Rolf Ward Green
Ralph Ellis Green
Anne Ruth Rutledge
Flora Marie Green

Perseus and Andromeda by Peter Paul Rubens, c. 1622 CE

The face of the Lord is against them that do evil, to destroy their memorial from the earth. The righteous cried, and the Lord hearkened to them.

(*Psalms 34:16; Brenton*)

Refer to the References for previous articles by the same author(s).

Wild Road Ahead To

History—

Israel Choosing Egypt

(Meet Your Marker)

Part 1:

(See also: Part 2
of Wild Road Ahead To History)

Chapter 1: Reevaluation Of Amarnan Dynasty
Chapter 2: Reasserting Amarnan Greenealogical Egypt
Chapter 3: Proposing Amarna Calibrates Egyptian Seasons
Chapter 4: Semite Israel Masterfully Pervading Lower Egypt
Chapter 5: Dynasty Akkad To Exodus
Chapter 6: Solstice Exacts Egyptian Dating
Chapter 7: Foothold In The Sinai

>(See also: Part 2
of Wild Road Ahead To History)

Chapter 1: Reevaluation Of Amarnan Dynasty

Right: The Great Sphinx at Giza *(Wallpaper)*

And the congregation of the nations shall compass thee: and for this cause do thou return on high.
(*Psalms 7:7; The Translation of the Greek Old Testament Scriptures, Including the Apocrypha. Compiled from the Translation by Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton 1851.*)

Oo dadyowga ururradoodu ha ku hareereeyeen, Oo adna iyaga xagga sare uga noqo.
(*Psalms 7:7; Somali Bible (Kitaabka Quduuska Ah) 2008.*)

11 An announcement was made, in Feb 2014, by the Egyptian Ministry for Antiquities, they saying that "conclusive evidence" exists for a coregency of "at least 8 years" between Akhenaten and his father Amenhotep III, and it has also long been common to date Akhenaten 1375-1358. For the BG, this has significant implications, because it shifts lunar alignments by 3 days (LD from x to x - 3) as caused by the 3-year backward shift in Year 1 of Akhenaten, making his Year 8 I Peret 8 anniversary the Julian year 1367 with a LD1 exact alignment on Nov 28, which was I Peret 1 in that year, his Year 2 I Peret 5 date an exact LD1 on Dec 03 1373, implying the date of his accession as I Peret 8 Dec 07 1375 (or I Peret 5). The I Peret 5 date in Year 2 is not certain, but there is additional confirmation in his Year 5 Pharmouthi 13 on three boundary stelae which Krauss proposed was the night of a new moon (LD1), and is instead probably LD2 Mar 11 1370 with lunar conjunction firmly Mar 10 1370. PLSV 3.1 at Amarna gives a. v. 10.79 or less as valid, with Schaefer's 8.5 deg as upper limit (20 deg azim.). Pharmouthi 13 is LD12 the next year, and is celebrated as its anniversary, 1369 Year 6 as a waxing moon date. Of Akhenaten's other dates, Year 8 I Peret (Tybi) 8 is LD8 in 1367 (ie. Tybi 1 is LD1), and Year 12 Mecheir 8 is Jan 03, an exact new moon date in 1364,

remarkably. Year 14 Mecheir 2 is Dec 28, astronomical full moon in 1363, almost two years after Jan 1364, and Year 16 has a III Akhet (Hathyr) 15 date, as LD-1 Oct 11 1360 BCE. In Chapter 29 of her book, M. Christine Tetley accepts only the Year 5 IV Peret 13 date of Akhenaten, and she dates it to 1459 BCE as her only received Amarna date, using her (very unconventional) Egyptian month system.[1] Her point about the DNA of Akhenaten is probably false because KV-55 is excluded by DNA from being Akhenaten, as Mr. Belmonte confirms using this same DNA evidence. [2,3] KV-55 would still be probably identified as Smenkhare.

[1](*The Reconstructed Chronology of the Egyptian Kings (2014 posthumously), by M. Christine Tetley, pp. 395, 399-401*) [2](*The Reconstructed Chronology of the Egyptian Kings (2014 posthumously), by M. Christine Tetley, p. 402*) [3](*DNA, Wine & Eclipses: the Dakhamunszu Affaire, Anthropological Notebooks 19 (Supplement) (2013), by Juan Antonio Belmonte, p. 432*)

Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela S *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XXXIX)*

---

12 When we accept that Akhenaten was coregent for 8 years with Amenhotep III, Akhenaten's new alignment allows a resequencing of the Amarna chronology in a consecutive manner, without gaps in the resoluable, Reign lengths. This is true, provided that the assumption is correct, that Ramesses II Year 1 as fixed in 1315, and Ramesses I Year 1 in 1320 BCE force Tutankhamun Year 1 to 1355, with his death, in 1346, finding an alignment with the Reign of Horemheb, and with Akhenaten's death in 1358. Ay rules about 5 years from 1346 to 1341, but is later usurped by Horemheb, who rules 1341 to 1328, but finds another

expression of his Reign, as from 1346 to 1320. The Reign of Smenkhare has now been decoupled from the 17 years of Akhenaten, and occupies a space 1358-1355, which seems fit to accommodate a Year 3 for Smenkhare. We find also notice of Smenkhare in Akhenaten Year 15.

---

13 The Year 17 wine vintage of Akhenaten implies that his Reign extends from 1375 until wine bottling in Year 17 (Aug to beginning of Sep, Gregorian, or Julian Sep 10, according to Krauss), and one wine jar was found which bears a Year 17 with a date for the sealing of the jar of II Akhet (Phaophi) 17, Sep 13 Julian year 1358 BCE. The sealing date would be consistent with 16 years and some 9 months having passed from early Dec 1375 Year 1 and signifies a death for Akhenaten after Sep 13 1358, three years earlier than that given in the B4 article. The Years 1 to 3 that follow fit into 1357-1355, three consecutive years of vintage, the third of which years has exhibited thus far only three wine labels compared to 50 or 60 in a year's vintage, signifying the end of the Reign of Nefertiti in 1355, and Tut's Year 1 1355, right about the time of early to mid-August perhaps, a time near the start of wine bottling season apparently and the time of Tutankhamun's accession,

though Krauss would explain it as the change of Year during the time of the sealing of the jars, inconsistent as this seems with Akhenaten dying after wine season of Sep 13, such date being also the change of year for his successors.

Above: Great Sphinx and Pyramid, Giza *(Wallpaper)*

---

14 Tutankhamun's Year 1 1355 is seen to be the same as we offered in *Trojan War,* in conjunction with 1320 as the Year of the burial of Horemheb, in his Year 27. There are, thus, 26 full years from Tut's death in Jan or Feb (or Mar) of his own Year 9 (ie. 1346) until the burial of Horemheb as dated in a Year 27, Mar 24 1320. We would here seek to explain

the details of the lunar alignments involved: for Smenkhare down to Ramesses I.

---

15 The name of *Ankheprure Smenkhkare-Djeserkheperu* was seen since *1845 from the tomb of Meryre II.* Smenkhare (and Nefertiti) have one calendar date, that of III Akhet (Hathyr) 10, which is a new moon in 1354, exactly, coming just one year after Tut's Year 1 1355. This Hathyr 10 date was found in the tomb of Pairy and is a graffito (at Thebes), Oct 05 in 1356 to 1354 BCE, which is falling in 1356 in such a way that it appears to place the death of Akhenaten more precisely between Sep 13 to Oct 05, as the 1358 accession would require. There are then two full years beginning 1358 and 1357, with Akhenaten's death in 1358 (ie. after Sep 13 1358) leaving the years 1358-1355 to Smenkhare and Nefertiti (we surmise), and Tut's accession in the fall of 1355. The Hathyr 10 graffito at Thebes would be Lunar Day 9, as Sep 27 is a stable LD1 at Thebes, so Oct 05 is LD9.[1] The LD9 is for 1356 and is the only waxing moon of the three years 1356 to 1354 for this date, apart from LD1 in 1354, which provides a low option that squeezes the years of Tutankhamun and his successors (or seems to), making 1356 Hathyr 10 the providential, viable

option. Of these three years 1356-4, to have had a LD1 amongst them but in the wrong year appears a minor temptation. Year 3 can't be 1354, as Ankheprure accedes in 1358 as fixed by the wine vintages 1374 to 1358, 17 inclusive, as Year 1 1375 of Akhenaten started after wine season, and Year 17 being Akhenaten's last known wine vintage. Akhenaten died in 'late summer or autumn' (Miller[2]), and "after Sep 13" (paragraph 1-3, Year 17 wine seal). However, were we to take the 26 years of Horemheb from 1354 to 1328 we have consistency with Manetho, where a King called Sethos (Seti) drives out the usurper, thus restoring the rightful Rule, so fitting to chronology. [3,4] Then again, we know that the difficulties of moving by one iota any of the Reigns established above are many. So, the fact that Hathyr 10 is a waxing moon on LD9 in 1356 (ie. between LD1 and LD15) is far more fortunate. Either way, the chronology may be fixed to this point. The importance of two options here is big, because, as Schaefer pointed out, our knowledge of lunar dates and the Egyptian, religious system was lacking as of 2000.[5]

[1](*Lunar Day 1 doesn't vary much around Egypt, but the Amarna dates do account the view from Amarna.*)
[2](*Altorientalische Forschungen Vol. 34 (2007) 2, "Amarna Age Chronology and the Identity of Nibhururiya in the Light of a Newly Recontructed Hittite Text," by Mr. Jared Miller, p. 271*)

[3](*Mr. Jared Miller wrote in 2007:*

If indeed Armaa is to be equated with Haremhab, and if Haremhab is not yet pharaoh in this text, then it would yield the important ***terminus a quo*** *[ed. meaning 'earliest possible date'] of Mursili's 9th year for the accession of Haremhab. This* ***terminus a quo,*** *if valid, would exclude the identification of Nibhururiya with Tutankhamun (see Fig. 1 [ed. see Miller's article]), and if so, then Nibhururiya can only have been Akhenaten.*

If KUB 19.15+KBo 50.24 would appear to exclude the identity of Nibhururiya with Tutankhamun and thus to cinch the identity of Nibhururiya with Akhenaten, how can one reconcile it with the rest of the multifarious evidence relevant to the question? This paper will now turn to those issues which bear some import for the matter of the identity of Nibhururiya and Amarna Age chronology associated with it. It does so with the realization that no current reconstruction seems to be able to account neatly for all the evidence.

(Altorientalische Forschungen Vol. 34 (2007) 2, "Amarna Age Chronology and the Identity of Nibhururiya in the Light of a Newly Recontructed Hittite Text," by Mr. Jared Miller, p. 255)

[ed. note: Mursili has Year 1 in 1350, in our Crucible article, paragraph 9-11, later])

[4](*Manetho says, according to Josephus:*

Sethos drove out Hermaeus and reigned for 59 years; then Rampses, the elder of his sons, for 66 years.

(Manetho, with an English translation (1940), by W. G. Waddell, p. 165))

[5](*B. Schaefer:*

In summary, sadly, I conclude that the current large uncertainties in predicting lunar visibility and in ancient Egyptian procedures do not allow for any possible astronomical solution of Egyptian absolute chronology with lunar dates.

("The Heliacal Rise of Sirius and Ancient Egyptian Chronology," Journal for the History of Astronomy, Vol. 31 (2000), Part 2, p. 154))



THE DISTRICT OF AKHETATEN (*after Petrie*).

Above: Map of Akhetaten (after Petrie) *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XXXIV, cropped)*

---

16 Key details can topple a carefully crafted chronology. In our previous articles, we had ignored the detail of Mr. Miller's article wherein he made Year 9 of Mursili the earliest (terminus a quo) for Year 1, of Horemheb. At the time, we had dated Year 1 Horemheb in 1344 BCE. Our recent *Trojan War* article has introduced an adjusted chronology (as we outlined above) for Amarna, details of which were beyond the scope of its context, and were founded on the Sothic alignment of Seti I (we summarize and expand Sothic alignments, in Chapter 2). Since, as we

noted from Jared Miller, [in footnote 2,] in the previous paragraph, Horemheb (Haremheb) did not rule Egypt prior to Year 9 of Mursili II (1350-1324)-- dated as thus 1342 BG-- were we to accept that thesis, the King who ruled after Tutankhamun's death (in 1346, by our own analysis, *Trojan War 2-12, footnote*) would be permitted 1346-1341 in our QWP chronology (or thereabouts), with 1341 Horemheb's Year 1 (see below). So, we now date Horemheb post-Year-9-Mursili (Miller). After Tut was the Pharaoh Ay (or Aya), whose Reign has been adjudged by experts as 3-5 years (5 yrs, Dodson). Before considering Ay, however, we review Tutankhamun.

Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela K (Lines 1-31) *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and*

Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XXXVIII)

17 Because the DNA work has been seriously misunderstood, we should first of all say that Tutankhamun is the son of KV-55, who is the son of Amenhotep III, and surely. Some take this to mean that Akhenaten is Tut's father, which is wrong because KV-55 is not in fact Akhenaten. KV-55 is most probably Smenkhare, as many may believe. Smenkhare is thus, in turn, the father of Tutankhamun. Tutankhamun is the grandson of Amenhotep III by KV-55. A single wine docket from 'Year 1, house of Smenkhare' indicates that Smenkhare was Pharaoh, perhaps briefly. This would be wine from 1357 in the QWP chronology, as Year 2 and 3 would be 1356 and 1355 for a continuation of his Reign by the Queen Nefertiti (Neferneferuaten). Pharaoh Tutankhamun began at the start of wine sealing in the year 1355 (BG), Year 3 of Neferneferuaten, when only 3 wine labels from Year 3 exist, with Year 1 from an unnamed Pharaoh who then changed the vintner title:[1]

The last vintage that is documented at Amarna dates to a regnal year 1; in that year the

vintner's title 'hrj k3mw' (sic) was reintroduced and continued to be used as wine jar labels in the tomb of Tutankhamun show.
(Ancient Egyptian Chronology (2006), p. 207)

[1](*Ancient Egyptian Chronology (2006), pp. 207-8*)

---

18 The years of Tutankhamun's Reign may be founded upon a backwards calculation from Year 1 of Ramesses II 1315. Seti I's Year 4 Sothic rising coinciding with the same event in Year 1 of Ramesses II in 1315 dates him 1318, and the attested Year 2 of Ramesses I places him 1320. Tut thus dies 26 full years before 1320-- in 1346 BCE. What lunar alignments we do find for Year 1 1355 based on the 9 vintage years of wine for Tutankhamun (he has a vintage in his first, but not his last Regnal year), are going to reflect back on 1375 as Year 1 Akhenaten. An accession for Tut in late summer of 1355 is some 20 years after Akhenaten's, as the 17 years for Akhenaten are followed by about 3 years for Smenkhare/Nefertiti. A Year 4 date for Tutankhamun, in IV Shemu (Mesore) 2, LD7 as Jun 23 1352 competes with LD3 Choiach 19 Year 6 (IV Akhet 19) as Nov 11 1349, one

Year 7 III Shemu Jun 06 1348 (Epeiph) 16 as LD5, or Year 8 III Peret Feb 12 1347 (Phamenoth) 22 as LD18/19 and Year 8 1348 as LD8.

Table 1.1:

Tut's BCE Lunar Dates

Regnal Year	Julian Year	Egyptian Date	Julian Date	Lunar Day	Year 1
4	1352	Mesore 2	Jun 23	LD7	1356
4	1351	Mesore 2	Jun 23	LD18	1355
6	1351	Choiach 19	Nov 11	LD12	1356
6	1349	Choiach 19	Nov 11	LD3	1354
7	1350	Epeiph 16	Jun 07	LD13	1357
7	1348	Epeiph 16	Jun 06	LD5	1355
8	1348	Phamenoth 22	Feb 12	LD8	1355
8	1347	Phamenoth 22	Feb 12	LD18/19	1354

In Table 1.1 (above) we see waxing or near full moons.

Removing one outlier at 1357 BCE, the average of seven lunar alignments gives Year 1 Tutankhamun as 1355 BCE. This confirms our study (above) of Year 1 Tutankhamun. In addition, of wine vintage years, we have (possibly) Year 1 at Amarna, with Years 4, 5, 9 (and possibly 10) from Tutankhamun's tomb, so that 1355 as Year 1 should also imply 1347 as the last (excluding 10), assuming a harvest at the very beginning of Year 1, and his death Jan 1346 (before the harvest), thus 9 years 1355-1347. Since Tut died about Jan 1346, and his Year 9 wine was thus bottled in that fall of the previous year (1347), the years of his Reign are 1355 to 1346 (agreeing with the footnote to paragraph 2-12, of *Trojan War.)* Were the Year 10 wine label found in his tomb his, and not Akhenaten's, it may imply Year 1 one year earlier, and would not change the date of death of Tutankhamun. We have Tutankhamun's Reign as, absolutely, 1355-1346. Year 1 of Akhenaten is 1375 vindicated by Tutankhamun. Furthermore, when we start from 1375 as Akhenaten Year 1 and add the Reigns of the Pharaohs preceding him, to get back to Ahmose I, the *Book of Sothis* gives:

1375 + 34 + 39 + 23 + 16
+ 11 + 15 + 13 + 26 = 1552
Year 1 Ahmose I

(Manetho w/ an English Translation, by W. G. Waddell (1940), p. 241)

Virtually none of the Reign lengths from this sequence matches, yet it strongly confirms: 1552 Year 1 Ahmose. So 1552, 1375, 1355 are evidently absolutely Year 1 of Ahmose, Akhenaten and Tutankhamun, respectively (QWP), since 1552 is Sothically aligned and lunar-aligned (in *Trojan War, see paragraphs 2-7, 2-10, and 8-2).* Statistically, it is extremely unlikely for any random set of eight Reign lengths to make a sum of 177 years, or the number of years between Ahmose I and Akhenaten, and this implies that someone accounted for the total, and that they (possibly Manetho) knew the time between Ahmose I and Akhenaten quite precisely, and certainly. In any event, it would say nothing of the dates of the Pharaohs between 1552 Ahmose I and 1375 Akhenaten BCE. We stop here just short of proclaiming absolute dates.

Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela K (Full View) *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XXXVII)*

---

[19] Four or five years for Pharaoh Ay are rather analogous to the four or five years of Armais in Manetho, but it appears to be possible to associate Armais to Ramesses (ie. Seti, who Manetho says was also called Ramesses), by virtue of the similarity of 'Armais' to 'Ramesses,' plus the Year 4 of Seti mentioning a Sothic alignment. Furthermore, Horemheb is called Harmais by Miller, and the 14 years of wine labels for Horemheb have scholars adding 10 years to Manetho's Armais and equating them. It is in the Eusebian Manetho that we see the Reign of Armais immediately preceding '68' years of 'Ramesses,' which without Seti's

name implies his preceding Reign. In our last article, *Trojan War,* however, we do find a valid way of understanding Manetho's accounting which seems to prove that Ramesses I started his Reign 164 years after *The Exodus,* so Year 1 1329 BCE. This is a simpler approach to the reckoning of Reigns.

---

110 Considering that Horemheb began to Reign 1341 BCE (see the footnote to 2-12, end of Chapter 2 of Trojan War), in agreement with Jared Miller's argument, and that he had a Year 14 wine label, as Jacobus van Dijk asserts, we have 1328 BCE as the year of Horemheb's death, only provided that the excess of Year 13 wine labels can be an indication (22 of Year 13 vs. 8 of Year 14) of Year 13 as his last year, with some accounting variation in the Year number being caused by perhaps a late jarring of wine, his 'burial' Pachon 09 being Mar 26 1328 BCE. Otherwise, it appears that a potential problem exists, seeing as there are not 14 grape harvests available in the years 1341 BCE to 1328 BCE, Horemheb's lunar dates implying an accession before Jul 13-17 in 1341, before the grape harvest of that year, and his 'burial' being before the harvest of 1328, implying not 14

inclusive. It appears explicable, however, as Jul 17 is but seven days from the calendric New Year Thoth 01, and shy too of the date of the Sothic rising at Memphis, slightly. Based on the frequency of similar Year number riddles, in the analysis of lunar dates (for example), combined with the asymmetry (22 to 8) in the label years and an ongoing accounting of the intervening Reigns remaining after Horemheb until Ramesses II in 1315 BCE, there is no strong objection that can be raised to this dating. Thus, as God wills it, Horemheb reigned 1341-1328 BCE, and his year '27' burial could date back to a subsumed Year 1 of 1355 BCE, now Year 1 of Tutankhamun's Reign. One can't say too much about the convenience of dates. Lunar alignments, together with known Regnal years for Pharaohs, tend to agree well with our chronology here.



