalekite Shepherd Kings and kindred peoples dominated the land of Egypt, as shall now be demonstrated. Historians have arbitrarily shortened this period to little more than a century and placed it much too early. But such are the vagaries of historians who have no respect for the record of history.

The Great Shepherds

Manetho tells us that Dynasty XV was composed of Shepherd Kings. The Egyptian word for them is "Hyksos". Hence these people are often spoken of as "the Hyksos." In the year the Hyksos overran Egypt they established their government at Memphis -- 1486 -- and ruled Egypt for the next 259 years. Nine years after the Exodus -- in 1477 -- they established court in Thebes. This explains why Eusebius assigns them only 250 years at Thebes -- 1477-1227. The year 1477, uniquely, coincides with the founding of Troy, in Asia Minor, by a related people. Dynasty XV is listed below according to Josephus and Eusebius. The varied spellings are from transcriptions by Josephus and Eusebius.

Names of Hyksos of Dynasty XV	Lengths of Reign	Dates
1 Salatis or Saites	19	1486-1467
2 Bnon	44	1467-1423
3 Pachnan or Apachnan	36	1423-1387
4 Apophis	61	1387-1326
5 Iannas or Staan	50	1326-1276
6 Archles or Assis	49	1276-1227

The name of the fifth ruler is usually spelled by modern archaeologists "Khayan" -- a title very similar to the Turkish and Tatar word Khan.

The fourth king, Apophis, is an important figure in Greek history, as will be seen when restoring to the correct dates the rulers of the Greek city of Sicyon. The Greeks knew him as Epopeus. He was killed in Greece.

The Great Hyksos kings of Dynasty XV tolerated the native rulers of Dynasty XIII of Thebes until 1227. In that year the Hyksos were forced to adopt a change in government at Thebes consequent to a native uprising. There followed, wrote Manetho, Dynasty XVII with 43 Shepherd Kings paralleled by 43 native kings of Thebes for 151 years. The native kings continued as vassals of the Hyksos. The 43 appointed Shepherd and native kings of Dynasty XVII ruled from 1227 to 1076, when the Hyksos were overthrown and the native Thebans of Dynasty XVII were superseded by Dynasty XVIII, In chart form the change in dynasties appears thus:

Dynasty XV 259 years

Dynasty XIII 453 years

1486-1227

Dynasty XVII 151 years
1227-1076

1680-1227

Dynasty XVII 151 years
1227-1076

The same pattern of change took place in 1179. In that year the fourteenth dynasty of Xois ceased (1663-1179). In its place arose an important new king line also called Dynasty XVII because it is related to the kings that came to power in Thebes in 1227. "They were brothers from Phoenicia and foreign kings: they seized Memphis." The Theban and Memphite branches were related by blood. The stronger ruled in Memphis the other in Thebes. This new line of Memphite kings ruled for 103 years -- 1179-1076. The names and dates are these:

Names of Great Hyksos of Dynasty XVII who Ruled in Memphis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
1 Saites	19	1179-1160
2 Bnon	40	1160-1120
3 Archles or Archaes	30	1120-1090
4 Aphophis	14	1090-1076

The year 1076 is clearly one of the most important in Egyptian history.

At the time of the conquest of Egypt by Dynasty XV, which set up its capital at Memphis, and later held court at Thebes, a lesser dynasty of foreigners set up a new regime in Upper Egypt in Thebes. This line of kings is known as Dynasty XVI. The names of these kings have not come down through the classical writers. There were 32 kings in all, ruling 511 or 518 years. The dates commence, of course, with the fall of the fifth dynasty 1486.

Many have thought these long dynastic figures preposterous. But they make good sense when studied in connection with the expeditions of Thutmose the Great. The two different lengths of reign extend to 975 and 968. They represent the 23rd and the 30th years of Thutmose. The campaign of 975 took him along the southern Phoenician coast and as far inland as Megiddo. The campaign of the 30th year brought Egyptian arms to Kadesh (Jerusalem) and to Arvad far to the north, along the upper Phoenician coast. Since the Phoenicians were associated with the Amalekites in the invasions of Egypt, under Dynasty XVII, the final overthrow of those rulers was in Egyptian records synonymous with the conquest of Phoenicia.

According to Africanus, the first five kings of Dynasty XVI ruled in Thebes for 190 years -- 1487-1297. At that time another line of Shepherd kings replaced them at Thebes for 221 years according to Barbarus. These 221 years extend from 1297-1076. It is apparent therefore that after 1297 Dynasty XVI ceased to rule at Thebes. The classical writers do not state where the government of this dynasty was later centered, although toward the end it was located in Phoenicia where Thutmose ends the rule of these local kings.

From Barbarus' account it is also clear that Dynasty XVII ruled at Thebes 70 years before replacing the Great Hyksos of the Fifteenth Dynasty in 1227. When Manetho stated the period as 151 years he

referred only to the time after Dynasty XV. In actuality Dynasty XVII had been reigning in Thebes since 1297 and continued for 221 years.

Thus all these figures, which at first seem so senseless, fit perfectly together. In chart form it may thus be illustrated.

Dynasty XVI 190 years 1487-1297	Dynasty XV 259 years 1486-1227
Dynasty XVII 221 total years 1297-1076	Dynasty XVII 151 years 1227-1076

One item yet remains for discussion -- the 48-year period between 1227-1179. The names of the chief rulers of Egypt from 1486 to 1227 are known -- Dynasty XV. So are the names of the rulers from 1179-1076 -- the Memphite branch of Dynasty XVII. What is the name of the ruler between these two dynasties? Surely Egypt can hardly have left us without a name for 48 years!

The answer is to be found in Africanus' account of Dynasty XV. Previously only Josephus' and Eusebius' transcriptions of Manetho were presented in chart form. It is now time to study Africanus' account.

Scholars have long puzzled over Africanus' transcription of Dynasty XV from Manetho. It is most commonly thought that Julius Africanus misplaced the name of Apophis from fourth place to last place in the dynasty. This assumption is unfounded. Africanus meant exactly what he wrote -- that an Apophis did in fact continue the line of kings of Dynasty XV after 1227. This second Apophis was not included after king Archles (1276-1227) by either Josephus or Eusebius. or in the Book of Sothis. Similarly Africanus did not include the first Apophis (1387-1326) whom the other transcribers recorded.

That there were in fact three Hyksos kings with the name Apophis -- two from Dynasty XV and one from Dynasty XVII -- has been amply confirmed by archaeological discovery. From the monuments modern research teams have recovered the full Egyptian names of each: Akenenre Apopi (1387-1326) who was slain in Greece: Aweserre Apopi (1227-1166) who fought a native rebellion which rocked the country in 1227: and Nebkhepeshre Apopi (1090-1076) of Dynasty XVII, whose short reign ended in the collapse of Hyksos dominion in Egypt. ("Egypt of the Pharaohs" by Gardiner, pages 157-168 and 443.)

The following chart presents the data preserved from Manetho by Africanus for Dynasty XV, beginning the year after the Exodus.

Dynasty XV According to Africanus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Saites	19	1486-1467
Bnon	44	1467-1423
Pachnan	61	1423-1362
(Aphophis I -- 1387-1326 -- is not included by Africanus, and a longer reign of 61 years instead of 36 years is assigned to Pachnan.)		
Staan (Iannas or Khian)	50	1326-1276
Archles	49	1276-1227

This is the Hyksos ruler whose reign extended over the 48-year period between the end of Dynasty XV in 1227 and the commencement of Dynasty XVII in 1179.

Hyksos in Book of Sothis

According to the Book of Sothis there were seven Hyksos kings who dominated Egypt from 1486-1227. These kings in the book of Sothis are labeled "the Seventeenth Dynasty" according to the reckoning of George Syncellus. They were, however, the kings usually known as Dynasty XV. Syncellus and Barbarus and other writers in early times apparently followed different methods in numbering Manetho's dynasties. Notice that even Africanus grouped two lines of kings -- one foreign, the other native -- under the heading "Dynasty XVII."

These Hyksos kings in the Book of Sothis appear as follows:

Names of Kings in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
26 Silites	19	1486-1467
27 Baion	44	1467-1423
28 Apachnas	36	1423-1387
29 Aphophis	61	1387-1326
30 Sethos	50	1326-1276
31 Certos	29 (or 44)	1276-1247 (or 1276-1232)
32 Aseth	20	1247-1227

At this point -- 1227 -- the natives forced the Hyksos or Amalekite to accept a new line of Egyptian rulers to represent Egypt at Thebes.

Amalekites After 1076

One must not assume, from these events. however, that Amalekite power was crushed solely by the Egyptians. Biblical history proves that Saul had no small part in the final overthrow of the Shepherd Amalekites outside Egypt. Saul was king 40 years altogether (Acts 13:21). After his anointing by Samuel there were almost twenty years (1091-1071) for which we have no record in the Bible. The country went to pieces under Philistine and Amalekite invaders. Then Saul regained his power for 20 years -- 1071-1051 ("Antiquities of the Jews" by Josephus, book VI, chapter XIV, section 9). One year later (following his return to power) Saul appointed his now-grown son Jonathan to assist him in a military campaign against the Philistines. This was the calendar year 1070-1069. God intervened on behalf of Israel with a tremendous earthquake that shook the earth (I Sam. 14:15).

"So Saul took the kingdom over Israel" (I Sam. 14:47) after this

great event. He then gathered a great host against the Amalekites and defeated them (I Sam. 14:48). This account is amplified in I Sam. 15:1-9.

It is significant that in the year 1069, in Greek history, there was an invasion of the Aegean by Amalekites and their brethren who were fleeing from war and from a terrible earthquake that had destroyed their possessions in Western Europe. Here we have the surprising Biblical evidence which reveals what befell the Hyksos in the 7 years after their expulsion from Egypt.

CHAPTER SIX

The Revival of Egypt

The return of Egypt to a great world power commenced with the overthrow of the Shepherd Kings in Upper Egypt. It opened the way for the most glamorous -- and the most incestuous -- of all Egyptian families -- Dynasty XVIII of Thebes.

(NOTE: To view the figure placed here, see the file CMPDM1A.TIF in the Images\OtherWCG directory.)

Archaeology has provided a wealth of information for this period. Yet no standard textbook has ever restored Dynasty XVIII to its rightful place in history. Because Manetho presented his history of Egypt's thirty dynasties in successive order, it was early assumed that the exodus occurred under this dynasty. Modern historians have long recognized that not one shred of evidence supports this preposterous traditional conception inherited from Catholic scholars. As a solution, they have proposed an even more preposterous theory -- that the exodus -- if it took place at all! -- was under the succeeding nineteenth dynasty. There is indeed a reference to Israel during the nineteenth dynasty of Egypt, but it is to the captivity of Israel -- not to the exodus, as will be demonstrated when restoring the Ramesside period.

Dynasty XVIII

Archaeological and classical materials are sufficient to restore in detail the dynastic sequence and relationship of the kings and queens of Dynasty XVIII. Ahmose commenced the dynasty and expelled the foreign Shepherd Kings. His queen, Ahmose-Nofreteroi, is "depicted for some unaccountable reason with a black countenance," declared Sir Alan Gardiner in "Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 175. The second king, Amenhotpe (Amenophis I), was pictured, black (I. Rosellini, "I Monumenti dell' Egitto e della Nubia", Pisa, 1832-44). Foucart in an article in the "Bulletin de, l'Institut Egyptien", 5 serie, II (1917), pages 268-269), presented evidence that in the Egyptian royal family of this period was Ethiopian blood.

But first, to restore Dynasty XVIII to its rightful place in history. From archaeological research and the classical writers the following chronological chart may be constructed.

Names of the Kings and Queen of Dynasty XVIII from archaeology	Names from Manetho	Lengths of Reign from Archaeological evidence and Manetho	Dates
Ahmose	---	25	1076-1051
Amenhotpe (Amenophis I)	---	21	1051-1030
Thutmose (I)	Chebron	13	1030-1017

Thutmose (II)	Amenophis	20	1017- 997
Hashepsowe (Hatshepsut)	Amessis or Smensis	21	996- 975*
Thutmose (III)	Mephres or Misaphris	54	997- 943
Amenhotpe (Amenophis II)	Mephramuthosis or Misphragmuthosis	25	943- 918
Thutmose (IV)	Tuthmosis	9	918-909

*Joint with Thutmose III.

At this point the dynasty should be interrupted to recount the major events in Egypt which synchronize with the history of neighboring nations and with the Bible.

The Biblical Parallel

The synchronism of Biblical and Egyptian history begins in the reign of Solomon, king of Israel. "Solomon became allied to Pharaoh king of Egypt by marriage, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David ..." (I Kings 3:1, Jewish Pub. Soc. trans.). (Who was the Pharaoh who became Solomon's father-in-law?

The answer may be established by determining the time of Solomon's reign. It is stated in I Kings 6:1, "And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Ziv, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord" (JPS trans.).

From Egyptian history the exodus may be dated Nisan (March-April) 1486. The 480th year thus extended from 1007-1006 (spring to spring). The fourth year of the reign of Solomon (1008-1007, reckoning autumn to autumn according to the civil calendar) thus corresponds to the time of Pharaoh Thutmose II. His chief wife and queen was Hashepsowe (Hatshepsut in earlier authors). As the mother of the Egyptian princess whom Solomon married is unrecorded it is presently impossible to determine from history whether Hashepsowe was Solomon's mother-in-law or step-mother-in-law. In either case she could learn firsthand of the riches and fame of Israel's king.

Solomon commenced the building of the Temple in his fourth year. In the eleventh year of his reign it was completed (I Kings 6:37-38). Thereupon Solomon devoted his time to the erection of his palace. "And Solomon was building his own house thirteen years ..." (I Kings 7:1). It was now the twenty-fourth year of Solomon's reign.

"And it came to pass at the end of twenty years (7 plus 13), wherein Solomon had build the two houses ..." that Hiram the king of Tyre came to visit Solomon (I Kings 9:10). But Hiram was not the only royal visitor who came about this time. "And when the queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon because of the name of the Lord, she came to prove him with hard questions" (I Kings 10:1). Jesus called the queen of Sheba "the queen of the south" (Matthew 12:42 and Luke 11:31). In the book of Daniel, chapter 11, the king of the south is the ruler of Egypt and Ethiopia. Jesus' designation of the queen of Sheba as the

"queen of the south" therefore means that she was the ruler of Egypt and Ethiopia. Was a woman -- a queen -- ruling Egypt in the twenty-fourth year of Solomon? Indeed -- Maekaure Hashepsowe!

Josephus, the Jewish historian, preserves an account of this famous visitor. "There was then a woman, queen of Egypt and Ethiopia book VIII, chapter vi, part 5).

Many modern historians have assumed that both Jesus and Josephus were incorrect. They limit the land of Sheba exclusively to southern Arabia. It is at this point that they seem to forget their history. Ethiopia anciently extended to southern Arabia. The land of Sheba -- the leading Ethiopian tribe -- included both southern Arabia and Ethiopia. Under Dynasty XVIII of Thebes Ethiopia and Egypt were united. The queen of the south was therefore also queen of Egypt -- the Hashepsowe of history.

Josephus preserves the name of the Queen of Sheba. He quotes from Herodotus and calls her "Nicaule" ("Antiquities", book VIII, chapter vi, part 2). Any philologist would immediately recognize in the name Nicaule (Nikaule in Greek) only a dialectic form of the Egyptian Maekaure, the "prenomen" of Hashepsowe.

Perhaps the most striking proof that Hashepsowe visited Palestine may be found recorded in the temple at Deir el Bahari. The walls of this temple enshrine the visit of the Queen to "God's Land." The event occurred in her ninth year -- 988-987 -- the year Solomon completed his great palace. In "Ancient Records of Egypt", by Breasted, volume II, may

be found the English translation of the inscriptions of the expedition. Here are extracts from this most famous of all Egyptian voyages:

"Sailing in the sea, beginning the goodly way towards God's-Land, journeying in peace to the land of Punt ..." (section 253).

God's Land is described in detail in section 288: "I have led them on water and on land, to explore the waters of inaccessible channels, and I have reached the Myrrh-terraces."

Queen Hashepsowe explored in God's Land "waters of inaccessible channels" -- an awkward modern translation meaning "spring-fed pools." Solomon built many spring-fed pools to supply the lovely artificial wooded terraces. "I made me gardens and parks," wrote Solomon, "and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruit; I made me pools of water, to water therefrom the wood springing up with trees" (Ecclesiastes 2:5-7).

"It is a glorious region of God's-Land; it is indeed my place of delight They took myrrh as they wished, they loaded the vessels to their hearts' content, with fresh myrrh trees, every good gift of this country, Puntites whom the people know not, Southernns of God's-Land." "Trees were taken up in God's-Land, and set in the ground in Egypt" (sect. 294). The vessels of the Queen, on the return trip up the Nile to Thebes were heavily loaded with "all goodly fragrant woods of God's-Land" and many other rarities which previously had been imported from around the world by the people of God's-Land. "Never was brought the like of this for any king who has been since the beginning" (sect. 265).

Scholars have foolishly puzzled for decades over the location of "God's-Land" -- "Toneter" in Egyptian. It is really no puzzle. The word in Egyptian signifies "Divine Land" or "Holy Land." The "Holy Land" is Palestine!

Egyptian inscriptions precisely define the location of God's-Land as Palestine. It lies between Egypt and Syria. In the Papyrus Harris one reads of "the products of Egypt, God's-Land, Syria and Kush"

(Breasted, op. cit., vol. IV, sect. 313). Again: "products of Egypt, products of God's-Land, products of Syria" (sects. 341, 387).

From the Piankhi Stela comes the same evidence: "Then the ships were laden with silver, gold, copper, clothing, and everything of the Northland, every product of Syria, and all sweet woods of God's-Land. His majesty sailed up-stream ..." from the Mediterranean coast southward up the Nile to Upper Egypt (Breasted, op. cit., vol. IV, sect. 883).

En route from Egypt to Upper Syria, Thutmose III passed by God's Land. "All plants that grow, all flowers that are in God's-Land which were found by his majesty when his majesty proceeded to Upper Retenu (Syria)" (Breasted, op. cit., vol. II, sect. 451).

Amenhotpe III cut cedar in God's Land for his sacred barge: " was dragged over the mountains of Retenu (Lebanon) by the princes of all countries" (section 888). No mistaking this reference. God's Land could refer to no other region than Palestine, the Holy Land.

In God's Land, or Palestine, Hashepsowe found more than one people. Inhabiting the southern portion, where the Queen first landed, were native "Puntites," presented to her as servants by the ruling people of the land. In her monuments at Deir el Bahari these "Puntites" are pictured as a short, round-headed, dark-skinned, thick-lipped people, whereas the dominant people were white men (Naville's "Deir el Bahari", Pt. III, page 12).

The two peoples of the Holy Land were Israelites and Canaanites. A remnant of Canaanites -- the "Puntites" of the inscriptions -- long lived in the mountains of Seir bordering on the Gulf of Aqaba. The words "Punt" and "Puntite" came to be pronounced in Egyptian without the "t." A better spelling of the Egyptian word would be "Puoni" or "Pwene", the latter most commonly used today by scholars. (See Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 37, note 1.) When referring to wars with the Canaanite Carthaginians, the Romans spoke of Punic wars -- Punic being a synonym for Canaanite. The chief Canaanite people were the Sidonians. The father of Sidon, in classical literature, was named Pontus (Eusebius, "Preparation for the Gospel", I, x, 27). In Scripture he is Canaan.

The land of Punt or Pwene was the land wherever Canaanites settled. Originally the land of "Punt" was limited to Palestine -- in Scripture "the land of Canaan" -- but in later times signified any land to which Phoenicians or Canaanites migrated. "Afterward were the families of the Canaanite spread abroad" (Genesis 10:18). Hence in Egyptian literature Punt included lands outside of Palestine or God's Land.

God's Land is Palestine. The Queen of Sheba is Hashepsowe. But who is "Shishak" the king of Egypt at the close of Solomon's reign?

Shishak Captures Jerusalem

In the later years of Solomon's reign, Egypt was ruled by a king named Shishak. He is introduced in I Kings 11:40, in an account of the strife between Solomon and Jeroboam. "Solomon sought therefore to kill Jeroboam; but Jeroboam arose, and fled to Egypt, unto Shishak king of Egypt, and was there in Egypt until the death of Solomon." Archaeology has as yet not found this name in Egypt, but it has appeared on tablets excavated at Ras Shamra in northern Syria. (See Dhorme's article in "Revue Biblique", XL, Jan. 1931, page 55.) The Pharaohs of Egypt usually

had many names, many of which have not yet been recovered by the archaeologists. Which king of Dynasty XVIII was Shishak?

The chronological chart at the beginning of this chapter indicates he was Thutmose III, often designated "the Great." He reigned not only in the later years of Solomon, but in the time of Rehoboam.

The Biblical record states that Shishak invaded Judah shortly after Solomon's death. "And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house: he even took away all; and he took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (I Kings 14:25-26).

A parallel and richer account is preserved in II Chronicles 12:1-8:

And it came to pass, when the kingdom of Rehoboam was established, and he was strong, that he forsook the law of the Lord, and all Israel with him. And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, because they had dealt treacherously with the Lord, with twelve hundred chariots, and three-score thousand horsemen; and the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt; the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Ethiopians. And he took the fortified cities which pertained to Judah, and came unto Jerusalem. Now Shemaiah the prophet came to Rehoboam, and to the princes of Judah, that were gathered together to Jerusalem because of Shishak, and said unto them: 'Thus saith the Lord: Ye have forsaken Me, therefore have I also left you in the hand of Shishak.' Then the princes of Israel and the king humbled themselves; and they said: 'The Lord is righteous.' And when the Lord saw that they humbled themselves, the word of the Lord came to Shemaiah, saying: 'They have humbled themselves; I will not destroy them: but I will grant them some deliverance, and My wrath shall not be poured out upon 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.' "

This momentous event in the history of Judah is dated to the fifth year of king Rehoboam. Reckoning from the fourth year of Solomon, 1008-1007 (autumn to autumn according to the civil calendar). the fifth year of Rehoboam would be 967-966. Now the thirty-first year of Thutmose III is 967-966 (spring to spring). The two regnal years overlap six months in the autumn and winter of the year 967-966.

In his thirtieth year Thutmose campaigned in Judah. He did not capture Jerusalem in this year (Breasted's "Ancient Records of Egypt",

vol. II, sect. 465, footnote a). However he did harvest their grain and take hostages.

Year thirty-one of Thutmose corresponds to Rehoboam's fifth. In this year Rehoboam humbled himself. Nevertheless, God allowed Thutmose to take Jerusalem. (For best Bible rendering see the Jewish Publication Society translation of II Chronicles 12:1-8.) For the list of spoils and tribute taken see Breasted, sections 471 and 473.

The first Egyptian to pierce the walls of Kadesh was Amenemhab He records in his biography: "His majesty sent forth every valiant man of his army, in order to pierce the wall for the first time, which Kadesh had made. I was the one who pierced it, being the first of all the valiant: no other before me did it" (section 590).

Archaeologists have spent years guessing the whereabouts of the city of Kadesh. No one, it seems, has suspected that it is Jerusalem!

All scholars recognize that the word Kadesh means "Holy." When used in reference to a city, it means a Holy City. Jerusalem is many times called the Holy City in Scripture. In Daniel 9:24 Jerusalem is referred to as "the holy city." In the original Hebrew, the root word for "holy" is KADESH. Nehemiah 11:1 speaks of "Jerusalem the holy city." Again the Hebrew root for "holy" is KADESH, sometimes spelled KODESH. See also Isaiah 48:2 and numerous other passages.

In all, Thutmose mentions one hundred and nineteen captured cities of Palestine. Kadesh is listed first, Megiddo second (A. Jirku, "Die aegyptischen Listen der Palaestinensischen und Syrischen Ortsnamen," "Klio Beihefte", XXXVIII, Leipzig, 1937). The wealth plundered from the Palace and the Temple in Jerusalem was engraved on the walls of the great Amon temple at Karnak and may be seen to this day.

Thutmose received continuous tribute from Judaea during the succeeding years of his reign, confirming the Biblical statement that the Jews became the "servants" of Shishak (II Chronicles 12:8).

In the forty-second year of Thutmose's reign he again "arrived at the district of Kadesh, captured the cities therein." (Sections 529, 531) This was in 955 or one year before Rehoboam died. Rehoboam reigned seventeen years in all (II Chronicles 12:13) In 954 Abijah succeeded his father -- twelve years after the capture of Jerusalem (966) Thutmose's intention was to perpetuate Egyptian rule on the kingdom of Judah. Rehoboam was old and weak after continual wars with Jeroboam.

Before completing the life of Thutmose, it is important to consider two other campaigns which preceded the attack on Jerusalem. In his twenty-third year, 975 exactly 511 years after the Exodus and the coming of the Hyksos into Egypt, Thutmose commenced "the first victorious expedition to extend the boundaries of Egypt with might ... Now, at that period the Asiatics had fallen into disagreement, each man fighting against his neighbor ." (Breasted, op cit., vol II, sections 415-416).

This campaign proceeded no farther north than Tripolis of the southern Lebanon. It marks the termination of the 511 years assigned to the Hyksos period by Josephus and the classical writers. Southern Phoenicia, from whence came some of the Shepherd Kings, was now subject to the Egyptians. Seven years later, 518 years after the Exodus in the thirtieth year of Thutmose III, a major campaign was carried on along the eastern Mediterranean coast to the city of Arvad (sect. 461). All of Phoenicia now passed under Egyptian sway. With this campaign the 518 years also assigned to the Hyksos period by Josephus were completed.

These momentous shifts in world politics at the close of Solomon's reign were the direct result of Solomon' sin, described in I Kings

11:1-13. Historians, interpreting history without God and the Bible, have mistakenly assumed that the spectacular growth in Egyptian power was due solely to Thutmose's political astuteness. Neglected is the military situation. Thutmose could never have accomplished his extended campaigns apart from revolts against Solomon. I Kings 11 14-40 unveils what the trip-hammer blows were that cracked Israel's power. The Edomites became restive, the Arameans in Damascus independent, and ten out of the twelve tribes of Israel were anticipating the death of Solomon as a quick remedy for excessive taxation. Thutmose merely seized the spoils of a nation which had grown soft spiritually because it set its mind on physical greatness alone.

Who Was Zerah the Ethiopian?

Time moves on to another generation. Thutmose is dead. In his stead reigns Amenhotpe II. In Jerusalem king Rehoboam was succeeded first by Abijah (for 3 years), then by his grandson Asa. The record is found in II Chronicles 14 and 15.

Important military changes were disturbing the eastern Mediterranean seaboard. Fortified cities had to be hastily constructed throughout Judah (II Chr 14:5). An efficient army was trained during ten years of quiet. Suddenly in the fifteenth year of Asa (937-936) "there came out against them Zerah the Ethiopian with an army of a thousand thousand (one million troops), and three hundred chariots; and he came unto Mareshah. Then Asa went out to meet him" Judah earnestly sought divine intervention against the great host of Lubim and the Ethiopians (II Chr. 16:8) that had come out of Egypt. "So the Lord smote the Ethiopians before Asa, and before Judah; and the Ethiopians fled. And Asa and the people that were with him pursued them unto Gerar; and there fell of the Ethiopians so that none remained alive: for they were scattered before the Lord, and before His host: and they (Judah) carried away much booty" (Jewish translation), After the battle and the spoiling of the region of Gerar, the Jews "gathered themselves to Jerusalem in the third month, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa. And they sacrificed unto the Lord in that day (Pentecost), of the spoil which they had brought ..." (II Chr. 15:10-11). Who was the Zerah whose army was totally annihilated in Asa's reign?

One would hardly expect to discover the full truth of such a catastrophic defeat engraven on the monuments of the vanquished. Perchance the defeat is glossed over and made to appear a victory.

No monument to our knowledge tells the story of the defeat. However, there certainly is an historical Zerah. He appears in the king lists of Ethiopia at the very time the battle occurred. Through the centuries the Ethiopians preserved the name of this man who played no small role in the history of Judah.

Zerah belonged to the Dynasty of Menelik I. The dynasty began with the death of Hashepsowe in 975 B.C. Menelik, the first ruler, was the son of Solomon and an Egyptian princess. The complete king list can be found in C.F. Rey's book: "In the Country of the Blue Nile", 1927.

Dynasty of Menelik I

Ruler	Length of Reign	Dates
-------	-----------------	-------

1 Menelik I (succeeded Hashepsowe)	25	975-950
2 Hanyon	1	950-949
3 Sera I (Tomai) Sera is Zerah the Ethiopian	26	949-923

The king list continues down to the present and can be referred to in the Compendium, vol. II, appendix B.

In Egypt Amenhotpe II was reigning. His authority extended south beyond Napata in Ethiopia (Breasted, "Ancient Records", vol. II, sect. 797). He succeeded his father Thutmose III in 943. Amenhotpe's first documented campaign into Palestine occurred in his year 3 (941). This was near the close of the 10th year of Asa, king of Judah. Asa had ten years of peace at the beginning of his reign (951-941). (See II Chronicles 14:1, 5, 6). A later Egyptian campaign occurred in the beginning of Amenhotpe's seventh year (937). The king set out on a grand expedition into Palestine. His seventh year corresponds to Asa's fourteenth. This date -- 937 -- is one year before Zerah's invasion. Amenhotpe's campaign, recorded on the Memphis stela, should not be confused with the Ethiopian invasion of Palestine in the spring of 936.

(NOTE: To view the figure placed here, see the file CMPDM1B.TIF in the Images\OtherWCG directory.)

The Memphis stela reads: "Year 7, 1st month of the third season. day 25 His majesty proceeded to Retenu (Palestine) His majesty reached Shamesh-Edom." On the Karnak stela the next move is also dated: "1st month of the third season. day 26. His majesty's crossing the ford of the Orontes on this day." He was north of Palestine.

The prince of Kadesh surrendered the city to the armies of Amenhotpe. He swore fealty to the Egyptians rather than undergo a siege. But this Kadesh -- a holy city -- was Carchemish in Syria. (Consult Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 245, and footnotes 8 and 9; also Breasted's translation of the Karnak stela, section 784.)

Dynasty XVIII in Manetho

Manetho's transcribers -- Josephus, Africanus, Eusebius -- are usually charged with totally corrupting this Theban dynasty. Had the archaeologists and historians spent as much time understanding Manetho's extractors. instead of condemning them, they would have recovered the full account of Amenhotpe II. The chart which follows is based solely on Manetho's transcribers. It should be compared with the first one given in this chapter which is based on archaeological evidence and on Manetho. (The abbreviations -- "J", "A", "E", "T" -- following either names, or lengths of reign stand for variations in Josephus Africanus, Eusebius, or Theophilus. -- The figures of Josephus have been reduced to whole calendar years.)

Names of Dynasty XVIII in Manetho	Lengths of Reign	Dates	Names from Archaeology
--------------------------------------	------------------	-------	---------------------------

Tethmosis (J), called also Amose (A) and Amosis (E)	25	1076-1051	Ahmoese
His son: Chebron, or Chebros (A)	13	1030-1017	Thutmose I
Amenophis (J), Ammenophthis (A) (E)	21 (A) (E) 20 (J)	1017- 996 1017- 997	Thutmose II
His sister: Amessis (J), Amensis (A)	21 (J) 22 (A)	996- 975 997- 975	Hashepsowe (Queen of Sheba)
Her (step)son: Mephres (J) Misaphris (A), Miphres (E)	12 (J) (E) 13 (A)	975- 963 976- 963	Thutmose III (Shishak)
His son: Mephramuthosis (J) Misphragmuthosis (A) (E) Mephrammuthosis (T)	25 (J) 26 (A) (E) 20 (T)	943- 918 944- 918 963- 943	Amenhotpe II
His son: Thmosis (J) Tuthmosis (A) (E)	9	918- 909	Thutmose IV

The insignificant differences of spelling in the Greek are due naturally to the changes in pronunciation of Egyptian sounds over many centuries -- and to abbreviations. Several of these names have never been discovered by archaeologists. This does not mean the Greek or Hebrew writers imagined names, but rather that archaeology is limited in what it can recover from the past.

Of greater historic significance are the variations in regnal years. Far from being mere scribal errors, each contributes additional information not preserved by the other epitomes of Manetho. If Manetho is to be fully understood, all the evidence must be taken together.

Consider the minor variations in the reign of Thutmose II and Hashepsowe. Josephus preserves the fact that he reigned only twenty full calendar years when succeeded by his son Thutmose III. But both Africanus and Eusebius bring out the detail that one more year elapsed before his sister and queen, Hashepsowe, assumed supreme rule as Queen of Egypt. Again, Africanus assigns 22 years to Hashepsowe to indicate that she was associated with her stepson for 22 calendar years after the death of her brother. Her dominant role in government as senior co-regent for 21 years is preserved only by Josephus, who is confirmed by archaeology and monumental finds.

The length of reign of Thutmose III as preserved by Manetho's abstractors has been rejected in toto. Though it appears on the surface to be irreconcilable with archaeological finds, it is nevertheless correct. Thutmose III reigned solely for only 12 years after the death of Hashepsowe. At that time he associated his son Amenhotpe II with him on the throne. Archaeology confirms a period of joint reign, but has not yet discovered its duration. Had the archaeologists opened their eyes, they would have long ago found its duration in Manetho. (See Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 245, footnote 1.)

The figure of 13 calendar years for the reign of Thutmose III,

preserved by Africanus, does not commence with the death of his step-mother, but with his assumption of power in 976 -- the beginning of his 22nd year. In the year following 976 he began his military campaign into southern Phoenicia, 511 years after the Exodus. Next the reign of Amenhotpe II -- the son of Thutmose III. His frightfully long name is not what has confounded historians. It is his length of reign that no one, it seems, has made sense of. Compare the information from archaeology, in the first chart, with these figures from Manetho. It is immediately evident that Theophilus has preserved the length of the joint reign -- 20 years -- 963-943. In 943 Thutmose III died. Josephus, by contrast, has preserved Amenhotpe II's length of reign -- 25 years -- after the death of his father. But Africanus and Eusebius give yet a different length -- 26 years. They measure the length of Amenhotpe's reign from the time he held full power during the last year of his father's reign -- that is 944-943. The emphasis upon this date in Amenhotpe's reign has been corroborated by archaeology. Again the figures of the transcribers can be explained.

It should be noted that none of the transcribers of Manetho has preserved all his facts. Each, however, complements the other. Why is Amenhotpe I missing as the second king in the dynasty? Tethmosis or Amose is correctly stated to be the first king. His 25 years are also confirmed by archaeology. He is plainly declared by Manetho's transcribers to be the father of Thutmose I or Chebron who was the third king of Dynasty XVIII. How are these apparent discrepancies to be resolved?

It has been commonly assumed by moderns that Thutmose I was a son of the first Amenhotpe by a secondary wife. But there is absolutely no evidence from archaeology to support this hypothesis (Drioton and Vandier, "L'Egypte" (1952), page 336).

Manetho's statement that he was a son of Ahmose explains, in part, why the classical writers passed over Amenhotpe I. The story of Dynasty XVIII is the story of a family through blood descent. Apparently Amenhotpe I was not in that line of descent. He may have been a younger brother of Amosis. The following list of kings, beginning from the expulsion of the Hyksos rulers in 1076, is preserved by Syncellus from the book of Sothis. Take special note of the dates of Amose.

The Book of Sothis

Kings in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
33 Amosis, also called Tethmosis	26	1076-1050
34 Chebron, his son	13	1030-1017
35 Amemphis	15	1011-1002
36 Amensis	11	1002- 991
37 Misphegmothosis	16	991-975
38 Mispheg	23	975-952
39 Tuthmosis	39	952-913

This list also placed Amosis immediately before Chebron (Thutmose I). Ahmose (Amosis) reigned into his 26th year. Syncellus therefore assigned the last incomplete year as a whole calendar year and gave him 26 -- from 1076 to 1050. In 1030 his son Chebron assumed the throne under the name of Thutmose. Manetho's other transcribers gave only the length of reign from 1076 to 1051 using the non-accession year method of reckoning. By contrast Syncellus used the accession year method of reckoning for Amosis, whereby the last incomplete year is assigned to the predecessor, not to the successor. Since Syncellus also did not include Amenhotpe I, he overlooked 20 years and proceeded to name Chebron next.

To fully understand Manetho, one must combine the evidence from his transcribers with archaeological discoveries. Neither Manetho nor archaeological evidence is sufficiently complete to be used alone for the beginning reigns of this dynasty.

The Book of Sothis' dates of the reigns of the first several rulers of the Theban dynasty are not necessarily indicative of the year of death. They may designate political changes. Recall the case of Joseph in the third dynasty, who lived another 14 years after completing his term in public office.

In the book of Sothis king Thutmose II, the husband and brother of Amenses-Hashepsowe, is given only 15 years. This dating is confirmed by rock inscriptions at Assuan. Hashepsowe ordered Senmut, an important public officer, to prepare two great obelisks to commemorate her co-regency "in year 16" of her brother Thutmose II. It has been commonly assumed that "year 16" refers to a time in her own reign. This conclusion is totally unwarranted, for "in year 16" Hashepsowe was still "King's Sister, Divine Consort, Great King's Wife." Thutmose II was still living. The inscription is in honor of "the Divine Consort, Sovereign of the entire Two Lands" -- that is, in honor of the assumption of royal power by Hashepsowe in her brother's sixteenth year. The obelisks were not finally erected and inscribed until her joint reign with her stepson Thutmose III. (See Breasted's "Ancient Records", vol. II, sections 359-362; also Weigall's "History of the Pharaohs", vol. II, pages 288-289.)

Thus for five years prior to his death, Thutmose II associated his sister-wife with him on the throne as queen consort. She became senior co-regent with her stepson in 996, one year after the death of her brother. She continued in public office until 975.

Why then does her reign appear to cease in 991 according to the book of Sothis? Who is the "king" named Misphragmuthosis who ceased to reign the very year that Hashepsowe died?

The answer is unique in Egyptian history. The masculine name Misphragmuthosis is Hashepsowe's! Under Thutmose II she was originally only queen consort. In the year after his death she began to rule as Queen. At length -- in 991 -- she assumed masculine titles, appeared as a man and took a man's name. The monuments of Egypt picture her in her later life as a male, though they at times refer to the king as "her."

Writes Sir Alan Gardiner in "Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 183: "man. The change did not come about without some hesitation, because there is at least one relief where she appears as King of Upper and Lower Egypt, and yet is clad in woman's attire."

The inscriptions recovered by archaeologists indicate she commenced the idea of becoming a king as early as her second year. ("Nachrichten von der Koeniglichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Goettingen," 1955, page 212.) But it was not until her sixth year that

it is officially recognized in the Book of Sothis.

One other hitherto unnoticed fact appears in the book of Sothis. The reign of Mispres (Thutmose III) continues 23 years after the reign of "King" Hashepsowe. At that point his grandson Thutmose IV is associated with him on the throne. The book of Sothis takes no notice of Amenhotpe II. These records indicate that the practice of Theban Dynasty XII, of associating sons and grandsons on the throne. was also a practice of Theban Dynasty XVIII. For the last nine years of Thutmose III or Shishak's life, he was associated on the throne with both son and grandson.

With the reign of Thutmose IV, the first half of Dynasty XVIII is completed. The succeeding rulers of the dynasty lead into the much-misunderstood period of the Ramessides, to be unravelled in the next chapter, or two.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Era of Confusion

No period of Egyptian history is in greater confusion than the close of Dynasty XVIII. To reconstruct this period scholars have limited themselves almost wholly to the meagre finds of archaeology. without any proof whatsoever, they have rejected or silently passed over the testimony of Africanus and Josephus, of the book of Sothis and the Bible.

To fill up gaps in the commonly accepted interpretation of history, they have written countless volumes on the unimportant king Tutankhamen -- who reigned only ten years. They have lauded Akhenaten, the father of King Tutankhamen, as the world's "first monotheist," when he was instead, a sexual deviate who used the cloak of religion to beget children by his own mother and daughters -- not to speak of his attraction toward his son Smenkhkare.

There is a reason historians have painted the closing years of Dynasty XVIII as one of religious idealism and philosophic wisdom. In some way they have to erase the presence of monotheism in Israel, and the rise of Proverb literature. Since the scholarly world has not been willing to attribute it to God, the origin has been sought in Egypt. No such foolish deduction could have been possible had historians properly placed Dynasty XVIII parallel with the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

Egypt As It Really Was

The history of Egypt for the late eighteenth and the nineteenth dynasties is vividly described in the Bible. It is a picture quite unlike that of the early Thutmoses. Changes were becoming noticeable in the reign of Thutmose IV. But not until the accession of Amenhotpe III, the grandson of Amenhotpe II, did the history of Egypt become one of utter religious confusion, political division, folly. What happened is made clear in the book of Isaiah:

"The princes of Zoan are utter fools;
"The wisest counsellors of Pharaoh are a senseless counsel;
"How can ye say unto Pharaoh:
" 'I am the son of ancient kings'? ...
"The princes of Zoan are become fools,
"The princes of Noph (Memphis) are deceived;
"They have caused Egypt to go astray" (Isaiah 20:11-13).

Who are these princes of Zoan -- the descendants of ancient kings? Isaiah again writes of the same period:

"And I" -- God is speaking -- "will spur Egypt against Egypt,
"And they shall fight everyone against his brother,
"And every one against his neighbor;
"City against city, and kingdom against kingdom.
".... And I will give over the Egyptians
"Into the hand of a cruel lord;
"And a fierce king shall rule over them,
"Saith the Lord, the Lord of hosts" (Isa. 19:2-4).

For nearly 170 years following the expulsion of the Hyksos, Egypt was united under one royal family. But here one sees an Egypt divided, not merely into cities, but into kingdoms. What parallel dynasties ruled these feuding kingdoms? Are the records of these internal wars found on the monuments?

Indeed! All these surprising Scriptures are made plain once the history of Egypt is properly restored to its true chronological position.

The Later Eighteenth Dynasty

The records of Theban Dynasty XVIII have been restored through Thutmose IV. Beginning with Amenhotpe III, historians are in great confusion. Most of the controversy is suppressed in textbooks. It does not reach the ears of students.

The controversy is primarily due to the serious mistake of rejecting the classical evidence from Manetho. As with the early dynasties, Manetho preserved much that archaeology has not, and perhaps never will, discover. By contrast, much that Manetho's transcribers thought unimportant has been rediscovered by archaeology. The true picture of what really happened in the next four centuries can be told only by utilizing both Manetho and archaeological finds.

So varied were the events surrounding the later years of Dynasty XVIII that no one ancient writer preserves all the details from Manetho. Not even Manetho appears to have recorded the whole account. Archaeology has unearthed many of the missing pieces of the puzzle. What is needed is to combine both Manetho and the finds of archaeology with the Bible.

Historians for years have been sharply divided over the events of the last years of Amenhotpe III. Many hold that he associated his son Akhenaten with him on the throne. Though other historians deny it, Manetho confirms the association. See the chart from Africanus presented later in this chapter.

The archaeologists who recognize that the father associated the son on the throne for a time have made the mistake, however, of interpreting the reign of Akhenaten as commencing, in the documents and monuments, from the beginning of his appointment. On his monuments, Akhenaten adopted the practice of dating his reign from the death of his father Amenhotpe III. The evidence of the El-Amarna correspondence absolutely proves that Akhenaten was abroad during many years of the coregency and did not return till the death of his father ("The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology", vol. 43, 1957, pages 13-14). This fact misled the opposing school of historians to deny the firmly documented coregency.

From archaeology the following chart may be constructed. (See "Journal of Near Eastern Studies", vol. xxv, April 1966, Pages 113-124, by Donald B. Redford.)

Names of Kings of Dynasty XVIII from Archaeology	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Thutmose IV	9	918-909
Amenhotpe III	38	909-871
Akhenaten (Orus)	17	871-854

Smenkhkare	3	854-851
Tutankhamen	10	851-841
Ay	4	841-837
Haremhab	59	837-778

The classical writers took no note of the short reigns of Orus' sons Smenkhkare and Tutankhamen. For them, the entire period was assigned to Orus. Similarly archaeology knows little or nothing of the other children born to Akhenaten.

King Ay, whose name appears next to last, was not of royal descent. He gained great influence in the latter years of the court of Amenhotpe III. He is mentioned in documents as father-in-law of Akhenaten. His daughter was Nefertiti, the king's chief queen. Unfortunately Ay later became the brother-in-law of Akhenaten. Ay's sister Tiy, who was the mother of Akhenaten, became also his wife toward the middle of his reign. What befell Nefertiti afterward is unrecorded in history.

Young Smenkhkare -- for whom Akhenaten also had an unnatural attraction -- later returned to the old capital of Thebes while his father remained at El-Amarna. After three short years on the throne, the youth was supplanted by his younger brother Tutankhamen.

Ten years later, Tutankhamen died. Ay gave Tutankhamen a sumptuous burial, then mounted the throne himself and apparently married Tutankhamen's young widow, his own granddaughter, to secure his claim to royalty. (See "Journal of Egyptian Archaeology", "King Ay, the successor of Tut-Ankh-amun," vol. XCIII (1932), pages 50-52.)

Ay reigned 4 years. He died in 837.

Haremhab, who succeeded Ay, was a general who played no small part in the drama that climaxed the El-Amarna period. General Haremhab controlled the army. At his coronation in 837 he married the "Queen's sister Mutnodjme" (Aldred, "Journal of Egyptian Archaeology", vol. 43. Page 39 and Breasted's "Ancient Records", vol. III, Sections 22 and 28.) Haremhab thus became the king's brother-in-law and Ay's son-in-law. A comparatively long reign is usually attributed to Haremhab. The highest discovered date assigned to him is 59 years. None of the documents bear a king's name. This figure is in agreement, however, with Manetho's transcribers.

Neither the mummy of Akhenaten nor of Haremhab has been found. A mummy, once thought to be Akhenaten's is undoubtedly that of Smenkhkare (Aldred, "The End of the El-Amarna Period," in December 1957 "Journal of Egyptian Archaeology").

Manetho's Evidence

Now let's consider what happened to the family of Akhenaten during the lifetime of Haremhab.

Africanus has correctly preserved Dynasty XVIII from Thutmose IV to a king named Ramesses. The variations of other writers will be considered later. Here is Africanus' record beginning with Thutmose IV:

Names of Rulers of Dynasty XVIII	Lengths of Reign	Dates
-------------------------------------	------------------	-------

according to Julius Africanus

Tuthmosis (IV)	9	918-909
Amenophis (Amenhotpe III)	31	909-878
Orus (Akhenaten)	37	878-841
Acherres	32	841-809
Rathos	6	809-803
Chebres	12	803-791
Acherres	12	791-779
Armesis	5	779-774
Ramesses (usually mislabeled "I")	1	774-773

A break in the list occurs here. Now let's examine Eusebius before proceeding further with Africanus.

Names of Kings of Dynasty XVIII from Eusebius' Greek Text	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Amenophis (III)	31	909-878
Orus (Akhenaten)	36	878-842
Achencherses, his daughter	12 (joint)	837-825
Athoris, her brother	39	842-803
Chencheres	16	803-787
Acherres	8	787-779
Cherres	15 (joint)	794-779
Armais	5	779-774

Note the parallel reign of Cherres, beginning 794. This figure will be significant for dating Dynasty XXIII of Tanis later. The dating of Akhenaton's daughter. Beginning in 837, will be proved shortly.

We should now consider other variants from Manetho, illustrated by this fragmentary copy.

Names of Kings of Dynasty XVIII from Eusebius' Armenian Version	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Amenophis (III)	31	909-878

Orus (Akhenaten)	28	871-843
Achencheres, his daughter	---	
---	16	803-787
Acherres	8	787-779
Cherres	15	794-779
Armais	5	779-774

Eusebius' account of Orus supports the archaeological record of 38 years for Amenhotpe III mentioned earlier:

Amenhotpe III	38 (from archaeology)	909-871
Orus (Akhenaten)	28 (Armenian version)	871-843

Eusebius' Greek Manuscript B of the king list differs from the others. It has been misunderstood by some modern editors who have inserted, mistakenly, the figure 12 in place of 16 (that is, 841-825) for the reign of Achencheres, Akhenaten's daughter. They assumed that Eusebius has been incorrectly copied. But manuscript B of Eusebius plainly has 16. Because Cencheres also reigned 16 years, certain manuscript copies of Eusebius' original work have deleted his name and that of Athoris. (Compare Eusebius Werke, edited by Rudolph Helm, vol. I, pages 40-45 with Manetho, by W.G. Waddell, Fr. 53.)

What do these variants mean? They indicate that Manetho originally gave in detail the events surrounding the reigns of Akhenaten, Tutankhamen, Smenkhkare and Ay! Now see how the year 837 -- the end of Ay's reign -- can be established from Josephus and the Book of Sothis.

Names of Josephus and Theophilus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Amenophis (Amenhotpe III)	30	909-879
Orus (Akhenaten)	36 (or 38 in Eusebius)	879-843 (879-841)
Acencheres (daughter of Orus)	12 (or 16 in Eusebius)	837-825 (841-825)
Rathotis (her brother)	9	825-816 (14 missing years)
Acencheres I	12	802-790
Acencheres II	12	790-778
Harmais	4	778-774
Ramesses	1	774-773

It must first be remembered that Manetho, in his original work, presented to the world three vast tomes. These have been lost to the world. But before they perished many writers extracted material that, to them, appeared vital. Different writers viewed the multitude of Manetho's facts differently. Josephus considered certain events more important than did Africanus, for example; his dates for the reign of a king consequently might differ somewhat from Africanus. On occasion, whole reigns might be deleted as unimportant -- a fact already noted for the first half of Dynasty XVIII.

Josephus' abstract contains several unusual features. First, it is not consecutive. There is a significant break between Orus and his daughter Acencheres.

The second divergency is the dating of Amenhotpe III. Africanus assigns him 31 years and ends his reign in 878. Josephus and Theophilus follow the Book of Sothis and end it in 879. There is no scribal carelessness here, only a difference in evaluating events. Amenhotpe III associated his son Orus on the throne toward the end of his 31st year -- after 30 years and 10 months, to use Josephus' account. The question naturally arose, should the 31st year of Amenhotpe III be assigned to him, or to the son now that he had come to coregency? Africanus adopted the former method, dating it 878. Josephus, as well as Syncellus in the Book of Sothis, adopted the latter method, dating it 879.

The same variation may be noticed for the reigns of the kings Acencheres I and II and Harmais. Africanus, in these instances, began their regnal years one year earlier than Josephus; but assigned five to Armais. The total in each instance is the same.

Now see the Book of Sothis confirm the unusual dates 837-816 for Akhenaten's daughter and son -- and consequently 837 for the end of Ay's reign.

