



1998

Biblical Chronology and Egyptian History

James R. Honeyman

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings

DigitalCommons@Cedarville provides a publication platform for fully open access journals, which means that all articles are available on the Internet to all users immediately upon publication. However, the opinions and sentiments expressed by the authors of articles published in our journals do not necessarily indicate the endorsement or reflect the views of DigitalCommons@Cedarville, the Centennial Library, or Cedarville University and its employees. The authors are solely responsible for the content of their work. Please address questions to dc@cedarville.edu.

Browse the contents of [this volume](#) of *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*.

Recommended Citation

Honeyman, James R. (1998) "Biblical Chronology and Egyptian History," *The Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*: Vol. 4 , Article 24.

Available at: https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings/vol4/iss1/24

BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY AND EGYPTIAN HISTORY

JAMES R. HONEYMAN
4404 CAMELOT PLACE
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301

KEYWORDS: Biblical History, Biblical Chronology, Egyptian History, Stone Ages

ABSTRACT

Fundamental to the Creation movement is belief in the inerrancy of Scripture. This permits the position that the original manuscripts of the Old Testament provided a precise outline of history and an equally accurate chronology. The words in our Bibles closely reflect the original text, but some of the chronological numbers in the Massoretic Hebrew text on which our Bibles are based, appear to have been deliberately reduced. The Greek translation of the Old Testament used by the Early Church, called the Septuagint, seems to more accurately present the chronological numbers of the original text. This would date Creation about 5500 B.C. The numbers for the pre-Flood patriarchs add to at least 2200 years, placing the Flood about 3300 B.C. Chronological information from Creation down to the Exodus is found by adding the age of successive patriarchs at the birth of the next in line. The Exodus is dated by conservative scholars within a year or two of 1446 B.C.

Champollion, after translating the hieroglyphs of Egypt, proposed a highly exaggerated date, 5867 B.C., for the First Dynasty of Pharaohs. Although reduced, secular Egyptian history still appears to be inflated. Comparing the collapse of Egypt's culture and power at the end of the Old Kingdom with the catastrophes which accompanied the Exodus may indicate that Egypt's history should be revised and shortened. When revised, the background in Egyptian history seems to emerge for every contact between the Hebrews and Egyptians. We have the record of the Bible, but also what appears to be an accurate chronology for much of Egypt's history in the Sothis King list.

INTRODUCTION

The chronology of earth's history is perhaps as difficult a problem as any of those which perplex Christians today. We should be able to determine from Scripture at least a reasonable approximation for the date of Creation and dates for the Flood, the birth of Abraham and the time of the Exodus. Even though we adopt a satisfactory chronology for Biblical history, there remains a serious question as to how it could be related to secular Egyptian history. In particular, the establishment of a date for the start of the Egyptian First Dynasty is significant in the development of a Biblical Flood model of earth history.

A very important part of a Flood model is the study of the effect of the Flood on people. There are a few verses in Genesis, chapter four, which demonstrate an advanced civilization before the Flood, particularly in the use of metals. These verses show that the pre-Flood people were highly intelligent, so it would have been a simple task to maintain a chronology. Scripture provides the number of years from the birth of a patriarch to the birth of the next in line. Whatever the original intention, if the record is complete, these chronological numbers provide all the data necessary to calculate the passage of time and construct an accurate chronology.

If metals were in use before the Flood, all the mines and smelters would have been buried by sediment, so that Noah's descendants were without metal, at least for a time. They probably used stone for tools and

pottery for utensils. This indicates a Stone Age for some period after the Flood, but knowing about metal, they would look for and eventually find new sources. It is possible that mines were found before the Tower of Babel, but when people were forced to migrate, it would be into new areas where sources of metal were unknown. Continued migration apparently caused eventual loss of knowledge about metal, beginning a second Stone Age which has lasted among some tribes into the Twentieth Century. Consistent with this Bible-based analysis, museums all over the world display countless stone age artifacts.

Secular history in general claims that the slow development of people through long Stone Ages eventually led to civilization. The Bible, however, places the first Stone Age period after the destruction by the Flood of a culture which included use of metals. Noah and his family would bring the knowledge of this civilization through the Flood, so that it could be rebuilt as population increased.

One goal of this paper is to untangle some of the contemporary confusion about chronology. The relevance of some historical facts which are available has not been fully appreciated. Combining the research of several scholars may give us a more confident sense of Scriptural history. Textual evidence has been found that indicates chronological numbers in the Hebrew text were deliberately shortened from the original manuscripts. In direct contrast, evidence is available which indicates that secular Egyptian history is somewhat inflated.

PROBLEMS WITH THE HEBREW (MASSORETIC) CHRONOLOGY

When the Christian teaching of the Early Church was extended to the Gentiles, the fact that the Old Testament was available in Greek, the international language of the day, greatly accelerated the spread of the Gospel. This translation was called the Septuagint, so the entire Bible became available in that language, as the New Testament was also written in Greek.

