

CHAPTER 8

THE REVISIONISTS

Jones and James Versus Velikovsky

Introduction

As Velikovsky neared the end of his life, he wrote the final volumes of the revision. *Peoples of the Sea* concerned the placement of the 20th and 21st Dynasty in the 4th century; *Rameses II and His Times* concerned the placement of the 19th Dynasty in the 7th century and *The Assyrian Conquest*, (published posthumously) concerned Haremhab and the Assyrian conquest of Egypt. This meant that his 9th and 8th century Libyan and the Ethiopian Dynasties fitted in between his 18th Dynasty and his 19th Dynasty. The Persians followed the 19th Dynasty and preceded his 20th /21st Dynasty. The complexity of the HIS scheme to remove 500 years of Egyptian history explains the reason earlier attempts, such as Torr's failed. They were just not equipped to cope with unravelling the complex assortment of duplication in Egyptian history.

Some revisionists balked at his revision, believing that the accepted dynastic order could not be changed. Efforts to rescue revisionism from Velikovsky's radicalism appeared shortly after *Ramesses and His Times* was published. At a conference held at Glasgow in 1978, Michel Jones wrote a rather poor paper. [Jones] In it he wrote that Velikovsky had claimed that there was no connection between Ramesses III and the following Ramesside pharaohs. Actually, In fact, Velikovsky had pointed out that the pharaohs Ramesses III to Ramesses VIII were not connected to Ramesses IX, X and XI and that these three pharaohs actually preceded Ramesses III. Next he claimed that Velikovsky had

identified Ramesses III as Nekht-a-neb, the Nectanebo I of conventional history. This is patently false. Velikovsky claimed that Nekht-a-neb was a Persian functionary and not the pharaoh of the 30th Dynasty. This meant that Velikovsky could claim that Ramesses III was the real Nectanebo I of Greek history. These simple mistakes should have caused his paper to be viewed with skepticism.

The main evidences in Jones' presentation were certain genealogies. He claimed they irrefutably connected the 19th and 20th Dynasties. In particular, Jones examined the relationships of a group of workmen in Deir el-Medina, who were responsible for the construction of the royal tombs. Inscriptions bearing the names of workers and Chief Workman, which referred to the name and year of the pharaoh, were found on the worksites. From the evidence it could be determined who succeeded whom from the conventional order of the pharaohs.

Also, a papyrus called the Salt Papyrus contained the story of an abusive Chief Workman named Paneb and his alleged crimes according to Amennakht. This story occurred in the reign of Seti II. Amennakht was the brother of the deceased Chief Workman Neferhotep and thus was eligible to be the next Chief Workman. He thought he should have succeeded his brother but Neferhotep had adopted Paneb and he inherited the job instead. All this took place in the reigns of Seti II, Amenmesses and Siptah/Twohre, who in the conventional view were the final pharaohs of the 19th Dynasty.

The next Chief Workman was Nekhemmut in the reign of Ramesses III, who succeeded his father, Paneb, who had been removed from office. Thus the end of the 19th Dynasty story is concluded in the 20th Dynasty. Jones claimed this showed continuity between the two dynasties. Thus Velikovsky had been wrong.

However, Jones forgot that Velikovsky had altered the conventional order of the pharaohs in the 19th Dynasty. Neferhotep, who served in the reign of Haremhab, was the eldest Chief Workman. Velikovsky placed Seti II, Siptah and Twohre next and Chief Workman Paneb worked under these pharaohs. That means Ramesses I, Seti I, Ramesses II and Merenptah succeeded the reigns in which the abusive Paneb worked and preceded Ramesses III's Paneb by almost 100 years. Thus Jones' argument depends on the accepted order of the pharaohs in the 19th Dynasty, which is denied by Velikovsky. Using the order proposed by Velikovsky leads to an entirely different conclusion. Thus, if the

orthodox order of the dynasties and pharaohs is used then the genealogies prove that Velikovsky was wrong. However, if the orthodox order is correct, then Velikovsky is already wrong. This is begging the question.

