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INTRODUCTION

The written history of the ancient world is composed without correct synchronization of the histories of different peoples of antiquity: a discrepancy of about six hundred years exists between the Hebrew and Egyptian histories as they are conventionally written; since the histories of other peoples are synchronized both with the Hebrew and the Egyptian past, they are completely distorted.

The ground plan for a redesigning of ancient history was ready in its main features in the spring 1940. During the years 1940-1944, I wrote and completed a Reconstruction of ancient history from the end of the Middle Kingdom in Egypt to the advent of Alexander the Great. Due to war conditions and their interference with the printing of extensive scientific works, the publication of “Ages in Chaos” had to be postponed. This short paper is intended to bring together in concise form most of the innovations of my work; I present them in the form of theses; the manifold proofs which underlie the Reconstruction and the numerous collations of historical material are reserved for the work itself.

New York, June 10, 1945.

I

1. Ancient History before the advent of Alexander the Great is written in a chaotic manner. It is entirely confused, and is a disarray of centuries, kingdoms and persons.

2. The cause of this confusion lies in an incorrect representation of the Egyptian past; and since the history of Egypt is chosen to serve for orientation in compiling the histories of other peoples of antiquity, the histories of these other peoples are brought into disorder as well. The error in Egyptian history consists of six to seven and, in some places, eight centuries of retardation.

3. Histories of Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, Assyria, Mycenae, Classical Greece, Chaldea, Phoenicia, and Caria, are written in duplicate form, with the same events repeated after a period of six or seven centuries. The confusion of centuries makes the life of many personages double; descendants are transformed into ancestors, and entire peoples and empires are invented.

4. The Egyptian and Jewish histories, as they are written, are devoid of a single synchronism in a period of many hundreds of years. Exodus, an event which concerns both peoples, is presumably not mentioned in the Egyptian documents of the past. The establishing of the time of the Exodus must help to synchronize the histories of these two peoples.

5. The literal meaning of many passages in the Scriptures which relate to the time of the Exodus, imply that there was a great natural cataclysm of enormous dimensions.

6. The synchronous moment between the Egyptian and Jewish histories can be established if the same catastrophe can also be traced in Egyptian literature.

7. The Papyrus Ipuwer describes a natural catastrophe and not merely a social revolution, as is supposed. A juxtaposition of many passages of this papyrus (edited by A. Gardiner, under the name “Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage”, 1909) with passages from the Scriptures dealing with the story of the plagues and the escape from Egypt, proves that both sources describe the same events.

8. The Papyrus Ipuwer comprises a text which originated shortly after the close of the Middle Kingdom; the original text was written by an eyewitness to the plagues and the Exodus.

9. The plagues were the forerunners and aftermaths of a great cataclysm the nature of which will be discussed in a work dealing with the natural history of the world. Earthquakes, eruptions of volcanoes, changes of the sea profile, were some of the results of that catastrophe.

10. The tenth plague, during which the houses were struck down, was an earthquake. The clay huts of the “dwellers of the marshes” suffered less than the structures of stone.

11. The “firstborn” (b’khorim) is erroneously used instead of the original “chosen” (b’chorim), and the tenth plague originally narrated the destruction of all the choice people among the Egyptians.

12. The naos (shrine) of el-Arish, now in the Museum of Ismailia, describes the plague of darkness and the death of the pharaoh in a whirlpool. The place of the last event is at Pi-Kharoti, which is Pi-ha-Kiroth of the Book of Exodus.

13. Tom-Taoui-Toth was the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

14. The Exodus took place at the close of the Middle Kingdom: the natural catastrophe caused the end of this period in the history of Egypt. This was in the middle of the second millennium before the present era.

15. The Israelites left Egypt a few days before the invasion of the Hyksos (Amu).

II

16. The Israelites met the Hyksos (Amu) on their way from Egypt. The Hyksos were the Amalekites.

17. The Arabic authors of the Middle Ages related traditions which reflect actual historical events, about the Amalekites who left Mekka amidst catastrophes and plagues, the invasion of Palestine and Egypt by the Amalekites, and the Amalekite pharaohs.

18. The catastrophes and plagues of these traditions are part of the cataclysm which is described in the Scriptures, the Papyrus Ipuwer, and the naos of el-Arish. The flood, which drowned many Amalekites who escaped from Arabia, was simultaneous with the upheaval of the sea on the day of the Passage.

19. Because of the occupation of southern Palestine (Negeb) by the Hyksos, the Israelites escaping from Egypt were forced to roam in the desert. The Desert of the Wanderings stretched deep into the Arab Peninsula.

20. The Hyksos stronghold Auaris was situated at the el-Arish of today. (Its other names are Tharu and Rhinocorura).

21. Its builder Latis, mentioned in the Arabic sources, is identical with the Hyksos King Salitis of Josephus-Manetho.

22. The Hyksos King whose name is read Apop (I) is the Agog (I) of the Scriptures. Similarly Apop II is the biblical Agog II.

23. Amalekite fortresses were built in Palestine. One of them was at Pirathon in Ephraim.

24. The Amalekites employed the same tactics in their devastating raids on Palestine and Egypt, choosing the time before the harvest.

25. The process of the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites was slowed down and reversed when the Canaanites allied themselves with the Hyksos-Amalekites. The wars of the Judges were intended to free the people from the yoke of the Hyksos.

26. The cataclysm which caused a migration of peoples brought the Philistines from Cyprus to the shores of Palestine. They intermarried with the Amalekites and produced a hybrid nation.

27. The Manethonian tradition about the later Hyksos Dynasty of a “Hellenic” origin reflects the period when the Philistine element became rather dominant in the Amalekite Empire.

28. The “Amalekite city” which was captured by Saul was Auaris.

29. As the result of his victory at Auaris, Saul freed Egypt and the entire Near East.

30. In the siege of Auaris, Saul was assisted by Kamose and Ahmose, the vassal princes of Thebes.

31. Manetho’s story about the Hyksos leaving Auaris by agreement reflects the scriptural incident concerning the Kenites leaving the besieged Amalekite fortress.