However, most Christian scholars recognized from the beginning of the Church that the Old Testament in the Hebrew language was the Word of God, written under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Eastern Christian churches, such as the Russian and Greek Orthodox, continue to use the Septuagint, but the Western churches consider the Hebrew manuscripts to be authoritative. Also, the Hebrew language has words which convey spiritual concepts that are not likely to be found in any other language. Therefore, a translation will be more accurate if translated directly from the Hebrew, rather than being derived from another translation such as the Septuagint. So as far as words are concerned, the Hebrew text is the best source, but numbers represent another problem.

The chronology of Biblical history has been in question for many years and there are serious differences of opinion among conservative Bible scholars. The problem arises from the different chronological numbers provided by the Hebrew text as compared to those in the Septuagint. The chronology, or passage of time, is given as the age of a patriarch at the birth of his son. Compare facts from Genesis 5:3-5: In the Hebrew, Adam was 130 years of age at birth of Seth, lived 800 years and died at age 930. In the Greek Septuagint, Adam was 230 years of age at birth of Seth, lived 700 years and died at the age 930. These differences are not copy errors, they are deliberate, because both of the first two numbers are changed. The question is, were the chronological numbers in the original manuscript increased or reduced?

In this example, the difference in chronology is 100 years, but the difference is repeated for six patriarchs before the Flood, seven patriarchs after the Flood and one patriarch, Nahor, whose numbers differ by 150 years (29 in the Hebrew, 179 in the Septuagint). The total effect was to make a difference in a date for Creation of more than 1400 years. These facts have created very serious uncertainty as to the age of the earth, and of particular importance to the Creation Movement, a date for the Flood. Central to this problem is the fact that data from the Hebrew text imply that Creation was about 4000 B.C. The numbers from the Greek indicate a creation date close to 5500 B.C. The pre-Flood numbers add to slightly more than 2200 years, placing the Flood about 3300 B.C.

It is a fact that our understanding of history can only be secure when we have an accurate chronology of events. The chronological numbers provided in the Massoretic Hebrew text, on which our Bibles are based, create a time problem for the period between the Flood and the birth of Abraham. The Bible provides information which locates his birth in relation first to the Exodus, which is dated by many conservative scholars close to 1446 B.C. [4, pp.190-94]. Then his birth date depends on how long Israel was in Egypt, which is 430 years, according to the Hebrew, or 215 years by the Septuagint, (430 years in Egypt and

Canaan). The Hebrew numbers move Abraham's birth back in time to about 2166 B.C. But the Hebrew numbers also bring the date of the Flood forward to about 2348 B.C. The severe time constraint imposed by these figures has been recognized for many years.

By contrast, the numbers in the Septuagint provide many more years, for a shorter time in Egypt would place Abraham's birth near 1951 B.C. If, as previously mentioned, the Flood was about 3300 B.C., there would be ample time for all the growth in population, the Tower of Babel and the migration from it to such lands as Canaan and Egypt.

The Massoretic Hebrew text followed by our Bibles, states in Exodus 12:40, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." The Septuagint, in the same verse states, "And the sojourning of the children of Israel, while they sojourned in the land of Egypt, *and the land of Canaan*, was four hundred and thirty years." (Emphasis added) Which is correct?

In the third chapter of Galatians, Paul developed a lesson based on the faith of Abraham. (He names Abraham seven times in this chapter.) In verse 17 he states, "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." When God told Abraham to leave Haran, Gen. 12:1-3, He stated, "... in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," evidently referring to Jesus. When Abraham reached Canaan, God added to the promise, Gen. 12:7, that his descendants would inherit the land.

The New Testament appears to agree with the Septuagint, in this case, for the promise that Jesus would come was given to Abraham just before he came into the land of Canaan, and the Law was given at Sinai, soon after the Exodus. Information on the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Genesis 12:4, 21:5, 25:26, and 47:9), show that they lived in Canaan 215 years. Therefore, the Massoretic would imply 645 years from the promise to the law. This writer believes that the Apostle Paul meant that the coming of Christ confirmed the promise to Abraham, which was 430 years before the Exodus. On this basis, the Septuagint numbers would be regarded as correct. Some believers have not viewed this verse as an instance of the New Testament arguing against the Massoretic, saying that the reference might be to a promise which God made to Jacob just before he went down to Egypt. That view appears to be refuted in the next verse, Galatians 3:18, which states: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise, but God gave the promise [of the coming Savior] to Abraham."

Those who believe that Israel was in Egypt for 430 years, may be concerned that the very large number of Jews in the Exodus could not have increased from the family of Jacob who went down to Egypt during the Famine. Genesis 45:27, "... all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten," that is, the males who, of course, also had wives and children. But what about the many servants and their families? When God prescribed circumcision for Abraham, all the men of his house were circumcised, Genesis 17:26-27. (When Lot was kidnaped, Gen. 14:12, Abraham had 318 servants able to bear arms). If the commandment to circumcise all the men was continued until Jacob's time, all of the servants of Jacob's family would be part of the tribe and therefore ancestors of many in the Exodus. It is possible that male servants exceeded the number of males in Jacob's family, so that with large families there may have been more than 1000 souls entering Egypt.

