

Queen Hatshepsut of Egypt
- The Ensigned Sheba of the South -
(Egypt/Ethiopia?)

A synopsis of the full dissertation by Don Stewart
(Updated June 2011)

Queen Hatshepsut of Egypt

[The “(En-)signed Shep(b?) Of the South”] ?

A dissertation to engender debate and to seek a solution to a major problem in history.

SYNOPSIS ONLY

Don Stewart

Wellington, New Zealand, June 2011.

Emails: dons@fresher.net.nz and ttdonaldstewart@hotmail.com

Blogs:

<http://don-stewart-research.blogspot.com/>

<http://donaldstewart-researcher-mary-magdale.blogspot.com/>

Book available at:

<http://174.121.152.61/~don/book/>

“Memphis, Merneptah and Ramesses and the Winged Disk of Judah”

A New Framework for Ancient Middle Eastern History

“Oh my dove thou art in the clefts of the rock, in the secret places of the stairs.”

(Song of Solomon 2:14)

**“Seek the Lord, look unto the rock whence ye are hewn
.... Look unto Abraham your father.”**

Isaiah 51:1-2

**Rock of Ages cleft for me
Let me hide myself in Thee**

(Church Hymn)

**“A wonderful Saviour is Jesus my Lord ...
He hideth my soul in the cleft of the rock
That shadows a dry thirsty land,
He hideth my life in the depths of his love
And covers me there with His hand”. ***

* Fanny J. Crosby (1820 - 1915); Sung to music by William J. Kirkpatrick (1838 - 1921).



The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut of Egypt and Ethiopia

(Source, *A Test of Time*, by David Rohl
Century Books, 20 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, 1995)

The top half of the picture shows Hatshepsut's temple nestled in the cliffs at Deir El Bahari, near the Valley of Kings and Thebes. The lower half of the picture shows the cliffs. This photo superbly demonstrates the very notable clefts in the rock. The stairways lead into the holy of holies (*djeser djeseru*) and the cleft-ridden cliffs. On either side, engineers excavated two tunnels. They seem to lead to nowhere according to most reports by Egyptologists. The tunnels and the holy of holies form three secret places. In Jewish ritual, only the high priest went into the holy of holies. It is safe to assume this was the case for the ancient Egyptians too.

Therefore, my contention is that Hatshepsut-Sheba built this temple to reflect the words of the *Song of Solomon* (SoS 2:14) where a black woman (SoS 1:5-6) is the second party in a song where two people seek God. The woman's name is Shulamite, or she may be a Shulamite (SoS 6:13) but Sheba-Hatshepsut may well have been the inspiration, or partly so, behind the woman.

Putting these points together, the Ethiopian-Egyptian queen, daughter of Thutmose I, partner, consort or wife of Thutmose II, known to us as "Hatshepsut", designed this temple in Egypt as a sign (*h'at*) that she was the Sheba (*shep*, *sheb* or 'ruler') of the South (*Sut*, or 'Egypt and Ethiopia' and the nations living on the banks of the Nile River). The temple, situated against the peculiar cleft-filled cliff, reflects the words:

Oh my dove, *that art* in the clefts of the rock,
in the secret *places* of the stairs
(KJV, Italics inserted by translation committee)

These words help demonstrate that Hatshepsut (H'at-Sheba-Sut) could have been privy to Solomon's words in this famous song. Knowing she would be excommunicated and removed from her throne for converting to worship of Israel's God, she coded this temple's architecture to tell future generations her story. The temple's walls tell us that she "heard a voice calling her to go to the Divine Land" or "Punt". Common sense tells us the "Divine Land" is the Holy Land or Israel as it must have been in Solomon's era if in no other.

Hatshepsut was unable to finish her project. We do not know why. She may have died. She may have been overthrown. She may have abdicated. I suspect the latter and that she then returned to live with her Ethiopian people until her death. The Ethiopians resented the implied breach of the treaty they had with Egypt under Ahmose, Khamose and Thutmose 1. Both nations had agreed to unite under one crown to regulate economic and environmental disputes besetting a comparatively heavily-populated region and to resist any more invasions from Europe or Asia such as by the Hyksos (Amalekites).

Preface to the Synopsis

A friend said “People make history”. Reworking the equation, “false history unmakes people”. And that is what is happening in the Middle East today. False histories are destroying people in the Middle East. The same problem affects the West too.

Culturally, and in various other ways, the ‘West’ is the Greco-Roman world. However, countries of the “West” such as Britain, France, Spain, Germany, North America and, perhaps, Russia and ‘eastern’ Europe, have more ancient pre-‘Greco-Roman’ histories too. Those histories have been destroyed by the Greco-Roman system that has dominated since Alexander of Macedonia began his conquests in the late 4th Century BC. From Alexander to Julius Caesar and Titus, the Greeks and Romans systematically destroyed ancient documents, cities and relics of other lands. In some places, e.g., at monolithic sites in Western Europe, that process was never completed and echoes of the former societies remain in language, archaeological discoveries and traditions.

In the late 19th Century AD, ‘western’ archaeologists began uncovering a magnificent temple built into a rock-face on the other side of the Valley of the Kings in Egypt. The place is called “Deir el-Bahari”. This is the temple of 18th dynasty Queen Hatshepsut of Egypt and Ethiopia. This queen supposedly reigned in the 15th Century BC. The design of her temple resembles nothing like any other temples in Egypt, or elsewhere, but it has some similarity to images of Solomon’s Temple based on written descriptions from Jewish sources such as the Bible. Sometimes, it is even suggested that Solomon copied his temple from Hatshepsut’s design. The *Shep* in Hatshepsut’s name evokes the name “Sheba” as in “Queen of Sheba” who is the famous suzerain who visited Solomon in Jerusalem *circa* 950 BC.

Putting this aside for a moment, there are other enigmas from pre-Greek or pre-Roman times. For example, why is there a stele of Ramesses II of Egypt, supposedly reigning *circa* 1279-1210 BC, next to that of Esarhaddon of Assyria who reigned *circa* 681-668 BC? On its own that might be a strange question but Ramesses’ son and successor, “Merenptah” or Merneptah-Baenre-Hotepirmaat, becomes important in this context because of his “Israel Stele”. It has the extraordinary statement that “Israel is laid waste - its seed is no more” or “The people of Israel is desolate, it has no offspring”! (A range of interpretations is presented in a table attached to this document). This statement cannot make sense in the 13th Century BC but it does in the 6th or 7th which is close to the time of Esarhaddon who is regarded as a liberator of Egypt (from the Ethiopians).

A few decades before the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC, Chaldeans, Medes and Scythians joined forces to defeat Assyria. The Assyrians called on Egypt for assistance. That explains why an Egyptian pharaoh placed his mark alongside an Assyrian liberator. It seems much more sensible to suggest the Fall of Jerusalem and destruction of Judea in 586 BC occurred in Merneptah’s reign. However, a few years earlier Merneptah’s father, Ramesses II, could not help prevent the Fall of Assyria to the Sar (Tsar) of the Kheta (Cheda, Chedean, Chaldeans?); or Nebuchadnezzar!

[Since that paragraph was written, it became clear that before he took the title “Nebuchadnezzar” the Sar of the Kheta was “Sar Haddon” (Zzar-Chadn) or

Esarhaddon II. Thus we now believe that both steles referred to were erected at the same time after the war between Ramesses II and the Kheta-Sar or Nebuchadnezzar in circa 610 BC. The title that Sennacherib gave his son or successor, Esarhaddon, means Tsar or Sar of the Haddon or Chaldeans. This title, like “Prince of Wales”, was used by two different kings of two different nations: Sennacherib the Assyrian and Nabopolassar the Chaldean and father of the ‘Nebuchadnezzar’ who ransacked Jerusalem in 586 BC.]

Another enigma, this time affecting Greece’s history, involves the Trojan Wars. Many will be familiar with Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* or with Virgil’s *Aeneid*. The *Iliad* ends with Odysseus and the Greeks going home to various misadventures. The *Odyssey* records the adventures of the King of Ithaca. The *Aeneid* records the adventures of Aeneas as he fled Troy and eventually settled in Rome. Presumably, Virgil picked up on Homer’s work. In Virgil’s account, Aeneas firstly tried to settle in Carthage. Aeneas, a prince without a throne, tried to marry Phoenician (Tyrian) royalty by offering his hand to the Queen of Carthage. She spurned him. That set up the scene for the next few hundred years of history, presumably from circa 750 BC, the usual date for the founding of Rome, where Greece, Rome and Carthage (the Phoenician colony) battled for Mediterranean supremacy. Rome eventually emerged the winner by conquering the other two.

The enigma arises because Archaeologists and Classicists tell us, on the basis of advice from Egyptologists, that archaeological evidence at Troy, at the level which they think is of the time of the *Iliad*, shows ample evidence of Egyptian pottery and artefacts from the period of the 18th Dynasty or more commonly of the 19th Dynasty Egypt. This places the Trojan wars circa the 12th or 13th Century BC according to official Egyptian chronology. But that would be four or five hundred years before the foundation of Rome, supposedly by Aeneas, the refugee from Homer’s Trojan Wars.

Three enigmas and in each case a period or person of ancient Egypt, i.e., Hatshepsut, Ramesses and Merneptah, would seem to be four, five or six hundred years out of place. The histories of Israel, Assyria, Greece, Rome and Carthage, populated by the Phoenicians after they fled the Assyrian conquest of Tyre, can be firmly anchored to modern schemes of chronology, mainly because there are links they have with each other that can be verified by third or fourth parties. Much of Egyptian history, written in the ‘hieroglyphic scripts’, was undecipherable until the last 150 years or so. Compared to other cultures, Egypt began to offer a lot more primary material to work on once the hieroglyphs could be understood. Consequently, it seems, rather than being careful to triangulate that evidence as they piloted their way through the vast archives of Egyptian documents, steles, temples, pots etc., Egyptologists insisted that other cultures’ histories had to be re-interpreted to fit in with the emerging schema that early 20th Century Egyptologists such as Petrie, Breasted *et al* had agreed on. The academic system at the time had no mechanism to enforce adequate peer review in this area of knowledge. As a result, they embedded major errors at an early stage.

Today’s academics have been forced to accept this schema by a peer review system that reinforced itself by awarding doctorates to those who accepted the basic schema. Some have gone through that system and then proposed their alternative schemata.

Those attempts at reform did not work. Others tackled the whole thing head-on. That did not work. The approach here is to bring everyone's attention to some crucial issues and to force an independent audit by focussing on those issues.

Firstly, I look more closely at the meaning of the name "Hatshepsut". I break this name into three parts. I suggest that 'Hat' is actually the Hebrew, Semitic or Egyptian word for "sign". That is the specific new piece of information I bring to that issue. **[Another new piece of information, having studied the Hebrew text of I Kings 9:28, 10:1 and 11, is that the Hebrew *v'malchat sheba* (ומלכת שבא) conjoins the Ophir (אופירה, *Auphirah* or *Aufirah* = Africa) of I Kings 9:28 (and 10:11) with the queen's name or title in I Kings 10:1. Later copyists or redactors, perhaps confused by the Hebrew and the history, may have changed it slightly. Or modern readers of the Hebrew are misreading it. Whatever the actual situation, it seems far more sensible to accept that *shba* (שבא) in I Kings 10:1 refers to the Hebrew verb to sit, administer, deliver legal opinions or rule. This could just as easily have been the word in Egyptian which had many Semitic words or Semitic may have been the official language at times].**

Secondly, from an **economic** perspective and from a review of some linguistics, I look at the location of "Punt" - Hatshepsut's mysterious 'trade-partner'. This brings Tyre, Byblos (the Lebanon or Levant) and Israel into connection with Egypt.

Thirdly, I look at three consecutive kings of Egypt about whom we have sound knowledge though their chronological position is enigmatic. They are Seti, Ramesses II and Merneptah of the 19th dynasty. We can verify their historicity from Egypt's sources but Merneptah's statement that "Israel's Seed is Destroyed" makes no sense in the 13th Century BC. **[By 2004-5, this part took priority on discovering William Flinders Petrie's excavation reports of Memphis Egypt (1908-14) when I was visiting the newly rebuilt and refurbished University of Otago Library, Dunedin, New Zealand. A century ago, the University and the Museum, both part of the same organisation at the time, had sent funds to support Petrie's expeditions in the Middle East. I had returned to New Zealand after some time in Israel and London discussing my synopsis with 'experts' only to be exasperated at their refusal to seriously discuss these issues on the basis that they would need to "study the excavation reports". This does not normally bother them so why did it with my research? That led to the production of my book *Memphis, Merneptah and Ramesses and the Winged Disk of Judah* which I subtitle "A New Framework for Ancient Middle Eastern History". This is freely available at <http://174.121.152.61/~don/book/>]**

Why do all this?

I go back to the point that if "people make history" then false history destroys people. And "those who do not study history are doomed to repeat its mistakes". Is that not happening in the Middle East now? Do we want the area laid waste once again? People ask, "can the narratives of the primary participants in the Middle East Crisis be changed?" A proper understanding of history shows that they can.

But the other immediate problem is for the so-called “West” with its democracy and systems of education, science and justice. What justice is there in allowing academics to reinforce a scheme of history that simply bears no relationship to common sense, buries or ignores obvious enigmas, and, if we are to consider scientific approaches, is completely unable to make any predictions about current events from the model?

If the academic and peer review system can allow contradiction to prevail in this particular body of (‘Western’) knowledge, where else might the same thing be happening? What’s happening in genetics, economics, physics, linguistics or origins? Episodes in the USA such as September 11 (2001), the Arthur Anderson - Enron Corporation auditing fiasco and the 2007-8 Financial Crisis exacerbated by the financial shenanigans of Goldman Sachs show that the West is susceptible to hypocrisy from within and danger from without. At the moment the ‘West’ very closely resembles Byzantium which fell to a motley crew of hooligans who unblocked a small drain in an obscure corner of the city walls. The Fall of Byzantium was a bit like Odysseus and the Trojan Horse or Cyrus the Mede who dammed the waters of the Euphrates and got his soldiers to crawl into Babylon through its sewers (*Ditto the West?*)

Alternatively, we can revisit the history of the pre-Greek or pre-Roman world so that we can better understand the world which we currently study through the ‘spin’ of Greek and Roman philosophy. For example, in regard to British history, we can re-evaluate the history of writing in Britain and ask if there was writing before the Romans brought their Latin alphabet. Indeed, how did the Romans develop their alphabet? What are the ‘Iberian’ influences on British history that historians darkly refer to? Recently Ireland’s Punt (Pound) got subsumed within the Euro. The Pound remains defiantly independent. If Britain joins the Euro, will it upset the balance too much and sink the US Dollar? If it joins the Dollar, will it sink the Euro? In a battle between the Euro and the Dollar, what happens to the Pound? What is it about the British that they own the world language, had a massive empire, still have a considerable presence in world affairs and, so far, insist on keeping their own currency? Britain’s culture and history seems to have echoes of the Hill (or *Byrsa*) of Carthage in its Pound (Punt), purses, bursaries and bourses. It controls Gibraltar (or *Gebel-Tariq*), former base of the cities of Tyre and Byblos (Hebrew “*Gebel*”) of Phoenicia. Are we watching a rerun of Greece versus Rome versus Carthage all over again in the Battle of the Euro-Dollar-Pound? Are some ancient rivalries being played out once again here? **[I have since developed or refined a First-Last view of history based on a new look at Biblical prophecy through the *Alpha-Omega*, *Aleph-Tav* or *Rishon-Acheron* principle. That will be explained elsewhere (3-D Bible Study System, refer [http reference above](#))]**.

Speaking of ancient rivalries, many people of Israel have returned to their homeland from all over the world. Merneptah (Hophra) boasted that they were finished as a people. But Merneptah’s very significant statement has been buried in the 13th Century BC where it has no meaning. Why? It is about time we re-investigated the problem

This synopsis was prepared in 2004. Since then, after further research as above in regard to Nebuchadnezzar and Esarhaddon, I have been able to refine the synopsis. As above, I will insert new points or information within square brackets and in bold type.

Synopsis (of parts 1,2 and 3)

Introduction

The full dissertation will suggest that “Hat-shep-sut”, Queen of Egypt and Ethiopia, where ‘Hat’ is האת or האות (Hebrew or Semitic for ‘The Sign’): can be read as;

H'aut-shep(b)-sut, or;

“the ensigned (H'aut) (or H'at) Sheba (Shep) of the South (Sut)”

In the Bible, the Old Testament strongly implies that the “Queen of Sheba” decided to visit Israel (Jerusalem) on the basis of a report (singularity emphasized) she received concerning Solomon’s Israel. The New Testament says “the Queen of the South” came to hear Solomon’s wisdom but there it is implied she came on the basis of a sign (singularity again emphasized). The voyage to Punt is recorded on the walls of Hatshepsut's temple at Deir el-Bahari. Within the constraints of translation from hieroglyphics, some confusion about her later career and a considerable effort to expunge her history from official archives, some interpret those records to say she “heard the voice of a god” (singularity and indefinite article emphasized) asking her to visit Punt (or “God's Land” or “Divine Land”). [Refer: Montet, page 187.]

Part 1 of the full dissertation will consider the possibility that Hatshepsut of Egypt is therefore “The Queen of Sheba”. Part 2 will look at the case for identifying “Punt” as Israel and/or the Phoenician cities. “Punt” is the land(s) that Hatshepsut visited. Her reliefs at Deir el-Bahari suggest she went to Punt in person. Part 3 will consider a review of the careers of Seti, Rameses II and Merneptah to consider whether Merneptah is the Pharaoh contemporary with the Jewish exile to Babylon or a Pharaoh contemporary with Moses. Part 3 acts as a check on the important issue (hypothesis) being raised here in connection with a placement of Hatshepsut in Solomon’s time:

That the chronologies of the pharaohs of Egypt, as described and explained by modern scholars, are grossly out of synchronisation with the chronologies of rulers of surrounding nations.

This issue has been raised in recent times by several authors (refer below). In general, these authors barely touched on the theological perspectives that are inevitably raised by the personal theologies of these ancient rulers and of the people they ruled. The ‘secular’ approach of most scholars and commentators failed to notice certain theological links. For example, possible links between Hatshepsut and ‘Sheba’, between Merneptah and ‘Hophra’ (Jeremiah 44:30) or even between Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 3:7) and Esarhaddon (Ezra 4:2), the two ‘chiefs of the Chaldeans’ who sought to impose new religions on the nations they subjugated. Either these rulers were deeply religious people. Or, they were cynical manipulators of religion, using it to further their political objectives. However, their behaviour has been examined, mostly, by non-religious people. For example, modern scholars or commentators never considered that Hatshepsut/Sheba had a religious conversion during her visit to Punt/Israel. Secularists, by definition, know little about ‘conversion’. In that sense

they are handicapped for they cannot recognise in others something they have not themselves experienced. The religious or spiritual person is more able to understand this and be alert to evidence of it.

