

Dynasties 26 and 19

By Alan Montgomery

Introduction

In his essay, Trevor Palmer elaborates the historical accounts of the XXVIth Dynasty that give a fairly consistent picture. Inscriptions and archaeological findings are rare but compatible with this history. The positioning of the 19th Dynasty and Ramesses II in this era is an essential part of Velikovsky's theory of Egyptian history. Therefore some reconciliation and integration is required to explain these different evidences within a Velikovskian view. So far no explanations seems fit all the evidence. Below is a summary of the different links, both historical and archaeological, of the XXVIth and XIXth Dynasties to the 7th/6th centuries. Different scenarios are then evaluated according to the evidence and an attempt is made to integrate the findings.

History of the Ethiopian and Saite Dynasties

Late in the eighth century, during the Libyan dynasty, Egypt was waning and the Ethiopians began to encroach on Egyptian territory. Eventually, Pianki, the Ethiopian emperor, marched into the Egyptian delta in his 21st year and subdued all the many delta princes and erected a stela of the victory at Gebel Barkal¹. Among the princes was one King Tefnakht, a Libyan prince, who eventually rebelled and was never really subdued. When Tefnakht died, his son, Bocchoris, reigned until Sabaka killed him in his 2nd year². (Pianki died in his 32nd year. As an aside, it is likely this king who is referred to as Zet of the 23rd Dynasty as he ruled 31 years.)

During the reign of Sabaka, the Assyrian King Sargon II attacked. While they did not conquer Egypt at that time, the Ethiopians had to hand over control to rebellious kings who sided with the Assyrians. Little evidence has been found to suggest that Sabataka, the successor to Sabaka, had much influence over the delta. Only with the reign of Taharqa can we see Ethiopian influence again. From Assyrian records Tirhaka ruled Egypt until driven out by Assurbanipal. Assurbanipal killed all the delta princes except Necho, whom he placed on the throne. Shortly thereafter Psammetichus became king.

At this point, the Africanus version and the Eusebian version of Manetho differ. According to Africanus, the first king was Stephinates but according to Eusebius, the 26th Dynasty began with Ammeris (12 years) and was followed by Stephinathis (7 years), Nechepsos (6 years), Necho I (8 years) and then Psammetichos. Psammetichos was established as king by the Assyrians after the death of Tirhaka³. Thus, Ammeris reigned during the Ethiopian period. In investigating the relationship of the XXVIth and XIXth dynasties, Pharaohs Tirhaka, Ammeris and Psammetichos are key figures.

Herodotus⁴ testifies to several key events about this time which are relevant. First, after Sabacos/Sabaka had left Egypt, Anysis the blind king came out of hiding to rule Egypt. His tactics sound very much like those of Teknakht vis-a-vis Pianki. Anysis was followed by Sethos. Sethos was threatened by the Assyrian King Sennacherib. According to conventional

Egyptologists there was no king named Sethos at this time. Now I want to insert here a claim I made in my biblical chronology paper presented to the International Conference on Creationism (Pittsburgh)⁵ (see ldolphin.org/icc-am.html). The invasion of Judea and Egypt by Sennacherib occurred within the reign of Sargon II and the incident that caused the withdrawal of Sennacherib was in 710 BC – a sabbatical year. This places the Sethos of the Sennacherib confrontation right in the middle of the Ethiopian period.

After Psammetichos became king he used the help of Ionians and Carians in his achievement of independence. The first presence of Greeks in Egypt during the 7th century is also very important. Diodorus also gave a similar story. Strabo⁶ in the first century AD mentions that Taharqa, after retaking the Nile delta expanded his territory far north along the Mediterranean coast. The Greek historians also mention the attack of Necho II against Jerusalem which is mentioned in the Bible⁷. Herodotus goes on to say that Necho II was succeeded by Psammis and Psammis by Apries and Apries by Amasis II.

The Bible records that after Nebuchadnezzar had defeated Necho II he came and besieged Jerusalem and captured it in the 11th year of Zedekiah⁸. Many people after that were taken captive to Babylon but others fled to Egypt and Pharaoh Hophra⁹. Hophra was interpreted by Velikovsky to be a hebraicized Hotepirmaat, part of Merneptah's name¹⁰. So the Bible testifies to the presence of Necho II of the XXVIth Dynasty and Merneptah of the XIXth Dynasty in the 7th/6th century.