It is apparent that the problem of chronology we are reviewing is twofold. We have the length of time Israel was in Egypt, which on the basis of information from the Bible, is still disputed. However, on the question of which chronological numbers are correct, the Hebrew or the Septuagint, we have evidence from another text called the Samaritan Pentateuch, to indicate which agrees with the original writing.

REDUCED NUMBERS IN THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

Comparison of the chronological numbers in the Massoretic Hebrew to those in the Greek Septuagint, has been provided to show that the numbers in the original text were either *deliberately increased or reduced*. The question is, which? The numbers provided by Josephus, in his Antiquities of the Jews, are similar to the Greek, and thus favor the Septuagint. Though his writing is not inspired, of course, Josephus stated that he had access to the Holy Scrolls from the Temple, after Jerusalem was destroyed. [9, p.27]

More than 300 years ago, scholars discovered a copy of the five books written by Moses, called the Pentateuch, which had been maintained by descendants of the Samaritans of Jesus' day. It is well known

that when the Jews returned from Exile, they would not accept any of the Jews who had been left in Palestine because they had intermarried with other people. Bitter enmity developed, but the Samaritans continued the worship of God by carefully copying the Pentateuch. Although there were minor differences, it agreed with the Hebrew text enough that extreme care in the separate copying of both texts was confirmed. One strange fact emerged: the chronological numbers for the patriarchs before the Flood were similar to the Hebrew, but those after the Flood were very much like the Septuagint. This was no help at all in determining the original facts, except that the chronological numbers for Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech were reduced from the numbers in both the Septuagint and the Massoretic. (Table 1)

One of the most widely recognized facts of Scripture is the age of Methuselah, 969 years, but the Samaritan Pentateuch gives his total age as 720 years. (Table 1) All other sources claim 969 years. Examination of the figures show that while the Pentateuch gives the same numbers for six pre-Flood patriarchs as the Hebrew, which each differ by 100 years from the numbers in the Septuagint, the figures for Jared, Lamech and Methuselah do not agree with any other text. The Greek, the Hebrew and Josephus all give the same numbers for these three patriarchs for a very good reason. Noah was six hundred years old when the Flood came, but Lamech was born 182 years before Noah, so his total age according to either the Massoretic or Septuagint text indicates that he died before the Flood.

TABLE 1
Comparison of genealogies of MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch

Patriarch	MASSORETIC TEXT [MT] existing since 100 A.D.			SEPTUAGINT [LXX] existing since 250 B.C.			SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH existing since 400 B.C.		
	Total			Total			Total		
Adam	130	800	930	230	700	930	130	800	930
Seth	105	807	912	205	707	912	105	807	912
Enos	90	815	905	190	714	905	90	815	905
Cainan	70	840	910	170	740	910	70	840	910
Mahaleel	65	830	895	165	730	895	65	830	895
Jared	162	800	962	162	800	962	62	785	847
Enoch	65	300	365	165	200	365	65	300	365
Methuselah	187	782	969	187	782	969	67	653	720
Lamech	182	595	777	188	565	753	53	600	653
Noah	500	450	950	500	450	950	500	450	950

In each case, the first column gives the age at birth of the next in line.
(Compiled by Richard A. Teachout, TH.B., M.DIV.)

Methuselah was born 187 years before Lamech, and 969 years before the Flood. However, the Samaritan Pentateuch reduced the chronological number for both patriarchs, which had the effect of moving their births closer to the Flood. In that case, if Methuselah lived to be 969, he would have lived many years after the Flood, which is contrary to the plain statement of Scripture. Using the numbers they had *reduced*, he would be 720 the year of the Flood, so that is the total age they claimed for him.

We now have this fact: the Hebrew and the Greek agree on the chronological number for Methuselah, evidently provided in the original manuscript, but when the Samaritan Pentateuch reduced that number, it created an obvious error. The numbers for Lamech differ slightly in the Massoretic and the Septuagint, but a reduction in the Samaritan number for him would also bring his birth too close to the Flood. It appears that in the Samaritan, someone made a wholesale reduction of the numbers for nine patriarchs before the Flood, but the numbers for six patriarchs out of the nine are exactly the same in the Massoretic. Since for the most part, the Samaritan was a faithful copy of the original manuscript, we have textual evidence that at least the chronological numbers for Jared, Lamech and Methuselah were reduced.

Using the numbers in the Septuagint, Creation would be about 5500 B.C. and the Flood about 3300 B.C. If there was a highly developed civilization before the Flood, it would be renewed post-Flood as population increased, probably in two or three hundred years, so it should be well established by 3000 B.C. These dates coincide with secular scholars' claim, according to McCone [5, p.125], that civilization began in Mesopotamia by 3000 B.C. Secular scholars, of course, do not recognize a Flood or pre-Flood development.