Names in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
39 Tuthmosis (IV)	39	952-913
40 Amenophthis (III)	34	913-879
41 Orus (Akhenaten)	48	879-831
42 Achencheres (a daughter)	25	841-816
43 Athoris	29	831-802
44 Chencheres	26 (note -- 14 missing years in Josephus found!)	816-790
45 Acherres	30 (or 8)	809-779 (or 787-779)
46 Armais	9	779-770

Very little is known of the family of Akhenaten in later years. What is known is that Acencheres, the daughter of Akhenaten, had a brother Rathotis (or Rathos). His son is Achencheres I, the Chebres of

Africanus. The next generation is Achencheres II, the Acherres II of Africanus. None of these names have been found as yet by archaeologists in Egypt. Yet they are important for their chronological value. If archaeologists had not been led astray they would have recognized the six successors of Orus as the six immediate predecessors of Piankhi, king of Nubia, of Dynasty XXV.

Now consider the literary evidence for this restoration of Dynasty XVIII.

The El-Amarna Letters

Amenhotpe III was an effeminate individual who purchased his pleasures by bestowing power on his friends. In his senile years he was sculptured "wearing a type of gown usually worn by women" (Cyril Aldred, "Bulletin of Metropolitan Museum of Art", Feb. 1957). Quite an about face since the days of the Queen of Sheba! The result of this personal aberration was the rise to prominence of non-royalty -- the family of Ay, for example.

The reigns of Amenophis III and Akhenaten have become famous for the El-Amarna letters. The letters are official foreign correspondence. Some date from the time of Amenhotpe III, or before, though most pertain to the government of his son.

It is the common assumption of the majority of historians that these letters reveal internal events in Palestine at the time Joshua was invading the Holy Land. To make the Biblical account of the conquest chronologically correspond to the time of Akhenaten, historians had to displace the history of the book of Joshua. Some went so far as to assume that Joshua lived before Moses -- since they had previously misdated the exodus in the later reign of Ramesses "the Great" or his son. Such foolish interpretations of history stand self-condemned. What the letters really indicate is an altogether different set of events.

The letters reveal that many of the coastal towns of Syria and Palestine, which had owed allegiance to Egypt, were torn asunder by internal strife or were being overrun. Local princes and Egyptian officials usually sought in vain for Egyptian assistance. What power expanded in Syria and Palestine during this period?

The Bible makes the answer plain. The Arameans.

The El-Amarna letters were written mainly in the days of Athaliah and Joash of Judah, and of Jehu and Jehoahaz of Israel. A few are from the earlier period of the Jehorams or before. The time setting is made clear in the Bible. Asa, in whose fifteenth year (937-936) Zerah invaded the land, died after a reign of 41 years. That brings history to 910. Jehoshaphat, his son succeeded him and reigned 25 years -- to 885. This was the 24th year of Amenhotpe III.

After the death of Jehoshaphat "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah . . . , then did Libnah revolt at the same time" (II Chronicles 21:10). The events move rapidly: "And the Lord stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians that are beside the Ethiopians and they came up against Judah, and broke into it up against him" -- Joash -- "and they came to Judah and Jerusalem, and destroyed all the princes of the people" (II Chr. 24:23).

During these years Israel was being devastated by the Arameans, "Then Hazael king of Aram went up, and fought against Gath, and took it; and Hazael set his face to go to Jerusalem" (II Kings 12:18). Later, in the reign of Jehoahaz of Israel, "the anger of the Lord was

kindled against Israel, and He delivered them into the hand of Hazael king of Aram and into the hand of Ben-Hadad, the son of Hazael, continually For there was not left to Jehoahaz of the people save fifty horsemen, and ten chariots, and ten thousand footmen; for the king of Aram destroyed them, and made them like the dust of threshing" (II Kings 13:3, 7).

Later, Israel was delivered from the power of Aram during the time of Jeroboam II.

In the El-Amarna letters "Aziru" is a king of "Amurru", with his capital at "Dumasqa". All historians recognize that Dumasqa is Damascus, the capital of Aram or Syria. "Amurru" is the common name for Aram. But who is Aziru in these cuneiform documents? Hazael! The "l" and the "r" are often linguistically interchanged. The "H" has been dropped, just as it has in Josephus' spelling of Hazael -- "Azaelos." Compare the Biblical dropping of the "H" in Hadoram to Adoram (II Chron. 10:18 and I Kings 12:18).

Hazael posed as Pharaoh's obedient ally -- as did most of the quarreling princes of the eastern Mediterranean coast. But he refused to render any act of submission. The king of Egypt had received many reports that Aram was not remaining loyal. In letter 162, addressed to Aziru or Hazael, the king of Egypt warns: "If thou for any object desirest to do evil, or if thou layest up evil words of hatred in thy heart, then wilt thou die by the axe of the king together with thy whole family. Render submission then to the king, thy lord, (and) thou shalt live. Thou knowest, indeed, that the king does not desire to go heavily against the whole land of Kinahhi" -- Canaan. ("The Tell El-Amarna Tablets", by Samuel A.B. Mercer, vol. II, page 523.)

The letter was filled with empty words. Egypt had too many troubles of her own to afford costly expeditions to Syria.

Are the "Habiru" Hebrews?

The letters to the Egyptian court also speak of the habiru -- sometimes spelled khabiru. It was at first commonly assumed that it meant "Hebrew," and was indicative of Joshua's invasion of Palestine. But not one king or Canaan in Joshua's day has ever been found in the El-Amarna letters. Nor is there one word of the fall of Jericho. The conquest of Palestine recorded in the book of Joshua contrasts at every fundamental point with the world of the El-Amarna letters. Egypt was an important power in the eastern Mediterranean in the days of the kings of Israel and in the El-Amarna world, but "Joshua did not find any such Egyptian hold during his conquest" (Sir W.M. Flinders Petrie, "Palestine and Israel", page 56).

Scholars have long disputed over the import of the word "habiru", or "khabiru". From the letters it was known to be equivalent to the word "sa-qaz" which means "brigands," "plunderers," "bandits," and "cutthroats." On occasion the word "khabiru" "is also written with an ideogram signifying 'cutthroats,' " declared C.J. Gadd in "The Fall of Nineveh". The Hebrew root of "khabiru" is "khaber" (spelled "chaber" in "Young's Concordance"). It means a "companion," "member of a band," hence, in a derogatory sense, "bandit." The word appears in Isaiah 1:23 as "companions of thieves": and in Proverbs 28:24 as "companion of a destroyer."

The "khabiru" or "habiru" were the Aramean, Philistine, Moabite, Arabian bands of plunderers who were overrunning Phoenicia, Syria and Palestine in the days of Jehoram and Jehoahaz.

Much also has been written of the person of Abdi-hibba. Scholars assume he was the king of "Urusalim". That the name "Urusalim" is the cuneiform transcription of the name Jerusalem is plausible. But Abdi-hibba was no king of Jerusalem. In addressing the Egyptian court he wrote: "Verily, I am not a regent; I am an officer of the king, my lord. Behold I am a shepherd of the king, and I am one who bears the tribute of the king. Neither my father nor my mother, but the mighty hand of the king has set me in the house of my father" (Letter 288). The king is Pharaoh, king of Egypt. Again in Letter 287 he repeats: "Verily, this land of the city of Urusalim, neither my father nor my mother has given it to me." And in Letter 285: "Behold, I am not a regent, I am an officer of the king, my lord." Abdi-hibba was a Palestinian adventurer who had himself appointed an officer of Pharaoh to administer Egyptian affairs over a portion of the land that belonged to the city of "Urusalim". "Take silver and follow me," he was accused of saying (Letter 280).

It was commonplace for the petty kingdoms of Syria and Palestine to seek Egyptian "foreign aid" in their quarrels. Isaiah reveals what God thought of it:

"Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, That take counsel, but not of Me: And that form projects, but not of My spirit, That they may add sin to sin; That walk to go down into Egypt, And have not asked at My mouth; To take refuge in the stronghold of Pharaoh, And to take shelter in the shadow of Egypt! Therefore shall the stronghold of Pharaoh turn to your shame, And the shelter in the shadow of Egypt to your confusion. For his princes are at Zoan, And his ambassadors are come to Hanes. They shall all be ashamed of a people that cannot profit them, That are not a help nor profit But a shame, and also a reproach" (Isaiah 30:1-5, "Jewish Pub. Soc." trans.).

And verse 7: "For Egypt helpeth in vain, and to no purpose: therefore have I called her 'Arrogancy that sitteth still.' "

Dissension and jealousy sundered Egypt's government during the El-Amarna period. It was, in part, the result of infiltration of foreign influence during the reign of Amenhotpe III. The book of Sothis records of his day: "The Ethiopians, removing from the River Indus, settled near Egypt."

They brought with them not only the concept of marriages between uterine brothers and sisters, a practice already established in Egypt by the royalty of Sheba, but of the marriage of parents with children. Children of the union of a mother and son were deemed especially well born. Akhenaten inherited this concept through his father's marriage relationships. But the practice was revolting to many Egyptians of high rank. No known ruler among them since the time of the Ethiopian Nimrod had dared marry his own mother and beget children of her.

Akhenaten did it because he regarded himself as a new incarnation of Nimrod, the sun-god. Hence the name Orus applied to the king. Orus is another spelling of Horus, third king of Egypt, who was anciently assumed to be the first incarnation of Nimrod.

The claims of Akhenaten were so widely known that in El-Amarna letter 41 the Hittite king addresses Akhenaten by the name of "Huria" -- the cuneiform of Horus.

Akhenaten made religion the cloak for his perversions. He pictured himself as the solar disk, and from his nude body emanated the beams of light that were to illuminate the world. The claims of the "heretic king" threatened the power of the Theban pontiffs. To retain their influence they first supported one, then another, or a third member of the royal family. Each change was presented to especially constructed idols which moved their heads -- through secret manipulation -- in approval or disapproval of the rival royal candidates.

After El-Amarna

The climax to the El-Amarna age is usually thought to be the early death of Akhenaten and the return to Thebes of young king Tut, supported by the Theban priesthood. What is not understood by historians or archaeologists is the sundering of Egyptian political unity.

In the next chapter it shall be proved that Libyans penetrated Lower Egypt and after the death of Ay set up a dynasty of their own. Two generations later the political center of gravity shifted to Tanis in the Delta. Egypt consequently became a significant sea power in the eighth century before the present era. Greek classical records provide numerous references to Egyptian trade, settlement and warfare in the Mediterranean during this century.

Upper Egypt meanwhile saw the last kings of Dynasty XVIII retire to their homeland in Nubia. Dynasty XVIII arose in Ethiopian Nubia to oust the Hyksos. Its king Zera is called "Ethiopian," and its queen, "Queen of Sheba." (Sheba was a son of Cush, father of the Ethiopians.) When the religious controversy under Akhenaten developed, the religious and political pressures of the Upper Egyptians forced a withdrawal of the later members of the Dynasty to Napata in Nubia. Here, as we shall presently see, a branch of the family arose to new power in Nubia and Egypt in the person of Piankhi and reestablished the famous Ethiopian era in Egypt. But this Ethiopian period was not centered any longer in Thebes, but in Napata, Nubia.

Historians have never understood the connection between the early Ethiopian influence in Egypt and the later Ethiopian period, because they have separated them by over five centuries. This restoration of Egyptian history makes plain the connection.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Egypt to the Persian Conquest

The next big surprise in Egyptian history is the dating of Ramesses the Great and Dynasty XIX. Few scholars were willing to consider the evidence, presented in 1945, for dating Ramesses about seven centuries later than the conventional dating (see "Theses for the Reconstruction of Ancient History," "Scripta Academica-Hierosolymitana", Scientific Report III, by Immanuel Velikovsky).

Ramesses the Great was a contemporary of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon! The king of Hatti whom Ramesses fought at Kadesh was the Chaldean king Nebuchadnezzar. At the rise of Babylon to a world power, Nebuchadnezzar had conquered Hatti -- the ancient name of Syria, Palestine and a portion of Asia Minor.

The site of the battle of Kadesh, which Ramesses made so famous in his monuments, was not a city on the Orontes River in Syria, but the famous city of Carchemish. Kadesh is a Semitic word for "holy." Kadesh was a holy city. A number of cities in the ancient world bore the name Kadesh because they were holy places. Carchemish was famous -- as was Jerusalem -- as a holy city. The Greek name of Carchemish was Hieropolis, meaning Holy City.

Before proceeding with the detailed relationship between Ramesses and Nebuchadnezzar, we should first establish the chronology of the period from Manetho's transcribers. The exact dating of Dynasty XVIII (and preceding dynasties) has been established and confirmed by the Biblical record. Dynasty XIX follows Dynasty XVIII -- and therefore ruled in the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries B.C.

The following table establishes the proper chronology of the period.

Names of Kings of Dynasty XVIII after 773 B.C. and of Dynasty XIX from Eusebius	Lengths of Reign	Date
Ramesses	68	771-705
Ammenophis	40	705-665
Sethos (Seti I)	55	665-610
Rampses (Ramesses the Great)	66	610-544
Ammenephthis (Merenptah)	8	544-536
Ammenemes	5 (See Africanus' epitome)	536-531
Thuoris, whose husband was Sethos II	7	531-524

The Egyptian year at this period began January 1 531 B.C. and

January 1, 524 B.C. This makes the calendar year 525 the last full year of Thuoris. With Queen Thuoris, a contemporary of Psamtik III, this royal line of Egypt and Nubia died out as Ezekiel foretold.

Dynasty XIX has been greatly confused in history books because historians carelessly discarded Manetho. They confounded several Ramesses in Manetho's list into one. It will be proved later that the Ramesses who ruled from 773 to 705 was the Ethiopian Piankhi. Modern historians have long assumed Manetho overlooked him. He didn't. Ramesses (773-705) is not a mere duplicate of Rampses (610-544). They are two different individuals.

The last documented year of Ramesses the Great recorded on any monument in Egypt is year 44 -- 567-566. The dynasty withdrew to Nubia following Nebuchadnezzar's attack on Egypt.

The "Israel" Inscription

This restoration of history for the first time makes sense out of the Egyptian account of "Israel" under Ramesses' son, Merenptah.

The name "Israel" has been clearly found only once in all Egyptian annals. This illustrates how inadequate is archaeology when used as the whole source of knowledge. The single inscription appears from the reign of Merenptah, son of Ramesses the Great. It is often referred to as the "Israel Stela." The reference to Israel is as follows:

"... Plundered is the Canaan with every evil;
"Carried off is Ashkelon; seized upon is Gezer; ...
"Israel is laid waste, his seed is not"
(See Pritchard, "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 378.)

It is to be specially noted that in the Egyptian text all names are preceded with a determinative sign meaning land, except for the name of Israel. The hieroglyphic determinative which precedes the name of Israel refers to people, not land. The record of Merenptah is therefore a historical account of the disappearance of the people of Israel from Palestine. This was never completely fulfilled until the captivity of the House of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar!

For decades historians have attempted to read into this document an account of the exodus, or of Joshua's invasion! Utter nonsense! It is a contemporary record of the deportation of the last remnant of the people of Israel from Palestine.

The "Thirteen Fatal Years"

In Josephus' "Contra Apionem", I, 26-31, there is a remarkable account of Egyptian calumnies against the Jews involving this period. The story involves "thirteen fatal years," and foreign invaders who polluted the Egyptian religious temples. The Egyptian Manetho made it appear that the enemies of Egypt were the Jews. The enemies were not the Jews but the Assyrians who sent their troops into Egypt, conquered the land and polluted its religious worship.

The setting of the event is during the time of an Amenophis. Josephus doubted such an individual lived. Josephus was correct in assuming the account was propaganda against Jews, but he was incorrect in denying the historical reality of the personages involved. Amenophis, king of Egypt, had, at the beginning of the thirteen years

of exile, a five-year-old son Sethos. Young Sethos was named Ramesses after his grandfather. Amenophis was subject to the Ethiopian king, Manetho reports.

The grandfather Ramesses is the Ramesses who rules from 773-705. The Amenophis is his son who ruled during the years 705-665 (including the 13-year exile). The 5-year old son is Sethos (665-610), father of Ramesses the Great. The period is the Assyrian occupation during Dynasty XXV.

Nebuchadnezzar and Ramesses the Great

As final proof of the dating of Ramesses' reign to 610-544, notice the parallels between Egypt and Chaldaeia. The history of Chaldaeia for this period is best summarized in the "Chronicles of the Chaldaean Kings" 626-556 (B.C.), edited by D.J. Wiseman, 1956 edition. Egyptian source material may be found in J.H. Breasted's "Ancient Records of Egypt", vol. III.

From these Chaldaean and Egyptian records the following events are extracted.

Egyptian:

607-606 -- fourth year of Ramesses, Egyptians march through Palestine, slay Josiah of Judah, and reach Kadesh (Carchemish) on Euphrates.

606-605 -- fifth year of Ramesses, Egyptians record spectacular victory in vicinity of Kadesh (Carchemish) over ruler of Hatti (Syria).

605-604 -- Ramesses silent about events in Syria and Palestine.

604-603 -- Ramesses again silent about events in Palestines

603-602 -- eighth year -- Ramesses reconquers Ashkelon, overruns Galilee and proceeds to Carche-

Chaldaean:

607-606 -- year nineteen of Nabopolassar, father of Nebuchadnezzar, Chaldaeans march up Euphrates, seize Kimuhu on banks of the river near Carchemish.

606-605 -- Babylonian Chronicle reports for twentieth year of Nabopolassar: "... the army of Egypt came to the city of Kumuhu and then captured the city." "The Egyptian army which had crossed the Euphrates at Carchemish came against the Babylonian army ... the Babylonian army withdrew quickly and retreated."

605-604 -- Egyptian army smashed at Carchemish. Chaldaeans seize "the whole area of the Hatti country."

604-603 -- Chaldaeans capture Judah and city of Ashkelon in land of Philistines.

603-602 -- in spring of year 603 Chaldaeans marched to land of Hatti with a powerful army. employ siege

mish. Breasted comments in a footnote: "At some time between the fifth and eighth years all Palestine ... revolted against Ramses II, and he was obliged to take up the reconquest of his Asiatic possessions, at his very door, Ashkelon" (pp. 157-158). Ramesses records nothing of the outcome of his march to Carchemish (Kadesh) except that he received tribute upon reaching the Euphrates.

601-600 -- a damaged monument seems to refer to year 10 of Ramesses and a struggle for Palestine (see p. 125 of Breasted's work, vol. III).

towers against a city whose name is broken away on the clay tablet. A notable victory is achieved. Jeremiah 46:2 comes to our aid. This victory was achieved at Carchemish -- it is the second battle for Carchemish (historians have only taken note of the first). The Egyptians are totally overthrown. (Who Pharaoh Necho was in the Biblical account will be explained later.)

601-600 -- Chaldaean chronicle records: the king "took the lead of his army and marched to Egypt. The king of Egypt heard (it) and mustered his army. In open battle they smote the breast (of) each other and inflicted great havoc on each other. The king ... turned back and returned to Babylon."

Here is historical confirmation of astounding significance. We have proceeded with the restoration of Egyptian history from its earliest period. That restoration required that Ramesses the Great be placed in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. -- contemporary with Nebuchadnezzar. And when the pages of history are opened for those centuries. the parallels are there!

In conclusion. note the deeds of Ramesses "the Great" found on the monuments under the name of Tirhakah, in classical tradition a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar.

Inscriptions found upon certain reliefs at Medinet-Habu -- the Pylon of the Ethiopians -- record the statement that a king Tirhakah claimed sovereignty over Western Mesopotamia, the land of Hatti, part of Assyria, as well as Libya and other regions of Africa (G. Daressy, "Medinet Habou", page 9). Scholars immediately recognized this vast realm was unhistorical for the Tirhakah of Dynasty XXV. The list was pronounced "worthless." Then Mariette discerned that the same record appeared elsewhere on the base of a colossal statue of Ramesses II. (See Mariette's "Karnak", page 67, plate 18.) Mariette refused to believe his eyes. But there was the evidence: This Tirhakah was indeed Ramesses "the Great."

"Curiously enough," admits E.A. Wallis Budge in "A History of Egypt", vol. VI, page 157, "Tirhakah obtained the reputation of being a great traveller and conqueror, and Strabo, under the name of 'Tearko the Ethiopian,' mentions him ... as one whose expeditions were not generally known." (See "Strabo", book I, chapter 3, part 21.) "In another place he quotes Megasthenes, who says that ... Tearko the

Ethiopian advanced as far as Europe" (See "Strabo", book XV, chapter 1, part 6.)

Catching Up Loose Ends

Now to complete the restoration of Dynasty XIX from archaeology and Manetho's transcribers. According to Eusebius, Manetho assigns 8 years (544-536) to Ammenephthis (known as Merenptah from archaeology). In Syncellus' copy of Eusebius' epitome of Manetho the figure given is 40 years -- that is 576-536. Now see this confirmed from archaeological sources:

Names of Ramesses and Successors from Monuments	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ramesses	67	610-543
Merenptah	10	576-566
Sethos II	6	543-537
Siptah	6	537-531
Twosre, a queen and widow of Sethos II (Thuoris in book of Sothis)	7	531-524

Compare this chart, based on archaeological evidence, with the record of Manetho. The reign of Merenptah (Ammenephthis) is given as 8 years in the Armenian version of Eusebius. This eight year period followed the reign of Ramesses. But Syncellus' copy of Eusebius' Manetho reads 40 years. Merenptah therefore reigned jointly with his father Ramesses for 32 years. Since the 10-year reign of Merenptah is recorded in Egypt, and not solely in Nubia, these ten years are Merenptah's first ten years -- 576-566. Merenptah continued his reign in Nubia after Egypt was depopulated between 570 and 566 by the Chaldaeans.

The reign of Ramesses in Nubia was followed by those of Sethos II, Siptah and Twosre. All the historical inscriptions of Siptah are Nubian graffiti, primarily from Wadi Halfa. Here again is confirmation of Ezekiel's prophecy of Egypt's 40-year desolation (Eze. 29:8-16).

The tombs of these rulers are all found in Egypt. The explanation is simple. Manetho's longer figures indicate that each began to reign in Egypt jointly with Ramesses before the land became desolate. Notice these additional figures from Manetho confirming the joint reigns!

Names of Rulers of Dynasty XIX according to Africanus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Sethos	51	656-605
Rapsaces (Ramesses the Great)	61	605-544

Ammenephthis (Merenptah)	20	557-537
Ramesses (Siptah -- in contemporary records his name is spelled Ramesse-siptah)	60	591-531
Ammenemnes	26 (according to Eusebius)	557-531
Thuoris (Twosre)	50 (from book of Sothis)	574-524

For the date 656 marking the beginning of the reign of Sethos, see Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs", p. 450, especially the comment on the reign of Tanuatamun.

With this, the restoration of Dynasty XIX has been completed. But what are we to do with all the other dynastic houses which, historians say, ruled Egypt during these centuries? And who is that other long-lived Ramesses dated 773-705?

Dynasty XXV, the Ethiopians

Drop back in time to the end of the eighth century B.C. This is the period of Ethiopian rule of Egypt. The evidence from Assyrian sources for the proper dating of this period is so overwhelming historians have been unable to upset it.

From archaeological discoveries the reigns of the recognized kings of Dynasty XXV appear as follows:

Names from the Monuments and Stelae	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Shabako	15	707-692
Shebitku	3	692-689
Taharka	26	689-663

In 663 Thebes was sacked by the Assyrian king Assurbanipal. In 663 Taharka was succeeded by another Ethiopian Bakare Tanuatamun, whom the Assyrians named Urdamane. Archaeology has recovered indications of only 8 regnal years, but the history of Dynasty XXVI of Sais preserves evidence that his reign following the destruction of Thebes was 9 years -- 663-654.

The account of Dynasty XXV from Eusebius provides additional information of joint rulership not discovered by archaeologists.

Names of Dynasty XXV in Eusebius	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Sabacon	12	707-695
Sebichos	12	695-683
Taracus	20	683-663

The name of Tanuatamun does not appear in the dynasty. In the book of Sothis the names are as follows: 75 Sabacon; 76 Sebechon; 77 Taraces. The lengths of reign are those of Eusebius.

A comparison of Eusebius' Manetho with archaeological finds indicates Shabako and Shebitku reigned as equals for 3 years -- 695-692, as did Shebitku and Taharka for 6 years -- 689-683.

The account of Africanus differs somewhat from that of Eusebius.

Names of Dynasty XXV in Africanus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Sabacon	8	705-697
Sebichos	14	697-683
Tarcus	18	683-665

The shorter reign of Sabacon will be explained later by the 46-year reign of Bochchoris, preserved by Eusebius. Thus:

Bochchoris	46	751-705
Sabacon	8	705-697

In Africanus it may be observed that Sebichos (Shebitku) is found associated on the throne in 697, two years earlier than the coregency indicated by Eusebius. A Biblical parallel may be observed in the relationship of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram. Jehoshaphat associated his son Jehoram on the throne with him in year 17, but it was not till year 22 that he was made full co-regent (compare I Kings 22 with II Kings 1 and 8).

Again these figures illustrate that if all the information is available, the records fit perfectly.

Scribal errors are not the cause of the variations. More important is the individual author's evaluation of events which leads him to emphasize different dates.

The short 18-year reign of Taharka (to 665 instead of 663) is easily accounted for by Egyptian and Assyrian information. Two years after Assurbanipal attacked Memphis (667) the Assyrian records indicate Tanuatamun came to the throne. He was king of Egypt during the final Assyrian attack on Thebes in 663. Though archaeology has provided no documents mentioning a joint reign, the classical writers plainly confirm the Assyrian record. Taharka and Tanuatamun were ruling jointly for two years: 665-663. With the end of the reign of Tanuatamun the last vestiges of Ethiopian control of Egypt cease.

Dynasty XXVI of Sais

The Ethiopian rule over Lower Egypt ended in 663 with the end of the reign of Taharka. Thereafter it passed to Dynasty XIX. In Lower Egypt in that year Dynasty XXVI of Sais rose to power. It was established by Assyrian authority, but its rulers were, to some extent, related to the Ethiopian Theban line by marriage. From the monument the following list of kings, parallel with Dynasty XIX Thebes in Upper Egypt, has been firmly established.

Names of Kings of Dynasty XXVI of Sais in Lower Egypt	Lengths of Reign	Dates
(Taharka)	(26)	(689-663)
Psamtik I	54	663-609
Necho	16	609-593
Psamtik II	5	593-588
Apries (Hophra)	19	588-569
Ahmoze II (Amasis)	44	569-525
Psamtik III	6 months	525

The Persian invasion occurred in the year 525 and the line of Egyptian royalty passed from the scene. The princes that had ruled Egypt for centuries ceased. At this point the proof of the restoration of Egyptian history is established. It agrees to the very year -- from the Tower of Babel in 2254 to the Persian conquest in 525.

Though the archaeological record for the last Saite dynasty is amply demonstrated, some scholars have been puzzled by the dating of the last king Psamtik. A record early in his year 2 has been found. The answer is, of course, that he counted the 44th year of Amasis, during which he came to the throne, as his first year. This method of pre-dating hereafter became the usual mode of reckoning the Persian rulers in native annals. Psamtik's six months of reign overlapped the end of one calendar year and the beginning of the next, hence the date "year 2" during which he was overthrown.

The classical writers preserve some important additional information concerning Dynasty XXVI that is not known from archaeology.

Manetho's Account of Dynasty XXVI

The evidence from Herodotus is especially valuable, as it gives a fuller view of joint reigns of the various kings. His information for the reign of Apries, the Hophra of the Bible, is as follows:

Name of King	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Psammetichos I (Psamtik)	54	663-609
Necho II	16	610-594
Psammetichos II	6	594-588
Apries	25	594-569
Amasis	44	569-525
Psammetichos III	6 months	525

The overlap of Necho II is insignificant. But it is worthy of note that Herodotus pictures Apries and Psammetichos exercising power from the same year. Both Africanus and Eusebius preserve a short reign of 6 years for Necho II, and Eusebius assigns 17 to Psammetichos. Thus:

Necho II	6	610-604
Psammetichos	17	604-587

Psammetichos died in the early part of 588, near the beginning of his 17th calendar year. From this it appears that Psammetichos and his father Necho shared the throne jointly for 10 years -- 604-594.

In Eusebius' "Chronicon" another set of regnal years (though improperly dated) is preserved for Apries and Psammetichos:

Psammetichos II	12	599-587
Apries	30	599-569

Here again one sees that Apries exercised equal authority with Psammetichos II even prior to his sole reign, whatever the significance of the year 599 may be.

Eusebius has two other variants of historical significance. He assigns Amasis 42 years only 567-525 -- dated from his expulsion by the Chaldaeans to Cyprus. Also, Eusebius assigns for the Theban reign of Psammetichos I 45 years (according to Syncellus) and 44 in the Armenian Version. These may be easily understood if 9 years (to be proved from book of Sothis) are assigned to Tanutamun, nephew of Taharka, and if 610 and 609 are considered the beginnings of the reign of Necho II. It should be remembered that Psamtik I ruled in Lower Egypt nine years before his first year at Thebes commenced.

Tanuatumun	9	663-654	9	663-654
Psammetichos I	45	654-609	or	44 654-610
Necho II	15	609-594	16	610-594

These are not scribal blunders, but consistent evaluations based upon different points of view. Some dates are predated, others postdated. The year 610 is predated. It marks the year in which Ramesses the Great, Necho's contemporary, rose to power. Dynasty XIX of Thebes and Dynasty XXVI of Sais were undoubtedly related. Their kings participated on joint ventures -- as, for example, the wars of Ramesses and Necho with Nebuchadnezzar.

Before the reign of Psamtik I, Manetho preserves a number of kings not included in archaeological lists. From Africanus the following list may be drawn up.

Names of Rulers of Dynasty XXVI	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Stephinales	7	684-677
Nechepsos	6	677-671
Necho I (whom the Assyrians	8	671-663

appointed in 671)

Eusebius adds the following extra information from Manetho not preserved by Africanus:

Names of Rulers of Dynasty XXVI	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ammeris the Ethiopian	12	696-684
("Ameres" in Armenian Version)	18 (in Armenian Version)	702-684

The remainder of the list is the same as Africanus'.

Book of Sothis and Dynasty XXVI

Before restoring other dynasties of this period, look at the book of Sothis. It ends with additional figures for the Saite dynasty. It appears so divergent from all other records that it has been totally rejected. Yet its details agree with this restoration of history. In the following chart the dates have been inserted, after which they will be analyzed.

Names in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
77 Taraces (Takarka II)	20	683-663
78 Amaes (Tanautamun)	38	692-654
79 Stephinathes	27	684-657
80 Nechepsus	13	684-671
81 Nechao	8	671-663
82 Psammetichus	14	648-634
83 Nechao II	9	609-600
84 Psamuthes II	17	604-587
85 Uaphris (Hophra)	34	600-566
86 Amosis (Amasis)	50	575-525

Several of these dates are in chronological order, others are not. In numerous instances the reigns apparently indicate the total length of public service. They take on meaning only after a consecutive chronology for the period has been established.

What is the significance of Nechepsos' 13-year reign? According to Manetho, his 7-years' reign ended in 671 at the Assyrian invasion of Esarhaddon. The 13 years of his reign must therefore precede that date. His reign parallels that of Stephinathes, beginning 684.

In the Sothic list Amaes is given as the successor of Taharka.

(The break in continuity occurs after Amaes' name, not before.) Tanuatamun was his Egyptian name. Urdamane is the name in Assyrian. He was the son of Shebitku and nephew of Taharka. He reigned as late as calendar year 655-654 according to Manetho. His 38-year reign would therefore extend from 692-654. It is significant that in 692 Shebitku assumed control of the government according to the archaeological record of Dynasty XXV. Shebitku then associated his son on the throne with him when he came to power.

Necho II's 9 years of reign in the book of Sothis immediately precedes an unusual 34 years of Hophra. This evidence indicates that Hophra, or Apries, assumed powers of government in 600. It explains the emphasis placed by one account of Eusebius on the next (postdated) year -- 599 -- as the commencement of the reign of both Psamtik II and Apries.

But did Hophra live into the calendar year 567-566? Indeed he did. His death is recorded on the Elephantine Stela as occurring in Year 3 of Amasis. Amasis' year 3 was from 567-566. The 50-year reign of Amasis is obviously his sole rule and co-regency.

And what is the origin of the unusual dating of Psammetichus? For an explanation we must turn to an earlier portion of the Book of Sothis.

Another Look at Book of Sothis

The account commences with the end of Dynasty XVIII.

Names in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
47 Ramesses Aegyptus	68	770-702
48 Amenophis	8	702-694
49 Thuoris	17	694-677
50 Nechepsos	19	677-648
51 Psammuthis	13	648-635
52 -- - (no name)	4	635-631
53 Certos	20	631-611
54 Rampsis (Ramesses "the Great")	45	611-566

This unusual list seems clearly to be based on political events and royal family relationships otherwise unrecorded. Notice the reign of Psammuthis (Psammetichus), beginning in 648. Observe also the date 702. Compare this with the 18-year reign of Ameres from Eusebius' version of Manetho's Dynasty XXVI presented earlier. Ameris the Ethiopian succeeded Ramesses-Piankhi the Ethiopian in 702.

Now turn back Egyptian history to the beginning of the Ethiopian period in Egypt.

Appearance of Dynasty XXIV of Sais

Immediately before the reign of Shabako of Dynasty XXV the city of Sais, in the Delta, became prominent in politics. Its dynasty is famous for one man, Bochchoris. His father Tefnakhte was of much less importance. The classical writers mention only Bochchoris. Archaeologists recovered the name of Tefnakhte. The total duration of Dynasty XXIV was 44 years.

Africanus assigns only 6 years to Bochchoris, but Eusebius and the book of Sothis each attribute 44 years to him. The variation allows for a simple explanation. Tefnakhte, Bochchoris' father, was a local prince before he became king. At the time he rose to kingship he associated his son with him on the throne. Tefnakhte must have survived 38 years. The dates of the dynasty are as follows:

Name of King	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Bochchoris, or Bocchoris (the Bekenrinfef of archaeology)	44 or	751-707
Tefnakhte	38	751-713
Bocchoris	6	713-707

The end of the official reign of Bochchoris is 707.

In one document Eusebius indicates Bochchoris survived two more years, for he assigns 46 years to his entire reign -- 751-705.

Africanus informs us that Bochchoris was captured by his successor Sabacon (Shabako).

Who Was Usimare Piankhi?

The pages of history must be turned back a few years again to establish the identity of the Ethiopian Usimare Piankhi, of Dynasty XXV, the immediate predecessor of Shabako, who ruled over all Egypt in the eighth century before the present era. By archaeologists Piankhi is determined to be the father of Taharka (689-663), and of Shebitku (692-689), and the brother of Shabako (perhaps the English "half-brother" would be more correct).

All archaeologists have expressed surprise that Manetho would have neglected so famous a ruler! But Manetho did not neglect him! The annals of Usimare Pianki reveal who he was.

No archaeologist professes to know when Piankhi obtained control of Egypt. They do know, however, that in the year 21 of his reign a rebellion broke out in Egypt against his rule. (Breasted, "Ancient Records", vol. IV, page 418). The leader of the revolt was Tefnakhte, the father of Bochchoris. In the Piankhi stela Tefnakhte is commencing his rise to power; he is not yet a king. His official title is only great prince. Upon hearing of the attempt to seize the Delta, Usimare Piankhi ordered his troops in Egypt to quell the rebels, while he remained in Napata, Nubia. The revolt was not quelled. Then, in the succeeding year (see Breasted's footnote on the dating in the Piankhi Stela), Piankhi himself led an expedition and drove Tefnakhte into the marshes of the Delta. An agreement was finally signed between the two, and local autonomy seems to have been granted Tefnakhte, the founder of

Dynasty XXIV.

Now turn to the tables of the rulers of Dynasty XXIV of Sais. The 21st and 22nd calendar years of Piankhi's reign must have preceded the first year of Tefnakhte rulership (751-750) for in Piankhi's inscriptions Tefnakhte was not yet king. Here are the limits. The 21st and 22nd years of Usimare Piankhi must not be later than 751. What famous king was in Egypt already in control of Egypt in these years, whose 21st year was 753-752 and whose 22nd year was 752-751 at the latest?

Only one! Ramesses Aegyptus at the end of Dynasty XVIII of Manetho. Ramesses Aegyptus (773-707) was of the Cushite line of Sheba that had been ruling Egypt from Solomon's day. They had intermarried for generations with Egyptians. Piankhi was also a Cushite or Ethiopian ruling Egypt. Archaeologists have discovered his Ethiopian name. They have completely overlooked the fact that Manetho mentioned him under his Egyptian name.

Archaeological evidence indicates that Ramesses-Piankhi made Napata in Nubia his royal city, ruling Egypt from Thebes. The other kings of Dynasty XVIII who succeeded Ay also must have made Nubia their center of operations, since archaeologists have not been able to find evidence for them in Egypt. They have ruled through General Haremhab.

Now consider what occurred in Lower Egypt prior to the Dynasty of Tefnakhte and Bochchoris of Sais.

Dynasty XXIII of Tanis

Dynasty XXIV of Sais was preceded in Lower Egypt by Dynasty XXIII of Tanis. Here are the facts surrounding the new royal family ruling in Lower Egypt while the Thebans of Dynasties XVIII and XIX ruled from Upper Egypt. In the following table "A" and "E" stand for Africanus and Eusebius.

Kings of Dynasty XXIII	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Petubastis (E) or Petubates (A)	25 (E) 40 (A)	794-769 794-754
Osorthon (E) or Osorcho (A)	9 (E) 8 (A)	770-761 769-761
Psammus Zet (only in A)	10 31 (A), or 34 (A)	761-751 751-720 754-720

For the dynasty the book of Sothis provides the following:

Names in Book of Sothis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
68 Petubastes	44	794-750
69 Osorthon	9	770-761
70 Psammus	10	761-751

These figures may, at first, seem confusing. They can be immediately simplified by the following arrangements.

Petubastis	25	794-769	Petubastis	40	794-754
Osorthon	8	769-761	Zet	34	754-720

or

Psammus	10	761-751
Zet	31	751-720

The year of overlap of Osorthon with Petubastis is probably the result of the co-regency having commenced during the 25th year.

This dynasty is very important in Greek history. Africanus wrote of Petubates: "in his reign of the Olympic festival was first celebrated" ("Manetho", by Waddell, page 161). The Olympic festival commenced in 776, about the middle of Pedubastes' reign.

Further, Osorthon, or Osorcho, was by the "Egyptians called Heracles." In Greek history, Heracles lived three generations before the famous Trojan War. He was also the originator of the Olympic games. No historian has ever been able to reconcile these two facts. The reason? None recognize that there were two major Trojan Wars -- one ending 1181, the other over 500 years later in 677. The full story of this dynasty and of the Trojan War must wait the restoration of Greek history.

Documents have been found dated to year 6 of Pedubast and year 12 of an unnamed king, and to year 16 of Pedubast and year 2 of Yewepet. Yewepet was king of Mendes, but none of the Mendesian dynasties have been recorded by Manetho. These parallel datings with Mendesian kings are of value in dating Piankhi contemporary with Dynasty XXIII of Tanis. (See references in Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaoh's", page 449; "L'Egypte", by Drioton and Vandier, vol. II, page 542, Elgood, "Later Dynasties of Egypt", page 52.)

Eusebius, unlike Africanus, ended Dynasty XXIII of Tanis with the reign of Psammus in 751, at which point he took up the Dynasty of Sais.

The date of 794 for the beginning of Dynasty XXIII is undoubtedly associated with events in the reigns of Acherres (802-794) and Cherres (794-779). But neither history nor archaeology has preserved any worthwhile events for this period.

In Manetho, Dynasty XXIII of Tanis was preceded by a royal family of foreign origin. It was Libyan, numbered Dynasty XXII and ruled from Bubastis.

Dynasty XXII of Bubastis

Few points in Egyptian history are more misunderstood than this dynasty. Archaeologists have turned up a wealth of information pertaining to Libyans from Bubastis. But they have failed to notice that their kingly line is utterly different in number and sequence from Manetho's. First, one must compare Manetho with history. Then the archaeological evidence must be examined.

Diodorus of Sicily tells us that during the reign of Horus the Libyans from North Africa west of Egypt came into Egypt during the expansion of their realm and dominated the land. That Horus is the Orus of the Greeks the Akhenaton of Dynasty XVIII!

In the previous investigation of this dynasty it should be noted

that Orus or Akhenaton actually lived longer than the mere 17-years assigned to his reign by archaeological investigation. Manetho assigns him a reign that even outlasts Ay. This explains several enigmas that historians have puzzled over.

The most plausible moment for the Libyans to have established their dynasty would be just after the death of Ay, in 837, while Akhenaton (Orus) still lived. At this moment in history a curtain of silence descends on the family of Akhenaton. How long Libyan control in lower Egypt lasted may be determined by examining Assyrian records of Egypt. When Essarhaddon and Assurbanipal invaded the land of Egypt in 671-663 they found no Libyan dynasty ruling at Bubastis. But 90 years earlier Piankhi the Ethiopian specifically names a Libyan as king in Bubastis. (See Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", pp. 289-295 for the Assyrian account.) The only recorded king of the Libyans mentioned in the Bible is "So, king of Egypt" (II Kings 17:4). The king's full name would be the Libyan "Soshenk" or "Soshenq".

For years the name Soshenk has been mistaken for the Biblical Shishak. The assumption is that the Libyans under Soshenk attacked Jerusalem after the death of Solomon. Impossible. No philologist can demonstrate why the "n" should have disappeared from Soshenk to become Shishak.

Several historians have questioned the authenticity of the Biblical So. But they need not have done so. The account of So is preserved by the Assyrians in the records of Sargon. In Assyrian the name is spelled Sib'e. The Greek Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Old Testament renders the name "Soba". According to the Biblical record So was a Delta king second in rank to the Ethiopian rulers of Upper Egypt. For that reason the Assyrians refer to him as "Turtan", or second in command, to the great "Pir'u" or Pharaoh.

King So or Sib'e conspired with Hoshea, king of Israel. The time was the calendar year 722-721. The Assyrians quickly heard of it. Sargon dispatched his army to Israel. "At the beginning of my royal rule" (in 721 -- the accession year of Sargon) the Assyrian king besieged and captured Samaria, carried away 27,290 captives and imprisoned King Hoshea. "I installed over them an officer of mine and imposed upon them the tribute of the former king," reports Sargon. In the second year of Sargon's rule (720) "Hanno, king of Gaza and also Sib'e, the "turtan" of Egypt set out from Rapihu against me to deliver a decisive battle. I defeated them; Sib'e ran away ... and has not been seen again" (Pritchard's Texts, pp. 284-285). So disappeared from the scene in 720.

Using the date of 720 as a guide for the reconstruction of the Bubastite Libyan Dynasty, the following table may be constructed.

Dynasty XXII according to Africanus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Sesonchis (Sosenq)	21	836-815
Osorthon	15	815-800
Three other kings	25	800-775
Takelothis	13	775-762
Three other kings	42	762-720

It is significant that 720 also marks the full end of Dynasty XXVIII of Tanis, with the demise of Zet. Assyrian power overwhelmed the petty dynasts and the Pir'u (Pharaoh) himself offered the Assyrians tribute to keep the peace.

Manetho's transcribers have not recorded the names of each of the three other kings. From contemporary sources discovered through excavations in the past century the following names may be supplied. For the period extending from 762 to 720 the Ethiopian Piankhi names "King Namlot and King Yewepet. Chief ... Sheshonk, of Per-Osiris (Busiris) ... King Osorkon, who was in Per-Bast (Bubastis)." (Breasted's "Ancient Records", vol. IV, pp. 423-424, 439) All these were Libyan kings in the Delta of Egypt at the time of Piankhi's war in the years 753-751. Manetho's second group of "three other kings" are here named, together with So or Sib'e. The implication is that during this period the Bubastite family ruled the Delta from three cities -- Osorkon in Bubastis, Yewepet in Tentremu and Tayan, and Namlot in Hermopolis. At a later time anyone of these three kings would have been replaced in his local realm by a son or other near relative. That is probably how So, thirty years later, came to be one of three kings.

For the same threefold division for the earlier period -- 800-775 -- we have the mention of a Libyan king Yewepet (who came to power in 780) as a contemporary with the Tanite king Pedibast. It is doubtful that any other names have yet been recovered.

So-called Dynasty XXII

Archaeologists and historians have totally discarded Manetho's account of Dynasty XXII. They have substituted for it a totally different group of Libyan kings and mislabeled it "Dynasty XXII." They never asked themselves whether they may have found another dynasty of Libyans not mentioned by Manetho. They took for granted without proof, that Manetho couldn't be correct.

It is admitted by all historians that the so-called Libyan Dynasty XXII followed Dynasty XX of Thebes. When did Dynasty XX of Thebes rule? After Dynasty XIX. But that would put Dynasty XX of Thebes after the Persian conquest of Egypt in 525 -- the date for the end of Dynasty XIX.

That shocking fact will be proved in the next chapter! There it will be established that Dynasty XX of Thebes governed Egypt during the fourth and third centuries B.C.! The Libyan Dynasty archaeologists have discovered therefore existed sometime during the Ptolemaic period of Egyptian history!

These kings of so-called Libyan Dynasty XXII were not Pharaohs in the ancient sense. They were only local dynasts -- similar to the princes and kings of colonial areas in the nineteenth and early twentieth century of the present era.

The kings of this mislabeled dynasty boasted of being related through intermarriage to the "royal sons of Ramesses" (page 327 of Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs" and other volumes for this period). Historians are hard pressed to explain away the "royal sons of Ramesses" who survived their father upwards of two centuries! They were indeed what the monuments and stelae claim, the sons of the Ramessides of Dynasty XX.

The monuments and historical inscriptions of the true Dynasty XXII are scarce. Nevertheless archaeology has contributed greatly to our knowledge of the later Bubastite royal family. No small portion of it

has been derived from the foreboding Memphite Serapeum, a vast subterranean structure where Apis bulls were buried. It was reopened by the Greek king of Egypt, Ptolemy I, after the Persians had forbidden its use.

Discovered by Mariette in 1851, the Serapeum contained huge sarcophagi with mummies of no less than sixty-four bulls. During its lifetime an Apis bull was worshipped as the embodiment of Apis -- a name connected with Orisis. On its death and replacement by another living animal it was mummified and buried with pomp. Stelae were erected in the Serapeum designating, among numerous details, its time of birth, time of death and length of life. The chronological value of the find is obvious. Its historical value negligible.

From the monuments, Nilometer inscriptions and these stelae the following restoration of the so-called Dynasty XXII of Bubastis is now possible.

Here briefly is the proper restoration of the later Libyans during the Hellenistic period.

Names of Kings of Bubastis during the Ptolemaic Era (mislabeled Dynasty XXII)	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Soshenk "I"	21	308-287
Osorkon "I" (Soshenk "II" co-regent)	36	287-251
Takelot "I"	7	251-244
Osorkon "II"	23	244-221
Takelot "II"	25	221-196
Soshenk "III"	52	196-144
Pemay "the Cat"	6	144-138
Soshenk "IV"	37	138-101

The Roman numerals given after the preceding rulers are those assigned by archaeologists. They are not correct and overlook completely earlier rulers of the real Dynasty XXII mentioned by Manetho. The priest Manetho lived and wrote during the early third century B.C. and died 150 years before the last of these Libyans from Bubastis reigned! No wonder they are not mentioned by Manetho!

These dates are established by the following facts. Soshenk "I" built the Bubastite Portal adjoining a small temple of Ramesses III of Dynasty XX. This Portal was built sometime AFTER Ramesses III completed his temple. Ramesses III lived near the close of the Persian Period as shall be proved in the next chapter. The Bubastites were therefore contemporary with and subject to the Ptolemaic Greeks of the Hellenistic Period. The last heir of Alexander the Great died about 308. (See Mahaffey's "The Empire of the Ptolemies".)

Alexander had been proclaimed a god-king by the oracle at Ammon in the Libyan desert. Apparently at the death of his last heir, about 308 B.C., the Libyans assumed the right to succeed his line. The first king

of this new dynasty, Soshenk "I," is commonly -- though erroneously -- assumed to be the Shishak of the Bible. The inscriptions arraying his captured towns in the Palestine-Syria area are found on the Bubastid Portal at Thebes. In them no reference is made to Jerusalem, or to any important town in Judah. Writes Sir Alan Gardiner of the vanishing list: "The innumeration is disappointing, of the 150 and more places named only a few are well enough preserved to suggest definite routes and these skirt around the hill-country of Samaria without reaching the centre of the Israelite kingdom; nor is there any hint that they ever touched Judah at all. There are, however, some indications of a raid into Edomite territory" ("Egypt of the Pharaohs", page 330).

Soshenk did not live in the fabulously rich Solomonic period. His was the period of Ptolemaic control of Egypt. His claimed capture of Palestinian and Syrian towns -- perhaps villages is the better word -- occurred as a general of Egyptian troops under Ptolemy I.

In the fourth year of Osorkon "I" -- 284-283 -- a vast compilation of wealth was donated to the temple service. Here again is a parallel with Ptolemaic history. In the year 284 prodigiously rich coronation ceremonies were celebrated for Ptolemy II Philadelphus. No small portion of the riches were later donated to the pagan temple service.

Also, a flood in the third year of Osorkon "II" corresponds to the period of upset weather conditions mentioned in the Canopus Inscription in the 240's. In Egypt famines are caused by either too much water or an insufficient amount of water flowing in the Nile at the period of inundation.

Osorkon "II," in most Biblical studies, is falsely equated with the Ethiopian Zerah of Scripture. Osorkon "II" was not an Ethiopian. Much less did he ever command a million troops in an attack on Palestine. It was Twentieth Dynasty Ramesside culture that influenced Palestine just prior to and during the years of Osorkon ("Archaeology of Palestine", by W.F. Albright, page 137). Osorkon "II" reigned after the fall of Persia, not in the days of Israel's kings.

In the 15th year of Osorkon's successor Takelot II, Egypt was devastated by revolt and Nubian invasion. "Now, afterward, in the year 15 ... great wrath arose in this land They set warfare in the South and North ----- not ceasing to fight against those who were therein ... while years passed in hostility each one seizing upon his neighbor ..." (Breasted, "Ancient Records", vol. IV, sec. 764).

It was during the last two years of the life of Ptolemy IV that Upper Egypt revolted, beginning in the year 207-206.

E.A. Wallis Budge writes: "... a revolt broke out in Upper Egypt, and the Nubians endeavoured to include the Thebaid in the kingdom as in the days of Piankhi I and his successors; this rising was not quelled when Ptolemy IV died, and the Nubians carried on their revolt into the reign of his son." (Page 251 of "Egypt Under the Saites, Persians and Ptolemies", vol. vii of the series "History of Egypt".)

The end of this Libyan dynasty is not necessarily indicated by the year 101. That is merely the last record in the Serapeum.

Dynasty XXI of Tanis

Yet another dynasty of Manetho must be restored -- number XXI of Tanis. Historians recognize that it preceded a Libyan dynasty. The question is, which one? Should it precede Manetho's Dynasty XXII of Bubastis because it is mentioned previous to it? Or should it be associated in some way with Dynasty XX of Thebes because it is

mentioned after it? It means a difference of centuries!'