Jones also failed to notice something else about the 19th Dynasty connection to the 20th Dynasty. According to Jones order, the last pharaohs of the 19th Dynasty were Amenmesse, Siptah and Twosre. In their reigns Paneb was the Chief Workman and was responsible for supervising the work of their tombs. Setnakht of the 20th Dynasty succeeded Twosre and died before Paneb lost his post. Upon Setnakht's death, Paneb and his tomb workers in the Valley of the Kings began tunnelling into the rock to prepare his tomb. Accidentally, they broke into the tomb of Amenmesse [Grimal, 1992, p. 271]. How could Paneb fail to know the position of Amenmesse's tomb that he himself had supervised just 10 years earlier? This action cannot be explained if the conventional dynastic order is accepted.

Setnakht's tomb workers must have been of a later generation that had forgotten where Amenmesse's tomb was. In which case, the tomb workers and Paneb, Chief Workman of 20th Dynasty, cannot be the same tomb workers and Paneb as those of the 19th Dynasty. This evidence firmly refutes the orthodox order of the dynasties and as well as Jones' argument.

Shortly thereafter, several scholars considered new chronologies based on Velikovsky's synchronisms between the Hatshepsut and King Solomon but which followed the conventional dynastic order. One proposal was called the Glasgow Chronology. It had one insurmountable difficulty. The sum of the reigns of the pharaohs, who came after the 18th Dynasty but before the 25th Dynasty, circa 715 BC, was too large. No amount of overlap or compression of the reigns would fit into so short a span of time. Like Torr they were unable to compress Egyptian history by 500 years and like Torr their proposal gathered little support.

Revisionism in Trouble

Revisionists began to look for new solutions that involved compressions of less than 500 years. To do this they had to abandon the synchronism of Hatshepsut and King Solomon and the identity of Thutmose III as Pharaoh Shishak of Velikovsky's scheme. They kept

the Exodus in the Middle Bronze but Hatshepsut, Thutmose III and the el-Amarna letters were repositioned to a time earlier than King Solomon. This reopened the question of the identity of Pharaoh Shishak, who under these new assumptions could no longer be Thutmose III.

They agreed with Velikovsky that the conventional identification of Sheshonq I as Pharaoh Shishak was wrong. However, they did not agree on just who he was. One such revisionist was Peter James, who supported Ramesses III of the 20th Dynasty as Shishak. This involved a 250-year reduction in Egyptian chronology, which was achieved by a generally described overlap of the 21th Dynasty with the 22nd Dynasty plus a major reduction in the length of the Third Intermediate Period (TIP). James supported his proposal from known anomalies of Egyptian chronology and complemented this with a detailed stratigraphic analysis of the gaps between the Late Bronze and Iron Age strata in the Mediterranean [P. James, 1993]. This work was a major step forward in understanding the stratigraphy of revisionism.

James' most important step forward came in understanding the stratigraphy of Israelite sites, the most important of which was Lachish. He did this brilliantly by avoiding all input from Egyptology. He redated the Hebrew writing found in Lachish Level II to the Persian era, allowing Lachish Level III to be advanced by 100 years to the Neo-Babylonian era. It now became concurrent with the fall of Jerusalem (a result compatible with the stratigraphy in Chapter 3). He applied his results to the stratigraphy of Megiddo. King Solomon, which the conventional archaeologists had placed in Level IV, was now removed 400 years into Level VIII in the Late Bronze IB. The Late Bronze IB was very prosperous and well-suited to the riches accorded King Solomon in the Bible. Megiddo Levels VII to IV now represented the era of the divided kingdom of Israel and Judah, equally well suited archaeologically to that period.

The most obvious problem lay in James own data. His stratigraphic gaps were typically 350-600 years contrary to his proposal of 250 years. Even the gaps could be challenged because the stratigraphic gaps are sometimes shorter than the chronological gaps. Moreover, James' reduction in Egyptian chronology did not match his reduction in stratigraphy. Revising King Solomon to Late Bronze IB lowered stratigraphic dates more than 400 years while his identification of Ramesses III as Shishak reduced Egyptian

chronology only 250 years. Despite shedding much light on the stratigraphic problems of stratigraphy, ultimately, James failed to deliver a workable revisionist chronology because of simple arithmetic. It would have been more profitable to keep Velikovsky's version.