Above: Spalding All-Stars and Chicago White Stockings at the Great Sphinx of Giza *(1889 photo)*

---

111 We already know that a shifting of dates down by three years will advance the Lunar Day numbers by three days as well, so that the earlier dating of Ramesses I Year 1 as 1331 can only be in 1328, to retain the alignment of his Year 2 date (see *Crucible* for the Jan 07 1329 alignment, and *B4* Chart 1 par. 2-11), made to fall now on Jan 06 1326, with Ramesses Year 1 1328.[1] The consequence is thus now a LD4 instead of new moon. This Year 2 date is on a stela, typically inscribed at the very beginning of the month, or perhaps full moon. However, a mitigating factor is the Reign, of 1 year 4 months, assigned by Josephus to

"Ramesses," a Reign so short as to 'require' the death of Horemheb in 1328, a death in January (ie. 70 embalming days before Mar 26) and late enough in that month as to make the remaining months until a Jun 09 accession of Seti I quite exact. Seeing that Seti's Reign is given as 11-15 years by an expert (Kitchen), and that we have 11 years remaining, before 1315 (Ramesses II Year 1), things look sublime. Save for the fact that Jan 06 1327 (II Peret 20 Y2) in fact is in Year 1 of Ramesses I (deja vu), this leaves a better lunar alignment, with Seti's Year 1 1327 BCE. Deja vu, because once again we see a Year discrepancy. One of the discrepancies is unavoidable in any similar relative arrangement of the Reigns, since lowering the death of Horemheb one year forces Seti to Year 1 1326, giving Horemheb his Year 14 wine label and making Year 2 II Peret 20 Ramesses I 1326 BCE (only Year 1 LD4 Jan 06, also), Seti I then suffering a lunar misalignment. Overall, though, the 'fit' is very near to perfection, as these difficulties persist in any absolute reality. The deciding factor is the Sothic alignment, for Seti.

[1](*B4 Chronology -- History of Babylon (2015), par. 2-11, Chart 1, "A Moon Alignment Reconstructing Neat Amarna"*)

Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela Q *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XLII)*

---

112 The star Sothis rose heliacally or just before the Sun for the first time during the year on Thoth 01 (in the Egyptian calendar, New Year's day) once in 1460 years, or so, an event which occurred of record in Year 04 of Seti (Gertoux, primary source K. Sethe in "Zeitschrift fur Agyptische Sprache," Vol. 66, 1931, pp. 1-7), with Seti being Seti I the father of Ramesses II the Great. *Arcus visionis* is a measure of visibility (arc) for objects (expressed in degrees of arc) of celestial manifestation near the horizon, a parameter quantified by Ptolemy in Egypt as 11 degrees, and which

when kept in the range of 10.91 to 11.10 using the modern PLSV 3 determines 'Year 04' of Seti I as, uniquely, 1324 BCE, the star Sothis rising heliacally on Jul 20 1324 first after 1460 years, again on Thoth 01 at Memphis, Egypt. With Seti's accession believed to have been in June, a date before the time in July when Sothis rises in each year, Seti's Year 1 1327 BCE is distinctly determined. Based on this Year 1, at least two recorded dates from Seti's Reign are calculated to fall on Lunar Day 01, a fact in agreement with all data about his Reign length being 11-15 years ending in 1315 BCE (hence 12 years). The drawbacks of our arrangement of the Egyptian Kings in Dynasty 19 are: 1. Jan 06 1327 is a waning moon and as LD23 doesn't befit a stela and 2. Horemheb has wine labels for a Year 14, but there were only 13 harvests. It appears possible that Horemheb ruled until 1327 and that Ramesses I (who was appointed by Horemheb, as his successor) may have coruled from 1331 until 1327 (then he corresponds to the Armais of Manetho who has either 4 y 1 mo in Josephus, or 5 years, Africanus/Eusebius). This appears consistent with Manetho's account, where:

When a considerable time had elapsed, Harmais who had been left

behind in Egypt, recklessly contravened all his brother's injunctions. He outraged the queen and proceeded to make free with the concubines; then, following the advice of his friends, he began to wear a diadem and rose in revolt against his brother. The warden of the priests of Egypt then wrote a letter which he sent to Sethosis, revealing all the details, including the revolt of his brother Harmais. Sethosis forthwith returned to Pelusium and took possession of his kingdom; and the land was named Aegyptus after him. It is said that Sethos was called Aegyptus, and his brother Harmais, Danaus.

(Manetho w/ an English Translation, by W. G. Waddell (1940), p. 105)

Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela R *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XLII)*

Horemheb appointed Paramesse, an official not from the Dynastic bloodline, to succeed him, thus from Horemheb to Paramesse (cf. Harmais of Manetho-- also J. Miller) we see a transition from the 18th to the 19th Dynasty. Horemheb is the last King of Dynasty 18 of Manetho, so some remarks are fitting here about Dynasty 18 itself. When Horemheb's Reign can be backdated to the death of Tut in 1346 (but now 1345, say), there are also now 14 years available from 1345 to 1331 exclusive from which to harvest vintages for his wine labels, and his death can be resolved back to 1331 (Mar 27), which permits a Reign of 4 years for Ramesses I

without any coregency. Seti I still begins to reign in 1327 in this revision, but the Armais of Manetho then belongs either to Ay or to Ramesses I, and Ay's Reign is subsumed by Horemheb, with Horemheb's actual Year 1 in 1341 (Ay: 1346-1341). An advantage here is that Tut's Year 10 wine label can now belong to his Reign of 9 full years 1355-1345 BCE. Thus, while the absolute nature from Tutankhamun on is not certain, Ahmose I through Akhenaten seem absolute. Before we end by tabulating Akhenaten's Reign, then, a summary is in order:

1. Ahmose I (late 1552--{~August} 1526 {25/26 years, Manetho/BOS})
2. Amenhotep I ({~August} 1526--1505 {20 or 21 years, Manetho})
3. Thutmose I ({'certain' accession III Peret 21} Mar 22 1505--1493 {12 or 13 years, Manetho})
4. Thutmose II (1493--1490 {number of scarabs confirming relative Reign length cf. Thutmose III})
5. Hatshepsut (1490/3--1468 {22 years/21 years 9 months, Manetho's Amersis/Amesses})
6. Thutmose III ({Apr 29 coronation LD15} 1490/3--Mar 15 1439 {death in Year 54 attested})
7. Amenhotep II ({Nov 16/17} 1439/42--1415 {25 years 10 months, Manetho-Josephus)

8. Thutmose IV (1415--1405 {9 years 8 months, Manetho-Josephus)
9. Amenhotep III ({Jun 17 coronation LD15} 1405--1375 {30 years 10 months, Manetho-Josephus} /{--1367 in coregency)}
10. Akhenaten (Dec 1375--{late summer/autumn} 1358)
11. Smenkhare/Neferneferuaten ({coregency from 1360}/1358--1355 {autumn}{Year 3 attested})
12. Tutankhamun (1355 {autumn}--Jan/Feb 1346/45 {spring burial}
    {wine labels from his tomb Years 4, 5, 9, 10})
13. Ay (Jan/Feb 1345--{before Jul 17} 1341 {subsumed by Horemheb})
14. Horemheb ({before Jul 17} Jan/Feb 1345 {/41}--Jan 1331 {/28}
    {Year 13 wine labels (22), Year 14 wine labels (8)}
    {'burial' Pachon 09 very early in Year 14 (15 at latest)}
    {wine labels Years 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14 (J. van Dijk *JARCE 44*)})
15. Ramesses I (Jan 1328 {/31}--{Jun 09} 1327/26 {/29-7} {Year 2 attested})
16. Seti I ({Jun 09} 1327/6--1315 {Years 1-11 attested save Year 10})
17. Ramesses II The Great ({Jun 09} 1315--1349 {every

year attested})

end of Chapter 1: Reevaluation Of Amarna Dynasty

Chapter 2: Reasserting Amarnan Greenealogical Egypt

Above: Nefertiti (bust) *(ca. 1370 BCE)*

Thou madest him a little less than angels, thou hast crowned him with glory and honour. (*Psalms 8:5; Brenton 1851.*)

And causest him to lack a little of Godhead, And with honour and majesty compassest him. (Psalms 8:5; Young's Literal Translation 1862/1898)

Не много Ты умалил его пред Ангелами: славою и честью увенчал его (Psalms 8:5, Russian Synodal Text 1876)

Du hast ihn nur kurz unter die Engel gestellt / und krönst ihn mit Ehre und Pracht. (Psalms 8:5, Die ganze Bibel / Neue evangelistische Übersetzung)

Hiszen kevéssel tetted õt kisebbé az Istennél, és dicsõséggel és tisztességgel megkoronáztad õt! (Psalms 8:5, Hungarian Károli Bible)

ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν· (Psalms 8:5, Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint (LXX), edited by Alfred Rahlfs.)

21 A couple of points bear mentioning about the foregoing Chapter 1 and its implications in the light of earlier work of ours: 1. The 1329 BCE Year 1 date obtained for Ramesses I in *Trojan War* from Manetho's numbers and 2. There is no longer a need to change the date of Tutankhamun's accession as given in *B4,* because Horemheb can reign from 1344 to Jan 1330 with 14 label years, so 1329 is still possibly Year 2 of Ramesses I, and 1330 to 1327 would yield at least 3 full years for Ramesses I (perhaps more with coregency) while keeping 1324 BCE, the Year 4 Thoth 01 Sothic rising of Seti I.

2[2] It is the stela in Year 2 of Ramesses I, aligned as it is only in 1329 on LD1, which favours the accession of Ramesses I in 1331 (although not certainly), and there are many possible resolutions in the backward reckoned Reigns of Horemheb, Ay, Tutankhamun, and Smenkhare, to get back to the fixed and absolute Akhenaten 1375 BCE. When we feel that Seti I in 1327 Year 1 is certain, we can work backwards from that point to see the Year for Ramesses I, which is a LD1 II Peret (Mecheir) 20 stela given as Year 2, implies Jan 07 1329 BCE new moon, and would make his Year 1 1330 or 1331, with Horemheb Year 1 having been dated and, fitting as 1444 in *B4.* When Mr. van Dijk wrote his 2008 *JARCE* article, he included a discussion of the lengthier estimates of Horemheb's Reign, and argued that whereas Seti I's own tomb was 'virtually' completed "within a decade," that of Horemheb even when begun in Year 7 or 8 was left in such an 'unfinished' state at his death as to indicate that these longer estimates of the length of his Reign (ie. above 14 years) lack for any substantial evidence in the mortuary temple whatsoever, more than 14 years.[1]

When we accept either 13 or 14 full years for Horemheb reigning (as van Dijk 2008), the Year 27 graffito from Medinet Habu can be also explained in a new way, based on the Year number of Ramesses II or III in which such a statue of Horemheb was "inaugurated" rather than the Year of Horemheb in which he was interred in the tomb. Mr. van Dijk also dismisses the 'Year 59' of Horemheb, found in the socalled 'Mose inscription,' as an error. These may be of interest but are not critical to date. We may thus withdraw our previous inclusions of these. Something that we did not consider which van Dijk also dismisses, is the Year number change from 27 to 28, on a Deir el-Medina ostracon (potsherd with writing), the reigning Monarch (purports to be Ramesside) debatable.

[1](*(Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt, JARCE 44 (2008), "New Evidence on the Length of the Reign of Horemheb," by Jacobus van Dijk, p. 198)*)

Above: Great Sphinx of Giza
(Photo by Felix Bonfils (1831-1885))

23 Therefore, we see that after Akhenaten, there seems no (or little) difficulty other than details which may be resolved and present opportunity for miniscule debate. It appears that 1375 Year 1 Akhenaten, and 1315 Year 1 Ramesses II are absolute, so that we have 60 years (59 years of Horemheb in cf. *Mose inscription*) from Akhenaten to Ramesses II (also Tutankhamun 1357-1347). I wouldn't say that Akhenaten is unmovable, but fixed, and that Tutankhamun is perhaps more absolute, because 1357 Year 1 for him provides

stunning lunar alignment, and because Year 15 of Akhenaten is known to be a time when Smenkhare Hall was dedicated, allowing or perhaps even necessitating a coregency between Akhenaten and a brother of his, the relation being so certain, by DNA. The explanation has been put forward by Belmonte, that a plague of some contagion was spread to Egypt in such a way that Akhenaten became ill and his choice of heir was hastened by this development, he having not a son.[1] His brother Smenkhare had a young son Tutankhamun, and was chosen and crowned, but died after perhaps a year. When we accept this version of events, it becomes more clear that Tutankhamun could have been competing to be the successor to Smenkhare, with Nefertiti, who didn't allow Tutankhamun that honour until he got it by means of her death, or that of Neferneferuaten, whoever that was (succeeding Smenkhare) whose funerary regalia were usurped by Tutankhamun in a way indicating disrespect.

[1](*DNA, Wine & Eclipses: the Dakhamunszu Affaire, Anthropological Notebooks 19 (Supplement) (2013), by Juan Antonio Belmonte, pp. 435(bottom half) to 436, genetic markers pp. 432 to 433(top)*)

Above: Colossal statue of Amenhotep III, British Museum, London
(2011 photo by A. Parrot)

---

24 The lineage of Tutankhamun was (equally with Akhenaten his uncle) a descent by Amenhotep III via Thutmose IV, whereas Nefertiti (as Belmonte suggests) wrote to King Suppiluliuma I of the Hittites and asked for a son for the purpose of assuming the Kingship of Egypt, because her own husband Akhenaten had had no son of his own, a problem which could not have arisen if Tutankhamun had been Akhenaten's son; no, Tut was simply too young, or innocent, to assert his authority, and Nefertiti could get benefit by the continuation of

Akhenaten's legacy. So the work of ours in *B4* retains merit in that the Reign of Akhenaten involves Smenkhare before death and Nefertiti took a possible role before Tutankhamun, and the new date for Akhenaten in 1375 (was 1372) will allow the short time needed for the Neferneferuaten of record to have ruled alone before Tutankhamun in 1357. This changes a few things, one being the dating of the letter sent by Nefertiti to Suppiluliuma I in 1355 (as of now 1358 is the death of Akhenaten), here 1358 BCE.

---

25 Tutankhamun's father is known to be KV-55, not certain to be Smenkhare, but certainly not Akhenaten, as it is widely believed that Tut's only wife was a daughter of Akhenaten and yet KV-55 showed no DNA evidence that he could pass the necessary genes on to his daughter, and in turn, to his granddaughters, whose DNA was studied. KV-55, on the other hand, was definitely Tut's father. This means that history puts Akhenaten as Tut's uncle. Akhenaten's body was never found, yet KV-55 was found. The best identification of KV-55 to date is Smenkhare. The rush to judgment that others have made to announce that Akhenaten as Tut's father is fully understandable from the

standpoint of the simplest way of showing it, or *Occam's Razor,* except that in this case they have overlooked this one fact of the parenthood of the wife of Tutankhamun of record as Akhenaten's daughter. As Mr. Belmonte points out, unless Ankhesenamun can be proven convincingly to *not* be Akhenaten's child (and not by mere historical record), then Akhenaten is *not* KV-55 and thus cannot be the father of Tut.



Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela N *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XL)*

---

26 So, the simplest understanding is as we now have it, a little different from *B4,* for Year 1 Akhenaten, his Reign being higher by three years (1372 now 1375). But essentially, Tut's accession in 1357 (~Feb) can be exactly as in the *B4* article, so that his lunar alignments (as good as they are) are totally retained. Looking at Mr. Belmonte's article, the years he offers from Amenhotep III Year 1 (1378) to Tut Year 1 (1321), 57 years, compares to our 1405 minus 1357 or 48 years. The difference is thus 9 years, from Amenhotep to Tut.[1] In our chronology Amenhotep's Year 1 is constrained by the full moon day of coronation LD15, Jun 17 1405 BCE, and Tutankhamun has lunar alignments with Year 1 1357. We can confidently assert that the dating is absolute.

[1](*This appears mainly due to 8 years of Corule of Amenhotep III with Akhenaten-- see paragraph 1-1.*)

Above: Neutron Star PSR B1509-58 *(Oct 23 2014 image, NASA's Chandra X-ray Observatory)*

---

27 Horemheb similarly has two excellent lunar alignments, when we take his Year 1 as 1344 (as in *B4*), and thus his death appears to be (with 13 or 14 vintages), considering his accession to have been before Thoth 01 Jul 25 1344 BCE, in 1331 (13 wine years) or 1330 (14). Since the date of Horemheb's death has been removed by van Dijk's remark, we no longer have stipulation about the time of year of that event, and this makes it true that Ramesses I could have begun to rule in the period between Jan 08 1331 and Jan 07 1330 (both Mecheir 20), with Mecheir 20 Year 2 of his Reign Jan 07 1329 a LD1. This LD1, a preferred date for stelas, is probable but not certain, and leads to non-absolute chronology when no further data can be furnished, but in

this case the Reign of 4 years 1 month given by Manetho-Josephus for 'Armais' is incredibly fortuitous because it allows us the determination of a compatible accession date up to May 1331 based on the Jun 09 1327 accession of Seti I, or May 1330 for an accession of Seti I in Jun 09 1326. Horemheb's wine labels are autumn-1344 to autumn-1332, for 13 inclusive (autumn-1344 to autumn-1331, for 14). In the account of Manetho, Armais was also the brother of Sethos (Sethosis, Seti), so it is a clear parallel.

Above: The Sphinx and the Pyramids, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston *(1865-1875 carbon print of photo by Adolphe Braun (1812-1877))*

[28] Brother in this case means, loosely, a blood relation, and Ramesses I is the father of Seti I, they being the first two Kings of Dynasty 19 (unrelated to Horemheb). Since the last attested Year of Seti I is Year 11, the Year 1 of 1326 would be preferred based on this as his final year (ie. 11 full years to 1315), but is this in agreement with the Year 2 of Ramesses I lying in 1329? Jan 1329 is only 8 months after May 1330 BCE; however, Egyptian New Year's Day as Thoth 01 is Jul 22 in 1330. Therefore, two Egyptian calendar years are included in the Reign of Ramesses I from May 1330 to Jan 1329 BCE. Mr. Carl Olof Jonson mentions an example of a King who ruled six months, yet had a Year 2 (Psammetichus III).[1] By this reckoning, though, we might consider that wine bottled in autumn 1331 would be, with accession in the spring of 1344 for Horemheb, a Year 15 vintage, maybe, since 1344 to 1331 is 14 years and 1344 has Years 1/2. The Sothic alignment obtained with Seti I in 1327 thus may be favoured here, since it would allow 1331 as the accession of Ramesses I (with still a Reign of 4y 1mo) and would furthermore make the Jan 1329 date truly one year and some months after the May 1331 accession, and so a true Year 2, while Horemheb would reign 1344-1331 for 13 full years, with the Year 14 vintage being from the fact of accession in 1344 before New Year's, or 14 years

inclusive (13 harvests, 1344 to 1332 inclusive), there also having been no known Year 1 wine label yet. As with fine wine, connaisseurs appreciate fine notes.

[1](*The Gentile Times Reconsidered (2004), by Carl Olof Jonson, 4th Edition, p. 144*)

---

29 Since the Year 14 wine vintage of Horemheb shows but 8 labels to date, and each of those were special, with a distinctly different style from the 22 plain labels of Year 13, it seems that the Year 14 is an artifice from the way of reckoning years and favours the 1331 death, of Horemheb, and the May 1331 accession of Ramesses I. No matter which option we choose (ie. 1331 or 1330), a date of 1329 for Ramesses I has to be put into Year 2. We thus acknowledge the two-year discrepancy between a Year 1 of 1329 for Ramesses I we obtained in *Trojan War* and that of *B4* and now, of Year 1 1331. This can be adjusted slightly, and so is not absolute. However exact, adjustment does not appear problematic. Any statistical weight in the 1329 Year 1 date derived from Manetho's numbers should be considered carefully, but would appear to affect Horemheb (more than Seti I, since one can revert to 1 y 4 mo for Ramesses I), when Horemheb's death is in 1329, since

Ramesses I may have been coregent with Horemheb from 1331, but it may also be the case that Horemheb began to rule in 1341, as we footnote at the end of Chapter 2 of *Trojan War,* and this can affect the Reign of Tutankhamun, perhaps. The "rags and tatters" of Egypt prevent absolute dates thus far for the Kings after Akhenaten, but the nearly absolute chronology is *B4* with the revision for Akhenaten to 1375 Year 1 and with Seti I as 1327-1315.