In trying to resolve the Massoretic versus Septuagint issue, we must not ignore instances where the New Testament confirms the Septuagint but not the Massoretic. Luke provides a list of the human ancestors of Jesus, all the way back to Adam, surely under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. In Luke 3:36, and the Septuagint, Gen. 11:12, Arphaxad is father of Cainan, the father Sala. The Massoretic skips Cainan and gives Arphaxad as father of Sala. Paul's statement of Galatians 3:17, discussed earlier, is another example favoring the Septuagint.

EGYPT AND THE SHEPHERD KINGS

To analyze the problem between Israelite and Egyptian history, only well-known contacts disclosed in Scripture will be used. It is readily acknowledged that a brief paper cannot present the large amount of evidence provided by several volumes. Our effort here will be to locate in Egyptian history a number of the Egyptians mentioned in the Bible. One series of facts is especially pertinent, because part of the problem is a fulfillment of the prophecy given in Exodus 17:14. Just after crossing the Red Sea, the Jews were attacked by some of the most vicious people of ancient times, the Amalekites. Israel would have been defeated except that God helped them as long as Moses raised his hands toward heaven. Aaron and Hur seated him on a stone and supported his arms until the Amalekites were defeated. Later, God told Moses in Exodus 17:14, "... I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." How does this affect history?

We know that Israel moved south along the Red Sea toward Mount Sinai, but Velikovsky [8, pp.55-60] proposed that the Amalekites had come from western Arabia, driving flocks and herds, and had only to wander north around the end of the Red Sea and walk into Egypt. Here was a country devastated by the plagues, and without a Pharaoh or an army, so they simply took control. (The death of Pharaoh is not definite in Exodus; however, Psalm 136:15 is exact: "But overthrew Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea.") This was the final, horrible punishment of the Egyptians who enslaved the Jews, for the Amalekites were killers and destroyers. They have been called the Shepherd Kings, or Hyksos by the Greeks, but in a precise fulfillment of God's prophecy of Exodus 17:14, historians have never recognized who conquered Egypt. Most still refuse to admit the possibility that it was the Amalekites, some out of intense antagonism toward Velikovsky.

The Bible tells us more about the Amalekites which is consistent with the hypothesis that it was they who conquered Egypt at the time of the Exodus. Nearly 400 years after the Exodus, Samuel came to King Saul and gave him God's command, Samuel 15:3, "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have...." Those who have studied Egyptian history found that Egypt went through an intermediate period of about 400 years when they were ruled by foreigners. The Egyptians, however, had been rebelling, and starting in the south, they gradually drove out the enemy. The Amalekites withdrew eastward into the Sinai, along the Mediterranean [8, p.67]. There a stream which drained most of the Sinai provided water for a great city, which was their main defense. (Around 3500 years ago, there was much more rainfall than at present.)

I Samuel 15:5, "And Saul came to the city of Amalek, and laid in wait in the valley." A valley or stream is sometimes a weak place in the defenses of a walled city. Verse 7, "And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt." If the city was conquered, any survivors would be likely to retreat toward Egypt. Still, in fulfillment of God's prophecy to "... put out remembrance of Amalek from under heaven," even Josephus, the Jewish historian who lived about the time of Christ, did not know who had ruled Egypt and that Saul ended the Amalekites long domination. Significantly, the Bible does not record a single contact between the Jews and the Egyptians during the time of the Judges, a period of several hundred years. If the Egyptians were under the control of foreigners, this might be expected.

Why are these facts important? As stated previously, Egyptian history is exaggerated, and to fill up some of the many extra years, Egyptologists claim that there were two intermediate periods, each of several hundred years. The second was the time of the Hyksos, and the names of their rulers are listed by the Egyptian historian, Manetho, as two dynasties of Pharaohs. But Courville [3, p.100ff] presents very persuasive evidence that the first period is imaginary. He indicates that it is no more than a misreading of some of the facts related to the second period. These facts are enumerated to demonstrate two points: first, there are contacts between Israel and Egypt which have not been recognized, at least prior to Velikovsky. Second, if the Exodus and the beginning of the Hyksos rule coincide, it can be shown that Egyptian history is seriously in error.

CHAMPOLLION'S ERRORS

When Champollion succeeded in deciphering the hieroglyphs and found that papyri and monuments confirmed the existence of many of the Pharaohs listed by a priest named Manetho, he calculated the length of Egyptian history. The lists supplied reign lengths which he simply added together and arrived at the conclusion that the First Dynasty of Pharaohs was founded in 5867 B.C. [3, p.15]. The first Egyptian Dynasty, of course, would be preceded by some stone age living which followed the migration from the Tower of Babel. Champollion's conclusion, in the early 1800's, caused a severe shock throughout the Christian Church, because it challenged Ussher's date for Creation, 4004 B.C. Allowing time for the Tower of Babel and the Flood would move Creation far back in time. Not many Christians today realize that Champollion's calculations, which we now know to have contained serious errors, opened the way for the vast expansion of time necessary for evolution.