The answer may be found in the Serapeum. Writes Sir Alan Gardiner in "Egypt of the Pharaohs": "Strangely enough not a single inscription of Dyn. XXI was found in the Serapeum, but the material bearing upon Dyn. XXII ... is all the richer" (p. 326). On the same page Gardiner adds: "Huge sarcophagi had contained the mummies of no less than sixty-four bulls, the earliest dating from the reign of Amenophis III and the latest extending down to the very threshold of the Christian era."

Yet none from Dynasty XXI of Tanis? Absurd -- unless there was a period when use of the Serapeum was forbidden. Just such a period occurred -- under the Persians and early days of the Greeks before Ptolemy I.

When Cambyses conquered Egypt he ended the religious worship of Apis bulls by ordering the Egyptian priests to devour their god as food! Not until Ptolemy I was the old worship restored to favor ("A Dictionary of Egyptian Civilization", art. "Serapeum").

Dynasty XXI of Tanis is the Persian and early Greek period and immediately precedes the mislabeled Libyan Dynasty XXII of Bubastis.

When Herodotus visited Egypt around 450 B.C., he did not find this dynasty ruling in Tanis. It therefore commenced sometime later. It could not have continued further than into the reign of the first Ptolemies.

Archaeology has provided evidence that the last king of Manetho's Dynasty XXI -- Psusennes II -- gave his daughter in marriage to the Bubastite Osorkon. He was the son of the Soshenq who founded the Libyan Dynasty. Therefore Psusennes was a contemporary of Soshenq and the daughter was of the same generation as Osorkon.

Archaeology has recovered the latest known year of Soshenq from his monuments as year 21. Whether this was his latest year or not may be answered by Manetho.

Psusennes, the contemporary of Soshenq is assigned two lengths of reign by Manetho -- 14 years and 35 years. The difference is 21! The answer is clear. Soshenq did reign only 21 years at Bubastis before Osorkon, his son, came to the throne. And those 21 years overlapped with the last 21 years of Psusennes II. With the date 308 (see preceding chart of Bubastite Libyans) for the end of the 14-year reign of Psusennes II, the entire twenty-first dynasty may now be reconstructed from Manetho. In the following chart the letters "A" and "E" stand for Africanus and Eusebius.

Kings of Dynasty XXI of Tanis	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Smendes	26	417-391
Psusennes (I)	41 (E) (46) (A)	391-350 (391-345)
Nephercheres	4 (A & E)	350-346
Amenophthis	9	346-337
Osochor	6	337-331
Psinaches	9	331-322

Psusennes (II)	14 (A)	322-308
	(35) (E)	(322-287)

The Book of Sothis preserves the following variations:

63 Psuenus	25	384-359
64 Ammenophis	9	359-350
65 Nephecheres	6	350-344
66 Saites	15	346-331
67 Psinaches	9	331-327

These charts are in perfect harmony. The Book of Sothis preserves the length of reign of Psusennes, not from the beginning of his reign, but from an event in 384 -- a little-known war between Persians and Egyptians to be explained in the next chapter. It also provides additional information regarding the longer joint reign of Amenophthis.

The beginning date of 417 for the dynasty occurs during a period, which, for historians, is "a complete blank so far as Egypt is concerned" (Gardiner, "Egypt of the Pharaohs", p. 371). All that is known of the period is that the Persian king who then governed Egypt never visited the country. The Tanites were probably established to maintain Persian authority in the absence of the Persian King. The dynasty survived severe struggles between Egyptians, Greeks and Persians as the only symbol of authority in the Delta, or Lower Egypt. Its last king had only a daughter as heir, and the line was superseded by Libyans who intermarried with the Tanite line.

What Eratosthenes Revealed

Up to this point little has been presented from Eratosthenes, the Alexandrian astronomer, geometer, geographer, grammarian and philosopher who became chief librarian, under Ptolemy III, of the Library at Alexandria. Eratosthenes is noted as the founder of "scientific chronology." He had access to the Theban records, preserved by the priests, of all the kings of Egypt. A fragmentary account of his complete book has come down to us through the work of George the Monk -- Syncellus.

Syncellus preserved only those points of Egyptian history of most interest to the Greek mind of his day. Included were the adventures of Cush, Nimrod, Horus, Heber, Shem. Next he preserved the kings who reigned from the momentous year 1958 -- when Babylonia was recovered from the Medes -- to the time of Job (Cheops) and his successors. Then the period of the Exodus.

Syncellus records nothing more of the original Eratosthenes. There is added beginning, with the king of Dynasty XXVIII, a series of rulers under the Persians and Greeks This additional list of kings is from later sources, not Eratosthenes. (See "Apollodors Chronick" by Jacoby, for proof the last section of the list is not Eratosthenes'.)

The proof of the dating of this list of petty dynasts is found in the names of the so-called "kings of Thebes." None are typical of the days of Egypt's greatness. Number 32 is called the second Ammenemes.

The previous king of that name was Ammenemes of Dynasty XIX who ruled from 557-531. This earlier Ammenemes does not appear in the list ascribed to Eratosthenes though, some transcribers have incorrectly inserted his name. This second must then have been later! Number 30 is titled Ochytyrannus -- meaning a tyrant like king Ochus -- the Persian who reconquered Egypt in 343. This king of Thebes must have been after the reign of Ochus to have borne such a title! This list is really of petty princes, priests or commanders of the army of upper Egypt who pretended to greatness by the names they took.

Kings Who Ruled in Thebes According to Eratosthenes	Lengths of Reign	Dates
1 Menes, a Theban of This	62	2254-2192
2 Athothes (Nimrod)	59	2192-2133
3 Athothes II (Horus)	32	2126-2094
4 Miabaes -- "His name by interpretation signifies 'humane', or 'friendly'". He is the second Osiris who was deposed and finally slain by Typhon.	19	2049-2030 (same dates as the Palermo Stone has)
5 Pemphos -- is Shem	18	2037-2019
Eratosthenes' record continues with events after 1958		
6 Toegar Amachus -- Momcheiri of Memphis, "leader of men" -- "he was irresistible"	79	1958-1879
7 Stoichos, "his son" -- "the unfeeling Ares" Ares is the Greek name of the god of War -- Mars	6	1879-1873
8 Gosormies -- "All demanding"	30	1873-1843
9 Mares, "his son" -- "gift of the sun"	26	1843-1817
10 Anoyphis	20	1817-1797
11 Sirius	18	1797-1779
12 Chnubos or Gneuros -- "gold" (Observe that Chnubos is contemporary with the seventh king of Dynasty II of This -- the last half of whose reign extended from 1775	22	1779-1757

1765. In Nephercheres' reign Manetho records that the Nile flowed with honey -- not literally, but figuratively, as the land of Palestine was to flow with milk and honey -- great prosperity. Hence the word "gold" as the name of the king, signifying prosperity.)

13	Rayosis	13	1757-1744
14	Baiyres	10	1744-1734
15	Saophis Comates -- "trafficker, money-getter" -- that is Joseph (according to Manetho, Dynasty IV, Joseph began his reign in 1734!)	29	1734-1705
16	Saophis II (Cheops or Job) (see Dynasty IV of Manetho for the same beginning date of Cheops: in 1699 a branch of Dynasty III came to power in the person of Zoser-teti or Tosertasis)	27	1726-1699
17	Moscheres (the year 1668 is also a major date in the internal history of Dynasties III and IV)	31	1699-1668
18	Mosthes	33	1668-1635
19	Pammes	35	1635-1600

(From here Eratosthenes proceeds to rulers of Dynasty VI who are recognized as rulers at Thebes as well as at Memphis, where the royal line originated.)

20	Appapos (Pepi "the very great"); Eratosthenes impllee that Pepi was chosen to sit upon the throne from the very date of his blrth.	100	1587-1487
21	Acheskos Okaras, the Pharaoh of the Exodus	1	1487-1486
22	Nitocris, a queen, widow of the Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea.	6	1486-1480

Eratosthenes' original list ends here. The succeeding kings are no part of the original Eratosthenes who wrote in the third century B.C. These rulers extended two centuries beyond his time.

23 Myrtaios Ammonodotos, the Amyrteos or Amonortais of Manetho's Dynasty XXVIII of Sais	22	421-399
24 Thyosimares, "Mighty is the Sun"	12	399-387
25 Thinillo, "having increased his ancestral power"	8	387-379
26 Semphrucrates, "Heracles Harpocrates"	18	379-361
27 Chuther Taurus, a tyrant	7	361-354
28 Meures Philoscoros	12	354-342
29 Chomaephtha	11	342-331
30 Ancunios Ochytyrannus -- a tyrant like Ochus" -- Ochus was the Persian king who reconquered Egypt	60	331-271
31 Penteathyris	16	271-255
32 Stamenemes (Ammenemes) II	23	255-232
33 Sistosichermes, "valiant Hercules"	55	232-177
34 Mares	43	177-134
35 Siphosas "also called Hermes"	5	134-129
36 Fourteen years for which name of king is lost	14	129-115
37 Phruron, "the Nile"	5	115-110
38 Amuthantaeus	63	110- 47

The calendar year 47 marks the year of Caesar's invasion of Egypt, and the perishing of native Egyptian dynasts under Greek Ptolemaic rule.

The dating of the first king of this period -- Myrtaios (421-399) -- is based on the known date 399, when, as the sole king of Dynasty XXVIII, he ceased to reign. The year 421 consequently marks his rise to power. It was undoubtedly to counteract this aspiring ruler that the Persians established Dynasty XXI of Tanis as a counterweight in 417.

The events that led up to the catastrophe of 47 is told by Budge. Ptolemy XIII died in 51 and "left his kingdom by will to his daughter Cleopatra VII., and to his elder son Ptolemy XIV., surnamed Dionysius, who was to marry his sister; three years later (B.C. 48) a violent dispute broke out between brother and sister, who had reigned jointly until that time, and Cleopatra was obliged to leave Egypt. In 47 Caesar sent troops to support her claims, and as a result her brother's forces were defeated with great slaughter. Ptolemy XIV, was accidentally drowned in crossing a river whilst trying to escape" ("A History of Egypt", vol. viii, p. 87).

As commander of the Egyptian contingent under Ptolemy, the last native dynast perished in 47.

This chapter of the Compendium closes the history of Egypt to the Babylonian and Persian conquests with a quick, and needed, view into two later dynasties. In all there were twenty-four recorded dynasties ruling from the time of Babel to 525 B.C. Now we come to Dynasty XX of Thebes! These are the many Ramessides III to XI. Where do they belong in Egyptian history? Is the story of Thebes not yet complete?

The answer will be found in the next and final chapter on Egyptian history.

CHAPTER NINE

The Eclipse of Egypt

For the first 2000 years of human history, Africa -- and Egypt in particular -- was the vortex of world politics. Today Africa is militarily a void. Its native population borders on savagery in many areas. Its culture is universally primitive. Egypt and Ethiopia -- once the world's leaders -- are today backward, unprogressive nations.

Why?

Numerous answers have been offered. None of them is the key to the sudden decline of Egypt and of Africa.

Answer in Ezekiel

The answer to the riddle of the Dark Continent lies in the book of Ezekiel, in a little-understood prophecy. Before revealing its significance, one primary fact of geography and history must be noted. The contact of Africa with the ancient Near East always passed through Egypt, or its domains. The valley of the Nile led to the heart of Africa. To cut off Africa from the influences of civilization, only one land had to be destroyed -- Egypt

Now to consider the prophecy of Ezekiel -- and its historical import for today. It is found in Ezekiel 29, specifically verses 8-16:

"Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will bring a sword upon thee, and will cut off from thee man and beast. And the land of Egypt shall be desolate and waste, and they shall know that I am the Lord: because he hath said: The river is mine, and I have made it. Therefore, behold, I am against thee, and against thy rivers, and I will make the land of Egypt utterly waste and desolate, from Migdol to Syene even unto the border of Ethiopia. No foot of man shall pass through it, nor foot of beast shall pass through it, neither shall it be inhabited forty years. And I will make the land of Egypt desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate, and her cities among the cities that are laid waste shall be desolate forty years: and I will scatter the Egyptians among the nations, and will disperse them through the countries. For thus saith the Lord God: At the end of forty years will I gather the Egyptians from the peoples whither they were scattered and I will turn the captivity of Egypt, and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their origin: and they shall be there a lowly kingdom. It shall be the lowliest of the kingdoms, neither shall it any more lift itself up above the nations; and I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations. And it shall be no more the confidence of the house of Israel, bringing iniquity to remembrance, when they turn after them and they shall know that I am the Lord God."

Historians insist this prophecy was never fulfilled. They find no monumental evidence in Egypt that the country was without inhabitant forty long years. Of course not! There was not a single human being living in Egypt to record it -- nor any wild animal: And what Egyptian would want to record it upon return from forty years' exile?

When was this prophecy fulfilled? and by whom? About the year 570 a message from God was sent to Ezekiel. It is found in Ezekiel chapters 29 and 30. In this divine message the frightful events to befall Egypt are further amplified:

"Behold, I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and he shall carry off her abundance, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and it shall be the wages for his army. I have given him the land of Egypt ..." (Ezek. 29:19-20).

Chapter 30:10-12 makes it even more emphatic.

"Thus saith the Lord God: I will also make the multitude of Egypt to cease, By the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. He and his people with him, the terrible of the nations, Shall be brought in to destroy the land; And they shall draw their swords against Egypt, And fill the land with the slain. And I will make the rivers dry, And will give the land over into the hand of evil men; And I will make the land desolate, And all that is therein, by the hand of strangers: I the Lord have spoken it."

The military power that overthrew Egypt was from Babylon. Its king, Nebuchadnezzar, carried the Egyptians captive. But man's power alone could not have wrought what befell Africa. Forty long years following the enslavement of the Egyptians God sent a terrible drought on East Africa. Normal rains ceased. No water flowed in the Nile. The land dried up. Wild beasts could not even survive in the parched soil of Egypt.

All this occurred at the time the remainder of the world was enjoying the Golden Age of human civilization. Cut off from direct contact with Europe and Asia, the native populations stagnated, then degenerated. Never again was Africa able to catch up with the world. It was the eclipse of Africa.

To cover up the humiliating defeat at the hands of Babylon, the Egyptian priests later invented the story that Egypt was never more prosperous than during these 40 years! Yet archaeologically the period in Egypt is a total blank. A few remains have been attributed to this period -- a dated grave here and there. But they were only late reburials of those who died abroad in captivity and whose families could afford the expense.

Historians have mistakenly taken the Egyptian priests at their word. They think they find supporting evidence in the rule of Pharaoh Amasis on the Isle of Cyprus. Without exception every ancient history text portrays Egypt militarily strong during this period. Amasis is acclaimed as the builder of an empire that included Cyprus, while Nebuchadnezzar was limited to the mainland. No one, it seems, has ever noticed that Amasis was sent into exile to Cyprus by Nebuchadnezzar's command!

The only document to record the total destruction of Egypt was discovered in 1878. In that year a mutilated cuneiform cylinder was discovered, disclosing an event of Nebuchadnezzar's thirty-seventh year. It was purchased by the British Museum. The fragmentary remains are difficult to translate. The record is cast in the form of a plaintive prayer from Nebuchadnezzar to Merodach, god of Babylon.

"My enemies thou usedst to destroy; thou causedst my heart to rejoice ... in those days thou madest my hands to capture; thou gavest me rest; ... thou causedst me to construct; my kingdom thou madest to increase ..."

Clearly something is wrong with Nebuchadnezzar. Though he began the Egyptian campaign with brilliant success, he did not continue on the throne to see it completed. He became insane. His generals continued the efforts as the document proves:

"... the 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Bab- ... Egypt to deliver a battle -sis of Egypt called up his army distant regions which are amidst the sea ... many ... who are in Egypt ..."

carrying weapons, horses and ... he called up to assist him" (Compare "Egypt and Babylon" by George Rawlinson, pages 90-91 with Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 308). The remainder of the cylinder is unintelligible.

The 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar was 568-567. The campaign in Egypt thus occupied the space of three full years -- 570-567. In the calendar year 567-566 the destruction of Egypt was complete. Amasis was sent into exile in Cyprus. Forty years later he returned to Egypt with his people, under the scrutiny of the Persians. Amasis was succeeded by Psamtik II. His attempted rebellion brought the Persian king Cambyses to Egypt. Psamtik II offered his daughter in marriage to the Persian. The request was rebuffed. The royal dynasty of Egypt was overthrown. In 525 the Egyptian royal blood perished.

Persian Kings of Egypt

Very little of the history of Egypt is known for the next century and a quarter. Most of what has been preserved comes from Greek sources. The chronology of the period is correctly preserved by Manetho. It is in full agreement with the Persian records. Minor controversial details that do not pertain to Egypt, but to Persia, will be treated there.

Manetho's history of Persian dominion begins thus: "Cambyses in the fifth year of his kingship over the Persians became king of Egypt." The fifth year was 525-524, spring-to-spring reckoning in Persian annals. Cambyses reigned over Egypt three years, according to Eusebius' extract, 525-522, EXCLUSIVE reckoning. He was followed by the Magi who seized the throne and reigned for 7 months in 522.

The account of Africanus differs considerably and has never been understood by historians. He records that Cambyses reigned over Egypt 6 years, INCLUSIVE reckoning, 527-522. The 8-year reign of Cambyses in Persia extended from 529-521. Africanus reckons to the end of Cambyses' eighth year (December 31, 522 according to Egyptian reckoning) even though the Persian monarch died early in the eighth year, March 522. But what of the date 527 for the beginning of his reign in Egypt? The only possible answer is that Africanus -- and Manetho -- considered the dominion of the Persian king in Egypt as beginning in the year that the Egyptian exiles returned. Africanus thus is a witness to the fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy of the 40-years' exile -- 567-527! The kings of Persia, including illegitimate rulers (in parentheses), are now listed in chart form in the traditional Greek spelling. The dates are according to the Egyptian calendar, which regularly preceded the Persian by three to four months.

Dynasty XXVII -- Kings of Persia	Lengths of Reign	Dates (Egyptian reckoning)
Cambyses	6 (A)	Jan. 2, 527-Dec. 31, 522
	3 (E)	525-522 (Conquest to Magian revolt)
(Magi)	7 months (E only)	522)
Darius	36	Jan. 1, 521-Dec. 22, 486

Xerxes "the Great"	21	Dec. 23, 486-Dec. 16, 465
(Artabanus	7 months	465)
	(A only)	
Artaxerxes	41 (A)	Dec. 17, 465-Dec. 6, 424
	40 (E)	465-425
(Xerxes (II)	2 months	424)
(Sogdianus	7 months	424)
Darius (II)	19	Dec. 7, 424-Dec. 1, 405

The specific dates for the commencement of the Egyptian years may be found in "Manuel d'Histoire de Genealogie et de Chronologie de tous les Etats du Globe", by A.-M.-H.-J. Stokvis, vol 1.

Egypt Rebels

Over 120 years elapsed since Persian armies marched into Egypt. Darius was now dead. Smoldering revolt suddenly flared into the open. Though Persian authority was tacitly acknowledged for a few years, Egypt became virtually independent. Persian and mercenary armies were sent against the land of the Nile. Unsuccessful attempts followed one another until 343, when Egyptian forces collapsed before a determined Persian onslaught.

The history of this fast-moving period begins with Dynasty XXVIII of Sais. This dynasty -- if it even deserved that designation -- consisted of one king, Amyrteos. His reign lasted only 6 years, 405-399. He was overthrown by pretenders from the city of Mendes, whose rulers constituted Dynasty XXIX.

None of these dynasties were of ancient royalty. They were largely of prominent families, often of foreign descent.

The duration of Dynasty XXIX was only 20 years, after which it, too, was overthrown. The evidence of Manetho, as preserved by Africanus, Eusebius and Syncellus is as follows.

Dynasty XXIX of Mendes according to Africanus	Lengths of Reign	Eusebius	Lengths of Reign
Nepherites	6	Nepherites	6
Achoris	13	Achoris	13 or 12 (in the Canon)
Psammuthis	1	Psammuthis	1
Nepherites (II)	4 months	Nepherites (II)	4 months
		Muthis	1

In the Armenian version of Eusebius Muthes precedes Nepherites. Eusebius also assigns 13 years to Achoris in the Armeinan, which is the total length of his reign.

The real puzzle that has confounded historians of this period is found in the Demotic Chronicle. The Chronicle places the name Psammuthis before Achoris, in apparent opposition to Manetho. The apparent contradiction would vanish if each writer were to be carefully compared with the other. Manetho and the Chronicle both preserve part of the facts: neither preserves all the details. But how could Achoris precede Psammuthis and yet have Psammuthis precede Achoris?

The key is found in Eusebius' Canon, which contains one version of Manetho not found elsewhere. The Canon notes that Achoris reigned 12 years before Psammuthis. As Achoris reigned 13 years altogether, the final year must have succeeded the one-year reign of Psammuthis. That is, Achoris was deposed, and returned to the throne a year later.

Remarkably, the unnamed king who follows Nepherites and precedes Psammuthis in the Demotic Chronicle is said to have been "deposed." Psammuthis usurped his throne one year. Then Achoris appears followed by Nepherites II. These details may be placed in chart form as follows:

Names of Kings of Dynasty XXIX of Mendes	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Nepherites	6	399-393
Achoris	12	393-381
Psammuthis	1	381-380
Achoris (again)	1 (the 13th year)	380-379
Muthis (jointly with Achoris)	1	380-379
Nepherites (II), son of Achoris	4 months	379-378 (winter)

It is to be noted that Muthis succeeds Psammuthis and reigns during the same calendar year that Achoris returns to the throne. This is made clear by the fact that his name is left out in Africanus' account in which Achoris is assigned 13 years. Eusebius, in one case, adds Muthis to his list in which Achoris is assigned only 12 years.

Why the years commencing in 381 suddenly became politically unstable will become apparent when unveiling the mystery of Dynasty XX of Thebes!

But to continue the history of Egypt with Africanus' epitome of Dynasty XXX of Sebennytus. (The monumental names are in parentheses.)

Kings of Dynasty XXX of Sebennytus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Nectanebes (Nekhtnebef)	18	379-361
Teos (Takhos)	2	361-359
Nectanebos (Nekhtharehbe)	18	359-341

The Demotic Chronicle (IV, 14) assigns to Nekhtnebef a reign of 19 years -- 380-361. This begins with the year that Achoris returned to power. In the previous line in the Demotic Chronicle a length of only 16 years is assigned -- 377-361. What event occurred in the calendar year beginning 377 will be clarified by the history of Dynasty XX of Thebes!

The account of Dynasty XXX found in Eusebius' Canon is the same as Africanus'. But in the Armenian Version of Eusebius and in Syncellus' account of Eusebius the following differences should be noticed.

Dynasty XXX of Sebennytus According to Eusebius	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Nectanebis	10	371-361
Teos	2	361-359
Nectanebos	8	359-351

This epitome of Manetho is chronologically abridged. But it does indicate major military or political events for the calendar years beginning in 371 and 351. The significance of the year beginning 371 again lies in the history of Dynasty XX of Thebes. In the calendar year beginning 351 an important invasion of Egypt was unsuccessfully attempted by the Persians ("Diodorus Siculus", XV, 40, 3) See also A. T. Olmstead's "History of the Persian Empire", revised edition -- one of the most accurate texts covering this century of Egyptian quasi-independence.

In 343 -- in the sixteenth year of Nectanebos -- a great Persian campaign against Egypt was mounted. The Delta soon fell. The Egyptian king fled to Ethiopia where he continued to exercise authority over Upper Egypt for another two years -- to 341.

In 341 the last vestige of Egyptian independence vanished. The short-lived Persian dominion which followed constituted Dynasty XXXI.

Persian Kings of Dynasty XXXI	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ochus	2	341-339
Arses	3	339-336
Darius	4	336-332

The conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great occurred in 332.

And Now Dynasty XX of Thebes

The authority of Thebes over Egypt disappeared about 663 with the Assyrian conquest. For almost three centuries no native dynasty is known to have been centered in the ancient capital of Upper Egypt. Yet, according to Manetho and the archaeological record, Thebes was again to become the capital of Upper Egypt! Its rulers -- including the famous Ramessids III to XI -- constitute Dynasty XX.

The famous Papyrus Harris contains a historical record of the

period immediately prior to the rise of Dynasty XX. It reads:

"The land of Egypt was cast aside with every man a law unto himself. They had no chief spokesman for many years previously up to other times. The land of Egypt consisted of officials and heads of villages, one slaying his fellows both high and low. Then other times came afterwards in the empty years, and a Syrian with them made himself prince. He set the entire land tributary under his sway. He united his companions and plundered their possessions. They made the gods like the people, and no offerings were presented in the temples." The king then claims: "He brought to order the entire land, which had been rebellious. He slew the disaffected of heart who had been in Egypt. He cleansed the great throne of Egypt He established the temples (Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 260).

Here is an era of many "empty years" -- with no native kings. Only officials and village headsmen. Foreign princes had Egypt in tribute. The religion of Egypt was suppressed; its temples bare. Not in all the history of Egypt had such a time occurred from the days of Nimrod to the Persian conquest! Even the Hyksos period had its own native kings ruling under the foreign Shepherd Princes. But here is a time when no native kings ruled.

Only one period in Egyptian annals corresponds to this tragic era -- the time of the Persian conquest and dominion. Dynasty XX of Thebes therefore rose to power during the period of rebellion against Persia in the fourth century before the present era. Yet historians would place the dynasty nearly eight centuries earlier -- in the time of the prophet Samuel and of king Saul!

The most famous king of Dynasty XX was Ramesses III. In his 8th year he fought a tremendous battle against invaders from Asia. These invaders are usually assumed to be Philistines. History texts claim that Ramesses' victory over the "Philistines" forced them to withdraw from Egypt and settle in Palestine, where they commenced their attacks against Israel in the time of Saul. This reconstruction of history is an utter fiction! Historians have willingly forgotten that the Philistines were already dwelling in Palestine in the days of Abram -- over eight centuries before the kingship of Saul. "And Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines many days" (Genesis 21:34, also verse 32).

The invaders whom Ramesses III repelled in his eighth year were "sea peoples" -- from the isles and coastlands of the northern Mediterranean. They were mercenary troops of a vast empire that ruled in Asia Minor and over Palestine. That was the Persian Empire -- and its mercenaries were Greeks and their allies! The Egyptian word *Haunebu*, applied by Ramesses III to the northern sea peoples, is the very same word found on Egyptian monuments in reference to Greeks! (See E. Naville's "The Shrine of Saft el Henneh and the Land of Goshen" (1887), pages 6 ff.)

Ramesses III's invaders were crested soldiers. The Greeks were famous for their crested troops. Ramesses' enemies moved through Palestine. So did the Persian and Greek troops in 373. By contrast, there was no land invasion from Asia Minor through Palestine in the days of Samuel or Saul!

Ramesses defeated his enemies at the time of the rising Nile. The Persians and Greeks were defeated in 373 at the time of the Nile floods ("Diodorus Siculus", XV, 41-43). Ramesses III speaks of natural calamity and unrest in the isles of the sea peoples. In 373 the Greek isles were devastated with frightful earthquakes and floods, according to Diodorus and other ancient writers.

The dates of Ramesses III may now be established as follows:

Ramesses III -- 31 years -- 381-350.

His 8th year was 374-373, the year of his great victory. Ramesses also records victories in his 5th and 11th years over Libyan and other invaders. His 5th year began in 377, his 11th year in 371. Now turn to the account of Dynasty XXX. The year 377 marked the beginning of the 16 years assigned by the Demotic Chronicle to Nectanebes. The year 371 begins his 10-year reign according to Eusebius. Thus the reign of Ramesses III, with its records of major wars in Egypt, provides the clues for the unusual dates sometimes assigned to Dynasty XXX.

The father of Ramesses III is known to historians as Setnakhte. His highest regnal date found on the monuments is Year 2. His reign, of little historical significance, was at least extended over the years 383-381. It is highly probable that he reigned no longer than these two years. A war between the Persians and Egyptians was fought about years 385-383. As Setnakhte was famous as a general, it appears that he arose in power in Thebes following the repulse of the Persian armies. The ancestry of Setnakhte is unknown, though the family was probably Ethiopian in origin. Everywhere they mimicked the ways of the famous Ethiopian king Ramesses II -- the Tarhakah of the Bible.

Manetho's transcribers provide no names for these kings, nor any individual lengths of reign. The only source of evidence is from the monuments and papyri. The unusual abundance of well-preserved papyri and monuments is another strong indication of the lateness of Dynasty XX. ("Egypt of the Pharaohs", Gardiner, page 299.) From these records the following information may be deduced.

Names of Kings of Dynasty XX of Thebes	Known Lengths of Reign	Resultant Dates
Setnakhte	2	383-381
Ramesse-hekaon (III)	31	381-350
Ramesse-hekamae (IV)	6	350-344
Ramesse-Amenhikhopshef (v)	4	344-340
Nebmare Ramesse (VI)	7	340-333
Usimare-akhenamun Ramesse (VII)	---	---
Ramesse-itamun-nutehekaon (VIII)	7	333-326

The records of Ramesses VII and VIII are very obscure. There are no known dates for Usimare-akhenamun Ramesse (designated Ramesses VII in *Bibl. Or.*, xiv, 138). A badly tattered document indicates that Ramesse-itamun-nutehekaon (VIII) reigned possibly 7 years. That his reign was PARALLEL with Ramesse IX is indicated by a papyrus discussed in *"The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology"*, xi, 72-75 and xiv, 60.

Of far greater interest are the three succeeding Ramessides, listed and dated in the next chart. (A discussion of the dates follows.)

Neferkare Ramesse (IX)	17	343-326
------------------------	----	---------

Khepermare Ramesse (X)	3	326-323
Menmare Ramesse (XI)	27 --	323-296 --

The Persian conquest of Egypt in 343 brought to power a collateral branch of the Ramessid family. Ramesses V was deprived of most royal prerogatives. (See page 297 of Gardiner's "Egypt of the Pharaohs".) In his place ascended Neferkare Ramesse, in whose latter years foreigners and sea peoples -- Greeks! -- were found in Thebes. The years of Ramesses IX disclose great unrest and serious unemployment -- a result of the Persian conquest and the later penetration of the Greeks.

Ramesses XI is famous for the controversial "Renaissance" -- or rebirth of Egyptian influence -- which commenced in his 19th year. The 19th year is 305-304 -- the very year that Egypt became independent under Ptolemy I. The Renaissance or "renewal of birth" is the independence of Egypt under the Ptolemies'

Further, after year 17 of Ramesses XI there was a rebellion of Pinhasi in Upper Egypt coupled with a "war in the Northern District" (Lower Egypt). This struggle occurred before the Renaissance, hence in year 18. Year 18 of Ramesses XI was 306-305 -- the year that Egypt was invaded -- unsuccessfully -- by Antigonus of Syria.

The remaining history of the petty rulers under the Ptolemies is exceedingly obscure -- and historically of little value. Theban and Tanite royalty are known for several generations following the Ramessides. They are mistakenly labeled by historians as Dynasty XXI -- but have nothing in common with the Tanite Dynasty XXI as found in Manetho. Most of their time was spent in rewrapping the mummies of the ancient pharaohs. A much misunderstood monument is the Bubastite Portal at Karnak. Containing material pertaining to Dynasty XXII and built after the reign of Ramesses III, it is at times called upon to support a false early dating of Dynasty XX. The answer is quite simple. The inscriptions are late reproductions inscribed by Bubastite officials in honor of their early and famous kings -- the Soshenks and the Osorkons. It was commonplace during the Persian and Greek period to revive the past.

With this chapter the restoration of Egyptian history is complete.

CHAPTER TEN

It Began at Babel

Civilization began at Babel. But the thread of history first had to be traced through Egypt. Into Egypt journeyed the founders of civilization. Egypt kept the history of the past alive. The Greek and Roman historians and theologians and philosophers were universally interested in Egypt.

By contrast, Mesopotamia died. Its early inhabitants migrated into Eurasia. Its history was only meagerly preserved. Later, Arabs dwelt on its barren wastes. Yet in those barren wastes lay the buried cities of ancient times, with their fallen libraries and history texts waiting the archaeologists' keen sight.

Mesopotamia Rediscovered

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries Europeans became aware of the treasures of the TELLs or mounds of the Mesopotamian flatlands. Archaeological expeditions cut into many of the most impressive ones. Hoards of private and public documents were discovered -- most of them lying to this day untranslated in the basements of European museums. A multitude of undreamed of facts were disclosed for the first time. But how were the archaeologists and historians to interpret these facts? How would they arrange the dynastic lists of hitherto unknown kings?

Unfortunately the key to a true knowledge of history was being discarded at the very time excavations began in Mesopotamia. That key is God in history. Without God -- and hence without the Bible -- there were no bounds to curb historical speculation. A deliberate conspiracy to interpret every possible fact in opposition to the Bible was summarily begun. The literary critics quickly seized the opportunity. The Babylonian accounts of creation and the Flood were interpreted as the originals of Genesis. Moses, they claimed, patterned the law after Hammurabi's Code.

No one questioned whether Hammurabi lived BEFORE or AFTER Moses. Or whether Genesis was written before rather than after the idolatrous Mesopotamian accounts of creation and the great Flood. Everyone assumed that the ancient arrangements of the dynastic lists of kings and city-states were in proper sequence. That the scribes might have deliberately arranged their history to make Babylonia appear older than any other part of the world did not dawn upon the first critics.

Then came the astounding discovery. Business documents, public monuments, literary classics were translated which made kings contemporaries who were separated by hundreds or thousands of years in the dynastic lists of kings. What were the historians to do?

Wrote Leon Legrain in 1922: "The problem of parallel dynasties is one of the most troublesome for Babylonian chronologists" (Publication of Babylonian Section of University of Pennsylvania, XIII, 17). Weldner of Austria forced the historical world to recognize the problem despite themselves. His famous articles pointing out that several successive dynasties were in fact contemporary appeared in 1923 in "Archiv fuer Keilschriftforschung" (I, 95), and in 1926 in "Archiv fuer Orientforschung" (III, 198).

But the strongest evidence against the modern interpretation of history was discovered by the French at Mari on the Euphrates River.

There it was discovered that during the lifetime of Hammurabi -- who was mistakenly dated by historians to the time of Abraham -- the Benjamites were in control of Palestine and men like David were famous! (See Werner Keller's "The Bible as History", pages 49-52).

How were the historians and archaeologists to interpret these astounding discoveries? Were they to date Hammurabi properly to the time of Saul and David? Not at all! Rather, they cleverly assumed that Benjamites were in Palestine long before Benjamin was born -- that the name of David was famous for nearly a thousand years before David was born! They hoped thereby to keep their interpretations of the king lists and reject the history of the Bible.

It is time such nonsense were banished from history. It is time that the truth of history were made plain.

What Archaeologists Learned

In the ruins of the libraries of Assyria and Babylonia the archaeologists uncovered many fragmentary and broken records of ancient Mesopotamian city-states and royal houses. These records will now be examined and the history of Babylonia restored.

The scribes of Babylonia drew up their records of the past quite differently from those of Egypt. In Egypt the scribes told the entire history of each city before passing to the history of the next city. Thus the history of Memphis was completed before the history of Thebes was expounded. The Babylonian records present a striking contrast. Ancient Babylonian history may be best understood by presenting a sketch of the Sumerian account of the dynastic royal houses.

Name of Dynasty

First Dynasty of Kish
First Dynasty of Uruk (Erech)
First Dynasty of Ur
Dynasty of Awan
Second Dynasty of Kish
Dynasty of Hamazi
Second Dynasty of Uruk
Second Dynasty of Ur
Dynasty of Adab
Dynasty of Mari
Third Dynasty of Kish
Dynasty of Akshak
Fourth Dynasty of Kish
Third Dynasty of Uruk
Dynasty of Akkad, etc.

Certain lists vary the order slightly or add other dynasties (a significant fact to be explained later).

This list when officially drawn up by scribes, intended to convey the concept that each dynasty in turn had dominated all neighboring states. The result was the mistaken concept that Babylonia, unlike other areas, was always united under one ruler at a time, and that Babylonia, by reason of its extreme antiquity, had political and religious precedence over the world.

No restoration of Babylonian history can claim completeness until these dynasties, recovered by archaeology, are properly assigned their

place in the chain of historical events.

Analyzing the Sumerian King List

The Sumerian King List opens the history of postflood civilization by the following account: "After the Flood has swept over the earth and when kingship was lowered again from heaven, kingship was first in Kish. In Kish, Ga ... ur became king and ruled 1,200 years" The First Dynasty of Kish contains three kings who ruled, according to the scribes, for 24,510 years! (Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts", page 265.)

Here certainly is a chronological account that is neither historical nor Biblical. Yet several of the kings named have left behind incontestable evidences of their reality. That the original reigns are purposely lengthened far beyond actual duration is recognized by all historians. The cause of this Babylonian flight of fancy is the same as that which prompted evolutionists and geologists to stretch out the "Ice Ages" to hundreds of thousands of years -- though in reality they occurred in historical times and are found described in Greek and Roman literature.

People want to believe in the extreme antiquity of Man's past. The ancient Babylonians were no exception. In his account of Babylon's first two kings, Cush and Nimrod, the priest Berossus assigned 2,400 years to Evechous (Cush) and 2,700 to Cosmaskelos (Nimrod). ("The Dawn of Civilization", by Maspero, p. 573.) These figures are significant. From Egyptian, Greek and Roman sources it has already been demonstrated in this Compendium that Cush ruled 60 years before he was succeeded by the 27-year reign of his son Nimrod. Thus Berossus multiplied the 60 years of Cush by 40 and arrived at the date 2,400. (In the Sumerian king list the figure for Ga ... ur, the first king, who is Cush, is 1,200 -- that is, 60 multiplied by 20.) Berossus multiplied the 27 years of Nimrod by 100 and obtained 2,700 years. The Babylonians used a clever mathematical trick to lengthen the reigns of the rulers of Kish. However, the device used by the priests has been solved. The dating for Dynasty I and II of Kish can be found in Appendix A of vol. II of the Compendium.

But what is the special significance of the city of Kish? Why should it be considered first to bear rule in Mesopotamia?

Kish is the city of Cush or Kush. It is situated near the site of ancient Babylon. It became a sacred site because people first dwelt there in the land of Shinar after the flood. From the area of Kish they commenced the erection of the city of Babel. But Babel turned out to be a failure -- "they left off to build the city" (Genesis 11:8).

The government of Cush and Nimrod, begun at Babel, thus continued at Kish while the towns of Erech, Accad and Calneh were being built in the land of Shinar following the abortive attempt at Babel. The First Dynasty of Kish commenced 2256 -- the date of the beginning of the construction of the tower of Babel. The dynasty continued to 1809 at which point the Second Dynasty of Kish began (see vol. II of the "Compendium" for proof).

The Second Dynasty ruled from 1809 to 1748.

History Continues at Erech

The first city which Nimrod succeeded in building was Erech. The

government of Cush and Nimrod extended over this city as well as over Kish, and its history is told in the surprising annals of the First Dynasty of Uruk or Erech.

From the "Sumerian King List", published by Thorkild Jacobsen, and accessible in Pritchard's often-quoted work, the first Dynasty of Uruk may be summarized as follows:

Sumerian Names of Rulers (some in fragmentary form)	Lengths of Reigns in King List	Notations in King List
Mes-kiag-gasher	325 (in one text read as 32(4), see p. 85 of T. Jacobsen's "Sumerian King List".)	Son of Utu, became high priest and king. Journeyed into the Sea and reached the Mountains beyond.
En-me(r)-kar	420	Son of predecessor. He built Erech.*
Lugal-banda	1,200	A god and shepherd.
Dumu-zi	100	A god and fisherman.
Gilgamesh	126	A divine man, begotten by a spirit. became a high priest
Ur-lugal	30	Son of Gilgamesh.
Udul-kalamma	15	
Labasher	9	
En-nun-dar-anna	8	
Meshede	36	A smith.
Melam-anna	6	
Lugal-ki-dul	36	

*Some tablets read: Under him Erech was built.

Though these names may, at first sight, be meaningless, five of the rulers are mentioned by other names in the Bible and a sixth -- Gilgamesh -- has already been alluded to in Egyptian history in this Compendium.

To break down this list one must commence from the known facts. Dumu-zi is a variant spelling of Tammuz, a Mesopotamian name of Nimrod. Nimrod succeeded his father Cush in Babylonia after a 60-year reign. The 60 year reign of Cush has been established as 2254-2194 (see the Egyptian history of Dynasty I of Thinis). The 100 years assigned to Nimrod are, like the records of Egypt, based upon the Era of Nimrod to the coming of his successor. Though Nimrod was executed after a reign of 27 years, his Era continued to year 100, and is to be dated

2194-2094.

What occurred in 2094? Who left Egypt in 2094 to come to the land of Shinar to claim the throne of Nimrod? Horus!

Thus Horus of Egypt is Gilgamesh of Mesopotamia. Each claimed to be heir of Nimrod. Both were born of a Queen of Heaven -- Isis or Ishtar. Both had a "spirit" as a father -- the supposed Nimrod alive as the impregnating sun.

Gilgamesh ruled in Mesopotamia, after he left Egypt, for another 126 years -- 2094-1968. This brings us down to the lifetime of Abram! Gilgamesh lived to be almost 200 years of age. This is in complete harmony with the genealogy of the Bible for the same period (Genesis 11:10-32).

Gilgamesh was succeeded by Ur-lugal -- a name which means "Great King." This Great King was ruler of Erech. Erech was in the land of Shinar. Whoever controlled Erech controlled Shinar. What was the personal name of this Great King who controlled Shinar in the days of Abram? Amraphel (Genesis 14:1).

Amraphel reigned 30 years before he was slain by Abram's army. The dates of Amraphel are 1968-1938. The struggle, recorded in Genesis 14 between Mesopotamian kings and the Canaanites therefore climaxed in 1938 with the death of four kings of Mesopotamia. When Assyrian history is studied this same year will be established for Arioch, king of Ellasar -- that is, king of the City of Asar or Asshur

To return to the Sumerian King List. The predecessor of Dumu-zi (or Tammuz, who is Nimrod), is named Lugal-banda -- a title meaning "Little King." He is Cush. Son Nimrod was, of course, the "Great King." The 1200 years assigned to Cush are a clever expansion (20 x 60) of the true figure of 60 years already established from other sources. The correct dates are 2254-2194.

But how are the two predecessors in the list -- Mes-kiag-gasher and En-mer-kar -- to be explained? Were they parallel rulers who also exercised authority in that world?

The mother of Gilgamesh -- Semiramis or Ishtar -- was at one time the wife of Lugal-banda -- that is, Cush (Jacobsen, "Sumerian King List", page 91). She was also a wife and daughter-in-law of Asshur. The real grandfather of Gilgamesh, however, was not Cush, but En-mer-kar (Aelian in "De natura Animalium", vii, 21, quoted in Jacobsen's work on page 87). From these facts it is clear that the Dynasty of Erech is composed of two blood lines -- that of Cush and that of Asshur.

In history there were three famous queens named Semiramis -- each one claiming to be a Queen of Heaven. The last Semiramis claimed to be thrice born. Each one of them was an Assyrian queen. Does this indicate that En-mer-kar is the Sumerian form of the Semitic name of Asshur? In the King List it is stated either that Erech was built under the rule of En-mer-kar, or that it was built by En-mer-kar. In the Bible the builder is Nimrod. But Nimrod did not build it alone! For "out of that land" Shinar -- where Erech is located -- "went forth Asshur, and built Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah" (Genesis 10:11). This is the correct translation according to the vowel pointing of the Hebrew text. But the consonants, without the pointing, may be translated, "he" -- that is, Nimrod, "went forth, being strong, and build Nineveh and Calah." The land of Assyria or Asshur is also the land of Nimrod (Micah 5:6). The original enterprise was a joint affair.

Cush was originally a prominent figure at Babel. But he was superseded by Nimrod, who gained the carnal affections of his own mother. Cush soon perished and the two dominant figures remaining were Asshur and Nimrod. Then Nimrod was driven from Mesopotamia to Egypt.

Thus the entire history of the later world came to be dominated by the shadow of Asshur's children.

But if En-mer-kar is Asshur, the result is that Mes-kiag-gasher is the Sumerian name of Shem! Mes-kiag-gasher was in Sumerian parlance, the "son of Utu" -- the God who warned Noah of the Flood. That is, he was a man who knew the God of creation.

Mes-kiag-gasher was also a high priest. From Egyptian records historians have discovered that Semsem -- the Great Shem -- of Dynasty I of Thinis was also pictured as a high priest! This famous man crossed from Asia over the water to the mountains of Europe. Shem travelled far and wide to put down the government of Nimrod.

Now consider the 325-year reign of Shem. When did it begin and when did it end?

In Egypt only a small part of his life story is revealed. But in the annals of Erech one sees Shem's great figure striding over three and a quarter centuries of history! Shem had no part in the government established at Babel in opposition to the rule of God. When the terror of Nimrod loomed great over the horizon, Shem acted. He exercised, after Nimrod's seizure of power, the administration of government beginning 2191 in Shinar as patriarch and priest of the Semitic world. His full 325 years of authority lasted from 2191 till his death in 1866.

This date -- 1866 -- is the exact year of the death of Shem in Scripture. According to Egyptian history the exodus occurred in 1486. This was exactly 430 years after the covenant God made with Abraham when he was 99 years old -- it was not made at the time Abram entered the land at 75. (See Genesis 17:1-8, Exodus 12:40-41 and Galatians 3:17.) The verb is not expressed in the original Hebrew of Exodus 12:40, which should properly be translated: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, completed four hundred and thirty years."

Calculating back from 1486, year 99 of Abraham was 1918-1917 autumn to autumn reckoning -- for in the next spring, of 1916, Abraham was already 99 years old and in his hundredth year. Abraham was 75 when he departed from Haran following the death of his father in 1941 (Gen. 12:4). By adding the figures of the Genesis 11, from Terah to Arphaxad, the year 2367-2366 is reached (autumn to autumn). In that year -- two years after the Flood -- Arphaxad was begotten. Shem lived after he begot Arphaxad 500 years (Genesis 11:10-11). This 500 years extends from 2366 to 1866 -- the very year Shem's 325-year reign ended, according to the evidence of the Erech list!

(The broken reading of 32(4) years. proposed by Sumeriologists, if correct, probably merely excludes the calendar year in which Shem died.)

The 420 years of En-mer-kar are also datable. The figure probably represents the length of time between the death of Asshur in 1906 (see German history in vol. II of the "Compendium") and his becoming a head of household in 2326, when age 40 (assuming he is a twin of Arphaxad who was born in 2366).

The First Dynasty of Uruk may now be restored as follows, beginning with Cush (Lugal-banda).

Names of Kings	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Lugal-banda (Cush)	(60)	2254-2194
Dumu-zi (Nimrod or	100	2194-2094

Tammuz)		
Gilgamesh (Horus or Ninyas)	126	2094-1968
Ur-lugal (Amraphel) dies in Abram's year 78)	30	1968-1938
Utul-kalamma	15	1938-1923
Labasher	9	1923-1914
En-nun-dara-anna	8	1914-1906
Meshede	36	1906-1870
Melam-anna	6	1870-1864
Lugal-ki-dul	36	1864-1828

After this dynasty the kings of Shinar do not reappear in the Bible until the reign of Merodach-baladan.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Berossus and Babylonian History

The writings of Berossus, the contemporary of Manetho, are altogether lost. No valid dates of individual kings have been preserved by classic writers from Berossus.

Berossus' first post-flood dynasty is completely distorted. It is said to be composed of 86 Chaldean kings who supposedly reigned about 34,000 years! This dynasty includes Evechous and Kosmabelos -- Cush and Nimrod. The kings who composed the first dynasty were not successive but contemporary leaders who formed the first Democratic Council in history this side of the flood. Samuel Kramer, in his book "History Begins at Sumer", draws attention to the fact that the earliest records of democratic government are found in references to Shinar and the city of Kish.

The other dynasties of Berossus strikingly confirm the Sumerian King List and Biblical history. The following chart is from Berossus' transcribers.

Dynasty II	8 Medes	224 years (the Armenian copy reads 234)
Dynasty III	11 Chaldeans	NO YEARS ASSIGNED, AS DYNASTY WAS CONTEMPORARY. (In margin of Armenian version 48 years is noted.)
Dynasty IV	49 Chaldeans	458 years
Dynasty V	9 Arabians	245 years (Semiramis II reigned during this period.)
Dynasty VI	45 Chaldeans	526 years to seizure of Babylonia by Pul.

The dates for these dynasties may easily be restored. Pul, in Babylonian history, is Tiglathpileser III. He seized the city of Babylon in 729, during the third year of the reign of Ukinzer. See the "Babylonian Chronicle", Col I. Tiglathpileser considered this his first year; the Babylonians considered it his accession year assigning it to Ukinzer. Ptolemy coupled them together and designated the period as that of Chinziros and Poros.

Dynasty VI continued 526 years -- 1255 to 729

Dynasty V for 245 years -- 1500 to 1255

Dynasty IV for 458 years -- 1958 to 1500

(Dynasty III for 48 years -- 2006-1958)

Dynasty II for 234 years -- 2192-1958

or
224 years -- 2192-1968

The year 2192 marks not only the beginning of Nimrod's rule in Egypt, but also the Median seizure of Babylonia at the time Nimrod usurped Supreme authority at the dethroning of his father Cush. This confirms Greek traditions that even Japetus (Japheth) opposed the Titans -- the followers of Nimrod. The Medes, descendants of Japheth kept their power over Babylon for 224 years to 1968 -- the year of the death of Gilgamesh. In another ten years (1968-1958) the Chaldeans regained full power.

Those ten years and the previous 38 were times of great stress during which 11 Chaldean kings, including Gilgamesh, ruled contemporaneously as Berossus' Dynasty III -- 2006-1958. The date 2006 is confirmed by the Persian account of Gilgamesh. Persian historians assign him only 38 years -- 2006-1968 -- the exact duration of his rule as part of Dynasty III of Berossus. (See Al Biruni's "Ancient Nations", page 99.) The remarkable agreement of all these figures, found among different nations, is proof that the historical data have never been totally lost.

Another Account of Earliest Dynasties

As generally recorded, Berossus' First Dynasty begins with Cush and Nimrod; the Second Dynasty was Median. But Alexander Polyhistor and Abydenus preserve, from the most ancient records of the Temple of Belus at Babylon, an account of parallel rulers -- five Chaldean kings who were in turn succeeded by no less than six Arabians (pre-Ishmaelites). The information may be obtained from Jackson's "Chronological Antiquities", Pages 233-235. These much-misunderstood dynasties -- even Jackson did not understand their import -- perfectly correspond with the restoration of the Dynasty of Erech already presented.