The secularists did not consider the theological impact of the fall, after Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, of the great holy city of Jerusalem (Kadesh?) on the ancient world. Nor have they considered the changes this brought about in world religions in the ensuing decades. The Fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC is of little consequence to modern commentators because the claims made by the people of ancient Israel were never fully accepted, least of all by modern theologians, archaeologists, historians and Egyptologists. Merneptah-Hophra certainly believed Israel was destroyed forever!

According to the New Testament (Matt 12:42, Luke 11:31, implied by the term "the south") and Flavius Josephus [*Antiquities of the Jews*, Bk. VIII, ch.6, s(5)], the queen who visited Solomon ruled "Egypt and Ethiopia". There is only one queen of any significance who ruled both Egypt and Ethiopia both south of Israel. She is very well known to us. Her name is Hat-shep(b?)sut. *Ipsa facto*, on the basis of this coincidence, and without considering any other factors at this point, she could be the contemporary of Solomon even if only because the name 'shep' or 'sheb' appears in the middle of this name. There is no possibility that we can remove Solomon back some five centuries of time to fit in with the chronological schema that places Hatshepsut in the 15th Century BC. Therefore, at the very least, we have to move forward in time by over 400 years a dynasty of Egyptian history, or part of a dynasty. Sir Isaac Newton realised there was a problem three centuries ago. Although the worlds of Kepler and Newton continue to move, the world of Egyptology is rigidly fixed in a dead scheme.

The dissertation investigates some theological issues that have been overlooked by other people investigating Josephus' account and the Scriptural accounts. The New Testament account strongly implies that the Queen of the South responded to a calling based on one piece of evidence, or "sign", in stark contrast to many "signs" given to those being addressed. Specifically, this means the two New Testament references to the "Queen of the South" have to be looked at in the full context of the gospel texts. The gospels themselves must in turn be considered in the full context of the Old Testament. All this has to be in the context of a Jewish perspective because these texts are written in Hebrew and concern the Israelite nation. Only when this is done will it be possible to understand the otherwise enigmatic reference to the "Queen of the South" in the New Testament. Both Matthew and Luke devote barely one verse to this personality, yet the context is overwhelmingly crucial as it turns out. The Old Testament (I Kings 10:6) refers to a "report" (*Devar*, ↔ דבר), again in the singular, on which Sheba acted. Josephus (*op.cit*), in contrast, says "reports (plurality emphasised) that went every day abroad induced her to come to him, she being desirous to be satisfied by her own experience, **and not by a bare hearing** ..." (singularity again emphasised).

Could it be that Flavius Josephus was aware of the theological implications of the New Testament statements about the "Queen of the South"? If that is so, it very strongly suggests that New Testament letters and documents were circulating in Jewish circles before the fall of Jerusalem in AD 66 - 70. On the one hand, Josephus wanted to cite

the visit of a very famous Head of State of yesteryear to enhance the antiquity of his beloved country, people and rulers. On the other hand, he wanted to weaken the claims or beliefs of either Jews, or of 'Christians' many of whom would have been Jewish in those days, who might be able to raise contentious theological points on the issue. On the one hand he wanted to attach the status of a very important person's visit to his country because it suggests very strongly that the Lower came to visit the Higher. On the other hand, to ease his own internal cognitive dissonance, he had to downplay the response of another generation of Israel's leadership - his contemporaries, peers and colleagues - to an important candidate for the Messiahship of Israel. All of Josephus' readers and commentators are faced with the same dilemma. In their ignorance, modern western commentators never realised that Josephus' discussion on the number of reports the queen heard actually revealed deep theological arguments. This revelation or discovery is raised by the implication, drawn from both Testaments of the Bible, that Sheba was given one sign ("report" in the Old Testament) either by 'God' (implied in the New Testament), or by "a god" (Deir el-Bahari reliefs) and she acted on it. Whereas Josephus' contemporaries had received many signs concerning a claimant as Messiah (Jesus of Nazareth, אֶת־נֹצֵר, ↔ *et nazar*, the branch) but rejected all of them.

The Hypothesis

A few years ago, when the modern State of Israel brought the "Falasha" Jews out of Ethiopia the organisers called the rescue programme "Operation Sheba". When the late Anwar Sadat said he would go "to the ends of the earth for peace" [Gilbert, M.] to seek peace with Israel, the Egyptian President, speaking from nearby Cairo, used the same phrase as Jesus did when he referred to the "Queen of the South" who came "from the **utmost parts of the earth** to hear the wisdom of Solomon" (Luke 11:31).

Perhaps Hatshepsut's desire to do this put her on a collision course with the Egyptian army, its protege the future Thutmose III, but more importantly, on her return, with the priests of Amun when they learned of her conversion (apostasy). Disagreements with any of these rivals probably explain what seems to have been the sudden or rapid demise of an otherwise popular Hatshepsut as implied by the Egyptian record. Was she executed after making a peace treaty like Anwar Sadat? Was she excommunicated? Did she abdicate and retire because of widespread opposition in Egypt to her policies?

The Bible, in the *Books of the Kings* and *Chronicles of Israel*, has the earliest known record of this person. In two almost identical reports, the Old Testament commits several verses to the "Queen of Sheba's" state visit to the King of Israel. Most English translations of the Old Testament translate the Hebrew as "Queen of Sheba". Normally, on strict grounds of interpretation, there seems little doubt that the Hebrew might have to be interpreted that way. However, if the region that a monarch ruled was ill-defined, or contested, it might be simpler for a scribe to refer to the realm under the name or title of its ruler. Normally, the Bible follows convention and names the monarch and the country he (or she) rules. Under circumstances where boundaries are being (re-) established this convention may not have been practical for the scribe at that time. This may have been the case for Hatshepsut, including the question of her status. We know from Egyptian records of the 18th Dynasty that it was expansionist (apart from during the

Hatshepsut and Ahkenaten periods). We know that it inherited provinces of the former Hyksos empire. Some of those provinces may have been in dispute amongst neighbours. Furthermore, we know that Ethiopia and Egypt had, during some periods anyway, a united monarchy. Against that background it may well have been more politically correct to refer to the “Land of Hatshepsut” or to the “Land of Thutmose” [refer endnote (2) on Thutmose]. Hence, assuming Hatshepsut is Sheba, the “*Malchat Sheva*” (↔ מלכת שבא) of the Hebrew text might be better understood as “Queen of the land (realm) of Sheba” or even just simply “Queen Sheba”. Therefore, Sheba became a personal name.

[Another interpretation is emerging from a review of the Hebrew. The term *Malchat Sheva* is preceded with a vav conjunctive (ו). This means the sentence introduced by the vav must be read in context with the previous verse, with a previous verse or with some other verse elsewhere in the text. In this case, we read of the land of “Ophir” in I Kings 9:28 (and II Chronicles 8:18). The vav conjunctive really requires us to recognise the queen as ruler (or *shba*, שבא) of Ophir. Furthermore, when we take a closer look at the spelling of “Ophir” we read it in Hebrew as אופירה or Auphirah. The form “Ophir” comes from earlier readings of this place in the form אפיר or Aphir literally. The various committees which have translated the Bible preferred to give consistent translations for place names, even if the Hebrew varied in the original text, to make things easier for the reader or keep them less complicated. In this case, the policy is unfortunately misleading. As linguists would easily recognise, “Auphirah” is Africa (*Ofriha*). Furthermore, the Hebrew שבא is often read as meaning to sit and judge. A *Sheba* or *shba* is one who officiates, often outside a city gate. The very act of inserting chapter and verse numbers as above tends to mislead the western reader. He is used to seeing chapters commencing new segments etc. However, the Hebrew text was written with a view that the reader will seamlessly include information from sentence to sentence or line to line without artificial segmentation via chapters and verses. The vav conjunctives assure the reader he must connect information in that way. Two other examples can be found in Genesis 22:19 and 23:1 where only a few verses separate the apparently split context. However, the rule breaks down between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2 unless one recognises that Genesis 1:2 requires the reader to understand the events of Ezekiel 28:12-19, specifically verse 15 where it is the iniquity of Satan when he ruled Earth from the a former ‘mineral’ Garden of Eden that led to the destruction and chaos (*Tohu ve Bohu*) of Genesis 1:2. Thus we now conclude that the queen who came to see Solomon was the ruler (*sheba*) of Africa (*Ophir*, Egypt and Ethiopia).]

A clue that there might be a problem comes from the New Testament. The Books of Matthew and Luke describe her as the “Queen of the South”. This poses an immediate problem because an obvious question arises. How is the woman called in one place (i.e., in the ‘Old Testament’ or the *Tanaach* of Judaism) the “Queen of Sheba” and in the other the “Queen of the South”? Are these two places one and the same? Are the passages corrupted? Or, are these two Biblical passages, and Josephus’ extra point that she was Queen of Egypt and Ethiopia, without any historical foundation whatsoever?

As far as is known, the sources quoted above are the three earliest accounts of the so-called "Queen of Sheba". Mythical or historical, this queen still captures the attention of those interested in antiquity. These main 'sources' are Jewish. Two are Scriptural sources and the other comes from Josephus who was probably a secularist. In many places in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus quotes Scripture almost verbatim. However, in respect to the land of the queen, or "woman" who at that time visited Solomon, Josephus clearly and distinctly nominates Egypt and Ethiopia. He is usually footnoted at this point by 'modern scholars' who think he is wrong. Usually, they suggest that South Yemen (Saba) is Sheba's country.

There are Arab traditions about this queen but, as far as anyone knows, they are of more recent origin than the oldest Jewish sources.

Another source that might be nearly as old as some of the Jewish sources is the Ethiopian record that the name of the queen who visited Solomon is *Makeda*. This name has been popularized by sects such as the Ras-Tafarians. But the name is very similar to an alternative name for Hatshepsut found on Egyptian stelas "*Makera*" (*Maatkare*). For those unfamiliar with Hebrew, the letters *reysh* (ר) and *daleth* (ד) are quite similar in appearance. That is also true for the Phoenician 'r' and 'd' which might be important if Ethiopian records were ever transcribed from source documents in Phoenician. Ethiopia has an ancient tradition in regard to both Judaism and Christianity. The New Testament presents a case of an Ethiopian reading a scroll of Isaiah (Acts 8:27-30). It seems reasonable to assume that scroll was written in Hebrew. That suggests manuscripts written in Hebrew (or less likely but not improbably in Phoenician) may have been circulating in Ethiopia in antiquity. Thus a text in Hebrew, or a text containing a Hebrew transliteration of "*Makera*" might well have been written somewhere. Consequently, it might be that '*Makera*' could have been misread from an original script in Hebrew as '*Makeda*'.

The nub of the problem is an apparent confusion of names and places. The confusion is not helped by the fact that many of these 'names', especially Egyptian royal titles, are really segments from often long-winded titles. Potentially, we have a situation where Jewish scribes in Israel read one segment of a title while Ethiopians read another segment, visiting Greeks such as Herodotus or modern scholars yet another. Furthermore, when there was a deliberate Egyptian campaign to erase or destroy most of Hatshepsut-Sheba's archives, correspondence and monuments; it is unlikely that much evidence supporting these conjectures will turn up. To some extent, under existing conventions especially of The Academy, scholars have little option but to conclude that stories about the "Queen of Sheba", or most if not all information in them, have little basis in historical reality.

The Koran (Holy Book of Islam) and the Kebra Negast (Holy Book of the Ras Tafarians) also refer to the Queen of Sheba. Most modern Jews will say she was an Ethiopian. The Ethiopians, including both the Christian and Jewish sects, have no doubt that she was their queen. However, the Muslims, especially the Arab Muslims, like to think that she came from southern Arabia and this view is generally supported by western academia. Though it seems odd that western academics should give more credence to the opinion of the Muslims or Arabs when the two principal nations involved - Israel

and Ethiopia - mutually agree on the Ethiopian and/or Egyptian link.

Although the Arab and Ethiopian sources are worthy of study in regard to this issue they are, at the moment, beyond the resources of this student. Therefore the dissertation will follow the Jewish sources apart from where other sources are quoted by commentators. Anyway, the Jewish sources benefit from certain editorial disciplines that make them inherently superior to other sources because of the strict editorial control that was always exercised in regard to the Scriptures. This discipline is often overlooked by scholars. For that reason, the Hebrew version that we have today of the Old Testament (*Tanaakh*) is regarded here as the only primary written document, although, as the discussion proceeds, certain documents will be found to have been embedded in stone soon after the events occurred. One cannot get much more primary than that. If Hatshepsut is proved to be Sheba, the data written on stone at Deir el-Bahari is about as primary as you can get.

To summarise, the three Jewish sources, albeit quite independently of each other, and translated into the English, deliver us the following equation for the hypothesis:

Sheba (of Ophir) = The South = Ethiopia and Egypt.
(Old Testament) (New Testament) (Flavius Josephus)

How can the Sheba (of Ophir) be the same ruler as the “Queen of the South” or the “Queen Ethiopia and Egypt”? The solution is potentially quite simple. The “South” in Jewish tradition, in contradistinction to the East (Mesopotamia) or the North (Syria, Assyria or even Russia) always refers to Egypt, the Sudan, and the Nile civilization generally. Ethiopia is normally referred to as “Cush” but there is no reason why it would not have been included in the generic term ‘south’ as well. Or, the term ‘south’ could refer to the region between Egypt and Cush (i.e., the modern “The Sudan”) but a broader application for the region stretching from the Mediterranean coast of Egypt to somewhere deep in “Ethiopia” (actually The Sudan using modern boundaries) seems more likely. Josephus is quite right to imply that Egypt and Ethiopia were occasionally united under one monarch. Modern archaeological interpretations of hieroglyphic inscriptions confirm this. In that context one could describe these regions either by the names of their capitals, e.g., Thebes, or by a general term e.g., the “South” (c.f. the “States”, “Washington” or “Europe”). In modern economics the poorer countries are referred to as “The South” in contradistinction to the rich “North”. Another way to describe a regional boundary is in terms of the name of the ruling monarch, or dynasty e.g., Elizabethan England, Angevin England or the empire of Genghis Khan.

Despite this, a survey of most Christian and Secular commentators will show that “Sheba” is generally assumed to be a region in the Yemen in the south of the Arabian Peninsula. The discovery of a kingdom with a name resembling “Sheba” (Seba?) in the Yemen, even if it was of little importance until the Assyrian period about 150 years after Solomon, led some to support the view that she was the queen of that country. This assumption is not entirely unreasonable but another option, rarely considered, is that Yemen/Aden/Oman could also have been one part of the (former) kingdom of ‘Sheba’ which was nevertheless an Ethiopian/Egyptian kingdom governed from Thebes which itself could be read as *Sebe* (Sheba). The Yemen (Aden) could have been annexed by

the Ethiopians (Cushites) and incorporated within a wider commonwealth involving Egypt, Ethiopia, (The Sudan?) and Saba-Yemen-Aden. A commonwealth of sorts, perhaps similar to one incorporating Israel, Phoenicia and perhaps Syria, makes it easier to differentiate or explain the various references to Sheba, Saba or even Sabea in the Bible. Werner Keller in *The Bible as History* says the Frenchman Halevy and the Austrian Glaser, found a city called Marib and they found inscriptions in Marib which referred to the Kingdom of Sheba (or Seba). The Bible seems to confirm that a kingdom by the name of Sheba or Seba existed in that part of Arabia but, like a tail wagging a dog, western academics seem to have allowed the less significant place become the origin of a very important suzerain. Realistically, the equation above forces us to resort to the African continent, specifically the Nile civilizations, rather than the Arabian peninsula, as the origin for the Old Testament's "Queen of Sheba". And, of course, as later research revealed, *sheba* (שֶׁבָא) in the Bible may refer to the function of administration rather than a geographical location.

From a full survey of the appearance of the words "Sheba" and "Seba" (personal name and country) in the Bible it does not seem possible to make any firm conclusions from about 33 references to "Sheba", "Sheva", "Seba", or, in one case "Shebah". There isn't any consistent pattern. It is precisely because of this lack of consistency that these regions, wherever they were, might have been independent, subject to greater powers or part of a commonwealth, customs union or some other entity at various times in their history. In Psalm 72:10, Sheba and Seba appear as two separate locations i.e., "Sheba and Seba". If "Seba" is the kingdom in southern Yemen that implies "Sheba" is elsewhere. But this is not sufficient to conclude that Sheba is definitely not Yemen. Although this issue is looked at seriously, the discussion on this point becomes academic if it is accepted that the queen who visited Solomon came either from Ethiopia or Egypt, or ruled both countries and possibly "The Yemen" as well. The equation presented above is stronger evidence that Egypt and Ethiopia, or "The South", somehow equate with Sheba or the personae thereof. It does not seem sensible to reject Josephus on a basic matter of geography. We may reject Josephus on other grounds, for example in regard to his link of the Jews with the Hyksos in Egypt but that mistake was probably due to a telescoping of time. That is understandable in the absence of common standards for chronological sequences between countries which we have today with the modern 'Roman' calendar. Moses lived with the Midianites, who might have been allies of the Hyksos, but that is not enough evidence to link the Jews with the Hyksos. Besides, Jethro the Midianite came to meet Moses to show that he did not approve of his fellow tribesmen ganging up against Israel (Exodus 18:1-12).

However, the names and approximate boundaries of great powers like Egypt, Assyria, Ethiopia and Babylon **were** well known to people of the calibre of Josephus; or Luke, whose detailed observations of the procedures of a crew in a ship caught in a violent storm on the Mediterranean (Acts 27) confirm Luke, at least, as a reliable reporter of the facts. Josephus must have had good reason to say the queen who visited Solomon ruled Egypt and Ethiopia. Compared to our generation, he lived 2000 years closer in time to the event. Modern academics need more than a passing resemblance to similarly-sounding names (Sheba - Seba) to dismiss Josephus on a matter of basic geography. Of course the problem here is that only one woman is known to have been queen of both Egypt and Ethiopia and this is the outstanding case of *Hat-shep(b?)-sut*

(emphasis added).