Now Josephus has more history to add from Manetho. He reacts against Manetho's characterization of the Jewish nation as a rag-tag mob of homeless lepers of recent origin and, in the process, reveals a number of people and events concerning the Ethiopian period. He says of a certain king named Amenophis that a group under Osarsiph threatened his kingdom. Rather than fight he gathered the sacred Apis and retreated to Ethiopia because the King of Ethiopia "was under an obligation to him". In other words he was a vassal to the Ethiopian Emperor. He took his 5-year-old son, Sethos, also called Ramesses and had a friend hide him¹¹. Then after a 13-year exile, Amenophis and another son led an army back to the Nile delta and defeated the rebels and drove them to the boundary with Syria. Amenophis, I believe, is a corruption of Merneptah of Ramesses Merneptah. This story sounds very similar to the story of Sabaka, who retreated from the delta "voluntarily" according to Herodotus. It is likely that the story has been transferred by the Egyptians to a national king. Sethos and Ramesses Merneptah retreated with Shabaka to Ethiopia to recover and regroup. Thirteen years is likely the reign length of Sebitku. After the deaths of Sabaka and Sebitku, Taharqa would lead the Ethiopian army together with his Egyptian allies against the rebels in the Nile delta.

The boy "Sethos" mentioned in this story is likely Seti the Great aka Seti I. Does Josephus mention the earlier Sethos who held Pelusium against the Sennacherib? Just before the Amenophis story is the story of two brothers Sethos and Hermeus. This Sethos was also called Egyptus and Hermeus also called Danaus. Hermeus sounds much like the Ammeris, the first pharaoh of the 26th Dynasty and Velikovsky's Haremhab¹². Earlier in section 15 of Josephus, the king is called Sethosis¹³. This king appointed his brother Armais to be his deputy over Egypt but forbade him to wear the diadem or touch the royal harem. He launched a campaign against Cyprus and Phoenicia. But Armais took advantage of Sethosis' absence and broke his oath.

Sethosis returned and retook his throne and drove Armais into exile in Argos. Armais and Sethosis of section 15 sound very much like the Sethos and Hermeus of the later section 26. Sethosis' expulsion of Armais sounds similar to the story of the Amenophis returning to Egypt from Ethiopia after his 13-year exile to expel the rebels with Taharqa.

Lastly, Josephus offers some interesting chronology. He claims that the Hyksos (shepherds) were driven out by Tethmosis 511 years after they came. Also that Danaus or Armais left for Argos 393 years after the Hyksos had been defeated¹⁴. Using my 1591 BC date for the Exodus makes the defeat of the Hyksos circa 1080 BC and the exile of Armais 687 BC. This is very close to the date of the return of Taharqa after the retreat of Sabaka. Is this just coincidence?

The Assyrians also contribute some information regarding the reigns of the 7th century Egyptian pharaohs. In 671 BC Esarhaddon attacked Taharka. He then, according to his inscription, appointed his own local kings, governors and administrators. Ashurbanipal continued the pressure on the Ethiopians. He attacked Taharqa also and appointed local kings, including Necho (Nikû), king of Sais and Memphis in 664 BC. Taharka escaped to the south. However, the Egyptians soon broke their oaths to the Assyrians and allied themselves with Taharka again. They were taken captive and executed at Nineveh, except for Necho I and Psammetichos. Ashurbanipal returned him to Sais, as the sole prince of Egypt. Soon afterward Taharka died, Tanutamun attacked and captured Memphis, apparently killing Necho in the process.