First Kings of the Chaldeans after the Tower of Babel	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Porus	35	2254-2219
Nechubes	43	2219-2176
Abtus	48	2176-2128
Oniballus	40	2128-2088
Zinzirus	45 (or 46)	2088-2043 (2088-2042)

(Note that the 35 years -- 2254-2219 -- of Porus are also the same for Mizraim.)

Dynasty of Six Kings of the Arabians	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Mardocentes	45 (or 44)	(2042-1998)
Mardakos	40	1998-1958

(the year 1958 marks the final expulsion of the Medes from Babylonia.)

Sisimardacus	28	1958-1930
Nabius	37	1930-1893
Parannus	40	1893-1853
Nabonnabus	25	1853-1828

In 1828, "the Assyrian kings succeeded in the Babylonian Empire, and thenceforth Babylonia and Chaldea became a part of the Assyrian Empire" -- Page 237, Jackson's "Chronological Antiquities". This is also the year of the defeat of Erech by Ur. Syncellus preserved a total of 190 years for the Chaldean kings, and not the above total of 211 -- though his separate figures add up to 211! It is exactly 190 years from 2233 to 2043. The year 2233 was famous in Babylonian history as the beginning of astronomical observation. The Babylonians began their observations 1903 years before Alexander came to Babylon in 330.

First Dynasty of Ur and Successors

The city of Ur in Babylonian history is not the Ur from which Abram came. Abram's Ur was Urfa in northern Mesopotamia, not on the fringes of Shinar.

According to the Sumerian King List, the First Dynasty of Ur came to power at the close of the First Dynasty of Erech.

Names of Kings of First Dynasty of Ur	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Mes-Anne-padda	80 (includes reign of son A-Anne-padda)	1828-1748
Mes-kiag-Nunna	30 (or 36)	1748-1718 1748-1712
Elulu	25	1718-1693
Balulu	36	1693-1657

The significance of the 36 years of Mes-kiag-Nunna will be explained when the Dynasty of Akshak is restored. The proper dates of Dynasty I of Ur are those of the Nippur list, which gives the total as 171 -- 1828-1657. (The Weld-Blundell Prism 444 adds the parallel reign of six years of Mes-kiag-Nunna to the total.)

At the close of the First Dynasty of Ur the Sumerian King List carries the government to the city of Awan in Elam (see page 224 of Pallis' "Chronology of the Shub-Ad Culture"). Reference to three kings is made, but only a cuneiform remnant of the last king's name is preserved: Kul ... 36 years. The total length of the Dynasty is 356 years -- 1657-1301. The date of the last king is therefore 1337-1301. A confirmation of these dates will be found in the succeeding history of the city of Isin and Dynasty III of Ur.

Historically the date 1657 marks Elamite prominence in Southern

Mesopotamia and throws important light on the early history of India.

After Awan the Sumerian King List returns to Dynasty II of Kish. Though the names of the rulers of Kish during this period are preserved, the dates assigned to its rulers are extravagant -- over 3000 years being designated to 8 kings. Kish II begins about the time of the reigns of Gilgamesh and Mes-anne-padda, whose lives overlapped; for the last king of Kish I submitted to both (see the Sumerian poem "Gilgamesh and Aqqa" in Pritchard's Texts). The true length of Dynasty II is confirmed by Kish III and IV which we will now establish.

Listed after Kish II, though in part contemporary with it, is the Dynasty of Hamazi. Only one name of this dynasty is preserved: Hadanish. The total length of the dynasty is sometimes given as 360 years, sometimes as 420. It cannot be dated until Dynasty II and Dynasty III of Uruk are determined.

The shattered list of Dynasty II of Uruk is in the prism given 60 years and 120 years. In other documents it ends a period of 480 years. There is a definite relationship between these figures and those of Hamazi. But Uruk II and Hamazi cannot be dated until Uruk III is established.

From archaeology it is known that Uruk II was followed immediately by Uruk III -- though the King List branches off into parallel dynasties. Uruk III is composed of one King Lugal-zaggisi, who reigned 25 years. Comparative archaeology establishes that he succeeded Ur I, 1828-1657. The date of king Lugal-zaggisi is therefore 1657-1632.

As Uruk II preceded Uruk III, the 480 years extend back from 1657 to 2137. That is, the year 1657 ended an era of 480 years which began in 2137. As Uruk I ended in 1828, Uruk II lasted only 171 years 1828-1657. The figure 480 is not the length of the dynasty but the dating of an era. What happened in the year 2137? Isis (Ishtar or Semiramis) came to power after the 57-year era (2194-2137) of Nimrod. It was commonplace to date reigns in the "Era of Ishtar" (see Pritchard's "Texts", page 266, in Sargon's "Chronicle", and footnote 2). In chart form the figures for Uruk II are as follows.

480 years -- 2137-1657

120 years -- 1777-1657

60 years -- 1717-1657

Now the Dynasty of Hamazi may be dated:

360 years -- 2137-1777

420 years -- 2137-1717

Both these dynasties commenced with the Era of Ishtar. In another chart these two would appear as follows:

Hamazi	360 years	2137-1777
--------	-----------	-----------

Uruk II	120 years	1777-1657
---------	-----------	-----------

or

Hamazi	420 years	2137-1717
--------	-----------	-----------

Uruk II 60 years 1717-1657

Skipping for the moment other parallel Dynasties, notice that Uruk III was succeeded by the Dynasty of Akkad. Uruk III -- composed of one king Lugal-zaggisi -- extended for 25 years to 1632.

Now Sargon of Akkad

The greatest name in Babylonian history in this period is undoubtedly that of Sargon "the Great" -- first king of the Akkadian Dynasty. The history of this dynasty has been confused by the Weld-Blundell Prism 444. The complete and correct record is that of the Nippur lists. Prism 444 is incomplete.

Names of Kings of Dynasty of Akkad	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Sargon	55	1632-1577
Rimush	15	1577-1562
Manish-tusu	7	1562-1555
Naram-Sin	56	1555-1499
Sharkalisharri	24 or 25	1499-1475 1500-1475
Igigi, Nanum, Imi	3 years of confusion	1475-1472
Dudu	21	1472-1451
Shudurul	15	1451-1436

The reign of Sharkalisharri confirms Berossus, who dates the Arabian invasion in 1500. It toppled Naram-Sin from his power and brought his successor to a weakened throne. Naram-Sin died after one more year of reign. Rimush is the younger twin brother of Manish-tusu (Jacobsen, "Sumerian King List", p. 113). He overthrew an otherwise unknown Kaku of Ur.

The Weld-Blundell Prism 444 is fractured in the middle of the history of this dynasty. However, its total indicates that Naram-Sin's reign is cut short and does not include part of the period of his subjection to the invading Gutti hordes. It also gives different figures for the three early rulers as follows.

Sargon	56 years	1633-1577
Rimush	9	1577-1568
Manish-tusu	15	1568-1553

Year 1633 is the accession year of Sargon.

This document (W.-B. 444) by itself is not a proper standard for Babylonian history. It should be used in conjunction with the other

lists rather than by itself as is customarily done by modern authors.

Dynasties IV and V of Erech

The collapse of the Dynasty of Akkad brought Erech again into prominence. In the Scheil Text the Fourth Dynasty of Uruk is listed as follows:

Names of Kings of Dynasty IV of Uruk	Lengths of Reign in Scheil Text	Dates
Ur-Niginak	3	1436-1433
Ur-Gigirak	6	1433-1427
Kudda	6	1427-1421
Puzur-ili	5	1421-1416
Ur-Utuk	6	1416-1410

The Weld-Blundell prism assigns 7 years to the first king -- 1440-1433.

Fragment C of the Susa list of these kings follows (see "Journal of Near Eastern Studies", Apr. 1960, p. 157).

Name of Kings of Dynasty IV of Uruk	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ur-Gigirak	15	1442-1427
Lugal-me-lam	7	1442-1435
Ur-Utuk	25	1435-1410

In this list the contemporary reigns of Kudda and Puzur-ili are incorporated in the long reign of Ur-Utuk. As in Egyptian history, numerous rulers shared the government at the same time. In another fragment of the Susa list the following information is preserved for the first three kings:

Ur-Niginak	30	1472-1442
Ur-Gigirak	15	1442-1427
Lugal-me-lam	7	1442-1435

What is the significance of the year 1472? It is the end of three years of confusion (1475-1472) under the Akkadian Dynasty when four kings ruled. During that period it became proverbial to ask: "who was king? who was not?" Far from being bad scribal errors, these various figures for Dynasty IV of Uruk tell much of the story that is otherwise unpreserved. The real rise to power commenced in 1472, though the kings of Uruk did not replace the kings of Akkad until 1436.

The kingship over Uruk was obtained in 1410 by Utuhegal, who constitutes Dynasty V. All documents agree in giving full 7 years to

this short-lived Dynasty -- 1410-1403. Utuhegal gained prominence at the beginning of his reign by overthrowing the Gutu who had invaded Babylonia 125 years before, in 1535, and wrested complete control in a second attack in 1500 (see the dates from the W.-B. Prism 444).

The Gutu Dynasty

Berossus designates 1500 as the year in which an Arabian dynasty of 9 kings wrested control of Babylonia from the Chaldeans. Coupled with this invasion from Arabia was one from the east under the Gutu. The Gutu Dynasty is not complete in any one document, but may be determined from a comparison of each of the documents. Its first King is nowhere preserved in the King Lists, but an otherwise unknown king of the Gutu has been found. As he is the only Gutu king known to have usurped the titles of Naram-Sin, it is quite clear that he -- Erridupizir -- should head the list as the leader in the initial attack on Akkad in 1535. (Jacobsen's , "King List", p. 117, from Hilprecht's "The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and The Temple Library of Nippur". Pennsylvania Univ. Babylonian Expedition, Series D: Researches and Treatises V 1 (1910), chap. 4.)

The initials in brackets in the following list indicate the source of the different reading. Their significance will be explained afterward.

Kings of the Gutu	Lengths of Reign	Dates
(Erridupizir)	(33 -- restored by subtraction from dynastic totals)	1535-1502
Imta	3 5 (L1)	1502-1499 1504-1499
Inkishush	6 or 7 (L1)	1499-1493 1500-1493
Sarlagab	6	1493-1487
Shulme (or Iarlagash in L1)	6	1487-1481
Elulumesh	7 (G) or 6	1481-1474 1481-1475
Inimabakesh	5	1474-1469
Igeshaush	6	1469-1463
Jarlagab	15	1463-1448
Ibate	3	1448-1445
Jarla (ngab)	3	1445-1442
Kurum	1	1442-1441

Habilkin	3	1441-1438
Laerabum	2	1438-1436
Irraum	2	1436-1434
Ibranum	1	1434-1433
Hablum	2	1433-1431
Puzur-Sin	7	1431-1424
Jarlaganda	7	1424-1417
Sium	7	1417-1410
Tirigan	40 days	1410

The second king is, in one tablet, assigned 5 years instead of 3. This indicates that Erridupizir may have reigned the last two years (1504-1502) jointly with Imta. The different lengths assigned to the reign of the third king -- Inkishush -- exactly fits the years 1500 and 1499 which overlap in the account of the Akkadian Dynasty. The variation in the reign of Elulumesh, the sixth king, is again made plain by the struggle for power recorded in the Akkadian Dynasty for 1475-1472. The king's total reign was 7 years, but only six to the year 1475, when the struggle for power in Babylonia commenced.

Three Other Dynasties

The coming of the Gutti into Babylonia brought further division to the land. At the city of Ur a new Dynasty rose to power and lasted 108 years according to the Nippur List. The total for the Dynasty is missing from the document, but the total for Dynasties I, II and III is plainly given as 396. Dynasty I ruled 171 years; Dynasty III, 117, as will be noticed shortly. These two figures, subtracted from 396, leave 108.

The royal names of this dynasty are nearly illegible, and no internal dates are preserved. The Dynasty may be dismissed with the dates: 1535-1427.

In 1427 the Dynasty of Adab succeeded Ur II according to the Sumerian King List. It exercised authority in Babylonia for 90 years -- until 1337. The only name of a king of this Dynasty is that of Lugal-Annemundu. The collective verb -- "they reigned" -- indicates other names are lost.

At the same time that Ur II lost control to the city of Adab, another city, far distant, on the Middle Euphrates, came into power. It was the city of Ma (e) ri. Mari later became famous as a town bordering on Israel's territory on the Euphrates. The Mari Dynasty, placed after Adab in the King Lists, was, in point of fact, contemporary. It lasted 136 years -- 1427-1291. All that has been thus far discovered of its rulers is a tattered document that looks like the following:

Fragmentary Names of Mari Kings	Lengths of Reign	Dates
------------------------------------	------------------	-------

Total: six kings for 136 years.

The year 1291 will become significant in the study of Kish IV.

Dynasty III of Ur

Meanwhile the city of Ur revived and another powerful dynasty came to power -- the Third. This dynasty was made famous by Woolley's excavations at Ur. It succeeded Dynasty V of Erech, and reigned for 117 years according to the Nippur List. Its first king once was functionary of Utuhegal before Ur rebelled and seized political prominence. Utuhegal (Uruk V) ruled 1410-1403.

Kings of Dynasty III of Ur according to the Nippur List	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ur-Nammu	18	1403-1385
Shulgi (often spelled: Dungi)	58	1385-1327
Amar-Sin (often spelled: Bur-Sin)	9	1327-1318
Shu-Sin	7	1318-1311
Ibbi-Sin	25	1311-1286

Fragment C of the Susa List has a different account of this Dynasty. This account is usually rejected, merely because it is different from the preceding one.

But in it is a key to yet a third account of the same dynasty! The duration of Ur III was 117 years -- 1403-1286.

Kings of Dynasty III of Ur according to Susa List	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ur-Namme	18	1403-1385
Shulgi	48	1385-1337
Amar-Sin	25	1339-1314
Shu-Sin	16	1318-1302
Ibbi-Sin	15	1302-1287

This list does not include the last year of Ibbi-Sin, during which he was carried captive to Elam. But, as in the Nippur List, it does

include that year in its dynastic total (123 years), which is one year more than the total assigned to all the kings (122 years).*

The 48-year reign of Shulgi assigned in the Susa List stops in 1337. This date is significant. It marks the end of the Adab Dynasty (already discussed). It also is the beginning of the reign of "Kul scribe recording the Susa List does not give the last 10 years of Shulgi as it is incorporated in the long reign of Amar-Sin.

The Weld-Blundell Prism 444 differs from either preceding list in its length of the reign of Shulgi, which it gives as 46 -- 1385-1339. This dating provides the clue to the proper beginning of the 25-year reign of Amar-Sin as recorded in the Susa List. Also, W.-B 444 shortens the reign of Ibbi-Sin to 24 years -- 1311-1287, ending it in the same year as the Susa scribe does. That is, it does not include the last year in which the king was taken captive. It also assigns 9 years to Shu-Sin, probably the 9 years from 1311 (when Ibbi-Sin came to power) to the year 1302 (the last year of Shu-Sin in the Susa List).

(*Note: dynastic total of 123 years includes coregencies.)

Dynasty of Isin

During the reign of Ibbi-Sin of Ur the Elamites made inroads into the land of Shinar. This is the time that Elamite Awan dominated part of Babylonia under its last king.

The question of the corresponding years between Ibbi-Sin of Ur III and Ishbi-Irra, first king of Isin, has led to many learned articles in all the journals on Near Eastern Studies. The question cannot be determined by itself. Vital information is missing for the earliest years of Ishbi-Irra. The problem can be resolved, however, when combining the known facts with the information contained in Dynasty IV of Kish. Why no historian has ventured to correlate Kish with both dynasties is a mystery: If they had done so, they would have resolved the difficulties.

The following outline history of the Dynasty of Isin begins with the correlation of Ibbi-Sin's year 24 with Ishbi-Irra's year 14, and year 25 of Ibbi-Sin with year 15 of Ishbi-Irra. This correlation is one of several possibilities commonly espoused. It is, however, the only one which harmonizes with the history of Kish IV -- a fact to be proved in a succeeding section.

Kings of Isin	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ishbi-Irra	33	1301-1268
Shu-ilishu	10	1268-1258
I(d) din-Dagan	21	1258-1237
Ishme-Dagan	20	1237-1217
Lipit-Ishtar	11	1217-1206
Ur-Ninurta	28	1206-1178
Bur-Sin	21	1178-1157

Lipit-Enlil	5	1157-1152
Irra-imitti	8	1152-1144
Enlil-bani	24	1144-1120
Zambia	3	1120-1117
Iter-pisha	4	1117-1113
Ur-Dukuga	4	1113-1109
Sin-magir	11	1109-1098
Damiq-ilishu	23	1098-1075

In 1075 Damiq-ilishu was overthrown by Rimsin of Larsa, who was in turn overthrown by Hammurabi.

The above list is the recognized standard for the Dynasty of Isin. Minor variations occur in two documents discussed in the "Journal of Cuneiform Studies", VIII, 4, "New Lists of the Kings of Ur and Isin." In

them the year in which Ishbi-Irra came to power is treated as the accession year -- only 32 are assigned him. Ishme-Dagan is given 19 instead of 20, but Bur-Sin is assigned 22 instead of 21. In other documents the last year of Irra-imitti is replaced by a usurper.

Dynasty IV of Kish and the "400 Years"

The records of Dynasty IV of Kish are so divergent -- and unusual -- that no historian or archaeologist would accept them. "Corrupt," "worthless," are the common epithets applied. No one has tested the evidence to see if the accounts are, in fact, true!

In the Scheil Text (left) and the Weld-Blundell Prism 444 (right) Dynasties III and IV of Kish appear as follows:

Names of Rulers	Scheil Text	W.-B 444
(Dynasty III)		
Ku-Baba, a queen	100 years	---
(Dynasty IV)		
Puzur-Sin	25 years	25 years
Ur-Zababa	6 years	400 years
Simudar	30 years	30 years
Usiwatar	6 years	7 years
Ishtarmuti	11 years	11 years
Ishme-Shamash	11 years	11 years
Nannia	3 years	7 years

Total 28 kings -- 586 years.

The 586 years of the Scheil Text includes the 400 not listed, minus the 6 which is listed: 100 plus 25 plus (400) plus 30 plus 6 plus 11 plus 11 plus 3 equals 586.

Now compare this with the evidence of the Susa Text. Notice the changed order of kings.

Puzur-Sin	25 years
Ur-Zababa	400 years
Usiwatar	6 years
Ishtar-muti	11 years
Ishme-Shamash	11 years
Shu-ilishu	15 years
Simudar	30 years

Who is this Shu-ilishu?

"This king can be no other than the well known Shu-ilishu of Igin and, comparing the account of the Isin dynasty ... we may perhaps assume that the copyist had a loose, unplaced fragment ..." -- and thus Thorkild Jacobsen suggests that a King of Isin was misplaced by a stupid scribe into the Kish IV Dynasty! (See page 108 of his "Sumerian King List", footnote 228.)

First, consider the mysterious 400 years. This period begins with the end of the reign of Puzur-Sin. The 6 years of Ur-Zababa (in the Schell Text) are a part of the 400 of the other texts. A break in the continuity of the dynasty is clearly indicated by this unusual figure.

Next, consider the close of the dynasty. One list ends with Nannia -- the other with Simudar. Now to assemble these divergent facts.

Shu-ilishu reigned 10 years after Ishbi-Irra according to the Isin dynastic list. His dates: 1268-1258. The W.-B Prism 444 states Shu-ilishu's total reign as 20 years, but does not count the first 10 in its total. In the Kish list from Susa his reign is given as 15 -- that is, 1273-1258. The following charts indicate how the remaining kings fit around the reign of Shu-ilishu.

Names of Kings	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Usiwatar	7	1291-1284
Ishtar-muti	11	1284-1273
Ishme-Shamash	11	1273-1262
Nannia	7	1262-1255
	or	
Ishtar-muti	11	1284-1273
Shu-ilishu	15	1273-1258

Nannia	3	1258-1255
	and	
Usiwatar	6	1291-1285
Simudar	30	1285-1255

What is the significance of the dates 1291 and 1255? The year 1291 is the date of the overthrow of Mari and the return of the old royal family of Kish to power. And the year 1255 is the date of return of the Chaldeans to power according to Berossus!

Now place the end of the 400 years in 1255. The beginning of the 400 years brings us to 1655. The 6 years of Ur-Zababa therefore extend from 1655 to 1649. This is shortly before the reign of Sargon "the Great" of Akkad. When Sargon was young he served as cupbearer to Ur-Zababa! (Pallis, "Chronology of Shub-Ad Culture", p. 360). Thus the 400 years have significance after all!

The reign of Puzur-Sin covers the preceding 25 years: 1680-1655.

But why should Kish IV have ended abruptly in 1649 and Ur-Zababa been slain? Archaeology answers: Lugal-zaggisi of Erech III overthrew Kish. The inhabitants were sent into exile. Years later Sargon restored the inhabitants to their estates: "Sargon, king of Agade, ... king of Kish restored Kish, he ordered them to take again possession of their city" (Pritchard's "Texts", p. 267).

The year 1649 is also of unusual significance in the history of India. IN THE WINTER OF 1650-1649 THE ASSYRIANS WERE DEFEATED ON THE BORDERS OF INDIA, resulting in collapse of Assyrian confederates in Mesopotamia.

Dynasty of Akshak

At the time Kish was overthrown Akshak was defeated also. The Dynasty of Akshak appears next.

Kings of Akshak	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Unzi	30	1748-1718
Undalulu	12 (or 6)	1718-1706 (1712-1706)
Ur-ur	6	1706-1700
Puzur-Sahan	20	1700-1680
Ishuil	24	1680-1656
Gimil-Sin	7 (or 24)	1656-1649 (1656-1632)

Several of the dates are paralleled with others in contemporary dynasties. Year 1748 marks the end of the long reign of Mes-Anne-pada of Dynasty I or Ur. The short reign of 6 years for Uhdalulut second king of Akshak, explains the extra 6 years of Mes-kiag-Nunna of Ur I. In chart form the two kings' reigns appear thus:

Mes-kiag-Nunna	30	1748-1718 (Ur I)
Undalulu	12	1718-1706 (Akshak)
	or	
Mes-kiag-Nunna	36	1748-1712
Undalulu	6	1712-1706

But the relationship does not end here. Under Akshak's king Puzur-Sahan aging Queen Ku-Baba of Kish III gained unusual reputation for her "pious deeds." As a result her son Puzur-Sin came to royal estate upon the death of Puzur-Sahan in 1680. (See Pallis' "Shub-Ad Culture", pp. 359-360.) Notice that in the restoration of Kish IV the year 1680 is already marked as the commencement of the reign of Puzur-Sin, the son of Queen Ku-Baba! Here again is harmony among contemporary dynasties. Though Akshak lost power in 1649 the last king, Gimil-Sin (1656-1649), is assigned in the Susa List a total reign of 24 years (1656-1632) to the reign of Sargon of Akkad.

Dates of Queen Ru-Baba

Only one more Dynasty needs to be firmly established -- Kish III. Kish III is famous for a one-time woman wine merchant who became Queen. Her son and grandson ruled during her late years as the first two Kings of Kish's Dynasty IV. Since Dynasty III of Kish is at times listed first and on occasion later than the Dynasty of Akshak, it must have begun at the same time as Akshak. The dates of Kish III are therefore 1748-1648. Who the husband or the father of Queen Ku-Baba may have been is not stated in the lists. That she continued one year after the death (in 1649) of Ur-Zababa, her grandson, is clear from the statement of Sargon. He claims that she adopted him as her own son in place of her own heir now dead (S. Lloyd, "Mesopotamia", page 140).

It becomes clear with this restoration that Dynasties I and II of Kish are limited to the time between 2254 and 1748, with Kish I ending in the days of Gilgamesh.

With this account the clouded history of Babylonia to the era of Hammurabi closes. It is a period of nearly twelve centuries of strife division and wars.

CHAPTER TWELVE

Hammurabi to the Fall of Babylon

Since the building of the city of Babel, not a single recorded dynasty originated in the city precincts of Babylon for over 1000 years. Not until the renowned First Dynasty of Babylon did it become the supreme seat of political power.

Hammurabi -- or rather each historian who has written about him -- has made The First Dynasty of Babylon famous. It was a time of blossoming culture, of proverbial literature, of law. Vast quantities of written material have been recovered from this and succeeding centuries.

Shortly after archaeologists uncovered the history of this period it was commonplace to connect Hammurabi with Amraphel of the Bible (Genesis 14). Today the equation of Hammurabi with the generation of Abram has been abandoned. In its place confusion reigns. Dates for this famous king now range from the "short chronology" of Albright and Cornelius through the "middle" of S. Smith and the comparatively "long" chronological reckonings of Goetze. In other words, anywhere from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century before the present era.

Why Hammurabi Dated Early

To bring disrepute upon the Law of God critical scholars early indulged in speculating that Babylonian law was the basis of the Hebrew Torah. Proof? -- There was none: History, when properly restored, overturns the hypothesis. Whatever influence there may have been was in the opposite direction.

Culturally the Hebrews in Solomon's day led the world. The reigns succeeding Hammurabi's saw a rapid expansion in writing of proverbs and other wisdom literature -- a consequence of Solomonic influence. Historians have assumed that this literature long antedated Solomon. Contrariwise, the writing of this kind of literature in Mesopotamia can now be proved a result of direct influence of Solomon's Empire on surrounding cultures. Egypt exhibits the same literary features at the same time -- not centuries before.

Now for the political restoration of the land of Shinar. In the days of Saul and David the cities of Sumer were in a three-corner struggle for supreme political dominion. In the struggle between Isin and Larsa, the latter won, only to be devoured by the city of Babylon. The events may be summarized in four concerted attacks. Babylon first reduced Isin, but was forced to yield to Larsa's military attack and final conquest of the city two years later. In another eight years, however, Babylon had grown in strength sufficiently to challenge the hegemony of Larsa over Shinar. Isin was recaptured. Then, 23 years later, Larsa succumbed to Hammurabi.

The Dynasty of Larsa

To date the First Dynasty of Babylon correctly, it is first necessary to restore the royal family at Larsa to its true place in history. This dynasty rose to power during the struggles between Elam and the Third Dynasty of Ur. The last king of Isin I -- Damiq-ilishu --

was driven from the city after completing a 23-year reign (1098-1075). Rim-sin, the victor, and king of Larsa won the war and incorporated the city of Isin into his realm in his year 29 -- 1075-1074. (Where Damiq-ilishu fled, and how much longer he reigned elsewhere, will be discussed later under the First Sealand Dynasty.)

From the synchronism between these two kings the entire Larsa Dynasty may be restored as follows (see "Journal of Cuneiform Studies", III, "Nippur und Isin", page 27, for lengths of reign).

Kings of Larsa	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Naplanum	21	1306-1285
Emizum	28	1285-1257
Samu'um	35	1257-1222
Zaba'a	9	1222-1213
Gungunum	27	1213-1186
Abi-sare	11	1186-1175
Sumu-ilum	29	1175-1146
Nur-Adad	16	1146-1130
Sin-idinnam	7	1130-1123
Sin-iribam	2	1123-1121
Sin-iqisham	5	1121-1116
Zilli-Adad	1	1116-1115
Warad-Sin	12	1115-1103
Rim-Sin	61	1103-1042

When Did Hammurabi Reign?

Larsa's last king, Rim-sin, reigned full 60 years. Then, in his year 61, Hammurabi attacked the aging king and captured Larsa in Hammurabi's year 29 -- 1043-1042. This victory became the "year-name" of the succeeding calendar year.

A second synchronism (already referred to) between the First Dynasty of Babylon and Larsa is provided in a historical record from the reign of Hammurabi's father, Sin-muballit. Sin-muballit attacked Isin and reduced it to submission in his year 16, which was year 22 of Damiq-ilishu -- 1077-1076. This event became the year name of Sin-muballit's succeeding year. ("Orientalia", series 2, no. 24, "Chronological Notes," by H. Levy.)

Two years later the Babylonians were driven out and Isin was overthrown by Larsa in Rim-sin's year 29. The event became the "year-name" of Rim-sin's year 30. (It was the custom in that day to name each year after some famous event in the preceding twelve months.)

Then, in year 6 of Hammurabi, Isin was recaptured by Babylon. A tablet dating from the time of the conquest bears the following double dating: "the eighth and tenth year since Isin was captured" ("Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt", by P. Van der Meer, page 44).

These chronological notes make absolutely certain the dates of the First Dynasty of Babylon as follows:

Names of Kings of First Dynasty of Babylon	Lengths of Reign from "Year-Names"	Dates
Sumu-abum	14	1174-1160
Sumu-la-ilum	36	1160-1124
Zabum	14	1124-1110
Apil-Sin	18	1110-1092
Sin-muballit	20	1092-1072
Hammurabi (often spelled Hammurapi)	43	1072-1029
Samsu-iluna	38	1029- 991
Abi-eshuh	28	991- 963
Ammi-ditana	37	963- 926
Ammi-zaduga	21	926- 905
Samsu-ditana	26	905- 879

Of special note are the 26 years for the last king. Many books erroneously insert the figure 31. Only 26 year-names have ever been found. ("Journal of Near Eastern Studies", "The Date List of Samsu-ditana," by Samuel I. Feigin, vol. XIV, no. 3, July 1955.)

The figure 31 is taken from a king list which dates the reigns differently. The two methods of dating should not be mixed promiscuously. From the king list the reigns of Hammurabi to the end of the dynasty are as follows:

Names of First Dynasty of Babylon	Lengths of Reign from King List	Dates
Hammurabi	55	1072-1017
Samsu-iluna	35	1017- 982
Abi-eshuh	25	982- 957
Ammi-ditana	25	957- 932
Ammi-zaduga	22	932- 910
Samsu-ditana	31	910- 879

The total from Hammurabi to the close of the dynasty is precisely the same -- 1072-879. The early kings of the dynasty appear as follows from the king list:

Sumu-abum	15	1174-1159
Sumu-la-ilum	35	1159-1124
Zabum	14	1124-1110
Apil-Sin	18	1110-1092
Sinmuballit	30	1092-1062

It is to be noticed that the king list preserves a ten-year joint reign in the early part of Hammurabi's long government -- from 1072-1062. These divergent figures are not mere scribal errors. They are genuine. Egyptian records and the Bible reflect the same practice. In most cases it is due to joint reigns -- of father with son. On occasion they are due to internal political changes of which the divergencies in dating are the sole remaining testimony.

In summary: Hammurabi is the contemporary of Saul and David!

The ancient king lists recovered by archaeological excavation insert two lengthy dynasties after the First Dynasty of Babylon -- the First Dynasty of the Sealand and the Dynasty of the Kassu or Kassites. The "Sealand" is referred to in the Bible as the "Desert of the Sea" in Isaiah 21:1, KJV.

It was originally assumed that these dynasties were successive. Today it is recognized that they were, in part, contemporary with the First Dynasty of Babylon and with each other.

The list of the Kassite kings is so badly shattered that it is not possible to restore it without recourse to Assyrian history. But it is possible at this point to present the history of the Sealand in full.

Damiq-ilishu Reappears!

No greater enigma faces Mesopotamian archaeologists and historians than the mystery surrounding the Sealand Dynasty. The total reigns of its kings -- several of which are exceedingly long -- still fall 22 years short of the total of 368 years assigned to the dynasty by the ancient scribes. At first numerous readings were proposed to "restore" the text. Critics simply could not accept the simple evidence of the tablets. Not until 1921 was a clear reproduction of an original tablet made available, by C. J. Gadd. (See Pallis' "Chronology of the Shub-Ad Culture", page 309.) The evidence was clear. The scribe had indeed added

22 years too many! Or had he?

The mistaken figure was presumably that of king Damiq-ilishu. But why should his reign be shortened 22 years? Could it be that the missing 22 years were the same 22 years which had elapsed in the reign of Damiq-ilishu of Isin at the time of the conquest of Isin by Sin-muballit of Babylon? Was Damiq-ilishu of Isin the same man as Damiq-ilishu of the Sealand?

Indeed! And the restoration of Mesopotamian history when completed will confirm it.

Damiq-ilishu was king of both Isin and the Sealand. The scribe

recorded in the Sealand Dynasty only those years of his reign which elapsed after Isin ceased to be independent. Isin, it will be remembered, was reduced to submission in year 22 of Damiq-ilishu by Babylon. Though Damiq-ilishu contained at Isin one more year -- his 23rd -- it was included in the reckoning of the Sealand because the king was independent only in the Sealand, not at Isin.

Following are the kings of the Sealand (excluding the first two, which will be discussed immediately after).

First Dynasty of the Sealand	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Damiq-ilishu (before & after Sin-muballit's conquest of Isin)	(First 22 years) 16	(1098-1076) 1076-1060
Ishkibal	15	1060-1045
Shushshi	24	1045-1021
Gulishar	55	1021- 966
Pesgaldaramash	50	966- 916
Aidarakalamma	28	916- 888
Ekurulanna	26	888- 862
Melamkurkurra	7	862- 855
Ea-gamil	9	855- 846

Some transcribers have 26 years for Shushshi, but see Pallis' summary regarding the clear reading of 24 years.

In 846 the Dynasty of the Sealand was overthrown by the Kassites in a famous war that involved Assyria and other Mesopotamian powers.

In the king list appears a vague notation after Gulishar. Its implication is that another king reigned at the same time as Pesgaldaramash. Who was that other king?

Listed before Damiq-ilishu in the Sealand Dynasty are two Kings of another branch of the royal house. Their reigns may readily be dated from synchronisms with the First Dynasty of Babylon. Van der Meer's study (page 21 of "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia", second edition) proves that the first of these two kings, Iluma-ilum, came to power in the year 14 of Samsu-iluna of Babylon. That is 1016-1015 (See the chart giving "year-name" sequence). Iluma-ilum reigned 60 years -- 1016-956. He was succeeded by the second in the king list: Itti-ili-nibi, who reigned for 56 years -- 956-900.

Little else is known of the Sealand other than these royal names.

Nebuchadnezzar the First

The end of the First Dynasty of Babylon in 879 brought to prominence a new line of kings from the city of Isin. One of its kings is the famous Nebuchadnezzar I, a predecessor of the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible. The new Isin royalty is often referred to as the Pashe

Dynasty. It exercised its government both from its native city and from the city of Babylon. At that time in history Babylon played a role in Mesopotamia similar to the role of Thebes in Egypt. Both cities had become the political and religious capitals of their respective regions.

It has been too long assumed by historians that the Second Dynasty of Isin followed the Kassite rule in Mesopotamia. It did not. It was contemporary with it. The kings of Isin record several wars with the Kassites. Nebuchadnezzar I attained the epithet "destroyer of the Kassites" consequent to his wars with them. Who the Kassites were will be discussed in the next chapter of this Compendium.

The most thorough discussion of the new royal house at Isin is found in the University of Chicago Press publication: "Second Dynasty of Isin according to a New King List Tablet," by Arno Poebel.

The Dynasty of Pashe or Isin II appears in chart form thus:

Names of Kings or Isin II	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Marduk-kabit-ahheshu	18	879-861
Itti-marduk-balatsu	8	861-853
Ninutar-nadin-shumi	6	853-847
Nebu-kudur-uzur (or Nebuchadnezzar I)	22	847-825
Enlil-nadin-apli	4	825-821
Marduk-nadin-ahhe	18	821-803
Marduk-zapik-zeri	13	803-790
Adad-apal-iddin	22	790-768
Marduk- . .	1	768-767
Marduk- . .	12	767-755
Nabu-sum-libur	8	755-747

The names of two of the kings are partly broken away in the most complete tablet. But they may be restored by other records to be discussed later.

Era of Nabonassar

At this point the history of ancient Babylonia is correct. Through all succeeding centuries the reigns after 747 have been known and available to the public. The year 747 marks the beginning of the "Era of Nabonassar" -- named after the first of a new series of kings, native and foreign, who ruled at Babylon. The ancestors of Nabonassar are broken away in the king lists.

The classic account of these later kings has always been, since its writing, the Canon of Ptolemy. In early days the Babylonian

Chronicle, unearthed through archaeological expeditions, contained the same information -- only in more detail. For those who do not have ready access to the Canon of Ptolemy for the Era of Nabonassar the following list is provided. The Greek spellings of Ptolemy are not used as generally the Babylonian names find complete acceptance with scholars. A list of the kings is available in "The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings", by Edwin R. Thiele, page 293.

Kings of Babylon from the Era of Nabonassar to the Persian Conquest	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Nabonassar	14	747-733
Nabu-nadinzir	2	733-731
Ukinzer and Pulu (Tiglath- pilerser III)	5	731-726
Ululai (Shalmaneser V)	5	726-721
Marduk-appal-iddin (Mero- dach-baladan)	12	721-709
Sargon	5	709-704
	Two kingless years	704-702
Bel-ibni	3	702-699
Assur-nadin-shum	6	699-693
Nergal-ushezib	1	693-692
Mushezib-Marduk	4	692-688
	Eight kingless years	688-680
Assur-akh-iddin	13	680-667
Shamash-shum-ukin	20	667-647
Kandalanu	22	647-625
Nabopolassar	21	625-604
Nebuchadnezzar	43	604-561
Amel-Marduk (Evil-merodach)	2	561-559
Nergal-shar-usur	4	559-555
Nabonidus (father of Belshazzar)	17	555-538

Babylon fell to the Persian and Median armies at an annual festival -- a new moon -- in the seventh month in year 17 of Nabonidus (539). But the calendar year continued to the beginning of spring in

538. The succeeding kings of Babylonia were the Persian rulers, whose reigns are commonly available. The finest summary of the period after the fall of Babylon is "Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 75", by Richard A. Parker and Waldo H. Dubberstein.

Three Succeeding Dynasties

Though the Second Isin Dynasty was succeeded at Babylon by king Nabonassar in 747, the king lists add three other short dynasties immediately after the Isin Dynasty. These ruled to 700, the year of the great Median rebellion against Assyria, recorded by Herodotus. These three short dynasties are listed next.

Second Dynasty of the Sealand	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Simmash-Shipak	18	747-729
Ea-mukin-shumi	5 months	729
Kashshu-nadin-ahhe	3	729-726

In 726 the Second Sealand Dynasty was displaced by kings from the House of Bazu.

Kings of Dynasty of Bazu	Lengths of Reign	Dates
E-ulmash-shakin-shumi	17	726-709
Ninurta-Kudurri-usur	3	709-706
Shiriktum-Shukamuna	3 months	706

The year 706 witnessed an Elamite incursion into the land of Akkad, an event which ultimately made possible the rebellion of the Medes (in 700) against their Assyrian overlords. The "Elamite Dynasty", the seventh to exercise authority at Babylon, was composed of one king: Marbiti-apal-usur. He reigned for 6 years 706-700.

With this the history of Southern Mesopotamia is restored, except for the Kassite kings of Karduniash. This line of kings cannot be placed until the history of Assyria is presented.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

History of Assyria

In earlier days of critical study scholars were enamored of Egyptian history. Everything in the Bible was made to conform to the latest interpretation of Egyptologists. As with all fads, it wore thin.

Then came an abundance of new material from Mesopotamia. Assyria proved particularly rich. In its buried palaces and libraries were unearthed long lists of Assyrian kings and of officials who gave their names to each succeeding calendar year. These lists were assumed to be consecutive. That is, one Assyrian dynasty was thought to have followed another in orderly succession for century after century. This careless interpretation of Assyrian history was a consequence of German Rationalism. If the scholars even once admitted the lists to be of parallel dynasties, they knew they would have to turn to some other source in order to assemble the dynasties correctly. That meant to the Bible, the only complete written record of the ancient world. That they would not do.

Instead, they contrived to reject the historicity and authority of Scripture. As always they found a way to justify their interpretation of the Assyrian dynastic lists. In the Assyrian "limmu" lists -- lists of officials who held an office comparable to Greek "eponyms" -- there was found a reference to a summer solar eclipse. It was dated to the "limmu" year of Bur-Sagale. As the lists were drawn up in successive order by the Assyrian scribes, this "limmu" year appeared to fall in 763. In that year, astronomers assured the historians, there was indeed a solar eclipse that could have been seen in Assyria. That pronouncement was deemed all-sufficient. Assyrian chronology -- as interpreted by modern scholars -- henceforth became the standard of the world. Where the Bible history did not agree with it, the Bible was arbitrarily rejected. Josephus contradicted the new interpretation. Out went Josephus.

Only one little flaw in the historians' conclusions. The astronomers' evidence they accepted would be valid only if the "limmu" lists were themselves correct. What astronomers overlooked is this. They assumed that the "limmu" year of Bur-Sagale was 763, when an eclipse did occur. They overlooked the fact that the "limmu" list was not drawn up until more than a century after 763. And that what really happened is that the eclipse of the year 763 was arbitrarily assigned to the "limmu" year of Bur-Sagale who really held office 124 years later. The scribes who added the astronomical datum to the "limmu" year of Bur-Sagale did so to make this historical record appear confirmed by astronomy, when, in fact, it was not.

The Bible records a more outstanding astronomical event than the solar eclipse of 763. This event occurred in 710 during the reign of Hezekiah. By a divine act the sun was seen in the heavens to return ten degrees in the direction in which it had arisen (Isaiah 38:8).

Egyptians, too, were startled by it. Their priests, who kept the records, informed Herodotus that their history preserved an account in which the sun was seen to set that morning at the place where it was wont to rise!

Ancient Peruvians, too, observed a drastic change in the heavenly movements about Hezekiah's time. See volume II of the Compendium for Yahuar Huquiz, Peruvian contemporary of Hezekiah.

Later Assyrian Kings

It is now possible to restore Assyrian history to its original form.

In 745 a new dynasty sat upon the Assyrian throne in Nineveh. It commenced with Tiglath-pileser III. This dynasty existed to the collapse of Assyria in 612. It is correctly dated in all modern history books. The original account of it is found in the Babylonian Chronicle and confirmed by Ptolemy's Canon of Babylonian kings.

Tiglath-pileser III came to power in April of 745. The "limmu" lists designate this as his accession year, but he claimed it as his first year. Altogether he reigned 19 years. He is listed below with his successors.

Dynasty of Tiglath-pileser III at Nineveh	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Tiglath-pileser (III)	19	745-726
Shalmaneser (V)	5	726-721
Sargon	17	721-704
Sennacherib	23	704-681
Essarhaddon	13	681-668
Assur-banipal	42	668-626
Assur-etililani	4	626-622
Sin-sarra-ishkun	10	622-612
Assur-uballit (II) -- reigned in Haran after fall of Nineveh, in 612, then disappears from history.	4	612-608

Who Was Shalmaneser?

Almost everyone has assumed that Shalmaneser V, whose inconsequential reign extended from 726-721, is the Shalmaneser of the Bible who besieged Samaria. But how, one might ask, could Shalmaneser V, who died late in 722 (in the last year of his reign), execute a three-year siege of Samaria in 721-718 after he was dead? And then wage war against Tyre, including a five-year siege of the famous emporium, as Josephus records? ("Antiquities", book IX, chap. 14.) Shalmaneser V accomplished neither of these two deeds! But the Assyrian records do reveal a Shalmaneser who did accomplish both!

Who was this Shalmaneser?

Surprising though it may appear, the Shalmaneser of the Biblical record -- and of Josephus -- is Shalmaneser "the Great" or the III. Ever since archaeology became a fad -- as well as a science -- scholars have assumed that Shalmaneser "the Great" was a contemporary of Israel's king Ahab and of king Jehu. They had no proof of it. They

merely wanted to believe it.

The dates in the Assyrian annals were 40 years too low for the reign of Ahab (914-892) It was impossible to reconcile the Assyrian records as understood by the critics with the Bible. It was much easier to strip away about 40 years from the Biblical record and make it conform to the assumed date of Shalmaneser III. Thus the end of Solomon's reign was changed from 971 to about 930 by historians.

But, ask the critics, did not Shalmaneser III refer to an Ahab of Israel and to a Jehu son of Omri in his monuments? Indeed he did! But once again the historians have had recourse to deception. The Jehu of the Bible is "the son of Jehoshaphat the son of Nimshi" (II Kings 9:2). The Jehu of the Assyrian records is another person -- the son of Omri! Two different people. How did the scholars resolve this dilemma? They concluded the Assyrians did not know what they were writing about!

Furthermore, not one word is in the Bible that Jehu ever paid tribute to any Assyrian king. Assyria is not so much as mentioned in his reign. Who the Jehu of the Assyrian records is will be revealed shortly.

But what of Ahab? In the Assyrian account this king of Israel is allied with the Arameans against the Assyrians. He contributed a contingent of troops to fight against Shalmaneser III at Karkar near the Euphrates. The Arameans and their allies were routed. Shalmaneser, follows up the victory by the conquest of Syria and Phoenicia and neighboring nations. (See Shalmaneser's annals in Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts".)

Does this political situation conform to the era of the Ahab of the Bible?

Certainly not! The Ahab of Scripture fought many battles with the Arameans, none with the Assyrians. Aram (Syria), in Ahab's day, was a powerful confederation. There is not the slightest Biblical indication that any Aramean king was the least concerned over Assyrian expansion. Nor is there any shred of evidence that Ahab, the son of Omri, ever sent troops to Aram to defend the eastern Mediterranean lands against Assyrian incursions at the time of his death.

Modern historians mistakenly place the death of Ahab in 853 -- the supposed year of the battle of Karkar. In the Biblical history Ahab died fighting the Arameans, not as an ally of the Arameans at Karkar against the Assyrians!

Who then is the "Ahab of Israel" mentioned by Shalmaneser "the Great" in his monuments? And at what period were Israel and Aram allied against Assyria?

The last question first. II Kings 16 unveils the answer. Israel and Aram (Syria) were allied shortly before the fall of Samaria! Rezin king of Syria and Pekah king of Israel united to attack Judah. In defense the Jews sought the assistance of the Assyrians who attacked Aram first, then later Israel.

But who was "Ahab of Israel"? The answer again is found in Scripture. II Kings 15:30 reveals that Hoshea made a conspiracy against Pekah, king of Israel, slew him and reigned in his stead. This occurred in the autumn of 737, the fourth year of Ahaz or twentieth of Jotham. Yet later, the Bible records Hoshea again returning to the throne, this time in the summer of 728, near the end of the twelfth year of Ahaz (II Kings 17:1). Tiglathpileser (III) records in his monuments that Hoshea has been deposed and that he had restored him to power.

About nine years occurred between Hoshea's seizure of the throne and his restoration. Who was king during those years? The Bible does not reveal the answer -- but the Assyrian records do! The king was Ahab

II, who perished in his wars with Assyria.

In his year 14 -- 722-721, spring-to-spring reckoning -- king Shalmaneser III sent 120,000 troops across the Euphrates to crush a revolt, which had suddenly developed along the shores of the Eastern Mediterranean. His attack met with brilliant success. The next three years are silent in Shalmaneser's annals.

No record has been preserved. Then, in year 18 -- 718-717 -- Shalmaneser receives tribute from "Jehu, son of Omri." The three intervening years (721-718) were those of the siege. When the war was over, the Assyrian reorganized Palestine into an Assyrian province and appointed Jehu, son of Omri, to administer Assyrian affairs temporarily in the land of Israel! Nebuchadnezzar treated the Jews in similar fashion when he appointed Gedaliah temporarily to supervise Babylonian affairs in Judah after the fall of Jerusalem (Jeremiah 40:5).

It is now possible to date the Calah Dynasty of Assyrian kings from the reign of Shalmaneser "the Great" to the revolt at Calah in 622-621. Calah, a suburb of Nineveh, was one of the three capitals of the late Assyrian Empire. It was also called Nimrud. (See page 53 of "Chronicles of Chaldean Kings", by D. J. Wiseman.)

Names of Assyrian Kings at Calah	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Shalmaneser "the Great" (III)	35	735-700
Shamshi-Adad (V), whose queen Semiramis (III), exercised great authority for 42 years -- 699-657	13	700-687
Adad-nirari (III)	28	687-659
Shalmaneser (IV)	10	659-649
Assurdan (III)	18	649-631
Assur-nerari (V)	10	631-621

Observe the exact parallel between these dates and the collapse of the Assyrian Empire. The last six years of Shalmaneser III's reign are the years 706-700. These years are each marked by the word "revolt" in the "limmu" canon. They are the six years of the incursion of the Elamite king Marbiti-alap-usur -- 706-700.

During the reigns of the last three kings in Calah (659-621) the Assyrian Empire gradually disintegrated. Plagues ravaged the homeland. Revolt flared throughout the length and breadth of the Empire. Then a final revolt in Calah in the last year of Assur-nirari V brought the downfall of the dynasty in the calendar year 622-621. This is the very year that the Babylonian Canon records a revolt and a great victory over the Assyrian army.

For details, compare the "Chronicles of Chaldean Kings", by Wiseman, with the corresponding "limmu" canons on pages 288-290 in Thiele's "Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings". Remember that Thiele misdates the reigns of Shalmaneser III and his successors 124 years too early:

Predecessors of Shalmaneser III

In the Assyrian Canon are listed 20 predecessors of Shalmaneser III who reigned altogether 323 years. These kings are usually dated about 124 years too early in most books because the dynasty is made to end about 745 instead of 621!

The following chart lists these 20 kings from the beginning of the dynasty through the reign of Shalmaneser III. (The cumbersome spelling of "Ashshur" is reduced to the simple Assur in this list.)

Names of Kings of The Calah Line	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ninurta-apil-Ekur, son of Ilu-ihadda, seized the throne	3	1058-1055
Assur-dan (I)	46	1055-1009
Ninurta-tukulti-Assur	reigned for a "bab tuppisu", that is, for part of the remaining official year	calendar year 1010-1009
Mutakkil-Nusku, his brother, fought with him, held the throne, then died.		1009
Assur-resh-isshi (II)	18	1009-991
Tukulti-apil-Esarra (Tiglath-pileser I)	39	991-952
Asarid-apil-Ekur	2	952-950
Assur-bel-kala	18	950-932
Eriba-Adad (II)	2	932-930
Shamshi-Adad (IV), son of Tiglath-pileser (I), deposed Eriba-Adad, seized throne	4	930-926
Assur-nasir-apli (I)	19	926-907
Shulmanu-asarid (Shalmaneser II)	12	907-895
Assur-nirari (IV)	6	895-889
Assur-rabi (II)	41	889-848
Assur-resh-ishi (II)	5	848-843
Tukulti-apil-Esharra (Tiglath-pileser II)	32	843-811

Assur-dan (II)	23	811-788
Adad-nirari (II)	21	788-767
Tukulti-Ninurta (II)	7	767-760
Assur-nasir-apli (II)	25	760-735
Shulmanu-asarid (Shalmaneser III -- "the Great")	35	735-700

Of these kings it is known that Assur-reshishi II was a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar I of Isin, and that Tiglath-pileser II of Marduk-nadin-ahhe of Isin. Van der Meer and most other historians mistakenly assumed Assur-resh-ishi I and Tiglath-pileser I were the contemporaries. This error arose when the Assyrians drew up in two opposite columns the kings of Assyria and the kings of Babylonia. Kings which were not contemporary were made to appear so, and those who were contemporary appeared not to be.