One enormous error that Champollion did not recognize was that for much of its history, Egypt had a Northern Kingdom and a Southern Kingdom, both having successive dynasties. The priest, Manetho, provided figures for all, and Champollion added them together. This error nearly doubled the actual history. In addition, Courville found that many times a Pharaoh would appoint his son as co-regent (apparently in two cases, a daughter). Manetho, however, in presenting reign lengths, sometimes included the years of co-regency with the years of sole reign, so in terms of a chronology, these years were imaginary. Further error developed during the long reign of Rameses II, [3, p.291] for in his later years his power deteriorated so seriously, according to the Harris Papyrus, that near anarchy prevailed. Rulers of nomes (counties) claimed the title of Pharaoh (their word for king) and several were reigning at the same time. Manetho, however, recorded the reign lengths of all, and Champollion added everything together. Finally, Manetho gave reign lengths for the Kings of the Hyksos, and a list of Egyptian Pharaohs who ruled in the same period. This duplication is now recognized by secular scholars, but several of the others are not.

Champollion's date for the First Dynasty has been shrinking steadily and for many years was estimated at around 3100-3200 B.C. Recently, according to Courville [3, p.15], Sharff proposed 2850 B.C. and has received some support from other Egyptologists. However, the date for the First Dynasty must still be somewhat inflated. Historians divide the major eras of Egyptian history into an Old Kingdom, a First Intermediate, the Middle Kingdom, a Second Intermediate (the period of the Hyksos) and the New Kingdom.

Velikovsky [8, p.22ff] made a brilliant start toward correction when he found an Egyptian papyrus, written by Ipuwar (Museum of Leiden #344), telling of the terrible catastrophes that befell the country, which paralleled the Biblical plagues almost exactly [8, p.48]. Immediately following the plagues was an invasion. To quote from the papyrus at 3:1 [8, p.38], "Forsooth, the Desert is throughout the land. The nomes are laid waste. A foreign tribe from abroad has come to Egypt." Additional evidence was provided by Velikovsky identifying this foreign tribe as the Amalekites, known in history as the Hyksos. However, placing the Exodus at the end of the Middle Kingdom and the beginning of the Second Intermediate, required a reduction of Egyptian chronology of several hundred years.

Previous to Velikovsky, historians assumed that the Exodus could only have occurred sometime during the New Kingdom. Courville states concerning the first dynasty of the New Kingdom, "... the beginning of Dynasty XVIII was similarly fixed at 1580 B.C." Bible Chronology would place the Israelites as slaves in Egypt at the time, but there is absolutely no period in the New Kingdom which evidenced the catastrophe of the Exodus, or the domination of foreigners. It was a time of great prosperity and power in Egypt. Secular historians scoffed at the idea that the Exodus could not only precede the New Kingdom, but be placed, as Velikovsky claimed, at the start of the Second Intermediate, the period of the Hyksos.

Aardsma provided an important insight into the place of the Exodus in Egyptian history [1, pp.12-14]. After showing that the First Intermediate follows the Old Kingdom, he then details the collapse of culture and power in Egypt at the end of the Old Kingdom. He states:

The First Intermediate is clearly the one of interest. Its onset shows all the characteristics one would expect to see as the natural result of the Biblical Exodus. No other period in Egypt's history is suitable to the Exodus, for no other period shows simultaneously the: 1. sudden onset of chaos at all levels of Egyptian society with accompanying famine and anarchy, 2. severe loss of centralized power and authority, 3. complete eclipse of Egypt's international prestige and influence, and 4. centuries long struggle to regain what had so suddenly and completely been lost. [1, p.14]

Certainly the catastrophes before and after the Exodus, as described in Scripture, should bring about all of these results. However, Aardsma proposed moving the Exodus back to the secular date for the fall of the Old Kingdom, at about 2450 B.C., hundreds of years before the Scriptural date for the Exodus.

Courville found Egyptian historical evidence in the Sothis King list that Koncharis, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, was the last king of the Old Kingdom. The proof for this statement depends on two facts: all the names which precede him in the list are Old Kingdom Pharaohs, and following Koncharis in this list are seven names of Pharaohs which are certainly not Egyptian names. Siliites, Bainon, Apachnas, Aphophis, Sethos, Certos, and Aseth are the Hyksos Pharaohs of the Second Intermediate, which immediately followed the Exodus. The effect of this is to eliminate both the First Intermediate and the Middle Kingdom. This goes much further than Velikovsky proposed. It is important to remember that the Sothis King list was an exact chronology preserved by Egyptians who lived close to the events they were recording.

The great expansion of Egyptian history was at least partly due to modern scholars assigning numbers to every dynasty, and then assuming that each succeeded the other in numerical order. The deflation which has already occurred is mostly derived from recognition of some contemporary dynasties. Subtracting both the Middle Kingdom and the First Intermediate comprises a drastic reduction in Egyptian history, but when that is done, the chronology of both Biblical History and the Sothis King list agree exactly. The background in Egyptian history for every contact with Israel also emerges.