Above: Winter Landscape in the Foret de Soignes, with the Flight Into Egypt, Private collection *(c. 1616 painting by Denis van Alsloot, Oil on oak panel, 49 x 67 cm)*

210 *Occam's Razor* is playing a role whenever we can explain more facts with less theory, and the Years for Akhenaten from Dec 1375 imply 1358 as Year 17 wine (or 1374 to 1358 inclusive), making Year 15 (for Smenkhare Year 1, perhaps) or 1360 Year 1, 1359 Year 2, and 1358 Year 1 for Akhenaten coregent(s), and then Year 1 1357 for Tutankhamun would fit easily into this succession. The wine labels from Amarna include a Year 1 and 2 for the King 'Ankhkheprure' (Smenkhare) and a Year 1 which may belong to his successor (or to Tutankhamun), which former fits 1358 when Nefertiti wrote to Suppiluliuma. The Year 1 of sole Rule before Tutankhamun's Year 1 is amenable to the premise of said letter from Nefertiti, as a King's presence may have prevented such a letter. If we may take the presence of this Year 1 wine label as indicating that a total of 3 years passed from the Year 15 of Akhenaten until Year 1 of Tutankhamun, the resulting chronology is possible as 1360-1357 for the final years of Akhenaten (and Smenkhare) and the only year of Nefertiti (1358-1357), afterward Tutankhamun. How this might relate to Horemheb's Reign is stemming from the end of Tut's Rule in 1347 or 1346 at latest, which could rule out 1345 as Year 1 Ay (subsumed as a Year 1 possibly for Horemheb), Tut having no Year 11. Lunar alignments also favour 1346 over

1345, but with 1344 Horemheb this leaves only 2 years for Ay, a fact that favours perhaps 1341 Horemheb, ending 1328, with 1328 Ramesses implying a possible coregency from 1331 of him with Horemheb, and a 1 year 4 month Reign from 1328 to 1327 (or 1326) Seti I, as we date Seti above.

Above: Portrait of Nicolas Copernicus, Unknown location *(Circa mid-16th-century portrait. Photograph of a portrait of Copernicus by an unknown painter. The original was looted—possibly destroyed—by the Germans in World War II.)*

---

211 The 1346 Year 1 Ay is a better lunar alignment than a 1349 Year 1, as 1346 makes LD1 of both of Ay's dates, but Tut's Year 1 1357 would give him 11 wine vintages ending

in 1347 inclusive, and no Year 11 is yet seen. We are also constrained to 1357 as Tut's Year 1 based on his 4 known dates (2 LD1's, LD15, LD17 full moon). Thus, Jan 1346 for Tut's death makes his Reign all of 10 and most of 11 years, all lunar alignments intact. With 1346 Year 1 Ay, the 5 years of Armais in Manetho fits for Ay as Armais, Horemheb in 1341 not so clear, but one of the 12-year Reigns brings it to 1329 (with a 12-year Reign that precedes Armais in Manetho), for Ramesses I, who gets 1 year 4 months, to 1327 Seti I. Having removed the 'burial' of Horemheb as erroneous, we see a manifold fit as a conclusion for Dynasty 18.

---

212 Thus, the chronology fits very well for the Amarna era Pharaohs with the absolute chronology we give from the beginning of Dynasty 18 all the way to Akhenaten 1375, despite the confusion of the subsequent Amarna period. The preferred Year 1 of Tutankhamun remains 1357, with absolute determination of Seti I possible at 1327 BCE.[1] Ramesses I is fixed well at 1331 BCE (even as we wrote in *Crucible*), and thus Horemheb is best in 1344 BCE with

solid lunar alignments there, leaving Ay with 1346-1344 for his Reign, less than the four years some experts tender for him, unless he can be moved back to 1348-1344, given that both of his dates are calendar 1 days (Epeiph 01 and Choiach 01), and in 1345 is waxing LD10 (Year 3 Epeiph 01 May 22), while in 1344 close to new moon LD-2 (Year 4 Choiach 01 Oct 23), waning moon. This last adjustment would restore Tut to having Years no higher than 9 for wine labels, and make the Year 10 label in his tomb attributable to his uncle Akhenaten. Tutankhamun would thus Reign from 1357 to Jan/Feb 1348 and have vintage years from 1357 to 1349, 9 inclusive. Other than Akhenaten (shifted up 3 years), the Amarnan chronology from *B4* is almost unchanged, with Ay Year 1 adjusted downward by a year (was 1349) to 1348. By two shifts is Dynasty 18 rendered splendid overall, 1375, 1357, 1348, 1344, 1331, 1327, and 1315 being BCE Year 1 dates for Akhenaten, Tutankhamun, Ay, Horemheb, Ramesses I, Seti I, and Ramesses II (1315 Dynasty 19). The probability of these all being right is, say, 10%. As the probabilities of the 1st (1375), 2nd (1357) and last (1315) be 100%, that of the others is about 20%+.*

[1](*See Chapter 3*)

* These probabilities are estimated, but not calculated. For the less certain dates 1348, 1344, 1331, and 1327, any further adjustment to those is minor-- hallelujah! The absolute errors may be estimated for these as +-3. For Akhenaten 1375, Tut

1357 and Ramesses II 1315, the absolute errors are believed in their case to be zero. Note that our chronology is higher than dating done by many prominent Egyptologists, with Donald Redford, for example, one of the highest, putting Ramesses II 1304. Christine Tetley, in her posthumous book of 2014, puts Ramesses II at 1390 BCE using her unorthodox calendar. Other Egyptologists date Ramesses II 1294-1279 Year 1. Akhenaten's Year 1, on the other hand, is in the range 1397-1349, with Redford at 1372, and Tetley 1464/1463.

end of Chapter 2: Reasserting Amarnan Greenealogical Egypt



Chapter 3: Proposing Amarna

Calibrates Egyptian Seasons

Above: Matter circling a black hole

He that dwells in the heavens shall laugh them to scorn, and the Lord shall mock them. (*Psalms 2:4; Brenton 1851*)

Dari takhta-Nya di surga TUHAN tertawa dan mencemoohkan rencana mereka. (*Psalms 2:4; Indonesian Bahasa Indonesia Sehari-hari (BIS) 1994*)

[31] The dependence of the Sothic alignment on a very exact knowledge of the 'arcus visionis' means that 1326 is a possible Year 1 also, especially considering that Year 11 is attested for Seti I and that a strong case for a Reign of 11 years has been made from other evidence, a position which would render Ramesses I Year 1 as 1328, or perhaps 1327, with Year 2 in Jan of 1326 offering a lunar alignment for the stela near LD4, and makes Year 1 of Horemheb lower by 3 years to 1341, both agreeable to our last article, 'Trojan War,' and to our adjusted views in Chapter 1 of the present article, which Jared Miller argues, that Horemheb's earliest Year 1 is also

Year 9 of Hittite King Mursili II, this being 1342 BCE or 1341 BCE (Year 1 Mursili 1350), and allows room for Ay to precede Horemheb from as early as 1348 (or 1346, when we allow that Tutankhamun reigned longer than was attested), a situation remarkable for the fact that it also employs the 5 years of Armais and 1 year 4 months of Ramesses in the Reigns attested by Manetho, when we accept the 1346 for Ay and 1328 for Ramesses I Year 1. The lunar alignments are later for Horemheb in 1341, a fact affecting three lunar dates which were LD1 (2) or LD3 with Year 1 1344, becoming LD3 (2) and LD5 with it in 1341, the last being New Year's Day Thoth 01 (ie. a Horemheb Year 6 Thoth 01 date, Jul 23 1336 LD5), which agrees remarkably with what is known from the Reign of Amenemnisu (par. 9-12 of 'Trojan War'), when the fifth day of a feast coincided with New Year's, and new moon was, as now, exactly four days before a Thoth 01, such a coincidence as to render Horemheb fixed in 1341, and the only remaining unknown being the Reigns of Tut and Ay, as dependent upon Tut's known years (9 or 10), and the lunar alignment of Ay's two known dates, one being LD-2 or LD-1 Oct 23 Year 4 1345, with Year 1 1348, and exact LD1 Oct 23 Year 4 1342, with Year 1 Ay 1346 BCE.

[32] Tut's lack of attestation beyond Year 10 favours Ay as Year 1 1348 rather than 1346, but the situation for Ay lacks by Horemheb's attempt to erase all memory of Ay. Manetho offers 6, 7, 8 or 9 years for Rathos, Achoris, Acherres or Rathotis (ostensibly Tut), and as Tut sits in 1357 Year 1, a Year 1 1348 for Ay appears favoured, but the 4 or 5 years for 'Armais' in Manetho favours a Year 1 of 1346 for Ay as 'Armais,' which agrees with a highest attested Year 4 for King Ay on the other hand. Lowering Tut to 1355 would permit a sole Reign for the successor(s) of Akhenaten for more like the attested 3 years, and although it worsens Tut's lunar alignments, would keep the Reign of Tut in line with 8 or 9 years.



Above: Colossal Statue of Tutankhamun, Oriental Institute Museum, University of Chicago *(2014 photo, 18th Dynasty, Luxor, Medinet Habu, temple of Aye and Horemheb, New Kingdom, quartzite)*

---

[33] However, Ay is allowed between 7 and 9 years by modern pundits, which in the *BG* allows Tut to keep his alignments at 1357 Year 1 while Horemheb keeps his own Year 6 New Year's Day LD5 alignment with his Year 1 at 1341, Tut dies Jan/Feb 1348 leaving Ay 1348-1341, with Ay's alignments at Epeiph 01 Year 3 a LD10 May 22 1346 and Choiach 01 Year 4 a LD-1/-2 Oct 23 1345, but since both are donation stela it appears more likely the 1st is LD-1 May 22 1347, because summer (Shemu I) began in Mar at this time, making the death of Tut or accession of Ay belong

to the prior summer-to-summer year, after Mar 23 1348 belonging to the next year, and, likewise, after Mar 23 1347 belonging to Year 3, and also Year 4 could then belong to after Mar 23 1346, with Year 1 as Jan/Feb to Mar 23 1348 (Year 2 starting on Pachon 01).



ve: Sphinx and the Pyramids of Ghiza *(1873-95 photo by Beniamino Facci*

---

[34] The calendar day 01's here may not be exact new moons, but are so close that they may take precedence, and we arrive at the best overall alignment (Tut 1357-1348 is followed by Ay in 1348), and it looks like Horemheb is best aligned in 1344 by far, making Ay 1348-1344, then

Horemheb 1344-1331, and Ramesses I 1331-1327, allowing the keeping of the LD1 in 1329 for a stela of Ramesses I on II Peret 20 (before summer), seeming to determine the accession of Ramesses I after Pachon 01 of 1331 in order for II Peret 20 to still be in his Year 2, and 4 years 1 month of Manetho implying a May 1331 accession for Ramesses I (with Jun 09 1327 Seti I's as accession date), thus a summer death for Horemheb (the middle of II Shemu is May 01), and 13 full grape harvests dating from his accession around Mar 22 1344–Jul 25 1344 til autumn 1332 (13 autumns, inclusive), for Horemheb.

---

35 When Tut's accession was dated Feb 1357, he ruled from before Pachon 01 and this would allow his Year 10 wine to be jarred in the year 1357-8=1349, when that autumn of 1357 is taken as Year 2, after a short Year 1, such as also agrees with Tut's death in about Jan/Feb 1348. However, to keep lunar alignments with Pachon 01 years this would seem to lower Tut to before Feb 15 1356 but Year 2 is still 1356 and so Year 9 wine stays in 1349. This seeks agree better with Manetho having 6, 7, or 8 years for

Tutankhamun, as Tut's Reign is thus 7 years, 11 months, or 8 years, from ~Feb 1356 to Jan/Feb 1348, also agreeing with his highest attested year (Year 8).[1] However, this is neither necessary, nor does it appear to offer any advantages, since a very short Reign (one year or less) has been proposed for Smenkhkare and the date of Akhenaten's death has been believed in 1359, a situation which allows more than a year prior to 1356. Also, Tut shut down Amarna, and he returned to Thebes, abandoning any tie to the religion of Uncle Akhenaten. Tut may be the exception, however, and those remaining Rulers of Dynasty 18 and even Dynasty 19 preceding the Reign of Ramesses II may have used a Pachon 01 dating.

[1](*But we refute this in what follows.*)



Above: El Amarna Boundary Stela A *(From the book "Archaeological Survey Of Egypt" (1908), ed. by F. LL. Griffith,17th Memoir, The Rock Tombs of El Amarna, Part V, Smaller Tombs and Boundary Stelae, by N. de G. Davies, 54 Plates and Coloured Frontispiece, Plate XLI)*

[36] The consideration of Pachon 01 (I Shemu 01, Summer Day 01) as the start of the year in the Amarna period from Akhenaten on (Ay, Ramesses I up to Ramesses II) is now of interest, and is a new proposition we arrived at by studying known dates, within the foregoing parameters. It appears inconceivable that an Aten-worshipping King like Akhenaten, who loathed Amun enough to overturn an entire religious system, would not introduce a reform, based on the Sun, to the calendar convention of Egypt. Interestingly, the 30 years and 10 months of Manetho's account in Josephus, as given for Amenhotep III can be reconciled beautifully with Amenhotep's Jun 17 date of coronation in 1405, because Mar 30 1374 is a Pachon 01 year beginning, and vernal equinox 1374 BCE is Apr 03. Akhenaten, the Sun-worshipping rebel, is dated to this time when vernal equinox was near the start of summer, or at the least the calendrical summer called Shemu I. (Pachon 01 is Apr 03 for the first time in 1393 BCE as Egyptian calendar months are regressing slowly through the Julian months and thus

through the actual seasons) The significance to chronology is that we now have the reason for the 30 years and 10 months of Josephus, for Amenhotep III (Amenophis), since the elapsed time from Jun 17 1405 Year 1 Amenhotep III to Mar 30 1374 Year 2 Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten's year beginning) is exactly a period in the Egyptian calendar of 30 years, 9 months, and 18 days (Epeiph 13 is III Shemu 13, thus 2 months, 12 days after Pachon 01 I Shemu 01), or in other words Epeiph 13 1375 is 30 years after 1405 coronation, with 10 months of 30 days each taking us to Pachon 08 1374, whereas Pachon 01 is the new start of the Regnal year. So 30 years and 10 months is pretty well 'reconciled.'

---

[37] It will be interesting to see how the lunar alignments are affected by this new year under Akhenaten's Reign. Since these adjustments only apply to the Amarna times during about 59 years, we draw on available resources.

Table 3.1
Dates in the Reign of Pharaoh Akhenaten

Waxing	Lunar	Julian	Julian	Year	Season	(Month)	Day	Year 1
yes	LD1	Dec 07	1376	**01**	I Peret	(Tybi)	08	1376
yes	LD1	Dec 26	1375	**02**	I Peret	(Tybi)	27	1376
(yes)	(LD9)	Dec 04	1375	**02**	I Peret	(Tybi)	(05)	1376
yes	LD12	Jul 31	1374	**03**	Epagomenal	(5 days)	04	1376
yes	LD2	Sep 06	1373	**04**	II Akhet	(Phaophi)	07	1376
yes	LD6	Oct 10	1373	**04**	III Akhet	(Hathyr)	11	1376
-	LD15	Feb 15	1372	05	III Peret	(Phamenoth)	19	1377
yes	LD8	Feb 15	1370	**05**	III Peret	(Phamenoth)	19	**Mar 1375**
yes	LD2	Mar 11	1370	**05**	IV Peret	(Pharmouthi)	13	**Mar 1375**
yes	LD13	Mar 10	1369	**06**	IV Peret	(Pharmouthi)	13	**Mar 1375**
[close]	LD-3	Dec 05	1368	**08**	I Peret	(Tybi)	08	**Mar 1375**
	LD-11	Nov 27	1368	**08**	IV Akhet	(Choiach)	30	**Mar 1375**
yes	LD-1/1	Nov 27	1367	08	IV Akhet	(Choiach)	30	1375
yes	LD-1/1	Jan 04	1364	12	II Peret	(Mecheir)	08	1376
								Mar

yes	LD11/12	Jan 03	1363	**12**	II Peret	(Mecheir)	08	**1375**
	LD-8	Oct 17	1364	**12**	(III) Akhet	(Hathyr)	20	**Mar 1375**
yes	LD4	Oct 17	1363	12	(III) Akhet	(Hathyr)	20	1375
[close]	LD-3/-4	Dec 28	1362	**14**	II Peret	(Mecheir)	(02)	**Mar 1375**
yes	LD-1/1	Oct 11	1360	**16**	III Akhet	(Hathyr)	15	**Mar 1375**

Above: Khafre Pyramid and The Great Sphinx
(2007 photo)

38 An examination of the dates in Table 3.1 above make it clear that Mar 1375 is a reasonable starting point for the Reign of Akhenaten, and with a Dec 1376 accession, the dates during his first five years reflecting 1376. The establishment of the new capital city at Amarna is known to have been an event in Year 5 of this Pharaoh. It is hard to say whether lunar alignment mattered for Akhenaten after he began Aten worship in Year 5, since Amarna constituted a break for him from the tradition. This makes it more difficult to date his Reign surely, but it makes the analysis of his dates more of import. The most important date from the time at Amarna is the foundation ceremony LD2 Mar 11 1370, which IV Peret 13 date had an anniversary the next year, as Year 6 LD13. Both of these dates are waxing moons, and the first is typical of a foundation ceremony happening near a LD1. After that, the fact that not all dates look waxing is hinting at the lesser concession to Amun after Year 5. Further study of the dating of Akhenaten is warranted, and will hopefully proceed as soon as time may permit.

---

[39] Akhenaten's vintage Year 17 would be dated from Year 1 grape harvest in 1375 to (1375 - 16), or Year 17 1359. Or, when 1376 be instead Year 1, then Year 17 is 1360. However, with a Year 16 LD-1/1 Oct 11 1360 his highest attested date, Akhenaten's Year 17 appears to be 1359. For by skillful direction you shall carry on your war, and in the multitude of counselors there is salvation.[1] Not knowing when a Pharaoh lived, nor when one died, a date for any wine of this King is at least as obscure. Akhenaten's Year 17 wine offers the time of his death, and since the evidence (Miller, 2007) is for an autumn death it would be 1359 (or 1358 before wine bottling).[2] Hornung would order 17 successive vintages for Amarna, including Year 4 wine vintage ('consumed at the site') Years 5 through 17 of Akhenaten (made there) and the 3 vintages attributed to Akhenaten's 'successors' there.[3] Before we get to Tutankhamun, there are 3 vintages for wine at Amarna (AEC, p. 208), the last a Year 3 having only 3 wine jar labels extant, likely not a full year. With Tut in 1357 and Akhenaten dying in 1359, there is no time for even two vintages in between them, and not three certainly, so that these 3 must be in coregency. It seems possible that Tutankhamun Reigned in his Year 1 under coregency with Nefertiti because of his youth, so both his Year 1 and her

Year 3 had been coexisting. Under 'Pachon' reckoning 1359 was Year 1 although Year 1 wine could not be until autumn 1358, for Smenkhkare. Thus, 1356 does appear to be Year 3 wine, synchronized with Year 3 wine of Tut in 1356, a problem which could only have been resolved by Tut overthrowing the Amarna system and backdating his Year 1 to 1357, probably the same time that his father Smenkhkare died (~Feb 1357). The Year 4 date (Jun) for Tutankhamun can only be Year 4 with an accession before Jun 24 1357, it appears, so that autumn 1357 wine vintage must belong to a Year 1. This is assuming an exact LD15 for a Jun 24 1354 date. The evidence from Amarna wine labels and from the tomb of Tut is consistent with it being Tut's Year 3 when a coup of import by Tut restored Amun worship at Thebes. The 3 Amarna vintages are by King 'Ankhkheprure', with Year 1 and 2 of wine explicit, the Year 3 implied by a single delivery of olive oil containing Years 2 and 3.[4] In Tut's tomb at Thebes are wine labels Years 4 and 5. There thus appears to be reason to believe that Year 3 of Tut was when Nefertiti died 3 years after the death of Akhenaten, which gave her a Year 3 attested in 1357 with Akhenaten's death in fall of 1359 and her Year 2, or Smenkhkare's, beginning in 1358, or ending in 1357. But if Nefertiti took power in 1357 after Smenkhkare's death in early February, her Year 3

would be 1356-1355 for Pachon 01 reckoning, Year 2 beginning in Mar 1357. It appears improbable that her Year 3 could be the LD1 of Oct 05 1354, though it falls III Akhet (Hathyr) 10. Tut's Year 4 full moon LD15 date June 24 1354 seems to rebut the Year 3 date of Nefertiti, when Oct 1354, but also owing to well-aligned lunar dates in Tut's Reign. The Year 4 date of Tut is a graffito from Saqqara near Memphis, IV Shemu (Mesore) 2, a LD15 in 1354, and LD15 is a 'typical' religious occasion for such a graffito. There is an improbability about Nefertiti's having her accession in Feb 1357 with Oct 1354 being only Year 3.