32. The invasion of southern Palestine by the escaping remnants of the Hyksos is reflected in I Samuel 30; and their further destruction at Sheruhen, in the Talmudic story of Joab’s war against the capital of the Amalekites.

33. This last bastion of the Amalekites was probably on one of the rocks of Petra.

34. Manetho confused Sheruhen with Jerusalem, and the Israelites, the redeemers of Egypt, with the Hyksos.

35. This confusion spread in the Ptolemaic time and became the cause of the rise of anti-Semitism which, fed from different channels, survived until today.

36. The period of the Wanderings in the Desert, of Joshua, and of the Judges, corresponds to the time of Hyksos domination in Egypt and the Near East. The period of the Hyksos lasted for more than four hundred years. The archaeological findings of the Hyksos period in Palestine appertain to the time of the Conquest and the Judges.

III

37. Two kingdoms rose on the ruins of the Hyksos Empire: the kingdom of Israel under David, and the New Kingdom of Egypt under the Eighteenth Dynasty. The beginnings of these two dynasties are not separated by six centuries; they started simultaneously.

38. The Egyptian Queen Tahpenes, the sister-in-law of Hadad the Edomite, was a wife of Ahmose.

39. Thutmose I attacked Gezer of the Philistines and gave it to Solomon, his son-in-law.

40. Queen Sheba is identical with Queen Hatshepsu.

41. The information of Josephus that the queen-guest ruled Egypt and Abyssinia, is correct.

42. The theories which place Punt and God’s Land in either South Arabia or Africa are equally wrong. Hatshepsu’s expedition, pictured in the temple of Deir el Bahari near Thebes, went to Palestine-Phoenicia.

43. By the time of the Old Kingdom, Palestine was already known as God’s Land or Holy Land. The tribe of Menashe lived in Palestine already at the time of the Old Kingdom in Egypt.

44. A preliminary expedition dispatched by Hatshepsu to prepare the way for the main expedition, was met by Peruha, the biblical Paruah, governor of Ezion-Geber.

45. The correction of the verses I Kings 4, 16-17 which place Aloth in the domain of the son of Paruah, is well founded.

46. Queen Hatshepsu participated personally in the main expedition to Ezion-Geber, Jerusalem, and Phoenicia. Her intention was to see what she had known “by hearsay” only.

47. The return voyage was made by sea from the Palestinian shore to Thebes on the Nile, and a second fleet was used. In the days of Hatshepsu there was no canal connecting the Nile with the Red Sea.

48. Jewish officers in the service of Solomon are portrayed on the walls of Deir El Bahari.

49. Exotic animals and plants, including the algum-trees “never seen before”, which Queen Hatshepsu received as gifts in God’s Land, had been brought by the navy of Hiram and Solomon from Ophir. They are seen in the pictures of the expedition.

50. Gifts were also presented to Hatshepsu by messengers of Hiram.

51. Solomon was not an obscure prince, as he is often represented. The riches of his kingdom astounded the Egyptians under their most magnificent monarch.

52. Silver-covered floors in the Jerusalem of Solomon were an actual feature; such floors were also built in the palaces of the viziers of Hatshepsu.

53. The architecture and ordinances of the Temple of Solomon were copied in the Temple of Amon at Deir El Bahari. The plan of this structure and its terraces can help in the reconstruction of the plan of the Temple of Solomon.

54. The Songs of Mounting, which are included among the Psalms, were sung by priests while ascending the terraces.

55. The office of High Priest was introduced into the Egyptian service in imitation of a similar post in the service in Jerusalem. The word pontifex is derived ultimately from the word Punt. The last word means Phoenicia.

56. The Abyssinian tradition preserved the name of the Queen of the South as Makeda, which is derived from the personal name of Hatshepsu (Make-Ra).

57. The Arabic claim that Queen Sheba was their Queen Bilkis, is unfounded.

58. The traditional origin of some Hebrew legends concerning Queen Sheba can be traced in the life and appearance of Hatshepsu.

IV

59. Thutmose III is the scriptural Shishak; he lived not during the fifteenth, but during the latter part of the tenth and the beginning of the ninth century.

60. Thutmose III refers in his inscription in Karnak to the state of disagreement and war among the Jewish tribes of Palestine after the death of Solomon.

61. The disintegration of the empire of Solomon was planned for by Thutmose III and carried out by him. He was also the author of the division of Palestine into two kingdoms.

62. Jeroboam, the first king of the ten tribes, is pictured during his stay in Egypt on a bas-relief in Thebes, together with a small son of his, as the prince of Dunip (Tunip), which is Dan.

63. Baalbek is the ancient Dan.

64. The list of the Palestinian cities inscribed by Thutmose III in Karnak comprises the names of the cities of Rehoboam in his fifth year. The city-fortresses built or fortified by Rehoboam, Etam, Beth-Zur, Shocco, Gath, Ziph, and Adoraim, can be identified in their Egyptian transcription.

65. The chief fortress besieged and captured before the Pharaoh came to Jerusalem, was Megiddo. Megiddo was defended by Rehoboam personally, and he eluded captivity when the fortress fell.

66. The city Kadesh, the most important among the Palestinian cities, and the first in the list of Thutmose III, is Jerusalem.

67. The submission of Rehoboam and the princes of the land, and their “becoming servants” to the Pharaoh is described in the annals of Thutmose III.

68. The vessels and furniture of the Temple of Solomon sacked by Thutmose III, are pictured on a bas-relief of Karnak. They can be seen in detail: altars, tables, candlesticks, etc.

69. The ornaments of “a crown of gold round about”, “buds among flowers” and “lily-work” described in the Scriptures, are shown on the bas-relief.

70. The showbreads had a conical form. The candlesticks had three branches on either side of the stem, or seven branches ~~on either side~~ [*altogether*]. The fountains for perfume were vessels ornamented with figures of animals.