One context in the Old Testament passages on the “Queen of Sheba” is that “all (the kings of) the earth sought the face of Solomon” (I Kings 10:23-24). Having mentioned “all the kings of the earth” the record only goes into the details of the visit by, oddly enough, a queen. That in itself is strange because the previous statement suggests ‘kings’ were the norm in the world in those days. Queens of any significance in the millennia before Christ were indeed rare. Furthermore, the Hebrew context, indeed Hebrew literary technique, suggests that this “Queen” was the most significant person out of the general group to have visited Solomon or to have “sought his face”. The only country or countries in about the year 950 BC that might have sufficient status to warrant special mention are obviously Egypt and/or Ethiopia, or perhaps Babylon or Assyria. A representative from the Indus civilizations or from China might be a candidate but it is assumed here that is unlikely. If she was queen of China (*Sinim*, סִינִים, Isaiah 49:12) or India (*Hodu*, הֲדוּ, Esther 1:1) the Bible would probably have told us. That is why Ophir, which is mentioned in the verses concerning this queen, must be even more likely the destination she set out from to come and meet Solomon. “Ophir” introduces the account about the “queen sheba” (I Kings 9:28) and more or less concludes the account in I Kings 10:11.

Put in these terms, the problem becomes one with high stakes because the only possible female candidate, on the basis of known monarchs to have ruled those regions, is Hatshepsut of Egypt. Conventionally, Hatshepsut is dated from the end of the 15th Century BC or some 500 years before Solomon. This dating seems to rule her out. Indeed, nearly everyone does rule her out on that basis! The stakes are high because Egyptian history would have to be completely restructured or re-written if Hatshepsut is indeed Sheba. It would be impossible to separate this one monarch out of the 18th Dynasty and put her into a later dynasty so the whole dynasty would have to be shifted forward in time. Then most if not all other Egyptian dynasties would be affected in a similar way. It is possible that a yet-undiscovered monarch fits the evidence more neatly but this dissertation, like any other commentary on the matter, only covers the evidence to hand.

Merneptah-Baenre-Hotepirmaat and the Israel Stela

This is not the only serious problem. An even odder mystery is why the first reference to “Israel” from Egyptian records, Egypt being an obviously important ‘next-door’ neighbour of Israel, is apparently Merneptah’s statement that “the people of Israel is desolate, it has no offspring” or that “Palestine has become a widow for Egypt” (refer Appendix from page 50). The only time that Israelite chroniclers ever used words such as “widow” (Jeremiah’s Lamentations 1:1) or ‘divorced’ (Hosea 2:2,7, Jeremiah 3:8) in reference to “Israel” was during the period of the Assyrian Exile (720 BC) or more completely during the Babylonian Exile (600 BC). As the popular song wails, “By the Rivers of Babylon”. Although Merneptah is conventionally dated in the late 13th Century BC (*circa* 1210 BC), the desolation of Israel cannot reasonably be dated earlier than the late 8th Century (for the northern kingdom) or the early 6th Century BC for Judah (the southern kingdom) which completed destruction of the independent Israelite nation of the Biblical period. From a Biblical point of view, it is the destruction of Judah and

Jerusalem that causes the greater sense of utter desperation. Merneptah, assuming he was not prophesying, would seem to be anywhere from five to seven centuries premature with his statement unless he too could have been placed in the wrong time zone by the archaeologists.

Another clue that Merneptah has been put in a chronologically enigmatic position comes from the prophecy in Jeremiah 44:30 that “I will give Pharaoh-hophra king of Egypt into the hands of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life”. Merneptah, who was killed by a crowd that stormed his palace, is more fully known as *Merneptah-Baenre-Hotepirmaat*. Linguistic conventions allow for the third part of this name to be shortened to hophra'ma because the ‘t’ and vowels like ‘i’ can be lost in speech especially when converting from one language to another.

The plot thickens when Merneptah’s predecessor is examined. Rameses II, supposedly the best candidate for the pharaoh who made life difficult for the Israelite slaves bonded in Egypt, had a major foreign opponent called the Chief of the Kheta. In a treaty of which two extant copies exist, one found in Egypt, the other found in Boghazkoi in Turkey, the Egyptian refers to the “Chief of the Kheta” or “Ketasar”. This name could be read: Sar (Tsar) of the Kheta (Kheda). [Velikovsky, (2)].

The warrior who sacked Jerusalem, causing Jeremiah to write “Jerusalem is a widow” (Lamentations 1:1) is known to the world, mainly from Biblical texts, as Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon. One of the favoured gods of Babylon, “Nebo”, appears in his name (*Nebu*). From these sources it appears that “Nebuchadnezzar” is none other than Nebo-khet(d)a-sar. The ‘zz’ is one convention used to differentiate the sound ‘s’ from ‘Ts’, which sounds, to the English ear, more like ‘z’, as in “Tsar” (c.f. Tsars of Russia). A similar convention is used in the Welsh language where ‘pp’ is pronounced ‘f’ and ‘dd’ pronounced ‘t’. The adjective of Kheda could well be Khedean or Chaldean. The English word ‘Chaldean’ comes from other middle-eastern or Greek names for this people the Jews called Kasdiymah (Gk. Chaldaios, Χαλδαῖος; Heb. ↔ כשדימה, or כשדי). Thus, someone with the title “the chief of the Chaldeans” became the King of Babylon. If Nebuchadnezzar and Ramesses II were contemporaries then the successor of Ramesses II, i.e., Merneptah, would be in a much better position, temporally speaking, to write “Palestine” is a “widow” or “Israel” is “desolate”. Nebuchadnezzar’s name in Hebrew is נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר where ‘כדנ’ is Chadne or the adjective Chade(a?)n. His successor was Belshazzar (בלשאצר) which implies “God’s (i.e., Bel’s) King of Kings” (c.f. Daniel 2:37 in relation to Nebuchadnezzar) or “Shah of Tsars”. The third ruler in the land (in Belshazzar’s reign) was Daniel himself in Daniel 2:26 and 5:29 and they entitled him “Belteshazzar” [בלטשאצר - refer Endnote (1) “Belteshazzar”] or “chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon” (Daniel 2:48) because “your God is a God of gods and a Lord of kings and a revealer of secrets” (Daniel 2:47).

Of course these names are transliterations or translations from one language c.f., Chaldean via others, e.g., Aramaic, Hebrew or even Greek and eventually into English (with its *quasi* Hebrew alphabet). One such transliteration is that of Esarhaddon (Ezra 4:2) or ↔ אסר חדן. The first thing to note here is that most English translations merge the two Hebrew words (Esar Haddn) into one (Esarhaddon). The Hebrew ‘(e)Sar’ means ‘prince’ and ‘haddon’ (‘חדן’) is simply the כדנ in Nebuchadnezzar except that in

the Book of Ezra, the scribe has (probably) used *Chet* (ח) to write 'כדנ' instead of *Kaf* (כ) for the 'ch' sound. This is probably a matter of dictation. Ezra was a 'ready' scribe which probably meant he wrote from shorthand or dictation (Ezra 7:6). A tendency to have trouble, in speech or in dictation, distinguishing the *Kaf* (כ) from the *Chet* (ח) is a familiar problem even amongst modern speakers of Hebrew. There is not any argument here. It is nonsense to suggest that somehow the 'authority' of Scripture is desecrated here. It is simply a matter of semantics - 'חדן' is 'כדנ' ! And, almost certainly it refers to the place we know as Chaldea or to the people known as Chaldeans! One might argue that a *Lamed* (ל) is missing in the Hebrew (*viz* 'חלדן') but a Jewish scribe familiar with "Kasdiymah" and listening to the name might never think to insert 'L' or *Lamed* while he was transcribing. Even in English the 'L' is weak though not as weak as in words like 'calm' or in towns like Holborn (in London).

The point above provides an excellent demonstration of the way in which we can use a proper reconstruction of ancient middle-eastern history to explain otherwise obscure problems. The chequered history of the Chaldeans is just another national history that can be put back together when we correct the chronologies. There is an enigmatic reference to the Chaldeans in Isaiah 23:13. There Assyria seems to be involved in the reconstruction of a national homeland for the dispersed Chaldeans, prior to the rise of the Chaldean dynasty of Babylon under Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar. So the reference is actually very easy to explain and this is examined in the dissertation. Poor old Assyria; the Chaldeans later bit the hand that fed them when, with the help of the Medes and the Scythians, they participated in the former's demise.

If Nebuchadnezzar is Chief of the Ch-d-n ('כדנ') and Esarhaddon is Prince of the H-dd-n ('חדן'), until now, the question has been "who were the Ch-d-n or the H-dd-n"? Both had the title before they became 'king'. Prince Charles, heir to the British throne is "The Prince of Wales". Most likely we have here a title borne by at least two monarchs, albeit of different (ethnic) dynasties, i.e., The Prince of 'Chaldea' or of the 'Chaldeans'. We know Nebuchadnezzar was a 'Chaldean', because this is explicit in the Biblical texts, but was Esarhaddon an 'Assyrian' or a 'Chaldean'? Did Sennacherib have a Chaldean queen (wife)? The title could expand across ethnic groups, just as Henry VIII was a Tudor (Welsh) Prince of Wales as Edward Plantagenet (English but technically born in Wales) or George Hanover (German origin) were also 'Princes of Wales'. There is no problem having an Assyrian heir apparent as 'Prince of the Chaldeans' in principle. The same political or constitutional principle is currently used by the 'British' to unite two nations in the aftermath of a conquest, be it the English over the Welsh or Assyrians over Chaldeans (or *vice versa*).

The ethnicity of Nebuchadnezzar might be questioned. Even the precise 'ethnic' status of the Chaldeans might be unclear. Were they an ethnic group or perhaps more of a class? Isaiah 23:13, *Genesis* and the *Book of Job* help to cast some light on this. However, when it comes to royalty the distinctions blur because in modern Europe we have kings and consorts descending from a small group of interrelated families that rule, or have ruled, countries as far afield as Britain and Bulgaria (c.f. Prince Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh, consort to Queen Elizabeth II). The Queen's consort is sometimes nicknamed "Phil the Greek", albeit somewhat erroneously.

Another coincidence is that the predecessor of Rameses II, Seti, has the name, if read in full, "Seti-Ptah-Maat". Sometime in the 6th Century BC, Herodotus the Greek historian visited Egypt. As far as we know, he did not read hieroglyphics. Probably, someone in Egypt translated them for him. We do not know how good the translator was. We do not know if that translator used exactly the same principles for reading hieroglyphs that our 'scholars' use. Our scholars have not been consistent and their methods and translations have changed over the years. Also, it is unlikely that ancient scholars who did understand hieroglyphs were consistent in either use or interpretation of them. As demonstrated above, precise accuracy is virtually impossible anyway and sometimes common sense would prevail. Herodotus wrote about a king called "Psammetichus". This name is simply a re-arrangement, or one possible arrangement, of a cartouche of hieroglyphics for "Seti-Ptah-Maat" with the Greek suffix 'us' added on. According to Herman Kees, *Ancient Egypt - A Cultural Topography*, Faber & Faber, 1961, page 245, Sethos' (**Seti**) named his shrine "The house of millions of years of King Men **Maatr** (Joyful in heart at Abydos)" and the central chapel he dedicated to **Ptah** of Memphis. Putting these phrases together, a type of anagram or word play is produced to give "**Seti-Ptah-Maatr**". Really, this name is just another title. However, while modern historians take just one segment of this name, "Seti" or "Sethos" and placed his "19th dynasty" in the 13th Century BC, Herodotus' commentary effectively forced modern commentators to place his "**Psammetich**" in the 7th Century BC in the 26th dynasty. We have no firm details of Herodotus' Psammetich from Egyptian records and it's the ancient Egyptians who mainly provide us with details of Seti. A comparison of the histories of the two Egyptian kings shows that both had remarkably similar careers. There is evidence they both fought a major campaign in "Asia", though that in itself means little. The successors of both (Ramesses II and Nechos) attempted to build a major shipping canal in the Suez region (a bit more unusual) and certainly both had impressive building programmes. Are these things coincidence?

Unfortunately, there is some difficulty in separating the reigns of Seti and Ramesses II because of a co-regency. This makes it difficult when making a precise comparison with Psammetich and his successor Nechos. In either case, there seems to have been a regency of some sort. Thus, it seems there is good evidence that one dynasty (the 19th) has been written up twice (viz., the 19th as the 26th) in the Egyptian canon. This is an appalling problem, and one that might even trace back to the Ramessides' own clumsy attempt to reconstruct and rewrite the history and culture of Egypt. But it is a problem that will have to be dealt with eventually. Within this troika of successive 19th dynasty Egyptian kings with their potential parallels in the 26th dynasty, it is the link between Ramesses II and Merneptah-Hophra that makes the most compelling subject for further study. The particular reason is that Merneptah-Hophra, who wrote "Israel's seed is destroyed; the land razed to the ground", must surely be Jeremiah's contemporary - Hophra. In many ways, this is the more compelling proof of the thesis than the evidence thrown up by considering "Hatshepsut" as the "Ensigned (or the Sign of the) Sheba of the South".

[Hence one reason for bringing the third part of the Synopsis into publication first in my book *Memphis, Merneptah and Ramesses and the Winged Disk of Judah*. The other reason was that *Biblical Archaeological Review* had published an article in July 2002 about a winged disk found in an ancient Israelite settlement

that was not within the boundaries of the modern Israelite state. That latter point was put by that article's author, Robert Deutsch. I have assumed he meant Jordan by that because that was where the Tribe of Manasseh had its territory and the Bible records that tribe's leaders having communications with Hezekiah King of Judah in *circa* 700 BC. I found a similar object in Mr Petrie's Memphis excavation reports which he named as the "Behudet Winged Disk". Petrie showed drawings of Merneptah worshipping this object and I realised "Behudet" was 'Be-Ehude-t' or "from the place of the people (t) of Ehude-Judah"].

A key point for the hypothesis is that while the three parts of Hatshepsut's title can be explained within a logical framework, Kings Seti, Ramesses II and Merneptah form a sequence of three kings through time, or through three generations, that seems to have *prima facie* links with key events in Israel's history. The events, and the building programmes, are those of the 7th Century rather than the 12th or 13th Centuries BC. These comparisons point to a major chronological problem. Seti seems to have a 7th Century *alter ego*. Ramesses almost certainly appears to have a link with Nebuchadnezzar [Nebo's Khet(d?)a-sar?]. Merneptah, alone amongst Egyptian rulers as far as we know today, definitely mentions 'Israel', albeit at a circumstance in Israel's history that could only be realistically explained by the events of hundreds of years later, that is *circa* 610-586 BC not in the 13th Century BC (1210 BC). Merneptah is firmly anchored in chronological sequence to Seti and Ramesses but he is even more firmly linked to Israel during the period of Jeremiah, in other words during the end of the 7th Century and at the beginning of the 6th Century BC. Under these circumstances, something has to give! When the theological significance of the 'Seed' and the 'Sign' are understood (see appendices attached) the orthodox framework has to give way to a radically restructured history of ancient Egypt.

Regarding 'Signs', the Queen of Sheba-Hatshepsut, in contradistinction to the pharaoh of Moses' day who ignored 'Signs' at enormous cost to Egypt, begins the sequence with a positive and friendly response to a sign she personally received and her response brought blessing on Egypt. Assuming Merneptah is "Hophra", he ruled Egypt when some Judeans fled there to escape Nebuchadnezzar's captivity (Jeremiah 44:28-29). In verse 29, before Jeremiah prophesies the death of Hophra-Merneptah (verse 30), the prophet admonishes the fleeing Judeans with a "sign unto you ... that I will punish you in this place" i.e., Egypt. Of course, eight centuries earlier, in 1500 BC, through various miracles, super-natural events and signs, God had hurt the Egyptians and protected the Israelites. The warning sign is clearly directed at Hophra-Merneptah as well. The Biblical word here for sign is one of the approximately eighty occasions (refer attached appendix) where אִוֶּת (*ôwth*) appears in the Hebrew text. In this verse it is accompanied by the definite article represented by ה (*he*). Merneptah may have lived long enough to write-off Israel on his stela but he and the Judean apostates came to horrible ends because they would not "hearken" to God's signs as Hatshepsut apparently did. Even if one does not accept the Divine nature of the Scripture there are too many coincidences involving the use of the word 'Sign' here to simply shove aside and ignore. Merneptah's Stele (Stela: Greek; boundary post, pillar) remains the only primary document surviving from Egyptian relics to modern times that clearly mentions "Israel" and her (his?) Seed.

From a Biblical perspective: Solomon, the Judean King of Israel (at least at the start of his reign); and Hatshepsut, famous ruler of Egypt and Ethiopia; both listened to the “signs” of God. But the bombastic Merneptah ignored the signs. His father, Ramesses II, contemptuously de-canonized good Queen Hatshepsut from the ‘king-lists’. Gloating at Israel's demise, Merneptah, along with some rebellious and disbelieving Judeans, came to an ugly end. This might be a romantic notion but it might be exactly what happened as well. A believer in the Bible would like to think this is the case. A disbeliever, or skeptic, might well be embarrassed if this could be proven. However, in good academic fashion, one has to say that proving this “romantic” perspective to be true does not **prove** anything about God. It is only evidential. This perspective might cause some people to rethink (= ‘repent’) their ‘philosophy’ about God. It might even prove to historians and archaeologists that there is a serious problem with the peer review system when an error of analysis of this magnitude could hold sway over *The Academy* for so long. There is a temptation to suggest that Hatshepsut's, Merneptah's and Ramesses' misplacement in history is a plot to undermine the Bible or to destroy Israel's history by the clever device of damaging or falsifying the history of Israel's main neighbour. However, there is a more practical issue behind this problem.

The name “Raamses” (Ramesses) is associated with one of the cities the Israelites built (Exodus 1:11) during their slavery in Egypt in the 15th Century BC. The primary reason why Merneptah appears in the 13th Century BC rather than the 7th or 6th (probably the latter) is because his father Ramesses II was the only really powerful pharaoh entitled “Ramesses” though Ramesses III was also significant. It has always been assumed Ramesses II was the only pharaoh with that title who could possibly have ordered a massive building programme that evidently used Jewish labour. Some people think a powerful 18th dynasty pharaoh might also have qualified on this count. Of course, these options overlooked the probability that a pharaoh destroyed at the Red Sea and an Egypt destroyed by both plagues and a subsequent invasion, would leave few or no records of an earlier building programme. But Ramesses II and 18th dynasty pharaohs bequeathed many relics and evidence of major constructions. In effect, a 7th Century BC building programme has been mistaken for a 15th Century programme of which little evidence apparently survives. The same point can also apply to the Israel of the 10th Century BC as observed from a post 586 BC perspective. The principle being; “the absence of evidence is not necessarily evidence of absence”.

Thus, by convention, it seemed probable that Ramesses II rather than, for example, Ramesses III, was the ‘Pharaoh of the Oppression of Israel’ and could be the only real candidate for that dubious title. This is unsatisfactory because Biblical chronology does not allow for a 13th Century BC date for the end of that oppression. Biblical chronology requires an early 15th Century BC date for the end of the ‘Oppression’ (1485 BC). In early western compilations of Egyptian chronologies Egyptologists attempted to place Ramesses II in the 15th Century BC to accommodate the Biblical date. But few, if any, Egyptologists will accept that date today, nor did they then. Generally, modern Egyptologists now place Ramesses II in the 13th Century BC most commonly in the years 1279-13 BC. Although only a matter of about 200 or 250 years out of thousands, this result is unsatisfactory even for the adherents of the orthodox framework of ancient middle eastern history. Nevertheless, this is why most commentators (Jewish, Christian or even Muslim) respond by shifting the Exodus to the “Thirteenth Century”, incidentally

keeping the whole thing a bit vague rather than spelling the exact years i.e., 1279-13.