[1](*Proverbs 24:6, New World Translation, paraphrased slightly: 'shall' cf. 'will'*) [2](*Altorientalische Forschungen Vol. 34 (2007) 2, "Amarna Age Chronology and the Identity of Nibhururiya in the Light of a Newly Recontructed Hittite Text," by Mr. Jared Miller, p. 271b*) [3](*We here note that the chronology in the present article with its lunar alignments does not permit such 'successors' to rule for 3 years after Akhenaten.*) [4](*The Year 3 is not explicit, however, and a Year 1 vintage (p. 207 AEC, last paragraph) following these Years 1 and 2 is actually the last known vintage.*)

Above: The Holy Family With St. Anne, Madrid *(Circa 1630 painting, oil on canvas, 115 cm x 90 cm, by Peter Paul Rubens)*

---

310 Concerning Smenkhkare, his accession in Year 15 of the Reign of Akhenaten is by Pachon 01 reckoning (Mar 1374 being the start of Year 2 of Akhenaten, now, thus Year 15 of Akhenaten would date within Mar 1361 to Mar 1360 {1374-15+2}) 1361 or 1360, so Smenkhare began in 1360, at the latest, which would put Year 3 vintage in 1358, though this is only assuming wine is Coregent vintage. Attested is 'Year 1, wine of the house of Smenkhkare.' Years 13 to 17 (AEC, p. 207) of Akhenaten show a title for the vintner, 'hrj b3h,' which continues in Years 1 and 2 wine records of King 'Ankhekheprure' Smenkhkare. Tut's first date is Year 4 and a LD15 which presents a solid case for his accession before Phamenoth 22 1357, and after Choiach

19 1358 (from Nov 1358 to Feb 1357). Since Tut had returned to Amun worship by Year 4, four dates aligned with the Moon agree with this accession. He being only as certain as Tut, Smenkhkare comes to a finish less than 2 years after the death of Akhenaten. It is more convincing because of the 2 vintages (or 3) recorded for Smenkhkare, who as sole Regent could only be responsible for 1358, this implying Coregent wines.* So little is known about Smenkhkare, however, that the Years 1357 and 1356 wines may be of Nefertiti or maybe the widow of Smenkhkare who are later subsumed by Tut. With a dated death of Tut in Jan/Feb 1348, autumn 1349 appears to be definitely the last vintage of Tut, Year 9 (1357-1349+1), as is attested in Tutankhamun's tomb, implying also that Year 10 found there is Akhenaten's. Hornung made this remark on Tutankhamun (AEC, p. 208). Tut abandoned Amarna and (we say) subsumed the 1358 to 1357 accession of Nefertiti (death of Smenkhkare), the old system of reckoning years from accession resuming.

* Assuming the wine is successive, 3 vintages distinctly occurring after 1359 date from 1358 to 1356 inclusive, but this still could be possible with Tut revoking the Aten worship in his own Year 3, moving back to Thebes, since his Year 1 could have been backdated thereafter, assuming Tut was Junior King after Smenkhkare's death. A neater solution is when Year 17 of Akhenaten, Year 1 to 3 of his successor(s), and Year 1 of Tut can all be included in the wine vintages for 1359, 1358 and 1357. The season of winemaking perhaps coincided with deaths for both

Akhenaten and his successor, causing sharing.



Above: Dream Stela of Thutmose IV *(from Carl Richard Lepsius, enhanced and cropped by Ward Green)*

---

311 Then the last detail to explain is the unattested Year 12 for Seti I, with his Reign 1327-1315, and Year 1 as 1327 being favoured by the lunar alignments I Peret 02 Nov 17 1320 Year 8 LD-1/1 and III Shemu 20 Jun 03 1318 Year 9 LD2, the latter being four days before Year 10, and the former several months prior to Pachon 01 seven years five months after accession, with Year 8 running Epeiph 24 Jun 07 1320 to Epeiph 24 Jun 07 1319, Year 9 then Epeiph 24 Jun 07 1319 onto Epeiph 24 Jun 07 1318. Also, IV Shemu

12 Year 11 Jun 24 1317 is LD5, two more dates for Seti I being Year 8 III Peret 13 Jan 27 1319 LD12, Year 1 II Akhet 01 shrine Aug 20 1327 LD12, both of these last when shifted a year back being near LD1. Whether this is accountable by a coregency or not, the implication is two plausible Year 1's for Seti I, with the accession of his predecessor, Ramesses I, May 1331 making Seti I's accession Jun 09 1327 preferred, based on the 4 years and 1 month of Manetho's 'Armais,' with the possible 1 year and 4 months of 'Ramesses' therein being the death of Ramesses I after a brief coregency, Seti I then reigning from Oct 1326 for 11 years alone. The Reign of Ramesses I then lasts up to 5 full years. However, Ay's Reign remains 1348-1344, and so 4 years.

---

312 Ay was an old man during Tut's entire Reign, and so he may have resumed the Amarna mode of reckoning upon the death of Tut, the likelihood of this being greater, as the measures Horemheb took to erase Ay were extensive. Whether the story told by Manetho about Seti's return, and his defeat of Armais, referred to the continuation of the

Pachon 01 reckoning after Horemheb, or whether, indeed, Amarna's traditions vanished after Ay, remains to be seen, but Seti's lunar dates support the former. Tut, on the other hand, clearly returned to the former capital at Thebes and abandoned Amarna and its ritual. The definite Year 9 wine label for Tut combined with a death in Jan/Feb 1348 (based on Ay's Year 3 May 22 new moon date LD-1 Epeiph 01 1347 it is in 1348 Tut died), determined partly by the Year 1 1344 of Horemheb, with greatest though moderate probability, leads to a first wine in 1357 for King Tut, and so 1357-1349 (9) wines. However, the few wine labels for Year 3 of the Pharaoh preceding Tut suggests that that Year 3 was also 1357, or, as Krauss suggested, that the year change occurred during the bottling of the wine, which is ruled out by 1359 being Akhenaten's last vintage, when the wines of the successor(s) are determined from the time of death of Akhenaten (ie. there are only 1358 and 1357--two), unless 1359 is a shared vintage, which no one attests. Akhenaten Year 1 1375 and Tut Year 1 1357 seem secure.

end of Chapter 3: Proposing Amarna Calibrates Egyptian Seasons

Chapter 4: Semite Israel Masterfully Pervading Lower Egypt

41 We always have a choice. The choice of some historians to choose Assyrian eponym lists in preference to God's Word is simply a choice that people make, and it comes ultimately to the point where we have to make a choice between what we are told, and what we finally believe, whether we have just claim to judge the others or not.

Many say concerning my soul, There is no deliverance for him in his God.
(*Psalms 3:2; Brenton 1851*)

Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God.
(*Psalms 3:2; King James Version 1769*)



Above: The Flight Into Egypt by Ansaldo, Palazzo Barberini, Rome *(1620 painting by Giovanni Andrea Ansaldo)*

'Judge not, that you not be judged,' serves us always. Yet the faith of ours is not large, though it seem so. A small amount can appear huge to one who has nothing. Fragility is then guarded, by not judging prematurely. At some point, we will have to say something about it. Perhaps, as Jesus did, we will ask them their destiny. I chose one, for which theirs does not seem the worse. Ultimately, they and we will have to answer for these. So, too, will Israel have to answer for their choices. In particular, the Jewish tradition failed to preserve an accurate chronology of the period of Kings, despite the Bible's own detailed King list, and the Babylonian record which permits accurate dating of that very era. Perhaps

because of pride the Rabbis allowed history to fall into the state in which their tradition sits now, one which is devoid of accurate chronology, senseless. In the same way, Egyptologists of today have permitted history to fall into a state in which it finds itself, after following the example of nameless glory seekers. "I will not carry their names upon my lips." (Ps 16:4) It is because of this failure of Israel's history that the Egyptian correspondences have been lost from time. We no longer have the marks of Israel in Egypt's past. This is what we deeply regret and must seek to remedy, for it has been lacking in all but yearning until now.

4[2] Manfred Bietak, in his excavations of the ancient city of Avaris at the site of the modern-day Tell el-Dab'a, uncovered evidence that Semites inhabited that city at the time that it was the Hyksos Egyptian capital city. Another city, Pithom, has been identified as a site of modern Tell el-Maskhuta in the eastern end of the Wadi Tumilat, 16 km west of Ismaliya (Pithom, Exodus 1:11).* Excavations at Tell el-Maskhuta from 1978 to 1985 were conducted under the direction of John S. Holladay Jr., of the University of Toronto, and have established the occupational history of the site, says Bryant G. Wood.[1] "Prior to ca. 610 B.C.

(Saite period), the *only* occupation was during the Hyksos period," Wood states.[2] This can simply be interpreted by the lay person as an assertion that the Israelites were working on building the city of Pithom (see Exodus 1:11) under the Hyksos. Both the discoveries of Tell el-Dab'a (ancient Avaris) and of Tell el-Mashkuta (ancient Pithom) are important to our quest for history in Israel's Egyptian sojourn, but the Pithom discovery is particularly so because of its chronological context which anchors the *BG,* for it was not long after the Hyksos left Egypt in our *Blessed Greenealogy* that Israel departed, also. We know this only by events as dated in our *BG.* The Hyksos departed in 1533 or 1532 BCE, with Ahmose I Year 1 in late 1552 BCE, and Israel stayed until 1493. This is merely the way it looks to us, but we are very much interested in finding what the evidence tells us. The occupation of Pithom coinciding with the Hyksos is a very important clue that Israel worked under Hyksos, and that the Hyksos were the ones not knowing Joseph.[3] This implies that Moses was raised by Hyksos Royalty, because the Book of Exodus makes it plain that it was under the same kind of tyranny under which Israel was oppressed and made to build Pithom that Moses came to be born, his life put at risk under Pharaoh's orders.[4]

* Or, "Pitho" in the translation by Brenton.

[1](*"From Ramesses to Shiloh: Archaeological Discoveries Bearing on the Exodus-Judges Period" (Apr 02, 2008), by Bryant G. Wood*) [2](*Ibid., italics ours*) [3](*Exodus 1:8*) [4](*Exodus 2:10*)



Above: Israelite four-room house

---

43 At the site of Tell el-Mashkuta, quantities were found of hand-made, flat-bottomed cooking pots such as those common in Canaan, or exactly what one would expect had Israelites been present as Exodus 1:11 says they were.[1] Tell el-Dab'a (ancient Avaris) has stratigraphy to the early 12th Dynasty, the same period as we date Joseph.[2] Another city, called Ramesses in the Bible, was called Piramesses (Pi-Ramesses) during the period of Ramesses

II's Reign, but was called Rowaty at some earlier time.[3] Again, the four-room houses found at Rowaty are similar to those found in Israel later on, during the Iron Age. Ramesses is mentioned in the Bible as the location that Israel stayed in Egypt, when Jacob moved to live there.[4] Both Pithom and Ramesses are places that had names that were different in the earlier times, perhaps, while the later names such as Ramesses mislead people, to believe that the Exodus took place in the Reign of Ramesses II, for its later name, "Ramesses," by which it was called. This is why we based chronology on time, and not names. For the names of places change at times, and the recent ones are no less likely to be used than the older ones, at least as far as any argument as has been heard goes. Even assuming that the original Biblical texts dated to the very time of the events described (however unlikely it may be), later editors could update the place names. It is a failure to believe in such editing that has led the belief that *The Exodus* dated to Ramesses II. Another assumption that is being made (perhaps wrongly) is that the name Ramesses did not exist before, at all. However, the Bible record has been proven true over and over again, and so can be taken as evidence on its own. The name may have existed before, as thereby evidenced. We ought not to stray too far from evidences of

Israel.

[1](*"From Ramesses to Shiloh: Archaeological Discoveries Bearing on the Exodus-Judges Period" (Apr 02, 2008), by Bryant G. Wood*) [2](*"Antagonisms in Historical and Radiocarbon Chronology," by M. Bietak, p. 78, in: A.J. Shortland and C. Bronk Ramsey (eds.), Radiocarbon and the Chronologies of Ancient Egypt (Oxford 1913): OxBow Oxford, 76-110.*) [3](*"From Ramesses to Shiloh: Archaeological Discoveries Bearing on the Exodus-Judges Period" (Apr 02, 2008), by Bryant G. Wood*) [4](*Genesis 47:11*)

Above: Rest on Flight to Egypt by Caravaggio, Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome
(1596-1597 painting by Caravaggio, Oil on canvas, 133.5 cm x 166.5 cm)

---

44 Since "Ramesses" was a personal name based on the name of Ramesses I when he was a vizier called

"Paramessu," it would be hard to argue that it had never been used. Most personal names have very long histories, in fact. Whether a district was named after a family or, as was betimes often the case, the family after the district, it would be narrow-minded to assert any guess as fact. Fairly, the scholarship of the Bible is unknown to us. The 'blind' acceptance of its pages is not so 'blind.' Such acceptance also prevents errors from speculation. While we still speculate and research intently, we may always return to the Bible, and favour it, in the end, based on its proven reliability alone above all means. The benefit of this is well-founded stability of mind. The frequency with which speculation results in error, on the other hand, argues equally strongly for a Book. That the book happens to be the Bible is not without a human element, as men wrote and compiled the accounts. Some believe in Biblical infallibility, which then has to be tempered by the knowledge that men were involved throughout the history of its compilation, so that any infallibility could only have been a miracle which was a result of the Holy Spirit acting over all this time, even that of the collation of the various Bible texts. The miracle is how nearly infallible it is, after all. As far-fetched as this indeed is, it itself testifies, and to the extent that it proves true, does constitute a large part of a

basis of our acceptance of its Word.

Above: Venus Presenting Aeneas with Armour Forged by Vulcan, Liechtenstein Museum, Vienna
(1748 painting by Pompeo Batoni, Oil on canvas, 99 x 74 cm)

---

45 No doubt there are external evidences of the truths of Scripture, the geography of Palestine constituting one of many such known (or partly known), external proofs. Egyptian proofs have been less well-known, some having been documented by late researcher Mr. Samuel Kurinsky in his writings on the hidden Jewish history in Egypt:

Such an economy existed long before the time in which Abraham is said to have arrived with his entourage and his animals to await a better season for the completion of his *aliya* to Canaan.

The economy Mr. Kurinsky refers to is, of course, that derived from the lush and fertile Nile Delta of Egypt. This black soil of Egypt's northern coastal region was recorded in the Bible as: "the very best of the land."[1,2] Evidence of Asiatics living in the Delta region may be found at Merimde beni-Salame, 37 miles north of Cairo. The Fayoum basin is another location where Asiatics in very ancient times settled, according to Kurinsky, and as a natural oasis has been considered at some length, Mr. Francis Cope Whitehouse having recognized its true role as a reservoir of antiquity, its source canal the 'Bahr Yusuf' being named after Biblical vizier Joseph. Written sources required for chronology are the Bible, whose authority as the living Word of God makes dating all sites any earlier than Joseph's time questionable. There may have been Asiatics other than the Israelites who lived in Egypt in numbers, of which the Hyksos are a well-known example that occurred during Bible times. Manfred Bietak, an Austrian archaeologist, has

found a lot of Semite or Asiatic artifacts at Tell el-Dab'a in the Delta of Egypt, the site having stratigraphy going back to the 12th Dynasty, as was already stated above, and the sites of (what might have been) ancient Pithom and Ramesses we mentioned also as having Semite proof. The problem with the dating of Kurinsky is when he had lacked documentation the dating is always in question.

[1](*Genesis 47:6*) [2](*Genesis 47:11*)



Above: Sphinx and stela

---

46 Dating of civilization using Ice Age epochs or various evolutionary Stone Age typologies lacks documentation. Even radiocarbon (carbon-14) dating requires parallel,

corroborative and reliable documentation to be useful. So, if we are to succeed in finding the clear marks of Israel's habitation in Egypt from Joseph's day, we are going to have to use the Bible as our reliable source. Secondary historical records are of course considered, and in some cases may appear to contradict each other. Unfortunately, it is not that these records are untrue at all, necessarily, but that their context is lacking in some way that prevents a consistent interpretation. Evidence of Semites or Asiatics is not the same as the proof that Israel was present as a nation, and without direct written testimony of the latter, the chronology of the Bible is important in correlating the evidence. Thus, we must stick to the Bible and seek for a direct reference to Israel amongst varied Egyptian artifacts. One rather *indirect* proof ties glass production in ancient Israel to the Asiatic glass finds in Egypt. Kurinsky dates glassmaking to 2400 BCE in Mesopotamia, the traditional home of the tribe of Abraham's father.[1] Simcha Jacobovici said the windows of Solomon's Temple were described in 1Kings 6:4 as transparent (shkufim).[2] The largest ancient glass factory found was at Hadera, Israel, and consisted of 17 furnaces, says Jacobovici. In 1956, a glass slab weighing 9 tons was found at the site of Beir She'arim in Israel, which measured on its edges 11 feet

long, 6.5 feet wide, and 1.5 feet thick! Names of Jews today bear evidence of the word 'glass.' So advanced technology is a marker that may assist us. Still, nothing beats documentation such as God's Word.

[1](*"Glassmaking; A Judaic Tradition Part I— The Biblical Period Fact Paper 6-I," by Samuel Kurinsky,* primary source:*"The Glassmakers; an Odyssey of the Jews" (1991), by Samuel Kurinsky*) [2](*Simcha Jacobovici is an Israeli-Canadian filmmaker known for the documentary film "The Exodus Decoded" (aired on April 16, 2006) on 'The History Channel.' He blogs on 'SimchaJTV,' 'The Times of Israel,' and 'The Huffington Post,' and has written for 'The New York Times,' 'International Herald Tribune,' 'The Globe and Mail,' 'Los Angeles Times,' and the 'Jerusalem Post.'*)

---

47 From Mr. Bietak's excavations report on Tell el Dab'a, the Stratum labelled as 'H' that he dates as 120 years later than the calibration by the radiocarbon of Bronk Ramsey (2010), is at its earlier point about 1920 BCE, which is the period (1923 BCE on) of Joseph as vizier. Since the dating of 12th Dynasty Egypt is based on the anchor point of a Sothic rising of IV Peret 16, Year 7 of Pharaoh Senusret III (early 19th century), it marks a beginning point ca. 1991 BCE for 12th Dynasty Egypt.[1,2] We see that the time of Joseph of the Bible, who ruled as second in authority over all Egypt in 1923 BCE from our own work, is apparently confirmed as

12th Dynasty. The *Turin King List* gives 213 years for the era of this Dynasty's duration, whereas Manetho offers the sum number of 160 (Africanus) or 245 (Eusebius) years. The probability of this having occurred by mere chance is admittedly very tiny, vindicating Bible chronology. Apart from the 480 years to Solomon (1Ki 6:1), and 430 years of Egyptian dwelling (Ex 12:40-41), there is the generation list of Heman in David's time (1Ch 6:33-43) giving 22 generations from Heman back to Jacob's time. All of these dates and times have been questioned some way or other by those who lived later than these eras. Based on the established success of our works to date, we observe that a period of "four generations" as told to Abraham concerning Israel's Egyptian sojourn is the correct value based on Abraham's age at Isaac's birth, but that ordinal numbers in Biblical Hebrew seem to be implying at times a cardinal meaning instead ("fourth" implying "fifth," hence "four whole units plus some"). Support for this may be taken from the ordinal numbers beyond "tenth" in Hebrew being displaced by cardinals. Abraham's age is 100 years at the birth of Isaac, thus the 430 years (Exodus 12:40) that the "sons of Israel" dwelt in Egypt and in Canaan from 1923 to 1493 (Joseph became a free Egyptian in 1923, and Jacob's family was brought into Egypt in 1914 BG) was "four

generations." It has taken eight or nine articles to see this fully.