Archaeological and Inscriptural Evidence relating the Ethiopians and Dynasty XXVI

The most important inscriptions of the Ethiopian period and the 26th Dynasty are obviously those of the Serapeum at Saqqara. A stela in the Serapeum refers to the burial of an Apis bull which was born in the 26th year of Taharqa and died in the 20th year of Psamtik I¹⁵. Another stela records the burial of an Apis bull that was born in the 53rd year of Psamtik I and died during the 6th year of Necho II. Another Apis bull was born during the 16th year of Necho II and died during the 12th year of Apries¹⁶. That Psamtek II reigned between Necho II and Apries is known from the inscription on a statue of his tutor which says that he was the son of Necho II¹⁷. From the "Adoption Stela of Enekhnesneferibre", we know that Psamtek II died in the 7th year of his reign, and was succeeded by his son, Apries¹⁸. The Apis bull which died in year 6 of Cambyses was placed in a sarcophagus so large that it became stuck in the entrance to the vaults so it is uncertain where it was intended to be placed. The remaining burials from the Persian period are found associated with the Psamtek I, Necho II, Apries and Amasis and those from the Ptolemaic period.

At Thebes, Psamtek I is pictured together with Shepenapt II, who was the sister or wife of Taharqa. Shepenapt II is being adopted by the Divine Adoratrice of Amun, Amenirdis II. This shows that Psamtek ruled in Thebes by his 9th year and also his close chronological relationship to Taharqa. Also there is a stela of Nekau II, which shows that Nekau's authority extended to Thebes¹⁹.

Can the stratigraphy be brought to bear on the validity of the above inscriptions and historical stories? Psammetichos invited Greek mercenaries to help him defeat his enemies. As a reward he gave them Daphne or Tahpanhes a home. When they excavated Tell Defenneh they found

hundreds of Greek vases of the 7th century. Under the fortress lay a foundation deposit that contained a cartouche of Psamtek I20. Petrie excavated a nearby town named Tell Nebesheh and found Cypriot pottery and weapons of the same Iron Age date as the material found at Tell Defenneh together with a small chapel of Amasis. He also found a temple of Rameses II of the 19th Dynasty. There was no Late Bronze II pottery that normally is associated with the 19th Dynasty. Like Pi-Thom and Succoth, the material of Rameses II is archaeologically and historically orphaned. Also some tombs contained material of the 20th Dynasty. How a settlement occupied between 664 and 565 BC came to contain Ramesside dated material was not satisfactorily explained.

Lastly, I would comment on the throne names of the XXVIth Dynasty. The first appearance of the term 'ib' in pharaonic names appears to be Wahibre in the prenomen of Sabaka. It would be logical then that the kings associated with the Ethiopians might also choose similar names with 'ib' in them. This is only a weak inference, but one worth noting. Gardiner gives Sabaka two different prenomen, Neferkare and Wahibre. Pharaohs occasionally changed their prenomen. It is not unheard of. Yet, in the Ethiopian period, all three Ethiopian emperors have a second prenomen²¹. It is completely novel for a consecutive series of pharaohs to have two prenomen.

Archaeological and Inscriptional Evidence relating the Ethiopians and Dynasty XIX

Badawi excavated a tomb at Saqqara. It contained a Libyan nobleman named Sheshonq, whose title was Crowned Prince Sheshonq and High Priest of Ptah. His father was Osorkon, Lord of the Two Lands²². He identified this Osorkon as Osorkon II but his identification would appear to be mistaken. Osorkon's cartouche does not contain the phrase "si-Bast" that usually adjoins the cartouche of Osorkon II nor does it contain "si-Ese" that usually adjoins the cartouche of Osorkon III. The wealth of the tomb would suggest Osorkon IV. Haremhab's cartouche is carved on the architrave, as well as written on his shoulder with no attempt to erase it. Thus he was the pharaoh at the death of Sheshonq, son of Osorkon IV. Osorkon IV reigned at the time of the invasion of Ethiopian Emperor Piankh, circa 730 BC and appears to be still alive in 715 BC when the Assyrians attacked Egypt.

Haremhab had been an important official before his appointment as king of Egypt. He is seen on an inscription together with Ethiopian Prince Taharqa of the 25th Dynasty²³. Apparently, he was pro-Ethiopian at one point. This association of Haremhab and the Ethiopian King Tarhaqa puts Haremhab in the late 8th or early 7th century. Haremhab's cartouche is also found on the outside of the tomb of Petamenophis in Thebes. The tomb is in the style of the Ethiopian age and dated to the late 8th century²⁴.