One way to resolve the problem is to suggest that a later Jewish editor/scribe ('redactor') of the Biblical scrolls would think it sensible to co-name the more ancient city that was built i.e., Pithom, with the name of the 'Capital' of the incumbent pharaoh or name of a more current or better known pharaoh to the scribe's contemporary readers. This is especially true for Greek readers who may have read about Seti's and Ramesses' buildings from Herodotus *et al* of the 6th, 5th, or later centuries BC. No doubt the great builders Seti and Ramesses decided to locate their 'Capital' in the same or traditional site of earlier illustrious rulers of Egypt because they too would find the site convenient, strategic etc. And they probably wanted to be identified with the great Egyptian leaders of the past. In fact, there is quite a lot of evidence that Ramesses and Seti simply cannibalised the remaining structures of the 'Capitol' of the former pharaohs, though this may be a rather harsh criticism especially if they were trying to do some genuine restorative work. A later redactor of the Jewish Scriptures (e.g., Ezra) might have seen the irony of a 7th Century BC Egyptian regime restoring structures originally built by Jews of the 15th and 16th centuries for their Egyptian masters and so he added 'Ramesses' (or "Raamses" KJV) to 'Pithom' in Exodus 1:11.

The English translations of the Hebrew of Exodus 1:11, and the subsequent translations into European languages, also overlook the use of the special definite article in Hebrew *eth* or *ath* (↔ את) before 'Pithom' and 'Raamses' in the text. This special definite article does not appear before the earlier noun (nouns?) to describe 'cities' either for storage or for treasure ('Capital' ; assets, wealth). Is the writer perhaps saying "The Pithom (The Ramesseum)"? Is the writer stressing 'the' as in "The Acropolis"? Is 'Pithom' actually the 'place (*pi*) of Thom' as Immanuel Velikovsky suggested, and since nobody knew anything about this pharaoh the scribe points out that the old site is now built on by the newer site - The Ramesseum?

[I am now taking the view that *Thom* is not the pharaoh's name but the second part of the name Amen-em-Hat, a 12th dynasty pharaoh, and that the Hebrew scribes of Moses' era wanted to refer to the capital city as the place (Pi) of Amenemhat. But the scribes would not write the name of this obnoxiously pagan Egyptian pharaoh who heavily persecuted the ancient Israelites with the reference to his god (Amun). Instead, they simply wrote the "Place of the leader" as *Pi-em-hat*. In Hebrew, where vowels are removed from the text, this would be best represented by the Hebrew letters for P-M-H-T or P-ThM. This is therefore Pithom (פיתם). The reversal or inversion of sounds (letters) is easily explained because Egyptian is written using clusters or acrostics of symbols. Another arrangement of this would be Memphit (מפ, mem). A Greek would read the latter arrangement as "Memphis"].

When this new Egyptology began to emerge at the start of the 20th Century, theologians were grappling with a serious problem. More than one hundred years ago, under pressure from Evolutionists and others, theologians were desperate to find a firm link between Biblical personalities and the histories of people 'unearthed' by archaeological discoveries. The link between Moses and 'Raamses' in Exodus 1:11 seemed perfect. Rather than wait to see how this information would integrate with other 'discoveries',

most Biblical archaeologists and historians jumped to a hasty but now clearly wrong conclusion. It is easy, however, to overlook the intense pressure they were exposed to. Now, the pressure is on the 'evolutionists'. They have to show how the ancient Kenyan ape-girl named 'Lucy', the first proto-human in 1,000,000 BC, produced ancestors who established the earliest of the oldest civilizations we know of from archaeology in Egypt *circa* 4000 BC. While archaeologists (specifically Egyptologists) may be grappling with the problems formed by having to deal with an error-gap of 500-700 years, the evolutionists must explain a missing 996,000 years! **[The gap for the evolutionist makes the error in Egyptian chronology look minute and relatively unimportant. The million-year gap is a fiction anyway but the Egyptian chronology error must be seen in its context which is the period between 2450 and 550 BC. It's a huge error in reality].**

Thus the secondary reason why nobody dares to remove Merneptah to a more reasonable contemporaneity with Israel is that it would be too embarrassing for the peer review system based as it is on the evolutionary paradigm. Worse, 'Biblical' Archaeologists acquiesced. It is probably even more embarrassing for them! The ultimate irony is that the 'Biblical archaeologists', fighting the evolutionist tidal wave, forced the secularists to accept this now-orthodox but quite false framework. As far as most observers of this problem can fathom, this situation perpetuates itself, not only amongst the secular academics but amongst Biblical scholars and theologians as well. The Biblical Archaeologists are handicapped by the theologians' models of the inspiration of Scripture which, generally, do not allow for editing techniques as suggested above. They believe making these suggestions opens a floodgate for liberal interpretations. But the horse would appear to have bolted anyway because they were not prepared to be flexible with practical dilemmas for the historians of all eras.

In his examination of the problem, Peter James in *Centuries of Darkness* (page 257) says the Egyptologists are "stubborn and arrogant" because they will not even consider major revisions to chronological systems. Academia is supposed to be about doing that sort of thing. Conservative theologians, i.e., those who might be expected to support literal readings of the Bible can be just as stubborn. To suggest that 'Raamses' and 'Pithom' might be two different names for the same place in two different eras, instead of two cities in one particular era is a lot different than suggesting Genesis 1:1 can be read "In the beginning God evolved heaven and earth". Clearly the Hebrew for 'Create' i.e., *bara* (ברא) cannot mean "evolve". But it might be reasonable to suggest that a later Jewish scribe, during for example the Exilic Period, bracketed the old site of Pithom with the contemporary structure of his own period, effectively describing it as a *Ramesseum*. Today, of course, "The Ramesseum" is also in ruins apart from those sections that have been restored in modern times. From a Biblical perspective, about 400 years separate the two references to *Ramesses*. The reference to "Rameses" in Genesis is to an event taking place four centuries before Exodus 1:11 ("Raamses"). The ramessides were kings for less than 150 years according to all Egyptian records.

The main dilemma is, and always has been, how to properly and consistently translate or transliterate, from many different languages and writing systems, the names of ancient locations or people and what to do with the names of ancient locations, that subsequently became heaps of rubble, that nobody had ever heard of before. These

translations, or transliterations, in turn have to be expressed in languages like English with its own particular limitations. Thus, some of the suggestions made here are simply matters of common sense. One does not need any great theological, linguistic or philosophical talent to recognise the possibilities. What prevents common sense from prevailing is the very fact that the whole framework is so suspect. It is so lacking in logic. Thus, common sense gets thrown out the window.

Earlier Approaches to the Problem

The overarching problem is that the Biblical account of the history of the middle east region (i.e., for Israel, Egypt, Syria, Babylon, Persia, Lebanon, TransJordan-Moab, -Ammon and -Edom etc.,) does not fit at all neatly into modern academic perspectives of the histories of those regions. One reason for this might be an over-restrictive theory of Biblical interpretation in deference and reverence, appropriately, to the sanctity of the Scriptures. Aside from that, it is rarely assumed that there might be a major structural problem with the framework(s) academics are using to interpret the history. The latter is exacerbated by an excessively secular approach.

Over the last hundred years or more, several writers have laboured to posit a new framework. Early in the 20th Century AD, people like Cecil Torr and Jens Lieblein would not accept the framework that Petrie *et al* were forcing the establishment to recognize. Between the 1950s and 1970s, Immanuel Velikovsky wrote four volumes that challenged the framework (in the *Ages in Chaos* Series). In 1991, Peter James, Nikos Kokkinos, I.J. Thorpe, Robert Morkot and John Frankish, graduates of the established schools in Britain, wrote *Centuries of Darkness* which again officially challenged the status quo. Four years later, in 1995, David Rohl published another framework in *A Test of Time*. Other writers, even less likely to be considered members of the establishment, Dr Charles Taylor, a linguist from Australia, and Donovan Courville, have come out in qualified support of the Velikovsky argument or the implications emanating from it.

The Main New Contribution

The main new contribution this dissertation makes to the whole debate is that whereas the Jewish commentator Immanuel Velikovsky observes that “*Shep*” as in “Hat-shep-sut” indicates the (phonetic) link with the “Queen of Sheba”, and whereas Dr Charles Taylor identifies the meaning of “*sut*” as “the south” or “of the Blacks” as modern Sudanese derive the meaning of ‘Sud’, this dissertation posits that “*Hat*”, perhaps more properly *H'aut*, is a representation of the Hebrew *ha ôwth* (הָאוֹת) or perhaps a general Semitic word meaning “The sign” or “The ensign” (refer Appendix on Signs, especially Note 1). As a secondary argument, the hieroglyphs may be meant to represent the definite article but stressed as we commonly do when someone has the same name as a more illustrious personality with that name e.g., Tony Blair, Charles Windsor or Elizabeth Taylor. Hence the meaning could be “**The** Sheba of Egypt and Ethiopia” or **The** Sheba of the Sut (Sud). “Sheba”, or variants of it, was a common name in the middle-east for places and people. In that case, this particular “Sheba” had to be distinguished from all the other ‘Shebas’! If Hebrew (e.g., as *Lingua Franca* ?) is being used here, this is no great surprise as neighbouring countries regularly

exchange words (c.f., England and France). Or, assuming Egyptians at one time had a Semitic language, ancient Egyptian may easily have had the same definite article as Hebrew or even the same word for 'Sign'.

Considering this cautiously, and with much lesser priority, another hypothesis that could be drawn from this relates to the origin of the definite article in English. If vowel sounds are to some extent guesses or interpolations based on a certain amount of guess-work, 'oth' or 'owth' might be just as easily transmitted 'eth' in speech. This word in Hebrew in its simplest form is *aleph, tav* (תא). *Aleph* can be transliterated as an 'e' and *tav* can be transliterated as a 'th'. As a standard representation for the definite article in ancient middle eastern languages, it could possibly be reflected in the English "the", a simple mirror image of the Hebrew *eth* because, of course, the English write from left to right and the Jews *vice versa*. From the broader model being established here, this would only be possible if there has been some transmission of Hebrew or Semitic words (and grammar systems) via Phoenician connections, perhaps in commercial contracts (*brits?*). We are almost certain that Phoenicians took silver and tin from Wales and South-west England (Cornwall). They used the tin to smelt copper into bronze or brass. Assuming Phoenicia is related to "Punt", frequently mentioned in Egyptian records, there seems to be a Phoenician connection with the currencies of Britain (Pound, Pount?) and Ireland (Punt) as is discussed in the section on Punt. If we are looking at a major restructuring of history, what might seem to be wild flights of fancy right now could indeed be plausible or even true.

Thus one application of this research applies to the study of British (ancient) history. Overall, historians who study British history have generally failed to study migration patterns to Britain, by sea, from the South-west, specifically from places along the Atlantic seaboard. They concentrate too much on migration patterns from the Continent from the north, east and south (Norway, Germany, Holland and France).

Returning to a more specifically theological issue, the discussion will also suggest that the reference to 'Israel' on Merneptah's stela refers primarily to 'Israel' the man i.e., Jacob son of Isaac son of Abraham rather than to Israel the country *per se* though both are closely related of course. The dissertation will re-investigate the Biblical theme of the "Seed of Israel" with respect to the covenants God had with these patriarchs and re-evaluate Merneptah's statement in that light (refer Appendix attached).

Probably the biggest difficulty anyone faces is that records of past events have become scarcer in roughly in proportion to the number of years that have passed. This seems obvious but there is an implicit tendency to ignore this when ancient writers are considered. We know much more about events of last century than we know of events ten centuries earlier. The Queen of Sheba and Solomon lived thirty centuries ago. The temporal distance between the New Testament writers and Josephus from Solomon is about the same distance as the modern English are from their Domesday ("Doomsday") Book. For that reason, it seems more sensible to assume, for example in regard to Josephus' statement that "There was then a woman, queen of Egypt and Ethiopia ... (who) came to Jerusalem ...", that Josephus was more likely to know what he was talking about than modern scholars editing his translated works. Not many Englishmen have seen the Domesday Book but most know about it. They also know that the same

“king” or “duke”, William I, ruled both northern France and England when the Domesday Book was written. Likewise, common sense suggests, especially for a learned man like Josephus, that Josephus’ comment on a basic matter of geography is more likely to be correct than the following footnote: “That this queen of Sheba was a queen of Sabaea in South Arabia, and not of Egypt and Ethiopia, as Josephus here asserts, is now generally agreed”. This footnote appears in most modern compilations of Josephus’ works. Almost certainly, the footnote is wrong.

[A more recent editorial footnote expands the original made by Josephus’ commentators].

The Land of Punt

This is the country that had commercial relations with Egyptians during several different generations and dynasties. The most detailed and most famous descriptions of Punt appear on the reliefs of Hatshepsut’s temple at Deir el-Bahari, an impressive site (indeed sight) on the other side of the hills of the Valley of the Kings in Egypt. References to “Punt” can be found going back to the 5th Dynasty and forward to the 20th Dynasty. Two important, and frequent, associations with Punt are “Byblos” and “The river that flows upside down” (*Mou Kedi*). [Kees, *op. cit* and Montet].

Generally, historians and archaeologists believe Punt was in modern Somalia (or somewhere in Africa). On some maps, the Somali coast facing Oman and Yemen on the Arabian peninsula is marked “Puntland”. Apparently this is a region of modern Somaliland (or ‘Somalia’) attempting to gain independence from the colonial entity riven by catastrophic civil war. In most compilations of Egyptian history, it is stated that the Hyksos invasion of Egypt cut the Egyptians off from trade with Punt. However, it is difficult to understand why trade between the ancient Egyptians and ancient Punt should be cut-off by the Hyksos who controlled Egypt from the Nile Delta and the northern Sinai if “Punt” was a country well to the south of the subjugated Egyptians. “Punt”, if it was in Somalia, was well out of reach of the Hyksos and outside their sphere of interest. The Egyptians were able to wage wars of independence from the south and if “Punt” was so wealthy, it is surprising “Punt” could not assist them in their fight for independence!

Furthermore, it seems surprising that a 5th Dynasty official should make “eleven trips to Punt (in Somalia) and Byblos” (Gubla, Gebel, Gwal) on the Lebanese (Phoenician) coast. That (laconic?) comment suggests, at the very least, that both places were in the environs of the other or that one was on the way to the other. We don’t have to guess where Byblos is located. If Somalia was ‘on the way’ to Byblos one would presumably have to circumnavigate the globe via the north and south poles to do this or go around Africa. Better to associate “Punt” as a place quite near Byblos, if not in the very neighbourhood (Tyre, Sidon and Israel).

In an incredible proposal, when trying to fit data into the model that Somalia is Punt, Montet says the transport of cedar logs from Lebanon on the “the river that flows upside down” actually refers to the Euphrates. Then, he suggests, the Egyptians were taking these logs across Syria (Aram) down the Persian Gulf and around the huge Arabian

Peninsula to Somalia, then up the Red Sea and across to Luxor and Thebes. Obviously, floating logs across the Mediterranean from Lebanon and up the Nile to Thebes or Luxor, against the flow of the Nile would be difficult enough but they did that with boats especially in war conditions. That would be a major though much less arduous task than shunting logs across northern Syria, down the whole length of the Euphrates, and around the entire and huge Arabian peninsula (sub-continent).

Another option, obviously more practical, is to take the logs from the Lebanese hills down to Lake Galilee, float them down the Jordan and Dead Sea then bring them to Eilat and from there, by the shortest sea-route of the various options: around the Sinai Peninsula which was much smaller than the Arabian sub-continent then towards the Nile Delta or across to El Quseir on the Red Sea Coast parallel with the inland cities of Thebes and Luxor. Luxor is strategically placed at a bend in the Nile where the river comes closest to the Red Sea. Proximity to the Nile and the Red Sea is an obvious reason for Thebes' situation. Otherwise, the most direct route from Lebanon is across an often choppy Mediterranean then an upstream slog against the strong current of the Nile to somewhere in the delta, or worse, all the way up to Luxor. It would have been far more sensible to use the alternative passage around the smaller Sinai rather than the huge Arabian sub-continent, and, if Luxor is the final destination, nipping across to El Quseir. This enhances a more sensible meaning for "the river that flows upside down" because although the Nile and the Euphrates were known to flow from lakes but **into** the Seas, either the Indian Ocean or the 'Great Mediterranean Sea', the Jordan flows '**down**' into a smallish lake (Dead 'Sea') from which, oddly, one gets to the Red Sea coast (at Eilat) by going **uphill!** Surely this is a better candidate for a "river flowing upside down". Some commentators even read into the narratives of Punt that the journey passed through a land of red mountains or red deserts. That might be a matter of interpretation. Mountains or deserts of that description exist elsewhere. However, the name 'Edom', i.e., the country on the eastern side of the Red Sea, is derived from the Semitic word for 'Red'. Hence the name 'Red Sea'. The Edomites doubtlessly controlled this waterway just as the 'English Channel' gets its British name. The French call the English Channel "La Manche". Furthermore, "El Quseir" reflects the name Seir which is a well-known landmark on the mountainous ranges of Edom.

However, Montet believed the "Mou Qedi" referred to the Euphrates because it flows North-South in contrast to the Nile which flows South-North. While the contrast undoubtedly explains the meaning of *Mou Qedi* and the Nile does flow South to North, the Euphrates flows North-west to South-East at about 45 degrees, so his sense of angle or direction is weak there to say the least. The sea journey from Eilat to El Quseir on the Egyptian Red Sea coast, a port parallel to Karnak, Thebes and Luxor on the Nile, is shorter than the route from northern Lebanon on the Mediterranean to the mouth of the Nile further along the Mediterranean coast. It's an even shorter route if one plied the Mediterranean coastline down from Lebanon instead of a direct as-the-crow-flies route across the deeper and rougher waters out in the middle of the Mediterranean. But the problem is that once the cedar logs arrived at the mouth of the Nile, there was another considerable journey, upstream of course, to the ancient Egyptian capitals where, presumably, many of the logs were needed. Clearly, the Mou Qedi must have been the river Jordan.