[1](*This is the modern version of Dynasty 12, which includes Amenemhet I, whereas Manetho's Dynasty 12, as beginning with Sesostris I, is modernly 1971 BCE, thus when we refer to the modern date of Dynasty 12 in par. 5-11 as 1971 BCE, Manetho's Dynasty 12 is intended (we follow as sources: Arnold, Piccione, and Redford.*) [2](*Clayton, Piccione, Redford, Grimal, and Arnold, of Egyptologists, give Year 1 Amenemhet I as 1991 BCE, a date which may be obtained from the Sothic rising on on III Peret 20 Year 5 of Sesostris I, together with a 9-year overlap of his Reign with predecessor Amenemhet I, from Tetley p. 335, cf. 10-year, "AEC," p. 174, and cf. also 9-year, from Notebook 33, WGreen, p. 28.*)



Above: Flinders Petrie *(Photo of him as a young man, restoration by Ward Green 2016)*

[48] Whether Semites lived in Egypt prior to Joseph and his family's arrival there or not, there is not benefit in departing from the Biblical narrative in such matters, though Mr. Kurinsky would defer to much later experts. While Abraham had certainly predated Joseph, who was a fourth-generation descendant of Abraham's (noting once more the reference to "fourth generation") who perhaps fulfilled in part the prophecy by "returning" to Jacob from Egypt wagons to assist his removal there during a seven-year famine that occurred during his generation, the elder patriarch had himself visited Egypt earlier. "Semitic immigration from Asia" was noted by Breasted, and Mr. Kurinsky here heeds a late great Egyptologist:

> **Sir Flinders Petrie, whose status in Egyptology is on a par with that of the great Breasted, was similarly impressed by the extent of Semitic influence he found on his excavations in Egypt. He was convinced of the fundamental Semitic origin of Egyptian civilization.**

According to the *Book of Jubilees* 8:12, the lot of Shem

(Semites) was "the middle of the earth," and a great many Semitic people are found today at latitudes of moderate value, in and around the equator of earth. The earth was divided in the "days" of Peleg, and this is from Genesis 10:25 (*Book of Jubilees* 8:8-9). When the "division" of the earth is equated with Babel and the confusion of tongues, it is noteworthy that in the *Book of Jubilees* 8:8, about Peleg, it is in "the days when he was born" that the earth is divided. In the *BG* Peleg is born 533 years after 3282 BG (The Deluge), ie. 2749 BCE, and according to Syncellus in *The Old Chronicle* (of Egypt), there are "534 years from the Flood to the Building of the Tower," as well as 2365 years from Egypt's first King to the last King Nectanebo (342 BCE by modern dating), and so with 42 years of building the Tower of Babel after 2749, we have Nimrod or Menes ruling from 2707 (2707-2365=342). Thus the Bible-based *BG* agrees, remarkably, and completely with *The Old Chronicle* of Syncellus.

3282 - 533 - 42 - 2365 = 342 BCE

Egypt's last King, Nectanebo II, ends

Above: Landscape with the Tower of Babel by Verhaecht, Palais des beaux-arts de Lille *(Painting by Tobias Verhaecht (1561-1631))*

---

49 Now while the Tower was built in Shinar the connection of Shinar to Egypt was strong, as we note in our work, previously, Mr. John Jackson having asserted a 22-year interval from the fall of the Tower to the King Thoth. In the *BG* it would now appear to be 2706 BG for the fall of the Tower after 42 or 43 years and 22 more years until the start of Old Kingdom Egypt in 2684 BG. But let's leave this topic for the moment and consider instead the beginning of the Egyptian calendar itself. The date of Thoth 01 was intended to coincide with the rising of Sothis the year of the calendar's inception, for this was the beginning of the great

Phoenix Cycle, which would end on Thoth 01 after 1461 Egyptian years. The year in which this occurs is determined by modern, astronomical calculation (PLSV 3.1), and with the same arcus visionis as Ptolemy (ie. 11.0) yielded 2783 BCE, a date which differs by 34 years from the birthdate of Peleg in 2749, but nears the death of Shem in 2780 BG.*

* *The date 2783 BCE for the start of the Sothic Cycle or Great Phoenix is measured at Memphis in Egypt, calculated using PLSV 3.1 with the arcus visionis that Ptolemy gave for the northern coast of Egypt, which is 11.0. To move the date as much as three years higher, to 2786 BCE, would require raising the arcus visionis but little further, to 11.5, so a three-year error isn't unexpected.*

4[10] Two remarkable points can be made about the difference of 34 years, both of which merit solemn contemplation. Firstly, the *Book of Sothis* lists as first King of Egypt Mestraim, or Menes, who reigned for 35 years. The second King, we must note for future reference, is given therein 63 years (named Kourodes), and the third (called Aristarchus) is allotted 34 years (34 again!). The fourth King is named Spanius, and reigns 36 years. The *Chronicle of Malalas* asserts that the first King of Egypt was called Naracho, of the tribe of Ham. When we equate Mestraim and Naracho

with Nimrod (as we discussed in *Ark* as to Menes, at least), we get a simple accounting of the years from 2783 to 2749 BG. Under this view, these years constitute Nimrod's Reign at first, before building of the Tower of Babel began. The calendar which begins in 2783, later used in Egypt by Thoth, possibly had its first month renamed, later, provided we accept the chronology already promulgated. At this point we know no more than this, and currently we have insufficient space to consider all reasonings. The second point, startling confirmation of the first, comes from the ancient record of the Babylonian Kings. Jackson says, in his *Chronological Antiquities,* that the original Babylonian Dynasty, which began from Nimrod's Reign on, and was the first after the Deluge, had a discrepancy, but lasted either 224 or 190 years, the difference between which numbers is also 34 years. The implication is that the length of the Dynasty thus depends upon whether one 'counts' the 34 years or not, with the Tower as a later, more memorable Reign start. Remarkably, Nimrod's Rule has variously been accounted as 69, 63, 62, 43, 42, 35, 34, 28, 27, 7, and 6 years.

Above: Nimrod Fortress, Mount Hermon, Syria-Israel
(2009 photo)

4[11] As part of Egypt's first Dynasty, Nimrod in Shinar was ruling at a time before the confusion of the languages or the dispersion of the nations throughout the earth, at which time all men, including Peleg, and later, his descendants, Terah and Abraham, were living in Shinar. So, in a sense, Peleg lived under Egyptian Rule before Egypt officially became a nation, and Shinar likewise. So, are the histories of Egypt and Shinar intertwined. The name 'China,' also, comes from the name of Shinar. Names like 'Shinar' and 'Nimrod' are important markers to understanding the history of Egypt and its dealings with Israel, a nation of Semites who in the

early part of Biblical history lived in Egypt, however obscurely. Not knowing a lot about the specifics beyond the Bible record about Joseph and his family (Genesis) and about Moses (Exodus), an accurate chronology is an important basis for knowing when to search for more information. We say 'when' to search, and not 'where,' because this search, in the worst case, lacks much direct evidence. Proof of the time period itself is then desirable, but still requires a double-ended approach, meaning that a dated artifact is meaningless without an expected date for the presence of the artifact, based on chronology. Uncertainties in chronology as well as in the dates of any artifacts themselves may still negate the results, so the problem is managed by minimizing the variables. Time is but one variable, and does not in itself prove the identity of what is sought with what is found, but merely increases the probability of relevant searches.

---

412 Jackson's Babylonian Dynasty, the first Kingdom coming after *The Deluge* of Noah, he granted either 224 and a half or 190 years (the 34 and a half year period we discussed above), then the second Kingdom after it, the

Arabian Dynasty, he assigns 215 years, consecutive to the first (Babylonian), and the third Dynasty, also of Babylon, Mr. Jackson offers a total of 217 years in what offers to be none other than the Dynasty of Akkad with an excess of 55 years, the Reign of Sargon as has been similarly put for a famous Belus, whose 'son' was Ninus of the Assyrian empire, but who he rightly makes the predecessor of Ninus by several Reigns, justly so. The totals we will get to shortly, but the 215 Arabian years corresponds quite accurately with those Sumerian Kings beginning with the Dynasty of Akshak, along with the Fourth Dynasty of Kish, and Third Dynasty of Uruk. The five Kings of Akkad also correspond perfectly with the five Kings (in number) that Jackson gives from the first, Belus, who rules 55 years, the other four being 162 years, or near the right total for the five Kings. This excess of 55 years is not surprising seeing as in traditional lists Belus is succeeded directly by Ninus with the ommission of the four others, a clear problem with the understanding of the proper placing of Belus. We draw the same conclusion here as in *Ark* that the Dynasty of Akkad is Jackson's third Dynasty and it totals only something near 161 years, rather than 217, based on modern research on the Dynasty of Akkad while retaining the maximum Reign lengths held by tradition.[1] Naram-Sin

the grandson of Sargon the Great is confused with Ninus, as we stated there also, which explains it also as to the Reigns omitted after Belus in writings. We have identified Ninus as Gudea or Chedorlaomer, who lived in Abraham's time, and who had a nickname Ninus, who reigned at 2141, the start of the Assyrian Empire:

2783 - 34 - 42 - 190 - 215 - 161 = 2141 BCE

Assyrian Empire begins 2141

The sum of the 34 + 42 + 190 (ie. 42 + 224) years that has the Tower-building years added (42) may be seen to be 266, which is just 263 when taken from the death of Shem in 2780 BG, and 263 is the total of Africanus for all the Kings he lists for the first Egyptian Dynasty. The date of 2141 is also very precisely determined, by the *Book of Jasher,* the *Battle of Siddim* being dated by Abraham's birth in 2206 BG and his age, 60 years, at the time, as being in 2146 BG, the last 5 years of Chedorlaomer's service to Amraphel (Arbelus), from the same *Book of Jasher,* being sequential, ending in Abraham's 10th year in Canaan at age 65 when in 2141 Chedorlaomer routs Amraphel the King of Shinar finally, and Gudea (Chedorlaomer) as Ninus begins Rule as

King of Assyria, ending the great Dynasty of Akkad.[2]

[1](*Jackson himself identifies the third Dynasty at Babylon as directly following the Arabian Dynasty, and consisting of Belus and four descendents, and although his duration differs, the number of Kings matches that of the Dynasty of Akkad with Sargon I, his two sons, a grandson Naram-Sin and great grandson Shar-Kali-Sharri (five in all), before the Assyrian Ninus conquered it; this he calls* ***An important Piece of History unknown to all Chronologers,*** *and gives for Belus a date of death, from Africanus "the 28th Year of Terah," a date which in BG chronology (Terah b. 2276) is c. 2248 BCE, coming to 53 or 54 years after 2302 Sargon Year 1, and thus in miraculously good agreement with the Reigns of Belus and Sargon I, each as 55 years.-- "Chronological Antiquities" Vol. 1 (1752), by John Jackson, p. 238*) [2](*Africanus says that Ninus inherited the Kingdom from Belus in the year 2141 BCE-- startlingly agreeing with us on this date, although he has to be corrected, as it was 'Arbelus' and not 'Belus,' for the full list of Kings who preceded Ninus is: Belus, Babius, Anebis, Chalaus, Arbelus-- see "Chronological Antiquities" Vol. 1 (1752), by John Jackson, date 2141 BCE: p. 238, list of Kings: p. 262*)

end of Chapter 4: Semite Israel Masterfully Pervading Lower Egypt



Chapter 5: Dynasty Akkad To Exodus



Above: Emperor Dom Pedro II of Brazil at Pyramid and Sphinx, Giza, Egypt *(1871 photo. Seated in chairs, from left to right: Auguste Mariette, Dona Josefina da Fonseca Costa, lady-in-waiting of the Empress, Luis Pedreira do Couto Ferraz, Baron and later Vicount of Bom Retiro, Empress Teresa Cristina, an unidentified man and Emperor Dom Pedro II of Brazil, surrounded by local Egyptians during the Emperor's trip to Egypt in the end of 1871. Behind them can be seen the Great Sphinx of Giza and the Giza Necropolis.)*

Hear me when I call, O God of my righteousness: thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress; have mercy upon me, and hear my prayer. (*Psalms 4:1; King James Version 1769*)

When I called upon him, the God of my righteousness heard me: thou hast made room for me in tribulation; pity me, and hearken to my prayer. (*Psalms 4:1; Brenton 1851*)

5[1] The date of *The Deluge* in Jewish tradition, and in the Masoretic tradition of the Bible, are different from that we obtained from the Greek Septuagint, being 2105 BCE (Jewish) or a little earlier-- 2348 (Ussher). Much proof of

the unlikelihood of this late date stems from the evidence of the early Bronze Age which ensued directly after the cataclysmic event itself, the early evidence of writing which greatly predates it, and the collated documentary evidence of the Greek Septuagint. Yet another possible proof comes from a gift made from astronomical records of Babylon after its conquest, by Alexander the Great, in 331 BCE, which was reported as having reached Aristotle, it having spanned 1903 years of observations sequentially prior to that date, which should thus date the beginning of records to 2234 BCE, and would render the Deluge date of 2348 BCE too late, allowing, as it does, only 114 years to build Babylon. On the other hand, many generations preceded the start of the failed Tower of Babel, according to our record, with the Old Kingdom of Egypt dated to about 2685 BCE, a date which postdated the Reign of Nimrod by 22 years according to Jackson, he ruling from 2707 BCE or about 42 years after the birth of Peleg in 2749 BG as above. The numbers are more accurate than we had expected, as Mr. Jackson gives 395 years for the Egyptian period to end 12 years after the Arabian Dynasty, agreeing with:

2685 - 395 + 12 - 161 = 2141 BCE

Assyrian Empire begins 2141,

this date 2141 being now firmly fixed in the annals of *Greenealogy* as Assyria's start, Abraham age 65.

---

52 While modern scholars place the Year 1 of Sargon about 2300 BCE, we date it likewise as 2141 + 161 = 2302 BG. [1] With Sargon's Reign, as that of Belus, 55 years, it is coming to an end about 2247 before Christ, which dates rather close to the 2234 earliest astronomical record. "Sargon of Akkad is the first King to rule Akkad...and ...famous for having first created the modern zodiac."[2] *Observations of Bel* is Sargon's 70-volume work, made a standard of Babylonian astronomy and astrology.[3] Child sacrifice by burning was also practised by these Babylonians, a detestable act logged in the same book.

It is probable that the first collection of astronomical observations and terrestrial omens was made for a library established by Sargon.

(*New World Encyclopedia, Akkadian Empire*)

[1](*New World Encyclopedia (2015), Akkadian Empire, end of paragraph 1 of subsection 'History.' Our own date for Sargon was put at 2299 or 2268 in our article 'Ark of Urartu.'*) [2](*The Ark of Urartu (2010), by Rolf Ward Green and Anne Ruth Ruthledge*) [3](*Nature, Vol 12, "The Astronomy of the Babylonians" (Oct 07 1875), by A. H. Sayce, p. 489*)



Above: Protoplanetary nebula IRAS 20068+4051 *(2010 by NASA. The protoplanetary nebula shown in this image is known as IRAS 20068+4051 and it is found in the constellation of Cygnus.)*

---

53 Any major discrepancy for the date of the astronomical

records in *Observations of Bel* with the date of Sargon's Reign may be explained, by Sayce, as follows:

> **The Accadians seem to have begun their astronomical observations before they left Elam, since the meridian was placed in that country, while the old mythology made "the mountain of the East" the pivot on which the sky rested. This will account for the large number of eclipses recorded in the "Observations of Bel," which imply a corresponding antiquity for the commencement of such records. These records were carefully kept, as there were State Observatories in most of the Babylonian and Assyrian towns—at Ur, Agand, Nineveh, and Arbela, for instance—and (at all events in later times) the astronomers**

royal had to send fortnightly reports to the King.

It is to the Accadians that we owe both the signs of the Zodiac and the days of the week. ...

Long before the reign of Sargon of Agane [Akkad], the discovery had been made that lunar eclipses recur after a cycle of 223 lunations, and records of them incorporated into the "Observations of Bel" generally begin with the words "According to calculation," or (it may be) "Contrary to calculation, the moon was eclipsed."
(*Nature, Volume 12, ed. by Sir Norman Lockyer, "The Astronomy of the Babylonians" (Thursday, October 7,*

1875), by A. H. Sayce, p. 489)[1]

Thus science was established well before the time even of Abraham (Abram) of the Bible, and the testimony now obtained regarding Abraham's own visit to Egypt cannot be lessened based on that lack of a scientific culture which prevailed at the time and prevented an accurate, objective record of events, such as was here recorded.

[1](*Nature, Volume 12, ed. by Sir Norman Lockyer, "The Astronomy of the Babylonians" (Thursday, October 7, 1875), by A. H. Sayce, p. 489*)

Admonitions of Ipuwer

54 Evidence for the Israelite *Exodus* from Egypt is claimed by a great many modern scholars as lacking, as though they reject such testimony of the Bible record. The implication is that all 'proof' of the presence of Israel in Egypt as well as of their departure from the Egyptian political scene must be from sources which do not corroborate the Bible, as they reject that source. The contrary view is, logically, that once one accepts the Bible as the primary testimony on the

subject, all that then remains to be done is to find out what other evidence there is that might provide one confirmation. Critics have long argued that no Egyptian contemporary records exist that confirm an Israelite *Exodus,* although New Kingdom Egypt has few papyri surviving in evidence (we currently believe less than one percent), and official records would typically seek to encourage Egyptian officials and thus would avoid embarassments. When confirmation is sought for the Bible record, with the idea that the Bible is the chief testimony, we are acting out of faith, consistent with Bible principles.[1] From this viewpoint, there is indeed a papyrus record, named the *Admonitions of Ipuwer,* to confirm it.[2]

[1](*"Everything not out of faith is sin." Romans 14:23*) [2](*"The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage" (1969), by Alan H. Gardiner, p. 18*)

Above: Ipuwer Papyrus, Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden *(13th c. BCE copy, hieratic handwriting on papyrus)*

5[5] Like all ancient events, the *The Exodus* is much easier to confirm when one knows *when* it was in time, or more so when one knows *precisely when.* This is a concept that we invented in *Crucible,* the idea that facts of history stand or fall within an exacting test created by the crucible of a chronology. While our date for the *Exodus* of Israel in 1493 from Egypt's New Kingdom under Thutmose I has remained secure throughout the duration of this test so far, it has at every stage been subject to possible rejection. Yet the date 1493 BCE has stood up to every test given by known fact, something not true of other held dates. Many events are 'hidden' in history simply because the precise dating of them prevents any meaningful search, as details of their meaning are hidden in the context. Time simply won't permit a 'broadband' history search. Even a slight error of dating changes meaning totally. In 1969, Alan H. Gardiner dated *Ipuwer* to about the time of the Hyksos of Egypt based on an historical assessment of its contents, noting that

earlier dating was possible only from philological and other aspects.[1] Since modern scholars adopt a much lower dating for an Israelite Exodus from Egypt (1200s BCE), they see only that the *Ipuwer* document is too early and so is irrelevant to their particular discussion of evidence. This is a remarkable example of how timing is crucial. Since it is irrelevant in their chronology, some since the time of Mr. Gardiner have chosen the earlier date, and make it too early for us, as we would now explain.

[1](*"The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage" (1969), by Alan H. Gardiner, p. 18*)

---

56 Still, our date is permitted, as *The Admonitions of Ipuwer* is dated no earlier than late 12th Dynasty, meaning that lower dates are possible, but because the only copy was from ca. 1300 BCE in our chronology, the original was deemed to have predated (a later) Exodus. In other words, their date of 1200s BCE for the Exodus occurred after the original record of the Admonitions. No problem with dating occurs in BG chronology though. Thus, we would have to see the *Ipuwer* as strong confirmation of the Biblical account, based on timing. The exact date of the original of

Admonitions unknown, and its only known copy being *after* our Exodus, we are thus in possession of contemporary, documentary evidence confirming *The 1493 Exodus* from Egypt. The content of Admonitions is outside our scope, here. We have faith that such correspondence is good enough. Others have studied and analyzed the document, though. There is sufficient debate to decide for confirmation. That is to say, in the BG, *a contemporary, Egyptian document does exist, and confirms Israel's Exodus!* Mr. Jacobovici is among those who aver a confirmation. *The Admonitions of Ipuwer* equals *Exodus*.