A similar error occurred when the late kings counted the years between themselves and their ancestors. Kings who lived no more than 200 years earlier, for example, were recorded to have lived perhaps 500 or 600 or more years previous. The cause of this kind of error is readily determined. The king lists were drawn up with the kings of the city Assur listed first, then the kings of Calah followed by Nineveh. This naturally placed the rulers of Assur, who were contemporary with those of Calah, centuries too early and centuries apart. These errors did not, however, completely obscure the known total length of time that had elapsed since Babel. But the contradictory statements of elapsed time between any two kings led later scholars in the Greek and Roman world into confusion. Van der Meer sums up these supposed durations of time between early and late Assyrian kings by saying: "The statements of Esserhaddon and Salmanasser also fail to agree with one another"; and "hence all the statements which we have from Nabonaid are incorrect" (pages 36, 35 of "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt").

King Pul and the Bible

This dynasty provides a clue to the ancestry of Tiglath-pileser III, who ascended a separate dynastic throne in 745. Tiglath-pileser III named "Adad-nirari" as his father. This is Adad-nirari II -- 788-767. Upon the death of the father the direct line of descent passed to Tukulti-Ninurta II. But the throne was shared with Tiglath-pileser, who, at that time, had the personal name of Pul, which he also later used when he ascended the throne of Babylon in 729.

In his later annals Tiglath-pileser refers to kings Uzziah of Judah and to Menahem of Israel. As both of these rulers were dead several years before 745, historians assume that the Bible is woefully in error. It never occurred to them to verify how many years elapsed between the death of Adad-nirari and 745, years in which the young Pul might have been ruling jointly with an older brother.

In the Bible the name "Pul" refers to those early years, and "Tiglath-pileser" or "Tilgath-pilneser" to the later independent reign beginning in 745. See II Kings 15:19 and 29. Also I Chronicles 5:26,

which should be translated: "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, EVEN the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria, and HE carried them (Israel) away."

Historians generally have been unwilling to recognize the possibility of joint reigns among Assyrian kings. Yet their own discoveries prove it. Events which Shalmaneser III dates as years 11 and 18 in his annals are dated to years 14 and 21 on the Black Obelisk (page 280 of Pritchard's "Ancient Near Eastern Texts"). He therefore reigned 3 years jointly with his predecessor. Similarly, Sennacherib was king of Assyria in year 14 of Hezekiah -- 711-710 (II Kings 18:13) -- although he did not succeed his father until 704.

Tiglath-pileser I and Thutmose III

Another king in the Calah list is very significant -- Tiglath-pileser I. His reign commences in 991, almost the exact midpoint of Solomon's reign. Tiglath-pileser wrote in his annals that he beheaded the kings of Meshech at that time. "In the beginning of my reign, twenty thousand men of the land of Mushki and their five kings, who for fifty years had held the lands of Alzi and Purukuzzi, which (in former times) had paid tribute and tax unto Assur, my lord, and no king had vanquished them in battle," he beheaded. ("Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia", by Daniel David Luckenbill, vol. I, page 74.) What is the significance of the 50 years from 1041 to 991 when Tiglath-pileser I defeated Meshech (Musku)? In year 32 of Hammurabi (1041-1040) he and his allies defeated Assyria and annexed it to his expanding realm! (See Van der Meer's "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia", page 30.) It was exactly 50 years between Hammurabi's victory and Assyria's return to power.

In the latter days of Tiglath-pileser I's reign Assyria was again defeated and conquered. who was the conqueror? Thutmose III! In his annals Thutmose recorded receipt of tribute from Assur. "The tribute of the chief of Assur" (Breasted's "Ancient Records", vol. II, sec. 446).

In conclusion. The first king of the Calah line -- Ninurta-apil-Ekur -- began his sole rule in 1058 (near the end of the reign of King Saul of Israel). The SDAS King List assigns a 13-year reign to him, implying a 10-year joint rule with a predecessor. Who were the kings that ruled Assyria before the Calah line came to power? The next chapter will answer!

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

History of Assyria Concluded

The history of Assyria differs greatly from the history of Babylonia. Babylonia was divided into numerous semi-independent regions and city-states. Its dynasties were usually shortlived. Assyria, by contrast, had unusually centralized government. Not more than two or three royal families dominated the life of the Empire for generations.

Historians today assume that these contemporaneous dynasties succeeded one another. They place the kings of the city of Assur -- the Ellasar of the Bible -- immediately before the kings of Calah and Nineveh. Their assumption is based on the fact that the Dynasty of Assur is listed immediately before the kings of Calah. As in all the royal canons, the order in which dynasties appear does not prove they were necessarily successive. It indicates only that one line of kings may have begun earlier than another. This fact is admitted for much of early Babylonia, but adamantly denied -- without proof -- when it comes to late Babylonian and Assyrian history.

The kings of the city Assur were contemporary with Dynasties XVIII and XIX of Egypt. Hence they, too, must have ruled during the time of the kings of Israel and Judah -- not in the time of the judges! Numerous letters of correspondence have been found in El-Amarnah, Egypt, that passed between these Assyrian kings and those of the Egyptian Empire. The Dynasty of Assur thus constituted a third contemporary royal line ruling Assyria from the twelfth to the seventh century before the present era.

The following chart restores to their proper dates the Assur kings from Enlil-Nasir II to Enlil-kudur-usur, the last king of the city Assur.

Names of Kings of the City Assur	Lengths of Reign	Dates
(two preceding numbers lost)		
Enlil-nasir (II) deposed his brother	6	930-924
Assur-nirari (II)	7	924-917
Assur-bel-nisheshu	9	917-908
Assur-rim-nisheshu	8	908-900
Assur-nadin-ahhe (II)	10	900-890
Eriba-Adad (I), son of Assur-bel-nisheshu	27	890-863
Assur-uballit (I)	36	863-827
Enlil-nirari	10	827-817
Arik-den-ili	12	817-805

Adad-nirari (I), brother of Arik-den-ili	32	805-773
Shulmanu-asarid (Shalmaneser I)	30	773-743
Tukulti-Ninurta (I)	37	743-706
While Tukulti-Ninurta lived, Assur-nadin-apli, his son, seized the throne	4 or 3	707-703 706-703
Assur-nirari (III), son of Assur-nasir-apli	6	703-697
Enlil-kudur-usur, son of Tukulti-Ninurta (I)	5	697-692

The "Cambridge Ancient History" or any other reputable source will provide the information linking the reigns of these kings with their contemporaries in Egypt. The exact dates are determined as follows. Assur-uballit I was a contemporary of Akhenaton and Tutankhamen, and corresponded with both. In 930 a revolt occurred in the Calah line. In the preceding chart a revolt in 930 brought Enlil-nasir II to the throne. The line ceased in 692 when the last king was killed in a battle with the Kassites in Babylonia. The year 692 witnessed a great war in Babylonia which also involved Sennacherib, an Assyrian king of Nineveh (see the account in his annals).

The Kassite Dynasty

The Kassite Dynasty in the King List was inserted by the ancient scribes after Dynasty I of the Sealand and before Dynasty II of Isin (the Pashu Dynasty). This position proves only that it began after the Sealand Dynasty (1098), but before Dynasty II of Isin (879). It is known to have been contemporary with both these royal families, as well as the line of Hammurabi. Its kings ruled over Karduniash, a territory bordering on Babylon and the Sealand.

The last king of the Assur dynasty of Assyria -- Enlil-kudur-usur -- died in the same battle in which a Kassite king fell. The year was 692. From this event the list of Kassite rulers of Southern Mesopotamia can be dated consecutively back to 845. Prior to that point the names and dates are broken away. A few contemporary tablets supply the missing names almost in entirety, but they cannot be dated.

Names of Kassite Rulers from 845-692	Lengths of Reign	Dates
---	------------------	-------

Nazi-bugash comes to power during struggle in 846 when Kassites overthrow Eaganil of the First Dynasty of the Sealand.

Kurigalzu (the younger)	25	845-820
Nazi-maruttash	26	820-794

Kadashman-turgu	18	794-776
Kadashman-harbe	11	776-765
Kudur-enlil	9 (or 6)	765-756 (765-759)

During the three years from 759-756 two other Kassite kings (listed next) came to the throne who were not sons of Kudur-enlil.

Enlil-nadin-shumi	1 1/2	759-756
Kadashman-harbe	1 1/2	

They were succeeded by

Adad-nadin-shumi	6	756-750
------------------	---	---------

Thereafter the royal line of Kudur-enlil was restored.

Shagarakti-shuriash, son of Kudur-enlil	13	750-737
--	----	---------

Kashtiliash, son of Shagarakti-shuriash	8	737-729
--	---	---------

At this point there occurs a break in the history of the Kassite Dynasty. Tukulti-ninurta I occupied Babylon for seven years -- 729-722. (observe that 729 is also the year that Tiglathpileser III "took the hands of Bel" and became king of Babylon.) An inscription of Tukulti-Ninurta I on a building informs us: "... I made ready to do battle with Kashtiliash, king of Karduniash, and brought about the overthrow of his host. His warriors I slew. In that encounter I took Kashtiliash prisoner. I trod upon his royal neck as on a footstool, naked and in bonds brought I him before Asshur my lord, Sumer and Akkad in their whole extent I brought under my power." Another document reads: "The defeat of Kashtiliash Tukulti-Ninurta turned back to Babylon ... he drew near, he wasted the wall of Babylon, he destroyed the Babylonians He set his governors over Karduniash. For seven years Tukulti-Ninurta ruled over Karduniash, thereafter the great ones of Akkad and Karduniash arose and made Adad-shumuli-nasir to sit upon his father's throne" (see pages 13-14 of Van der Meer's "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia").

Adad-shumuli-nasir	30	722-692
--------------------	----	---------

The period from Kudur-enlil to Adad-shumuli-nasir has not been properly understood by any modern authors. Van der Meer espouses one view; M. B. Rowton another in the "Revised Cambridge Ancient History", Vol. I, ch. IV. The Assyrian record proves that no Kassite rulers succeeded Kashtiliash until the reign of Adad-shumuli-nasir. Therefore the only place for the reigns of Enlil-nadin-shumi, Kadashman-harbe and Adad-nadin-shumi was at some previous period. Where that period occurred is revealed by the otherwise inexplicable difference in the length of reign of Kudur-enlil -- 6 or 9 years. The Kassite king list does not place them in the actual order of their rule. It places the son and grandson of Kudur-enlil first because the scribe who drew up

the document presented the kings in their blood relationship. His list of kings was not intended to be successive.

After the year 692 four more Kassite kings came to the throne. They are as follows:

Kassites from 692-660	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Melishipak	15	692-677
Marduk-aplaidin, his son	13	677-664
Zababa-shumiddin	1	664-663
Ellil-nadin-ahhe	3	663-660

In 660 the Kassites -- Cushites from the east -- were overthrown in an Assyrian attack that carried Assyrian arms to the River Indus!

The Earliest Kassites

The Kassite kings make their first appearance in Southern Mesopotamia in year 8 of Samsu-iluna, son of Hammurabi. The event is commemorated in the "year-name" of year 9: "Year in which Samsu-iluna the king (defeated) the host of the Kassites." Year 8 is 1022-1021. (See p. 23 of Van der Meer's "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia".) The first Kassite kings are listed below:

Names of First Kassite Kings	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Gandhe (or Gandash)	16	1022-1006
Agum the First, son of Gandhe	12 (or 22)	1006-994 1006-984
Kashtiliash I	22	984-962
Ushshi	8	962-954

Though succeeding names are known, the years of reign are broken away.

Now consider Agum I, who is variously assigned 12 or 22 years. Who was his contemporary after 12 years of reign? Here is the answer. The great-grandfather of the Assyrian king Enlilnasir II (930-924) was Puzur-Assur. The dates of Puzur-Assur's reign have not yet been presented. (Later it will be demonstrated that they fell from 994-980.) A contemporary of Puzur-Aggur III was the Kassite king Burnaburiash. A document naming them both reads: "Puzur-Assur, king of Assur, and Burnaburiash, king of Karduniash, took oath, they established the border of that region." (Page 19 of Van der Meer's "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia", second edition.)

This Burnaburiash (probably an older brother of Kashtiliash I) was contemporary with the Kassite kings Agum I and Kashtiliash I. His reign must have begun in 994.

For the 109 years between Ushshi (962-954) and Kurigalzu the Younger (845-820) only a bare outline of Kassite names is preserved. By

a comparison with Egyptian and Assyrian and Babylonian history the Kassites can be associated with their contemporaries, though it is not always possible to determine which Kassite rulers were brothers, which sons.

After Kashtiliash I (984-962) some lists place either Ushshi or Abirattash (who were apparently brothers). After Abirattash come either Kashtiliash II or Tazzigurumash (again probably older and younger sons of Abirattash). Inheritance of the Kassite line was passed first to brothers, then to sons.

Following Tazzigurumash were Harbanshipak, Tiptakzi and Agum II Kakrime, probably all brothers, since Agum II is known to be a son of Tazzigurumash. Agum II overthrew Babylon in 879, bringing to an end the First Dynasty of Babylon. (page 22 of Van der Meer's "Chronology of Ancient Western Asia"). No lineal descendants of Agum II are known. Agum II is the fifth generation after Gandhe in about a century and a quarter.

The successor of Agum II was Burnaburiash II, who descended from a different line of Kassite kings. Burnaburiash II's long reign began in the closing years of the life of Amenhotpe III of Egypt and extended to the early years of Tut-ankhamen. (p. 17 of Van der Meer's publication). Burnaburiash's father was Kurigalzu I, a contemporary of Amenhotpe III. The two previous generations were Kadashman-harbe I and Karaindah I. Karaindah I, near the close of his life signed a treaty with Assur-bel-nisheshu (917-908). He also gave his daughter (a sister of Kadashman-harbe I) to Amen-hotpe III. Karaindah I was therefore of the generation of Thutmose IV of Egypt. The ancestry of Karaindah is not yet recovered. He may have been a descendant of Ushshi, brother of Abirattash.

Burnaburiash II had three sons: Karaindah II, Ulamburiash and Kashtiliash III. Ulamburiash defeated Eagamil and conquered the Sealand in 846. Some years later the Sealand had to be reconquered by Agum III, a son of Kashtiliash III in a war which involved Nebuchadnezzar I, the king of Isin (847-825).

A third son of Burnaburiash II was Karaindah II, who married the daughter of Assur-uballit of Assyria. Their son was Kadashman-harbe II (who was also named Karahardash in the Assyrian record). A rebellion broke out against Kadashman-harbe II. He was slain and a usurper, known by the names of Suzigash or Nazi-bugash, seized the throne. To avenge his grandson, Assuruballit (863-827) launched an attack on the Kassite realm. Upon the defeat and death of Nazi-bugash the throne was restored to Kurigalzu the Younger, a son of Kadashman-harbe II. This Kurigalzu has already been dated from the Kassite list as ruler from 845-820.

Thus all 36 kings of the Kassites have been recovered from contemporary documents. Their government in Mesopotamia and Sumer extended from 1022-660, a period of 362 years. Because of numerous joint reigns with brothers, nephews and sons the total assigned to the Kassite kings in the King List is 576 years. There is no reason to dispute this figure, as many scholars have recently done. A final note of caution. None of the artificial lists of Kassite kings usually found in history textbooks is correct.

The First 1000 Years of Assyrian History

The complete line of kings from the city Assur has not yet been restored because the two predecessors of Enlil-nasir II have their regnal years broken away in every tablet thus far discovered.

The key to these missing years lies in the early history of Assyria preserved exclusively in classical Greek sources.

The Greek historian Ctesias copied out of the annals in the Persian realm the ancient histories of Assyria and Media. Historians, since the advent of archaeology, have cast aside his records as worthless. They have found no evidence of the kings -- but then they have found no written records of anything for that period. Mere lack of knowledge does not disprove the traditional record of history.

In numerous cases the most important events of the past were carefully copied each generation on perishable materials -- and later preserved in the classical writers. Witness the history of the Hebrews. The history of Palestine cannot be found on stone monuments or on clay tablets. It is to be found only in the pages of a Book, the Bible.

The same is true of Assyria. The earliest ages have come down through royal annals only in the pages of books. Archaeology had nothing to say about the period other than confess its own ignorance!

The most complete evidence for the early Assyrian kings may be found in "Fasti Hellenici the Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece", by Henry Fynes Clinton, vol. I, p. 267. Additional works include John Jackson's "Chronological Antiquities", vol. I, pp. 247-253. The classical records in Greek and Latin are reproduced in Dr. Alfred Schoene's "Eusebi Chronicorum", especially in the "Excerpta Latina Barbari." Compare these with Dr. Rudolf Helm's "Die Chronik des Hieronymus".

Ctesias begins his consecutive history with the last 38 years (2006-1968) of the reign of Gilgamesh or Ninyas. Ninyas, it should be remembered, was the Assyrian name for Gilgamesh; Horus was his Egyptian. Ctesias does not preserve any record of the short period following the 42-year reign of Semiramis I (the Egyptian Isis) to the year 2006. This was the period of Median power in Babylonia.

In his History, Ctesias noted that the Assyrian power endured 1306 years before the time of the Median revolt. It was exactly 1306 years between 2006 and 700, the year the Medes obtained their freedom from the Assyrians -- only to lose it again to their own rulers!

In the following chart all significant variants in names and figures are included.

Names of Assyrian Rulers Preserved by Ctesias	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Ninyas (Gilgamesh)	38	2006-1968
Arius (Arioch of Genesis 14)	30	1968-1938
(Note that the year 1938 also marked the death of Amraphel of Shinar, according to the king list of Erech. Thus archaeological and classical records confirm the date of Abram's slaughter of the kings as 1938.)		
Aralius (Amyrus)	40	1938-1898
Xerxes (Balaeus)	30	1898-1868
Armamithres	38	1868-1830
Belochus	35	1830-1795
Balaeus	52	1795-1743

Sethos (Zastagus, Altallus, or Altadas)	35	1743-1708
Mamythus	30	1708-1678
Aschalius (Macchaleus)	30 (or 28)	1678-1648 (1678-1650)
Sphaerus	20 (or 22)	1648-1628 (1650-1628)

(The year 1650 marked a great Assyrian attempt to conquer India. The battle was fought in the winter of 1650-1649. Assyrian losses, together with those of their allies, were sufficient to change the balance of power in Babylonia in 1649. See the history of Indian and early Babylonia for that date.)

Mamylus	30	1628-1598
Sparaethus (Spartheus, or Spareus)	42	1598-1556
Ascatades	38	1556-1518
Amyntes	45	1518-1473
Belochus	25	1473-1448
Attosa (Semiramis II)	23	1448-1425
Beletares	34	1425-1391
or		
Belochus	45	1473-1428
Attosa (Semiramis II)	7	1428-1421
Beletares	30	1421-1391

(With Semiramis II the direct male line ceases. Beletares, the keeper of the royal gardens, comes to the throne, possibly through intermarriage with an heir of royal line.)

Lamprides	32	1391-1359
Sosares	20	1359-1339
Lampares	30	1339-1309
Panyas	45 (or 42)	1309-1264 (1309-1267)
Sosarmus	19 (or 22)	1264-1245 (1267-1245)
Mithraeus	35	1245-1210

Teutamus (Assyrian King during the First Trojan War)	32	1210-1178
Teutaeus	44	1178-1134
Thinaeus	30	1134-1104
Dercylus	40	1104-1064
Empacmes	38	1064-1026
Laosthenes	45	1026-981
Pertiades	30	981-951
Ophrataeus	21	951-930
Ephecheres (Ophratanes)	52	930-878
Acraganes	42	878-836
Thonos Concolerus	20	836-816

In 816 the Medes end the Assyrian dynasty. The king at this time was at his royal Palace at Rehoboth-Ir on the Euphrates (Genesis 36:37). A history of the Median kings who rode to prominence in 816 will be given in another section.

Analyzing the King List

Several unusual features, some not included in the preceding chart, are worth special study.

First, consider king Sethos or Altadas (1743-1708). His reign, according to Syncellus, extended over half a century -- 1758-1708. Why did he come to the throne about 1758 during the reign of Balaeus? Assyrian history is silent. But Egyptian history may reveal the answer. This was the time of King Senwosre III (the Sesostris of classical writers). Senwosre III had spent his first 19 years (1779-1760) in the subjugation of Ethiopia (Breasted's "Ancient Records", vol. I). He then set out to conquer all Asia. Manetho records that "in nine years he subdued the whole of Asia (meaning Western Asia), and Europe as far as Thrace." It is very probable that the year 1758 marks the conquest of Assyria by the Egyptian Pharaoh and the beginning of a joint reign in Assyria to stabilize the weakened monarchy.

In Eusebius' account of Ctesias only 32 years (1740-1708) are assigned to Sethos or Altadas. As this king's reign is the only one in the early part of the list to vary so unusually, this figure too must have significance. As the sole reign of Senwosre III ended in 1741, it may well be that the year 1740 points up the regaining of independence from Egyptian overlordship.

Now consider the reigns of Sosarmus (1267-1245) and Mithraeus (1245-1210). In the "Excerpta Barbara" king Sosarmus is assigned only 20 years (1267-1247). In Africanus his successor Mithraeus is given 37 years (1247-1210). What is especially significant is that Eusebius assigns only 27 years to Mithraeus (1247-1220).

Eusebius' figure cuts the reign of Mithraeus short by 10 years. What is the significance of his figure which ends the reign in 1220 instead of 1210? Herodotus answers the question! The year 1220 marks the beginning of 520 years of Assyrian hegemony over Upper Asia, ending in the year 700 at the Median revolt (Clio -- I, sect. 95).

The full significance of the year 1220 has not yet been exhausted. Syncellus' account of Ctesias includes four otherwise unknown Assyrian rulers who belong to a collateral dynasty. Their reigns total 162 years. No other writer includes them. Where should these kings be placed? Syncellus provides a clue. He placed this short dynasty at its midway point, opposite kings Teutaeus and Thinaeus. Its beginning would therefore be about 1220. Observe the missing link in Assyrian history when this short dynasty is properly placed beginning in 1220.

Contemporary Kings of Assyria	Lengths of Reign	Dates
(Mithraeus)	27	1247-1220
Arabelus	42	1220-1178
Chalaus	45	1178-1133
Anebus	38	1133-1095
Babius (or Tautamus II)	37	1095-1058
(What occurred in 1058? The answer is in the next line!)		
Ninurta-apil-Ekur, son of Ilu-ihadda, seized the throne	3	1058-1055, etc.

From here on the kings of the Calah line continue until 621. Thus the four kings of Syncellus provide the missing link that unites the testimony of Herodotus with the list of Ctesias and the record of archaeology!

To return to the history of Ctesias. For the three kings Teutamus, Teutaeus and Thinaeus (1210-1104) several transcribers of Ctesias provide shortened figures. Altogether, 6 years are deleted. Who came to power during those six missing years? In chart form the three reigns appear thus:

Teutamus	31 (6 missing years)	1210-1179 (1179-1173)
Teutaeus	40	1173-1133
Thinaeus	29	1133-1104

Did a new dynasty perhaps arise in the years 1179-1173? Was there a king who ruled 6 years at this period in Assyrian history? Indeed. These years witness the rise of the royal house of the city of Assur. Its first king, Assur-dugul, reigned 6 years. In his sixth year -- 1174-1173 -- some kind of internal catastrophe hit the city, for six kings came to the throne during the sixth and last year of Assur-dugul. Was there a special event that befell Mesopotamia in the year 1174-1173?

The year 1174-1173 was the first year of king Sumu-abum of the First Dynasty of Babylon: Heretofore no parallel event could account for the sudden appearance of government at Babylon in 1174. A major revolution in Assyria would have been necessary to allow a rival power to rise in the city Babylon, which had had no political power since the days of Nimrod.

With this period as a starting point it is now possible to complete the list of kings of the city Assur and fill in the sum of the two missing reigns.

Kings of the City Assur	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Assur-dugul, "son of a 'nobody'"	6	1179-1173
Assur-apla-idi, "son of a 'nobody'";		
Nasir-Sin, "son of a 'nobody'":		
Sin-namir, "son of a 'nobody'":	"together exercised sovereignty for a BAB TUPPISU", that is, the remainder of an official year	
Ipqi-Istar, "son of a 'nobody'";		
Adad-salulu, "son of a 'nobody'";		
and Adasi, "son of a 'nobody'" 1174-1173		
Belu-bani, son of Adasi	10	1173-1163
Libaiiu	17	1163-1146
Sarma-Adad (I)	12	1146-1134
En-tar-Sin, son of Sarma-Adad	12	1134-1122
Bazzaiiu, son of Belu-bani	28	1122-1094
Lullaiiu, "son of a 'nobody'"	6	1094-1088
Su-Ninua, son of Bazzaiiu	14	1088-1074
Sarma-Adad, son of Su-Ninua	3	1074-1071
Erisu, son of Su-Ninua	13	1071-1058
Samsi-Adad, son of Erisu	6	1058-1052
Isme-Dasan, son of Samsi-Adad	16	1052-1036
Samsi-Adad, son of Isme-Dasan, son of Su-Ninua	16	1036-1020
Assur-nerari, son of Isme-Dasan	26	1020- 994
Puzur-Assur, son of Assur-nerari	14	994- 980
Enlil-nasir, son of Puzur-Assur	13	980- 967

Nur-ili, son of Enlil-nasir	12	967- 955
Assur-saduni, son of Nur-ili	1 month	955
Assur-rabi (I), son of Enlil nasir, deposed Assur-saduni, and seized the throne	---	---
	(25)	(955-930)
Assur-nadin-ahhe (I), son of Assur-rabi (I)	---	---
Enlil-nasir (II) deposed his brother Assur-nadin-ahhe	6	930-924, etc.

The lengths of the reigns of Assur-rabi and Assur-nadin-ahhe are broken away on every document. But the preceding restoration of contemporary history supplies the total length of the missing figures -- 25 years (955-930) -- a very reasonable figure for the passage of one generation. The reigns of Enlil-nasir and his successors to 692 have been presented in a former section.

With this chart the restoration of Assyrian history is complete for all datable reigns.

The next chapter will connect the history of Media, India and Japan with the Assyrian Empire and with famous Queen Semiramis III, the thrice-born "Queen of Heaven."

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Media, India, Japan and China

The wide conquests of the Assyrian Empire brought her into direct contact with many nations dwelling within and beyond the confines of the Middle East. Twice Assyria attempted to conquer India. Twice she failed. Twice the Medes rose in successful revolt against the Assyrians.

A people so far removed as the Japanese also trace their history to a remarkable event in Assyrian history. Only the Chinese, of all eastern people, remained relatively apart from the West.

The Revolts of the Medes

In one sense no restoration of the Median Empire is necessary. Ctesias and Herodotus preserve accurately the chronological history of the early Median tribes and of two distinct revolts. The modern historian has created an artificial problem by rejecting the traditions of both Ctesias and Herodotus. Why were they rejected? Because many of the leading events surrounding the Medes' early rise to power were absolutely supernatural. Take the classic example in Herodotus. At least 150 years before the birth of Cyrus, the prophet Isaiah was inspired by God to record the name of Cyrus as the future conqueror of Babylon. The birth of Cyrus is narrated by Herodotus. The last Median king, wrote Herodotus, had no son, only a daughter. During the pregnancy of his daughter, Astyages was frightened by a dream in which it was revealed that the child to be born of her was destined to overthrow the grandfather and conquer the world. To thwart this portent he contrived to have the child murdered. The official appointed to accomplish the deed sublet the act to a shepherd whose wife has just suffered the loss of a young baby boy. The dead infant was substituted for the living infant Cyrus. Thus the young lad survived, eventually to rule the world.

Historians view such an account as myth. By that they mean that anything so unusual as the birth of Cyrus speaks of the intervention of God whom they refuse to acknowledge. To rid themselves of His presence and His intervention in history they must discount the writers who recorded these events.

The history of Media is preserved by several early Greek and Roman writers. Diodorus Siculus records in detail how the Medes successfully overthrew the Assyrians in 816 -- the time of the prophet Jonah. One of the royal Assyrian capitals at that time was at Rehoboth on the Euphrates. There the Medes successfully attacked the person of the king, Thonos Concolerus, also known as Sardanapallus, slew him and his armed guards and razed the city. Only the repentance of the Ninevites saved it from the Median ravages.

This was also the period of the extensive conquests of Seti I in Asia.

The Median royalty which came to power in 816 was the line of Darius the Mede. The Median kings who rose to power after the revolt in 700-699 were another and distinct line of Kings.

Here are the Median kings according to Ctesias' record from the Persian archives.

House of Arbaces Median Rings After Overthrow of Assyrians at Rehoboth	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Arbaces	28	816-788
His son Mandauces	20	788-768
Sosarmus	30	768-738
Artycas	30	738-708
Arbianes	22	708-686
Artaeus	40	686-646
Artynes	22	646-624
Astibaras	40	624-584
Aspadas (called Astyigas or Astyages)	35 (or 38)	584-549 (584-546)

The successor of Aspadas was Darius the Mede, mentioned in Daniel 5:31 and 9:1. The Hebrews called Aspadas "Ahasuerus". The Greeks called Darius the Mede Cyaxeres II.

Historians have completely misunderstood the events surrounding the end of Median independence. The reason is this. There were two Median kings reigning at the same time with the same name -- Astyages, or similar spelling. One was grandfather of Cyrus the Persian; the other, Aspadas called Astyigas, was father of Darius the Mede. Before explaining any more details, it is necessary to introduce the second Median royal house and the second Astyages.

In the year 700-699, following the death of Shalmaneser III, the Medes successfully completed a second revolt against the Assyrians. Not until this year were all the Medes completely free from Assyrian dominion. Herodotus preserves the names of these Median kings who ascended the throne in 699.

House of Deioces Median Kings Following Revolt in 700-699.	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Deioces	53	699-646
Phraortes	22	646-624
Cyaxeres I	40	624-584
Astyages, grandfather of Cyrus	35	584-549

Certain late Greek and Roman writers used figures other than those given by Herodotus and Ctesias. The preceding are the original and true figures. The variants may have risen from otherwise unknown events occurring in the Median realm, or from joint reigns.

In 549 Astyages was overthrown by his grandson, Cyrus the Persian.

Cyrus had come to the Persian throne, which he shared with his father, in the year 558. He reigned altogether 29 years (558-529).

The chronological evidence from Ctesias and Herodotus indicates the last three kings of each Median line shared the throne jointly. Each was succeeded by a son in 646, 624 and 584. An exception occurred in the case of Astyages, son of Cyaxeres I. This man, declared Herodotus, had no son, only a daughter. He ruled with a harsh hand. His daughter he gave in marriage to the king of Persia, Cambyses, who became the father of Cyrus. By contrast Josephus stated that Astyages had a son -- Darius the Mede. Historians have -- for no justifiable reason -- assumed the testimony of Josephus and Herodotus were irreconcilable. A little thought would have made it plain that each writer was discussing a different Astyages. Josephus, and Daniel too, wrote of the Astyages or Aspadas who was of the house of Arbaces. Herodotus' account was of Astyages of the house of Deioces.

The confederation of Persians and Medes, often stressed in the Bible, resulted from a political union of the house of Arbaces, which began in 816, with the young Persian monarch Cyrus. Cyrus could never have come to power had there not been strife between the two Median royal families.

Worthy of special note in the preceding charts is the date 584, ending the reigns of both Cyaxeres and Astibaras. This was 28 years after the overthrow of Nineveh (612) and marked the end of Scythian dominion in ancient Upper Asia. Who those Scythians were will become apparent in the study of Japanese history and the traditions of the Parsees of India.

History of Early India

In 1956 a remarkable book on early India was published. Its title: "The Chronology of the Reign of Asoka Moriya." The author, Dr. P. H. L. Eggermont, resolved several difficult problems in early Indian literature. His solutions are in complete harmony with the history of Assyria.

Many of the enigmas in Indian history could long ago have been resolved had the scholars RESPECTED the literary accounts preserved by the early scribes and priests. The first step in the solution of early Indian history began when Dr. Eggermont recognized the historicity of India's earliest literary accounts. Too many scholars had arbitrarily rejected or altered them.

Dr. Eggermont's book does not include later problems in Indian history. As these difficulties have no direct bearing on the authenticity of Biblical history they are also excluded from this compendium. Only the history to the time of King Asoka is presented here.

True Indian history begins with the famous battle of Kuruksetra in the winter of 1650-1649. At the winter solstice a heavy attack was launched against Sahadeva, Indian king of Magadha, by the "Assuras" or "Daityas" from the west. The Indian king perished. Had not there been some kind of supernatural change in the weather during the course of the struggle India would have been devastated. As events turned out, Assyria was defeated.

Indian scholars long ago recognized in the "Assuras" or "Daityas" the Assyrians of the west.

The date 1649 is paralleled in Mesopotamia. In that year king

Lugal-zaggisi, of Erech's Third Dynasty, toppled Assyria's allies and suddenly seized control of the land. (See the restoration of Early Babylonian history.)

The Bahadratha dynasty rose to power in Magadha in the beginning of 1649, upon the death of Sahadeva. Names, but no dates of previous kings are preserved. The following chart outlines the history of India until about 180.

Names of Dynasties	Duration of Dynasties	Dates
Bahadratha	989	1649-660
Pradyota	138	660-522
Sisunaga	162	522-360
The Nanda	43	360-317
Maurya	131	317-186

(For the length of the Mauryas see "Persica", No. II, 1965-1966, article by Eggermont.)

The year 1649 is not the time of the traditional migration of Aryan-speaking peoples into India. Those migrations, so famous in Indian history, did not commence until shortly before 660, toward the close of the Assyrian Empire. Aryan-speaking people were, however, already in India from earliest times.

To the plains of India the Assyrians sent into exile (around 660) tens of thousands of Ethiopians, thousands of Egyptians and multitudes from the region of the Hindu-Kush mountains in Bactria. This forced migration was the period of Assyrian conquests in Egypt and Bactria.

The wholesale dumping of captive slaves was climaxed by an Assyrian attempt to conquer India in 660. In that year Semiramis III (699-657) -- self-styled reincarnation of the "Queen of Heaven" -- led Assyrian troops to the frontier of India. Diodorus of Sicily describes the battle in detail in his history of India. A great catastrophe befell the Assyrians. The troops of the Queen were annihilated. She fled almost alone from the battle scene -- to live on in myth and religious tradition as the thrice-born "Queen of Heaven."

Early Indian Kings of Magadha

Following the tragic Indian victory in 1649 Somadhi founded a new dynasty on the Ganges. Indian history, preserved in the Puranas, centers from this time onward in the modern province of Magadha. From here royal influence was exercised across the plains to the Indus River region. Though there were other princely families governing India, only one dynastic line exercised supreme authority.

Political disintegration in India did not develop until centuries later.

Following is the official account of the Dynasty of Somadhi (beginning 1649) which was overthrown at the time of the Assyrian invasion in 660. It is taken from the Vayu Purana, edited by Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta, 1888. (Eggermont, "Chronology of Asoka", pp. 217-218).

Royal House of Somadhi	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Somadhi	58	1649-1591
Srutasruvas	64	1591-1527
Ayutayus	26	1527-1501
Niramitra	100	1501-1401
Sukrtta	56	1401-1345
Vrhatkarman	23	1345-1322
Senajit	23	1322-1299
Srutamjaya	40	1299-1259
Nrpa	35	1259-1224
Suci	58	1224-1166
Ksema	28	1166-1138
Bhuvata	64	1138-1074
Dharmanetra	5	1074-1069
Nrpati	58	1069-1011
Suvrata	38 (or 28)	1011- 973 (1011- 983)
Drdhasena	48 (or 58)	973- 925 (983- 925)
Sumati	35	925- 890
Sucala	22	890- 868
Sunetra	40	868- 828
Satyajit	83	828- 745
Virajit	35	745- 710
Arinjaya	50	710- 660

In Indian literature other spellings and occasional variations in reigns are used. But the preceding is the official register and is in perfect harmony with parallel events elsewhere in the world. The extra long reign of Niramitra is not out of keeping with the contemporary Old Testament world in which men were living to be 120.

Consequent to the Assyrian invasion a change of power occurred in Magadha in 660. The Pradyota regime came to prominence. Its kings ruled to the time of the death of Cambyses in Persia.

Pradyota Dynasty in Magadha	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Pradyota	23	660-637
Palaka	24	637-613
Visakhayupa	50	613-563
Ajaka	21	563-542
Varttivarddhana	20	542-522

At this juncture the Saisunagas replaced the Pradyota family. The Saisunagas received their name from the fourth and most famous king.

Dynasty of the Saisunagas in Magadha	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Bimbisara	28	522-494
Ajatasatru	25	494-469
Udayin	33	469-436
Sisunaga	40	436-396
Kakavarna	36	396-360

The Saisunagas in Indian literature were so famous that the length of the dynasty became artificially inflated with contemporary reigns to suit the heroic deeds of its kings. Dr. Eggermont had no need to restore the two dynasties preceding the Saisunagas. His efforts were spent primarily on the kings between the end of the Pradyotas (in 522) and the reign of Asoka. Any questions arising on this period should be directly referred to his aforementioned study published by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands.

The next dynasty after 360 was composed of one king -- The Nanda, or, in Indian literature, Mahanandin. His actual length of reign was only 43 years -- 360-317.

The year 317 is the direct link between India and Greek history. At that date Eudamos and Peithon departed from the Panjab and Sindh, whereupon Candagutta occupied the Indus. The Mauryas ruled for 131 years. Dr. P.H.L. Eggermont proves in his book that the date for the commencement of this dynasty is not 321, as long assumed, but 317, a restoration which makes Indian history harmonious with all contemporary records.

Dynasty of the Mauryas to Asoka	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Candagutta (Chandragupta)	24	317-293
Bindusara	25	293-268
Asoka	29	268-239

Dasaratha	8	239-231
Samprati	10	231-221
Salisuka	13	221-208
Somasarman	7	208-201
Satadhanvan	8	201-193
Brhadratha	7	193-186

(See Eggermont's reconstruction in *Persica*, No. II, 1965-1966, "New Notes on Asoka and His Successors".)

The year 186 marks the commencement of the Sunga Era, from which point succeeding dynasties may be accurately dated.

For a complete list of later ruling houses consult volume I of Stokvis' "Manuel D'Histoire", p. 237.

Scythia and the History of Japan

The vast reaches of Scythia were famous in antiquity. Within its borders lived numerous unrelated tribes. Anciently the word Scythia (or Sacae) was applied to a people living in that region in the Caucasus, (Jeremiah 51:27). This area bore the name "Land of the Rising Sun."

But in the process of time the name Scythia passed to other tribes and peoples who dwelt in, or migrated through, the land of Scythia. Hence the Greek writers included in Scythia the Eastern Slavic people who migrated from Asia Minor into Eurasia. Diodorus Siculus refers to their queen as "Zarina" -- Russian feminine for Czar (Book II, 34, 3). Other writers, like Paul the apostle, divided the world into Greek and Jew, Barbarian and Scythian (Colossians 3:11) -- applying the name Scythian to that people which came out of the east and migrated into Western Europe and the British Isles. The modern word Scot is, in fact, merely a corruption of the old Greek Scythian.

Herodotus describes the Eastern Scythians. To him they were unusual people, lacking body hair, with noticeably rounded face and chin, flat-nosed, speaking a peculiar language and wearing a distinctive costume (Melpomene, 23).

According to Herodotus the Scythians of antiquity were allied with the Assyrians during most of the last century of Assyrian dominion. Semiramis III -- famous for her marital relations with the "kings of the earth" -- especially prized her relationship with these Scythians. The alliance between the two royal families endured long after the Assyrian "Queen of Heaven" died.

In 612 the Medes and Babylonians were besieging Nineveh. Onto the scene came Scythian troops from the region of Bactria to lift the siege. The Medes, sensing what would happen if Assyria were to recover strength, submitted terms to the Scythians in exchange for breaking their alliance with Assyria. They were accepted. Nineveh fell. But the agreement cost the Medes control of much of Upper Asia for 28 bleak years. (Herodotus, *Clio*. 106).

At the end of that period Media and Scythia came to blows. Scythian ravages were more than the Medes could take. The Medes were victorious. The Scythians withdrew to far Asia.

The Parsees of India have preserved several traditions of these

events. (The Parsees are Persian immigrants living in India.) In their sacred literature references to a famous prince Zoroaster II -- a "son of heaven" -- are found. He came to royal prominence in 660, following defeat in India of his mother, the "Queen of Heaven." Zoroaster means "seed of Ishtar." He spread the religion of sun-worship throughout the east. The Parsees -- and scholars ever since -- have puzzled how Zoroaster II could have exercised such influence and yet not be a king of Media or Persia. They overlooked Scythia.

In Parsee tradition Zoroaster lost his life in a war in Media in the year 584-583 (see "Ency. Amer.", art. "Zoroaster").

Is there any Oriental nation, at least in part Scythian, with a tradition of a "son of Heaven" who came to the throne in 660, who reigned for about 584, who extended his rule from west to east, whose mother was a "goddess" and a queen, in whose land sun-worship spread? Was Zoroaster II known under another name in the Far East?

Absolutely! In Japan. The Japanese royal throne, according to the "Nihonji", a book of traditional and sacred history, was founded in 660. Its first emperor is assigned 76 years, to 584. He was a "son of Heaven;" his mother a "goddess" and a queen. In the traditions of the Nihonji it is reported of him that he said: "Now I have heard ... that in the East there is a fair land encircled on all sides by blue mountains I think that this land will undoubtedly be suitable for the extension of the Heavenly task" -- that is, world conquest -- "so that its glory should fill the universe" (p. 110 of "Nihonji", trans. by W. G. Aston).

The Nihonji continues: "In that year, in winter, ... the Emperor in person led the Imperial Princes and a naval force on an expedition against the East" (page 111).

In Chinese history we find the following quote: "The barbarians invaded the territory of the Marquis of Wei I Kong in 660 B.C. The Marquis gave them battle in the marsh of Yug." The Chinese were defeated and the barbarians passed on to the east. ("Cults and Legends of Ancient Iran and China", Sir. J. C. Coyajee, p. 47.)

The Japanese, according to their tradition, were led to their isles by a symbolic three-legged sun-crow. In Pamphylia and Lycia, in Scythian-dominated Asia Minor, coins have been found which bear the rare figures of three-legged birds in various forms. ("La Migration des Symboles", by Comte Goblet d'Alviella, page 222 of 1891 edition.) Compare this symbol with the Biblical "wings of a great eagle" (Exodus 19:4).

Here are coincidences that cannot be explained unless Scythian tribes migrated to Japan under the authority of a prince who was a son of the Assyrian "Queen of Heaven." Had historians been willing to restore Assyrian history and Semiramis III to the proper place in history, had they been willing to credit the chronological framework of Japanese history, the mystery of the Scythians, of Togarmah and other peoples of North Asia would have vanished.

Of course there are legends and apparent contradictions in Japanese historical literature. But they do not alter the essential facts of history around which the legends were later woven. Historians carelessly reject most early Japanese records on the unprovable assumption that their history could not have been recorded prior to the adoption of the Chinese art of writing. Overlooked is the fact that in Scythia they were literate long before adopting Chinese culture in the east.

The Japanese Imperial family is found in most thorough histories of that nation and need not be included here. One note of caution,

however. It has become all too common for historians to criticise freely what they do not want to believe. Because the early Japanese rulers appear to have governed unusually long -- 76 years, 36, 38, 35, 83, 102, 76, 57, 60, 68, etc. (but much shorter later) -- the early period is discounted. Yet Chinese sources of the same period refer to the Japanese as especially longlived people in the centuries immediately following their arrival to the isles. Also, the sons who succeeded to the throne were often not the eldest. "Primogeniture was evidently not recognized in Japan at the time ...", writes Aston on page 110, note 1, in "Nihonji".

The names of Japanese emperors, by which they are known in history, are given to them after death. The first emperor received the posthumous name Jimmu Tenno -- signifying "divine valour." (For further references see the "History of the Empire of Japan", compiled and translated for the Imperial Japanese Commission of the world's Columbian Exposition, 1893.)

History of China

Everyone owes a great deal of respect to the Chinese nation for being the only people whose chronological records have been preserved without need of restoration from the time of Babel till now. The history of the Chinese nation is found in the Shoo King, which means literally the "Canon of History."

China naturally has had her literary critics who have sought to reinterpret the ancient records. Witness the "Bamboo Annals". But their attempts have been consistently rejected as unwarranted opposition to the traditional history of the "Shoo King". Only China's unusual reverence for tradition -- and superstition -- could have preserved the framework of history for more than 4,200 years:

True, some of the events are legendary. Nevertheless, no other people's secular history is more accurate than China's. The Chinese recorded their history in a form similar to the Hebrews' accounts in the books of the Old Testament. Each ruler is evaluated for his "moral conduct." His special contributions, good or bad, are simply evaluated. Such evaluations are, of course, subjective and may reflect later political thinking. But politics, in the modern western sense, was unknown in China.

The Chinese reckon the reigns of their rulers in calendar years commencing at approximately the winter solstice. In the earliest period it fell in what would have been the later weeks of January. (See page 99, vol. III, 1, of Legge's "Chinese Classics".) As centuries rolled by, the Chinese regnal year came to approximate a January-to-January year. Later still, the solstice dropped back into December.

The following list of Chinese rulers is derived from Shoo King, translated by Legge in "Chinese Classics", III, 1, pp. 184-188. As the later history of China is recognized by all reputable scholars as valid, only the early portion is included in this Compendium.

Late in Chinese historiography it became the practice to add to the list of early rulers the legendary names of heroes from before the flood. These late additions are manifestly invalid, for no nation without the Hebrew record had access to the information after Babel.

The first man of whom Chinese sources speak is Yao, or Yaou. The traditional information about Yao is nebulous. When referring to the Mongols, the Arabian historians speak of Magog and Yagog. It is likely that the Yagog of Arabic tradition is the personage whom the Chinese

tradition knows as Yao.

The results of a catastrophic flood were still apparent in Yao's day. "The deluge assailed the heavens, and in its vast expanse encompassed the mountains, and overtopped the hills ..." (Canon of Yao).

In the lifetime of Yao a stranger named Shun came to power. The meaning of his name is obscure. Later legends found in the Shoo King attempt to create Shun a native Chinese hero. But the earliest records (some found in the Bamboo Annals) make it clear he was a black foreigner. His mother was "Queen of the West land;" his father was Kusou, or Chusou -- Cush. From Babylonian traditions we learn that Cush and Nimrod shared jointly in the government together until Nimrod displaced his father. In Chinese records, as in Genesis, only Shun (Nimrod) appears -- for he was certainly the mainspring of the rebellion.

Shun reigned but 50 years after Babel over the Chinese people 2254-2204. Thereafter, through migration, the Chinese appear to have gained independence. A native Chinese family came to power in 2204, known in modern parlance as the Hsia Dynasty. It governed 439 years -- 2204-1765. (Some authors incorrectly pre-date these years into the December of the preceding year.)

Kings of Hsia Dynasty 2204-1765	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Yu	8	2204-2196
Ch'i	9	2196-2187
T'ai K'ang	29	2187-2158
Chung K'ang	13	2158-2145
Hsiang	27	2145-2118
Hong-Yi, a usurper		2118
Han Cho, another usurper, assassinates Hong-Yi	40	2118-2078
Shao K'ang	22	2078-2056
Ch'u	17	2056-2039
Huai	26	2039-2013
Mang	18	2013-1995
Hsieh	16	1995-1979
Pu Chiang	59	1979-1920
Chiung	21	1920-1899
Chin	21	1899-1878
K'ung Chia	31	1878-1847

Kao	11	1847-1836
Fa	19	1836-1817
Chieh Kuei	52	1817-1765

Shang (or Yin) Dynasty (1765-1121)

Under first king of this dynasty the year was made to begin at new moon nearest winter solstice.

Ch'en T'ang	13	1765-1752
-------------	----	-----------

In his reign China suffered from seven years of famine, shortly before that of Egypt (Jackson's "Chronology of Most Ancient Nations", vol. II, 455).

T'ai Chia	33	1752-1719
Wu Ting	29	1719-1690
T'ai Keng	25	1690-1665
Hsiao Chia	17	1665-1648
Yung Chi	12	1648-1636
T'ai Mou	75	1636-1561
Chung Ting	13	1561-1548
Wai Jen	15	1548-1533
Ho Tan Chia	9	1533-1524
Tsu Yi	19	1524-1505
Tsu Hsin	16	1505-1489
Wu Chia	25	1489-1464
Tsu Ting	32	1464-1432
Nan Keng	25	1432-1407
Yang Chia	7	1407-1400
P'an Keng	28	1400-1372
Hsiao Hsin	21	1372-1351
Hsiao Yi	28	1351-1323
Wu Ting	59	1323-1264

Tsu Keng	7	1264-1257
Tsu Chia	33	1257-1224
Lin Hsin	6	1224-1218
Keng Ting	21	1218-1197
Wu Yi	4	1197-1193
T'ai Ting	3	1193-1190
Ti Yi	37	1190-1153
Ti Hsin (Chou)	32	1153-1121

Chou Dynasty (1121-256)

Wu Fa	7	1121-1114
Ch'eng	37	1114-1077
K'ang Chao	26	1077-1051
Chao H'ia	51	1051-1000
Mu Man	55	1000- 945

This king was unusually fond of horses and chariots. He lived during the time of King Solomon who exported horses and chariots throughout the world.

Kung I Hu	12	945-933
I Hsi	25	933-908
Hsiao P'ih	15	908-893
I Sieh	16	893-877
Li Hu	51	877-826
Hsuan Tsing	46	826-780
Yu Kung Nieh	11	780-769
P'ing Hsuang Chiu	51	769-718
Huan Lin	23	718-695
Chuang T'o	15	695-680
Hsi Hu Ch'i	5	680-675
Hui Lang	25	675-650
Hsiang Ching	33	650-618

(from this reign on the years in this chart are reckoned as corresponding to Roman years, January through December)

Ch'ing Jen K'uang	6	617-612
K'uang Pan	6	611-606
Ting Yu	21	605-585
Chien I	14	584-571
Ling Hsieh Sin	27	570-544
Ching Kewi	25	543-519
Ching Ch'ih	44	518-475
Yuan Jen	7	474-468
Chen Ting Chiai	28	467-440
K'ao Wei	15	439-425
Wei Lieh Wu	24	424-401
An Chiao	26	400-375
Lieh Hsi	7	374-368
Hsien Pien	48	367-320
Shen Ching Ting	6	319-314
Nan Yen	58	313-256

A list of succeeding dynasties may be found summarized in "The Year Names of China and Japan", by P. M. Susuki. A simple, though uncritical, outline of each emperor's reign is preserved in John Jackson's "Chronology of Most Ancient Nations". Few modern writers cover the earliest period (except Legge's original translation of the Shoo King in the "Chinese Classics"). If described at all, China's earliest ages are unfortunately limited to studies of potsherds and bronze statuary!