Lachish

So what forced James to a new revision? Several issues undermined his confidence in Velikovsky's claims. Some issues have been raised in previous chapters and will not be rehearsed here. Only additional criticisms will be examined.

Velikovsky's explanation of the stratigraphy of Lachish was, according to James, just not credible [P. James, 1978]. Lachish in southern Judah had two major features: the Fosse temple, found in the moat around the city and the citadel. The Fosse Temple had an early level, a second level built in the time of Amenhotep III and a third level destroyed in the time of Ramesses II. Israelite pottery had been found in the third Level of the Fosse temple, which ended in a conflagration. Velikovsky stressed that the Iron Age material were dug down into the Ramesside stratum in the Fosse Temple at Lachish and that the conflagration level had Ramesside material dug up into it. [Velikovsky, 1978, p. pp. 44-5]. James wrote in response that the Israelite pottery had come from graves,

“That this was *not* an explanation ... concocted by embarrassed archaeologists is quite clear from the reports and photographs, one of which shows a grave containing a skeleton sunk into the older Temple floor. The graves contain Iron Age material; the strata they are dug into contain Late Bronze (and Ramesside) material. [P. James, 1978]”

In Chapter 3, Stiebing criticized Velikovsky's scheme because Late Bronze material was never found in Iron Age strata. James now illustrates what happens to the interpretation of strata where this occurs; the two potteries are divided into two separate strata. The Excavators dates the Iron Age pottery in Fosse temple stratum III to the 9th/8th century but, as James later argued, the late Iron Age II material in Level III is Neo-Babylonian and misdated by a century, that is, it should be dated to the 7th century [James, 1993]. This leaves a rather awkward gap between the 13th century Ramesside Late Bronze level

and the 7th century Iron Age II Israelite pottery in the graves dug into the temple floor. This is exactly the same gap that appears at imperial Hittite sites (see Chapter 5). It was never questioned by the excavators that no such gap existed. This is rather awkward considering that no such gap existed on the citadel of Lachish.

Level VI on the citadel (Iron Age I) contained a plaque assigned to Ramesses III. This plaque, mentioned in a previous chapter, had the prenomen of Ramesses III, User Maat Re Meryamen in a cartouche. Thus, Level VII was assigned to Ramesses II even though no artefacts of the 19th Dynasty were ever found there. The plaque is ambiguous, however, as User-Maat-Re Meryamen is also the prenomen of Sheshonq IV, an 8th century pharaoh of the Libyan Dynasty. The plaque could be evidence of an 8th century Libyan pharaoh as we have argued already in Chapter 3. In this case Levels V, IV and III are all within the Assyrian period, late 8th and 7th centuries just like Beth Shemesh IIa/b.

What is not ambiguous is the location of the Ramesside finds on the citadel. It was found in the form of sherds, fragments of gold leaf and faience found under the lowest level of stones of a Level IV temple.

Velikovsky had claimed that on the citadel the destruction layer (Level III) was associated with Nebuchadnezzar's attack and contained material from the reign of Ramesses II. His claim is incorrect in that the temple had been built earlier in Level IV. However, Level IV, according to the Beth Shemesh model is 7th century. It was destroyed at the same time as the Neo-Babylonian Level III. Once again Ramesses II is found in Iron II context.

So what then do we make of the Ramesses II material in the Fosse Temple. The Israelite pottery dug into Ramesside level was the same date as that of Level IV on the citadel. If we take this to mean the same date then the Ramesside material found in the Fosse Temple and the Ramesside material found in Level IV are also the same strata and have the same Iron II date in the 7th century and the six century gap disappears just as Velikovsky claimed.

James criticism does not stand. It is based on an interpretation of the Level VI plaque given by conventional archaeologists using the conventional dynastic order to date it to the 12th century 20th Dynasty. The association of the 20th Dynasty and the Iron I Philistine ware has already been examined and found to be false. If the plaque is identified with the

Libyan pharaoh, then the date of Level VI is 8th century and the destruction in that level belongs to that of Sennacherib's campaign.

The 19th and 26th Dynasty in the 7th century

Velikovsky claimed that Psammetichos and Necho were alternate names for Seti I and Ramesses II. The former names were used by foreigners in writing Egyptian history and the latter were the names used the Egyptians themselves. Velikovsky identified the few Egyptian records of Wahibre Psametik I and Wehemibre Nekau II as important Persian appointed officials. James claimed this explanation was incorrect based on the evidence from the Apis bull records at the Serapeum at Saqqara.