Above: Red-knobbed Starfish, Bristol Zoo Aquarium, Bristol *(2005 photo by Adrian Pingstone, Species 'Protoreaster lincki,' in Protoreaster (Genus), Oreasteridae (Family))*

Greenealogy

57 The continued, startling success of the *BG* with regard to its ability to include the Bible in history, which is the long sought *Holy Grail* chronology, is due to factors which, while unknown, belong to God. We have thus far consistently attempted to maintain an argument for the early nature of our work, based as it is on the recent development of the online phenomenon.[1] Our approach has been based on numbers and the records of documents, including astronomy and logical factors. We even include arithmetic factors, such as the number of years between events being represented as a product of these, for example, the date of Tutankhamun in 1357 BG as 343 years = 7 x 7 x 7 years before the Temple of Solomon being founded (dated by us as 1014 BG or BCE). Of course, the thoroughness required for these details would be excessive unless true accuracy were probable. Overconfidence is something we also have much avoided. We always seek the lowest dates to encompass all eras. In so doing, though, we have to allow for generational requirements of lineal descent and national alignment. We try to be thorough, and yet the hour remains

early. When there is no truth in our time, we must assert it. We have maintained the simple Bible account of Judah's Kings as giving the true date of Solomon's Temple from its founding in 1014 BCE, with 1Kings 6:1 then leading (add 479) to a date of 1493 BCE for *The Exodus*. The simplicity of this approach is that it is faithful to the Bible record, and leads to consistency with the date of 587 BCE for Jerusalem's destruction, something proven by modern astronomy and the Babylonian records.

[1](*"Early" we here mean in the sense of "green" or "in infancy."*)



Above: Cleopatra's Banquet, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam *(Circa 1675-1680 painting by Gerard de Lairesse, Oil on canvas, 74 x 96 cm)*

58 We won't have time to consider every corrupted version of chronology ever created, but it is instructive that there were numbers given in the *Book of Sothis*. It can be shown that they agree with Abraham's dating, in the BG, and that its 700 combined with 511 years of Shepherd Kings in Josephus counted from Peleg's Year 5 in BOS (which is 2745 BG) gives 1534 BCE, a year prior to the expulsion of the Hyksos as is stated elsewhere.[1,2] Not only that, but the 700 years themselves end in the year 2045 BG, one year prior to the BG birth of Jacob. When the first Dynasty of Egypt is 228 years (Eusebius gives of Manetho) and is followed by 215 years of Arab Kings of Jackson's Babylonian sequence, we get 2302 as the start of the Dynasty of Akkad, as already allowed. These are some of the few numbers which add up neatly. One of the beauties of the Akkadian Dynasty start date being near this time is that it puts Naram-Sin as King very near or just after the birth of Abraham, and also causes the alignment with Chedorlaomer at Akkad's end. The great fame of Naram-Sin fits his identification as Nimrod or Ninus by some later commentators on Abraham.

[1](*The Crucible of Credible Creed (2012), by Rolf Ward Green et al., paragraph 3-4, middle*) [2](*Trojan War-- Year End Report (2015), by Rolf Ward Green et al., paragraph 2-10, middle*)



Above: Clay tablet relating the birth of Sargon of Akkad

(Clay tablet relating the birth of Sargon and his quarrel with king Ur-Zababa of Kish, 'paleo-Babylonian period,' 2nd millenium BCE, but relating to 3rd milennium Reign of Sargon, c. 2302 BCE)

---

59 Although we ought to be aware of the apparent accuracy of our 2141 BCE date for the start of Assyria, whereby we make Ninus its first King to be some name for Gudea and Chedorlaomer both, Abraham's contemporary (as also Naram-Sin was in his early life), we are hardly fairly more convinced by Jackson's statement that Belus ruled Assyria first and was succeeded by Ninus, according to Africanus, in precisely this identical year, 2141 BCE.[1] Striking though the correspondence be, it adds little, requiring that

we also take by Belus that he means the final King to reign in the Dynasty of Sargon of Akkad. An unlikelihood of agreement adds inertia to the date, but the circumstances had already belike convinced us. From this arithmetic coincidence and the account given by Jackson and attributed to Abydenus we may find that that Dynasty of Akkad preceded the Kingdom of Assyria. The confusion about Ninus being the 'son' of Belus, in several versions, is cleared up by the belief that the King Chedolaomer was the servant of Amraphel, for some period, as was recounted in the *Book of Jasher*. Chedorlaomer is to us Gudea (the 'Assyrian' Ninus), as Amraphel (aka 'Nimrod') is Shar-Kali-Sharri, of Akkad.[2,3] Should we have any doubt about the date of 2141 BCE as the inception of the Assyrian Empire, Ctesias had said that it began 1000 years before the Trojan War (though what date he assigned to that is not clear), and there are the 1903 years of astronomical observations stated as (perhaps a minimum) preceding Alexander in 331 BCE, their start attributed to the Dynasty of Akkad lasting from about 2302 BCE to 2141 BCE, reasonably agreeably, stated as being from 2233 BCE, 1903 years consecutive. The Assyrian Empire is reported to be 1300-1400 years, so with its end in 809 BG it lasted 1332 years in all. This 1332 as computed is 11 x 11 x 11 + 1 or 12 x 111.

[1](*See footnote [1], paragraph 4-12, above.*) [2](*He being the fifth King including Sargon, with there being some confusion following this Reign.*) [3](*See also par. 4-12.*)

---

510 During Israel's time in Egypt, attested primarily from the Bible, lasting from 1914 to 1493 BCE for the whole family of Jacob (aka Israel) and Israel's descendants, very little is known yet of the history of the period. When the 19 years of King "Silites" and his successors in the *BOS* are totalled to 274 years (using the 44 years, the greater of the two values for 'Certos'), and 108 years for Dynasty 15 from the Turin List taken as adding to it, the total of 382 years added to 1532, the year of the Hyksos expulsion, gives the year 1914. The name 'Silites' resembles the Hebrew word referring to Joseph's position as Governor, which is "Shalliyt," as given explicitly in Genesis 42:6 (Masoretic H7989). Josephus gives the name of this King as 'Salitis,' and Manetho has it elsewhere as 'Saites,' always 19 years. The death of Amenemhet II is given as 1895 BCE (modern computations), which was 19 years after the year 1914.[1] Thus, the name and time period fit Joseph excellently. We are unable to give space to the many corruptions of Manetho which disagree, nor do they lessen any import.

The Shepherds are said to leave Egypt and to found the city of Jerusalem, something which became true, later. Of King Salitis, he is said to have given out rations, something that Joseph did, we know, during the famine.[2]

[1](*The BCE Reign of Amenemhet II is given by Egyptsite (1929-1895), Clayton (1926-1895), Grimal (1928-1895), Redford (1929-1896) and Dodson (1932-1896).*) [2](*After completion of this article, it appears to be notable that the names "Silites" and "Shalliyt" are similar to our word "silo," meaning a storage facility for grain, which Joseph used at Genesis 41:49,56.*)

Above: Hyksos Sphinx of Amenemhat III from Tanis.
(Front view of one of the so-called "Hyksos sphinxes" of Amenemhat III, later usurped by Apophis and much later by Psusennes I (the partial cartouche, bottom). from a book "A History of Egypt," Vol. III (1902), by E. A. Wallis Budge (1857-1934), p. 65.)

511 Furthermore, the identification of Salitis with Joseph is bolstered by a further quote of Manetho by Josephus which calls Salitis an invader from the East (which is true as Joseph was from Canaan) who built Avaris (Eber = Avar would appear to be the origin of this name, ie. father of the Hebrew nation) a city of the Delta, also "levying tribute from Upper and Lower Egypt," as would agree with Joseph's actions (Genesis 41:34; 47:24,26), since Joseph levied, during the seven years of plenty, a fifth of all the produce of Egypt as tax to Pharaoh. Since we place Joseph during the time of Amenemhet II, in the 12th Dynasty, it appears possible to accept the 12th Dynasty as the Dynasty of the Shepherd Kings, the Dynasty called the 16th by Julius Africanus, who gives 518 years as its duration, a number which added to the year of Israel's arrival at Palestine in 1452, gives a date of 1970 (the modern date for Dynasty 12 is 1971).[1] Consideration of corruption of Dynasties 12 through 17 of Manetho or by Manetho reveals that all of these are confused or redundant accounts of the very same years.

[1](*See also par. 8-11 and par. 4-7, note [1].*)

---

512 The date of *The Exodus* can be approached from a different angle by considering the burning of Jericho, when it can be shown that such an event occurred 1452, since this would be the time of Israel's arrival there under Joshua's leadership after the Bible's stated, 40 years (and some months) of their wilderness wandering. According to Mr. David Livingston, William Dever gives a date for the start of the Late Bronze Age, and makes "a strong case" for lowering the LBIA thereby to 1450. [It] "takes into account the difficulty that virtually all scholars acknowledge in discerning a clear ceramic break between the Middle and Late Bronze ages (quoting 'Dever 1992:16,' he puts the LBIA start at 1450 BCE)". He offers Dever's "composite transitional MB III/LB IA phase which would embrace both the later campaigns (of Thutmose III) that ended MB III" as Dever's reasoning. Livingston thus makes the end of MB II 100 years lower and eliminates the problem Kathleen Kenyon found, that made her date the Fall of Jericho 100 years too early, causing her to conclude that Joshua wasn't at Jericho.[1] Thus Jericho confirms the 1493 BCE *Exodus* date.

[1](*In the work entitled "The Exodus - Conquest Dating Fiasco" by Dr. David*

Livingston, subtitled 'How the Dating of the Exodus and Conquest Became Confused,' Dr. David Livingston writes:

> *William Dever makes a strong case for a "composite transitional MB III/LB IA phase which would embrace both the later campaigns (of Thutmose III) that ended MB III." We note with this that he brings LB IA down as late as 1450 BC. He says further, "[This] takes into account the difficulty that virtually all scholars acknowledge in discerning a clear ceramic break between the Middle and Late Bronze ages (Dever 1992:16)." In this we find at least 100 years drop in the date for the end of MB II making only 50 years difference between that date and the biblical date of 1400 BC.*

In our chronology (The BG), there is thus very good agreement between the end of MB II and our Biblical date for the conquest of Jericho, in 1452 BCE.)

end of Chapter 5: Dynasty Akkad To Exodus

Above: Jacob blessing the sons of Joseph by Victors, National Museum in Warsaw *(Circa 1650 painting by Jan Victors, Oil on canvas, 136 × 190 cm)*

Chapter 6: Solstice Exacts Egyptian

Dating

Above: The Core of Andromeda Galaxy *(Modified NASA/ESA)*

When the stars were made, all my angels praised me with a loud voice.
(*Job 38:7; Brenton 1851*)

When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?
(*Job 38:7; Jay P. Green 1976-2000*)

61 How important the Egyptian calendar is in establishing the absolute chronology of the world's history depends upon, simply, how the calendar acts to seed the dates. The Phoenix or Sothic Cycle, 1460 Julian years, equals 1461 Egyptian years, exactly, because the 365 Egyptian calendar days (assuming a fixed calendar) are short of the 365.25 days of the Julian year, and thus amount to a full year's difference after 1460 Julian years (1460 divided by 365 equals 4, one quarter day per year, for 1460 years, makes 365 days or one full Egyptian year). Because the Egyptian calendar differs by

one day every four years from the Julian calendar, 100 years means a shift of 25 days of the summer solstice calendar date. By way of contrast and comparison, the Julian solstice date is shifted three quarters of a day for 100 years. The Julian year of 365.25 days is longer than the true solar year (about 365.24 days), while the 365-day year of Egypt shifts relative to the Julian for 1461 years. In the Julian calendar, the summer solstice that falls Jun 20-21 in the Gregorian calendar in 2016 CE fell on Jul 16-17 in the 2700s BCE (2800-2700 BCE), coinciding nearly with Julian Jul 18 in 2774 BCE, the date Sothis rose and the Egyptian calendar New Year, ie. Thoth 01. There is also an annular solar eclipse passing exactly over the site of Noah's Ark in Turkey Jul 18 2774 BCE. These factors together favour 2774 BCE as the Egyptian calendar's Year 1, summer being also a highly favoured season (named Shemu) in the Egyptian religious system. Other factors might refine the date, however slightly, as we see that ca. 2774 BCE is *highly favoured.*

---

62 Closely known dates for the coincidence of Thoth 01 or the Egyptian New Year with the rising of Sirius-Sothis (the

dog star of constellation Canis Major), in 139 CE and 1324 BCE, definitely imply that the beginning date of the Egyptian calendar = 1324 + 1460 = ca. 2780 BCE. A date 1460 years before that would be possible, also, but rendered moot by the global *Deluge* of 3282. The BG dates the *Noachian Deluge* to 3282 BCE in harmony with Bible genealogy and the Greek Septuagint. Note that dates lower than 2780 for this *Deluge* would render the 2780 calendar start moot, since it is connected with early Egypt and Nimrod after the flood. It is from the Bible that we get the information about the first nation after the flood, presided over by the hero or rebel Nimrod in the land of Shinar (now Iraq). *Genesis Chapters 10 & 11* tell us the genealogy, and logic would dictate that some generations would be required for the growth of the population after global destruction, an exponential growth over the centuries. Before post-diluvial Egypt could begin, the precursory *Tower of Babel* was undertaken, and this failed. We have discussed these things at length, without much conclusive result, noting that Chinese mythology dates the Reign of Yan Di to 2737 BCE, the same century from which the Egyptian calendar is now proved to originate with high probability, as does the Septuagint's Babel.

Above: Tower of Babel, Gemaldegaerie Alte Meister, Dresden *(1595 painting by Marten van Valckenborch, 75.5 x 105 cm)*

---

63 Without prejudice to how much more information we have yet to find regarding the 28th century BCE, we do well to pay attention to the correspondences available now. One of these, the *Book of Sothis,* gives a clear double dating of the *Dispersion* that spread the people (by a confusion of tongues at Babel) as Peleg's (Phalec) 5th year = Arpachshad's (Arphaxad) 34th year.[1] Some information which we had determined previously is the death of Shem in 2780 BCE, the death of Arpachshad in 2745 BCE, and the birth of Peleg in 2749 BCE or BG. Those of us who believe in God are more so than others inclined to believe

that someone may know more than us about our human history, but then we try to make sure. Since the year 2745 is both the 5th year of Peleg from his birth in 2749 BG, and 2745 BG is the year of death of Arpachshad, here is a clue to the *Dispersion* date, suggesting that it may date to exactly 2745 BCE. The corruption of the name Peleg to Phalec and that of Arpachshad to Arphaxad could (and did) prevent us from at first identifying the people so evidently intended.

[1](*See paragraph 5-8, sentence 2.*)



Above: Nicolaus Copernicus portrait (from Town Hall in Torun), Regional Museum in Torun, Poland *(1580 painting by Unknown Artist, Tempera and oil on wood)*

64 Manetho was an Egyptian credited with authorship of at least *Aegyptica* (possibly also the *BOS*), and his most ancient witness Josephus (c. 70 CE) gives reason to believe that Manetho included Bible history, made more obvious in his strong objections to Manetho.[1] Thus, that the *BOS* may contain some independent account of those events found recorded in the Bible is perhaps conceivable, a highly significant possibility. Whether we believe it or not will depend upon the fate or the final assessment of the many numbers expressed. However, we saw above a use of 2745, Peleg's 5th year, a highly improbable eventuality and evidence of truth, there being 700 years from 2745 to the birth of Jacob, and 511 years after to the expulsion of the Shepherds. Thus, we have good reason to investigate 2745 further. There are also other dates that warrant our attention.

[1](*He disagreed with Manetho's identification of Moses as Osarseph, for example, "Against Apion," I. 26-31, ss227-287, from 'Manetho w/ an English Translation' (1940), by W. G. Waddell, p. 147*)

---

65 First, we would like to investigate the 700 years from the

BOS account, and an apparent discrepancy in its 395 years, as compared to the *Old Chronicle* and its corresponding 443 years for the first 15 Kings of the *Sothic Cycle* (as given by Eratosthenes). Let's be realistic and admit that something so ancient is probably going to take many iterations to sort out. Taking the 443 years of the *Old Chronicle* as 48 years more than 395, and counted from the start of the *Sothic Cycle,* here a 48-year difference appears to compare with 42 or so years when the Tower of Babel was being constructed, with about 6 years unaccounted, although the account in Genesis 11:8 says that *they gradually left off building the city* of the Tower.[1] In order to preserve as much as possible the 42 years, we might take the 48 years as 42 years plus the 6-year Reign of Nimrod after the *Dispersion,* and by so doing seeing the *Dispersion* as 'gradual' over 6 years (and so preserve its date 2745, or 2744), though with 2786 as the start of the Great Phoenix, or Sothic Cycle, we now take 748 years from 2786 (as raising the 700 years of the *BOS* by 48 to reflect 443 years in the *Old Chronicle* cf. 395 years *BOS*), or 700 years from 2738 BCE, to get 2038 BCE for a date 115 years before Joseph in 1923 BCE, a result obtained exactly from the *BOS* using numbers there given.

[1](*The Ark of Urartu (2010), by Rolf Ward Green and Anne Ruth Rutledge, paragraph 4-7, middle*)

Above: Engineer's Phoenix, Cornell University's Dragon Day
(2008 photo)

---

66 When the 6 six years of Nimrod are subtracted from 228 for Egypt's Dynasty 1 of Eusebius, 222 years remain to subtract from 2738 or 2739, leaving 2516 or 2517, from which 215 years of Arabian Kings give 2302 or 2301 BCE for the start of the Dynasty of Akkad, as given above. These 222 years compare favourably with the 224 years, for the first Babylonian Dynasty (also given as 190 as discussed above, with a 34-year discrepancy attributed to the time between the Phoenix start and Tower start, although in the revised dating it's more complicated). Hoping for a simpler solution, we note that as the BOS gave the Dispersion as

occurring in the '34th year' of Arpachshad, there should be another 9 or more years to add to 33 years to arrive at 42 years for the Tower, a period of 9 years to add to the death of Shem in 2780. This only raises the Phoenix higher, to 2789, making a difference of 82 years from 2789 to 2707, and compares to 67 years from 2774 to 2707, where the 42 years from 2749 to 2707 formerly were Tower building years, while the 34-year discrepancy was from 2741 to 2707, before. Thus, the Tower looks to have been from 2786-2744, and the three years from 2744-2741 the 'gradual' cessation of the Tower building, and 6 years 2744-2738 of Reign. From 2786 to 2741 is thus a 45-year period for Babel's Tower construction, with the *Dispersion* falling in the 42nd year (2745) or after 42 full years (2744).[1]

[1](*Below we argue for the 42 years starting in the year 2780 or ending in 2738 BCE (paragraph 8-12).*)

Above: Tower of Babel by van Valckenborch, Mittelrhein-Museum, Koblenz *(1595 painting by Lucas van Valckenborch, oil on oak, 43.5 x 64.5)*

---

67 Another way of viewing the *BOS* account of Kings Silites (Salitis) and his successors is remarkable, in that the predecessor of Senusret I of Dynasty 12 has a throne name *'Sehete*pibre,' and reigns 20 years, so that this together with Senusret I's 45-year Reign, immediately following Amenemhet I (Sehetepibre), gives one to note an obvious parallel to the BOS Dynasty 17. The similarity of "Sehete" to "Saites" and of 20 years to 19 years would be enough, but 45 years for Senusret I the successor of Amenemhet I compared to 44 years of Rule for the successor of Saites is

more identifiable. The 19, 44, and 36 years of the one case correspond to 20, 45, and 34 years (34 is overlapping) of the other. Any further comparison may be less useful, but this is not to lessen a positive identification of Dynasty 12. This is important to Israelite history in Egypt, as it is in Dynasty 12 that we previously saw Joseph and his family arriving in Egypt in our BG chronology, and the 12th Dynasty is the Dynasty during which the conqueror Sesostris emerges in the account of Manetho to conquer Asia, the same King called Osiris by Sir Isaac Newton. As previously mentioned, recorded events of the rising of the star Sothis during the Reigns of both Sesostris I and Sesostris III in Dynasty 12 of Egypt have helped to date this Dynasty, which according to some scholars has dates more precise even than much later Dynasties.[1] Gae Callendar, writing in Chapter 7 of "Oxford History of Ancient Egypt," does not agree with this viewpoint.