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Asia Minor and the West

The journeys of the apostle Paul have made Asia Minor an important area of New Testament studies. In apostolic times the region was under Roman dominion. The inhabitants were primarily Greek, with a heavy influx of Jews into the cities of the southeastern provinces. Scattered remnants of earlier peoples existed, primarily Armenians.

Today the Turk inhabits Asia Minor. But neither Turk nor Greek were the original peoples of the plains and mountains of Anatolia. Until the advent of archaeology, the history of Asia Minor was almost unknown before the Greek period. Classical writers indeed preserved marvelous tales of the region -- of the Golden Fleece -- of the Trojan War (there were really three wars!) -- of King Midas -- of Amazons -- of the Phrygians who later migrated into Europe.

Modern Mythology

The Greeks turned the facts of Anatolia's history into myths. Unfortunately the archaeologist and the modern historian, discarding both Greek myth and historical fact, have created new and more fabulous myths.

Scholars today would have us believe, for example, that most of Asia Minor and the Greek world went through five long centuries of darkness -- "Dark Ages" is the academic label used. The early civilizations of Crete, of Greece, Cyprus and Asia Minor snuffed out for centuries -- only to suddenly reappear in full bloom 500 years later.

Historians label the early civilization in the Aegean world "Mycenaean" after the site of ancient Mycenae in Greece. This civilization is assumed to have perished during the twelfth century before the birth of Jesus. Not until the seventh century does the curtain of history lift with clarity again -- according to the modern myth:

Such an interpretation of history is absurd. This was long ago admitted in a publication of the Cambridge University Press: "Memphis and Mscenae", by Cecil Torr. Torr wrote on page 69:

"For example, the Greek coins and gems of about 700 to 600 resemble the Mycenaean gems so closely, that any judge of art would be prepared to place the Mycenaean age immediately before 700." Not before 1200 as is done today:

In Asia Minor the same absurdity exists in modern textbooks. A great Anatolian empire -- the Hatti -- is said to have perished shortly after 1200. Its greatest heyday is marked by an utter paucity of monuments. Yet in the five following centuries -- after the Empire (supposedly) perished -- the Hatti kings "left a wealth of monuments, reliefs, steles, rock carvings, most of them covered with the hieroglyphic script, in striking contrast with the relatively few monuments that have survived from Imperial times." ("Hittite Art", by Maurice Vieyra, page 7.)

Of course, the only reason for a 500-year blank is that Asia Minor and Aegean history have been conformed to the misplaced chronology of Egypt. Once the history of Egypt and Mesopotamia is restored in proper historical setting, the gaps in Asia Minor and Greece disappear.

Beginnings of History

Asia Minor first appears in Biblical history in the days of Abram. In Genesis 14:1 "Tidal king of Goiim" is named as ruler of Asia Minor. "Goiim" is the Hebrew word for "Nations." The history of ancient Asia Minor is the story of continuous attempts to unite the warring nations of the region into a loose confederacy. In earliest days Tidal ruled this confederacy.

But the nations of Asia Minor were themselves part of a greater empire composed of kings of Shinar, Elam and Assyria. The Jewish historian Josephus describes this vast empire in "Antiquities", I, ix. "At this time, when the Assyrians had the dominion over Asia, the people of Sodom were in a flourishing condition the Assyrians made war upon them; and, dividing their army into four parts, fought against them. Now every part of the army had its own commander; and when the battle was joined, the Assyrians were conquerors; and imposed tribute on the kings of the Sodomites, who submitted to this slavery twelve years ... but on the thirteenth year they rebelled, and then the army of the Assyrians came upon them, under their commanders Amraphel, Arioch, Chodorlaomer, and Tidal. These kings had laid waste all Syria, and overthrown the offspring of the giants"

Tidal was therefore an Assyrian king and general ruling over several different nations and peoples. So famous was Tidal that many later kings took the same name in Asia Minor. Historians, transliterating late cuneiform inscriptions, spell the name Tudhaliya(s) -- as, in similar fashion, they spell Tiglathpileser Tukulti-apil-Esarra.

In the three succeeding centuries after the battle of Genesis 14, little is known of Asia Minor. The curtain lifts during the reign of Sargon "the Great" of Akkad. Assyrians from Mesopotamia continually migrated into Asia Minor, where they set up numerous trading posts. The Akkadian kings claim to have conquered the region. A vast collection of cuneiform tablets from this and later periods have been recovered by archaeologists. They exhibit an unusual affiliation between native rulers and Assyrian traders. An affiliation inexplicable apart from Josephus' statement that Assyrians settled and ruled Anatolia in Abram's day. So prominent were the Assyrians in Asia Minor that Syllax, the author of "Periplus" (he lived about 550), wrote of this region: "The coast of the Black Sea ... is called Assyria" (p. 261 of Perrot and Chipiez' "History of Art in Sardinia, Judaea, Syria and Asia Minor", vol. II).

Assyrian kings and traders were only one of the early people to inhabit Asia Minor. Egyptian and Mesopotamian records reveal it was also the land of Meshech and Tubal (spelled Musku and Tabal in Assyrian documents), and of Armenians and Lydians. Along the coasts dwelled outposts of the children of Javan. Greek traditions speak of Amazons and Phrygians. Cappadocia, in eastern Anatolia, was a dwelling place of the children of Togarmah (Tegarma or Tilgarimmu).

But how did the name "Hittite" become associated with this land of many races? Modern historians, remember, use the words "Hittite" or "Hatti" or "Chatti" to designate any or all of the diverse peoples who dwelled in Asia Minor or North Syria.

Even the Bible uses similar expressions. Solomon traded with the "king of the Hittites," who dwelt in the mountainous lands north of the Arameans (I Kings 10:29).

The true "Hittite" people were children of Canaan. Canaan was the father of Heth, the Hittite. The land of the Hittites in the days of Joshua, and of the judges who followed, extended north of Palestine through Syria to the Euphrates (Judges 1:26).

After the Israelite conquest of Palestine, many Hittites migrated northward through Syria into Anatolia. So famous were these people, so different from other races, that they gave their name to the whole wide regions to which they migrated. As late as the Chaldean Empire of Nebuchadnezzar the name Hatti, or Chatti, was applied to the vast area of Syria-Palestine and to part of eastern Asia Minor.

In Egyptian monuments the original Canaanite Hittites were portrayed with singularly striking characteristics. They were depicted with unusually prominent noses, "somewhat broad, with lips full, the cheek-bones high, the eyebrows fairly prominent, the forehead receding like the chin, and the face hairless." "The hair is black, the eyes dark brown." ("The Races of the Old Testament", by A. H. Sayce, page 133.)

They were a brachycephalic or even hyperbrachycephalic people. The skin color varied from brown to yellowish and reddish. Greek tradition insists the people were a warlike, rude people, known for their frenzied dances and music.

This racial type has become so characteristic a part of the Armenoid racial stock of Anatolia, the Caucasus and Syria, that one must conclude the Hittites heavily intermarried with their Armenian and Aramaic neighbors.

The Proof of Language

The true Armenians are sons of Hul, son of Aram (compare Genesis 10:23 with Josephus).

Armenian is an Indo-European language. Indo-European languages are divided into two groups by scholars. It had long been assumed that the Armenian belonged to the Eastern or satem group, primarily because of vocabulary. Then the ancient language of the Hittites was discovered.

It proved to belong to the Western or centum group, to which the German, Celtic, Latin and Greek belonged. Then scholars began to recognize that this ancient language, rediscovered after 2000 years, bears a striking resemblance to Armenian.

The Armenian language has been found to share so many grammatical and lexical elements with the ancient language of the Hittites that scholars have been forced to the conclusion that Armenian developed from the Hittite-Luwian dialects of Lesser Armenia west of the Upper Euphrates. (See W. M. Austin's "Is Armenian an Anatolian Language?" in "Language", 18 (1942), 22 ff.)

Hittite and Armenian, for instance, are characterized by lack of grammatical gender. So many other phenomena were found to be exhibited by both groups that scholars now wonder why they did not see the relationship before. The Hittite language, a member of the "centum" group of Indo-European languages, lives on today in Armenian.

Over the centuries the Armenian, of course, has acquired a very large number of its vocabulary words from neighboring languages. So many, in fact, that its original relationship with the Western or "centum" group of Indo-European languages has been obscured. An excellent summary of the relationship of Armenian and Hittite is found in the revised edition of Cambridge Ancient History, vol. I, chapter iv, part iii "The Indo-Hittite Family," by Albright and Lambdin.

The Proof of Race

The Armenians are the only people who have preserved the well-known "Armenoid" form of the ancient Hittite crania. Admittedly continuity of physical type and language is not necessarily related. But if both language and racial characteristics are found among two peoples who still live in almost the same geographic region, but separated by centuries of time, the proof becomes striking. Especially when it is considered that no other group of people in ancient times had the same racial strains.

The original cradle of the Armenian nationality and culture is precisely that area characterized by the greatest use of hieroglyphic script. In fact the latest Hittite inscriptions can be proved to overlap the known presence of Armenians in the same region (in the inscriptions of Darius Hystaspes) by a number of centuries, once the ancient history of the Hittites is properly restored.

The use of the modern Armenian alphabet begins where ancient Hittite hieroglyphic inscriptions cease!

Because of early predominance of population and war-like characteristics, the fame of the ancient Hittite name spread. The rulers of Asia Minor, once known as "kings of nations" (in Abraham's day), because of the many different peoples who populated the region, came to be called "kings of the Hittites" by Solomon's time. The Armenians ceased to be referred to under their national name and were included among the Hittites (spelled also Kheta, Chatti, or Hatti) by distant nations.

In Syria and Asia Minor, as time passed, the Arameans and Armenians gradually gained predominance over their Hittite neighbors and absorbed them. The Hittites disappeared as a separate racial stock and their name was totally lost. The names Aramean and Armenian replaced that of Hittite.

The Hebrew root "heth" (from whence Hittite is derived) signifies "warrior." The Canaanite Hittites were famous warriors. As the Assyrians were a war-making nation, the world also attached the name "Chatti" -- meaning "warrior" or "men of war" -- to them when they anciently migrated to the Halys River basin in Asia Minor. Thus Assyrians, like Armenians, in Anatolia also came to bear the name "Chatti."

Ninevite kings marched their armies through Anatolia to aid Troy in the First Trojan War shortly before the rise of the Canaanite Hittites to power. Assyrian colonists continued to live in Asia Minor for centuries thereafter. Sardanapallus, king of Assyria, "sent his three sons and two daughters together with much of his treasure to Paphlagonia (Asia Minor) to the governor Cotta ..." (Diodorus II, 26,8). It was an Assyrian district. For the same reason Assyrians were "removed to the land between Paphlagonia and Pontus" after the collapse of Nineveh (Diodorus II, 43,6).

After the fall of Troy in 677 the Assyrians commenced migration out of Anatolia northwest up the Danube into Europe. Roman annals within a few centuries were filled with the name Chatti, or Hatti, which later became changed to Hesse. (See "Encyclopaedia Britannica" article "Germany".)

The warlike proclivity of the Hessians through the Roman period and the Middle Ages, is undoubtedly due to some absorption of Hittite stock.

The history of the Hittites of Asia Minor may now be restored in proper setting. First, it should be remembered that modern textbook writers are in utter confusion chronologically. They speak of an "Old Kingdom" and a "New Empire," sometimes of a "Middle Kingdom." Rulers of the "Old Kingdom" were about 750 years too early, the latter about 600! The reason for this preposterous restoration of central Anatolian history is this. "Old Kingdom" rulers are known to parallel the close of the Hammurabi Dynasty of Babylon. As Hammurabi is often placed about 750 years too early in history, these kings of Hatti are likewise misplaced by that figure. The late kings of the supposed "New Empire" are known to be contemporary with Ramesses the Great of Dynasty XIX of Egypt. Since this period of Egyptian history is misplaced about 600 years, the kings of the "New Empire" are likewise placed six centuries too early.

Babylonian and Egyptian archives prove there was only one Empire period in Central Anatolia. That more than one king at a time was on occasion ruling Hatti is confirmed by the documents: "Formerly Labarnas was king: and then his sons, his brothers, his connections by marriage and his blood-relations were united." ("The Hittites", by O. R. Gurney, page 21.) Most of these were set over major cities in the realm -- such as Carchemish.

For the Great Kings of Hatti king lists exist, but no date lists. A restoration can provide only synchronisms with other nations. In the following chart parallel rulers in other lands are listed and dated to indicate synchronisms.

The chart begins with kings of the so-called "Old" and "Middle Kingdom" and continues with the "New Empire" rulers who are known through correspondence as contemporary with the kings of Dynasty XIII and XIX of Thebes. (In spelling the following names of Hatti kings, the final "s" is used, though in numerous documents the letter is often dropped or sounded as an "sh.")

Contemporary Kings of Egypt	Great Kings of Hatti	History from Contemporary Documents
Thutmose III	Labarnas (I), founder of new dynasty	Contemporary of Solomon
Amenhotpe II Thutmose IV	Hattusilis (I), son Mursilis I, adopted son	Attacks and destroys Aleppo. Conquers Babylon at end of Samsu-ditana's reign (905-879). After returning home is assassinated.
Amenhotpe III		Arameans attack Hittite realm in south. Numerous disasters. Hurrians and Mitanni in Mesopotamia.
Akhenaten	Hantilis (I), brother-in-law	

	Zidantas (I)	
Ay	Ammunas, son	Rise of Medes (Mitanni)
	Huzziyas (I)	
	Telipinus, brother-in-law of Huzziyas	Hittites slowly revive and expand (see "Journal of Cuneiform Stud.", xi, 3, p. 73)
	Alluwamnas, son in-law	
	Hantilis (II)	
Piankhi	Zidantas (II)	Hittite fortunes continue to rise
	Huzziyas II	
	Tudhaliyas (II)	
	Arnuwandas (I), a brother	Expansion of Hittites as Assyrians decline and Troy falls; long struggle with Medes
Taharka	Suppiluliumas (I)	
Seti I	Arnuwandas (II), son	Arnuwandas dies of plague after reigning a few months
	Mursilis (II), brother	Plague and wide spread rebellions.
	Muwatallis, son	Fought with Nebuchadnezzar against Ramesses at battle of "Kadesh" in his tenth year.
Ramesses the Great	Urhi-Teshub, son	Reigned jointly with brother and nephew. Signed treaty with Ramesses in latter's year 21.
	Hattusilis (III), uncle	
	Tudhaliyas (III). son	West in rebellion -- struggle with

Lydia

Arnuwandas (III).
son

East in
rebellion --
expansion of
Medo-Persians

Suppiluliumas (II),
brother

Collapse of
Hittite Empire
as Persians
conquer Asia
Minor in 546

Notice the parallel between the events in column three and the Biblical history of the rise and fall of the Arameans. During the reign of Amenhotpe III and Mursilis I -- about 890 -- the Arameans rebelled and expanded under general Naaman. In their wars against Israel they feared the possibility that Israel would hire Egyptians and Hittites, to attack them. In II Kings 7:6 the Arameans, after hearing a noise of supernatural origin, are quoted as saying: "Lo, the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians. to come upon us."

There are two known areas of contact from documents between these Hittite kings and Egypt and Babylon. Suppiluliumas, Mursilis, Muwatallis and Hattusilis are the known contemporaries of Ramesses the Great and his father Seti. This documented contact, including the account of the battle of Kadesh (Carchemish), determines the general dating of the late Hittite rulers. Muwatallis came to power about 616 since the first battle of Kadesh was fought in his tenth year. This was in the year 607-606, the date of the initial Egyptian struggle against Babylon and its allies. Egypt was momentarily victorious (see the restoration of Egyptian history for the period of Ramesses the Great).

An earlier area of contact is established by documentary evidence for the reign of Mursilis I, conqueror of Aleppo and Babylon at the close of the reign of Ammisaduga. Since the Babylonian king can be accurately dated, the overthrow of Babylon by the Hittite king dates the period of the early Hittite rulers. It is then merely a matter of placing the generations in between. The known number of generations of Hittite rulers and the time between Ammisaduga and his Egyptian contemporary to the reign of Ramesses the Great agrees perfectly.

The only question is the supposed parallelism between Suppiluliumas and Akhenaten and Tutankhamen. This parallelism is impossible. It arose from a false assumption. The Hittite documents of Suppiluliumas and his son mention two Egyptian rulers by name. But the names are not specific. Scholars have merely assumed that the Hittite names may refer to Akhenaten and his son. The names could just as well belong to other Egyptian kings -- in this instance to the period of the close of Dynasty XXV This is the only possible period to which the events could apply. The eighteenth dynasty, archaeologists assume, died out with the widow of Tutankhamen. This is untrue. The line of Akhenaten continued to rule to the time of Piankhi the Ethiopian. The only dynasty to cease to reign through the male line in Egypt was that of the Ethiopians at the end of Dynasty XXV. The Ethiopians were killed in battle or fled from the Assyrians. The successor dynasty was Saite, of the line of Necho, an Egyptian family appointed by the Assyrians. This line intermarried into the Ethiopian line to legitimize its reign in Egypt. It is this family that must have plotted the death of the son

of Suppiluliumas who was on his way to Egypt to become heir to the Ethiopian line in Egypt.

The Kingdom of Mitanni and the Hurrians

In Mesopotamia, on the upper reaches of the Euphrates river, is a kingdom known as Mitanni in hieroglyphic and cuneiform records. This was the region in which the Median revolt occurred in 816. The history of the kingdom of Mitanni is, in fact, the history of the Medes and Midianites in the ninth and tenth centuries before the present era.

In the following chart the kingdom of Mitanni is restored to its proper place in history. In column one are the kings of Egypt. Column two, center, contains the kings of Mitanni. The third column is devoted to excerpts of important contemporary history. No date lists of the early kings of Mitanni are known.

Contemporary Kings of Egypt	Kings of Mitanni	History from Contemporary Sources
Thutmose I (1030-1017)	Suttarna I	Conquers city of Assur during Assyria's 50 years of decline (1041-991)
Thutmose II (1017-997)	Saussatar	
Thutmose III (997-943)	Artatama I	Thutmose III asks for his daughter to wife.
Thutmose IV (918-909)		
Amenhotpe III (909-871)	Suttarna II	Amenhotpe III sought his daughter in marriage.
	Artasura	Kingdom of Mitanni sundered.
	Tusratta, son of Suttarna II	
Akhenaton (871-854)	Mittiwaza	Rise of Hurrian kingdom under Artatama II and Suttarna III. Mattiwaza became Hittite vassal. Assyria rules Mesopotamia under Assur-uballit.

The final comment in column three again demonstrates that Assyria and the Great Kings of Kheta or Hatti formed one vast empire far more extensive than modern historians realize.

Who Were the Hurrians?

But who were the Hurrians who suddenly migrate from apparently nowhere to dwell in Mitanni on the borders of the Egyptian Empire in Asia? Of all the people known in the Middle East the "Hurrians," or "Harrians," are the most controversial. They should not be. Consider the facts of history.

Tushratta (Tusratta) was the first Mitannian king of this era to claim the title "lord of the Hurrian land" as well as "lord of the Mitanni land." ("Journal of Cuneiform Studies", XI, 3, p. 67, column two.) Tushratta was a contemporary of Amenhotpe III. Is there any record of a people in the days of Amenhotpe III who came to dwell on the borders of the Empire of Egypt? There certainly is. The record has already been mentioned in this Compendium in connection with Akhenaten ("Hurria" in Hittite) in the beginning of chapter eight. Here it is again: "The Ethiopians, removing from the River Indus, settled near Egypt."

There are two branches of Ethiopians in the world. wrote Herodotus. Those who dwell in India, with straight or wavy hair; and those who dwell in Africa with frizzled hair ("Polymnia", sect. 20). The Indian Cushites. or Ethiopians, are Aryan-speaking. The leaders of the Hurrians, or Harrians. were Indo-Iranian or Aryan speaking. The Hurrians worshipped Indra, Varuna and various other gods of the Hindu pantheon. No such worship has ever been found among African tribes. No migration to Africa from the Indus is known. But the migration of Indo-Iranian people into Mesopotamia is well attested in history.

Why, then, did Manetho, in the Book of Sothis, refer to "Egypt" as the neighborhood of the Ethiopian migration from the Indus? Because in the days of Amenhotpe III the Empire of Egypt extended to the Upper Euphrates. Literally dozens of Assyrian references speak of "Musri" -- Egypt -- as that territory immediately west of the Upper Euphrates. See the annals of Tiglath-pileser I, for example. As late as the days of Necho and Nebuchadnezzar the city of Carchemish, on the Euphrates. was regarded as the fixed border of Egypt. That the Hurrians were Cushites is also clear from Egyptian annals which speak of "God's Land, Syria and Cush."

The famous migration of Cushites into Mesopotamia during the reign of Amenhotpe had been preceded by Cushite migrations from the Persian highlands over a century before. They were the Kassu or Kassites under Gande, the first Kassite king. The Kassites worshipped Maruttash, a god of India. These Ethiopian incursions from the East were paralleled by Ethiopian conquests in Asia from Egypt under the Theban kings. The influence of the children of Cush in the ancient world has never been made plain before. It reveals why so many of the descendants of Aram and Lud, sons of Shem, show strong intermixture with dark races. In most of the Middle East, the population today has become light brown, not white, as a result of such mixture.

Phrygians and Hatti

To turn to northwestern Anatolia. Historians have constructed from Greek annals an extensive kingdom in northwestern Asia Minor called Phrygia. Its influence is known to have extended over much of Anatolia at the very time Assyrian and Egyptian history speaks of the Empire of Hatti.

"Phrygia" is a Greek word. The eleventh edition of the

"Encyclopaedia Britannica", article "Phrygia." provides its meaning: "Phrygia, the name of a large country in Asia Minor, inhabited by a race which the Greeks called Phryges, 'freemen'." The Phrygians -- or Freemen -- were said to have spoken "the original speech of mankind." They were known for their extensive wealth. It is said of one of their kings, Midas, that everything he touched turned to gold -- figuratively, of course! They showed a high degree of artistic skill.

After the Trojan War the region of Phrygia was utterly devastated by Cimmerians -- Greek for people of Gomer. The Phrygians gradually migrated into Europe. Because they came from the region ruled by the wild Cimmerian hordes, it was common to speak of the Phrygians also as Cimmerians. The Greek name Phryges was gradually changed to Phraggoi. When the Romans encountered them, they applied the Roman word for Freemen -- Franci -- Franks in English. Procopius, in his Roman history, called the Franks Phraggoi (III, 3, 1). They finally settled in France. Is it only a coincidence that the name of the capital of their new land is Paris -- the name of the famous Trojan or Phrygian hero Paris, son of Priam?

The original region which the Greeks called Phrygia extended to the Hellespont, for the Phrygians at one time controlled the sea. This land was termed Wilusa or Uilusa in Hattic inscriptions. The Great Kings of Hatti were allied with the Phrygians of Wilusa -- a name changed in later Greek to Ilion, the plain of Troy. "In bygone times Labarnas, my ancestor, fought against the Arzawan Lands and the Land of Wilusa; he subdued them. Now after that, Arzawa became hostile ... but never did the Land of Wilusa secede from Hatti, but from afar they remained loyal to the kings of Hatti," declared the Treaty of Muwatallis, Great King of Hatti, with Alaksandus (Alexander) of Wilusa (Ilion, or early Phrygia). This union maintained itself even after both the Assyrians in the land of Hatti and the Phrygians were defeated at the fall of Troy in 677.

The collapse of Phrygia and the decline of the Hittites east of the Halys River basin in 677 is confirmed by Herodotus. His words are: "... the Medes bent under the Persian yoke, after they had ruled over all Asia beyond the river Halys for the space of one hundred and twenty-eight years, excepting the interval of the Scythian dominion" ("Clio", 130). The Medes succumbed to Cyrus in 549. And 128 years before is 677 the date of the Fall of Troy and the defeat of the Hatti who were Trojan allies. There were no five centuries of darkness between the so-called "Hittite Empire" and the Medes. One followed the other. West of the Halys River the Phrygians are said by several classical writers to have been overrun in the succeeding year, 676, by the Cimmerians.

In a sense the Phrygians and Assyrians in Hatti were one vast confederation. When these people journeyed into Europe they maintained the old league. The Romans recognized among the Franks, or Phraggoi, two groups: East and West Franks. The one German, the other French. The German tribe called East Frankish was the Chatti or Hessian tribe -- the same as in ancient Anatolia. Could history repeat itself any more precisely?

In reading any book on Asia Minor -- many are now being published -- always remember that it is common practice to apply the name "Hittite" to all peoples of Asia Minor. It properly belongs only to Canaanite Hittites, a wild and rude people who disappeared from the area after the fall of Persia.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

How Greek History Was Corrupted

It is not generally admitted. But Homer, the famous epic poet of Greece, was mad. His "Iliad" and "Odyssey" -- recording the events surrounding the Greek struggles with Troy -- were written while Homer was demented.

Homer was not merely an insane poet. He was also a mad historian. Through Homer Greek history was altered, with diabolical cleverness. Homer telescoped three Greek wars with Troy into one. Men and events five centuries apart are artificially joined together as if contemporary. Recent archaeological investigation at Troy reveals Homer's lie. There are three wars layers -- the first and last separated by about five centuries' (See C. W. Blegen's "Troy," in the revised edition of the "Cambridge Ancient History".)

Little wonder Paul the apostle wrote of Homer -- and of Hesiod and the other demented poets: "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying ..." (I Timothy 1:4).

Greeks Admit Homer Was Demented

No poet in ancient Greece was ever considered worthy of special honor unless he was demented. Democritus "denies that any one can be a great poet, unless he is mad," wrote Cicero (Cicero, "Divin"., i, 80). Homer was therefore mad.

Plato described the unusual kind of insanity that clutched the minds of Greece's great poet-historians and philosophers. In the "Phaedrus" Plato characterizes "poetic inspiration" as the "state of being possessed by the Muses" -- a kind of "madness, which, on entering a delicate and virgin soul, arouses and excites it to frenzy in odes and other kinds of poetry But he that is without the Muses' madness when he knocks at the doors of Poesy, fancying that art alone will make him a competent poet, -- he and his poetry, the poetry of sober sense, will never attain perfection, but will be eclipsed by the poetry of inspired madmen" (245 A). Again, in the "Laws" Plato wrote that "whenever a poet is enthroned on the tripod of the Muse, he is not in his right mind" (719 C). In "Ion" the Greek theory of "inspiration" is most thoroughly expressed: "It is not by art, but by being inspired and possessed, that all good epic poets produce their beautiful poems they are dancing, even so the melic poets are not in their right mind when they are composing their beautiful strains. On the contrary, when they have fallen under the spell of melody and metre, they are like inspired revellers, and on becoming possessed, -- even as the Maenads are possessed and not in their right senses ... the soul of the melic poets acts in like manner, as they themselves admit And what they say is true; for the poet ... cannot compose until he becomes inspired and out of his senses, with his mind no longer in him; but, so long as he is in possession of his senses, not one of them is capable of composing, or of uttering his oracular sayings" (533 E-534 D).

In Biblical terms, Homer and all the famous Greek poet-historians were possessed of demons. It was not really the poets or philosophers who uttered the sayings, but the demon, masquerading as God, "who is the speaker, and it is THROUGH them that he is speaking to us,"

concluded the author of "Ion".

The conclusion is absolutely clear. History has purposely been perverted by the diabolical influence of fallen spirits who seized the minds of poet-historians, such as Homer and Hesiod, and through them twisted the events of antiquity. Jesus Himself declared that Satan, the prince of demons, "deceiveth the whole world" (Revelation 12:9). One of Satan's clever artifices is manifest in the form of corrupted history! This diabolical plot to make God and His Word appear untrue has deceived the whole world.

The Plot Centers on Troy

The final fall of Troy in 677 occurred at the close of the reign of Thuoris (694-677) of Egypt. Eusebius confused this Thuoris with the later queen Twosre and placed the event in her last year of reign. (See the restoration of Egyptian history in this Compendium.) The year 677 marked the rise of Media (according to Herodotus) to power in Asia Minor east of the Halys river.

The third fall of Troy in 677 climaxed a ten-year siege of the city. A Greek victory had once before occurred -- about 504 years before, in 1181. Another war, ending in 1149 -- and to be discussed later -- is generally unreported in Greek annals, for it was a Greek defeat!

Archaeology finds evidence of all three wars. Homer's epics deliberately associate the leaders and events of the third war with those of the first war. By so doing half of the history of ancient Greece was made to appear over five centuries too early. Events that transpired between 1181 and 677 were pushed back to the period 1685-1181.

The same diabolical conspiracy that worked through Homer in Greece also worked through the priesthood of Egypt. Its dynasties were deliberately placed successively so that sections of Egyptian history appeared five centuries earlier. Similar diabolic manipulations occurred in Mesopotamia. When later Greek, Roman, and now modern critics and historians found Homer in apparent agreement with the altered Egyptian and Mesopotamian data, they never thought to question Homer or the Egyptian records. The conspiracy -- the deception -- was so thorough, so far superior to human ingenuity that the whole world has been deceived by it.

Homer and the Lydian Kings

To perpetuate this deception -- for the critics and historians cannot admit they have been deceived -- we are told that Homer lived several centuries before 677, in fact, near the time of the first Greek war with Troy.

If Homer lived at that early period, counter the critics, how could Homer have been responsible for a clever twisting of historical events that occurred long after he was dead?

The answer is, Homer's own writings date his life to the time of Gyges, king of Lydia. Homer mentions "'the Gygaean lake,' so called from Gyges, king of Lydia" (J. S. Watson's footnote to Alexander Pope's translation).

Before proceeding further, it is important to inset the kings of Lydia, from which the date of Homer may be determined. Herodotus is

absolutely correct in his list of late Lydian kings. Modern historians attempt arbitrarily to shorten the reigns of the Lydian monarchs. Following is a list of the last royal family -- the Mermnadae -- to rule Lydia to the time of Cyrus, king of Persia.

Mermnadae Kings of Lydia	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Gyges	38	716-678
Ardys	49	678-629
Sadyattes	12	629-617
Alyattes	57	617-560
Croesus	14	560-546

In 546 Sardis, the capital of Lydia, was overthrown.

Prior to the Mermnadae, another line of kings governed Lydia -- the Heraclidae. Their rule lasted 22 generations during 505 years -- 1221-716 (Herodotus, I, 7).

The history of the kingdom of Lydia, settled heavily by the children of Lud, son of Shem, has been lost. All that has been preserved are a few fragments of Xanthus' history of his nation.

Restoring Greek History

The modern interpretation of ancient Grecian civilization is a paradox. Strange though it may seem, historians today reject the valid history of Greece as error and take for granted the Homeric fable of the Trojan War!

It is time history students were told why the traditional histories of Athens, of Sparta, Sicyon and Corinth have been rejected -- and why confusion rules the dates of the Trojan War. This kind of twisted thinking took its rise in the German literary criticism of the eighteenth century. In the German schools all antiquity was rejected in total as fabulous. None of the ancients knew how to write, the critics assumed. And oral tradition was at best a weak link. Within a century the historians, trained in this literary atmosphere, began to assume the same rationalist explanations of the past. With no history left by which their speculations could be judged, the historians were free -- so they thought -- to reconstruct the Aegean world. Even the Trojan War was called into question as fabulous. It barely passed muster.

But what the historians never thought to query was the general date of the last Trojan War. The literary critics wanted to believe in the early dating of the war with Troy to make it appear as folklore. Historians, newly entering the critical field, accepted as valid the literary critics' supposition of one early Trojan War. It never occurred to them that the period of the last war over Troy had been confused with the first war and the contemporary kings of Argos and Mycenae. Once the dates of the three major Trojan Wars are determined, the problems in Greek history vanish.

Kings of Corinth

The chronological history of Greece commences later than the Tower of Babel. Hence it is necessary to begin with more recent times and build up the history of early Greece to its beginning. The starting point will be the city-state Corinth, whose dates will be immediately confirmed by those of Athens. The kings of Corinth ruled for 323 years. They were followed by a constitutional oligarchy for 90 years, then by the Tyranny of the Cypselidae. The dates of the Cypselidae are determined from nearly contemporary sources.

It should be noted that late traditional dating in the Greek world was made to conform to the Olympiads, which began at the summer solstice. The following lists may therefore generally be considered June-to-June calendar years.

The rule of the Cypselidae Tyranny lasted 73 and 1/2 years, according to Aristotle ("Politics", 1315b). It dates from 656 (June) to 583 (December). The founder of the tyranny, Cypselus, reigned altogether 30 years -- 656-626. According to Eusebius, however, he associated his son Periander with him in the government in 628, after 28 years. Periander, according to Aristotle, ruled altogether 44 years until his death in 584. The date of the death of the tyrant Periander is given by Diogenes Laertius in "Periandros". Laertius, quoting Sosikrates, places it at the end of Olympiad 48, 4, immediately before Olympiad 49, 1. As the Olympiads commenced in 776, the 48th Olympiad ended at the summer solstice in 584. (Each Olympiad consists of 4 years.)

The last of the Corinthian tyrants was Psammetichus, the brother or nephew of Periander. He ruled three years according to Aristotle -- 586-583 (December to December). Psammetichus came to the government SIX MONTHS AFTER Periander had completed his 40th year (reckoned from the death of Cypselus in 626), or his 42nd year (reckoned from the beginning of his reign in 628). The Armenian version of Eusebius assigns to Periander 43 years, including the calendar year in which Psammetichus came to the government.

The commencement of the Corinthian Tyranny by Cypselus in 656 marked the overthrow of the Constitutional Oligarchy. The Constitution lasted altogether 90 years -- 746-656. In the year 746 the last of the early kings of Corinth was overthrown. The revolt ended 323 years of kingship. The following chart lists the kings of Corinth from the beginning of their rule in 1069 to the revolt of 746. The significance of the year 1069 will be discussed under the history of Athens.

Kings of Corinth	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Aletes	35	1069-1034
Ixion	37	1034- 997
Agelaus	37	997- 960
Prymnus	34 (or 35)	960- 926 (960- 925)
Bacchis	36 (or 35)	926- 890 (925- 890)
Agelas	30	890- 860

Eudemus	25	860- 835
Aristomedes	35	835- 800
Agemon	16	800- 784
Alexander	25	784- 759
Telestes	12	759- 747
Automenes	1	747- 746
The Constitution	90	746- 656
The Tyranny	73 1/2	656- 583

The History of Athens

Athens was for centuries, as it is today, the chief city of Greece. Its early history focuses on the year 1069 when an Athenian victory combined with a great earthquake to rekindle the myth of the "fall of Atlantis."

Modern writers reject Athens' early history altogether of course, they have never disproved it. Their only argument is the falacious assumption that the Greeks could not have known their own history!

The following chart gives the complete framework of Athenian history which has been preserved correctly from Castor, the historian of Rhodes, in the Eusebian Chronicles. Athenian history commences with the founding of the city by Cecrops in 1556.

Kings of Athens	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Cecrops	50	1556-1506
Cranaus	9	1506-1497
Amphictyon	10	1497-1487
Erechthonius	50	1487-1437
Pandion I	40	1437-1397
Erechtheus	50	1397-1347
Cecrops II	40	1347-1307
Pandion II	25	1307-1282
Aegaeus	48	1282-1234
Theseus	30	1234-1204
Menestheus	23	1204-1181

(Eusebius dates the fall of Troy in the First Trojan War to the year 1181, just before the summer solstice. Immediately after the war

Menestheus was murdered at the Isle of Melus, before he was able to return to Athens.)

Demophon	33	1181-1148
Oxyntes	12	1148-1136
Aphidas	1	1136-1135
Thymoetes	8	1135-1127
Melanthus	37	1127-1090
Codrus	21	1090-1069

Codrus, the last Athenian king, perished in a great war in 1069. Though she lost her king, Athens triumphed over her foes. It was in this very year -- 1069 -- that Athen's enemies turned the rule of Corinth over to Aletes. Who they were will be noted shortly. To honor the fallen king, Athenians agreed that no other man in after days should have the honor of that office. Thereafter Athenian rulers assumed the title of Archon. Until 753 the Archons held office throughout their lifetime. The Perpetual Archons are listed next.

Perpetual Archons of Athens	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Medon, son of Codrus	20	1069-1049
Acastus	36	1049-1013
Archippus	19	1013- 994
Thersippus	41	994- 953
Phorbas	31	953- 922
Megacles	30	922- 892
Diognetus	28	892- 864
Pherecles	19	864- 845
Ariphron	20	845- 825
Thespheus	27	825- 798
Agamestor	20	798- 778
Aeschylus	23	778- 755
Alcmaeon	2	755- 753

In 753 the Perpetual Archons were replaced by Dicennial Archons. That is, each held the office for 10 years. The seven Dicennial Archons of Athens were Charops, Aesimides, Clidicus, Hippomenes, Leocrates, Apsander, Eryxias. Their rule covered a period of 70 years -- 753-683.

In 683 the government of the Athenians -- famous for their democracy -- passed into the hands of Annual Archons, the first of whom was Creon. This date is fixed by numerous evidences. See Clinton's "Fasti Hellenici", I, 182.

The History of Sicyon

Athens was not the oldest city in Greece. That honor goes to Sicyon, a city located near Corinth. Interestingly enough, Sicyon ceased to be an important city during the flowering of Corinth, beginning in 1069. When Corinth became subject to internal strife during the reign of Periander, Sicyon again rose to prominence under the Tyranny of Clisthenes. It quickly achieved a high degree of prosperity and fame.

The ancient city-state of Sicyon lasted 1000 years, according to Apollodorus and others. Its prominence blanketed the millennium from 2063 to 1063. That the figure should be exactly 1000 years has troubled many a historian. Yet that is the plain record of history. When will men learn that the destinies of men and of cities and nations are in the hands of God who numbers all things! He determines the times and the seasons during which men rule.

There were other ancient Greek historians who reckoned the history of Sicyon differently. The information preserved from their writings assigns Sicyon dominion for only 962 years -- that is, from 2063 to 1101. Year 1101 is the time of the re-establishment of the Heraclidae at Sparta, 80 years after the fall of Troy in the First Trojan War.

Both these views of the history of Sicyon are valid. The difference is only one of viewpoint. For during the years from 1101 to 1063 the old dynasty at Sicyon was displaced by priests of Apollo Carnaeus who were subservient to the Heraclidae.

The original name of Sicyon was Aegialea. This Greek name was derived from the city's first king, Aegialeus.

The name Aegialeus in Greek means "man of the coastland" or "shoreland" (Smith's "Classical Dictionary", art. "Achaia"). Compare this with the meaning of the name Eber, or Heber, from which the word Hebrew is derived. One of the root meanings of Eber is "shoreland" or "shoreregion." Another root meaning is "migrant." Both are very closely related. The ancient routes of migration usually took one along the shores of a river or along coastlands.

The evidence unmistakeably points to the name Aegialeus as a Greek translation of Heber. In other words, Hebrews were among the settlers of ancient Greece.

Elisha, son of Javan, also settled the Greek coastlands. From him the name Hellas came to be applied to Greece.

Early influence of Hebrew people in the Grecian land is also recorded throughout Greek history. Witness the incursions of the Hyksos -- the Edomite Heraclidae -- a branch of the Hebrews. Later the Danites from Palestine appear. The influence of Hebrews in the Grecian land helps to explain one of the most remarkable events in the Gentile world -- the choosing of the Greek nation to preserve the New Testament Scriptures.

The Greeks knew of the God of Shem because the Hebrews, a Semitic people, dwelt among them. Two thousand years in advance God was preparing the Greek people for the preservation of His Word.

Moreover the Greeks have preserved most of the history of the ancient world. Manetho has come down to us, not in the Egyptian tongue,

but in the Greek language. The early history of Assyria is found in Greek, so also that of the early kings of Media.

But to return to the kingship of Aegialea or Sicyon.

Kings of Sicyon	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Aegialeus	52	2063-2011
Europs	45	2011-1966
Telchin	20	1966-1946
Apis	25	1946-1921
Thelxion	52	1921-1869
Aegydrus	34	1869-1835
Thurimachus	45	1835-1790
Leucippus	53	1790-1737
Messapus	47	1737-1690
Eratus, or Peratus	46	1690-1644
Plemnaeus	48	1644-1596
Orthopolis	63	1596-1533
Marathon	30	1533-1503
Marathus	20	1503-1483
Echireus	55	1483-1428
Corax	30	1428-1398

(The lists, as they have been handed down, add Epopeus next, followed by Lamedon, younger brother of Corax. Epopeus was a foreigner, a Shepherd King, who demolished Greek temples and altars. He is Apophis I of Egypt, Hyksos king of Dynasty XV. As Egyptian records proved he died in 1326, it is clear that Lamedon preceded Epopeus, then was driven into exile. He returned, in old age, and ended his reign shortly afterward.)

Lamedon	40	1398-1358
Epopeus	32	1358-1326
Lamedon again	3	1326-1323

(According to Sycellus, Lamedon reigned altogether 43 years. Eusebius assigns him only 40 years -- the years prior to his exile. Eusebius attributes 35 years (from 1358-1323) to the era of Epopeus, and takes no note of Lamedon's reign after his return.)

Sicyon, who gave his name to the city.	45 (or 42)	1323-1278 (1323-1281)
Polybus	40 (or 43)	1278-1238 (1281-1238)
Inachus	42	1238-1196
Phaestus	8	1196-1188
Adrastus	4	1188-1184
Polyphides	31	1184-1153
Pelasgus	20	1153-1133
Zeuxippus	31 (or 32)	1133-1102 (1133-1101)

(The year 1102-1101 marks the return of the famous Heraclidae, in the 80th year after the fall of Troy (1181) in the First Trojan war. In his last year Zeuxippus was compelled to share the throne with the priests of Apollo Carneus, appointed at the return of the Heraclidae.)

Priests of Apollo Carneus Governing Sicyon	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Archelaus	1	1102-1101
Automedon	1	1101-1100
Theoclytus	4	1100-1096
Euneus	6	1096-1090
Theonomus	9	1090-1081
Amphichyes	12 (or 18)	1081-1069 (1081-1063)

The year 1069 (for the reign of Amphichyes) is the date of the decisive struggle when Athens maintained her independence against a grand alliance of foreign peoples, associated with the Heraclidae. In 1069 Corinth superseded Sicyon as the dominant city in the Corinthian plain.

Enter Sparta

One of the most famous cities in the classical Greek period was Sparta. Castor wrote the history of this famous city. Though now lost, its bare outline is preserved by Eusebius and others. Sparta was founded by the Heraclidae 80 years after the First Trojan War. From here, a generation later they launched an attack on Athens. Though finally defeated, they were yet strong enough to establish a new line of native kings in Corinth friendly to Sparta. The Spartan kingship,

descended from the Heraclidae, was very unusual in that two royal houses ruled the throne at the same time for almost 900 years. A full list of the two royal houses is preserved in Lempriere's "Classical Dictionary", article "Lacedaemon." The following short summary from Eusebius is all that needs be included in this Compendium.

Many doubts have arisen over the dates of the Spartan kings due to the tradition among them of dating the reigns from the time of appointment to the throne as minors. In most instances Spartan kings are known to have lived into the reigns of successors who are listed chronologically as kings when only minors under tutelage.

Agidae Kings of Sparta to the First Olympic according to Eusebius	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Eurysthenes	42	1101-1059
Agis	1	1059-1058
Echestratus	35	1058-1023
Labotas	37	1023- 986
Dorysthus	29	986- 957
Agesilaus	44	957- 913
Archelaus	60	913- 853
Teleclus	40	853- 813
Alcamenes	37	813- 776

About the year 813, when Alcamenes came to the throne, a migration into Macedonia occurred. A new line of kings was founded in Macedonia of Greco-Heraclidae descent. From this line ultimately sprang Alexander the Great, as illustrated in the following chart.

Kings of Macedonia to Alexander the Great	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Caranus	28	813-785
Coenus	12	785-773
Tyrimmas	38	773-735
Perdicca I	51	735-684
Argaeus I	38	684-646
Philippus I	38	646-608
Aeropus	26	608-582
Alcetas	29	582-553

Amyntas I	50	553-503
Alexander	43	503-460
Perdicca II	28	460-432
Archelaus	24	432-408
Orestes	3	408-405
Archelaus (again)	4	405-401
Amyntas II	1	401-400
Pausanias	1	400-399
Amyntas II (again)	6	399-393
Argaeus II	2	393-391
Amyntas II (again)	18	391-373
Alexander	1	373-372
Ptolemaeus	4	372-368
Perdicca III	6	368-362
Philippus II	26	362-336
Alexander the Great	12	336-324

In the preceding list the duration of time is accurately preserved. But it should be noted that in several occasions the change of reign does not mark the death of the predecessor, but the appointment to royalty of the son and heir to the throne. This same type of varied dating also occurred in ancient Egypt. It has led historians to treat the records as artificial or fabricated, when they should have viewed the records as relating only part of the story.

Alexander died in his 13th year, in 323. But as the Macedonians adopted the non-accession-year system, the last incomplete year of Alexander -- 324-323 -- was assigned as the first year of his brother Phillip.

Who Were the Heraclidae?

Most everyone has assumed that the Heraclidae were Greeks by descent. That they were influenced by Greek culture and language is true. But they were not originally Greek in ancestry. With occasional intermarriage they became partly Grecianized.

The Heraclidae are said to have returned 80 years after the First Trojan War. They returned to Greece from Asia Minor. Asia Minor had earlier been dominated by the Hyksos rulers -- Apophis and Khayan. The Hyksos were Amalekites and other tribes descended of Edom (see the early chapter on the history of the Hyksos in this Compendium). Was there a racial affinity between Hyksos and Heraclidae?

The Greeks called these people Heraclidae after an ancestor Heracles. Who that man was may be discovered by investigating the history of Argos in Greece.

The History of Argos

The story of the taking of Troy by Agamemnon is known to almost every schoolboy who has studied literature. What is not known today is the history of Agamemnon's dynasty. How, and when it originated, through whom it began.

The complete list of rulers of the Greek cities of Argos, Mycenae, Tiryns in the Argolid plain of Greece to the first Trojan War is derived from Castor. It has been preserved in entirety by Eusebius. (See "Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Drei Jahrhunderte", vol. 7, edited by Rudolf Helm.) The list is given below, with the correct dates.

Kings of Argos to End of First Trojan War According to Castor, from Eusebius	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Inachus	50	1852-1802
Phoroneus	60	1802-1742
Apis	35	1742-1707
Argus	70	1707-1637
Criasus	54	1637-1583
Phorbas	35	1583-1548
Triopas	46	1548-1502
Crotopus	21	1502-1481
Sthenelus	11	1481-1470
Danaus, fled from Egypt to Greece	50	1470-1420
Lynceus, son-in-law of Danaus	41	1420-1379
Abas	23	1379-1356
Proetus	17	1356-1339
Acrisius	31	1339-1308
Eurystheus	45	1308-1263
Atreus and Thyestes	65	1263-1198

Agamemnon, exercised
hegemony over Argos

17

1198-1181

Agamemnon reigned 35 years according to Eusebius -- that is, from 1215 to 1180. His first seventeen years were in his youth, when Thyestes still governed. The Greeks seized Troy in the beginning of summer, in 1181, at the very beginning of the eighteenth year of Agamemnon. The king lost his life at the end of the year upon his return to Greece.

The date of Inachus is significant. Inachus is but the Latin form of the Greek name Inachos, or the Egyptian name Weneg. The tradition is that Inachus and his immediate descendants were in some way connected with Egypt. A comparison with Dynasty II of Egypt reveals a king Weneg whose reign ended in 1852, the very year Inachus appeared in Greece! There can be no doubt that this was an early Egyptian colony in Greece. Inachus was not some unknown hero. He was of the royal family of Egypt. Note Egyptian names of son and grandson -- Phoroneus, Apis -- as added proof.

Genealogy of Danaus

Now consider the lineage of Danaus who came to Egypt with his brother Aegyptus, according to Greek tradition, from somewhere in the region of Arabia or Palestine. The lineage, given below, with dates of those who ruled in Greece, is from Henry Clinton's "Fasti Hellenici", vol. I, p. 101. Unless otherwise stated, each is presumed a son of the name above.

Belus, father of Danaus and Aegyptus
The many sons of Aegyptus who ruled in Egypt
constituted Dynasty VII of Memphis.

Danaus (1470-1420)

Hypermnestra, daughter of Danaus
Married Lynceus (1420-1379), son of Aegyptus

Abas (1379-1356)

Acrisius (1339-1308)

Danae, a daughter
Danae secretly had a son by "Zeus" -- probably
Giemshid the Persian king.

Perseus, the Alpidun of the Persian king list
Perseus was grandfather of Eurystheus of Argos
(1308-1263). He had a son Perses, report the Greeks.
Persian history makes Perses the son of Irege, son
of Perseus. Since Irege died before his father,
Perseus must have adopted Perses as his son. His
Persian name was Manougeher, and he was known as
Phirouz -- that is, Perses.

Electryo, daughter of Perseus

Alcmena, a daughter

Heracles, a contemporary of Eurystheus

Hyllus

Cleodaeus

Aristomachus

Aristodemus

Eurysthenes (1101-1059), king of Sparta

From him one of the royal Spartan kingly lines descended. The Spartans claimed descent from Abraham according to a letter they wrote to the Jews. See Josephus: "Antiquities of the Jews", XII, iv, 10 and XIII, v. 8. The Jews admitted the truth of the statement, saying they found it in their Scriptures.

Our question is where in Scripture is Belus, the ancestor of this royal line, mentioned? The only Belus mentioned at that period in the Bible is Bela (the Latin form would be Belus), the son of Beor and brother of Balaam. Bela was a king of Edom (Genesis 36:32). Edom was the son of Isaac and grandson of Abraham. Here is one of the earliest indications of the settlement of the Aegean and the western parts of Turkey by the sons of Esau. The ancient Spartans were a very warlike people, at constant cross-purposes with other Greek city-states.

Now consider the chronological significance of Danaus' actual arrival in Argos. Note that Danaus first arrived in Argos in 1486 -- the actual year he fled from his brother when the Hyksos quarreled over setting up the kingship in Egypt. For the significance of 1486 see the section on Egyptian history concerning the Exodus.

Kings of Argos According to Syncellus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Inachus, Weneg of Dynasty II of Egypt	56	1858-1802
Phoroneus	60	1802-1742
Apis	35	1742-1707
Argus	70	1707-1637
Criacus	55	1637-1582
Phorbas	25	1582-1557
Triopas	36	1557-1521
Crotopus	24	1521-1497
Sthenelus	11	1497-1486
Danaus, flees from his brother	58	1486-1428

Lynceus	35	1428-1393
Abas	37	1393-1356
Proetus	17	1356-1339

Sea Powers of the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean

One of the most interesting documents of antiquity is a list of Sea Powers (Thalassocracies) preserved by Eusebius from Diodorus. This list begins with the revival of anti-Greek Heraclidae power in the second Trojan War under the Maeonians who settled in Lydia. The Maeonians are mentioned in the Bible, in Judges 10:12 as Maonites, and as allies of the Midianites and Amalekites. (See also Judges 6:33.) "The Journal of Hellenic Studies", Vol. XXVII (1907), page 83, provides the most important scholarly study of the Thalassocracies yet made.