The Serapeum was a large cavernous hall, which acted as the burial site of the holy Apis bull, the physical embodiment of the god, Ptah. It consisted of long tunnels with huge side chambers containing gigantic coffins of the sacred bulls. Inscriptions and stele ascribed these bulls to various reigns of the pharaohs. One stele 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 Psametik I [Breasted, Vol IV, Sec 959-962]. These showed Taharqa was followed directly by Psametik I and subsequently by the other 26th Dynasty pharaohs. They were not Persian functionaries as Velikovsky claimed.

What then happens to Velikovsky's arguments that Ramesses II and Hattusilas III were 7th/ 6th century monarchs locked in a monumental battle for supremacy? What about the 7th century pottery in the Tomb of Hiram together with the vase of Ramesses II? What about the 7th century Israelite pottery found in the Fosse temple at Lachish and the Hittite seals that overlapped the Phrygian era? Either these must be abandoned altogether or Velikovsky's explanation of Psametik must be rejected and another explanation found that accounts for the Apis bull records.

If we take the second course, how are we to explain that Psammetichos and Seti I are ruling at the same time? Are there two separate dynasties ruling two separate areas of Egypt or are these two pharaohs actually one individual with two names? The success of both the 19th and the 26th Dynasties in international conflicts could only be achieved with a strong and united central government. This makes the former possibility unreasonable and leaves only the option that the two sets of names are actually a single dynasty.

How can this be demonstrated? Many lines of evidences indicate this is the only explanation. First, achievements of the pharaohs of the 19th and 26th Dynasties are not only similar, some are unique. Second, the sources who described the history of Psammetichos and Apries have used also the name of Sethos and Hophra in the same historical context. Third, both the 26th and the 19th Dynasties have archaeological remains in the deposits of the same period. Fourth, pharaohs in both dynasties are connected to the same people in the late 8th and early 7th century. It is only a small step to infer they are the same people.

Similar achievements

Herodotus [Herodotus, II: 159] recorded 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 19th Dynasty also record that Ramesses II began to build such a canal in his reign [Budge]. In the conventional view Egyptologists are forced to debate whether Herodotus was deceived. Herodotus also described the conquests of Necho II in Syria. In the Bible Necho II advanced towards Carchemish but was met by Josiah at Megiddo (Herodotus called this city Magdolos) [II Kings 23:30]. He defeated Josiah and took Jerusalem and installed his own king named Jehoiakim.

Jeremiah also described Necho II's subsequent attack on Carchemish on the banks of the upper Euphrates River [Jer: 46]. This involved 4 divisions of troops. The result was disastrous and Necho II retreated in disarray. The Egyptian monuments also describe Ramesses II and his military forays into Syria. He also advanced with 4 divisions well into Syrian territory before receiving a major defeat. Velikovsky did a detailed comparison of the campaign of Ramesses II and Necho II and concluded that Ramesses II's attack was focused on taking Carchemish as was Necho's [Velikovsky, pp. 1-36]. Thus both Necho II and Ramesses II had similar achievements. If they are both 7th century it is difficult not to conclude the actions are of one individual not two.

Mixing histories

Herodotus mentions a Sethos, the priest of Ptah. Yet, he placed him during King Sennacherib's invasion.

“ king Sanacharib (came) against Egypt (Sethos) with a great host of
Arabians and Assyrians [Herodotus, II, 41].”

Egyptologists assumed that Herodotus had made a mistake. However, what if Herodotus is right? Then Sethos must be an 8th century pharaoh as Velikovsky propped.