Evidence presented early in this paper placed the Flood about 3300 B.C. Therefore, the Egyptologists date of 3100-3200 B.C. for the First Dynasty is too early. Migration to Egypt would follow the Tower of Babel, and after some Stone Age living along the Nile, culture and government would develop. After an unknown period of years, these authorities were brought together under a Pharaoh, establishing the First Dynasty. Courville [3, p.210] did not claim a date for the First Dynasty, but he could only justify from his own research a date of 2124 B.C. for its beginning. Contacts with Israel started somewhat later.

The date for the Exodus is derived from 1 Kings 6:1, "... in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign ... he began to build the house of the Lord." The time of David and Solomon is known within a year or two, which places the Exodus close to 1446 B.C. Of course, any date is useless without corroborating evidence both before and after the Exodus. Velikovsky, in *Ages in Chaos* [8] began to examine subsequent contacts between Egypt and Israel. The information about the Hyksos, already presented, covered about 400 years, approximately the period of the Judges, down to Samuel and Saul. Velikovsky continued to analyze contacts between Israel and Egypt to the reigns of Jehoshaphat in Judah and Ahab in Israel. However, he did not discover the basic reasons for the over-expansion of history, and he did not investigate history before the Exodus.

Courville, on the other hand, realized that archeology, after finding many facts which supported Scripture, was claiming very serious differences with Biblical chronology. His two-volume work, [The Exodus Problem and it's Ramifications](#) [3], is rather difficult reading for most Christians. His method of correcting archeology was this: first present the accepted view of a period, as well as the problems with that interpretation. Then he stated a revised chronology and the facts which supported the change, but this revision always agreed with the Bible and clarified the contacts between Jews and Egyptians. Also, he found the background to the Famine of Joseph, and continued at least to the conquest of Egypt by the Persians in 525 B.C., after which the history of Egypt is fairly well established. However, when he analyzed history before Abraham, he seemed to be constrained by Ussher's dates.

THE FAMINE OF JOSEPH

When Joseph faced the problem of trying to collect vast amounts of food prior to the Famine, an increase in irrigated crop land would certainly help [3, pp.142-3]. Egypt is mostly the canyon of the Nile, which widens in one area. A canal about 120 miles long, called Bar Yusef (The Canal of Joseph) was dug on the west side of the valley which might nearly double the number of acres which could be irrigated. The problem is, archeologists date the digging of the canal several hundred years before Joseph would be in Egypt, by Bible chronology. Of course, Courville's revision places him there at exactly the right time. [3, p.133ff] Moreover, the local people believe that Joseph developed the canal.

Famines in Egypt are rare, but only one occurred with a previous warning. To quote Courville [3, p.134], "Sesostris I was the second king of the XIIth Dynasty. A famine inscription from the reign of this king appears in the tomb of one Amen...." Courville then quoted Brugsch [2], "No child of the poor did I afflict, no widow did I oppress.... I had tilled all the fields of the nome of Mah.... I did not prefer the great to the humble in all that I gave away."

Courville refers to this quotation, [3, p.135]:

It is presumed that Brugsch had primary reference to the famine inscription of Beba (Bebi), which was found in the tomb of this personage, since it is this inscription which he later quotes in support of a famine in the XVIIth Dynasty. That part of the inscription of Beba referring to an extended famine reads "I collected corn as a friend of the harvest god. I was watchful at the time of sowing. And when the famine arose lasting many years, I distributed corn to the city each year of the famine."

Courville, however, [3, p.136] cites evidence from Vandier [7], that Bebi should be assigned to the XIIIth Dynasty. So he states:

.. it follows from the rarity of extended famines in the Nile Valley that the famine of Bebi is quite the same famine as that of Amen's inscription and is properly to be dated in the era of the early XIIIth Dynasty which must have been contemporary with the early XIIth.

MOSES AND THE EXODUS

Scripture tells of Israel in slavery in Egypt and at one time all male babies of the Hebrews were to be killed. When Moses was born, he was adopted by an Egyptian Princess. Courville [3, p.220-1] found a princess, Sebeknefrure, who was married to Chenephres, but they had no children. There are indications that Moses was trained to be the next Pharaoh, but Hebrews 11:24 states, "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter." Sebeknefrure survived her husband by less than four years [3, p.221], but with her death, Dynasty XII ended. Dynasty XIII was contemporary, so the rule passed to it. Evidence for this in the Sothis King list is the statement that Rameses is son of Uaphres, but the parent would not be named if the Dynasty had not changed. Rameses reigned 29 years and then Koncharis reigned five, ending Dynasty XIII.