[1](*Please see par. 4-7, notes [1] and [2].*)

---

68 In our earlier study of the 28th century BCE in *Ark of Urartu,* we considered Osiris as Nimrod, brother of Thoth,

which would help explain how the first month of the Egyptian calendar came to be named after Thoth. As Nimrod was a great hunter, so Osiris was associated with Orion, the Great Hunter constellation of the sky. Nimrod, or Osiris, was betrayed by Thoth after some 28 years of Reign (the Sun in Scorpio according to myth). Myth contains a lot of hidden information that has not been dated yet, with later people adding to the myths. Osiris may have been a god of the moon, as is shown by his having been divided into 14 pieces, this being the number of the days of waning moon after the full moon.[1] With Joseph made Shalliyt in 1923 BCE and Amenemhet II dying in 1895 (modern date), Joseph is Ruler 28 years, and as he is 2nd in the Kingdom the lunar analogy with Osiris is in that the Moon is 2nd in power to the Sun.[2] The Pharaoh who ruled after Amenemhet II (who possibly ended Joseph's Governorship, or who perhaps was Joseph himself, although not necessarily) was Senusret II (or Sesostris II), and it is either he or Senusret III his son and successor who Manetho says conquered all Asia. This deserves at least brief consideration right here.

[1](*The Dawn of Astronomy (1894), by Sir Norman Lockyer, p. 391*) [2](*See paragraph 5-11, footnote [1]*)



Above: Cnemidaster wyvilli Sladen
(Zoroasteridae is a family of starfish that includes the genera Cnemidaster, Bythiolophus, Doraster, Myxoderma, Pholidaster, Sagen Aster and Zoroaster. The original description of Cnemidaster wyvilli was given by W. P. Sladen in 1889.)

---

[69] Senusret II was involved in waterworks (and Bahr Yusef meaning Joseph's Canal), in the Fayoum Oasis of Egypt. This fact alone suspiciously identifies him as Joseph. Senusret III was said to be "next to Osiris," and this may identify him with Joseph's son Ephraim, as we have discussed at greater lengths in some earlier articles. It is highly significant that father and son among the royals of Egypt would take the same name, it being far more usual that grandfather and grandson should do so. Whatever his

descent was, however, Senusret III is the likely Egyptian identified by Manetho and Herodotus as Sesostris, as he is the great conqueror they describe.

---

610 The *Blessed Greenealogy* may appear to be 'high' in some regards for some dates (to some observers, who prefer lower dates), so it is of some import to note a point of departure in this regard when it comes to the Egyptian and Babylonian Kingdoms at their inception, a start which occurs in our own Bible-based view as some time in 28th century BCE, not the 31st century, as the advocates of Egyptian chronology may commonly suppose. There are no true standards in ancient chronology, the study of which is fraught with many vast difficulties. On the other hand, the Bible is the best final source. Only with reliable testimony may we seek a truth past, either from past testimony or from any remote viewing. Jesus believed that Israel wandered in the wilderness.[1] There is no doubt that they had come forth from Egypt. The Egyptian calendar is therefore important to faith. There are so many variables (actually unknowns) in the time period of the 28th century BCE that even the best knowledge available to date leaves much to be

desired. Those are worse off who advocate the 31st century BCE. The further back we go the more uncertainties we have, and had the Egyptian calendar originated at an earlier time than the 28th century, it is with less certainty. However, the 31st century is not a likely time for it. Most importantly, the 28th century is the most likely. That both are possible appears indicated by the dating of the Mayan long count calendar to 3114 BCE and Hindu religious dating for a Kaliyuga alignment to 3102 BCE.

[1](*John 6:31; 49*)

Above: Great Sphinx of Giza
(1893 photo by R. M. Junghaendel)

611 The date of Nimrod appears to be closely connected, in timing, to that of the post-diluvial Kingdom of Egypt, and the *Dispersion* of mankind during the period of the *Tower's* construction at Babel (in Shinar associated to Nimrod) to the early Kings of Egypt, and this is founded upon associations of Nimrod to Osiris, Narmer, and Menes, the earliest of the Egyptian Kings. The Sumerian King Enmerkar ruled at Uruk or Unug three Reigns before Gilgamesh, who was a contemporary of Aga of Kish, according to *Epic of Gilgamesh,* and it may be calculated from the Reigns of Sumerian Kings as recorded on the *Sumerian King List* when Aga and also Enmerkar ruled, provided that we know two things. One, we must know the starting point of the Kings that preceded Aga, and two, the meaning of the word 'year,' as there are Kings ruling for as many as '1200 years.' When each year is taken to be one day in a lunar month of 29.530588 days (about 29.5 days), we divide by 29.5 to convert each Reign into a corresponding new number, with all of the new Reigns lasting less than 40 years. The choice of 29.5 is that it's the only, astronomical constant known on earth that would be about this size. Two, we require a starting point for the calculations. We are blessed with the *Deluge* date 3282 BCE in the BG, a date, by God's grace, given to us, uniquely. The starting point we

have is 3281 BCE, the end of the *Deluge* in the BG, as the earliest Kings of Kish ruled "after the flood," as the record appears to say. Although this is not strictly consistent with a global *Deluge,* and the *Ark* landing in Turkey, a later corruption of the record is possible, we assume. It results in Enmerkar being dated as 2751 BCE Year 1.

---

612 The significance of this date is marked by the Year 1, given by Abulfaragi the learned, Armenian historian of the thirteenth century CE, for Nimrod's Reign, as from 531 years after *The Deluge* (BG, also 2751 BCE).[1] This is the date, actually, for the *Dispersion,* says Abulfaragi, said to be *one of the most learned and versatile men from the Syriac Orthodox Church.*[2] It would be a wonderful privilege to delve more deeply into this date and its meaning for Egypt, which we may indeed do, but it is beyond the scope of this chapter. Summer solstice in the Julian calendar throughout most of the 28th century BCE was Jul 16 or Jul 17, and when Sothis rose depended strongly upon the latitude, while New Year's day Thoth 01 drifted through the centuries. The Egyptian calendar, when it originated in the range 2800-2700 BCE (28th century), or

when it did not, came to Thoth 01 in 2774 BCE at Eridu Jul 18, very near the date of both summer solstice and the rising of Sothis. Apart from this coincidence, we have little other than mythology, or writing without dates, to go on in order to establish the Egyptian calendar start, and the date of the summer solstice is the marker to pray exact it.*

* The Bible, at the risk of opening up a digression from the present topic, did give calendar dates for the day of the *Deluge* event itself, and for another day one year later, as simply '27th day of the 2nd month.' The Masoretic text differs, in giving the '17th day of the 2nd month' for the *Deluge* downpour's start, but the discrepancy is resolved when we reckon the day in the Septuagint (the '27th') from the calendar later known as the 'Egyptian,' should we only extrapolate it backwards to 3282 BCE, for then we mark Phaophi 27 was also a Lunar Day 17 in the year 3282 itself, and after one full year had elapsed, also, we mark that, in 3281 BCE, Phaophi 27 in Egyptian time fell on Lunar Day 27. Adding to this dispassionate observation, in both 3282 and 3281 BCE, Phaophi 27 corresponds to Jan 17 Julian, this a day computing as the day after winter solstice. Markedly elegant this appears, save that the year 5550 BCE (Jehovah be glorified) has a correspondence in the BG to Adam Year 1 (Anno Mundi 1), in the Egyptian date Phaophi 27 (Julian Aug 7 5550 BCE) as summer solstice. The Egyptian calendar date of *The Deluge* is the date of summer solstice at man's creation (Phaophi 27) and fell on Jan 17 (Jan 16 = winter solstice) in 3282, 5550 BCE being man's creation in the BG chronology and 3282 BCE being the BG year of *The Deluge* onset. The 'BG' is our *Blessed Greenealogy* chronology.
[1](*"Chronological Antiquities," Vol. 1 (1752), by John Jackson, pp. 215, 233*) [2] (*Abulfaragi is known as Gregory Bar Hebraeus, or by his Latin name* ***Abulpharagius,*** *and was a catholicos or bishop of the Syriac Orthodox Church who died Jul 30 1286 CE. He was born in 1226 CE.*)

end of Chapter 6: Solstice Exacts Egyptian Dating

Above: Reconstruction of the boat at the pier in Eridu
(From which Uruk could be reached)

Chapter 7: Foothold In The Sinai



Above: Sinaitic

And these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, for they received the Word with all readiness, daily examining the Scriptures if these things are so.
(Acts 17:11; Jay P. Green 1976-2000)

Por këta ishin më fisnikë nga ndjenjat se ata të Thesalonikit dhe e pranuan fjalën me gatishmëri të madhe, duke i shqyrtuar çdo ditë Shkrimet për të parë nëse këto gjëra

Inscriptions Alphabet ("Harmony of Primeval Alphabets," traced) by Charles Forster *(From "The One Primeval Language (1852), by Charles Forster, front pages betwee Dedication and Part I, ed. by Ward Green in 2016)*

ishin ashtu.
(Acts 17:11; Albanian Bible)

71 Having established the Egyptian calendar's relation to the *Blessed Greenealogy* at the time of Nimrod's Rule and centuries before that, we can doubtless state *The Exodus* date with more confidence than ever: (Egyptian) Pachon (Pashons) 6 (Julian May 3) 1493 BCE. This was a Friday, and as discussed in *On* based on Exodus 12:41 it is 430 years to *the very day* after the appointment of Joseph as 2nd Ruler of Egypt. Furthermore, Israel began observance of the Sabbath on Iyyar 22 which was 36 days after Nissan 15 in 1493 BCE and a Saturday, as were Jewish Sabbath days afterward.[1] This makes the first Jewish Sabbath Day five weeks one day after May 03 1493, or on Saturday Jun 08 1493 BCE. At Numbers 33:10-15, the wilderness of Sin was between Elim and the wilderness of Sinai as Israel left Egypt. The account of Israel's journey thus mentions "Sinai." The route that the vast company travelled as they went out of Egypt's northern Delta region has been studied, over the years since that time, by a number of people, including many scholars, and evidence in Sinai sought, for the presence of Israel during that time

concerned. Israel's number was some 600,000 able-bodied men, from the Bible, thus millions including women and children. However, the search may be looking for Ramesside items of pottery when searchers believe in a Ramesside date, and thus far it is claimed that not a sherd was found, overlooking not only dating but the temporary camps of Israel, who may have carried only skins on the journey rather than pots, and who stopped only briefly anyway.[2,3] Of some interest, though, are inscriptions on the rock faces in certain locations in the Sinai Peninsula, and it is with them that the present chapter is concerned.

[1](*Exodus 16:1*) [2](*Kadesh-Barnea: Its Importance and Probable Site (1884), by Henry Clay Trumbull, p. 275. The site of Ayn Qades as confused with Ayn Qudeirat is discussed, with Trumbull far preferring Ayn Qades as Kadesh. The spelling of Ayn as Ain is possible, and Qades as Kades or Kadeis, also with variants due to the approximation in English of Arabic names.*) [3](*Radiocarbon, Vol. 49, Nr 2 (2007), pp. 481-497, "Radiocarbon Dating The 'Wilderness Of Zin,'" by Hendrik J. Bruins and Johannes van der Plicht. The discovery of remains in the neighbourhood of Ain Kadeis [Kades], or their later survey by Woolley and Lawrence, is reconsidered here using radiocarbon, with the finding of remains in the area from the middle of the 2nd millenium BCE, the actual time period of the Exodus as we date it in our BG chronology. The name of the place is as identified in the Bible, ie. 'The Wilderness of Zin' near Kadesh, pp. 482 (Numbers 13:21), 485 (Numbers 34:3-5), 489 (these remains at Ain el Qudeirat Valley are small pieces of charcoal appearing in the mortar of the "3rd" aqueduct that they evaluated and radiocarbon dated (H. B., J. vdP.) as 1641-1438 BCE, with 64.9% probability).*)

[72] Obviously, when Israel had left "writing on the wall," so to speak, at the time of their *Exodus* out of Egyptian territory, it would be of great service to us who seek evidence of the Israelites in Egypt, to study and try to authenticate the writing, as it does exist. It is perhaps a topic worthy of an article of its own. Such writing has been found, and the many inscriptions have been added to over the years by other travellers. The subject will take all of our skill to examine, for it is controversial, and involves an ancient language, the nature of which is not encountered from elsewhere. Numerous informal inscriptions carved into rock faces, even when accessible, when these are made in a country wilderness setting, without signs of habitation, imply a nearby nomadic encampment with knowledge of writing. The nature of the writing has been described variously as ancient, the date not unanimously agreed upon, from a mixture of Arabic, Hebrew, and Egyptian hieroglyphs, as well as Greek in some instances, the full treatment of which probably awaits a more detailed, later study. In the meantime, of a more general nature, seeing that these so-called *Sinaitic Inscriptions* are found only in places in the Sinai Peninsula and Arabia which could satisfy the requirements of Israelite wilderness wandering

encampment locations, and involve such great numbers of inscriptions at these sites, it will surely be of interest to religious and scholarly persuasions, Bible students included, to study them in some detail. So, this we will do, should Jehovah God indeed permit.[1]

[1](*Hebrews 6:3*)



Above: Sinaitic Inscription Beer, 108. B.
(Illustration from an 1852 book "The One Primeval Language," by Charles Forster, p. 118)

7[3] I am very excited about the opportunity to present the story of the *Sinaitic Insriptions,* since I have known about

them for some time now, but was prevented, as their controversial nature left me overly hesitant. In the time ensuing since that time, I have been using the processing power of logic to examine the arguments fully, and have drawn satisfying conclusions about it. There are first of all basically two schools of belief about them, either for or against their identification as Israelite inscriptions dating to *The Exodus*. I further came to the realization about these carvings in the rocks, that their inherent linguistic character could essentially be separated, as could their dating, from the far more important issue of their authorship. I was well aware already that the simple confirmation, as discussed in the case of the *Ipuwer Papyrus,* of *The Exodus* of Israel, was one interpretation of ancient (possibly) Israelite inscriptions in Sinai. That is to say, any such evidence may be confirmatory. This is without getting involved in linguistic debate. There may even be reason to avoid using any linguistic argument in a field where the evidence begs precedent: highly literate, itinerant engravers-- in a wasteland. This story would be interesting without any connection to *The Exodus,* real or imagined, and to Israel.

---

74 The addition of the Israelite element to this story of markings on rocks adds controversy, and because of its religious component adds pressure onto its proponents, because of the presence of Anti-Semitic organizations. This makes simple, cogent arguments more so preferred, and ones based on obscure, linguistic studies less so. Primarily, thus, are the best arguments logistical and thoroughly logical in nature, then all other evidence. Within the realm of the logistical arguments, what are the reasons for a large number of inscriptions located at specific geographic locations throughout the Sinai, unless they be made by the original group of trekkers, and then, later, added to by those interested in them. Logic would dictate that later fans of the Israelites, attempting to retrace their wilderness route, wouldn't be sure enough to warrant their making of inscriptions along any route unless that route were clearly marked. This is true, even where inscriptions are easily made. It is, however, the case that the locations where such inscriptions are found are not always very accessible, but they are sometimes high up on the rock wall faces. Indeed, it was the concerted effort on the part of the original makers of these inscriptions to preserve them by making them inaccessible, as though a vital record. The knowledge of the route taken would be missing were the inscriptions only

made by later religious zealots, for they could not have been sure enough of the route. So logic requires that the first trekkers were Israel, and the proof is that later inscriptions were added by believers who believed that Israel followed the route.



132 THE VOICE OF ISRAEL

No. XII.

GRAY, 83.

Rock: apparently perfect. Besides the serpent there are two little figures standing on the letters marked +, and a camel before the last line but one.

Above: Sinaitic Inscription Gray 83

(Illustration from an 1852 book "The One Primeval Language," by Charles Forster, p. 132)

---

[75] Clearly, some of the inscriptions date to a later time period and were made by visitors to the original ones. Christians in the Common Era came to Sinai to view the

more ancient inscriptions, and they too made markings. For this reason, evidence of later inscriptions do not refute those which were original to the sites in Sinai and that should today also be of far greater interest. To unbelievers, though, enough doubt was introduced by the later marks to render the first ones less certain. Scholars who have studied the markings as a whole feel either strongly in favour of the Israelite premise for them or strongly otherwise, based on linguistic clues. However, the language of the Israelites is very poorly understood linguistically in the second millenium BCE. Therefore, based on linguistic grounds, these writings cannot be proven absolutely to exclude the Israelites. The Sinai Peninsula was part of Egypt then, as it also is today, and Israel had been living in Egypt for some centuries before their departure in *The Exodus.* The *Sinaitic Inscriptions* are to a small degree Egyptian hieroglyphic in nature, and most being Arabic and very ancient, draw an alphabet parallel to Hebrew. Mr. Charles Forster treated the subject with reverence in the books he wrote on the writings in the 1800s CE, and he was convinced of the Israelite origin of these. He refutes the 'late' Professor _____ (who in *Studia Asiatica* presented "a host of puerilities," in the words of Mr. F.) and all claims of a Nabataean origin.[1]

[1](*The One Primeval Language Traced Experimentally Through Ancient*

Inscriptions In Alphabetic Characters, Of Lost Powers From The Four Continents, Including The Voice of Israel From The Rocks Of Sinai (1852), by Charles Forster, p. 41)



Above: Sinaitic Inscription Beer 18a, 18b
(Illustration from an 1852 book "The One Primeval Language," by Charles Forster, p. 161, facing)

---

[76] He allows: *If our translations sometimes differ, it will be held in mind [he says] that so do the text and the marginal readings of the English Bible [xi b].*[1] In contrast, Mr. ____ produces no translations at all. Mr. Forster, an authority on ancient Arabic and Hebrew alphabets, "the oldest alphabets of the world," offers a prefixed *Harmony of Alphabets* that translates the letters of the *Sinaitic Inscriptions* from a very ancient Arabic into their more

modern Hebrew, the modern Arabic, and also Roman or modern English signs. This expert's method was empirical and employed a very convincing number of the *Sinaitic Inscriptions*. Forster includes any direct correlations to the Bible, while politely refraining from compelling any beliefs. His thorough treatment of Mr. ____'s comments gives an overly generous exposure to the opposing side, but Mr. G. F. Gray is rightly named as providing, in 1830, 177 "fairly copied" *Sinaitic Inscriptions* of worth.[2] On the reality of these inscriptions is what we touch. This is the annal of their globally published notices.

[1](*The One Primeval Language Traced Experimentally Through Ancient Inscriptions In Alphabetic Characters, Of Lost Powers From The Four Continents, Including The Voice of Israel From The Rocks Of Sinai (1852), by Charles Forster, Dedication, p. xi*) [2](*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, Vol. II, Part I (1830), by G. F. Gray*)



104 THE VOICE OF ISRAEL

No. III.

Beer. 48. B.

نجام ابحر
ها عم رمو

The red geese ascend (from) the sea
Lusting the people eat on at them.

No. IV.

46. Pr. II.

نجام ابحر
ها عم ارم

The red geese ascend (from) the sea
Lusting the people devour till nought is left.

No. V.

47. Pr. IV.

نجام ابحر
ها عم ورا

The red geese ascend (from) the sea
Lusting the people feed to repletion.

FROM THE ROCKS OF SINAI. 105

نجام, *nuham*, Nomen avis rubræ, quæ formâ anserem refert, "Name of a reddish bird resembling a goose."*

ابحر, *bahar*, Mare, بحري Marine (This, and the first word, answer, apparently, to our "sea-fowl.")

ها, *hâá*, Desiderio ejus captus fuit; desideravit. Inflamed with desire of any thing; lusting after.

عم, עם, *am*, Populus: plebs. "The People."