After Nebuchadnezzar had defeated Necho II he came and besieged Jerusalem and captured it in the 11th year of Zedekiah [II Kings 25:1-3; Jer 52: 1-5]. The Bible mentions the name of Egypt's ruler as Pharaoh Hophra. Many Israelites rebelled against Jeremiah's word to remain in the land but instead fled to Pharaoh Hophra of Egypt [Jer. 44:30]. Hophra was interpreted by Velikovsky to be Pharaoh Merenptah, the son of Ramesses II. His full name is Merenptah Hetephermaat [Clayton, p. 156]. When the second part is hebraicized it becomes Hophra as the letter t in Egyptian is unsounded. The Greek equivalent was Apries. Note the Egyptian pharaoh who followed Necho II according to the steles at the Serapeum was named Uaibre Wahibre. The Hebrew or Greek versions of this name would not be Hophra or Apries. So the Bible and Greek sources testify to the presence of Seti I and Merenptah of the 19th Dynasty in the same historical context of the 7th/6th century 26th Dynasty.

Mixing Archaeologies

According to Herodotus Psammetichos invited Greek mercenaries to help him defeat his fellow Egyptian princes to take the crown of Egypt. As a reward he gave them two towns, one of which was Daphne or Tahpanhes (Tell Defenneh) as a home to keep them separate from the Egyptians. At Tell Defenneh Petrie excavated hundreds of Greek vases of the 7th century. Under the fortress lay a foundation deposit that contained a cartouche of Psametik I [Petrie, 1888]. This is archaeological verification of Herodotus stories and the conventional assignment of Psametik I to the 7th century.

Petrie also excavated Tell Nebesheh not far from Tanis 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 Pharaoh Amasis (569-525 BC) [Petrie, 1888]. He also found a temple of Rameses II of the 19th Dynasty and material of the 20th Dynasty. Did a Cypriote mercenary settlement occupied between 664 and 565 BC also contained Ramesside material of both the 19th and 20th Dynasty? On its face, the town existed from the 13th to the 12th century and was abandoned until the 7th century and continued until the time of Amasis II. Then Amasis II moved some of the material in Ramesses II temple into his own.

Connected Individuals

Pharaoh Taharqa ruled Egypt about 690-664 BC with brief periods of conflict with the Assyrians. They eventually won. He is mentioned in the Bible [II Kings 19:9] as coming to attack King Sennacherib, when he was besieging Jerusalem at the end of the 8th century. There ought to be no connections from the 19th Dynasty to an 8th/7th century Taharqa, yet there are several.

Strabo in the first century AD mentions that Taharqa, after retaking the Nile delta expanded his territory far north along the Mediterranean coast [Strabo, Geography, XV, i, 6]. Taharqa listed the cities he conquered in his Asian campaign. The list of Taharqa is a copy of the list of Seti I according to Petrie [Petrie, 1905, p. 297]. This really makes no sense. An Ethiopian pharaoh, having driven the Assyrians out of Egypt and liberated much of the Mediterranean coast would hardly 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. It is a 7th century Seti I who has copied Taharqa. It is possible that Seti I conducted an identical campaign and found the same Assyrian-hating allies along the way to help him. A list of the same cities conquered by Taharqa is also claimed on the list on Colossus of Ramesses II. These lists connect Taharqa the 7th century Ethiopian pharaoh to both Seti I and Ramesses II.

Haremhab had been an important official before his appointment as king of Egypt. He is seen on an inscription together with the Ethiopian Prince Taharqa of the 25th Dynasty [De Rouge]. 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 century

[Von Bissing]. The cartouche of Haremhab on a tomb of the Ethiopian period would place him in the late 8th or early 7th century.

In Haremhab's tomb on a bas-relief a group of Syrian nobles stand behind Haremhab who stands in front of the interpreter for the king [Velikovsky, 1979, pp. 5-9]. Why does the king need an interpreter? Because 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 Egyptian monuments that picture them. The only answer left was an Assyrian king.

At Saqqara, not far from Memphis, Badawi excavated a tomb of a Libyan nobleman titled the Crowned Prince Sheshonq and High Priest of Ptah. His father was Osorkon, Lord of the Two Lands [Badawi]. Haremhab's cartouche has been chiseled out of the architrave and also written on his shoulder of Prince Shoshenq with no attempt to erase it. Badawi identified his Shoshenq's father, Pharaoh Osorkon as Osorkon II but this 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. Given the other associations of Haremhab with the Ethiopians it must be Osorkon IV. Thus Haremhab was the pharaoh at the death of Prince Sheshonq, son of Osorkon IV, whose reign likely began around 730 BC. Thirty to forty years afterward, 700-690 BC would be a reasonable time for the burial of his son. Badawi also discovered a cartouche of Seti Merenptah on the back wall with no prenomen [Badawi, p. 161]. This must be Seti II, the grandfather of Seti I.