Velikovskiy supplies some facts about the death of Koncharis. A granite monolith found near the ancient stronghold of the Amalekites in the Sinai had engraved upon it an account by an Egyptian of the catastrophe which apparently accompanied the Exodus. To quote Velikovskiy [8, p.43], "The march of the pharaoh with his hosts is related amidst the description of the great upheaval in the residence and the tempest that made the land dark. He arrived at a place designated by name: (quoting from the monolith) 'His majesty- (here words are missing) finds on this place called Pi-Kharoti'." Velikovskiy continues, "A few lines later it is said that he was thrown by a great force. He was thrown by the whirlpool high in the air. He departed to heaven. He was no longer alive."

Compare Exodus 14:9: "But the Egyptians pursued after them, all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh ... and overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-ha-Kiroth." The other place name, Pi-Karoti, only differs slightly because the two names are translated from different languages.

Furthermore, Courville found that the Sothis King list, previously mentioned, provides an accurate chronology for Egyptian history through several dynasties, although not for all dynasties are included. That

is, where two dynasties co-existed, only one was named, and years of co-regency were excluded. Historians ignored the Sothis King list, believing it was too short.

THE QUEEN OF SHEBA

Evidence indicating that the Hyksos ruled Egypt at the time of the Judges in Israel has already been presented. The XVIIIth, the first Dynasty of the New Kingdom, arose after the Hyksos were defeated. The fourth ruler of this dynasty was Queen Hatshepsut, one of the great queens of all time. By the revision, she was contemporary with Solomon. Velikovsky [8, pp.103ff] showed that she had great murals drawn which said that she went from the Nile to the Red Sea, then in one of the ships of her fleet to Ezion-Geber, which is at the head of the Gulf of Aqaba, and on past the Dead Sea and Jericho to Jerusalem. There she gave gifts to Solomon and received rich gifts from him, but afterward, she went down to the Mediterranean and boarded a ship of that fleet on which she returned to the Nile and thence to Thebes.

Velikovsky states [8, p.108], "A magnificent temple called 'The Most Splendid of Splendors' at Deir el Bahari near Thebes in Egypt was built against a semi-circular wall of cliffs." He believes that this temple was built by Hatshepsut to be as near a replica of Solomon's Temple as it was possible to build in a different location. The architecture was completely different from any other building in Egypt. It was in this temple that the record of her journey was carved, and it is the only record of any Queen of Egypt who traveled extensively outside of her own country. Velikovsky quotes in the inscription in the temple which reads [8, p.116], "Sailing the sea, beginning the goodly way towards God's Land,..." Historians could not understand this because they believe that Hatshepsut lived hundreds of years before Solomon. Here is a notable fact: Egyptian history tells of two Queens before Cleopatra, Sebeknefrure and Hatshepsut, but the exaggerated secular history of Egypt can be reduced by hundreds of years with the result that these two are found exactly where Bible chronology places them.

Another statement by Velikovsky [8, p.143], "During the last period of her reign Queen Hatshepsut made Thutmose III co-ruler with her on the throne." While the Queen loved peaceful pursuits, creating beautiful buildings and art, Thutmose wanted to conquer the world. Again on p. 143, "Later, when he reigned alone, Thutmose III became the greatest of all conquerors who sat on the throne of the New Kingdom in Egypt." In the book, Ages in Chaos [8, p.168], there is a line drawing by Wreszinski of a mural in the Temple of Karnak, detailing the rich plunder Thutmose III brought back from a conquest. Among hundreds of articles made of gold or overlaid with gold, of silver or of bronze, there is not one idol. What country beside Israel would have no evidence of idolatry? Still the historians maintain to this day, Israel did not exist at the time of Thutmose III, who is dated by Breasted from 1503-1449 B.C. [8, pp.168-9]. By Biblical history, at that time Israel was in slavery in Egypt.

Velikovsky made an extensive comparison of the Karnak mural with the facts revealed in Scripture about the furnishings of the Temple. For example, in II Chron. 4:8, "He made also ten tables, and placed them in the temple...", and in I Kings 6:21, "So Solomon overlaid the house within with pure gold..." The top row of the mural shows seven table designs, but the unit designations beneath indicate a total of ten. Many of the articles depicted in the upper rows of the mural were stated to be gold, or overlaid with gold.

II Chron. 5:6 states, "And they brought up the ark ... and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle..." They were to be placed in the Temple built by Solomon. The Ark of the Covenant was not taken from Jerusalem, but on the mural there are three box-like articles equipped with rings and staves, apparently for carrying. It is possible that these chests were used to carry small articles when the Tabernacle was moved.

In Exodus 39:4, we have information about making an ephod, part of the holy garments of Aaron, "They made shoulderpieces for it, to couple it together..." Apparently many more were made for the other priests, for the mural pictured many ephods and collars. Their position in the fourth and fifth rows demonstrates that they were considered both valuable and beautiful. Many other artifacts are shown which can be identified from descriptions in the Bible.