Another reason why Somalia is invoked as the land of Punt is because Punt seemed specifically to supply spices, fragrances, frankincense, myrrh etc. Of course these products may have been available in Somalia or many other places for that matter. Location is not really crucial. Somalia may have grown these products but it could just as easily have been a staging post for shippers bringing these goods from even further afield. Somalia might have been out of the way of port or taxation authorities as a bonus. Or, after a longish haul across the Indian Ocean or up the African coast, Somalia would have been a welcome staging post. There is no particularly good evidence to show that Somalia was a producer, or any better producer of these products than other countries if it was indeed a producer of these things at all. But it seems highly unlikely that Egyptians would shunt lumber from Lebanon via the Euphrates and the Indian Ocean to Somalia - just to piggy-back even the most valuable spices with the load. If these spices etc., were available along the most efficient route to travel that would certainly be a bonus. The model proposed here by Montet, and many others, is unrealistic - to an Economist anyway.

From the archaeological evidence, economists can detect a logical trade pattern or flow where shippers pick up high-value but low-volume commodities to offset the costs of shunting bulky lower-value papyrus (or grain), floated down the Nile to delta ports. From there the papyrus would be taken to "Byblos" [= "Papyrus", where 'B' = 'P'; 'p' = 'b'; and 'l' = 'r' giving allowance for peculiarities of the Egyptian speech]. The grain would go on to Tyre perhaps. Then, in the next stage, very bulky logs from the Lebanese hills would be brought back to Egypt and Israel. In other words, the very-high-value frankincense, as economists know, would help to finance the bulk trade but not over Montet's vast distances. If this high-value Frankincense and Myrrh was purchased as the log-trade convoy passed through the Gilead-Jericho-Jerusalem districts, to be sold at profit in Egypt, we have all the ingredients for a classic business deal without having to invoke an expensive and logistically much more difficult Somalian connection. The deal involved: Egyptian exports (papyrus, grain) to Phoenicia; Phoenician exports of logs to Israel or Egypt; and Israelite exports to Egypt of Frankincense etc., already produced in great quantities and high quality for Temple Services. Israel may not have been the original source for these precious spices etc., but her skilled horticulturalists may have developed much more abundant varieties in the Israelite climate. It was a land of milk and honey even in Jacob's time (Genesis 37:25, 43:11 and Jeremiah 8:22). Furthermore, the distances described here, though not short, or without some effort, are much less grandiose than having to assume a circuit involving Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, East Africa or even the African continent.

Another clue that "Punt" had to be the region of Israel and Phoenicia, is that "Punt" appears in terms like "take a punt" on a business deal and this would seem to be a clear identification with the merchant-adventurer Phoenicians who were able to use Israel's port in Eilat. That port (*punt*) gave the Phoenicians based in Tyre, Sidon and Byblos, access to India, China and a route to circumnavigate Africa (Ophira, Ophir ? where O = Au ?). Somalia could well have provided the Puntites (Phoenicians) with a trading base for Indian Ocean operations hence, perhaps, the name 'Put' used for Somalia as it was for other regions in the Tyrian hegemony, c.f., Tunisia, Carthage, Libya. But Somalia was not Punt itself. At the most, it was just a trading post **for** Punt. If the Phoenicians met Asians in Somalia, 'Put' might be a reflection of the Asian tendency to

weaken the 'n' in Punt much as they do with the 'r' in Port. Herodotus says the Phoenicians came from the "Red Sea", a region that might have included northern Somalia depending on where one drew a boundary between the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. Ports on the western coast of the Red Sea such as El Quseir, hinting at the name of tribes in Edom on the opposite or eastern side of the Red Sea, may have been operated by Phoenicians. Herodotus visited Egypt at least a couple of centuries after the Assyrians sacked the Phoenician cities of Tyre (Hebrew; *Tsor*) and Byblos. By then, those great trading cities had established colonies throughout the Mediterranean, e.g., in Carthage, for the fleeing refugees, capitalists, entrepreneurs and holders of intellectual property e.g., maps and trade routes. In Herodotus' day, Phoenicians might still have been operating from bases in Somalia, Oman (e.g., city of *Sur*) so it was certainly not a silly thing to write but it seems more likely that Herodotus took a limited set of facts and interpreted them out of context. Somalia and Oman, like Carthage and Gibraltar, were colonies, stations for replenishment or trading posts of Punt. However, from the 10th Century BC and from an Egyptian perspective, "Punt" had been Phoenicia, probably including Israel as part of the general *desig*-nation.

The mistake being made by archaeologists and historians is a bit like the two pebbles and carrot lying on a lawn. How did they get there? They were the eyes and nose of a snowman that had melted before the observer got there. Hatshepsut's record, and those of other Egyptian pharaohs, helps to establish the former existence of the snowman. Unfortunately, because of chronological problems, it is Herodotus' record that has been relied on to influence our conclusions about Phoenicia. Thus modern understanding of Phoenicia is built on the basis of a mere couple of 'pebbles and carrot' rather than on the basis of a 'snowman' that Egyptian history, in a proper chronological context, could offer. The metaphor is appropriate because a proper 'snow-job' has been done on the histories of these ancient nations by using the weak assumptions reported here. A blizzard of confusion exists.

Events in the Middle East will force the world to address this problem!

Other small bits of crucial evidence can pierce the void. The Phoenicians were famous for naming places after their home-ports. For example Gibraltar is Jabul-Tariq or the port of Jebel/Gebel/Byblos and Tyre. Portugal is possibly 'Porto-Gwal' (Port of Gebel). Tharshish is also associated with Phoenician settlements (c.f., Isaiah 23:6-7). Generally, though, the wave of settlement out of Phoenicia seems to have travelled westwards from the Levant. Why, this is so, is not clear apart from the possibility that the western Mediterranean and western Europe were comparatively unpopulated areas. However, the extent of megalithic remains along the Atlantic seaboard of western Europe suggests a considerable population level in the First and Second Millennia BC unless those structures have something to do with the Phoenicians or the colonists they brought to those parts of the world.

From an agricultural perspective, the new colonists in western- or Atlantic-Seaboard-Europe would be unfamiliar with the seasons in the northern latitudes which might explain why the people constructed so many stone circles to map the stars to measure seasons or climate cycles. If other people had populated those lands in significant numbers, perhaps the settlers shipped there by the Phoenicians may have found that

they could contract (*brit*) to settle in prescribed areas of western Europe much like the European deals with Maori in New Zealand. Hence we can derive the origin of the name the *Brit* peoples and the name of Brittany in north-west France. “Ish” in that context is the Hebrew-Semitic word for “man” indicating that the people who settled those parts were men sent out on contracts to develop the region or exploit its resources. Food production became a priority for survival but as global warming proceeded, climate change actually turned agriculture into an enterprise equally if not more profitable than mining, hunting, precious stone gathering or smelting.

Similarly, after the fall of Rome, first Saxons then Danes, negotiated with ‘indigenous’ peoples to live in the British Isles. A contract in the Middle East was called a ‘Brit’. Thus, it is possible to see that parts of Europe, including perhaps parts of France (Brittany), were places where people (viz., refugees or migrants from the Middle East) could negotiate or contract to settle. Officials and employees of Phoenician trading companies might have settled in those parts to service the trading company, perhaps by growing food for fresh victuals for passing vessels. A contract or negotiation is certainly a more civilised and less bloody way to resolve land-tenure disputes. Tyrone in Ireland could reflect the name “Tyre”. Galway might be the ‘Way of Gwal’ (or Byblos). Certainly the Irish currency, the Punt (pound), is logically associated with the coin of Punt. It is surprising those clues have not triggered at least some sort of association with Phoenicia in the minds of “mainstream” British historians. The hill in Carthage where the Phoenician merchants gathered to trade was called the *Byrsa* (as in Paris Bourse). ‘Byrsa’ (Bourse) is still the term used, by those in the trade, for stock-markets in western Europe. The British words ‘purse’ and ‘bursar’, reflecting the close relationship of the letters ‘B’ (‘b’) and ‘P’ (‘p’) emanate from the name of this ancient hill. Places like Portsmouth in England and Punta del Est as far away as Argentina/Chile reflect Punt or Port which might be a phonetic or derivative of Punt in speech.

Punt can also be defined as bridge through Latin connections as in *Pons*, *Pontis* for bridge or Pontiff (bridge, heretically speaking, between man and God). Bridges were often (and still are today by armies) constructed by lining up ‘punts’ or **pontoons** across a river. One can **punt** the Thames. In Baltimore, one can ride on a vessel looking like a pontoon or barge as it carries tourists on a circuit around the harbour (in 1992 AD at least). Israel and Phoenicia lay on the land bridges of the continents of Eurasia and Africa (Auphir_ca, reflecting Ophir where ‘O’ = ‘Au’). Etzion-Geber on the Red Sea may well have been the port where Zion (Israel) and Gebel (Geber) the Phoenician port of Byblos joined forces to exploit trading opportunities with Egypt and beyond in the 10th Century BC. These options had been blocked by the nihilistic Hyksos (or Amalekites under this reconstruction). The Hyksos were parasites who gorged themselves on the enterprise of Egyptians and Jews. The passage from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, situated not far from the border between modern Turkey and Greece was called the Hellespont or Bridge (Latin; *pontis*) of the Hellenes (Greeks). Today it is Turkish territory. Nearby was the Roman province of Pontus.

Thus ancient Roman and Greek names for strategic territories bordering major waterways, as in Pons, Pont and Pontis, are another clue that the land between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea might have been known in ancient languages as the Punt Land. Israel and Phoenicia are a better fit for ‘Punt-Pont’ than Somalia which is

actually some distance south of the strategic gap between the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean as one passes modern Djibouti (African shore) and Aden/Yemen (Arabian shore). Anyway, Djibouti and Aden are much more typical of a Phoenician port or base than Somalia because they would be more accessible to overland trade routes than the much more isolated eastern horn of Africa. Furthermore, echoes of the name 'Punt' (or cities with names like Tyre/Tsor, Gebel) are found more commonly westward and northward of Suez: Cyrenaica, Tripoli, Misrata, Sirte, Syria, Derra (Syrian-Jordanian border) and Syracuse (Sicily). It is worth repeating here that "Punt and Byblos", the latter definitely to the North of Egypt, were bracketed together by a 5th Dynasty official suggesting a close geographical relationship between the two. And the Hyksos, who apparently cut off trade between Egypt and 'Punt', ruled Egypt from the Nile Delta which suggests they must have blocked Egypt from trade with a partner to the North or East rather than to the South. At best, Somalia (or Oman) was only a trading post of "Punt" but Israel and/or Phoenicia are a much more obvious site for "Punt" itself - at least from an Egyptian perspective.

Even Rugby, a rather curious British game that probably originated in the British Isles, uses a special oval-shaped ball which 'speculates' its way into touch, if kicked a short distance along the ground. Sometimes the ball is kicked a long way up a field or high up into the air. The technical term for this is a 'punt'. In the long wait for crops to harvest or for ships from 'home' to call into port, did these people invent games that retained terms linking them to the ancient name of the peoples that played them?

One of the colonies, or various colonies of Phoenicia, was called Tarshish. In Ezekiel 38:30, the prophet refers to the 'merchants' of Tarshish and their 'young lions'. Anyone familiar with a pride of lions is aware that the older ones rest while the young ones play games most of the day. Some of their time is spent hunting but leisure appears to be a predominant activity. Prides eventually split with younger males being more or less obliged to go off, sometimes in a group, and build a new pride for themselves in another area. Perhaps the prides of Tarshish-Phoenicia took their games across the globe. Today the British Lions and the French play rugby teams from the former colonies in New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Fiji and even in Argentina. That particularly independent former colony, the United States, plays a variant of the game all on its own - and with its own rules. In Australia, a variation of the Irish or Gaelic game is played in the State of Victoria - Australian rules of course. The Rugby Union (International Rugby Board or IRB) runs an international game with 'international' rules, though the Australians and New Zealanders (some 'young lions'?) and others would suggest the IRB's rules are dominated by a particular 'Home Union' - England. The other "home unions" are Scotland, Wales and Ireland. These are also the nations that tend to be 'pro-Israel' as the verse in Ezekiel implies. However, the designation 'Tarshish' almost certainly also includes Spain, Portugal, Holland and France - Atlantic sea-board countries that also had large overseas territories (colonies). These countries are also 'pro-Israel' these days. NATO could even stand for North Atlantic Tarshish Organisation!

The Resurrection of Queen Hatshepsut

Finally, as far as the Hypothesis is concerned, one could entitle the dissertation “The Resurrection of Hatshepsut”. Modern historians did not know about Hatshepsut until from about 1870 AD. Egyptian records of the monarchs of Egypt had excluded Hatshepsut and Akhenaten ostensibly because they were heretics. Akhenaten’s heresy is well known or at least reasonably well understood. He changed his worship from a pantheon of traditional gods to worship of the solar disk alone (monolatry). Akhenaten still believed other gods existed. He just did not worship them or abandoned worshipping them. Akhenaten was a precursor to the Arabians who began the Muslim religion. Muslims placed the moon god as their sole object of worship. In practice the Muslims retained worship of the planet or star of Venus as well as is shown on most modern Muslim national flags. Akhenaten’s new religion was soon abandoned after his demise.

But what was Hatshepsut’s heresy? That remains a mystery, unless the ‘heresy’ was to dare to reign as queen in her own right and somehow offend the gods this way. Certainly that was a factor and much is made of it. The ancient Egyptians turn out to be a very chauvinistic lot under this assumption. But it was not the most important factor and if no suitably mature male heir is immediately available, even the most chauvinistic nation will settle for a queen. Perhaps she also changed her beliefs about God. It was Ramesses II, we now know, who was the prime mover in eradicating Hatshepsut and Akhenaten (and his heir Tutankhamen) from the canon of Egyptian pharaohs because of religious heresy or apostasy. Reconstructing Hatshepsut as the *Queen of Sheba* [or the **Queen who ruled (sheba) Ophir (Auphirah)**] and taking the rather obvious implication from the Biblical phrase “there was no more spirit in her” (1 Kings 10:5) one can then assume she ‘succumbed’ to conversion to Israel’s God. That is confirmed by the New Testament view of her. Thus, it seems more likely that Hatshepsut’s principal heresy was apostasy - at least from an Egyptian religious perspective.

What was her apostasy? Was it to turn to the God of Israel? Unfortunately we do not know much about the ancient Egyptians’ concept of God. What did they call God and did they have a concept of one supreme God? If Amun, or Tut or Ra were equivalent to a supreme God was Hatshepsut’s apostasy really more akin to the difference between a Roman Catholic and Protestant perspective of God? Or was her conversion to a completely different God? The latter would seem to be the more likely. Even so, whether we use Mary I of England, and her Roman Catholicism, as an example or the Judean kings (*vis a vis* the religion of Baal), it seems the people let a monarch’s reign run its course rather than overthrow the king or queen. Cromwell executed Charles I of England and Scotland because of political and economic pressures. A better construction of Egyptian history would help us to answer these questions. If this hypothesis is correct, it is almost certain that Hatshepsut was an apostate to the religious, political and military authorities and worse - she actually converted to the worship of a God who had once destroyed Egypt. The gods of the Nile, and their acolytes, could never accept that.

Modern archaeologists, flush with their powers of decipherment following Champollean’s code-breaking achievement, began to read the hieroglyphics on the walls of

Hatshepsut's temple which had been buried in rubble long before, possibly by her successor, Thutmose III. This detritus covering much of this temple could have come from erosion of the surrounding cliffs but it looks more like it was deliberately put there, probably shovelled over the cliff-face. The process of recovery started *circa* 1870. By 1930, books on Egyptian history were re-inserting Hatshepsut back into the 'Canon'. By the early 1950s, Immanuel Velikovsky had identified her as "The Queen of Sheba". In 1983, Dr Charles Taylor in *Rewriting Bible History (According to Scripture)* identified the Egyptian phrase for "south and north" as Sut-en-bat which is reflected in the name for the country south of Egypt and north of (modern) Ethiopia i.e., The Sudan. Thus, by 1983, "Hatshepsut" could be read as Hat- (meaning not clear) Sheb(p)a- of the Suten (South) = Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia. Now, assuming that *Hat* or *H'aut* can mean 'sign' or 'en-signed', it is possible to see that the Egyptian Queen called Hatshepsut could be:

The Ensigned (or sign of) *the* Sheba [= **Ruler**] of the South (= Egypt and Ethiopia).

In the gospels of Matthew and Luke, the "Queen of the South" is only mentioned in the contexts of Signs and Resurrection i.e., the Sign of Jonah (given to Ninevah). Thus linking the three great nations/regions of the Bible: Egypt/Ethiopia, Israel/Phoenicia and Assyria. But it is the strange link between Hatshepsut and Resurrection that is most ironic because knowledge that Hatshepsut **is** Sheba would send shockwaves throughout the institutions of man's learning. If accepted, the Bible's narrative of history would be resurrected in the context of its claim to historical and prophetic veracity. To repeat, proving the Bible's historical veracity does not mean that certain theological positions are thereby proved by the reinstatement of the Bible's veracity in this regard - only evidence.

However, the process of re-discovering who Hatshepsut really is runs closely in parallel with a process that resulted in the re-establishment, re-creation or *resurrection* of a nation of Jews in the land of ancient Israel. Both processes began in earnest in the 1870's when modern nations adopted a policy to re-establish ancient nations in their former or traditional homelands in order to protect them from persecution. Prime Minister Benjamin D'Israeli of Britain and Bismarck of Germany re-formed Bulgaria to help solve a Balkan crisis. Step by step, at the same time as more information on Hatshepsut came to light, the emancipated Jews began to gather internationally, for example at the Congress of Basle (1897) where they agreed on 'Palestine' as the object of their aspirations for their own nation-state. In 1917, the Balfour Declaration brought the support of a great power amongst the nations in support for an independent homeland for the Jews in 'Palestine'. By 1948, both Israel and Hatshepsut were firmly re-established in world history though certainly not without a certain degree of mystery or indifference. The return of Hatshepsut to the history books, verifying the amazing world of Solomon and Sheba, is thus worthy of more study.

And one final note of interest. While the mummies of all the pharaohs of the 18th Dynasty, indeed of most dynasties, have been exhumed and opened, Hatshepsut's is nowhere to be found. Can we say "Rest in Peace Queen Hatshepsut - until your resurrection"?

Endnote (1) : Belteshazzar and Signs

The only difference between the name or title of the Chaldean king who succeeded Nebuchadnezzar and the title which the prophet Daniel had is the Hebrew letter *tet* (ט). Daniel, or Belteshazzar is בלִטְשַׁאצַּר (Daniel 2:26). Nebuchadnezzar's successor, is Belshazzar (בלִשְׁצַּר). Some of the *Book of Daniel* is written in Aramaic so this title must be a transliteration via at least one or two languages. What can the '*tet*' represent? Whether it is an Aramaic or Hebrew *tet* is not an issue. One expects that since two very different people with quite different roles have a very similar title that there must be some significance behind *tet* on this occasion.