Haremhab's tomb is also indicative of the late 8th and early 7th centuries. His tomb at Memphis gives his titles as "King's follower, Greatest of the Great: Mightiest of the Mighty Great Lord of the People, Head of the Army, Chosen of the King, presides over the Two Lands, in order to carry out the administration of the Two Lands, General of Generals"²⁵. Velikovsky points out that the appointment of Haremhab to these titles was by an unknown king. This implies Horemhab was not of royal blood. He does, however, wear the uraeus, the symbol of royal authority.

On another fragment of the Memphite tomb, a group of Syrian nobles stand behind Haremhab who stands in front of the interpreter for the king. The king's figure has been erased. Velikovsky concludes that this means the king is a foreigner, who has assembled his vassals to demand obedience and submission. What nationality was this king, who appointed Haremhab? It would not have been Ethiopian. Interpreters never appear in any of their monuments. On another fragment of the tomb, a bas-relief of the king, he is sitting on horseback, contrary to Egyptian custom. Although the figure of the king has been erased, it is still evident he is riding a horse in the Assyrian fashion and the horse is depicted in the way that Assyrian artists portray horses²⁶.

Returning to the tomb of Sheshonq, King's Son of Osorkon IV, Badawi also discovered a cartouche of Seti Merenptah on the back wall with no prenomen²⁷. It would follow that it was the Seti who was contemporary with Haremhab at the end of the 8th century. This aligns with the stories in Josephus where a Sethos and a Hermeus were brothers. Seti is denied any existence in the conventional view of the 8th century. Rather, he is placed after the reign of Merenptah. Such a view leaves an unsatisfactory explanation for the Sethos Temple at Hermopolis²⁸. This tomb contains inscriptions of Ramesses II, Merenptah and Seti II. However, Merenptah's inscription claims he completed the construction of the Temple. Such an inscription would preclude any significant contribution of his successor Seti II. One can explain this more satisfactorily if the Seti Merenptah of the above tomb started the construction which was finished by Ramesses and Merenptah.

Another connection between Taharqa and Seti I is the list of cities they conquered in their Asian campaign. Petrie points out that the list of Taharqa is a copy of the list of Seti I²⁹. This is, of course, in the conventional view. However, it really makes no sense that an Ethiopian pharaoh, having driven the Assyrians out of Egypt and retaken much of the Mediterranean coast would feel the need to copy a 600-year-old-list of a long forgotten dynasty. How many names of towns on such a list would be obsolete? However, it is apparent that in revisionist terms the copying is reversed and it is a 7th century Seti I who has copied Taharqa, unless you believe that the two pharaohs conducted two identical independent campaigns. Another copy of this list also occurs on the Colossus of Ramesses II.

The archaeological connection between Ramesses II and the 7th century comes through his synchronism with the Hittites. His Hittite counterpart was Hattusilas III with whom he made a peace treaty after his loss at Kadesh. Velikovsky demonstrates the Kadesh of Ramesses II is not in Phoenicia, but is actually Carchemish³⁰. The capital of Hattusilas was Hattusas. The archaeological evidence found at Hattusas, whether art, weaponry, writing style, science or Phrygian pottery places the imperial period of the Hittites in the late 8th early 7th century and beyond into the 6th century. In particular, the Hittites record that they took Carchemish from the Assyrians only to lose it again. They then retook it under Mursilis II. Mursilis II also asked his commanders to notify him if they saw the Egyptian army coming. Only one time in Assyrian history was there an ongoing conflict over Carchemish and only one time when both the Assyrians and the Egyptians were simultaneously and militarily involved in the fight for Carchemish. The three-party contest for Carchemish is also verified by the biblical record³¹. The archaeology I have written up already in my composition, "The Hittite Problem". I will therefore cease at this point on Ramesses II. I have already mentioned the biblical reference to Merenptah Hotepirmaat known in the Bible as Hophra. The pharaohs of the XIXth Dynasty clearly belong

to the late 8th, 7th and early 6th century and cannot be removed without ignoring substantial evidences in history, inscriptions and archaeology.