71. The copper covered doors and chains of gold were actual features of the Temple of Solomon.

72. Golden chariots, like those mentioned in the Song of Songs, were carried from Palestine as tribute, and are pictured in the sepulchral chambers of Rekhmire, the vizier of Thutmose III.

73. The theory about the supreme artisanship of the Canaanites in the pre-Israelite period is without foundation.

74. Jewish artists brought to Egypt introduced their fine arts and influenced the aesthetic conceptions of the Egyptians.

75. Animals and plants of Palestine of the days of Rehoboam are pictured in the temple of Karnak. They comprise the collections of Solomon.

76. “Arzenu” (our land), by which the Scriptures mean Palestine, was its name in the Egyptian tongue (“Rezenu” ), a geographical equivalent of the name “God’s Land”.

77. The name of Israel is found in the annals of Thutmose III as that of a people bringing tribute. The assertion that the name of Israel is met for the first and only time in the inscription of Marneptah is wrong.

78. Rehoboam, “the king of Kadesh”, is pictured on a bas-relief in the tomb of Menkheperre in Thebes.

79. The people of Genubath in the inscription of Thutmose III, is the people of the scriptural Genubath, son of Hadad the Edomite.

80. Sosenk, the Pharaoh of the Libyan dynasty, was not Shishak of the Scriptures.

V

81. Amenhotep II lived not in the fifteenth but in the ninth century, and was the scriptural Zerah.

82. The theory that the Ethiopian Zerah came from Arabia is wrong; equally wrong is the theory that he is a mythological figure.

83. The battle of Ain-Reshet, referred to by Amenhotep II, is the battle of Mareshet-Gath, which was lost by Amenhotep II and won by Asa.

84. This intrusion of Amenhotep II-Zerah is also narrated in the poem of Keret found in Ras Shamra.

85. The theory that Terah of the Poem, who invaded the south of Palestine with millions of soldiers, is the father of Abraham, is wrong.

86. The Shemesh-Edom of the war-annals of Amenhotep II is the Edomite city of Shapesh (Shemesh) referred to in the Poem of Keret.

87. In the days of Thutmose IV, Palestine again became a protectorate of Egypt in fear of a menacing conquest by Assurnasirpal (885-860), father of Shalmanassar.

88. Shishak mentioned in the Ras Shamra texts is Thutmose IV.

89. The texts found in Ras Shamra are not of the fifteenth, but of the ninth century.

90. The close resemblance of the texts of Ras Shamra with diverse books of the Scriptures repudiates most of the assertions of the Bible criticism (late origin of the texts), as well as the modern theory about the Canaanite heritage in the Scriptures (early origin of the texts).

91. The theory that alphabetic writing was perfected in the sixteenth century cannot be supported by the Ras Shamra texts of the ninth century.

92. As the alphabetic writing of Hebrew in cuneiform of Ras Shamra is contemporaneous with the stela of Mesha written in Hebrew alphabetic characters, the alphabet most probably did not originate in Phoenicia but in Palestine.

93. The theory that the Ras Shamra texts contain mention of Ionians, and of their city Didyme, is correct, but it concerns the ninth century Ionians.

94. The Khar of the Egyptian and Ras Shamra texts were not Hurrites or Troglodytes, but Carians.

95. The statement by classical authors that the Carians migrated from Crete is corroborated by the name of Keret of the Ras Shamra texts.

96. The Khari (Cari) of the Scriptures were the Khar or Carians from Ras Shamra.

97. The Carian language is studied in the disguise of the Hurrian (or Hurrite) language. The reading of the cuneiform Khar can be helped by a comparative study of the Carian inscriptions in Greek letters found in Egypt.

98. The reading of Carian will contribute to the decipherment of the Cyprian and Cretan hieroglyphics and may aid in reconstructing the early history of the West.

99. The name of the city Ugarit (Ras Shamra) is probably the equivalent of Euagoras, the Carian-Ionian name of a number of Cyprian kings.

100. The name Nikmed of the Ras Shamra texts is the Ionian-Carian name Nikomed(es).

101. The city of Ras Shamra was destroyed in the days of the King Nikmed by Shalmanassar (in 856 B. C. E). Its destruction is recorded by Shalmanassar and the city is called “the city of Nikdem”. A proclamation telling about the expulsion of Nikmed, found in the city, refers to the same event.

102. It is highly probable that King Nikmed (Nikdem) fled to Greece, and that this man of learning there introduced alphabetic writing. Therefore, he might have been Cadmos of the Greek tradition.

103. Minoan inscriptions of the Mycenaean Age may comprise alphabetic writings following in principle the cuneiform alphabet of Ras Shamra Hebrew.

104. The vaults of the necropolis of Ras Shamra and similar vaults in Cyprus are contemporaneous, and not separated by six centuries.

105. The tombs of Enkomi on Cyprus, excavated by A. S. Murray in 1896, were correctly assigned by him to the eighth-seventh century.

106. The time table of the Minoan and Mycenean culture is distorted by almost six hundred years, because it is dependent upon the wrong Egyptian chronology.

107. No “Dark Age” of six centuries duration intervened in Greece between the Mycenaean Age and the Ionian Age of the seventh century.

108. The large buildings and fortifications of Mycenae and Tiryns in the Argive Plain date from the time of the Argive Tyrants, who lived in the eighth century.

109. The Heraion of Olympia was built in the “Mycenaean” age, in the first millennium

110. The so-called Mycenaean ware was mainly of Cypriote (Phoenician) manufacture. It dates from the tenth to the sixth century.

111. The so-called Geometric ware is not a later product than the Mycenaean ware; they were products of the same age.

112. The entire archaeology of the eastern Mediterranean, based upon the assumption that the Mycenaean culture belongs to the fifteenth-thirteenth centuries, is built upon a misleading principle.