Sea Powers (Thalassocrasies) of the Eastern Mediterranean and Aegean Seas to 480	Duration	Date
Lydians, who are the Maeonians	92	1149-1057
Pelasgians or Sea Peoples	85	1057- 972
Thracians	79	972- 893
Rhodians	23	893- 870
Phrygians	25	870- 845
Cyprians	32	845- 813
Phoenicians	45	813- 768
Egyptians	43	768- 725
Milesians	18	725- 707
Carians	61	707- 646
Lesbians	68 (or 96)	646- 578 (674- 578)
Phocaeians	44	578- 534
Samians	17	534- 517
Lacedemonians (Spartans)	2	517- 515
Naxians	10	515- 505
Eritreans	15	505- 490

In the year 480 Xerxes marches his armies from Asia into Europe.

Several significant figures appear in the preceding list of Sea Powers. The year 1149 marks the period of the Second Trojan War, and the defeat of the Greeks. In archaeological finds at Troy, two war layers immediately follow one another -- one ending in 1181, the second in 1149. Troy, it must be noted, was a key port, the control of which was essential if the Lydians or Maeonians were to gain control of the seas. A third war layer, during the Mycenaean period, is separated by about five centuries of deposits.

The name Pelasgians in Greek annals referred to the Phoenicians and Israelites. Notice that the period of Pelasgian domination in Greek literature (1057-972) covered the period of Phoenician greatness and of Solomon's reign, referred to so often in the Bible.

Notice also the period of the Carian control of the sea. Diodorus (V, 84) declares that the Carians continued to grow in sea power even after the war with Troy. The Third Trojan War was ended in 677. This was the very period of Carian dominance. The Carians were also famous as hired mercenaries during the early years of Psammetichus of Egypt.

But what of the Egyptian sea power? No sea power of Egypt is known between 768-725 according to the modern interpretation of Egyptian history. When Egyptian history is restored, however, this period is very significant. The year 768 is the second year of Osorthon, of Dynasty XXIII of Tanis on the shore of the Mediterranean. Osorthon is called Heracles by the Greeks and was famous for his sea expeditions.

Take special note also of the dates of sea power of the Cyprians and the Phoenicians. Compare these with the chart in a succeeding chapter on the archaeological sequence of Troy. Note that the Mycenaean Late Bronze period at Troy commences during this period. This list of sea powers will offer strong evidence that the Mycenaean culture was not native Greek, but Phoenician. That the homeland of Mycenaean wares was the Syrian coast, and that the extensive settlement of Phoenician colonies in the Greek world occurred during this and succeeding centuries. The Mycenaean culture paralleled native Greek wares with their geometric designs.

The History of Italy

Troy is famous in European history. After the third war over Troy, many peoples from Asia Minor migrated into Northwestern Europe and carried the name of Troy with them. London became New Troy. In France appeared Troyes.

The refugees of the First Trojan War settled also in Italy. They founded Lavinium two years after the First Trojan War -- that is, in 1179 -- and later the city of Alba (the site of the Pope's summer palace today) at the time of the Second Trojan War in 1149. (Consult Dionysius or Diodorus for these details.) The Trojan royal house founded in Italy a line of kings that reigned in Alba from 1178 until 753, when the center of government passed to Rome.

Latinus, king of Latium who preceded the Trojans, died in 1178, three years after fall of Troy in 1181. In Greek his name is spelled "Lateinos". Aenaes the Trojan, son-in-law of Latinus, succeeds him.

Early Kings of Lavinium

Lengths of Reign

Dates

(founded 1179) and Alba
(founded 1149) after the
First Trojan War

Aenaes	3	1178-1175
Ascanius	38	1175-1137
Sylvius	29	1137-1108
Aenaes Sylvius	31	1108-1077
Latinus Sylvius	50	1077-1027
Alba Sylvius	39	1027- 988
Aegyptus Sylvius	24	988- 964
Capis Sylvius	28	964- 936
Carpentus Sylvius	13	936- 923
Tiberinus Sylvius	8	923- 915
Agrippa Sylvius	41	915- 874
Aremulus Sylvius	19	874- 855
Aventinus Sylvius	37	855- 818
Procas Sylvius	23 (or 21)	818- 795 (818- 797)
Amulius Sylvius	42 (or 44)	795- 753 (797- 753)

In 753, according to the accurate account of the Roman historian Varro, Rome was re-founded for the third time. Shortly before that famous event the twins Romulus and Remus killed Amulius Sylvius in the last year of his reign. Amulius Sylvius had deprived his older brother Numitor, maternal grandfather of the twins, of the throne at Alba.

Slight variations in the preceding list occur in some authors. Eusebius assigned only 40 years to Agrippa Sylvius, predating each reign: Dionysius designated 51 to Lateinos Sylvius, postdating the reigns.

Another variation indicating joint rule is given in chart form thus:

Aenaes Sylvius	30	1108-1078
Lateinos Sylvius	50	1078-1028
Alba Sylvius	38	1028- 990
Aegyptus Sylvius	26	990- 964

Kings of Rome to the Founding of the Republic	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Romulus	37	753- 716
(An Interregnum of one year followed -- 716-715)		
Numa Pompilius	43	715- 672
Tullus Hostilius	32	672- 640
Ancus Martius	24	640- 616
Tarquinius Priscus	38	616- 578
Servius Tullius	44 (or 34)	578- 534 (578- 544)
Tarquinius Superbus	25 (or 35)	534- 509 (544- 509)

In the 25th year (or 35th) year of Tarquinius Supurbus -- 510-509 -- the first Roman Consuls were appointed. They held their office about 16 months. The Consuls thereafter held their office for a Roman calendar year -- January to January. A complete list of consular magistrates may be had in Lempriere's "A Classical Dictionary", article "Consul".

In several instances in the preceding list, the lengths of reign of the kings are shortened by some authors -- notably Eusebius, Cicero, Polybius -- who viewed the royal power as subordinate, on occasion, to the Senate. But the full and correct account is preserved correctly by Dionysius of Halicarnassus' "Roman Antiquities", I, 75.

Hereafter the history of Rome is essentially correct in most histories -- though the lessons of Roman rule have yet to be learned by Man!

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

The History of Ireland

At first thought it may appear unusual that the Emerald Isle should have a recorded history far older than Rome. There is a reason.

Unlike Italy, for example, which for centuries felt the ravages of foreign invaders who drove out, in successive waves, each predecessor, Ireland remained under the continuous dominion of one people. Irish history begins, not with the Tower of Babel, but at the end of the flood. Irish history is the only literature which specifically connects Israel with its past. It has long been assumed that late monks invented this relationship under Catholic influence. Nothing could be further from the truth. Catholic influence elsewhere never associated the ancient world with Israel -- except the obvious case of Egypt. And in Ireland the Catholic monks did their best to make it appear that Ireland was not settled by Hebrews at all, but by Magog! This Irish "myth" had its origin among the Catholic monks.

How Confusion Arose in Irish History

The history of Ireland under the Milesian kings has come down to us in two forms -- a short and a long form. The long form arose out of an attempt to make Irish history conform to the faulty chronology of the Septuagint Version approved by the Roman Catholic Church. The Domestic Annals were artfully expanded to make it appear that Irish history commenced centuries earlier than it did in fact. The task of the monks was rendered easy by an unusual circumstance.

Under the Irish kings, Ireland was divided into several kingships or countries. Each country had its own sovereign who was related by blood to the other royal families. Among these contemporaries there was constant strife. First one branch, then another, gained the ascendancy and held the supreme office over Ireland. Whichever king sat on the throne in the supreme office became known as an "Ard-Riga" or Arch King. As each King usually ruled much longer over his own kingship or country than as Arch King, he would have a longer and a shorter length of reign. At times there were disputed claims to the Arch Kingship, and also joint reigns. Each of these factors made it easy for certain later monks, who followed the Septuagint, to alter and expand the official record.

The original and correct history of the Milesians in Ireland has, however, been preserved unaltered only in the Domestic Annals, the official history of ancient Ireland. They may be found in O'Flaherty's "Ogygia". They have been reproduced in French in A.-M.-H.-J. Stokvis' "Manuel D'Histoire", volume II, pages 234-235. The early history of Ireland, from the flood to the coming of the Milesians, may be found in Geoffrey Keating's "History of Ireland", but his chronology is not always correct. In the following tables the Irish spellings have been generally preserved, including the unpronounced "h's" indicative of aspirate sounds, a Hebrew affinity.

The First 1000 Years

According to Irish history the first claim to Irish soil was made

by Nin mac Piel -- that is Irish for the Assyrian king Ninus, son of Bel or Belus. But no permanent settlement was established.

Ireland remained generally uninhabited for about three hundred years after the flood -- 2368-2068 -- records Keating (p. 114). In 2068 Parthalon and a band of Hebrew warriors arrived from the Greek world and established a settlement at Inis Saimer, a small island in the river Erne, at Ballyshannon. Thirty years later -- 2038 -Parthalon died and the land was divided between his four sons; Er, Orba, Ferann, and Fergna (p. 120) (p, 118). Twenty years later (2018) a plague befell the settlers. The settlers were exterminated, save for those who fled. After 30 years of desolation -- 2018-1988 -- the remnant that fled returned to Ireland and continued to inhabit it for another 250 years until 1738. The total time which the family of the Parthalonians inhabited Ireland was 300 years -- from 2068-2018 and from 1988-1738. Keating records that at this time another catastrophe came upon the Parthalonians, possibly at the hands of Phoenician Formorians. Keating quotes (p. 118) a poetic record:

"During thirty years, full told
It lay desolate, without warriors brave,
When all its hosts died in one week
In flocks upon Mash-n-Elta."

No Irish historian professes to know when the Formorians came to Ireland.

This second period of thirty years' desolation -- 1738-1708 -- puzzled Keating. He doubted there were two similar periods of the same length, though his sources preserved the fact that there were indeed two.

A second and related wave of migrants came into Ireland from Scythia. Irish annalists often have been laughed at because they picture these migrants sailing from the Black Sea to the North Sea through what is now European Russia. Such "poor geography" was in fact the same geography of early classical writers, who mentioned the early ease of sailing the same route. This geography is not unusual when it is recognized that the Pripet Marshes in Russia were once -- in the centuries after the Flood -- a vast lake connected by rivers to the Black and North seas!

The migrants from Scythia at this period were called Nemedians, after Nemedh, the leader of the expedition. They dwelt in Ireland for 216 years -- 1708-1492. During much of this time they were reduced to slavery under the Formorians. A part of the Nemedians fled to Grecian Thrace to escape the oppression (p. 126). They returned to Ireland 216 years after the Nemedians first reached the shores of Ireland. Upon their return they bore the epithet Fir-Bolgs, a name derived from the circumstances of their oppression while in Grecian Thrace. The Fir-Bolgs set up a kingship upon their conquest of the Formorians. From Keating a list of Fir-Bolg rulers may be obtained (pp. 131-132).

Thirty-six years after the Fir-Bolgs returned to Ireland -- 1456 -- the first small migration of the Tuatha-De-Danaan occurred. This was during the time of the Wandering in the wilderness under Moses. The total length of Danite dominion in Ireland before the coming of the royal house of the Milesians was 440 years -- 1456-1016 (p. 168). Keating quotes the ancient poet:

"Forty years above four hundred,
There were, since came the tribes of Dana

Across the straits of the great sea,
Till Miledh's sons first heard dread Ocean
His music beat on Eri's shores."

By other reckonings the Danite dominion was much shorter -- only 197 years -- that is, from 1213-1016 This second migratory wave in 1213, was in the days of Barak and Deborah -- 1233-1193, when "Dan abode in ships" (Judges 5:17). Deborah and Barak had delivered the children of Israel from Jabin. king of Canaan, whose military strength lay in Hazor and Syria. Jabin lorded it over Israel for 20 years -- 1253-1233 -- before his defeat. The Irish annals speak of this oppression. Keating records that while the tribe of Dan dwelt in Greece, "It happened that a large fleet came from Syria to make war upon the people of the Athenian territory, in consequence of which they were engaged in daily battles As to the Tuatha-De-Dananns, when they saw the natives of the land thus vanquished by the Syrians, they all fled out of the country, through fear of those invaders. And they stopped not until they reached the regions of Lochlinn (Scandinavia), where they were welcomed by the inhabitants, on account of their many sciences and arts When they had remained a long time in these cities, they passed over to the north of Alba (Scotland), where they continued seven years in Dobar and Iardobar" (pp. 136-137). Keating continues (p. 139): "When the Tuatha-De-Danann had remained seven years in the north of Scotland (or Alba), they passed over to Ireland and landed in the north of this country."

Many Monkish tales were later told about the Tuatha-De-Danaan to make it appear they were a fabulous people. When the tales of magic are dismissed the truth is plain. The Tuatha-De-Danann of Keating's "History" were none other than the tribe of Dan, and the invaders from Syria were the armies of Jabin king of Canaan!

The kings who bore rule for 197 years over the Danites in Ireland are found in O'Flaherty's "Ogygia", in Keating's "History of Ireland", pages 142-146, and in vol. II of Stokvis' "Manuel", page 232.

The Coming of the Milesians

The ancient royal houses of Ireland and Scotland, and later of England, are derived from the Milesian Royal House that conquered Ireland in 1016. The Milesians were named after Miledh, or Milesius, of Spain, whose sons conquered Ireland and ruled over the Danites. All the migrants from Parthalon to the Milesians were distantly related to each other. The most famous ancestor of the Milesians was Eibher Scot -- Eber of Scotia, of Scythia -- identifying the Milesians as sons of Eber, or Hebrews. The children of Eber early settled in the regions of Scythia, and gave their name to Iberia, a region in the Caucasus in Classical times. The generations between Eber and Milesius are not completely preserved in any Irish annals -- the records are complete only after the coming of the Milesians to Ireland. A late fictitious genealogy going back to Magog arose in monkish times from the known fact that Hebrews once dwelt in Scythia, which was also inhabited by Magog.

A key to the line of descent may be found in the symbols used to designate various branches of the Milesian Royal House. Examples are the Crimson Branch, the Red Branch, signifying the line of Zarah from Judah. Zarah, at his birth, appeared with red thread about his hand. He was expected to be born first, but after his hand appeared, and the

thread wound about it, the other brother Pharez came unexpectedly.

The wanderings of the family of Heber to Milesius are summarized by Keating on p. 173. The final migration, under Milesius, was from Egypt, via Thrace to Spain. This was shortly before the expulsion of the Hyksos in 1076. Of this period of Milesius in Egypt, Irish records declare: "At this time, there was a great war between Pharaoh and the king of Ethiopia. Pharaoh made Miledh the commander of his army, when he had estimated his bravery and valor, and sent him to meet the forces of Ethiopia therewith. There then ensued many engagements and conflicts, between the forces under the command of Miledh and those of the Ethiopians. In these he was so successful that his fame and renown spread through all nations, whereupon Pharaoh gave him one of his own daughters to wife" (Keating, p. 176).

"Miledh at length remembered ... Ireland was the land in which it was destined that his posterity should obtain a lasting sovereignty. Upon this he fitted out three ships, supplied them with crews, and took his leave of Pharaoh. He then set sail from the mouth of the Nile, into the Mediterranean, and landed on an Island near Thrace." (Keating, p. 177.) After further migrations the prince landed in Spain to join members of the family he had left behind years before. In Spain he died. There followed a scarcity of food in Spain for about 26 years according to Irish records (p. 179).

According to the Domestic Annals a consequent invasion of the Irish coast was planned to relieve the pressure from the drought. It occurred in 1016, near the end of the reign of David king of Israel. The invasion was successful. The Tuatha-De-Danaan were forced to accept the new line of Royalty. The realm of Ireland was now divided between the two surviving sons of Milesius -- Ebher and Ghedhe the Ereamhon (or Heremon). This Ghedhe, the Heremon, has often been mistaken by the British Israel World Federation for ANOTHER king of later fame ALSO CALLED "the Heremon" in Irish bardic literature. Heremon or Ereamhon is a title, which, in the case of Ghedhe, came to be used as a personal name.

Of this Ghedhe the Heremon, brother of Eber, the "Annals of the Four Masters" reads: "Tea, the daughter of Lughaidh, son of Itha, whom Eremhon married in Spain." This Tea is an altogether different person from the Tea who came more than four centuries later to the Irish Isles. The British Israel World Federation has confounded two different events, separated by over four centuries, simply because it was and is unwilling to believe the history of Ireland as it is plainly recorded. The Tea who married Ghedhe the Heremon was a daughter of Lughaidh, the son of Ith, uncle of Miledh (also spelled Mileadh). That is exactly what Irish history records. These events occurred in David's reign, not Zedekiah's. What did happen after Zedekiah's reign will be made plain shortly.

The brothers Eber and Gede the Heremon founded a town after gaining possession of Ireland. To be the new capital of Ireland, they named it Tea-mur, the town of Tea. At different times in history it has borne other names, the most common being Tara (cp. the Hebrew word "Torah", meaning "Law").

Did David Visit Ireland?

Even to this day another of the names of the old site of Tara has been preserved: Dowd's Town -- which means literally David's Town. The name is found attached to an area three miles north of Tara Hill (see B.M. Ordnance Survey maps, Ireland, 91, 101). Is it possible that David

king of Israel visited Ireland and Tara toward the end of his life?

At the time of the founding of Tara shortly after 1016 an event occurred involving a beautiful woman who was "sorrowful to a harlot." The passage, quoted in the poem of Cuan O'Lochain ("Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy", vol. xviii, 1839, and other works), has never been fully understood. It can hardly refer to Tea who had long been married to Gede the Heremon. But, if David gave his daughter Tamar in marriage to Irial, the son of Gede, then all becomes clear. Tamar had been violated by her half-brother. She left the scene of the unfortunate event in a torn garb and remained unmarried in her brother's Absalom's house. See II Samuel 13. It was not until after the death of Absalom that David was free to depart for Ireland, very probably to give his disconsolate daughter in marriage to a prince of the line of Zarah.

Jeremiah Goes to Ireland

Now we come to one of the most remarkable events in history -- the joining of the lines of Pharez and Zarah in Ireland after the fall of Jerusalem in 585 B.C.

The Bible records God as saying that David would never lack a descendant to sit on his throne. Now consider, all of Zedekiah's sons were slaughtered before he was carried to Babylon. But his two daughters escaped with Jeremiah. Part of the story of how the line of David through Zedekiah continued has been preserved in Masonic tradition, and well known as recently as one century ago. Remember, kings and royalty of Britain have commonly been Masons.

According to this Masonic tradition, a Prince Eochaid of Ireland came to Jerusalem several years before 585. He was present during the siege. This Eochaid (meaning Knight) was none other than Oilioill Olchaoin, the son of Siorna Saoghlach mac Dian called the Heremon. Eochaid was blood royal of the Milesian Zarah line. After the fall of Jerusalem he married Zedekiah's daughter, named in the Masonic tradition Tea Tephi, of the Pharez line. They fled in 585 with Jeremiah and Baruch to Egypt.

The last Biblical record places them in Egypt. Masonic tradition, however, traces their journey to Ireland. Irish histories relate the arrival of a royal party in 569 B.C. (See "The Irish Prince and the Hebrew Prophet", New York, 1896, pages 137-145). The arrivals included Prince Eochaid, his wife Tea Tephi, their son and a prophet called Ollamh Fodhla and his scribe Baruch. When they reached Tara, Eochaid was proclaimed king since his father had just died. A description from the Masonic tradition reads: "Jeremiah had joined the hands of the prince and princess over the sacred stone (lia fail) ... and commanded the blessing of Israel's God to rest upon the throne of David." ("The Irish Prince and the Hebrew Prophet", page 139).

This ceremony was not the marriage of Eochaid and Tea Tephi but, the symbolic joining of the lines of Zarah and Pharez.

The Milesian Kings

The following chart gives the list of kings unaltered and without need of restoration, from the Domestic Annals as preserved by O'Flaherty in his "Ogygia". Both the dates and lengths of reign are accurately preserved. The abbreviations after the names indicate from

which branch of the Milesians the king descended. "Er." is the line of Ghedhe the Ereamhon; "Eb." is Ebher, brother of Ghedhe the Ereamhon; "Ith" is the line of Ith or Itha, brother of Miledh or Mileadh; "Irw" is the line of Ir, another (uncrowned) brother of Eber and Gede.

Arch Kings of Ireland	Lengths of Reign	Dates from O'Flaherty and the Domestic Annals
Ghedhe the Ereamhon mac Mileadh	14	1016-1002
Ebher mac Mileadh, rules jointly with his brother	1	1016-1015
Muimhne mac Gede the Ereamhon, Luighne mac Gede,	3	1002- 999
Laighne mac Gede		
Er mac Eber,		
Orba mac Eber,	6 months	999
Fearon mac Eber,		
Feorgna mac Eber		
"Irial" (Ariel) Faidh (meaning the "prophet") mac Ereamhon	10	999- 989
Eithrial mac Irial (Er.)	20	989- 969
Conmhaol mac Eber	30	969- 939
Tighearnmas mac Follagh (Er.) (Introduces idolatry into Ireland during heyday of Baalism in Israel and Judah.)	23	939- 916
(Interregnum)	(7)	916- 909
Eochaidh I Eadghadhach mac Daire (Ith)	4	909- 905
Cearmna Fionn mac Ebric (Ir), Sobhairce mac Ebric (Ir)	40	905- 865
Eochaidh II Faobharglas mac Conmhaol (Eb.)	20	865- 845
Fiachadh I Labhrainne mac Smiorgoll (Er.)	24	845- 821

Eochaidh III Munho mac Mofebis (Eb.)	21	821- 800
Aonghus I Olmucadha mac Fiachadh (Er.)	18	800- 782
Eadhna I Airgtheach mac Eochaidh (Eb.)	24	782- 758
Roitheachtach I mac Maoin (Er.)	11	758- 747
Seadhna I mac Airtri (Ir)	5	747- 742
Fiachadh II Fionscothach mac Seadhna (Ir)	14	742- 728
Muineamhon mac Cas Clothach (Eb.)	5	728- 723
Faildeargdoid mac Muineamhon (Eb.)	9	723- 714
(Eochaidh) Ollamh Fodhla mac Fiachadh (Ir) (not the later prophet Ollamh Fodhla)	40	714- 674
(Elim) Fionnachta I mac Ollamh (Ir)	20	674- 654
Slanoll mac Ollamh (Ir)	17	654- 637
Ghedhe Ollgothach mac Ollamh (Ir)	12	637- 625
Fiachadh III Fionnailches mac Fionnachta (Ir)	8	625- 617
Bearngal mac Ghedhe (Ir)	12	617- 605
Oilioll I mac Slanoll (Ir)	15	605- 590
Siorna Saoghlach mac Dian (Er.), called the Heremon. He restored the power of the line of Ereamhon. At his death a prophet called Ollamh Fodhla brought Tea Tephi to Ireland with his son Oilioll Olchaoin, who was her husband.	21	590- 569
Roitheachtach II mac Roan (Eb.)	7	569- 562
Elim I Oillfinshneachta mac Roitheachtach (Eb.)	1	562- 561
Giallachadh mac Oilioll Olchaoin (Er.), son of Tea Tephi	9	561- 552
Art I Imleach mac Elim (Eb.)	12	552- 540

Nuadhat I Fionnfoil mac Giallachadh (Er.)	13	540- 527
Breas mac Art (Eb.)	9	527- 518
Eochaidh IV Apthach mac Fionn (Ith)	1	518- 517
Fionn mac Bratha (Ir)	20	517- 497
Seadhna II Ionnarrach mac Breas (Eb.)	14	497- 483
Siomon Breac mac Aodhan Glas (Er.)	6	483- 477
Duach I Fionn mac Seadhna (Eb.)	8	477- 469
Muireadhach I Bolgrach mac Siomon (Er.)	1	469- 468
Eadhna II Dearg mac Duach (Eb.)	5	468- 463
Lughaidh I Iardonn mac Eadhna (Eb.)	5	463- 458
Siorlamh mac Fionn (Ir)	16	458- 442
Eochaidh V Uaircheas mac Lughaidh (Eb.)	12	442- 430
Eochaidh VI Fiadhmuine mac Congal Cosgarach, (Er.)	5	430- 425
Conaing Beageaglach mac Congal Cosgarach (Er.)		
Lughaidh II Laimhdhearg mac Eochaidh (Eb.)	4	425- 421
Conaing Beageaglach mac Congal Cosgarach (returns, (Er.)	7	421- 414
Art II mac Lughaidh, (Eb.)	7	414- 407
Fiacha Tolgrach (Er.)		
Oilioll II Fionn mac Art (Eb.)	9	407- 398
Eochaidh VII mac Oilloll (Eb.)	7	398- 391
Airgeatmhar mac Siorlamh (Ir)	10	391- 381
Duach II Ladhgrach mac Fiachadh Tolgrach (Er.)	10	381- 371
Lughaidh III Laighdhe mac Eochaidh (Eb.)	4	371- 367

(Next four reign alternately in 28 years.)

Aodh I Ruadh mac Badharn (Ir)	7	367- 360
Diothorba mac Deman (Ir)	7	360- 353
Ciombaoth mac Fionntan (Ir)	7	353- 346
The prophet Ollanh Fodhla lived about 240 years before his time. He was Jeremiah.		
Machadh Mongruadh, Queen (Ir)	7	346- 339
Reachtaidh Righdhearg mac Lughaidh (Eb.)	9	339- 330
Ugaine Mor mac Eochaidh Buadhach (Er.)	30	330- 300
(Ruled Western Europe to Tyrrhenian Sea. Time of Celtic greatness in Roman history.)		
Badhbhchadh mac Eochaidh Buadhach (Er.)	1 1/2 days	300
Laoghaire I Lorc mac Ugaine (Er.)	16	300- 284
Cobhthach Coal-Breagh mac Ugaine (Er.)	17	284- 267
Maen Labhraidh Loingseach mac Oilioll Aine (Er.)	14	267- 253
Melghe Molbhtach mac Cobhtach (Er.)	12	253- 241
Modhcorb mac Cobhtach Caomh (Eb.)	6	241- 235
Aonghus II Ollanh mac Oilioll (Er.)	7	235- 228
Irereo (Iarann) Gleofathach mac Melghe (Er.)	6	228- 222
Fearcorb mac Modhcorb (Eb.)	7	222- 215
Connla Camh mac Irereo (Er.)	4	215- 211
Oilioll III Caisfhiacloch mac Connla (Er.)	25	211- 186
Adhamair Foltchaon mac Fearcorb (Eb.)	5	186- 181
Eochaidh VIII Ailtleathan mac Oilioll (Er.)	7	181- 174
Fearghus I Fortamhail mac Breasal	12	174- 162

Breac (Er.)

Aonghus III Tuirmheach Teamhrach mac Eochaidh (Er.)	32	162- 130
Conall I Collamhrach mac Ederscel	5	130- 125
Niadh Sedhamain mac Adhamair (Eb.)	7	125- 118
Eadhna III Aighneach mac Aonghus	10	118- 108
Criomthann I Cosgrach mac Fedhlimidh (Er.)	4	108- 104
Rudhraighe mac Sithrighe (Ir)	17	104- 87
Ionnatmar mac Niadh (Eb.)	3	87- 84
Breasal Boidhiobhadh mac Rudhraighe (Ir)	9	84- 75
Lughaidh IV Luaighne mac Ionnatmar (Eb.)	15	75- 60
Congal I Claroineach mac Rudhraighe (Ir)	3	60- 57
Duach III Dallta Deadhadh mac Cairbre Lusg (Eb.)	7	57- 50
Feachtna Fathach mac Rudhraighe (Ir)	24	50- 26
Eochaidh IX Feidhleach mac Finn (Er.)	12	26- 14
Eochaidh X Aireamh mac Finn (Er.)	10	14- 4
Ederscel mac Eoghan (Er.)	4	4- 1
Nuadhat II Neacht mac Seadhna Sithbhaic (Er.)		1
Conaire I Mor mac Ederscel (Er.)	59	1- 60
(Interregnum)	5	60- 65
Lughaidh V Sriabhndearg mac Breas Fineamhnas (Er.)	8	65- 73
Conchobhar I Abhradhruadh mac Finn Fili (Er.)	1	73- 74

His year of reign corresponds to year 5 of Vespasian
-- ("Annals of Tighernach")-73-74.

Criomthann II Niadhnair mac Lughaidh

(Er.)	16	74- 90
Cairbre Cinncait (usurp.) and son	5	90- 95
Morann Mac-Maom		
Fearadhach Finnfeachtnach mac Criomthann (Er.)	21	95- 116
Fiatach Fionn mac Daire (Er.)	3	116- 119
Fiachdh IV Finnfolaidh mac Fearadhach (Er.)	7	119- 126
Elim II mac Conrach (Ir)	4	126- 130
Tuathal I Teachtmhar mac Fiachadh (Er.)	30	130- 160
Mal mac Rochraidhe (Ir)	4	160- 164
Feidhlimidh Reachtmhar mac Tuathal (Er.)	10	164- 174
Cathaoir Mor mac Feidhlimidh Firurghlais (Er.)	3	174- 177
Conn Cedcathach mac Feidhlimidh (Er.)	35	177- 212
Conaire II mac Modha-Lamha (Er.)	8	212- 220
Art III Confhir mac Conn (Er.)	30	220- 250
Lughaidh VI Mac-Con mac Macniadh (Ith)	3	250- 253
Fearghus II Duibhdeadach mac Imchadh (Er.)	1	253- 254
Cormac Ulfada mac Art (Er.)	23	254- 277
Eochaidh XI Gonnat mac Feig (Er.)	2	277- 279
Cairbre Liffeachair mac Cormac (Er.)	17	279- 296
Fothadh I Cairptheach mac Lughaidh (Ith) and	1	296- 297
Fothadh II Airgtheach mac Lughaidh (Er.)		
Fiachadh V Sraibhtine mac Cairbre (Er.)	30	297- 327
Cairioll Colla-Uais mac Eochaidh Doimhlen (Er.)	4	327- 331
Muireadhach II Tireach mac Fiachadh		

	(Er.)	26	331- 357
Caolbhadh mac Crunn Badhrai (Ir)		1	357- 358
Eochaidh XII Muighmheadhoin mac Muireadhach (Er.)		8	358- 366
Criomthann III mac Fidhach (Eb.)		13	366- 379
Niall I Naoighiallach mac Eochaidh (Er.)		26	379- 405
(Feradach) Dathi mac Fiachra (Er.)		23	405- 428
Laoghaire II mac Niall (Er.)		35	428- 463
Oilioll IV Molt mac Dathi (Er.)		20	463- 483
Lughaidh VII mac Laoghaire (Er.)		25	483- 508
(Interregnum)		5	508- 513
Muircheartach I Mor Mac-Earca mac Muireadhach (Hereafter all are of the line of Ereamhon.)		20	513- 533
(Sent Lia Fail -- Stone of Destiny to Scotland (in 513) to officially establish branch dynasty under Fearghus mac Erc -- 513-529. See the history of the kings of Scotland.)			
Tuathal II Maolgarbh mac Cormac Caoch		11	533- 544
Diarmaid I mac Fearghus Ceirrbheoil		21	544- 565
Fearghus III mac Muircheartach and Domhnall I Ilchealgach mac Muircheartach		1	565- 566
Eochaidh XIII mac Domhnall and Boadan I mac Muircheartach		2	566- 568
Ainmire mac Seadhna		3	568- 571
Baodan II mac Ninnidh		1	571- 572
Aodh II mac Ainmire		27	572- 599
Aodh III Slaine mac Diarmaid and Colman Rimidh mac Baodan		6	599- 605
Aodh IV Uairidhnach mac Domhnall Ilchealgach		7	605- 612
Maolcobha mac Aodh		3	612- 615

Suibhne Meann mac Fiachna	13	615- 628
Domhnall II mac Aodh	14	628- 642
Conall II Caol mac Maolcobha	16	642- 658
Ceallach mac Maolcobha	12	642- 654
Blathmac mac Aodh and Diarmaid II Ruaidnaigh mac Aodh	7	658- 665
Seachnasach mac Blathmac	6	665- 671
Ceannfaoladh mac Blathmac	4	671- 675
Fionnachta II Fleadhach mac Dunchadh	20	675- 695
Loingseach mac Aonghus	9	695- 704
Congal II Ceann-Maghair mac Fearghus	7	704- 711
Fearghal mac Maolduin	11	711- 722
Fogartach mac Niall	2	722- 724
Cionaoth mac Irgalach	3	724- 727
Flaithbheartach mac Loingseach	7	727- 734
Aodh V Allan mac Fearghal	9	734- 743
Domhnall III mac Murchadh	20	743- 763
Niall II Frosach mac Fearghal	7	763- 770
Donnchadh I mac Domhnall	27	770- 797
Aodh VI Oirnidhe mac Niall	22	797- 819
Conchobhar II mac Donnchadh	14	819- 833
Niall III Caille mac Aodh	13	833- 846
Maolseachlainn I mac Maolruanaidh	17	846- 863
Aodh VII Finnlaith mac Niall	16	863- 879

Viking invasions ravaged Ireland in 843 under Niall III Caille. While Niall was reigning, his son Aodh VII Finnlaith presented (in 843) the Lia Fail permanently to the king of Scotland, whose daughter he married. (See O'Flaherty's "Ogygia".) The Scottish king, Kenneth mac Alpin (843-858), thereby became full heir to the now-bankrupt Irish line which was forced to submit to Viking rule. The throne line was thus transferred to Scotland, from whence it would be transferred, in a

few centuries, to England.

The Throne in Scotland

In 503 a migration to Scotland established the direct line of Eremon in the new land.

Kings of the Scots	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Loarn mac Erc	10	503-513
Fearghus I mac Erc	16	513-529
Fearghus I receives Lia Fail for coronation ceremony.		
Domhangart mac Fearghus	5	529-534
Comghall mac Domhangart	24	534-558
Gabhran mac Domhangart	2	558-560
Conall I mac Comghall	14	560-574
Aodhan mac Gabhran	32	574-606
Eochaidh I Buidhe mac Aodhan	23	606-629
Conadh Cerr mac Eochaidh		629
Domhnall I Breac mac Eochaidh	13	629-642
Fearchar I mac Connchadh	7	642-649
Conall II Crandamhna mac Eochaidh Dungal I mac Duban	11	649-660
Domhnall II Donn mac Conall	13	660-673
Moalduin mac Conall	16	673-689
Fearchar II Fada mac Feradhach	8	689-697
Eochaidh II Rianamhail mac Domhangart	1	697-698
Ainbhceallach mac Fearchar		698
Sealbach mac Fearchar	25	698-723
Dungal II mac Sealbach	3	723-726
Eochaidh III Angbhaid mac Eochaidh	7	726-733
Dungal II mac Sealbach (returns)	3	733-736
Alpin mac Eochaidh	5	736-741

(Royal line suppressed until 843 by a related branch of Pictish kings. For princes of Scottish line from 741 to 843 see page 230 of Vol. II of Stokvis' "Manuel".)

Kings of Scotland	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Cinaeth I (Kenneth) mac Alpin	15	843-858
(Obtains Lia Fail from son-in-law, Aodh VII Finnliath of Ireland, in 843.)		
Domhnall III (Donald)	4	858-862
Custantin I	14	862-876
Aodh II	2	876-878
(Eochaidh V, king Strathclyde)	(11)	(878-889)
Circ mac Dungal	11	878-889
Domhnall IV	11	889-900
Custantin II	43	900-943
Maelcolaim I (Malcolm)	11	943-954
Illuilb	8	954-962
Dubh	5	962-967
Cuillen	4	967-971
Cinaeth II	24	971-995
Custantin III	2	995-997
Cinaeth III	8	997-1005
Maelcolaim II	29	1005-1034
Donnchadh I (Duncan)	6	1034-1040
Macbeathadh (Macbeth)	17	1040-1057
Lulach	1	1057-1058
Maelcolaim III Ceanmohr	35	1058-1093
Domhnall V Bane	4	1093-1097
Donnchadh II	1	1093-1094
Edgar	12	1094-1106
Alexander I	18	1106-1124

David I	29	1124-1153
Maelcolaim IV	12	1153-1165
William	49	1165-1214
Alexander II	35	1214-1249
Alexander III	37	1249-1286
Margaret	4	1286-1290
(Interregnum)	(2)	(1290-1292)

Dynasties of Baliol and of Bruce

John Baloil	4	1292-1296
(Interregnum)	(10)	(1296-1306)

In 1296 Edward I of England declared himself king of Scotland and removed the coronation stone -- Lia Fail -- from Scone to Westminster.

Robert I Bruce	23	1306-1329
David II Bruce	4	1329-1333
Edward Baliol	13	1333-1346
David II Bruce (returns)	25	1346-1371

Dynasty of the Stuarts

Robert II	19	1371-1390
Robert III	16	1390-1406
James I	31	1406-1437
James II	23	1437-1460
James III	28	1460-1488
James IV	25	1488-1513
James V	29	1513-1542
Mary	25	1542-1567
James VI, becomes James I of England in 1603	58	1567-1625

With this outline the essentials of Irish history are restored. For details of the reigns of each king of Ireland consult Keating's "History of Ireland", or O'Flaherty. The modern idea that the Irish were illiterate, and that their history is all myth, is itself a modern

myth. The real myths circulating in the name of Irish history are generally limited to attempts on the part of the Catholic Church to hide the identity of the racial descent of the Irish nation. In fact, the only reason for ever inventing myth is to hide, obscure or pervert some evidence or truth. Once the source of Truth -- the Bible -- is manifest, the difference between myth and fact becomes readily apparent.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

Early Britain and Western Europe

Why does the history of Western Europe begin with the Romans? Eastern Asia's history begins with the Chinese over 22 centuries before the birth of Christ. Africa's history commenced along the Nile equally early. So did Mesopotamia's. Greek history commenced with the government of Heber in 2063. Irish history reaches into the dim past to within three centuries after the Flood. Why should the history of continental Western Europe be so different? Was Europe really uninhabited all this time? If inhabited, were its people the only folk unable to write or preserve a history? For even backward people of India have a recorded chronological history beginning 1649 before the present era!

The Enigma Solved

Surprising though it may be, Western Europe does have an ancient written history! Europe was populated -- albeit sparsely -- by numerous tribes who were indeed able to preserve their remarkable past in written form. This history of early Western Europe was included in some texts as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century! Yet today it is almost wholly unknown! It has been literally erased from the consciousness of men.

The people who preserved the history of early Western Europe until modern times were the Welsh and the Germans. Because of bitter jealousies between the English and the Welsh and Germans, the history of early Europe and Britain -- especially Wales -- was finally extirpated from the English school system. English historians did everything in their power to label this history as "myth." Educators around the world, enamored of the theory of evolution, gradually accepted, without seriously questioning, the conclusions of the English historians. How could early Europe ever have had a written history, so went the reasoning, if Europe was still gripped by the fetters of the "Stone Age" at the time Egypt and Mesopotamia were near the end of the "Late Bronze Age"?

Today, however, leading archaeologists admit that the so-called Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages were not ages at all, but cultures. It is time the whole question of myth, archaeology and early European history were reopened. It is time we asked ourselves what is the time relationship between so-called Stone, Bronze and Iron cultures and written history. Did civilization and writing really begin only with the bronze period, as is commonly assumed today? Or were the first civilizations and the earliest written records the products of people who, in fact, had not yet blossomed into what is today termed the bronze period? In what period, for example, did the Hebrew patriarchs live -- the Stone? the Chalcolithic? the Early Bronze?

To answer these basic questions, let us first present the history as it has been preserved by ancient Welsh and German authors.

Early Europe

Who were the earliest Europeans to inhabit the regions now known as Britain, France, Germany and Italy? The Angles and the Saxons -- the

ancestors of the English-speaking people -- did not reach the British Isles until 449 -- over four centuries after the crucifixion of Jesus! This was the same period that other tribes flowed into the Roman regions of France, Germany, Italy -- and most everywhere else in Western Europe. Who were the people that possessed this part of the world before the coming of the recent Europeans, and before the coming of the Romans?

The history of Western Europe 2000 years before the conquests of Julius Caesar is just as surprising as the history of Ireland. Early volumes covering this period include: "Britannia Antiqua Illustrata: or, The Antiquities of Ancient Britain", by Aylett Sammes, 1676, London, Thomas Roycroft publishers: "The Historie of Cambria, now called Wales: A part of the most famous Yland of Brytannie, written in the Brytish language above two hundred years past": translated into English by H. Lhoyd, 1584; and "Cambria Triumphans, or Brittain in its Perfect Lustre shewing the Origen and Antiquity of that illustrious Nation", by Bercy Enderbie, London, 1661.

The first volume mentioned -- by Aylett Sammes -- is by far the most complete and most accurate. It preserved to the very year the entire period from the beginning of settlement to the coming of Caesar. Sammes begins his book by dating the earliest record as "A.M. 1910." As he follows Archbishop ussher, his date is equivalent to 2094. (That is, After Man 1910 in Sammes' terminology means 1910 years after 4004.)

What is the significance of 2094? That date, famous from Mesopotamian history, is the beginning of the kingdom of Horus (Gilgamesh or Ninyas) in the land of Shinar. In 2094 Horus (Kenkenes), the son of Ninus II, left Egypt to restore the government of Nimrod, in Erech in Babylonia.

Sammes himself recognized a direct connection between the Middle East and Western Europe. The history of Western Europe, in fact, begins with the kingship of Gilgamesh in 2094 in Shinar.

But why should the early Europeans have begun their history with an event in the land of Shinar?

Because it was in the land of Shinar that they were living when Horus arrived from Egypt! It was from Shinar that Horus, or Zames Ninyas, led them to Western Europe.

Ancient Belgian and German records confirm that their oldest city, Trier, was founded by Trebeta another son of Ninus II, king of Assyria. The inhabitants of Trier maintain that their city is the oldest in all Europe," records Josef K. L. Bihl in his text "In deutschen Landen", p. 69. "Trier was founded," he continues. "by Trebeta, a son of the famous Assyrian king Ninus. In fact one finds ... in Trier the inscription reading, 'Trier existed for 1300 years before Rome was rebuilt.'"

Trebeta was a half-brother of Horus or Ninyas. His mother was not Semiramis, but a daughter of the ruler of Armenia. The Welsh or Britons knew Zames Ninyas as Samothes.

The migration from Shinar and the Assyrian realm in Mesopotamia shortly after 2094 brought Chaldeans and Assyrians, and probably Elamites as captive slaves, into Western Europe as its first civilized inhabitants. Thereafter Europe became the land to which Chaldeans and Assyrians continued to migrate as they left the Middle East.

Horus continued his rule in Western Europe until 2048, according to the traditions preserved by Sammes. That was the year his mother by duplicity came to the throne of Assyria. See Syncellus' history of Assyria, where Semiramis is assigned a 42-year reign (2048-2006) immediately prior to the 38-year reign of Zames Ninyas (2006-1968). Zames or Samothes relinquished personal dominion over Western Europe to

his son in that year and returned to Assyria, where a lengthy three-way struggle ensued between himself, his mother and the king of Armenia.

Here are the first kings to rule over Western Europe.

Names of Rulers	Lengths of Reign	Dates according to Sammes
Samothés, also called Zeus or Jupiter (the Gilgamesh of Erech)	46	2094-2048
Magus, his son (the ancestor of the tribe of Magi who later migrated into Persia from Europe)	51	2048-1997
Sarron (the ancestor of the tribe of Sarronides or sacrificing priests of early Europe)	61	1997-1936
Druis (the ancestor of the tribe of Druids)	14	1936-1922
Bardus (the father of the ancient tribe of Bards)	75	1922-1847
Longho, conqueror of Scandanavia (ancestor of the Longobards who finally migrated into Italy after the fall of Rome)	28	1847-1819
Bardus II (by whom the principles of music were first taught in Germany)	37	1819-1782
Lucus Protector	11	1782-1771
Celtes, so famous he gave his name to all the early peoples of Western Europe	13	1771-1758

Celtes' mother was named Galathea. In her honor he named his daughter Galathea also. As celtes had no son he gave his daughter in marriage to Hercules (who has been identified with Seir the Horite from Josephus). From her Hercules had a son named Galathes, the ancestor of a tribe named Galli -- one of the Gauls or Galatians. This tribe, joined with others, later migrated into Asia Minor and gave its name to the region of Galatia.

With Celtes the direct male line of kings from Samothés or Horus ceases.

The Heraclidae Kings

In the next chart will appear the line of kings who sprang from Galathea.

Names of Kings	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Hercules, the conqueror of Libya (a full account of his exploits must await Vol. II of Compendium)	19	1758-1739
Galathes (father of the tribe of the Galli)	49	1739-1690
Narbon (ruled Samothea or Britain during lifetime of his father: afterward governed entire realm from city of Narbon in Gaul)	18	1690-1672
Lugdus (the founder of Lugdunum)	51	1672-1621
Beligius (gave his name to the Beligici, later called Belgae, among whom he established his capital; he died without issue)	20	1621-1601
Jasius (a prince of a related line who, in 1602, had been made king of Italy; he had all Celtica under his rule)	68	1601-1551
Allobrox (Obtained Celtica upon death of his father; his brother Corybantus obtained Italy)	68	1551-1483
Romus	29	1483-1454
Paris	39	1454-1415
Lemanes	62	1415-1353
Olbius	5	1353-1348
Galathes II	48	1348-1300
Namnes	44	1300-1256
Remus (died without a male heir; married his daughter to Phranicus of Trojan descent)	40	1256-1216

Phranicus (he retired to Gaul
and left Britain to be governed
by the Druids)

67

1216-1149

In 1149 Brutus of Troy came to Britain with his troops.

The Trojans and Western Europe

The story of the famous Trojan kings -- once so widely discussed in Greek literature -- is little known to history students today. It begins in the days of Jasius, or Jason, who became king of Celtica in 1601. The halfbrother of Jasius is Dardanus, whom Josephus declares to be Darda or Dara (See II Chronicles 2:6). Darda was of the House of Judah and the Trojan kings therefore were Jews! Following a quarrel Dardanus fled to Asia Minor, married the daughter of a native king, and founded the vital fort of Troy.

Thus the Trojan line of kings -- to be discussed in detail in Vol. II of the Compendium -- were able to dominate Western Asia Minor. The Trojans were generally supported by the Assyrians in all their wars against the Greeks. The line of Trojan kings may be found on page 12 of Enderbie's "Cambria Triumphans, or Brittain in its Perfect Lustre".

Kings of Troy to 1181	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Dardanus (Compare the date 1477 with Eusebius' account of Dynasty XV in Egypt)	65	1477-1412
Erictanus	46	1412-1366
Tros	40	1366-1326
Ilus	49	1326-1277
Laomedon	44	1277-1233
Priamus (Priam)	52	1233-1181

In 1181 the Trojans were crushed in the First Trojan War with Greece. Aeneas, of the royal family, fled to Italy. A son, Brutus, expelled from Italy returned to the Aegean area and organized the enslaved Trojans, Lydians and Maeonians. The Greeks were defeated and Troy was recaptured. With the recapture of Troy in 1149 the list of Sea Powers of the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean began. According to the terms of the treaty with the Greeks Brutus migrated, with all who wished to follow him, via the Mediterranean into Britain.

His sons continued to rule ancient Britain, and on occasion vast areas of the continent. The line of Brutus fell in a fratricidal war in 482.

Line of Brutus	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Brutus	24	1149-1125
Lochrine	20	1125-1105

Madan	40	1105-1065
Mempricius	20	1065-1045
Ebranck	40	1045-1005

(Ebranck was a great conqueror, made an alliance with the king of Italy, occupied all Gaul and much of Germany, threatened to invade the eastern Mediterranean. Does this explain the unusual behavior of King David of Israel in his late years when he sought to take a census of the House of Israel in preparation for a vast military program?)

Brute II	12	1005-993
Leil	25	993-968
Lud	39	968-929
Baldud	20	929-909
Leir	60	909-849
Cordeilla, queen	5	849-844
Cunedag and Margan	33	844-811
Rival	46	811-765
Gurgust	84	765-681
Silvius	49	681-632
Jago	28	632-604
Kimmacus	54	604-550
Gorbodug	63	550-487
Ferrex and Porrex	5	487-482

These two sons of Gorbodug perished in a fratricidal struggle after 5 years. Thus the direct line of Aeneas and Brutus ceased -- as the Trojan line through Aeneas and Ascanius perished in Italy in 509, only 27 years before.

After the death of Porrex and Ferrex the land of Britain was divided among Rudaucus, king of Wales; Clotenus, king of Cornwall; Pinor, king of Loegria; Statorius, king of Albania, and Yevan, king of Northumberland for 48 years -- 482-434.

The total duration of the struggle that ensued upon the death of Gorbodug was 53 years -- 487-434. In 434 Molmutius Dunvallo, son of Cloten, king of Cornwall, unified the kingdom. (The ancestry of Cloten is unrecorded). He enacted remarkable laws and was the first prince of Britain to be installed with the rites and ceremonies of Coronation. He wore a golden crown and other ornaments of solemn inauguration, a custom unknown by his predecessors. This new line of kings ruled till the coming of Julius Caesar in 55.

Native British kings continued even under the Roman Caesars, revived after the departure of the Romans, and were finally replaced by the direct Davidic line from Ireland, Scotland and England by Edward I.

Line of British Kings from Molmutius	Lengths of Reign	Dates
Molmutius	40	434-394
Belinus and Brennus	22	394-372
Gurguint	19	372-353
Guintelyn	26	353-327
Silvius II or Silisius	15	327-312
Kimarus	3	312-309
Elanius or Danius	10	309-299
Morindus	9	299-290
Gorboman	10	290-280
Archigallo	1	280-279
Elidure his brother	3	279-276
Archigallo restored	10	276-266
Elidurus again	1	266-265
Vigenius and Peridurus	9	265-256
Elidurus again	4	256-252
Gorbonian	10	252-242
Morgan	14	242-228
Emerianus	7	228-221
Ydwallo	20	221-201
Rimo	16	201-185
Geruntius	20	185-165
Gatellus	10	165-155
Coilus	10	155-145
Perrox II	5	145-140
Cherimus	1	140-139

Fulgentius	1	139-138
Eldred	1	138-137
Androgeus	1	137-136
Urianus	3	136-133
Elihud	5	133-128
Dedantius, or Dedacus	5	128-123
Detonus	2	123-121
Gurguineus	3	121-118
Merianus	2	118-116
Bleduus, or Bladud	2	116-114
Capenus	3	114-111
Ovinus	2	111-109
Sisilius	2	109-107
Bledgabedrus	10	107- 97
Archimalus	2	97- 95
Eldolus	4	95- 91
Rodianus	2	91- 89
Redargius	3	89- 86
Samulius	2	86- 84
Penisillus	3	84- 81
Phyrrus	2	81- 79
Caporius	2	79- 77
Dinellus	4	77- 73
Heli	1	73- 72
Lud	11	72- 61

In the seventh year of his sons Angrogaenus and Theomantius, when Cassibelan their uncle usurped the kingdom, Julius Caesar entered Britain. The seventh year is 55-54. Caesar first came in autumn of 55.