Discussion

The Greek historians, the inscriptions and the archaeologists all place the XXVIth Dynasty in the 7th /6th century. In some revisionists models these pharaohs had to be moved to another century or their names had to be associated with figures that lived in other centuries. The Serapeum inscriptions testify not only to the existence of these XXVIth Dynasty pharaohs between the Ethiopians and the Persians but the position of the tombs of the Apis bulls also supports this view. Other Saitic inscriptions at Thebes connect Psamtik to other Ethiopian figures closely attached to Taharqa. With the above evidences in mind, it is not possible to conjecture an XXVIth Dynasty in the Persian era as Sweeney and Heinsohn do. Nor is it credible to expect these names when found in a Persian context can be used as an alternative to explain away their presence in the 7th century as Velikovsky does.

The placement of a Sethos/Sethosis and Hermeus/Armais in the Ethiopian period by Herodotus and/or Manetho is confirmed by scenes associating Haremhab with the Ethiopian noble Taharqa. This and other scenes of an Assyrian monarch appointing Haremhab as ruler of Egypt pinpoints the time of the XIXth Dynasty as the late 8th, 7th and early 6th Dynasty. Thus the Haremhab of the XIXth Dynasty and the Ammeris of the XXVIth Dynasty must be one and the same person. Both the XIXth and the XXVIth Dynasty then occupy the same 7th century time frame. A return to the conventional view then is also ruled out. This leaves only two possible options. Either there are two independent dynasties occupying different cities in Egypt or the names are “alter ego” throne names for the same pharaohs.

Between the two scenarios, the two-dynasty and the one-dynasty, I believe the two-dynasty scenario has the worst problems. The first hurdle is the problem of jurisdiction. There were times when more than one pharaonic power ruled in Egypt. In particular, the XXIIInd Libyan Dynasty reigned in Bubastis and Tanis while the XXIIIrd ruled in Leontopolis and Thebes. These two dynasties vied for dominance in the 8th century before the Ethiopians came. There are inscriptions and texts that described some of these conflicts and several Nile level texts are double-dated to both dynasties. This is not the situation we find in the XXVIth and the XIXth Dynasties. None of these pharaohs ever mentions another pharaonic power in Egypt during their reigns.

What areas of Egypt did the two dynasties occupy? Everywhere in Egypt there are evidences of the glory of the XIXth Dynasty. Even in places where the XXVIth Dynasty established a new town for the Greeks, like Daphne/Defenneh, there is a XIXth Dynasty presence. There is literally no place to hide. Stelae of Psamtek and Necho are found at Thebes, where we know that the XIXth Dynasty held sway. On the other hand the one-dynasty scenario has no difficulty with jurisdiction.

Herodotus³² records that Necos (Necho II) was the first to construct a canal from the Red Sea to the Nile River. Necos lost 120,000 men in the process and had to abandon the project. Eventually, King Darius I of Persia completed the canal. The Egyptian records of the XIXth

Dynasty also record that Ramesses II began to build such a canal in his reign³³. In the conventional view Egyptologists are forced to conclude that Herodotus was deceived. The two-dynasty scenario, however, is faced with a dilemma of a different sort. Two different pharaohs living at the same time and claiming the same glorious feat! The liar among the two would risk almost certain reprisals. In the one-dynasty scenario this is expected.

Velikovsky goes into great detail to show that Ramesses II and his campaign against Kadesh is actually an assault on Hattusilas III at Carchemish. In the conventional view this would not be a problem because Necho II and Ramesses II are 700 years apart. In the two-dynasty scenario it means that both Necho II and Ramesses II fought Egypt's foes at Carchemish about the same time with the same result. It would also imply that both Necho II and Ramesses II were both able to raise a substantial army with the same auxiliary troops. The results of both battles lead to a tipping point in the struggle against the northern foes of Egypt. [Velikovsky, I. 1978. *Ramses II and His Times*, Double Day, Garden City, NY, p. 7-36]. If both Necho II and Ramesses II led powerful armies against Babylonian/Chaldean/Hittite forces, how could pharaohs this powerful tolerant the presence of an equally powerful rival? If they had been rivals, the dynasties could not have lasted almost 150 years without a major power struggle for control. Such a struggle must be evident somewhere in the inscriptions and records of these two dynasties. Yet again, the two-dynasty scenario is a dubious proposition and the "alter ego" explanation is easier to accept.