VI

113. The el-Amarna Letters were written not in the fifteenth-fourteenth century, but in the middle of the ninth century.

114. Among the correspondents of Amenhotep III and Akhnaton are biblical personages: Jehoshaphat (Abdi-Hiba), King of Jerusalem; Ahab (Rib Addi), King of Samaria; Ben-Hadad (Abdi-Ashirta), King of Damascus; Hazael (Azaru), King of Damascus; Aman (Aman-appa), Governor of Samaria; Adaja (Adaja), Adna (Adadanu), Amasia, son of Zihri (son of Zuhru), Jehozabad (Jahzibada), military governors of Jehoshaphat; Obadia, the chief of Jezreel; Obadia (Widia), a city governor in Judea; the Great Lady of Shunem (Baalath Nesse); Naaman (Janhama), the captain of Damascus; and others. Arza (Arzaja), the courtier in Samaria, is referred to in a letter.

115. Mesha, King of Moab, is often mentioned in the Letters by his name (Mesh). The omission of the name of the rebel king by the translators of the Letters is not warranted.

116. The King of Hatti, who for years invaded and harassed Syria, was Assurnasirpal and after him Shalmanassar.

117. The following correspondents of Amenhotep and Akhnaton are known from the inscriptions of Shalmanassar; Adima, Prince of Siana and Irqata; Mut-Balu (Matinu-Bali), Prince of Arvad.

118. Burnaburias is the Babylonian name of Shalmanassar, and under this name he corresponded with Amenhotep III and Akhnaton. In the Letters he is also referred to as Shalmajati.

119. The military chief who opposed Shalmanassar at Karkar was the governor of MegiddoBiridri (Biridia), one of the Pharaohs correspondents. The identification of Ben Hadad with Biridri is wrong.

120. Sumur of the Letters is Samaria; Gubia is Jezreel. The new residence of the king of Israel was named in honor of his wife Jezebel.

121. Jarimuta or Rimuta of the Letters is Ramoth in Gilead; Sigati is Sukkoth; Ambi - Moab; Durnui - Edom; Rubuti - Raboth in Ammon; Kilti - vadi Kelt.

122. “Elippe” in a number of el-Amarna Letters means “a man over a thousand” or a chief, and not a “ship”. Several cities (Sumur being one of them) are incorrectly located on the seashore because of the mention of “elippe”.

123. The scriptural penman also confused “elippe”, the chief, with the same word meaning a thousand, and thus a correction of the text is required in the story of twenty-seven thousands killed by the wall of Aphek.

124. Ahab was faithful to the Egyptian protectorate. Ben Hadad, supported by Shalmanassar, inspired Mesha to revolt.

125. The capture of Ben Hadad and a covenant signed between him and the King of Samaria are events also related in the Letters.

126. The sieges of Samaria, the negotiation about sending Egyptian detachments, and the flight of the Syrians at the spreading of a rumor about the arrival of the Egyptian troops, can also be read in the Letters.

127. King Ahab was not killed at Ramoth in Gilead, but merely wounded. He survived Jehoshaphat by two years. The version 2 Kings 3, 2 is erroneous, and the rival version 2 Kings 1, 17 is correct.

128. Many events ascribed by the Scriptures to Jehoram, son of Ahab, or to the undefined “king of Israel”, happened in the days of Ahab. Ahab is the author of more than sixty letters found in the el-Amarna collection.

129. Jehoram of Israel and Jehoram of Judea were probably one and the same person, a son-in-law of Ahab.

130. The insurrection of Mesha took place during the life-time of Ahab, after the defeat at Ramoth in Gilead.

131. The K-r-k-h (the capital) of the Mesha Stela means Samaria. The Moabites succeeded in entering Samaria. The Ophel of K-r-k-h is the Ophel of Samaria. The fall of Samaria signified the “everlasting humiliation” and the “great indignation” in the Scriptures and the Stela.

132. By “cuttings” of K-r-k-h, the ivory work of the palace of Samaria is meant.

133. Samaria was the center of the Egyptian administration in Palestine. Possessing and building it was the privilege of the first among the chiefs.

134. Jehoshaphat’s position was of comparative independence, as there was no permanent Egyptian governor in Jerusalem. Adaja was the deputy over Edom and he was subordinate to Jehoshaphat.

135. The expedition of three kings against Moab preceded the invasion of Palestine by tribes of Transjordan and Seir. The sequence in Josephus is wrong.

136. The invasion of the Moabites, Ammonites, and the tribes of Seir is described in the Letters. Khabiru means bandits.

137. The prayer of Jehoshaphat is authentic, being similar in spirit and content to his letters addressed to the Pharaoh.

138. The monotheism of Jehoshaphat is proved by his letters. The notion that Akhnaton was a monotheist (“the first monotheist” ) is wrong.

139. The letters of Jehoshaphat’s generals and city-chiefs substantiate the complaint of the scriptural writer that idolatry was not eradicated in Judea in the days of Jehoshaphat.

140. The el-Amarna Letters provide ample material for elucidation of the feudal system in Palestine in the ninth century.

141. The failing of water sources, the drought and the great famine of seven years duration in Israel are described in many of the letters of the King of Samaria.

142. Ramoth in Gilead was a subject of rivalry because it was not afflicted by drought and famine.

143. The existence of a Great Lady of Sunem called Baalat Nesse (“Wonder occurred to her” ), throws a side-light on the life and acts of Elisha.

144. The change in the attitude of Janhama, the captain of Damascus, toward the King of Samaria, throws another sidelight on the biblical narrative about Elisha.

145. The story about sending assassins against Ahab and about his repeated escapes is also narrated in the Letters.

146. The sickness of Ben Hadad, and his being killed while sick, is confirmed by the Letters. Hazael, his murderer, was his son by a harem woman.

147. The biblical dialogue of Hazael is truly transmitted, as his letters and letters about him prove. In his writing, he used the very same expressions ascribed to him in the Scriptures.