رعى, *raá*. Perseveravit in edendo una re; *pecul. græc.* Persevering in eating of one thing; *especially of stork.*†

نجام
ابحر
ها
عم
ارم, *aram*, i.q. اكل, Edit, voravit, absumpsit, ut nihil reliquum fuerit Eating, devouring, consuming, until nothing is left.

نجام
ابحر
ها
عم
ورا, *wara*, Repletus fuit *cibo*. Replete with food.

* Can the two birds in the Frontispiece, which Beer takes for ostriches, be representations of the *nuham*, or long-legged red goose? If so, they illustrate the miracle.

† *Especially of stork*. There is an agreement of congruity between this definition, and the appearance of the *stork-like* ruddy goose.

Above: Sinaitic Inscriptions Red Geese
(Reproduction from an 1852 book "The One Primeval Language," by Charles Forster, pp. 104,105)

---

[7][7] The publication of these *SI* could not have been readily enabled before invention of the printing press permitted, as early as 1452 CE, print by movable type.[1,2] It was not until 1706, however, that mention was made, by a certain book editor, of their prior documentation in a hitherto unpublished work of Egyptian monk Cosmas Indicopleustes, who noted them in the sixth century CE while travelling in the company of Jews who read them. This Cosmas asserted that the Jews travelling with him understood the inscriptions as from *The Exodus*.

Accordingly, he mentioned their great age at the time, as evidenced by the fact that many of the rocks having been inscribed previously were broken off by waterfall or the action of water in winter, and lay upside down.[3] Independent witnesses thus fairly establish their age. The later translation of them by Mr. Forster leaves no doubt of Israel's marks made during *The Exodus.* While the proof of the *SI* as Israel's own, made with great difficulty in often inaccessible places, is acceptable to believers without further testimony, the content of their message may yet build up or edify us, and may possibly disqualify itself wherever unfitting. They need for this reason the duration of the chapter.

[1](*http://www.historyofinformation.com/expanded.php?id=344, accessed 1026 hrs DST Ottawa Mar 24 2016*)
[2](*http://www.gutenbergdigital.de/gudi/eframes/index.htm, accessed 1029 hrs DST Ottawa Mar 24 2016*)
[3](*The One Primeval Language Traced Experimentally Through Ancient Inscriptions In Alphabetic Characters, Of Lost Powers From The Four Continents, Including The Voice of Israel From The Rocks Of Sinai (1852), by Charles Forster, p. 2*)



Above: Galactic Wreckage in Stephan's Quintet *(2009 by the new Wide Field Camera 3 (WFC3) aboard NASA's Hubble Space Telescope. A clash among members of a famous galaxy quintet reveals an assortment of stars across a wide color range, from young, blue stars to aging, red stars. Four of the five members of Stephan's Quintet make up Hickson Compact Group 92. Spied by Edouard M. Stephan in 1877, Stephan's Quintet is the first compact group ever discovered. WFC3 observed the quintet in July and August 2009. The composite image was made by using filters that isolate light from the blue, green, and infrared portions of the spectrum, as well as emission from ionized hydrogen. These Hubble observations are part of the Hubble Servicing Mission 4 Early Release Observations. NASA astronauts installed the WFC3 camera during a servicing mission in May to upgrade and repair the 19-year-old Hubble telescope.)*

[78] It may be noted by a study of Mr. Forster's *Harmony of Alphabets* that many of the letters from the old Arabic alphabet used in the *SI* resemble closely the modern Hebrew alphabet, there being also what look to be variant, or stylized, forms of the same letters.[1] Some of the letter

shapes are identical to the Hebrew. The presence of pictorial elements in the same passage together with Egyptian hieroglyphics is not known from Egyptian inscriptions, yet is seen to be consistent in the *SI* with the Israelites sojourning in Egypt. Generally, there appears to be nothing to disprove the Jewish authorship of the *Sinaitic Inscriptions,* thus their presence is the strongest possible proof of Israel's presence in and *The Exodus* from Egypt. The perfect identity, of the alphabet of the *SI* with a combination of *Hebrew and Old Arabic,* is not the best proof of their Israelite nature-- rather, the content of the thousands of these inscriptions is, since they are deciphered alongside pictorial, unified engravings-- they confirm the Bible tales they relate. The proof we presented above dates the same *Sinatic Inscriptions Greatly Noteworthy And Truly Underscoring Realized Exodus,* while noncontradictory content is necessary but not sufficient (with no date) in itself. The inscriptions themselves are in locations extremely difficult to reach, the access to which would be quite assuredly unlikely to be attempted by casual pilgrims.

[1](*The One Primeval Language Traced Experimentally Through Ancient Inscriptions In Alphabetic Characters, Of Lost Powers From The Four Continents, Including The Voice of Israel From The Rocks Of Sinai (1852), by Charles Forster, prefixed*)


form, which is no other than that of the Hebrew letter ע, *âin*, as the reader shall be left to judge.

No. XXII.

With this final illustration, I leave in the hands of my readers the word, which, all authorities are agreed, can alone determine the origin, and guide the interpretation, of the written rocks of Sinai.

L 3

Above: Sinaitic Inscription Camel with Ayin
(Illustration from an 1852 book "The One Primeval Language," by Charles Forster, p. 149)

---

79 The Phoenician alphabet is typically accredited to the son of Agenor, who is named Cadmus in Greek mythology, but it appears clear that Agenor is the 15th Dynasty's Apophis, who had a rather unique Prenomen, "Aqenenre," and King Agenor's son Cadmus is Egypt's King, Khamudi. This remarkable correspondence would date Cadmus about the time of Moses, the adoptive brother of Khamudi who led Israel to settle in Palestine (Phoenicia), who was called Phoenix the brother of Cadmus in the mythology. Moses became the Phoenix rising from proverbial ashes.

Phoenician is very similar to Hebrew and Arabic and so fits perfectly the descent from Proto-Sinaitic script, the Egyptian parent language of Phoenician and Arabic. This perfect circle or Phoenix shows no problem as yet with the BG dating for *The Exodus,* of 1493 BCE. The *Sinaitic Inscriptions* have been shown to be written in a similar precursor alphabet to the abjads, Hebrew and Arabic, as Mr. Forster shows, and as Cosmas Indicopleustes an Egyptian monk remarks, about 520 CE:

> **And when they had received the law from God in writing, and had learned letters for the first time, God made use of the desert as a quiet school, and permitted them for forty years to carve out letters on stone. Wherefore, in that wilderness of Mount Sinai, one can see, at all their halting-places, all the stones, that have there been broken off from the mountains, inscribed with Hebrew letters, as I myself can testify, having travelled in these places. Certain Jews, too, who had read these inscriptions informed me of their purport, which was as follows: The departure of so and so of such and such a tribe, in such and such a year, in such and such a month, just as with ourselves there are travellers who scribble their names in the inns where they have lodged. And the Israelites, who had but newly acquired the art of writing, continually practised it, and filled a great multitude of stones with writing, so that, all those places are full of Hebrew inscriptions, which, as I think, have been preserved to this day for the sake of unbelievers. Any one who so wishes can go to these places and see for himself, or at least can enquire of others about the matter, when he will learn that it is the truth we have spoken. When the Hebrews therefore had been at the first instructed by God and had received a knowledge of letters**

> **through those tables of stone, and had learned them for forty years in the wilderness, they communicated them to their neighbours the Phoenicians, at that time first when Cadmus was King of the Tyrians, from whom the Greeks received them, and then in turn the other nations of the world.**
> (*Christian Topography, Book 5 (1897), by Cosmas Indicopleustes, ca. 518-519 CE*)[1]

This was 6th century CE work of Cosmas Indicopleustes.

[1](*Christian Topography, Book 5 (1897), by Cosmas Indicopleustes, ca. 518-519 CE, pp. 138-243*)



Above: Egyptian chariot *(From 1875 book "Illustrerad Verldshistoria," by Ernst Wallis)*

[7]10 Phineus was the son of Agenor, Poseidon and Phoenix in

various versions of the Greek mythological traditions, and Phinehas is one of the priests in the Bible, which also confirms the representation of Moses, by Phoenix, according to our identification of Joseph as Poseidon.[1] There can be little doubt among believers about Israel leaving Egypt in *The Exodus* at the time written about by Moses in the Book of the same name, but still we tread softly for the sake of the unbelievers, as we need not hold to all details as given above by Cosmas. As the region of Phoenicia was indeed the area settled by Israel after returning there, Moses fits the person of Phoenix in that he is sent out by Agenor, and later settles in Phoenicia, and the Phoenix bird of myth has to return to bury his father before dying, as Moses is sent by Aqenenre (in a sense) and returns the bones of Joseph for burial at Shechem but dies before arriving. The parallel is a truly wonderful one to witness here. Khamudi was driven out of Egypt by Ahmose and with the Hyksos brought writing (as Cadmus to Greece) with him. From the Phoenician alphabet the Greek also developed. Phoenician, in turn, is based on Egyptian hieroglyphs. To illustrate this, Mr. Forster has an artist draw the bodies of Pharaoh and some animals depicted as lost in the letters of the tale of the returning of the water. The artist remarks upon the uniqueness of the posture, in this one of

the known *Sinaitic Inscriptions*. Here Pharaoh and his horse are separated in panic when the waters of the Red Sea return upon Egyptian forces.

[1]([*'On', by Rolf Ward Green*])



Above: Djebel Mokatteb Hieroglyphic Sinaitic Inscription (accidentally originally published inverted, top line) *(Translation by Mr. Charles Forster: "Fleeth the swift long horse raising both fore feet together going at full speed his rider dashed to the ground. Pharaoh running with long strides (like) a fleet horse takes startled flight casting off violently (with) both hands to quicken (his) pace (his) helmet.")*

7[11] Two more examples will suffice to illustrate the power of the *SIGNATURE* to manifest *The Exodus*. In the first example, there are multiple instances, in the *SIGNATURE,* showing Israel a stubborn 'ass.' The Bible records that Israel was a rebellious people.[1-3] There are four separate, known examples of *SI's* having to do with the 'people' kicking, like an 'ass,' translated with the help of illustrations of a donkey.[4] The only difficulty was of the translation of the very language of the *SIGNATURE,* done by Mr. Forster, and this objection vanishes by sheer numbers of cases. The Wadi Mokatteb has literally thousands of the SI's, and is translated as the "Valley of the Inscriptions." One of these, Mr. G. F. Gray's No. 59, was obtained by the ingenuity of loosing the camels at night to occupy the Arab guides for several hours the next day finding and retrieving them, while tracings were made by those who had thus bought themselves time here prerequisite.[5,6] It may appear cruelty toward the Arab guides, although Richard Pococke relates a warning story of a 'mistake' of paying some who take gain from all future visitors.[7] A man who lived for four years in Palestine and Arabia Petraea, who was "domesticating" himself "at leisure" in the camps of the Bedouins, as a Fellow and Tutor of Cambridge University recently returned from the East-- Mr. Forster mentions him

as a gentleman-- was able to, upon examining it, confirm the identification of Marah in Mr. Gray's *SI* No. 59 from Wadi Mokkateb, the shape of the waterhole being depicted in exact outline and with "a quadruped opposite the last line but one." Forster foretold to friends the identification of this quadruped as "an ass," which within the next day or so was verified by a duplicate inscription provided by an oriental scholar, showing also the "figure of an ass."[8,9] Thus was "Marah" identified with certainty as Howarah, lending certainty to the Israelite route from crossing the Red Sea, to Howarah, in three days travel by foot.

[1](*Deuteronomy 9:7*) [2](*Hosea 8:9*) [3](*Jeremiah 2:22,23*) [4](*The One Primeval Language Traced Experimentally Through Ancient Inscriptions In Alphabetic Characters, Of Lost Powers From The Four Continents, Including The Voice of Israel From The Rocks Of Sinai (1852), by Charles Forster, p. 56*) [5](*Ibid., p. 6*) [6](*Ibid., p. 57*) [7](*A Description of the East, Vol. 1: Observations on Egypt (1743), by Richard Pococke, p. 142*) [8](*The One Primeval Language (1852), by Charles Forster, pp. 50-58. In a footnote on page 58 Mr. Forster considers the probability of his having arrived at the translation of the word for "ass" by mere chance alone, and notices that the lack of any drawing intially combined with the 10,000 known Arabic root words implied a 1 in 10,000 probability of his having guessed the word by random chance, whereas, assuming the picture could pertain to any of the seven words of the inscription, would be 1 in 7 once one had received knowledge of the picture itself alongside, in which case the probability was 7 in 10,000 beforehand, still a better guess than one in 1300, which satisfies "the most incredulous" of the witnesses, Forster says.*) [9](*The words "am ramah," translated "the people kicked like an ass," by Mr. Forster, are found also in John Lewis Burckhardt's depiction of an inscription, according to Mr. Forster p. 58, from Wady Aleyat at Mount Serbal (south of Mokatteb), "Upon a large rock beyond*

the spring, and towards Wady Feiran," shown in "Travels in Syria and the Holy Land" (1822), by John Lewis Burckhardt, p. 614 top, # '7.')



Above: Djebel Mokatteb Sinaitic Inscription- Gray, No. 59 ("A Quadruped opposite the last line but one")
(Translation by Mr. Charles Forster:
"The People with prone mouth drinketh [at] the water-springs
The People [at] the two water-springs
kicketh [like] an ass
smiting with branch of a tree
the well of bitterness he heals."-- Deuteronomy 32:15)

---

[7][12] The *Sinaitic Inscriptions* are found at a number of

locations in the Sinai Peninsula, in Arabia, and at Kadesh-Barnea in the southern desert region of Israel. They thus follow the attested wilderness route that we derive from the Bible and historio-geographical study. The presence, in them, of hieroglyphic characters, and more especially of hieroglyphic characters with a size much larger than any found in Egyptian temples or than are known to be native to Egypt, makes doubly certain, as we agree with Mr. Forster, that Israelites were the authors of the *SI,* after having lived in Egypt, and Moses been learned in all wisdom of the Egyptians.[1,2] However, critics may rightly demand, as unbelievers, a proof of the most specific kind, namely an inscription like the *Rosetta Stone,* which has the evidences of both the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the Old Arabic. When, as Mr. Forster so convincingly relates, the Arab guides of a certain Mr. Butler were asked at length as "to the existence of any other inscriptions [of such a type] besides those already known," they did at length and after much and close inquiry, inform him, that, in a mountain cave halfway up Djebel Mahara, in fact were such texts of the very kind of which he was in search. Indeed, halfway up this mountain he was brought to the cave promised, the entrance of which was about four or five feet (1.5m) high, which he, at once disappointed, at first hesitated to enter,

whereupon, when he judged it better to try, he knelt down and found, cut on both sides, were "planes" in the mouth of the entrance, and on the right-hand side of it was a triple inscription, two columns of which were pure Egyptian hieroglyphics, the third column existing in pure Sinaitic characters:

> **The Sinaitic inscription was illustrated by the hieroglyphic figure of an ostrich, with wings dispread, neck out-stretched, and mouth open, as in the action of running and flying. The *disjecta membra* of the ostrich reappear in the Egyptian portions of the tablet, showing that there is a common subject.**
> (*The Israelitish Authorship of the Sinaitic Inscriptions (1856), by Charles Forster, p. 62,* Note: see illustration of ostrich, below)[3]

There has never been better evidence of *Exodus.* Together with the corroboration of the myth of Phoenix and Cadmus c. 1500 BCE, and our BG dating of 1493 BCE, there is no longer any reason to doubt the truth about *The Exodus* of Israelites with Moses from Egypt. Finally, we have incontrovertible proof of the Bible's witness by independent testimony, in *SIGNATURE.* The *SIGNATURE* has a footprint that fits Israel.[4]

Above: Ostrich (restored, right), Djebel Maghara, Sinai
(Israel in the Wilderness (1865), by Charles Forster, p. 46)

[1](*The Israelitish Authorship of the Sinaitic Inscriptions (1856), by Charles Forster, p. 58*) [2](*Acts 7:22*) [3](*The Israelitish Authorship of the Sinaitic Inscriptions (1856), by Charles Forster, p. 62*)
[4](*Israel in the Wilderness (1865), by Charles Forster, pp. 57-60 (see illustration of ostrich, above):*

1. *The internal evidences suffice to show that this bird is not a work of Egyptian art. In the monuments of Egypt it is true that the ostrich not unfrequently occurs among their hieroglyphics, but always in mere and miniature outline, as a hieroglyphic character; and always, moreover, not singly, but in interlinked groups of three or four birds, uniformly running, as the emblem of speed.* The bird is never represented as a picture, and never, I believe, alone. In the hieroglyphic collections of Young, Champollion, Wilkinson, &c, I do not recall a single example of the ostrich, save as a conventional hieroglyphic character or group,** Like its counterpart, the camel, it seems to have been prescriptively excluded from pictorial representation, and, in all likelihood, for the same reasons of superstition. Now the uniformity of conventional usage in Egypt, and its vital connection with religion, plainly render departure from its rigid rules by native Egyptian artists a thing impossible.*

But the living portrait of the ostrich of the triple inscription is not more contrary to Egyptian usage than it is foreign from Egyptian art. Such a breathing copy from nature will be sought in vain throughout the monuments of the Pharaohs. The artist, indeed, may detect a hidden grace and expression lurking behind those dry conventional forms, but the realities of life and nature will ever be missing to the common eye. It is left with the general reader to determine whether these realities do not meet in the glyphograph of the ostrich prefixed to this chapter; although, according to Mr. Butler, neither cast nor photograph can adequately convey the living, breathing expression of the original, as seen by him upon the rock.

** It is specially note-worthy [sic] that three ostriches (the usual conventional group) thus running at full speed, interlaced in the usual Egyptian style, mark the connection between this triple tablet and the hieroglyphics at Sarbut-el-Khadem, as of common origin, and with a common object; this object, judging by the grand hieroglyphic ostrich, being to symbolize the wanderings of God's people.*

*** Since writing the above I discover a solitary exception in Wilkinson: the figure of an ostrich led by a string round the neck in a procession of Abyssinians leading various animals, supposed to be tributes to the Pharaoh of the day. But the figure is hard and lifeless, without the least expression. The tablet in which it occurs, moreover, is on a foreign subject, wholly unconnected with Egyptian idolatry.*

2. *From these internal proofs that the ostrich of the triple inscription could not have been the work of an Egyptian artist, we come next to the Scriptural proof that the ostrich is the prophetic symbol of God's people Israel; a point which, once established, authoritatively identifies any figure of the ostrich at Sinai of unquestionable Mosaic antiquity (as the ostrich of this triple inscription most unquestionably is) with Israel and the Exode. The proof required is supplied by the prophet Jeremiah; who, in a passage of his Lamentations, connects the apostate Israel of his day with the ostrich, and the ostrich with the wilderness, in terms which irresistibly carry back the mind to apostate Israel in the desert, and to the symbol of the ostrich, certainly as old as the age of Moses, which stands a witness to the force of the prophecy to this day, in the cave on Djebel Maghara. It is with this glyphograph before us that we can realize his imagery, as without its aid we*

never could: 'The daughter of my people is cruel like ostriches in the wilderness.'-Lamentations 4:3)

end of Chapter 7: Foothold In The Sinai



Chapter 8: Truthfully Historical Egypt

O Lord, rebuke me not in thy wrath, neither chasten me in thine anger.
(Psalms 6:1; Brenton 1851)

耶和华啊，求你不要在怒中责备我，也不要在烈怒中惩罚我！
(Psalms 6:1; Chinese Union Version 1919)



Above: The Sphinx, the Great Pyramid and two lesser Pyramids, Ghizeh (Photograph), Royal Collection *(1862 photo by Francis Bedford, Albumen print, 231 mm x 290 mm, acquired by King Edward VII when Prince of Wales)*

Go to Part 2 of Wild Road Ahead To History

Wild Road Ahead To History—

Israel Choosing Egypt

(Meet Your Marker)

Part 1
Wild Road Ahead To History
Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Reevaluation Of Amarnan Dynasty
Chapter 2: Reasserting Amarnan Greenealogical Egypt
Chapter 3: Proposing Amarna Calibrates Egyptian Seasons
Chapter 4: Semite Israel Masterfully Pervading Lower Egypt
Chapter 5: Dynasty Akkad To Exodus
Chapter 6: Solstice Exacts Egyptian Dating
Chapter 7: Foothold In The Sinai

>**(See also: Part 2 of Wild Road Ahead To History)**