But the difficulty goes even further. Velikovsky³⁴ analyzes the military campaigns of both and found they fought battles at the same places, in the same order, with the same result and the same number of years apart. There is no room here for coincidences. The duplication of military adventures is definitely evidence for the alter ego scenario over the two-dynasty one.

Trevor Palmer has allowed in his composition a case for an alter ego explanation. He asks how this scenario can accommodate the use of two different throne names and two different sets of Apis bulls. Sherlock Holmes once said that once one had eliminated the impossible, the alternative must be true no matter how improbable. However true this may be it is not a terribly satisfying answer.

Velikovsky³⁵ argues from Herodotus and Strabo that the Saitic branch of the Nile is the same as the Tanitic. He then concludes that Sais and Tanis must be the same city. Strictly speaking this does not follow. Sais might be on the Saitic branch and yet be another city. The proof of this are the kings set up by Esarhaddon and recorded by Assurbanipal. The list of the different kings and cities includes one Pedubast, king of Tanis, while Necho I is king of Memphis and Sais³⁶. Can Pedubast and Necho I both be reigning in the same town? Why would Necho rule over two towns so far apart? I believe there has been an error all around. Sais is not in the west nor is it Tanis. So what town on the Tanitic branch was a royal city but is not mentioned in the list of Esarhaddon? My candidate for Sais is Pi-Ramesses. This makes much more sense than San el Hagar, which was a few miles outside Tanis – separated from the capital Tanis but not a separate capital.

In regard to double throne names, there is no precedent for the use of two throne names in Egyptian history prior to the XXVth dynasty, other than the three Ethiopian kings Pianki, Sabaka, and Sabatak (Sebitku). I suspect that these three kings chose three Egyptian throne

names that were easily spoken in the Ethiopian language. This name would tell the Ethiopian people of their rule over Egypt. The second prenominal was more conventional and made the Egyptians aware of the overlordship of Ethiopia. Many Egyptian nobles retreated in front of the Assyrians and turned to the Ethiopians for hope of recapturing their country from the Assyrians. The story of a pharaoh named Amenophis in Manetho portrays just such a noble. Velikovsky's, Seti the Elder would be among them (Seti II). They might have learned to speak Ethiopian in their 13-year exile and may have chosen a second throne name, one that would show the Ethiopians their submission and their gratitude.

Petrie does explore the meaning of Psamtek. One meaning derived from demotic is "drinking-bowl maker"³⁷. This is not an impressive etymology for a royal name. The other name supposes that Psamtek is of Ethiopian origin. He writes it is evident that Psamtek is a name of the same type as Shabataka; that means 'wild cat's son, the' in the inverted Ethiopian order. So Psamtek would mean 'the son of sam'. The prefix P is the Egyptian article..." He goes on later, "as there is an Upper Egyptian word 'zam' for lion, this cannot be ignored..." Petrie thus proposes that Psamtek means the 'the lion's son'³⁸.

The Seti the Elder might have adopted this name either to impress or to please his master's Ethiopian tongue but it might also be that Pianki imposed the name on Seti. When Necho II took Jerusalem, he took away Jehoahaz II and replaced him with Eliakim, whose name he changed to Jehoiakim. When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, he took away Jehoiachin and replaced him with Mattaniah, whose name he changed to Zedekiah. This showed the power of the victorious king over the defeated king. Thus if the kings allied with the Ethiopian may have received their throne names from the Ethiopian emperors. These throne names would have been used in their political and diplomatic relationships with the Ethiopians but otherwise they used their Egyptian name. This not only explains the two throne names but also why there are two Apis bulls. One is to satisfy the honour of the god Ptah and the other is to honour the Ethiopians who liberated Egypt from the foreigners.