Deciphering words from ancient languages involves a lot of guesswork in regard to vowels. The first thing to ask is whether a vowel might be associated with *tet* in this name. If so, could it be 'o', 'au', or 'e' ? Furthermore, when translating or transliterating the names of people or places or titles across languages, whether one writes *tet* for *tav*, or *vice versa*, is often semantic. Conventions may have differed from scribe to scribe through the ages. As stated in the discussion, *owth* (sign) is normally written in Hebrew as *aleph*, *vav*, *tav* (אורת) [c.f., page 17]. A case in point appears in Alfred Edersheim's "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah" where, in an appendix quoting from a Haggadah about Simeon Kepha (שמעון כִּיפָא), Edersheim records the following:

"Having learnt the Ineffable Name he (i.e., Peter) proclaimed that every believer in Christ should come to him, since he was an Apostle. The multitudes required that he should prove his claim by a sign ('*oth*') such as Jesus had done while he was alive."

The Haggadah says Peter responded with a miracle. This Haggadah is a rabbinical commentary on events in the early Church. It accurately reflects the word for 'sign' in those times was *oth* (אורת) a word used throughout the Old Testament as our table shows. This is precisely the evidence we need to show that when Jesus was asked for a "sign from thee" (he did not respond in the positive to requests for "signs from heaven", leaving that to Elijah and others perhaps) the word in use in Israel was *oth* or *owth*, i.e., the Hebrew אורת. *Aleph* and *vav* (au) can obviously be represented by English's 'o' or by a single vowel sign because 'au' = 'o' (c.f., **Austria**).

Belshazzar was 'King of Kings', a bombastic term, or Shah of Tsars. Reza Pahlavi, former Shah of Iran, was officially 'Shahinshah'. But Daniel's title was to reflect his God of gods and Lord of kings and "revealer of secrets" (Daniel 2:47) or, we can probably assume, of 'signs' (*otot* ?). If 'zz' is צ, could not 'tt' be ט ?

Daniel was King of Kings of signs and wonders or of signs and secrets. Perhaps Daniel had talked of the signs or the אורת (plural for *owth*) and his Hebrew got transliterated into Chaldean, then back into Aramean for the purposes of this particular Book. In that process it is possible that the vowels, or a vowel, leached out in the wash. Or, perhaps Hebrew did not re-import vowels from foreign names or titles. If *owth* (אורת, אַת) in one form or another could be transferred into either Chaldean or Aramaic (**as** ט), or was actually in the lexicons of those languages, could it not be applied by Egyptians as well? If one wanted to refer to someone who had received a sign the use of a definite article

would also be employed hence it is not inconceivable that הַאֲת (Hat) could have been appended onto the name of 'Sheba of the South' to render Hatsheb_asut (Hatshepsut) or "The Ensigned Sheba of the South".

Endnote (2): Thutmosis and Ramesses

Thutmosis (Thutmose or Thutmose) and Ramesses (Ramoshe or Ramoshe) are simply the Greek enunciations of the name found in the hieroglyphs of the Egyptian pharaohs. As far as we know, four "Thutmoses" reigned and, in theory, about thirteen "Ramesses" reigned. We have quite a lot of information about the four Thutmoses but only sparse information for most of the Ramesseses: numbers II and III being the most notable exceptions. Hatshepsut reigned between Thutmosis II and III. She seems to have been married to Thutmosis II who died young. After his death, Hatshepsut began to reign in her own right. This may have been a bit like the case of William III and Mary II of the United Kingdom (of England and Scotland), where William was in any case the former Prince of Orange, a Dutch principality. That couple was united by marriage as well. After Mary, daughter of James II, died, William continued ruling. After Hatshepsut's demise, abdication, death, overthrow, execution or whatever, we do not know, Thutmosis III, possibly another son of Thutmosis I, took over. He was a very powerful king of Egypt.

However, the more important question which is often left unanswered, is what do the names Thutmosis or Ramesses mean? A simple breakdown of these names indicates two well-known gods of Egypt - Thut (or Tut) and Ra. The latter part is simply Moshe which means "drawn from the water". Since Egypt relied so much on the Nile for its existence, status and commerce, the ruler of Egypt was, in a sense, the river. So any leader might well take a cognomen to indicate his status "from the River". The most famous case of this is of course the Hebrew prophet, lawgiver and leader of Israel. His sister hid him in the waters of the Nile to protect him from the pharaoh's edict that all Hebrew new-born boys had to be executed. As it happened, a daughter of Pharaoh found him and adopted Moses. Moses, "drawn from the water", got his name from this incident!

The 18th, 19th and 20th dynasties are the main ones that have kings who used this name - *Moshe* (Hebrew/Semitic) or *Mosis* (Greek). It is curious that these are, given the obvious parallel between a ruler of Egypt being drawn from the Nile, the only occurrences of this title or name. No other dynasties seem to have used "mosis" in their royal titles. This alone should make one suspicious of the chronologies of these supposed dynasties. Moses (Hebrew; מֹשֶׁה, *Moshe*) may well have even been groomed for leadership of Egypt, but probably not kingship, as the modern Hollywood film "Moses Prince of Egypt" alludes to. These three dynasties, according to the conventional chronology, existed between 1539 and 1069 BC. That is for a period of about 470 years. If we insert this group of dynasties into a period beginning with the rise of Israel, e.g., from 1050 BC we arrive at the year 580 BC for the end of this sequence.

The situation is complicated slightly by the need to account for a period, or periods, when the Ethiopians and Carthaginians ("Libyans") conquered Egypt and the Assyrians subsequently liberated (or conquered) Egypt. There may also have been times of

general dissension, perhaps adding to a few decades, where nobody ruled as a strong king of a united Egypt between 1050 and 580 BC. However, there is also little evidence to show that Ramesses IV to XI (possibly Ramesses X excepted) ruled at all or for anything like the 50 years or so allotted to them. **[As discussed in *Memphis, Merneptah and Ramesses And the Winged Disk of Judah*, these ramessides may have been the constitutional experiment that Herodotus reported when Egypt became a sort of confederation of 12 states or provinces with a Ramesses as leader of each province. Herodotus does not call them “ramessides” but I suspect that’s who the ramessides actually were. Thus the ramessides IV to XI (four to eleven) were contemporaries.]** But that does allow us to comfortably slot the three dynasties (or two and a half considering the paucity of information on the 20th) into the kingdom period of Israel’s existence, when the latter was a (reasonably) united kingdom from *circa* 1050-930 BC and when “Israel” split into two kingdoms, ‘Israel’ and ‘Judah’ (or “Upper and Lower Retinu” of the Egyptian records) between *circa* BC 930 to BC 586.

This might also explain why the Egyptian pharaohs began calling themselves ‘Moshe’ because as Moshe of Tut (Thutmose) or as Moshe of Ra (Ramose, Rammesse) at times when ‘Egypt’ was generally ‘stronger’ than ‘Israel’ they were in effect saying, “well your ‘Moshe of Israel’ might have led the Family (Tribes) of Israel to Canaan and yes, you left Egypt in a blaze of glory, and yes your God desolated Egypt but now our kings (or moshes), and/or gods, are far mightier than yours”.

In that context, Hatshepsut’s conversion to the worship of the God of Israel, would be seen as tantamount to heresy or even worse - Treason! Apart from Akhenaten, she was the only one who seems to have challenged the religious institutions of Egypt. We frequently read of Biblical kings of Judah doing that (one way or the other) but those two are the only serious challengers to the orthodox theology of Egypt. In support of the view that Hatshepsut converted to worship Jehovah (*Yahweh*), her temple at Deir el-Bahari resembles Solomon’s. Furthermore, Akhenaten probably borrowed the concept of a single ‘god’ from Israel, perhaps as a compromise measure! His religion was actually monolatry anyway. He was not a monotheist.

Another clue that the Thutmossides and Ramessides reigned contemporary with the kingdoms of Israel (united, north and south) is that we find the region on the other side of the Sinai being referred to as “Retinu”. Now it is common for even modern Israelis to refer to their home as “Eretz”, for example in responding to where they live (“**B’Eretz?**”). In Hebrew, “Our Home” or “Our Land” is *Eretzainu*. It is easy to see when Egyptians spoke this could slip into the form ‘Eretinu’ turning the ‘Tz’ or ‘Z’ into a ‘T’ sound. The vowel-sound at the start of *Eretinue* would not necessarily be easy to see in the hieroglyphics and it would not be a strong-sounding vowel in daily speech anyway so “Retinu” was most probably a general Egyptian way of referring to “Israel”. Traders crossing at the border posts or “Eretz crossings” (of today as well) might well hear an official of Israel, speaking in Hebrew, say “stop, this is our land (*Eretzeinu*)”.

Finally, ancient Egyptians had much difficulty putting an ‘l’ sound into the middle or end of a word. In that way they had the same delightful impediment, can we say in the nicest way possible, as our Japanese friends have today. Just as the Japanese will say

“Brookryn” for “Brooklyn”, the ancient Egyptians, in the only extant primary example we have (Merneptah or Israel Stela), said “Iserar” for “Israel”. Since the ‘Seed’ of Israel appears to be mentioned on this stela, there is good reason to suggest Merneptah is specifically referring to the founding patriarch of Israel - Jacob, also named ‘Israel’. Therefore, for the period when “Israel” the nation existed in ancient times, as a reasonably strong nation with organised government (including during the divided period of the Northern and Southern Kingdoms), it would not be at all surprising for Egyptians to refer to “Retinu” instead of Israel. Merneptah, of course, did spell out “Israel” in his stela for the reason outlined in the dissertation - The Seed of Jacob = Israel. In 586 BC, Merneptah, and many others no doubt, thought that Israel’s great theoretic experiment had come to a ‘final solution’ - destruction. In Egypt, *circa* BC 1485, the birth of ‘National Israel’ had started off with a bang amidst great signs and wonders. In *circa* 950 BC, Hatshepsut (The En-signed Sheba of the South?) had responded in favour of Israel on the basis of one sign, or even just a mere internal sense of devotion or piety, but Merneptah, lucky inheritor of his father’s kingdom (probably established by the Assyrians anyway) decided to boast at Israel’s final and most complete demise at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (BC 586). If Jeremiah was correct, Merneptah’s days were numbered and on another day in the future God would still remember Israel favourably. **And that is the test we are watching today.**

Appendix on Signs
(Updated February 2007)

A "Sign" ('ōwth Strong #226) in the Old Testament: "probably from 225 (in the sense of <i>appearing</i>); a signal (lit. or fig.) As a <i>flag, beacon, monument, omen, prodigy, evidence</i> etc.: - mark, miracle, (en-)sign, token.			
Genesis	1:14	לאַתת	"..let them be for signs and for seasons .."
Genesis	4:15	אוֹת	"And Jehovah set a mark on Cain ..."
Genesis	9:12	אוֹת	"And God said, This <i>is</i> the token of the (Noahic) covenant ..." (↔ אוֹת־ הַבְּרִית (וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים זֹאת
Genesis	9:13	לְאוֹת	"I have set My bow in the cloud, and it shall be a sign of a (Noahic) covenant between Me and the earth."
Genesis	9:17	אוֹת	"And God said to Noah, This is the sign of the covenant which I have made stand between Me and all flesh that is on the earth". (↔ זֹאת אוֹת־ הַבְּרִית = This is the sign of the covenant)
Genesis	17:11	לְאוֹת	"And it (circumcision) shall be a token of the covenant between Me and you (Abraham)." (לְאוֹת בְּרִית) = a token of the covenant).
Exodus	3:12	הָאוֹת	" ... and this <i>shall be</i> the sign for you ..."
Exodus (Refer Note 1)	4:8	הָאוֹת	"... hearken to the voice of the first sign " (First = Rishon, הַרְאִשׁוֹן)
Exodus (Refer Note 1)	4:8	הָאוֹת	" .. will believe the voice of the latter sign " (Latter = Acheron, הַאֲחֵרוֹן)
Exodus (Refer Note 2)	4:9	הָאוֹתוֹת	".. will not believe also these two signs "
Exodus (Refer Note 2)	4:17	הָאוֹת	".. hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs " (אַת־ הָאוֹת)
Exodus	4:28	הָאוֹת	".. all the signs which he had commanded" (וְאוֹת כָּל־ הָאוֹת)
Exodus (Refer Note 3)	4:30	הָאוֹת	".. Moses did the signs in the sight of the people" (מֹשֶׁה וַיַּעַשׂ הָאוֹת)

Exodus	7:3	את - אתתי	".. My signs and My wonders in the land of Egypt"
Exodus (Refer Note 1, 4)	8:23	האת	"And I will put a division between My people and thy people: to morrow (sic) shall this sign be" (Authorized Version). [Interlinear; " Miracle "]
Masoretic Text:	8:19		
Exodus	10:1	אתתי	" .. might shew these my signs before him" (Interlinear: "these signs of Mine in their midst").
Exodus	10:2	אתתי	" .. and My signs which I have done among them, and you may know that I am Jehovah"
Exodus Note 1	12:13	לאות	"And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are ... (והיה הדם לכם לאות על הבתים)
Exodus	12:6	אתו	"... and shall kill it ..."
Exodus	13:9	לאות	".. for a sign unto thee upon thine hand" (Re: keeping the Passover).
Exodus	13:16	לאות	"And it shall be a sign on your hand, and frontlets between your eyes"
Exodus	31:13	אות	"For it is a sign between Me and you" (Re: the Sabbath)
Exodus	31:17	אות	".. A sign between me and the children of Israel"
Numbers	2:2	באתת	"Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their father's house .." (Interlinear: according to the ensigns)
Numbers	14:11	האתות	".. how long will it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which I have shewed among them?"
Numbers	16:38	לאות	".. and they shall be(come) a sign unto the children of Israel."
Numbers	17:10	לאות	" .. to be kept as a token to the sons of rebellion"
Deuteronomy	4:34	באתת	".. by signs , and by wonders, and by war."

Deuteronomy	6:8	לאות	".. bind them for a sign upon thine hand."
Deuteronomy	6:22	אותת	".. the Lord shewed signs and wonders."
Deuteronomy	7:19	והאתת	" .. and the signs , and the wonders, and the mighty hand, and the stretched out arm"
Deuteronomy	11:18	לאות	" .. bind them for a sign upon your hand."
Deuteronomy	13:1	אות	" .. and giveth thee a sign or a wonder."
Deuteronomy	13:2	האות	".. the sign or the wonder come to pass.." (Wonder = mōwphêth, מופת)
Deuteronomy	26:8	ובאתות	".. and with signs , and with wonders ..."
Deuteronomy	28:46	לאות	".. they shall be upon thee for a sign , and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever."
Deuteronomy	29:2,3	האתת	".. Ye have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt unto Pharaoh, and unto all his servants, and unto all his land; the great temptations which thine eyes have seen, the signs , and those great miracles.."
Deuteronomy (Extracts)	34: 9-11	האתת	"And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him ... (vs 10) .. And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew <i>face to face</i> (פנים אל - פנים), * (vs 11) in all the signs and wonders which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt to Pharaoh ... ". * Note plurality, actually "faces to faces".
Joshua	2:12	אות	" ... and give me a true token :" (Re Rahab's agreement with the two spies).
Joshua	4:6	אות	"That this may be a sign among you"
Joshua	24:17	את - האתת	".. which (who) did those great signs in our sight"
Judges	6:17	אות	" .. me a sign that thou talkest with me"
1 Samuel	2:34	האות	" ... this shall be a sign unto thee that ..." (Re the death of the sons of Eli).

1 Samuel	10:7	האתת	“ .. when these signs are come unto thee”.
1 Samuel	10:9	האתת	“.. all those signs came to pass that day”
1 Samuel	14:10	האות	“ .. and this shall be a sign unto us” (Re: Jonathan’s exploits).
2 Kings	19:29	האות	“And this shall be a sign unto thee, Ye ...” (Re Sennacherib’s attempt to destroy Jerusalem).
2 Kings	20:8	אות	“What shall be the sign that the Lord will heal me” (Re: Hezekiah’s mortal illness)
2 Kings	20:9	האות	“This sign shalt thou have of the Lord” (Re letting the Sun’s shadow ‘return backward ten degrees’).

Nehemiah	9:10	אתת	“ .. signs and wonders upon Pharaoh, and on all his servants”
Job	21:29	אתתם	“Have ye not asked them that go by the way? And ye do not know their tokens ” (signs ’, Interlinear)
Psalms	65:8	מאותתך	“They that dwell in the uttermost parts are afraid at thy tokens : ...” [Actually ‘From (מ) your (↔ יך) signs ’ - Interlinear]
Psalms	74:4	אותתם אתות	“Thine enemies roar in the midst of thy congregations: they set up their ensigns for signs ”
Psalms	74:9	אתותינו	“We see not our signs : <i>there is no more any prophet neither is there</i> among us any that knoweth how long” (ינו = ‘our’).
Psalms	78:43	אתותיו	“How he had wrought his signs in Egypt, and His wonders in the field of Zoan”.
Psalms	86:17	אות	“Show me a token for good (לטובה)”
Psalms	105:27	אתותיו	“... shewed words (דברי) of his signs among them”

Psalms	135:9	אתות	"Who sent tokens and wonders into the midst of thee, O Egypt, upon Pharaoh (בפרעה) ..."
Isaiah	7:11	אות	"Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God"
Isaiah	7:14	אות	".. The Lord Himself shall give thee a sign "
Isaiah	8:18	לאתות	" ... are for signs and for wonders in Israel"
Isaiah	19:20	לאות	"And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of Hosts in the Land of Egypt (↔ בארץ מצרים) :"
Isaiah	20:3	אות	"Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot three years <i>for</i> a sign and wonder upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia". * [* Actually 'Cush' (כוש)]
Isaiah	37:30	האות	"This shall be a sign unto thee, Ye shall .."
Isaiah	38:7	האות	" .. this shall be a sign unto thee from the Lord"

Isaiah	38:22	אות	"What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord" (מעלה בית יהוה) (מה אות כי)
Isaiah	44:25	אתות	".. frustrateth the tokens of the Liars"
Isaiah	55:13	לאות	" .. for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."
Isaiah	66:19	אות	"I will gather all nations ... they shall come, and see my glory. And I will set a sign amongst them, and I ..."
Jeremiah	6:1	משאת	"... set up a sign (<i>mas'eth</i> , Strong #4864) of fire at Beth-haccerem ..."
Jeremiah	10:2	ומאתות	".. O house of Israel: Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them." (↔ ומאתות השמים)

Jeremiah	32:20	אתות	".. (Who) has set signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, even unto this day ..."
Jeremiah	32:21	באתות	" .. and hast brought forth thy people Israel out of the land of Egypt with signs , .. wonders ... strong hand ...stretched out arm ... great terror ..."
Jeremiah Refer page 11 of Synopsis	44:29	האות	"And this shall be a sign unto you ... I will punish you in this place." (i.e., "all the men of Judah that are in the land of Egypt") ... vs 30 "Behold, I will give Pharaoh Hophra king of Egypt (↔ את - פרעה חפרע מלך מצרים) into the hand of his enemies ..as I gave Zedekiah king of Judah into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar (נבוכדנצר)."
Ezekiel	4:3	אות	"This <i>shall be</i> a sign unto the House of Israel"
Ezekiel	14:8	לאות	".. and will make him a sign and a proverb ...and ye shall know that I <i>am</i> the Lord"
Ezekiel	20:12	לאות	".. I gave them my sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."
Ezekiel	20:20	לאות	" ... and hallow my sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you ..."
Ezekiel (Refer Note 5)	39:15	ציון	" .. When any seeth a man's bone, then shall he set up a sign by it ..."
Daniel	4:2	אתיא	"I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me."
Daniel (Refer Note 6)	4:3	אתוהי	"How great are his signs ! And how mighty are his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom and his dominion is from generation to generation (עם - זר ודר) - Nebuchadnezzar (נבוכדנצר) speaking.
Daniel	6:27	אתין (Aten as in Akhen- aten ?)	"He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions."