148. Hazael burnt the towns of Israel and occupied most of their land; this is verified by the Letters.

149. Hazael, after leaning toward Shalmanassar, was acknowledged King of Damascus by Akhnaton on the condition that he oppose Shalmanassar.

150. Shalmanassar’s inscriptions and the letters of Hazael (Azaru) give coordinated records about their war and other conditions in Syria.

151. The theory of a Mizri kingdom in Syria is wrong. The soldiers of Mizri at Karkar were Egyptians. The gifts sent by the King of Mizri to Shalmanassar are those enumerated by Akhnaton in his letter to the King of Hatti.

152. Ahab, under pressure from Hazael, went to Beirut. He was not permitted by his brother to return to Jezreel. He went from Beirut to Sidon, to the family of his wife Jezebel. In his lifetime, rumors about his death were spread, and they contributed to the confusion of later chronographers.

153. Sawardatta of the Letters was a prince of the Sodomites who lived at Vadi-Kelt.

154. Labaja of the Letters was a rebellious prince of Libna.

155. The letter addressed by Subliliuma to Hurria does not belong to the el-Amarna collection. It was written in the seventh century and addressed to Tirhaka-Hurria, the Ethiopian. It should be a matter of further investigation, whether any other letters are wrongly ascribed to the el-Amarna archive.

156. The ivories of Samaria of the time of Ahab are not late imitations of the ivories of the time of Amenhotep III, Akhnaton and Tuthenkhamon, but are contemporaneous products.

VII

157. Between the Eighteenth and the Nineteenth Dynasties there was a period of about 150 years, during which Egypt was ruled by the Libyans and the Ethiopians (Twenty-second to Twenty-fifth Dynasties).

158. The period of the Libyans in Egypt lasted not over 200 years but about 100 years only, and its termination is correctly fixed at the end of the eighth century.

159. The only period of ancient Egypt which is correctly placed in time, is the short Ethiopian period. But this retention of its proper place at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the seventh century caused a still greater chaos in historiography; generations which actually followed became progenitors, ancestors became descendants.

160. Osorkon I was not Zerah of the Scriptures, nor did he invade Palestine. Osorkon II was not a contemporary of Omri and Ahab.

161. Hebrew letters on the statues of Osorkon and Sosenk made by the Phoenician kings Elibaal and Abibaal represent the characters of the eighth century, not the tenth century.

162. The ostraca of Samaria were not written in the days of Ahab, but close to the end of the kingdom of Israel, in the days of ~~Jehoram~~ *[Jeroboam*] II. These ostraca, written in characters similar to those of the Siloam inscription of Hezekiah, do not signify an abnormal development of the Hebrew script.

163. Pharaoh So who received gifts from Hoshea was Sosenk IV, and his bas-relief scene pictures this tribute. Sosenk regularly placed as I (first) was IV (last).

164. Osorkon, the priest who caused a civil war and was expelled from Egypt, was the historical prototype of Osarsiph of Manetho, whom he wrongly identified with Moses.

165. After the battle of Eiteka, Egypt became a vassalage of Sennaherib.

166. Psammetich-Seti I, King of Egypt and an ally of the Ethiopians, was deposed by his brother Haremhab, who was in charge of the government during the king’s absence because of the war. Haremhab went over to the Assyrians. The legend about Harmais (Josephus-Manetho), who deceived his brother, is the story of Haremhab.

167. Haremhab was King of Egypt under Sennaherib, and in this service made war against the Ethiopians. His laws were made on the Assyrian model, as were also the punishments involved.

168. Harsiese, the priest of Ammon at the end of the Libyan Dynasty, was the man who reared Haremhab.

169. Haremhab was expelled by Tirhaka, the Ethiopian, and probably fled to Cyprus.

170. The 59th year of some reckoning mentioned in a document ~~written in~~ [*referring to*] the days of Haremhab, is the 59th year of the era of Nabonassar, which started in 747 B. C.E.

171. A cartouche of Haremhab on the inner wall of a sepulchral chamber cut in the days of the Ethiopians, does not constitute an enigma.

VIII

172. The so-called Nineteenth and Twenty-sixth Dynasties are substantially one and the same.

173. Ramses I is identical with, Necho 1. He was one of the viceroys under Essarhadon. After the death of Essarhadon, when the viceroys took sides with Tirhaka the Ethiopian and were killed by Assurbanipal, Ramses I, pardoned by the Assyrian King, was installed by him as the king of Egypt.

174. Shamash Shum Ukin, King of Babylon, and brother of Assurbanipal, corresponded with Tirhaka and allied himself with him.

175. Psammetich-Seti II, son of Ramses I, rose from vassal to the position of an ally of Assurbanipal in his war against Shamash Shum Ukin.

176. Psammetich-Seti II (Seti the Great) repeatedly invaded northern Palestine. He mentions smaller conflicts with Manasseh, referring to the latter by his name.

177. The city Pekanon to which he laid siege and which he captured was a fortress-capital of Peka, King of Israel, who lived two generations earlier. Being a capital, it was probably Samaria.

178. Beth-Shan-Scythopolis was the city where Seti met the vanguard of the Scythians. He occupied the city, as he reported on his stela found there.

179. Seti built a fortress on the Oronteg, at Tell Nebi Mend; it is Riblah of the Scriptures.

180. Seti participated in the war in the valley of the Euphrates on the side of Assurbanipal and against Nabopolassar. The Egyptian army referred to by Nabopolassar in his annals was that of Seti.

181. Greek soldiers sent by Gyges of Sardis to Egypt in the days of Seti became the first Greek settlers there.

IX

182. There was no Empire of the Hittites in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries. The archive found at Boghazkoi belongs in its larger part to the Neo-Babylonian Empire of the seventh-sixth centuries.

183. These documents reflect the political, religious and juridical activities of the Chaldeans.

184. In the seventh century the Chaldeans were centered in Asia Minor, in an area bounded by the Black Sea, the Euphrates, and the Halys.