Having thrown out the early history of Europe and Britain, historians have sought archaeology as the only remaining means of unravelling early European history. But archaeology alone is insufficient.

What historians should have done was to combine the evidence of scientific archaeological research with the testimony of written history. Then they would have known the time, the people and the leaders whose mute testimony they have uncovered from the soil. Consider, for a moment, what archaeologists have to report concerning early Britain. Take special note of the vocabulary they must use in order to clarify themselves.

The first substantial migration to British soil, report archaeologists Jaquetta and Christopher Hawkes in "Prehistoric Britain", page 8, was of "Neolithic" long-headed farmers. When they came, who they really were, how long they resided until the succeeding migration -- these and other questions can only be guessed at. The second migratory wave to reach British shores were a round-headed, "bronze-culture" folk whom archaeologists have dubbed "Beaker Folk", or "Bell-beaker Folk." But all this jargon does not really tell who they were. How would you know who a people really were if all you were told was that they were a "Food-Vessel folk," a "Tea-kettle folk", or a "Beerbottle People"? Or used buttons instead of zippers?

After this, archaeologists declare, came an "Urn People," later a "Deverel-Rimbury" invasion followed by a "La Tene" invasion -- and at length Julius Caesar's invasion in 55. Is it not time that sober historians cease fooling themselves by supposed knowledge that is, by itself, really no knowledge?

Now see how clear this evidence becomes when placed side-by-side with written history. In the succeeding chart is the evidence -- couched in scientific Jargon -- as recovered by archaeology, combined with the written history of Britain -- as preserved in historical sources.

Archaeological Parlance	Testimony of Written History
Paleolithic period	Remains of pre-flood world, lasted 1656 years to 2369-2368
Mesolithic period; Britain becomes an island; Maglemose semi-arctic culture	Latest pre-flood and earliest post-flood hunters migrate through Britain
"Neolithic" period; several subdivisions; farmers bring fertility cult; megalithic period	Arrival in Western Europe of Chaldeans (Hebrews) and Assyrians from Shinar under Samoths, or Zames Ninyas -- shortly after 2094; continues through several centuries; climaxes in Megalithic sites of Tuatha De Daanan after 1457 (see Irish history)
"Early Bronze": "Beaker Folk"; round-headed; largely nomadic	Coming of Brutus and of Troy and Trojan heroes in 1149; Trojans were acquainted with Aegean civilization; peacefully

penetrated land; cremated their dead and put ashes in urns for burial -- a custom common to Asia Minor

Rise of "Wessex chieftains" and "Urn People"; trade with Minoan civilization of Crete; period begins as "Early Bronze," followed by transition into "Middle Bronze" culture

Time of expansion under Ebranck in Solomon's day

Numerous books separate "Wessex Chieftains" from "Urn People." They were the same people -- Wessex chieftain burials were merely those of the aristocracy; urn burials those of the common people, See page 106 of *Wessex*, by J. F. S. Stone. "unfortunately we have," writes Stone, "absolutely no knowledge whatsoever of the existence of any contemporary habitation or occupation site in Wessex." Had the scholars combined the "Urn People" with the Wessex chieftains, they would have had the contemporary sites of occupation.

"Deverel-Rimbury" invasions in so-called "Late Bronze" period; gradually replace "Urn People"

A new, but related, people invade British Isles during days of Silvius (681-632) and Jaso (632-604); see Sammes' "Antiquities of Ancient Britain", p. 170; these were first wave of children of Jacob (Esau's brother) who were uprooted by Assyrians

So-called "Early Iron" immigrants penetrate into Britain; in after years early pastoral "Urn People" migrate out of Britain to Brittany in France

Another wave of same people who invaded in days of Silvius and Jaso now peroclade into Britain: civil war results; old line of kings overthrown and perish in 482: civil war ends in 434 with new line of kings

Another wave of "Early Iron" invaders; originally from region of Austria and Moravia, migrants passed through Gaul and became known among archaeologists as "La Tene" people from site of their culture in Gaul

In days of Morindus, king of Britain (299-290), invaders from Gaul attack Britain named "Morini" or "Moriani" in welsh records -- from whence Moravia, their original homeland, is derived; King Morindus defeats them after they had already overrun much of the country (Sammes' "Antiquities", pp. 175-176); from archaeology comes this testimony: "The determined and organized resistance to aggression ... discouraged the La Tene raiders and prevented them from settling in any force on the southern chalk

no wholly La Tene type of
society was established"
(p. 126 of Hawkes'
"Prehistoric Britain")

And that is how history provides a clear explanation of archaeological findings. Of course the idea that iron was not in use until the "Iron Age" is absurd. Yet this is the idea that most laymen have as a result of using such terminology.

Since much of the early history of Britain is interwoven with ancient Troy, the next chapter will present the archaeological results of the excavation at Troy, side-by-side with the record of history, especially the historical list of Sea Powers that seized upon Troy as a key to controlling the Eastern Mediterranean and the Aegean and Black seas.

CHAPTER TWENTY

The Proof of Archaeology

Troy was an ancient fort-city occupied from antiquity into Roman times. Troy was as important in early trade routes as Suez or Singapore were in the nineteenth century to the far-flung British Empire. Each people who possessed political control of Troy remoulded the city after its own image. Nearly every twenty to twenty-five years -- about every generation -- a thorough rebuilding of the site occurred. The foundations of major buildings and often the entire floors were left IN SITU and piled upon them were the remains of the demolished buildings, with all the broken wares of that generation. With each passing age the mound on which Troy was built became higher and higher. Walls about the city rose in proportion.

Today archaeologists dig down through these buried remains and find one cultural level beneath another. The lower is in each instance the older unless a late building has been sunk deep into the mound. Periods without occupation are obvious from signs of extended erosion. According to modern historical ideas there should be an immense gap -- of about 500 years between the fall of Troy and the rebuilding of the city by the Aetolian Greeks in the 600's. The fragmentary remains of life between the final war stratum and the Aetolian city prove there was no more than the lapse of a few years! In other words the final Fall of Troy was in the early 600's, not the early 1100's.

Archaeologists have numbered each major period of occupation at the site of Troy. Beginning from the top down -- through Roman, Hellenistic and Persian periods -- one soon comes to the Greek settlements that immediately succeeded the temporary Trojan village established after the final war. The sequence of strata is continuous. If archaeologists had been honest with what they saw they could have concluded no other fact than that established already in the historical section of this Compendium.

In the left-hand column, on the following pages, are the numbers used by archaeologists to designate the strata from the top of the mound to the virgin rock below. At the right are comments about the meaning of each numbered building period, with the proper dates.

Archaeological Designation
of Superimposed Deposits
at Site of Ancient Troy

The Explanation of Trojan
History from Classical Writers
and Biblical Evidence

Beneath Roman, Hellenistic
and Persian remains is a
period of Greek settlement
corresponding to the Late
Assyrian and Chaldean
Empires. Immediately under
this -- NOT FIVE CENTURIES
EARLIER -- appear the
following strata, as
labeled by archaeologists

VII b 1: post-war settlers

Trojan stragglers temporarily
resettle site after Third

Trojan War

VII a;	seige layer over-lying city remains, preceded by earthquake; this stratum said to end "Late Bronze" period	Third Trojan War (687-677) involved a 10 year siege; (this stratum includes previous city built after great earthquake (710) related to events in Hezekiah's day (Isaiah 38: 7-8); Carian sea power became dominant beginning 707
VI h	earthquake ends this stratum	City during Milesian Sea Power which began in 725
g		Three stages of city "g" through "e" reflect control of Egyptians for 43 years (768-725) and the Phoenician for 45 years (813-768)
f		
e	beginning of so-called "Late Bronze"	
d	end of "Middle Bronze"	Cyprus controls the Troad as a key to sea power for 32 years (845-813); two levels reflect major changes during period in Egypt and the Aegean world at Argos
c		
b		Phrygian sea power in control of Troy for 25 years (870-845): Phrygians were allies of Kingdom of Hatti in Asia Minor
a	beginning of so-called "Middle Bronze"	Rhodes in control 23 years (893-870); culture of Greek world and Asia Minor replaces that of previous European people
V d	traditional end of "Early Bronze" in the Troad	Four building periods during rule of European Thracians for 79 years (972-893); the people of Thrace at this period were civilized, cultured farming people related to the Phrygians (Franks) and Pelasgians; in later centuries a wild people, given to hunting and rapine, temporarily settled in Thrace before being driven out of Western Europe in Roman times
c		
b		
a		
IV e	(intermittent earthquakes appear from time to time)	Pelasgian sea control during four building periods; 85 years (1057-972); this is period of Solomonic, Davidic and Phoenician sea power in
d		

c	Mediterranean; upon revolt in House of Israel in Solomon's last year in Palestine the maritime power passed to Hebrew settlements in Thrace
b	
IV a -- a layer immediately overlying devastation by a tremendous earthquake	Five building periods elapsed under Maeonian, or Lydian, control of the seas (during close of Hyksos period); layer III d ended in terrible earthquake of 1069 (I Samuel 14:15 and II Sam. 22); total period from "III a" to "IV a" covers 92 years (1149-1057); the year 1149 (at which III a begins) marks Greek defeat which ended Second Trojan War and began Maeonian sea power
III d ends in earthquake	
c	
b	
III a commonly designated as beginning of "Early Bronze 3" period	
II g war layer ends period	Covers period of Greek domination from 1181-1149
f war layer ends period	End the period of the First Trojan War (1181)
e (Entire period from d "II a" to "II g" is commonly referred to b as "Early Bronze 2"; a layers "a" to "e", though divided into 5 parts, represent 10 building periods	Building periods "II a" to "II f" represent the lengthy period of Hyksos domination from 1477-1181 (Troy was refounded in 1477 by Dardanus)
I (not less than 10 building periods, commonly referred to as "Early Bronze 1")	The period of pre-Hyksos settlement; began in 1700's and ended with Hyksos conquest

Notice the general cultural relationship between Troy, in Asia Minor, and Britain in Western Europe (where many Trojans settled before finally migrating to Brittany).

The use in archaeology of the terms "Early," "Middle," and "Late Bronze" and "Iron," is deceptive. Iron was used during Troy's "Bronze" period. The fact is, archaeologists do not really use metals as a guide. Their cultural dating is dependent on pottery, whether or not metals are even present.

Scholars label certain cultures as "Neolithic," or "CHALCOLITHIC," OR "BRONZE," OR "IRON" NOT BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE, BUT BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE THAT THESE PARTICULAR CULTURES EXISTED DURING WHAT THEY ASSUME WERE THOSE "AGES" OR "PERIODS."

Archaeology in the Aegean World

Historians have long puzzled over the archaeological evidence

uncovered in the Aegean world and in Asia Minor. What they found did not fit their theories.

Here is what happened, and why. First historians made the mistake of assuming that the traditional framework of Egyptian history is true. They never questioned the scheme of having each Egyptian dynasty succeed the other. It never entered their minds that there may have been extensive periods in Egyptian history during which different dynasties in Upper and Lower Egypt reigned contemporaneously.

Once the false view of Egyptian history was accepted, archaeological evidence in Egypt was made to conform to it. The so-called "Bronze" and "Iron" ages, for example, were dated centuries too early. This had an immediate effect on archaeological studies in the Greek world.

In Egypt archaeological evidence is often associated with inscriptions that date the remains to a specific dynasty or Pharaoh. In the Greek world this is not the case. The kings of ancient Greece did not leave inscriptions. How then is one to properly associate the remains of a Greek palace with the king who reigned in it? The answer is, archaeologists can only guess.

What they attempt to do is date the Greek pottery by evidence from Egypt. The ancient world was a trading world. Greeks, Egyptians and Phoenicians traded their wares in each other's ports. Egyptian pottery found its way into Greece. Greek and Phoenician pottery into Egypt.

Pottery styles change. Each century or generation created its own distinctive pottery. If pottery remains in any one of these countries could be accurately dated, then of course it could be immediately determined what kind of pottery was contemporary in the other countries.

It was assumed that Egyptian pottery could be accurately dated. By noting what kind of Greek pottery was being traded at specific periods in Egypt, archaeologists thought they had arrived at the correct method of dating Greek pottery. They overlooked only one thing. Egyptian pottery is not correctly dated. Most of it is dated centuries too early. Pottery in the Aegean world and in Asia Minor is consequently dated too early also. Greek kings long dead came to be associated with palaces and pottery styles they never saw or dreamed of. Kings were assumed to be buried in tombs that belonged, in reality, to their descendants or to others living twenty generations later.

In Egypt this curious error could not occur, because archaeological remains included royal inscriptions associating the ruler with tomb, palace or pottery. In Greece there were no inscriptions to date remains. So pottery, tombs and palaces in Greece and Asia Minor were predated in accordance with Egyptian history, but the kings were either rejected as fabulous or were dated according to Greek chronologers who usually had the kings correctly dated.

Thus Agamemnon, king of Mycenae, who fought in the First Trojan War came to be associated with pottery of the Third Trojan War. The pottery was dated centuries too early because it was found in Egypt associated with remains of Dynasties XVIII and XIX which were dated centuries too early!

In the Aegean world archaeologists use the terms Early, Middle and Late Helladic (in Greece). or Early, Middle and Late Cycladic (in the Cyclades), or Early, Middle and Late Minoan (in Crete). Each of these are also sometimes designated Early, Middle and Late Bronze by archaeologists, Mycenaean culture in the Eastern Mediterranean is another name for the so-called Late Bronze period. It is commonly thought to have originated in Mycenae in Greece during this period.

Hence its name. The Mycenaean culture is assumed, today, to be the Greek culture of the First Trojan War. This assumption is based on the fact that Mycenaean remains have been found in association with remains of Dynasties XVIII and XIX of Egypt which are dated five to six centuries too early. The previous chart on the archaeological remains of Troy proves that the culture of Greece during the First Trojan war ending in 1181 was Early Bronze. The culture of Greece during the last Trojan War was Mycenaean. Hence Agamemnon is to be associated with Early Bronze (so-called) pottery, not with Mycenaean palaces which belonged to tyrants living centuries later!

Archaeologists contend that the Mycenaean world collapsed and was followed by so-called "Dark Ages" in Greece. Traditional Greek geometric styles of pottery, it is assumed, returned to favor after falling into disuse during the Mycenaean period. These geometric styles, we are asked to believe, continued down to the Hellenistic period, around 331, when Alexander conquered Persia. In most archaeology books about eight and one half centuries are allowed between the end of the Mycenaean world and Alexander the Great. But the true restoration allows less than one and one half centuries. Here is an extraordinary variation of over seven centuries between traditional interpretations or archaeological evidence and the facts.

Have archaeologists really uncovered remains abundant enough to fill the extra seven centuries demanded by their theories? Were there really "Dark Ages" that befell Greece at the close of the Mycenaean world?

Archaeologists have, of course, found the surprising evidence. But they have been unable to believe it. There simply are not enough material remains to fill the gap artificially created by antedating the Mycenaean world to conform to the false Egyptian scheme of history taken for granted today.

Chester G. Starr, in his book "The Origins of Greek Civilization", admits on page 77 that "only the scantiest of physical remains" exist to fill the gap. Now consider the facts.

The so-called Mycenaean or Late Bronze or Helladic culture has been subdivided by archaeologists into three major periods. The third period has been further subdivided into three parts. At the time of the final fall of Troy in 677 Greek imports were still of the late Helladic IIIB cultural style. This style continued well into the next century during the reign of Ramesses the Great (610-544). During his reign the Mycenaean pottery styles degenerated into sub-Mycenaean or IIIC pottery styles which continued even after the overthrow of Mycenae. Greek history tells us that Mycenae was destroyed in the 470's by Argos (see "Oxford Classical Dictionary").

But this date does not mark the introduction of Geometric pottery into Greece. Archaeologist Wilhelm Doerpfeld in his work "Alt-Olympia", published in 1935, proves that excavators deliberately hid their eyes from the fact that Mycenaean wares were contemporary with Geometric pottery in Greece, that Mycenaean wares were actually of Eastern or Phoenician origin and existed side by side with Greek geometric wares during the so-called Late Bronze period in the Aegean.

The geometric styles were followed by Orientalizing styles in Greek pottery. This Orientalizing style is associated with the Greeks of Asia Minor and the Aegean Isles. The list of Sea Powers presented earlier dates this period from about the time of the last Trojan War to the defeat of the Aeginetan sea power in 480. In other words, Orientalizing styles among the Greeks occurred during the sub-Mycenaean period.

The rise of Athens after the Persian wars led to Athenian wares dominating the markets of the world, beginning in the 470's. This is the time of the spread of Attic black-figured ware -- not a century and a quarter earlier as is usually assumed. Archaeologists, of course, have carelessly overlooked the significance of the ancient list of Sea Powers which proves that Athens did not control the seas until after the defeat of Xerxes. Classic styles of Greek ware, soon developed, continued to the late fourth century when Hellenistic tastes took on new dimensions with Alexander's conquests.

Palestine, Syria and Archaeology

The land which boasts the most complete archaeological record is Palestine. This is partly an empty boast. The only really early city that is thoroughly documented is Jericho. Hardly any of the other early Palestinian sites are known. By contrast, much of early Syria and Mesopotamia is better documented.

Early Jericho begins with a "Prepottery Neolithic A" culture. The duration of this culture extended over a few centuries, though it is carelessly maximized by archeologists many more hundreds of years.

The period of this culture is pre-Flood, as is the succeeding "Prepottery Neolithic B." It is found in strata X to XVII. It is a period of intense warfare. The city walls were being constantly rebuilt. The story of Jericho is really the account of the great walled city Cain built before the Flood. Jericho had walls long before any other city. See the latest excavation reports by Miss Kenyon.

Thereafter two new cultural strata occur. Each is a period of great retrogression, as if some calamity had befallen the people. Each is separated by a span of time in which the site was depopulated. The inhabitants used pottery. (See Chart I of "The Archaeology of Palestine" in "The Bible and the Ancient Near East", edited by G. E. Wright.) The site of Jericho hereafter was for several centuries abandoned. The population of Palestine disappeared. This is the period of the Flood. of human depopulation, and the meagre beginnings of the new post-Flood world. In Mesopotamia small beginnings of modern society developed.

Then over much of the Jordan valley, the southern hill country and elsewhere in Palestine a new culture sprang up. It is labeled Chalcolithic or Ghassulian after a site where first discovered.

It flourished in areas which today are far removed from any water sources. Sites with this culture extend far out into the arid plain about the Dead Sea. The culture comes to a sudden end!

Now notice the record in Genesis 13:10, "And Lot lifted up his eyes. and behold all the plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt."

Here is the so-called Ghassulian culture! It was in the days of Abraham. This culture perished with the burning of the cities of the plain in the year 1916 -- just before the birth of Isaac.

Very little is known of cultures elsewhere in Palestine prior to this time. All that has so far been recovered are remains of wretched cave cultures and open camp sites. These cave cultures, usually placed millenniums before the habitation of Jericho, include both pre-Flood remains and early post-flood deposits. Cave dwelling continued, however, long after the beginning of cities. Even Lot, when he fled from Sodom, dwelt in a cave (Gen. 19:30)

The culture which follows the overthrow of the cities of the plain is designated "Early Bronze I." It is subdivided into sections "A", "B" and "C". This culture has been associated, mistakenly, with Dynasty I of Egypt. It is indeed found in the tomb of Semempses (Shem) in Egypt (pp. 59, 70 of "Pottery of Palestine", by G. E. Wright). All that proves is that it was the family of Shem which introduced it widely among the Canaanites after the destruction of Sodom. Early Bronze I was succeeded by Early Bronze II and III. The latter ends abruptly in 1446, at the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua.

The Coming of Israel Into Palestine

The next archaeological period in Palestinian stratigraphy is designated "Early Bronze IV" or "Early Bronze III B." It is a period at Jericho and elsewhere of frantic building of defences. "No well-preserved constructions of Early Bronze IV have yet been discovered," writes William Foxwell Albright in "Archaeology of Palestine", page 77. The most spectacular remains of this period is of a gigantic open-air camp site overlooking the Dead Sea. Here is William Albright's description of it: "... overlooking the Dead Sea from an eastern terrace, is a great open-air enclosure, defended by a wall of large field stones. Inside the enclosure and around it are many ancient hearths, with quantities of sherds" -- and here an incorrect date is suggested. "Outside, at a greater distance, are many graves dug in the ground and surrounded with small stones arranged in such a way as to resemble megalithic dolmens superficially Most of the graves were covered by shallow tumuli. At a little distance is a group of fallen menhirs ("messaboth"), which seem originally to have numbered seven" (p. 78). Whose camp was this? Israel's!

At this point in the cultural history of Palestine archaeologists find the country was suddenly devastated. Destruction and abandonment of towns are everywhere. A sudden reduction in population occurs. Here is the archaeological evidence of the invasion of Joshua!

Now we are in a position to place in chart form the proper relationship between archaeological finds and history. Note that during the so-called bronze culture, iron was every where in use in Palestine. A description of each period may be found in detail in the works of Albright, Glueck, Kenyon, Wright and others.

Cultural Development in Palestinian Pottery	Contemporary Historical Events
Early Bronze I-III	1916-1446 From about the destruction of Sodom to the crossing of the Jordan
Early Bronze III B also labeled by Kenyon Inter. Early Bronze- Middle Bronze or Middle Bronze I (by Albright)	1446-1441 From crossing of Jordan to the division of the land in 1441-1440: dates are found by subtracting successive judgeships from 300 years after Exodus -- 1446-1146 (see Judges 11:26).
Middle Bronze I	1441-1391 Lifetime of Joshua and

(Kenyon) also labeled
Middle Bronze II A
(Albright)

Elders, oppression of
Cushanrishathaim and
his defeat in 1391

Middle Bronze II
(Kenyon) or II B and C
(Albright) (influence
of culture from
Mesopotamia)

Phase 1 Judgeship of Othniel
1391-1333 (40 years) and period
 of Ammonite oppression
 (18 years)

Phase 2 Period of major deposits
1333-1253 during lengthy time of
 peace -- judgeship of
 Ehud (during 80 years)

Phase 3 Oppression of Jabin king
1253-1193 of Canaan (20 years);
 also time of Philistine
 incursions; judgeship
 of Barak (40 years) and
 of Deborah and Shamgar

Phase 4 Midianite, Amalekite and
1193-1146 Maonite invasion (7 years)
 followed by judgeship of
 Gideon (40 years)

Phase 5 Philistine invasion (40 years
1146-1091 1146-1106) and second Ammonite
 invasion during time of
 Samuel, Jephthah, Samson.
 Three hundred years after
 conquest of Palestine east
 of Jordan (1446) the
 Ammonites launched an attack
 upon Palestine (Judges 11:26)
 and overran the land for 18
 years 1146-1128; parallel with
 this invasion the Philistines
 attacked Israel (in 1146) and
 oppressed the land 40 years
 (during the life of Samson);
 Samuel delivered the country
 from the Philistines in 1106:
 peace restored until Saul's
 reign, which began in 1091

Phase 5 of Middle Bronze, so-called, ends in
Palestine with a sudden destruction of every
major city! This is the Philistine invasion
about 1091 when Saul was first made king.

Transition Middle to
Late Bronze
(Kenyon and
Mazar)

Reign of Saul to the time
of David's victory over the
Philistines; period of dis-
location

Late Bronze I

Later years of David, reign
of Solomon and time of
Thutmose's domination of
Palestine

The so-called Late Bronze period in Egypt and Palestine was quite lengthy. It began much earlier than in Greece and the region of the Troad. This period has not been clearly subdivided by archaeologists because they do not know it pertains to the time of Israel and Judah. It is usually assumed that it represents the pre-Israelite Canaanites.

Not only does the so-called Late Bronze continue to the time of Assyrian domination of Israel in the north of Palestine, it continued through the time of the kingdom of Judah to Nebuchadnezzar's invasion and the reign of Ramesses the Great. Throughout the Late Bronze there is evidence of war and gradual decline. Late Bronze pottery continued in use in Palestine even after the sixth century. It was the culture of the returning Jews during the Persian period. This shocking fact can be proved from contemporary Egyptian history!

Miss Kathleen M. Kenyon points out in her book "Archaeology of the Holy Land" (Praeger edition), page 218, that near the close of Late Bronze II the site of Megiddo has yielded a model pen-case bearing the cartouche of Ramesses III. His dates, restored earlier, are 840-810. At Bethshan a statue of Ramesses III was found in Late Bronze setting. Below Ramesses III were stelae of Seti I of the seventh century and scarabs and other objects of Thutmose III.

Late Bronze II, Level VII, of the dig at Megiddo even yielded evidence of the reign of Ramesses VI (correctly dated to 723-715) in association with a little so-called "Philistine" pottery. This pottery is not Philistine ware at all. It is Greek and Phoenician ware of the time of Alexander the Great! It is derived from sub-Mycenaean III C, which is datable to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

So-called "Philistine" ware is misdated eight centuries too early. It is falsely attributed to Philistines of the time of Samuel, Saul and David! The reason for this mistake is, of course, that it is associated with Dynasty XX of Egypt, which has been misplaced by about eight centuries. "Philistine" -- actually Aegean -- ware marks the final transition from the so-called Bronze to Iron ages in Palestine. It is commonly believed that the Iron Age began about the period of Joshua's invasion of Palestine, that so-called Philistine ware then appeared, and that the archaeological remains of David and Solomon and the kings of Israel all belong to this period. This idea is utterly false. Other than at Samaria, the so-called Iron Age in Palestine is a period of decadence and poverty. It generally represents the period of rising Greek influence in Asia and the later Hellenistic period and early Roman periods.

The site of Samaria has been used as proof that the Iron Age is the period of the Israelite kings. It proves just the opposite. The citadel on the summit of the hill of Samaria, which is commonly attributed to Omri, Ahab and Jehu has all the characteristics of typical acropolises invariably associated with Greek towns! The Greeks under Alexander, having overthrown the Samaritans, cleared away the top of the hill of Samaria and built their garrison buildings on its summit. Archaeologists have taken for granted that Omri built it. The architectural remains show typical Greek architecture. The excavation on the hill of Samaria has not included the living quarters of the common people of the Israelite period. If all the area had been excavated, archaeologists would have found remains typical of the

Israelites' culture during the so-called Late Bronze period. (See page 269 of Kenyon's "Archaeology of the Holy Land".)

As a result of antedating the so-called Iron Age culture by about eight centuries, the period after the exile under the Persians is nearly a total blank in archaeological works (see Kenyon's work, pages 298-299). On page 301, Miss Kenyon writes: "The only architectural remains belong to official buildings presumably associated with the Persian administration, and the few rich burials probably belong to members of the official hierarchy." In reality, the few structures found are those of the Hellenistic period.

Mesopotamian Archaeology

The final phase of the restoration of World History is now approaching -- the archaeology of Shinar, Assyria and Egypt. The region of Mesopotamia is best studied by taking Shinar as one unit, and the remainder of Mesopotamia as another -- the political areas of Babylonia and Assyria.

The post-Flood culture of Shinar begins with a phase known as "Late Ubaid." "Early Ubaid" is pre-Flood. "At all sites so far investigated in the South the Ubaid remains rest directly on virgin soil, and there seems little doubt that the people who bore this culture were the first settlers on the alluvium of whom we have any trace" (Perkins, "Comparative Archaeology of Early Mesopotamia", p. 13).

The earliest known phase near Ur is known as Ubaid I. It contains Woolley's "flood deposit." The earliest post-Flood phase is known as Ubaid II which continues to 1938, the year of the defeat of the four kings in Palestine by Abram.

With the defeat of the Mesopotamian (Assyrian) kings in 1938 a total break ensues in the cultural complex of Ubaid III. The land is never again culturally united until the late Assyrian Empire.

The next major period is generally known as the Protoliterate Period. In older works and the most recent it commonly receives the name Jamdat Nasr, after a city in Mesopotamia. In this Period excavations at the cities of Eridu and Uruk will be noted in chart form.

City of Eridu

Temple stratum III covers the period ending 1717, the close of the Hamazi Dynasty (2137-1717). In archaeological parlance this is phase "a" of the Protoliterate Period.

City of Uruk

Phase "a" is composed of strata VIII-VI. Stratum VIII of the Eanna Temple contains a major cultural change. This period continues to 1777 -- the earliest recommencement of the Second Dynasty of Uruk. Stratum VII also exhibits a new, though minor cultural phase. This period extends from 1777 to 1748, the time of the rise of both Kish and Akshak. Stratum VI extends from 1748 to 1717, the date of the final restoration to power of Uruk.

Eridu Temple stratum covers phases "b," "c" and "d" of the so-called Protoliterate Period. It ends around 1649 with the rise to power of Dynasty III of Uruk.

The second phase of the Protoliterate Period covers the remains of strata V-III. Written materials begin to make their appearance in the strata, but this is not the real beginning of writing in Mesopotamia. Divisions of the later Protoliterate Period are based not so much on political events as on Temple strata V, IV and III, which correspond with "b", "c" and "d." Quite significant! -- but that is the foolishness to which scholars descend who have cut themselves off from true history.

The next Period is designated Early Dynastic I. It is properly equated with the Dynasty of Akkad (see "Relative Chronologies of Old World Archaeology", p. 48). The cultural period extends to the initial invasion of the Gutti in 1535.

Early Dynastic II extends from 1535 to about the end of the Akkadian Dynasty in 1436. (Of course, these political dates are only general indicators of changes in cultural patterns.)

Early Dynastic III extends to the Elamite invasion that brought about the establishment of the cities of Isin (1301) and Larsa (1306).

The next cultural phase is properly associated with Isin, Larsa and Dynasty I of Babylon (1174-879).

Northern Mesopotamia

And now Northern Mesopotamia, especially the land of Assyria.

It is commonly taught today that Assyria and the highlands surrounding the Mesopotamian plain were settled long before the region of Shinar was dry enough to inhabit. To some extent this is true. But the duration of time cannot be archaeologically determined. Only a historical record can determine that. The duration of human settlement from the highland down the river valleys eastward to Shinar took only about one century! The city and the tower of Babel were built only 114 years after the flood ended.

The earliest cultural phase in Northern Mesopotamia is generally designated Hassuna, from a site where it was first found. Unstratified, less advanced cultures have also been found in the highlands, but they are not demonstrably older. They are of nomadic peoples and minor villages, and continued parallel for a few centuries with other cultures in the growing cities of the later pre-Flood Mesopotamian Plain.

The pre-Flood Hassuna culture is represented at the site of Nineveh by strata 1 and 2, and at Hassuna by strata I-V. The phase covers human movements somewhat before the end of the pre-Flood world in the area settled by the family of Seth.

We next find the development of a later pre-Flood culture. This northern culture is called by archaeologists the Halaf Period -- after

the site of Halaf. These meaningless archaeological names would really become interesting if they had been properly connected with contemporary leaders who have molded ancient history.

Halafian is represented at Nineveh by strata 2 b and 2 c. At Hassuna by strata VI through X. At Arphchaiyyah it is represented by strata 10 through 6. At each site there is evidence of warfare at the end of the period. Violence filled that world.

The sudden end of the Halafian period signifies the end of the pre-Flood world. Just before it ended there was a new cultural development in Southern Mesopotamia. The next cultural period was once thought to commence with a heavy influence out of Iran, but now is beginning to be recognized as of local origin. The new cultural period is termed Northern Ubaid I and is the latest pre-Flood culture. Through Noah's family it continues into the post-Flood world.

The most important post-Flood phase of this new period reveals a revival of religious practice. At Tepe Gawra in Assyria, a temple began to be built. Its commencement corresponds with the new building phase of the temple at Eridu. This revival of religion can be dated from the time of Nimrod to about the year 2137 -- the return of Isis (Semiramis or Ishtar).

A complete break in cultural unity occurs at the end of Northern Ubaid II. As in Shinar the land becomes divided into numerous local cultures. This phase -- the Warka Period -- bears the same name as in the south, but it exhibits many different features. It is related to Eastern Anatolia and North Syria, the Aramaic homeland. It corresponds in time to the latter period of influence of the Arabian or Aramean Dynasty of Berossus -- 2043-1828.

Beginning with the Warka Period, the cultural phases of northern Mesopotamia are generally correctly associated with the phases of Babylonia as not to necessitate further discussion here. Any of the publications listed in the Bibliography are suitable for pursuing this section further. It is only in the earliest periods that a restoration is needful.

Note in concluding, that every cultural phase is reflected in political events. Further, observe that the common stratum occupies about the space of a generation -- not upwards of a century as postulated by evolutionary archaeology.

Egypt In Parallel

But what about the many centuries that are assigned to the "Pre-Dynastic" cultures of early Egypt? How can these be reconciled with the demonstrable historical fact that human beings did not arrive in Egypt until the Dynastic Period? Egyptian history teaches us that there was no "Pre-Dynastic Age" in Egypt. What have the archaeologists discovered in the Nile Valley? Is there correspondence between Egypt and Palestine and Mesopotamia that dates these assumed early cultures of Egypt? Indeed there is!

The Maadi culture in North Egypt is known to correspond with the Gerzean in South Egypt (p. 2 of "Relative Chronologies in Old World Archaeology", R. W. Ehrich editor). With what period is Gerzean contemporary?

Here is the surprising answer: "The equation of Late Gerzean and Early Bronze I in Palestine is clear" (page 5).

Again: "Most important for establishing a synchronism are the four cylinder seals of Jemdet Nasr style (imports and imitations), two of

which occur in well-documented Late Gerzean graves" (page 5).

This means that the latest so-called "Pre-Dynastic" culture was parallel with the Protoliterate in Mesopotamia, which began about 1828. Egypt's latest "Pre-Dynastic" (!) culture was the culture of Egypt just before the coming of the family of Jacob to Egypt -- four hundred years after the first dynasty commenced at Thisis.

Prior to the Maadi (in the North) and the Gerzean (in the South), Egyptian culture is subdivided into Merimde and Fayum in the North and Amratian, Badarian and Tasian in the South. These cultures show affinities with the Ubaid of Mesopotamia and the Neolithic of Jericho.

But how does one explain the backward cultures of the people of Egypt when the royal tombs exhibit such sophisticated tastes -- superior, in fact, to the common tastes of Palestine or Mesopotamia? Josephus answers: "Whereas these Egyptians are the very people that appear to have never, in all the past ages, had one day of freedom, no not so much as from their own lords" ("Against Apion", II, 12). See also "Antiquities" I, 8.

Egyptian princes and kings always lived in a fashion far beyond the inclinations, or even the knowledge, of the common fellaheen. The backward culture of early Egypt is not found stratigraphically beneath the remains of the earliest dynasty, but contemporary with it and succeeding dynasties. "Neolithic" remains in Egypt were reproduced even to Roman times!

With this material the essential framework of history is restored. There is perfect harmony between true history, true scientific archaeology and the Bible. History and the Bible can be reconciled.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akurgal, Ekrem, "The Art of the Hittites". London, 1962.
- Albright, William F., "The Archaeology of Palestine", Baltimore, 1960.
- Allen, Herbert J., "Ssuma Chien's Historical Records", "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," April 1894, January and July 1895.
- "Anatolian Studies". 1951-. London.
- Ancient and Modern Britons. (No author.) London, 1884.
- "Ancient Egypt", 1914-1933. London.
- "Antiquity a Quarterly Review of Archaeology". 1927-. Gloucester, England.
- Aston, W. G., "Nihongi". London, 1956.
- Bellew, H. W., "The Races of Afghanistan". Calcutta, 1880.
- Beloe, William, "Herodotus, Translated From the Greek". 4 vol. London, 1821.
- "The Biblical Archaeologist". Vol. I (1938)-. New Haven, Connecticut.
- Blegen, C. W., "Troy" ("Cambridge Ancient History, Fascicle 1".), Cambridge, 1961.
- Bosanguet, J. W., "The Fall of Nineveh and the Reign of Sennacherib, Chronologically considered". London, 1853.
- Breasted, J. H., "Ancient Records of Egypt". 5 vol. Chicago, 1906.
- Breasted, J. H., "A History of Egypt". New York, 1905.
- Brinton, D. G., "The American Race". New York, 1891.
- Brinton, Daniel G., "The Myths of the New World". Philadelphia, 1905.
- Brugsch-Bey, H., "Egypt Under the Pharaohs". London, 1891.
- Bryant, Jacob, "A New System; or, an Analysis of Ancient Mythology". Third Edition. 3 vols. London, 1807.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis, "The Book of the Kings of Egypt". 2 vols. London, 1908.
- Budge, E. A., Wallis, "A History of Egypt from the End of the Neolithic Period to the Death of Cleopatra VII. B.C. 30", 8 vols. London, 1902.
- "Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research". No. 1-. New Haven, Connecticut.

- Bunsen, C. C. J., "Egypt's Place in Universal History". 5 vols. London, 1848.
- Burn, Andrew R., "The Lyric Age of Greece", New York, 1960.
- Bury, J. B.; Cook, S. A.; Adcock, F. E., "The Cambridge Ancient History". 12 vols. Cambridge, 1923.
- Cary, Earnest, "The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus". The Loeb Classical Library, 7 volumes. London, 1948-.
- Ceram, C. W., "The Secret of the Hittites", New York, 1956.
- Clark, Grahame, "World Prehistory", Cambridge, 1961.
- Clerigh, Arther Ua, "The History of Ireland to the Coming of Henry II". London.
- Clinton, Henry Fynes, Fasti Hellenici. "The Civil and Literary Chronology of Greece from the earliest accounts to the death of Augustus".
- Contenau, G., "La Civilisation des Hittites et des Hurrites du Mitanni". 1948.
- Dawkins, W. B., "Early Man in Britain". London, 1880.
- Dawson, Christopher, "The Age of the Gods. A study in the Origins of Culture in Prehistoric Europe and the Ancient East". New York, 1928.
- Domenech, Em., "Deserts of North America". London, 1860.
- Dougherty, R. P., "The Sealand of Ancient Arabia". New Haven, 1932.
- Drioton E. and J. Vandier, "Peuples de l'Orient Meditteraneen I and II (L'Egypte)". Paris, 1952.
- Duruy, Victor, "History of Rome and the Roman People". 6 vols. London, 1883.
- Edgerton, W. F. and J. A. Wilson, "Historical Records of Rameses III". Chicago, 1936.
- Eggermont, P. H. L., "The Chronology of the Reign of Asoka Moriya". Leiden, 1956.
- Ehrich, Robert W., "Relative Chronologies in Old World Archaeology". Chicago, 1954.
- Elgood, Lieut.-Col. P. G., "Later Dynasties of Egypt". Oxford, 1951.
- Enderbie, Percy, "Cambria Triumphans, or Brittain in its Perfect Lustre Shewing the Origen and Antiquity of that Illustrious Nation." London, 1661.
- Eyre, Edward, "European Civilization. Its Origen and Development". 7

- vols. London, 1935.
- Fane, R. A. B. Ponsonby, "The Imperial House of Japan". Kyoto, 1959.
- Gadd, C. J., "The Fall of Nineveh". London, 1923.
- Gardiner, Sir Alan, "Egypt of the Pharaohs". Oxford, 1961.
- Gardner, Percy, "New Chapters in Greek History". New York, 1892.
- Garstang, John, "The Land of the Hittites". London, 1910.
- Garstang, John and O. R. Gurney, "The Geography of the Hittite Empire". London, 1959.
- Ghirshman, R., "Iran from the Earliest Times to the Islamic Conquest". Baltimore, 1954.
- Giot, P. R., "Brittany". London, 1960.
- Glanville, S. R. K., "The Legacy of Egypt"., Oxford, 1942.
- Glueck, Nelson, "The Other Side of the Jordan". New Haven, Connecticut, 1940.
- Glueck, Nelson, "Rivers in the Desert". London, 1959.
- Granet, Marcel, "Chinese Civilization". New York, 1958.
- Grote, George, "History of Greece". 12 vols. London, 1851.
- Gurney, O. R., "The Hittites", London, 1952.
- Hall, H. R., "The Ancient History of the Near East". London, 1913.
- Hawkes, Jacquetta and Christopher, "Prehistoric Britain". London, 1958.
- Hayes, William C., "A Papyrus of The Late Middle Kingdom". Brooklyn, 1955.
- Hayes, William C., "The Scepter of Egypt". 2 vols. New York, 1953.
- Helm, Rudolf, "Eusebius Werke -- Die Chronik des Hieronymus Hieronymi Chronicon". Leipzig, 1913.
- Herrmann, Paul, "Conquest By Man". New York, 1954.
- Hibben, F. C., "Digging Up America". New York, 1960.
- Hodge, F. W., "Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico". 2 vols. New York, 1959.
- Hodges, E. R., "Cory's Ancient Fragments of the Phoenician, Carthaginian, Babylonian, Egyptian and Other Authors", London, 1876.
- "The Holy scriptures according to the Masoretic Text". The Jewish

- Publication Society. Philadelphia, 1917.
- Horn, Siegfried H. and Lynn H. Wood, "The Chronology of Ezra 7".
Washington, D. C., 1953.
- Hrozny, Bedrich, "Ancient History of Western Asia, India and Crete".
New York, 1953.
- Hutchinson, R. W., "Prehistoric Crete", Baltimore, 1962.
- Huxley, G. L., "Achaeans and Hittites". Oxford, 1960.
- Huxley, G. L., "Early Sparta". London, 1962.
- Jackson, John, "Chronological Antiquities". 3 vols. London, 1752.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild, "The Sumerian King List". Chicago, 1939.
- Jessel, E. E., "The Unknown History of the Jews". London, 1909.
- Jones, George, "An Original History of Ancient America". London, 1843.
- "Journal of Cuneiform Studies". vol. I (1947)-. New Haven, Connecticut.
- "The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology". vol. I (1914)-. London.
- "The Journal of Hellenic Studies". 1881-. London.
- "Journal of Near Eastern Studies". (Previously "The American Journal of
Semitic Languages and Literatures", Volumes I-LVIII, and
Hebraica.) vol. I (1942)-. Chicago.
- Kaempfer, E., "The History of Japan". 3 vols. Glasgow, 1906.
- Keating, Geoffrey, "History of Ireland", New York, 1857.
- Kenyon, Kathleen, "Archaeology in the Holy Land". London, 1960.
- Kienitz, Friedrich K., "Die Politische Geschichte Aegyptens vom 7. bis
zum 4. Jahrhundert von der Zeitwende". Berlin, 1953.
- King, Leonard W., "A History of Babylon", London, 1915.
- Lane-Poole, Stanley. "The Mohammadan Dynasties". Paris, 1925.
- Langdon, S. and J. K. Fotheringham, "The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga".
London, 1928.
- Langdon, S. Y. and L. Ch. Watelin, "Excavations at Kish". 4 vols.
Paris, 1924-1934.
- Langer, William L., "An Encyclopedia of World History". Cambridge,
Massachusetts, 1952.
- Legge, James, "The Chinese Classics". 7 vols. Hongkong, 1861.
- Lempriere, J., "A Classical Dictionary". London, 1832.

Lenormant, Francois, "Histoire ancienne de L'Orient". 5 vol. Paris, 1881.

Leslie, Lieut.-Col. Forbes, "The Early Races of Scotland". 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1866.

Logan, James, "The Scottish Gael", 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1876.

Lorimer, H. L., "Homer and the Monuments". London, 1950.

Luckenbill, D. D., "Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia". 2 vols. Chicago.

Lysons, Samuel, "Our British Ancestors". London, 1865.

Macalister, R. A. S., "The Archaeology of Ireland". London, 1949.

Mackenzie, Donald A., "Myths of Crete and Pre-Hellenic Europe". London.

Mahaffy, J. P., "The Empire of the Ptolemies". New York, 1895.

Majumdar, R. C., "The History and Culture of the Indian People". Vols. 1 and 2. Bombay, 1951.

Martin, P. S. and Quimby, G. I. and Collier, D. "Indians before Columbus". Chicago, 1947.

Maspero, G., "The Dawn of Civilization". London, 1894.

Maspero, G., "History of Egypt". 13 vols. London.

Maspero, G., "The Passing of the Empires". New York, 1900.

Maspero, G., "The Struggle of the Nations Egypt, Syria, and Assyria". London, 1896.

Meer, P. Van der, "The Chronology of Ancient Western Asia and Egypt". Leiden, 1955.

Menzel, Wolfgang, "The History of Germany". 3 vols. London, 1848.

Mercer, S. A. B., "The Tell El-Amarna Tablets". 2 vols. Toronto, 1939.

Meyer, Eduard, "Aegyptische Chronologie", Berlin, 1904.

Meyer, Eduard, "Geschichte des Altertums". 5 vols. Basel, 1953.

Meyerowitz, E. L. R., "Akan Traditions of Origin". London, 1952.

Meyerowitz, E. L. R., "The Divine Kingship in Ghana and Ancient Egypt". London, 1960.

Minns, Ellis, H., "Scythians and Greeks". Cambridge, 1913.

Mosso, Angelo, "The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization". London, 1910.

- "The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities". 1929-. Stockholm.
- Mylonas, G. E., "Ancient Mycenae the Capital City of Agamemnon".
London, 1957.
- O'Flaherty, Roderic, "Ogygia, or, A Chronological Account of Irish
Events". Dublin, 1793.
- Oldfather, C. H., "Diodorus of Sicily". The Loeb Classical Library. 10
vols. London, 1933-.
- Olmstead, A. T., "History of the Persian Empire". Chicago, 1959.
- "Orientalia", Vol. I-. Rome.
- Pallis, Svend Aage, "Chronology of The Shub-Ad Culture", Copenhagen,
1941.
- Palmer, Leonard R., "Mycenaeans and Minoans". London, 1961.
- Parker, R. A. and W. H. Dubberstein, "Babylonian Chronology 626
B.C.-A.D. 75". Providence, Rhode Island, 1956.
- Perkins, Ann L., "The Comparative Archaeology of Early Mesopotamia".
Chicago, 1949.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. Flinders, "Abydos". 3 vols. London, 1902-4.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. Flinders, "A History of Egypt". 3 vols. New York,
1899-1905.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. F., "Royal Tombs of the Earliest Dynasties". 2 vols.
London, 1900-1.
- Piggot, Stuart, "Approach to Archaeology". Cambridge, Massachusetts,
1959.
- Poebel, Arno, "The Second Dynasty of Isin According to a New King-List
Tablet". Chicago, 1955.
- Posener, Georges, "A Dictionary of Egyptian Civilization". London,
1962.
- Pott, F. L. H., "A Sketch of Chinese History". Shanghai, 1923.
- Pritchard, James B., "Ancient Near Eastern Texts". Princeton, 1955.
- Pumpelly, R., "Explorations in Turkestan". 2 vols. Washington, D. C.,
1908.
- Ramsay, Sir William M., "Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilization".
London, 1927.
- Raphael, Max, "Prehistoric Pottery and Civilization in Egypt". New
York, 1947.
- Rawlinson, George, "Egypt and Babylon from Sacred and Profane Sources".

- New York, 1885.
- Rawlinson, George, "The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World". 3 vols. New York, 1873.
- Rawlinson, George, "History of Ancient Egypt". 2 vols. London, 1881.
- Rawlinson, George, "History of Herodotus". 4 vols. London, 1862.
- Rawlinson, George, "History of Phoenicia". London, 1889.
- Rawlinson, George, "A Manual of Ancient History". New York, 1878.
- Rawlinson, George, "The Origin of Nations", London, 1877.
- Rogers, R. W., "A History of Babylonia and Assyria". 2 vols. New York, 1902.
- Sammes, Aylett, "Britannia Antiqua Illustrata: or. the Antiquities of Ancient Britain". London, 1676.
- Sandys, John E., "A History of Classical Scholarship". 3 vols. Cambridge, 1903.
- Sayce, A. H., "The Races of the Old Testament." London, 1891.
- Schaeffer, Claude F. A., "Stratigraphie Comparee et Chronologie de l'Asie Occidentale". London, 1948.
- Schmidtke, F., "Der Aufbau der Babylonischen Chronologie". Muenster, 1952.
- Schoene, Alfred, "Eusebi Chronicorum". Berlin, 1875.
- Sharpe, Samuel, "The Early History of Egypt, from The Old Testament, Herodotus, Manetho, and the Hieroglyphical Inscriptions". London, 1836.
- Shotwell, J. T., "An Introduction to the History of History", New York, 1922.
- Smith, Sidney, "Early History of Assyria". London, 1928.
- Smith, Sir William, "A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology, and Geography". New York, 1894.
- Starr, Chester G., "The Origins of Greek Civilization 1100-650 B.C.", London, 1962.
- Stock, Hanns, "Die erste Zwischenzeit Aegyptens". Rome, 1949.
- Stokvis, A.-M.-H.-J. "Manuel d'Histoire, de genealogie et de Chronologie de tous les Etats du globe". 3 vols. Leiden, 1888.
- Stone, J. F. S., "Wessex Before the Celts". New York, 1958.
- Ten Cate, H. J. Houwink, "The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and

- Cilicia Aspera During the Hellenistic Period". Leiden, 1961.
- "An Universal History, From the Earliest Account of Time". 20 vols.
London, 1747.
- Vacano, Otto-Wilhelm von, "The Etruscans in the Ancient World". London,
1960.
- Velikovsky, Immanuel, "Ages in Chaos". New York, 1952.
- Velikovsky, Immanuel, "Oedipus and Akhnaton", New York, 1960.
- Vieyra, Maurice, "Hittite Art 2300-750 B.C.", London, 1955.
- Wace, A. J. B. and M. S. Thompson, "Prehistoric Thessaly", Cambridge,
1912.
- Waddell, W. G., "Manetho", The Loeb Classical Library. London, 1940.
- Wathen, G. H., "Arts, Antiquities and Chronology of Ancient Egypt".
London, 1843.
- Webster, T. B. L., "From Mycenae to Homer". London, 1958.
- Weigall, Arthur, "A History of the Pharaohs". 2 vols. London, 1925.
- Whiston, W., "The Complete Works of Josephus".
- Wiener, Leo, "Africa and the Discovery of America". 3 vol.
Philadelphia, 1920.
- Wilkinson, Sir J. G., "The Manners and Customs of the Ancient
Egyptians". 3 vols. London, 1878.
- Williams, F. W., "A History of China". New York, 1901.
- Winlock, H. E., "The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes".
New York, 1947.
- Wiseman, D. J., "Chronicle of Chaldean Kings (626-556 B.C.)". London,
1956.
- Wright, G. Ernest, editor, "The Bible and the Ancient Near East". New
York, 1961.
- Wright, G. Ernest, "Biblical Archaeology". Philadelphia, 1957.
- Wright, G. Ernest, "The Pottery of Palestine From the Earliest Times to
the End of the Early Bronze Age". New Haven, Connecticut, 1937.
- Wylie, J. A., "History of the Scottish Nation". 3 vols. London, 1886.