WHO WAS SHISHAK

Christian scholars have struggled diligently with Egyptian history, trying to equate it with Scripture. One identification they feel certain about is that the "Shishak, king of Egypt" (II Chron. 12:9), who carried away the treasures from Jerusalem, was the Pharaoh Sheshonk. The information just presented is evidence that

Thutmose III was the Pharaoh called Shishak in the Bible. Who then was Sheshonk? This is an example of the difficulty with Egyptian names, for every Pharaoh had several. Courville states [3, p.261], "The historian Rawlinson early pointed out that the name Sheshonk and the names of his successors (Osorkon and Takeloth) are not Egyptian names at all, but are rather of Assyrian origin." [6]

The Assyrians conquered Egypt, according to Courville, about 300 years after Solomon. Moreover, he points out that Zerah the Ethiopian, of II Chron. 14:9, came against Jerusalem with a million men about thirty years after Shishak. Osorkon would follow Sheshonk at the right time, but Courville states [3, p.264], "... Osorkon I was an insignificant ruler who, from all available evidence, never marched a dozen men across the isthmus into Palestine, to say nothing of raising an army of a million men." However, if Thutmose III was the Biblical Shishak, then his son, Amenhotep II, not only ruled at the right time, he invaded Palestine twice. His first invasion may have been against Syria, but the second threatened Judah and Asa their King, who served God faithfully. When Asa prayed for God's help (II Chron. 14:11), it was granted and the Egyptians (and allied Ethiopians) suffered a terrible defeat.

CONCLUSION

It appears that a very important theme in Scripture is the chronology of historical events. How did Adam know how old he was when Seth was born? How could Adam determine the length of a year, which is derived from astronomy, unless God taught him and then commanded him to keep a record of each passing year? The chronology of events is so constantly recorded in Scripture that it becomes a very important part of God's revelation to those who believe in Him.

The facts supplied in this paper support the conclusion that the chronological numbers for fourteen patriarchs were deliberately reduced in the Massoretic Hebrew text on which our Bibles are based. This has caused confusion in the Christian Church and disturbed the faith of many. By determining the facts in the original manuscript of the Bible, we have a solid, Scriptural anchor against the vast expansion of time proposed by evolutionists.

When we analyze inflated Egyptian history, it becomes apparent that the Egyptian priest, Manetho, who provided a complete list of Pharaohs, was not concerned about a record of the passage of time. He apparently recorded all the years of co-regency and sole reign for every person who had any claim to the title of Pharaoh. He also recorded all the dynasties of Pharaohs, without regard to any which might be contemporary. To him, the Pharaohs were important; chronology was not.

This paper is an invitation for every reader to carefully examine the evidence which indicates the chronological facts provided by the original manuscripts of the Bible. Such study should lead to some agreement in the Creation Movement for an approximate date for Creation. We would also have an accurate outline of history from the Creation to the return of the Jews from Exile. In such an outline, we would not only have the history of Israel, we could also correlate all the history of Mesopotamia and Egypt.

There is one fact about history which is often ignored. When any period of time has passed, whatever happened in that period is frozen—it can never be changed. Our problem is to try to determine what occurred, but if it can be established, it is not a hypothesis or a theory, it is an absolute, unchangeable fact. One of the best methods of proving a historical fact is to discover the continuity of events, those leading to and those which follow any occurrence. Scripture presents powerful evidence of continuity from Creation through several thousand years of human history.

Science, it should be recognized, differs radically from history. Theoretical considerations are very important in science; they help to analyze many problems. However, science has one severe limitation: it cannot change history. If the date of creation can be determined, it would place an absolute limit on the scope of radioactive dating. How could radioactivity date an event on an earth that was not yet created? However, secular historians and archeologists are fettered by the same limitations. The Bible demonstrates that Stone Ages were not long periods of time which gradually led to civilization; they actually followed the high development of culture.

There exists an enormous body of facts concerning Egyptian history. The problem is the time frame of that history. What really happened in the past actually controls the science of archeology, just as Creation and the Flood place restrictions on the study of the physical sciences. Therefore, the study of the age of the

earth by examining Scripture provides a chronology upon which both history and science may be accurately established. If we could agree on the chronology of history set forth in Scripture, we would have a framework on which we could make great progress in the Creation Movement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I very much appreciate the advice of Judy Young and the extensive help and editing of Dr. Paul Ackerman.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aardsma, G. E., **The Exodus Happened 2450 BC**, Proceedings Third International Conference on Creationism, Editors: Robert E. Walsh, et al, 1994, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA.
- [2] Brugsch-Bey, H., Egypt Under the Pharaohs, 1881, Translation by Philip Smith, 2nd Ed.
- [3] Courville, D., The Exodus Problem and Its Ramifications, Volume 1, 1971, Challenge Books, Loma Linda, CA.
- [4] Finegan, J., Handbook of Biblical Chronology, 1969, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [5] McCone, R. C., **The Origins of Civilization**, A Symposium on Creation IV, 1972, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI.
- [6] Rawlinson, G., Ancient Monarchies, 1897, 4th ed.
- [7] Vandier, J., LaFamine Dans L'Egypt Ancienne, 1936.
- [8] Velikovsky, I., Ages in Chaos, 1952, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, NY.
- [9] Whiston, W., The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus, 1957, John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, PA.