185. The “Hittite” hieroglyphics are the Chaldean script.

186. The presumed “Hittite” art of the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries is the Chaldean art of the seventh-sixth centuries, and is coeval with and subsequent to late Phrygian art. The bas-relief of Yasilikaya dates from the time of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Greek sculptures with “Hittite” (Chaldean) signs present no problem, neither does the silence of Greek authors about the “Hittites” of the “post-Empire” period.

187. The “Hittite” stela in the palace of Nebukhadnezar in Babylon is a contemporary Chaldean document. The lead tablets from Asaur with “Hittite” hieroglyphics, date from the last centuries before the present era.

188. The succession of the kings of the Neo-Babylonian Empire was: Nabopolassar, Nergilissar, Labash-Marduk, Nebukhadnezar, Evil Marduk, Nabonides. Berosus, according to whom Nergilissar and his son followed Nebukhadnezar, is wrong.\*

189. The treaties of Subliliumas with Azaru of Damascus, with a patricide prince of Mitanni, and with the widow of Tirhaka, make plausible his identity with Shamash Shum Ukin. This would signify also that Nabopolassar was a son of Shamash Shum Ukin.

190. The people and the kingdom of Mitanni did not “disappear” in the thirteenth century. Mitanni is another name for Medes; the northwest part of Medes retained this name as Matiane (Herodotus).

191. Mursilis of the Boghazkoi texts (Merosar of the Egyptian texts), also known as Bijassili, is Nabopolassar of the Babylonian texts, Belesys of Diodorus or Bussalossor of Abydenos. Bel-shum-ishkun is another name of Nabopolassar.

192. The annals of Nabopolassar from his tenth until his seventeenth year (now in the British Museum), can be supplemented by the “Hittite” annals of his from the first to the tenth year (two variants) and from the nineteenth year on, as they survived in the Boghazkoi archive.

193. The presence of the Scythians (Umman-Manda) in Asia Minor, who in the days of Essarhaddon arrived from behind the Caucasus, is also reflected in the Boghazkoi texts dealing with the Umman-Manda.

194. The Assyro-Egyptian alliance against which Mursilis conducted a long war in the valley of the Euphrates, was the alliance of Assurbanipal and Seti (see §180).

195. Assuruballit in Harran, against whom Mursilis marched, was the younger brother of Assurbanipal.

196. The capture of Manassehand his release are recorded in the annals of Mursilis.

197. The Median prince and ally of Mursilis-Nabopolassar was his brother-in-law, known in the texts by the name of Mattiuza.

198. The sickness of Nabopolassar, his subsequent inability to head the army, his invalid condition and his death, as described by Berosus, find their confirmation in the report of Mursilis-Nabopolassar about the first and second strokes of paralysis that befell him.

199. Nergilissar who called himself son of Bel-shum-ishkun, King of Babylon, was a son of Nabopolassar. He was the second son of Nabopolassar; his elder brother died before being crowned.

200. Nergilissar followed the policy of his father in signing international protective treaties, with Chaldea playing the part of the protector.

201. The name of one of his allies, Alexandus (Alexandos) of Wilusa, who came to Alasia (Cyprus), does not imply that the name Alexandos or Alexandros was already in use in the fourteenth century. (Alexandus of Wilusa might have been identical with Alexandros, son of Akamas and father of Chytros, who was connected with the city of Chitroi on Cyprus.)

202. The Aiavolos mentioned in the Boghazkoi texts and identified as Aioles, and connected in the texts with Lesbos, were the colonists from Boeothia on Lesbos (Thukidides I, 12ff.). This process of migration is reflected in the Boghazkoi texts.

203. Nebukhadnezar left an autobiography found among the Boghazkoi texts (the autobiography of Hattusilis-Khetasar). Like other documents of Boghazkoi it is incorrectly ascribed to a period seven centuries earlier.

204. Nebukhadnezar was the third son of Nabopolassar. Of feeble health, he was reared in a temple of Ishtar. When his elder brother died, he was given the name of the deceased.

205. Nergilissar appointed Nebukhadnezar as chief of the army and governor of Assyria. In this capacity he battled the Egyptians under Ramses II, in the second year of the latter; in the fifthyear ofRamses II, raised to the station of King of Assyria, Nebukhadnezar again battled the Egyptians, at Kadesh-Carchemish.

X

206. Ramses II (of the Nineteenth Dynasty) and Pharaoh-Necho (of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty) of the Scriptures or Necos of Herodotus are one and the same person.

207. The theories that make Ramses II the Pharaoh of Oppression or the Exodus are wrong.

208. For nineteen years Ramses II was in a state of war with Nebu-khadnezar.

209. The defeat of Josiah is portrayed in a mural fragment, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

210. The tribute imposed upon Judea and the imprisonment of Jehoahaz are referred to on an obelisk of Tanis.

211. The first march of Necho-Ramses II toward the Euphrates is related on the obelisk of Tanis and on the rock inscription of Nahr el Kalb near Beirut, written in his second year. The rock inscriptions of Ramses II are not as old as that of Essarhadon on the same rock.

212. The second campaign which Ramses II led toward the Euphrates is narrated in his annals and in the Pentaur-poem and has a parallel record in Jeremiah 46.

213. The Shardana mercenaries were the people of Sardis (Lydians), and not of Sardinia.

214. The city Kadesh the Old of the battle was Carchemish.

215. The remnants of the fortifications and the double moats of Kadesh-Carchemish pictured by Ramses II are recognizable in situ.

216. Hieropolis the Old was situated on the site of Carchemish.

217. The river ‘N-r-t or ‘R-n-t was the Egyptian name of the Euphrates.

218. Bab and Aranime mentioned by Ramses II in the course of the battle are Bab and Arime on the road from Aleppo to Carchemish.