NB: The last three examples from the Book of Daniel are included here because of the following from Strong's Concordance;

852: “ ’ath (Chald), *awth* corresp. To 226; a *portent*: - sign ; and

853: “ ’eth, ayth; appar. Contr from 226 in the demonstr. sense of *entity*; prop. *self* (but generally used to point out mor def. the object of a verb or prep. *even* or *namely*): - [as such unrepresented in English].

Notes:

(1) These appear to be the only places in the Old Testament where the word for “the sign” (singular) is in the form *h’at* (↔ האת). Elsewhere “the sign” is generally in the form *h’aut* (↔ האות). In English speech, or in other languages like ancient Egyptian, these might be read ‘hat’ and ‘hot’ because the ‘au’ as in Australia or Austria is an ‘o’ sound. In these examples, the Hebrew (ה) stands for the definite article ‘the’. Why is there a difference between *h’at* and *h’aut*? And why just four examples out of 43 in the singular form? [In Zechariah 12:10, a fifth example “upon me (את) whom they have pierced” might be argued].

In regard to modern interpretations of the Egyptian “hat” seen in the hieroglyphs one obvious possibility is that there has been a transcription error that is the fault of an Egyptian scribe. Or, as discussed elsewhere, it might be that archaeologists are slightly misreading the hieroglyphics, reading *h’at* in the Egyptian in Hatshepsut or Amenemhat (Hat-em-Amen ?) when *h’aut* or *h’ot* would be a better transcription. However, if, as my thesis suggests, there is some link between what the archaeologists read as *h’at* in the first part of Hatshepsut’s name and the Hebrew word for ‘sign’, another possibility arises. In fact, it is the pursuit of that question that effectively led me to consider the following.

Another possibility, and another intriguing one again, is that Jesus’ final response to persistent demands for a sign (from Heaven or from Himself) in the New Testament might be a reference or fulfillment of the sentence in Exodus 4:8. The only sign He was finally prepared to give, after everything else He had done, was a “sign of resurrection” or strictly, “the sign of Jonah”. That refers to Jonah’s miraculous resurrection from the great fish of the sea (Matthew 12:39 and Luke 11:29, refer also to the Book of Jonah). In terms of Jesus’ own resurrection, the Jewish leadership continued to reject this sign as confirmed by the statement in Matthew 27:64-65 where they said to Pontius Pilate “that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night and steal Him away”. Whether one believes the reliability of the record or not, or indeed any of this, the discussion recorded in the New Testament between the Jewish leaders and Pilate contextually recognises a continuing rejection of Jesus’ resurrection. This situation might reflect the words “if they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the **voice of the first sign** (*h’at*, האת) ...”. Refer Exodus 4:8.

After Jesus’ resurrection and the preceding raising of Lazarus, which was presumably

the voice of the first sign, the only other sign of “resurrection” or sign of “Jonah” with an associated ‘voice’, that is recorded in the Bible, comes in the Book of Revelation 11:3-12. In that passage, which also answers a question posed 500 years earlier in Zechariah 4:14, “the two anointed ones” are slain after they preach their message. They are left as cadavers on the streets of Jerusalem only to arise and go up to Heaven after “three days and a half”. The result of this momentous event is that “they (men of Jerusalem) gave glory to the God of Heaven”. A major theme of the New Testament is that Israel will eventually “be saved” (Romans 11:26) *in toto* and this event in Revelation 11 is part of that (still future) process that leads Israel to “.. believe the **voice of the latter sign** (*h’at, תאֲהוּ*)”. Refer Exodus 4:8 and Revelation 11:12.

Very few people, about 500 according to I Corinthians 15:6, saw Jesus after his resurrection. The leadership of Israel along with many others rejected the raising of Lazarus. We do not know of any voice, loud or otherwise, accompanying Jesus’ resurrection unless the earthquake, recorded in Matthew 28:2, that frightened away the soldiers accounts for this or equals a third ‘voice’. Only the resurrections of Lazarus and the Two Witnesses are accompanied with a voice speaking words from a known language clearly understood by the surrounding public. The conclusion from this is that the resurrections of Jesus, Lazarus and The Two Witnesses are signs that meet the conditions of the ‘Sign of Jonah’ but those of Lazarus and the Witnesses are specifically tailored for the audience we label “The Children of Israel” and specifically fulfill the prophecy in Exodus 4:8. **[I am now coming to the view that only Jesus’ resurrection is ‘a’ or ‘The’ Sign of Jonah. The resurrections of Lazarus and later, in our future, the resurrections of the Two Witnesses (“the two anointed ones”) fulfill the two signs in Exodus 4:8. The Two Witnesses are not even buried. Their bodies are left lying on the street. So only Jesus’ own resurrection fulfills the “Sign of Jonah”. The other two resurrections refer to the two signs given to Moses to demonstrate before Pharaoh and the Children of Israel. It is important to note that “Israel” readily and completely accepted Moses after he demonstrated the two miracles of Exodus 4:8. Why then have a debate about whether Israel would accept Moses this time. Forty years earlier, Moses had attempted to help Israel after killing the Egyptian assaulting the Israelite man. That Israelite subsequently asked Moses who told you to lead us? So Moses’ hesitation in Exodus 4:8 is quite understandable, but why does God not know the outcome? The next paragraph continues from this point].**

It is worth noting that in the incident recorded in Exodus Chapter 4, the Children of Israel, in what is an almost laconic comment (verses 30 and 31), “believed”, without question “these signs which Moses did”. Why then the elaborate or intense discussion between Moses and God (who knows the future anyway) about whether the people would or would not believe? Israel’s unquestioning acceptance at this point, virtually the only time Israel is recorded as being so compliant and obedient to the point of perfection, makes that whole discussion between God and Moses about Israel’s response even more intriguing. Even if one only considered the Bible to be a collection of stories, this discussion is quite strange just simply from the point of view of literary technique. It’s quite unnecessary. A story-teller knows the outcome of his tale so he does not invent passages like Exodus chapter 4:1-17.

All of this then led me (2005-7) to develop an integration of Exodus 4:8 firstly with the passages recording Elijah's and Elisha's resurrections of the Phoenician women's sons and secondly with Jesus' own resurrection and subsequent first appearance to the Magdalene. Jesus appeared to specifically choose Mary Magdalene to announce His resurrection. As *The Da Vinci Code* and other books query, the reason why Jesus chooses Mary Magdalene first, rather than His mother or Peter or even John, to make His resurrected physical appearance is enigmatic to say the least. Their view is that He wanted to appear to His beloved wife before anyone else. But the real reason must be to reveal a sort of code through a sequence of seemingly unrelated bits of Biblical text to effectively prove that the Resurrection of Jesus is almost certainly true. It cannot be a proof for that would contravene the Biblical necessity for faith for salvation. (This author believed the Resurrection of Jesus long before he discovered any of this historical data). However, anyone who does reject the Resurrection having been shown the sequence in detail will surely regret that decision in future. Investigating the meaning of the name for this great Queen (Sheba), assuming she is Hatshepsut, leads to an unlocking of the meaning of some very important Biblical passages.

Returning to the relationship between Sheba, Hatshepsut and the Queen of the South and "The Sign", we note the "Queen of the South" will "rise up" (i.e., resurrect) in "judgement" of the generation of Jesus' day and "shall condemn it" (Matthew 12:42, Luke 11:31). The leaders of Israel, although not all of them, and the people following those leaders, began rejecting Jesus before the resurrection of Lazarus, and in my view even at His Birth and His Bar-Mitzvah-year-12 in the Temple. They disbelieved Him over the Beelzebub incident (Matthew 12:24, Mark 3:22 and Luke 11:15) but it may finally be due to their disbelief in the "**voice of the first sign**" (i.e., the raising of Lazarus) that "Hat-Shep-sut" will condemn them. She heard, obeyed and acted on that voice (sign, H'at, הַאֵת) she received. According to the Gospel texts, "Israel" (i.e., its leaders etc.,) did not believe many other signs previously given by Jesus, let alone those of the prophets before Him as Jesus Himself pointed out. However, the Queen Sheba positively, correctly and faithfully responded to the one and only sign she had. According to some renditions of her statement on the walls at Deir el-Bahari, Hatshepsut (Hat-Sheba-Sut?) says "I heard the voice of (a?) (god?) God". This "voice", which might be a sort of inner feeling or indeed a clearly audible voice - who can say - exhorted her to go and look at the land of Punt for herself. Assuming Punt includes Israel of Solomon's time, we have here a very clear link between Jesus, Solomon, Hatshepsut and the Queen of the South via this particular rendition of the Hebrew word for 'sign' - **and the voice of the sign**.

We can link the word for 'sign' used by Jesus during His sojourn in Israel with the word in the Old Testament by reference to a *Haggadah* on Simon Peter. In that tract "*oth*" (↔ אֹת) is the Hebrew word for sign. [Refer to Edersheim in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (page 789)]. This was written by Jews who rejected the Messianic claims of Jesus (Hebrew; יֵשׁוּעַ, *Yeshua*). They would write the most commonly found form of the word in the local parlance of the day. According to these 'critical' Jewish commentators in the period immediately following the crucifixion/resurrection, Peter had to prove himself worthy of leadership, although James the brother of Jesus seemed to have this status in regard to the Church at Jerusalem. To prove his worthiness, Peter also had to "prove his claim by a sign" just as "Jesus had done while he was alive"

(passim 789). Incidentally, of course, this is evidence from a sceptical quarter that the request for a (special) sign from Jesus was an historical incident and that it was a very public issue at the time.

It seems sensible to assume that to the Israeli (Israelite) public in Jesus' day knowledge about the Queen of Sheba or the Queen of the South was at least as common as knowledge of William the Conqueror or Alfred the Great is to modern Englishmen even though a thousand (or 1200) years separate these English kings from the moderns. Some mythological *obiter dicta* might have crept in to accompany a typical person's knowledge of these kings but their essential historicity is understood and accepted. If, as Josephus says, the (mighty) queen of no less a place than Egypt and Ethiopia came to visit Jerusalem on a journey crossing between a pilgrimage and mission of state, then one might expect this event to be written down in formal documents of both nations. One would expect the event to be remembered in the popular imagination or memory as one of the more significant events of yesteryear. Hence Jesus made the comparison. He touched on a bit of well-known history. It made a lot of sense to the public of his day. The writing of the scriptures was inspired by God in order to demonstrate these things and preserve them in a written record for later generations and in particular for the generation spoken of in Daniel 12:4, 9. It is just that it makes little sense to the academics of today. Blinded by their own chronological distortions, they are disinclined to follow this line of research, or barely able to conceptualise such a line.

(2) Since the two signs in Exodus 4:8 are the "first and last" or *rishon* and *acheron*, and the word for sign in the four cases in Exodus 4:8 (x2), 8:23 and 12:13 is made up from just the first and last letters of the alphabet, I then began exploring the incidence of the 'first' and 'last' in the Old Testament. The normal word for sign could be read 'aleph' (א) and (vav, ו) 'tav' (ת) to form the word אַת because vav (ו) is often a conjunction usually inserted as the first letter of a word but not standing alone as an independent word as we do with our 'and'. A sign points the way for a journey which has a start and an end with much in between.

To illustrate this point, I have selected the following passages for their relationship to the first-last theme which speaks of God who is "The First and the Last":

Jeremiah 50:17-18 re Assyria and Babylon being the first and last nations to conquer Israel;

Exodus 17:6 (Moses to smite the Rock) and Numbers 20:8 (Moses to speak to the Rock);

Numbers 24:20 where Amalek is first or chief of the nations but will perish at latter end;

Exodus 17:12, where the sun goes down at the end of a long battle against Amalek, is contrasted with Joshua 10:12, 27. These two contrasts are with two battles where Joshua fights until sunset. The first (Amalek just outside Egypt in the Sinai Desert) is an inconclusive result suggesting Israel was badly mauled or bruised. However, the last (latter) is a comprehensive defeat for the enemy. The first is when Joshua is a young

man but the battle for Jerusalem is when he is much older. The first is in the desert and the latter in the Land of Milk and Honey (Paradise). The first parallels Jesus (Yeshua) being bruised by Satan. The last parallels Jesus' (Yeshua's) comprehensive slaughter of His enemies at Bozrah (Isaiah 63:1-5). In the latter, Isaiah has the victor "looking around" and "there was none to help" with "none to uphold". This is a contrast with Aaron and Hur upholding Moses' hands as Joshua battled Amalek (Exodus 17:11). However, Jesus won't need any help at Bozrah.

Exodus 32:16 just before Moses breaks the first set and Deuteronomy 10:1-10 for the Lord's command to make two new tables of stone for God to write a new set of Ten Commandments;

Deuteronomy 18:18 for the theme of Moses and Jesus being the first and last prophets;

Elijah (first?) and the resurrection of the Zarepathite woman's son (I Kings 17:9-24) and Elisha (last?) and the Shunamite woman (II Kings 4:8-37, 8:1-6) and resurrection of her son. Relationship of these two resurrections with Exodus 4:8, John 11:25, 43,46-53, Revelation 11:3-13. Exodus 4:8 is fulfilled by the New Testament resurrections of John 11 and Revelation 11 and not by those of Elijah and Elisha which are fore-runners of the NT examples. Two pairs of resurrections, first and last in each. The resurrection of Jesus was to 500+ faithful alone and to all subsequent generations of those who believe but don't see.

Tohu and *bohu* (תהו ובהו) of Genesis 1:2 (the Aleph) contrasted with end of unsaved Man's reign in Isaiah 34:11 (the Tav) but punctuated by Jeremiah 4:23 (the Vav so to speak). In the beginning, the earth became *tohu* and *bohu* because of Satan's disobedience. At the end, since Bozrah is Edom's former capital, Messiah destroys Edom as thoroughly as He will waste Satan in the fires of Hell because of Edom's complicity in helping to destroy Israel not only in the past but in our day too (Edomite refugees in the Palestinian 'diaspora'). Between the destruction of Satan's dwelling on this earth and the destruction of Edom (in our future), God allowed Nebuchadnezzar to waste Judah and Israel to punish disobedient Israel. But that was not a permanent punishment (Jeremiah 30:10-11) like the other two. Satan will never see or experience his former dwelling again. Judah's "*tohu* and *bohu*" came between the first creation (for Satan and the angels) and the last whether one considers that to be the New Heaven and Earth or the preparation for a restored earth for the Messianic Kingdom to operate in.

Genesis 1:1 (א) and Revelation 21:1 (ת) punctuated by Isaiah 65:17 (ו) are reminders of the New Heaven and New Earth to replace the old destroyed by sin.

Dial of Ahaz in Isaiah 38:8 and II Kings 20:11.

Isaiah 41:3 and NT quotes in Matt 3:3, Mark 1:3, Luke 3:4, John 1:23, re John the Baptist and the voice crying in the wilderness. Although Luke quotes the full passage, John actually cuts short because there will be a break for the Mystery Kingdom brought in by Israel's rejection of the king. John fulfills the first part if Israel had accepted John and the Messiah but Elijah returns to fulfill the rest of the prophecy as Israel is prepared

prior to the Second or Last Coming to accept Jesus (Yeshua).

Isaiah 61:1 and Jesus' quote thereof in Luke 4:18. This is where Jesus parallels John the Baptist's quote (previous paragraph) and breaks the quotation He reads so that the end is separated from the beginning. Jesus fulfills the first part at his First Coming and the last part at his Last (Second) Coming.

Isaiah 44:6 and Revelation 21:6, 22:13 (as well as 1:8, 11, 17) where God is first and last, Jesus is Alpha and Omega (Aleph and Tav, אַת).

Isaiah 48:12-16.

Leviticus 26:40 and Isaiah 65:7.

Exodus 1:11 re "(את) Pithom and (את) Raamses" - the first city (Pithom) built in 1500 BC by Amenemhat III and the last being the final (last) phase of Egyptian grandeur was renovated and expanded from 650 BC by Ramesses II.

Jeremiah 23:20 and the last days (בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים), Isaiah 2:2, Genesis 49:1.

Jeremiah 31:31 and New and Old Covenants.

Haggai 2:9: "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former", or, "גְּדוֹל יִהְיֶה כְבוֹד הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאֲחֵרִין מִכְּהַרְאֲשׁוֹן".

Job 8:7

Ruth 3:10 where Boaz's obscure statement has more meaning if we consider: his own ancestry from the less-than-ideal Tamar or Rahab; and Ruth's from Lot's incest with his daughters; contrasting with the very prim and proper courtship he and Ruth had; and considering their descendants included David and Jesus. There was more righteousness at the latter end than at the beginning when we consider what Tamar, Rahab and Lot's daughters got up to!

(3) After showing the miracles to the people, Moses and Aaron took them to Pharaoh who then replied in Exodus 5:2, "Who is the Lord (יהוה) that I should hear his voice?" I believe we can say this was Amenemhat IV (or possibly Hat-em-Amen IV) of the 12th dynasty. This contrasts with Pharaoh Hatshepsut who tells us she immediately responded to the voice she heard as noted on the walls of her temple at Deir el-Bahari. The 12th dynasty's Amenem-**hat** IV disregarded God's voice but the 18th dynasty's **Hat**-shepsut obeyed it As the so-called "Queen of Sheba", the Bible tells us she obeyed and acted positively towards this voice. The 19th dynasty's Merneptah-**Hot**-ephir-maat (Hophra-maat), however, saw Israel coming back full circle with the Jews populating Memphis-Pithom in *circa* 600 BC as refugees escaping the punishment God had allowed Nebuchadnezzar to inflict on Judah. Merneptah said, "Israel's Seed is destroyed or cut off and the land razed to the ground". Jeremiah forecast what would happen to him in Jeremiah 44:30.