Yet, another connection comes from the Dog River near Beirut, where Ramesses II carved an inscription on a rock face. Next to this inscription was the inscription of an Assyrian King Esarhaddon who invaded Egypt in the 7th century and drove Taharqa from the Nile delta. The conventional view is that Esarhaddon put his inscription next to the Egyptian pharaoh he admired. But, Velikovsky's placement of Ramesses II in the 7th century means that it was Ramesses II who chose to place his inscription next to the Assyrian monarch.

Beth Shan is also mentioned by Herodotus [Herodotus I,103]. In the 7th century the Scythians, had conquered most of Anatolia and began raiding Palestine. They reached

Beth Shan and found that the Egyptian pharaoh Psammetichos was besieging it. A negotiation apparently took place and Psammetichos offered an alliance between the two and as a reward gave Beth Shan to the Scythians. The Scythians took the offer. At the end of the siege the main force of the Scythians continued on to Ashkelon but some remained at Beth Shan and it became known as Scythopolis.

This leads to a problem for the conventional view. If Psammetichos was responsible for the fall of Beth Shan, then why is there nothing found from the 26th Dynasty at Beth Shan? According to the current view the Iron II level ends at 700 BC and no further occupation is known until the Greek era [F. James, 1966]. Thus there was neither Psammetichos' victory, nor 26th Dynasty residence nor any Scythian occupation. Why, in the stratigraphy in Palestine, do the Iron II levels not contain artifacts of the 26th Dynasty but, instead, contain Ramesside artifacts? The conventional view has no reasonable answer to this question.

Dual names

Did pharaohs ever have two sets of prenomen and nomen? If so, what was the purpose of the double name? The 26th Dynasty is not alone in this trait. Gardiner gives Pianki or Piye two prenomen: Usimare and Sneferre, Sabaka two prenomen: Neferkare and Wahibre and Shabataka two prenomen: Djedkaure and Menkheperre [Gardiner, p. 450]. It happened occasionally that pharaohs changed their prenomen during their reigns but it is unique to the Ethiopian period that three consecutive Ethiopian emperors have a second prenomen. It is possible that the Ethiopians had one name to go with their Ethiopian titles and a second to go with their Egyptian titles.

It was not uncommon for conquering monarchs to choose to replace the defeated king. Furthermore, he often renamed the new king to suit his pleasure. When Pharaoh Necho II took Jerusalem, he took away King Jehohaz 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 land. Thus, the pharaohs, who were yoked under their Assyrian and Ethiopian masters, may have received their second throne names from them. According to the Assyrian records, the Egyptian princes

rebelled under Assurbanipal. He took them to Nineveh and executed all the rulers except “Niku”, whom he installed as king in Memphis. This can be easily seen to transliterate into the Egyptian Nekau.

The name Psametik may have an Ethiopian origin. Petrie noted that Psametik derived from the Egyptian demotic is “drinking-bowl maker” [Petrie, 1905, p. 339]. He was not impressed with this meaning for a royal name. He proposed that Psametik was a name of the same type as Shabataka, which means “wild cat’s son”. The definite article ‘ka’ placed in the inverted Ethiopian order. Substituting an Ethiopian word zam meaning lion for Shaba he proposed Zam-Ta-Ka as its etymology meaning “the lion’s son”. Thus there are possible foreign etymologies for the second names of these Egyptian pharaohs.

In Eusebius version of Manetho the 26th Dynasty began with Ammeris, then Stephinathis, Nechepsos and Necho I. The name Ammeris the first pharaoh of the 26th Dynasty sounds much like Haremhab, the first pharaoh of the 19th Dynasty. The pharaoh, who returned with the Ethiopians to defeat Ammeris or Haremhab, would be Seti Merenptah or Stephinates. The next pharaoh is his son Siptah or Necho Siptah or Nechepsos. However, it was his mother, Sitre Twosre, who ruled as his Regent. The titles of Twosre on her tomb indicated that she was a pharaoh in her own right as well as the King’s Daughter and Great Wife of Pharaoh. Her full name was Sitre Meryamen Twosre. Sitre was the name of Ramesses I wife. By marrying a King’s Daughter he qualified to be pharaoh. The conventional view has no explanation for the Ramesses I entitlement to bear the title pharaoh.