219. At the beginning of the battle, Ramses II, with the division of Amon, was northwest of Carchemish; the division of Re was between Sadjur and Carchemish; the division of Ptah and Sutekh were south of Bab. The army of Re was driven northward away from its base, and, together with the division of Amon, was thrown into the Euphrates.

220. After the defeat at Carchemish, Ramses II lost dominion over Syria and Palestine for three years, until the eighth year of Jehoiakim.

221. A fragment of a clay tablet, dealing with the battle of Carchemish, is preserved in the archive of Boghazkoi.

222. Nebukhadnezar returned from the pursuit of Ramses II because he was accused before Nergilissar of intending to usurp the imperial crown.

223. The person of his accuser, Arma, a very aged relative, whom he ultimately put to death, is intimated in the rabbinical literature and in the Fathers of the Church as that of Hiram, King of Tyre, old relative and accuser of Nebukhadnezar.

224. Nergilissar exacted an oath from Nebukhadnezar that he would be faithful to his son and heir, Labash-Marduk (Lamash or Labu in the Boghazkoi texts). After Nergilissar’s death. Nebukhadnezar crowned his nephew, but nine months later, he arrested him. A letter of Nebukhadnezar (Hattusilis) to his minor nephew, containing a denunciation, is preserved.

225. The repairs of the palace and the temple of Ezagila in Babylon made by Nergilissar antedate those made by Nebukhadnezar.

226. The queen of Nebukhadnezar was a daughter of a priest of Ishtar. She was not an Egyptian or Median princess, as related by early authors.

227. Nebukhadnezar became King of Babylon five years after Ramses II became King of Egypt.

228. In his ninth year Ramses II occupied Askalon and the Philistine shore. Marching through the valley of Jezreel, his troops reached Beth Shan.

229. In the twelfth year of Ramses II, Palestine was again subdued by Nebukhadnezar.

230. During the interval between two sieges of Jerusalem in the days of Zedekiah, a treaty was concluded between Ramses II and Nebukhadnezar; its text is extant.

231. Jewish fugitives in Egypt were extradited in accordance with the treaty.

232. The “Fossae Temple” of Lachish was built in the days of Solomon and rebuilt in the days of Jehoshaphat and Amenhotep III; the city was captured by Sennaherib, and destroyed by Nebukhadnezar. The “Fossae Temple”, burnt in the days of Ramses II, and the city-walls, burnt in the days of Nebukhadnezar, are remains of one and the same fire.

233. Nebukhadnezar did not invade Egypt. The only historical inscription which is ascribed to Nebukhadnezar and which deals with a march toward Egypt, has a counterpart in the Marriage Stela of Ramses II.

234. Ramses II married a daughter of Nebukhadnezar. The bas-relief of Abu-Simbel portrays the visit of Nebukhadnezar bringing his daughter to Ramses II.

235. “Bit-Niku” outside the wall of Babylon was the palace built for Ramses II who used to visit there.

236. Nebukhadnezar’s daughter had a palace at Daphneh-Tahpanhes.

237. Red baked bricks of the Ramses period in Tahpanhes were an innovation introduced from the Babylon of Nebukhadnezar.

238. The Bentresh Stela deals with the mental disease of the elder daughter of Nebukhadnezar, and was written by the priests of Khons a few decades thereafter. This daughter was married to a prince of Damascus.

239. The paranoiac character of Nebukhadnezar is fully reflected by his autobiography and other texts of Boghazkoi, notably dealing with exorcisms. The biblical record about his suffering from nightmares and about his mental disease is substantiated.

240. The tomb of Ahiram found at Bybios dates not from the thirteenth century, but from about 600 B.C.E. The Cyprian pottery of the end of the seventh century and the vases of Ramses II found in this grave are contemporaneous.

241. Itobaal, son of Ahiram, the builder of the tomb, was probably the defender of Tyre against Nebukhadnezar, as mentioned by Josephus.

242. The inscriptions of Ahiram’s tomb are of the same age as the ostraca of Lachish. The development of the Hebrew letters went through a normal process without falling into archaisms.

243. The dispute as to whether Ramses II or Necho built the canal connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea, deals with a spurious problem.

244. Greek armor found in Daphneh (Daphnoi), as well as iron tools and ingots, are coeval with the temple of Ramses II there, and are products of the Greek mercenaries in the service of the pharaohs of the Nineteenth (Twenty-sixth) Dynasty.

245. Tiles of buildings erected by Ramses II (in Kantir) which have Greek letters on the back, are products of Greek laborers in the service of the pharaoh. The letters are genuine Greek letters of the sixth century.

XI

246. Pharaoh Marneptah is the biblical Hophra and Apries of the Greek authors. Marneptah was not the Pharaoh of the Exodus, but the Pharaoh of the Exile. His royal name usually read Hotephirma, must be read Hophra-Mat.

247. That part of the population of Palestine which escaped deportation to Babylon, went to Egypt, and this migration through the fortress city of Takhu was recorded by the officials of Marneptah.

248. The fortress and palace station Takhu on the frontier, is the biblical Tahpanhes (Daphnoi).

249. The mention of Israel in the “Israel Stela” of Marneptah as an unsettled people refers to their status of exiles.

250. Marneptah used metaphors similar to Jeremiah’s in describing the plight of Palestine and Israel.

251. The incursion of Marneptah into Syria is echoed in Diodorus I, 68. This could have taken place during the mental illness of Nebukhadnezar.

252. The city Kaditis in Palestine, referred to by Herodotus, is Jerusalem, and not Gaza.

253. The Libyan campaign of Marneptah was caused by the migration of the Greeks to Cyrenae. It was not an archaic invasion of Hellenic peoples in the thirteenth century, but the mass migration encouraged by the Pythian oracle and described by Herodotus (IV, 159).

254. Amasis deposed Marneptah. There were not seven centuries between Marneptah and Amasis; the latter was a general in the service of the former. Amasis kept his prisoner for a while as co-ruler on the throne.