The Saitic/Tanitic dynasty would look like this. Seti Merenptah was the brother of Haremhab but they were divided on which foreign power should be allied with Egypt. With the aid of King Sennacherib Haremhab revolted against the Ethiopians and was established as the supreme commander in the delta. Sabaka, who had become emperor about 8 years earlier contested with Haremhab, leaving Sebitku to mind the throne. Sabaka was driven out with Seti and retreated to Ethiopia. This took 4 to 6 years. At his point, Sennacherib appointed Haremhab pharaoh. He ruled for 12 years, as Haremhab/Ammeris aka Hermeus aka Armais. When Tarhaqa returned with Seti they were able to expel Haremhab and Seti the Elder aka Stephinates, or Wehibre Tefnakht II was made the Egyptian king. He was succeeded for a short period by Amenmesses. Then the throne passed to Merenptah Si-Ptah or Nechepsos. His mother, Twosre, was regent. After his death the internal feuding was resolved by her marrying Ramesses I aka Necho I. Then there followed Psammetichos, aka Seti the Great, Necho II aka Ramesses II, and Merenptah aka Hophra and Apries, whose history has been proposed by Velikovsky. Amasis II revolted against him and finally the Persians came.

References

1. Clayton, P., *Chronicle of the Pharaohs*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1994 pp. 190-1.
2. Ibid p. 189.
3. Gardiner A. *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford and New York, p. 450
4. Herodotus [II:141], *The Histories*, Translated by Aubrey de Selincourt, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
5. Montgomery, Alan, Towards a Biblically Inerrant Chronology, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Creationism*, Editor Bob Walsh, Pittsburgh, 1998.
6. Strabo, *Geography*, XV, i, 6.
7. II Kings 23:28-37; II Chr 35: 20-27.
8. II Kings 25:1-3; Jer 52: 1-5.
9. Jeremiah 44:30.
10. Velikovskiy, I. *Ramses II and His Time*, Double Day, Garden City, NY, 1978, p. 190
11. Josephus: *Against Apion*, I:26, Complete Works of Josephus as translated by Whiston, Kregel, Grand Rapids, 1960.
12. Ibid., I:27
13. Ibid I:15
14. Ibid I:15
15. Breasted, A., *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol 4: Sec 959-962
16. Petrie, W.H.F., *A History of Egypt*, Vol. III, Books for Libraries Press, p. 339.
17. Dodson and Hilton, *The Complete Royal Families of Egypt*, p. 244.
18. Breasted, op. cit., Vol 4: Sec 988.
19. Petrie, op. cit., p.327 &333.
20. Petrie, W.H.F. Murray, S. Griffith, F.Ll., *Tanis, Nebeshesh, and Defenneh*, 1988.
21. Gardiner, A. op. cit., p. 450.
22. Badawi, A., Das Grab des Kronenprinzen Scheschonk, Sohnes Osorkon II und Hohenpriester von Memphis, *Annales du Service des Antiquités*, Vol. 54, 1956. p. 159ff.]
23. Le Vicomte de Rouge, M., Etude sur quelque monuments du regne de Taharka, *Melanges d'Archaeologie*, Vol. I, 1873. as cited by Velikovskiy.
24. von Bissing, F.W., Das Grab des Petamenophis in Theben, *Zeitschrift fur Egyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, 74 , 1938, as cited by Velikovskiy.
25. Breasted, op. cit., Vol III, Sec. 20.
26. Velikovskiy, I. The Correct Placement of Haremhab in Egyptian History, *Kronos*, Vol IV, No 3, 1979, pp. 5-9
27. Badawi, op. cit. p. 161.
28. Velikovskiy, op. cit. p. 20
29. Petrie, W.H.F., Ref. 16, p. 297 citing Mariette's "Karnak"

30. Velikovsky, I. *Ramses II and his Times*, Double Day, Garden City, NY., 1978, pp 17-36.
31. II Kings 23:29
32. Herodotus, op. cit. II:59
33. Budge, E.A., *A History of Egypt*, Vol VI, London, 1902-04, p. 219 as cited by Velikovsky in *Ramesses and His Time*, p. 5.
34. Velikovsky, op. cit. pp. 55-59.
35. Velikovsky, I., op. cit. pp. 210-11.
36. Petrie, W.H.F., op. cit. p. 318.
37. Petrie, W.H.F. op. cit. p. 321.
38. Petrie, W.H.F. op. cit. p. 322.

24 October, 2008
Alan Montgomery

PS. I apologise, Trevor, for pinching some of your references.