Conclusion

The Saite Dynasty pharaohs were not misplaced Persian functionaries as Velikovsky claimed. James’ call to resolve this flaw was in order. Four lines of evidence justify the identification of the Saitic and the Ramesside pharaohs as a single dynasty. Furthermore, the repeated discovery of Ramesside remains in strata that should contain Saitic artifacts is evidence that something is gravely wrong with conventional stratigraphy and Egyptian history.

Moreover, it would be very easy to disprove Velikovsky’s claim by producing the tombs of the great Psammetichos. If two tombs, one of Psammetichos and the other of Seti I,

existed they could not possibly be the same person. This would completely undermine Velikovsky's position regarding the placement of the 19th Dynasty. Psammetichos ruled 54 years and must have produced a large number of monuments. These are lacking. Similarly, the great battle Necho II fought at Carchemish must have produced some consequences for the 26th Dynasty. Necho recorded no battle scenes of this war or any war. Could these Saitic pharaohs lead Egypt into prosperity and significant military campaigns without leaving more than a few scarabs, shabtis and Apis bulls? The reader must decide.

James mentioned Velikovsky in the Preface to *Centuries of Darkness* describing him as a “wayward polymath whose work outraged scientists in many fields other than ancient history”. This is a regrettable technique in science today. To discredit one theory, a scientist refers to another failed theory in another field and, by inference, he suggests incompetence. James also goes on to refer to Velikovsky's model as “disastrously extreme” and that Velikovsky understood little of archaeology and “nothing of stratigraphy” This is another regrettable technique. When multiple disciplines are involved, experts belittle those of lesser competence in their specialty. James makes no acknowledgement of the debt owed by revisionists to Velikovsky and this is quite sad and undeserved.

References

- Badawi, A., **Das Grab des Kronenprinzen Scheschonk, Sohnes Osorkon II und Hohenpriester von Memphis**, *Annales du Service des Antiquités*, Vol. 54, 1956. p. 159ff
- Bittel, K., 1970. *Hattusha: The Capital of the Hittites*, Oxford University Press, New York
- Breasted, A., *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol 4: Sec 959-962
- 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.
- Clayton, P., *Chronicle of the Pharaohs*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1994 pp. 190-1.
- De Rouge, Le Vicompte M., 1873. **Etude sur quelque monuments du regne de Taharka**, *Melanges d'Archaeologie*, Vol. I, as cited by Velikovsky
- Gardiner A., 1960. *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford and New York, p. 450
- Grimal, N., *A History of Ancient Egypt*, 1992, Blackwell, Oxford, p. 271.
- James, F., 1966. *The Iron Age at Beth Shan: A Study of Levels VI-IV*, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia
- James, P. 1978. *SIS Review Vol III: 2* (Autumn 1978), pp. 48-55
- James, P. et al., 1993. *Centuries in Darkness*, Rutgers University Press, Brunswick, NJ.
- Strabo, *Geography*, XV, i, 6.
- Jones, Michael, 1978. , **Some Detailed Evidence from Egypt Against Velikovsky's Revised Chronology**, *Proceedings of the Glasgow Conference*, Society for Interdisciplinary Studies
- Josephus: *Against Apion*, I:26, Complete Works of Josephus as translated by Whiston, Kregel, Grand Rapids, 1960
- Petrie, W.H.F. Murray, S. Griffith, F.Ll., *Tanis, Nebeshesh, and Defenneh*, 1888.
- Petrie, W.H.F, 1905. *A History of Egypt Vol III*, Books for Libraries Press, p. 339.
- Velikovsky, I. 1978. *Ramses II and His Time*, Double Day, Garden City, NY, 1978, p. 190
- Velikovsky, I. 1979. **The Correct Placement of Haremhab in Egyptian History**, *Kronos*, Vol IV, No 3.

Von Bissing, F.W., **Das Grab des Petamenophis in Theben**, *Zeitschrift für Egyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, Vol. 74, 1938, as cited by Velikovsky