255. The violent death of Apries-Marneptah at the hands of the assassins was caused by a lethal wound of the head, as the perforation of the scull of his mummy ghows.

XII

256. The overthrow of Egypt, which Ramses III referred to as having occurred a number of generations before his own days, is the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in the year of Amasis’ death.

257. The Palestinian Irsa who taxed Egypt is Ezra, the scribe; he taxed Egypt in accordance with the decree of Artaxerxes.\*\*

258. Ramses III is identical with Nectanebo I of the Greek authors. He lived not in the twelfth but in the fourth century.

259. In Herodotus there can be no reference to Ramses III, because the historian lived before the pharaoh. The history of Egypt by Herodotus, though defective in details, is more nearly accurate than that of the later and modern historians, because he placed the history of the Eighteenth, the Ethiopian, and the Nineteenth Dynasties in fairly accurate order.

260. “Invasion of Egypt by the archaic Greeks” in the twelfth century is a fallacy. The Greeks who participated in the wars of Ramses III and who are shown as changing sides, were at first soldiers of Chabrias, assisting Egypt, and then troops of Iphicrates, opposing Ramses III.

261. Agesilaus, the King of Sparta, had already arrived in Egypt in the days of ~~Nectanebo I (Ramses III)~~, [*Tachos (Ramses IV)*] and Ramses III, who referred to his arrival, mentioned also his notably small stature.

262. The Pereset, with whom Ramses III was at war, were the Persians of Artaxerxes II under the satrap Pharnambazus, and not the Philistines.

263. The war described by Ramses III, and by Diodorus and other classical authors (the war of Nectanebo 1), is one and the same war of 374 BCE

264. A camp was set up by Pharnambazus in Acco in preparation for an attack against the Egypt of Ramses III.

265. A naval invasion against Egypt was undertaken by forcing the Mendesian mouth of the Nile, fortified by Ramses III.

266. Flame throwers were used on the Persian ships forty years before their use by the Tyrians at the siege of Tyre by Alexander.

267. The Egyptian bas-reliefs of the temple at Medinet Habu show Sidonian ships and Persian carriages comparable to the pictures of ships and carriages on the Sidonian coins minted during the years of the invasion.

268. The bas-reliefs of Medinet Habu show the reform of Iphicrates in lengthening the swords and spears and reducing the armor intended for defense.

269. The Jewish military colony at Elephantine still existed in 374 BCE and participated in the defense of the eastern border of Egypt. These professional soldiers were called Marienu by Ramses III, which is the Aramaic Marenu.

270. Semitic languages and the Palestinian cult of Baal made headway in Egypt at the time of Ramses III.

271. The Greek letters of classical form incised on the tiles of Ramses III during the process of manufacture (found at Tell-el-Yahudieh in the Delta) present no problem. They are Greek letters of the fourth century.

272. The inlay work and glazing of the tiles of Ramses III are innovations introduced from Persia.

273. The hunting motifs in the art of Ramses III were inspired by Assyrian and Persian bas-reliefs; some motifs of the Greek art also made their influence felt in the murals of Ramses III.

274. Other kings known by the name of Ramses, from Ramses IV to Ramses XII, are identical with the kings of the Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Dynasties and their order of succession is confused.

275. The papyrus of Wenamon describes the conditions in Syria during the late Persian or early Greek times. In the days when the Testament of Naphtali was composed, the Barakel Shipowners Company mentioned in this papyrus was still in existence and owned by a son of Barakel.

276. The so-called Twenty-first Dynasty flourished not in the twelfth-eleventh century, but in the fifth-fourth century; it was established by the Persians as a dynasty of priestly princes in the oases of the Libyan desert for strategic purposes. It existed before, during and after the Twentieth (Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth) Dynasty.

277. The so-called Stela of the Exiled is the Egyptian record of the visit of Alexander the Great to the oracle of Amon in the oasis. The question about the exiles refers to the exiles from Chios; the question about the punishment of the murderers refers to the murderers of Philip.

278. The narration of Greek and Latin authors concerning this visit of Alexander is historical and true in many details; such is, e. g., the episode of the priest applying the word “son” to Alexander, or the oracle’s manner of answering questions by nodding.

XIII

279. The history of the ancient world, confused for a period of over one thousand years, reaches the end of its confusion with the time of Alexander the Great. Since then it is rendered in a synchronized form.\*\*\*

280. The problem of the beginning of the Iron Age in diverse countries is confused by wrong chronology. The Iron Age developed simultaneously in Egypt and Palestine.

281. The often made assumption that the royal signs (scarabs with cartouches) of the Egyptian kings do not present a valid argument for the time valuation of the strata in which they are found, is erroneous. In most cases they were neither heirlooms deposited at a later date, nor late counterfeits, but genuine gems as old as the strata in which they are found.

282. Archaeological work in the Near East is misled by the erroneous chronology of Egypt. In the excavations where the strata were carefully distinguished, as in Beth Shan, no strata of the Israelite period above the stratum of Rames II could be found.

283. The astronomical computation of chronology made by calculation of the Sothic periods is entirely arbitrary in many aspects. The Egyptian New Year followed the planet Isis, which is Venus, and not Sirius. The Canopus Decree of the priests of Ptolemy III Euergetes was concerned with the transfer of the New Year from the heliacal rising of Venus to a date regulated by the rising of Sirius (Sothis).

284. After the end of the Middle Kingdom, a change in cosmic scenery caused a reform in the calendar. During the time of the Libyan Dynasty (between the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties) another change was made in the calendar.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| \* | Velikovsky later concluded that there were two Nergilissars, the second reigning after Evil Marduk. |
| \*\* | Velikovsky later rejected Irsa being Ezra, and identified him as the Persian official Arsames. Cf. *Peoples of the Sea,* n. 8 on page 27. |
| \*\*\* | Velikovsky later found that the confusion persists until the time of Ptolemy II. Cf. *Peoples of the Sea.* |
|   | —The Editors |