(4) “Tomorrow” is obscure but probably relates to Jesus being the cause of separation between believing Jew and Gentile versus unbelieving Jew and Gentile. We know that some Egyptians joined the Exodus, and possibly even Edomites as well if Caleb’s ancestor is the same person with that name amongst the Edomite Dukes. The records of Othniel and Caleb suggest they could have been descended from the Edomite Kenaz (Genesis 36:11,42, Numbers 32:12). Other examples of this use of “tomorrow” occur in Esther 9:13, Genesis 30:33 and Exodus 16:23 where את appears twice with another meaning, “This is that”. “That” in English is “the at” in contrast with “the here” and could be said to consist of the Hebrew *eth ath* (את את).

(5) The planting of these signs takes place after Meshech’s host is destroyed (Gog and Magog). One interesting thing here is that the word tsîyûwn (Strong 6725) is really the origin of the English word ‘sign’. Accepting that Spanish turns ‘w’ into ‘g’ we get tsîyûgn or tsign or sign. The ‘g’ is like a silent vowel in English hence. This parallels the vav (ו) or (‘o’, ‘u’ or ‘v’) in Hebrew. The ‘w’ is a ‘double ‘u’ or double ‘v’. Gebal (גבל) reflected in today’s Gebal-Tyre or Gibraltar, was somehow transliterated into “Byblos”, the ‘os’ being the Greek nominative ending common for subject nouns. How ‘G-B-L’ came to be B-B-L and how ‘G-B’ or “B-B’ became ‘W’ is something of a mystery unless the Hebrew *gimel* (ג) was mistaken for a vav (ו). Furthermore, the Hebrew *beit* (ב) or ‘B’ also counts as a ‘v’ for which the Hebrew vav is also used. So the word was read ‘V-V-L’ or W-L. The latter in the form of Port-u-Gal gives us “Portugal”. That may mean, originally, that “Portugal” was a port of Byblos until Tyre achieved sole dominance over the Phoenician system. Originally, both Gebal-Byblos and Tyre shared Gibraltar as a base. In the polyglot pre-Roman Mediterranean, many variations and mixes of Phoenician, Hebrew, Greek and later Latin scripts were in use. Whether we can untangle the various bits of confusion when transliterations took place is an unknown. Most likely, we can no longer sort out the mess. We just have to live with the results and confusion. Finally, the Hebrew word here for ‘sign’ is the same as for Zion.

(6) Nebo=Mercury=Hermes is the messenger from the gods in the pagan pantheon thus Nebuchadnezzar sees himself as Nebo’s zzar (Tsar, Sar or Shah) of the Ch-d-n or Chaldean. Also Hermes, Hermeneutics or what we can learn about God by studying the Scriptures.

Merneptah and the Seed of Israel.

Merneptah Baenre Hotepirmaat's (or 'Hophra's) reference to Israel, archaeologists frequently remind us, is "the first reference to Israel in an Egyptian inscription". What they do not add is that it also appears to be the last reference to 'Israel' in Egyptian literature. If there are other references, we either have not found them, or our archaeologists and commentators overlooked them in their narratives.

The problem is resolved in two ways. Either 'Israel' was more commonly referred to by some other name (c.f., *Retinue*), or names, or it is possible to infer that Merneptah's reference was aimed not at Israel the nation but at Israel the patriarch. Israel the nation is descended from Israel the Patriarch i.e., Jacob who was renamed 'Israel' after his struggle with God (Genesis 32:28). Israel is also descended from Abraham and Isaac but other nations (Arabia and Edom) can also claim descent from the first two Patriarchs. The Twelve Tribes of Israel were descended from the families that came to Egypt as refugees from famine in 'Canaan'. These families multiplied over four hundred years of sojourn in Egypt and they left their host nation in a blaze of glory (or destruction), claiming to be the Chosen of God, the Seed of Jacob (Israel). This is why Israel is really looked on as the Seed of Jacob (Israel). To connect Merneptah's reference to Israel in this context is not particularly obvious unless it is considered in the context of the word 'Seed' in its theological context with Israel.

Theologically, the 'Seed' referred to the promise given to the wives of Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob then Judah, one of the sons of Jacob (Israel). From the beginning of the 6th Century BC (probably 610-586 BC), Nebuchadnezzar began to carry away to Babylon all the 'Chosen' or the brightest and 'royals' of Judah and Jerusalem. This culminated with the complete destruction of Jerusalem. Nebuchadnezzar's armies despoiled the whole country. It would have seemed to the observer in Egypt, and elsewhere, that Israel's (i.e., Jacob's) Seed or posterity had indeed been exterminated.

Actually, the mere reference to 'Seed' in Merneptah's stele seems enigmatic unless it had somehow been an important concept. A concept of importance can be understood if it is looked at in the Biblical context. Some of this is in a theological context. That theological context would have been understood by Israel's contemporaries for they too had strong (probably contrary) religious beliefs. But looked at from the perspective of modern secular historians the real connections are more likely to be misunderstood. Even so, the secular observer cannot deny the frequency of reference to the concept of the 'Seed' in the Biblical text as the following table seeks to demonstrate.

The following table takes the various Biblical references to the 'Seed' in a chronological sequence beginning from the promise given to Eve, the first woman. Other references will be given to amplify the theme. The Hebrew word for 'Seed' appears more than two hundred times in the Old Testament. It is the same Hebrew word throughout, with about four exceptions, and it applies to both the plural and the singular though context determines which is to be applied. Obviously 'Seed' as in seeds of plants sown for harvesting is plural.

Those references are excluded from the table below. Sometimes 'Seed' is referred to in reference to sexual intercourse where 'Seed' can be contextually singular or plural.

Genesis	3:15	"And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy <u>seed</u> and her <u>seed</u> ; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel."
Genesis	4:25	"God has appointed me another <u>seed</u> instead of Abel".
Genesis	9:9	(To Noah) "I establish my covenant with you, and with your <u>seed</u> after you"
Genesis	12:7	(To Abram) "Unto thy <u>seed</u> will I give this land".
Genesis	13:15	(.. The land ..) "To thee will I give it, and to thy <u>seed</u> for ever"
Genesis	13:16 a	"I will make thy <u>seed</u> as the dust of the earth"
Genesis	13:16 b	" .. if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy <u>seed</u> also be numbered."
Genesis	15:3	(verse 2, "I go childless") "Behold, to me thou hast given no <u>seed</u> :"
Genesis	15:5	(alluding to the host of stars in the heavens) "If thou be able to number them, So shall thy <u>seed</u> be."
Genesis	15:13	With reference to the slavery in Egypt ".... thy <u>seed</u> shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs,"
Genesis	15:18	"Unto thy <u>seed</u> have I given this land"
Genesis	16:10	(To Hagar, re Ishmael's descendants) "I will multiply thy <u>seed</u> exceedingly"
Genesis Numbers	17:5 17:15 13:8 13:16	Abram (אַבְרָם) renamed Abraham (אַבְרָהָם). Sarai (שָׂרַי) renamed Sarah (שָׂרָה). Oshea (הוֹשֵׁעַ) named. Oshea renamed Jehoshua (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ) [c.f., Acts 7:45]. A word picture where the <u>seed</u> represented by the image of the Hebrew letter <i>yod</i> (י), the equivalent of English's 'i' or 'j', is taken from Sarai and conferred on Oshea.
Genesis	17:7	(To Abraham) "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy <u>seed</u> after thee."
Genesis	17:8	"And I will give unto thee, and to thy <u>seed</u> after thee, the land ..."
Genesis	17:9	"Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy <u>seed</u> after thee in their generations".
Genesis	17:10	"This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy <u>seed</u> after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised."

Genesis	17:19 - 21	<p>(19) "And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him.</p> <p>(20) And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.</p> <p>(21) But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year."</p>
Genesis	19:32	(re Lot and his daughters) " ... That we may preserve the seed of our father."
Genesis	19:34	(Lot's daughters) " ... That we may preserve the seed of our father."
Genesis	21:12	" .. for in Isaac shall thy seed be called."
Genesis	21:13	(re Hagar) " And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed ".
Genesis	22:17	" ... I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven ; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies;"
Genesis	22:18	(To Abraham) "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed because thou hast obeyed my voice"
Genesis	24:7	".. Unto thy seed will I give this land; ..."
Genesis	24:60	(Rebecca's family blessing Rebecca) "let thy seed possess the gates of those that hate them."
Genesis	26:3	(To Isaac in Canaan) "Sojourn in this land ... for unto thee, and unto thy seed , I will give all these countries ..."
Genesis	26:4	(To Isaac) "And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."
Genesis	26:24	(To Isaac) "I am the God of Abraham thy father, ... (I will) ... multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake."
Genesis	28:4	(Isaac blessing Jacob) " .. and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee ..."
Genesis	28:13	(At the scene where Jacob dreamed of the ladder going to heaven) " ... the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed ."
Genesis	28:14	(To Jacob) "... thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."
Genesis	32 :12	(Jacob asking God for protection from Esau) "I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea."

Genesis	35:12	(God to Jacob) "And the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land".
Genesis	38: 8-9, 29	"And Judah said to Onan, Go in unto thy [late] brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother. And Onan knew that the seed should not be his, and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother." (Judah then impregnates Tamar, believing her to be a prostitute, and Pharez is born, verse 29. Refer next to Ruth 4:12.)
Genesis	46: 6-7	(Jacob leaves Beersheba for Egypt) "And they took their cattle, and their goods, which they had gotten in the land of Canaan, and came into Egypt, Jacob, and all his seed with him: His sons, and his sons' sons with him, his daughters, and his sons' daughters, and all his seed brought he with him into Egypt."
Genesis	48:4	(Jacob telling Joseph, his son, what God had told him regarding his seed) " ... and will give this land (i.e., Canaan) to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession."
Genesis	48:11	(At Jacob's reunion with Joseph) "And Israel (i.e., Jacob, c.f. Gen 35:10) said to Joseph, I had not thought to see thy face: and, lo, God hath showed me also thy seed ."
Genesis	48:19	(Re Ephraim the younger son of Joseph) " ... and his seed shall become a multitude of nations."
Exodus	28:43	(Re Aaron's priestly office and his descendants) " ... it shall be a statute for ever unto him and his seed after him."
Exodus	30:21	(Re Aaron's priestly office) " ... it shall be a statute ... To them ... and to his seed throughout their generations."
Exodus	32:13	(Moses interceding on behalf of Israel about to be destroyed by an angry God) "Remember Abraham, Isaac and Israel , thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thy own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of the heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed , and they shall inherit it for ever."
Exodus	33:1	(God angry with Israel again says to Moses) " (instead) Unto thy seed (i.e., Moses') will I give it (i.e., the land)."
Leviticus	21:15	(Rules for priests) "... neither shall he profane his seed among his people."
Leviticus	21:17	(to Aaron) "Whosoever he be of thy seed in their generations that hath any blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God."
Leviticus	21:21	"No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron ... shall come nigh ... to the Lord ..."
Leviticus	22:3-4	Further statutes regarding the seed of the priestly office.
Numbers	14:24	(Re Caleb, Joshua's faithful supporter) "... and his seed shall possess it." (Promising that Caleb would survive to enter Canaan, whereas all others of his generation, Joshua excepted, would die in the desert.)

Numbers	16:40	(After Korah's rebellion) "To be a memorial unto the children of Israel , that no stranger, which is not of the seed of Aaron, (shall) come near to offer incense before the Lord ..."
Numbers	18:19	"All the heave offerings ... , which the children of Israel offer unto the Lord is a covenant to thy seed with thee."
Numbers	23:21-23	(God turns Balaam's attempts to curse Israel into a blessing. This is interesting for the clear identification of ' Jacob ' as ' Israel '): "He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob , neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel : the Lord his God is with him and the shout of a king is among them. God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn. Surely there is no enchantment against Jacob , neither is there any divination against Israel : according to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel , What hath God wrought!"
Numbers	24:7	(Another curse by Balaam turns into a blessing) "He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters, and his king shall be higher than Agag (of 'Amalek'), and his kingdom shall be exalted." [c.f., Numbers 24:20: "Amalek was the first (<i>Roshit</i> , ראשית, or 'chief') of the nations; but his latter end <i>shall be</i> that he perish for ever." (c.f., Esther 6:13.)]
Numbers	25:12-13	(God's covenant with Phineas because he stopped the Children of Israel , c.f., verses 6, 8 and 11 in the same chapter, from sinning against God) "... I give unto him my covenant of peace: And he shall have it, and his seed after him .."
Deuteronomy	1:8	"Behold, I have set the land before you, go in and possess the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them."
Deuteronomy	4:37	"Because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with mighty power out of Egypt."
Deuteronomy	10:15	"Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day."
Deuteronomy	11:9	"and that ye may prolong your days in the land, which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give unto them and to their seed , a land that floweth with milk and honey." (I.e., Israel/Canaan.)
Deuteronomy	28:46	(When Israel did not obey God's law, or while they were in disobedience, curses would "pursue" them in contrast to the situation with Balaam's attempt to curse Israel. Thus:) "And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever".
Deuteronomy	30:6	"And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed , to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." (c.f., Jeremiah 31:33).
Deuteronomy	30:19	"... Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

Deuteronomy	31:21	(Re the song that Moses is about to give before he dies:) "And it shall come to pass, when many evils and troubles are befallen them, that this song shall testify against them as a witness, for it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed : ..." (The song appears in chapter 32.)
Deuteronomy	34:4	(God shows Moses the land he promised to Israel.) "This is the land which I swear unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed : ..."

Joshua	24:3	(Joshua giving a short history of Israel before he dies.) "And I took your father Abraham from the other side of the flood, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan, and multiplied his seed , and gave him Isaac."
Ruth	4:11-12	(Boaz, Ruth's second husband, was descended from Judah and Tamar; c.f., Genesis 38: 8-9, 29.) "The Lord make the woman (i.e., Ruth) that is come into thine house like Rachel and like Leah (the wives of Jacob/Israel) which two did build the house of Israel : and do thou worthily in Ephratah, and be famous in Bethlehem. And let thy house be like the house of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah, of the seed which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman"
I Samuel	20:42	(Jonathan to David re his pact with David.) "The Lord be between me and thee, and between my seed and thy seed for ever."
I Samuel	24:21	(King Saul to David, once he realises David's seed will inherit the throne of Israel.) "Swear that thou wilt not cut off my seed after me"
II Samuel	4:8	" ... Behold the head of Ish-bosheth the son of Saul thine enemy, which sought thy life ... the Lord hath avenged my lord the king this day of Saul, and of his seed ." (David had these murderers executed.)
II Samuel	7:12	(The word of the Lord, via Nathan, to David.) "And when thy days be fulfilled, ... I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom." (c.f., I Chronicles 17:11 ff.)
II Samuel	22:51	(Note: c.f., Psalm 18:50.) "He is the tower of salvation for his king: and sheweth mercy to his anointed, unto David, and to his seed for evermore."
I Kings	2:33	"... but upon David, and upon his seed , and upon his house, and upon his throne, shall there be peace for ever from the Lord."
I Kings	11:14	"And the lord stirred up an adversary to Solomon, Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed in Edom."
I Kings	11:39	(The kingdom is divided because of Solomon's hedonism, and God gives ten of the tribes of Israel to Jeroboam the son of Nebat who later proves to be no better king.) "And I will for this afflict the seed of David, but not for ever."

II Kings	5:27	"The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever."
II Kings	11:1	"... she (Athalia) arose and destroyed all the seed royal." (The context shows that she did not quite succeed.)
II Kings	17:20	"And the Lord rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hands of spoilers, until he had cast them out of his sight."
II Kings	25:25	"... Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, of the seed royal ..." (c.f., Jeremiah 41:1)
I Chronicles	16:13-19	"O ye seed of Israel his servant, ye children of Jacob , his chosen ones ... be ye mindful always of his covenant ... <i>even of the covenant</i> which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, <i>and to Israel</i> for an everlasting covenant, Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance, when ye were but few, even a few, and strangers in it."
I Chronicles	17:11	"And it shall come to pass, when thy days be expired that thou must go <i>to be</i> with thy fathers, that I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons; and I will establish his kingdom." (c.f., II Samuel 7:12 ff. In this case, there is no reference to a need to 'chasten' the son as in II Samuel 7:14. The 'seed' here is assumed to be sinless Messiah Jesus.)
II Chronicles	20:7	(A prayer of Jehoshaphat, facing a coalition of Ammonites, Moabites and Syrians, and seeking God's help). " <i>Art</i> not thou our God, <i>who</i> didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend for ever?"
II Chronicles	22:10	"... she (Athalia) arose and destroyed all the seed royal of the house of Judah." (The context shows that she did not quite succeed, c.f., II Kings 11:2.)
Ezra	2:59	"... but they could not show (presumably from records or archives) their father's house, and their seed , whether they <i>were</i> of Israel."
Ezra	9:2	"... so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people (settlers) of <i>those</i> lands: ..."
Nehemiah	7:61	"but they could not show their father's house, nor their seed , whether they <i>were</i> of Israel."
Nehemiah	9:2 7-8	"And the seed of Israel separated themselves from all strangers, and stood and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers." "Thou <i>art</i> the Lord God, who didst choose Abram, and brought him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; And foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites to give <i>it</i> , <i>I say</i> , to his seed , and hast performed thy words, for thou <i>art</i> righteous."

Esther	6:13	"... then said his wise men and Zeresh his wife unto him (Haman the Aagagite/Amalekite), if Mordecai be of the seed of the Jews, before whom thou hast begun to fall, thou shalt not prevail against him, but shalt surely fall before him." (c.f. Numbers 24:7)
Esther	9:27	(Re the keeping of the 2-day feast of Purim.) "The Jews ordained, and took upon them, and upon their seed ... that they would keep these two days according to their writing ..."
Esther	9:28	"And that these days of Purim should not fail from among the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed ."
Esther	9:31	"To confirm these days of Purim in their times <i>appointed</i> , according as Mordecai the Jew and Esther the queen had enjoined them, and as they had decreed for themselves and for their seed , the matters of the fastings and their cry."
Esther	10:3	"For Mordecai the Jew was next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren, seeking the wealth of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed ."
Psalms	18:50	c.f., II Samuel 22:51
Psalms	22:23	"Ye that fear the Lord, praise him; all ye the seed of Jacob , glorify him; and fear him, all ye the seed of Israel ."
Psalms	22:30	"A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation."

Psalms	37:25-28	"... I (have) not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread, ... He is ever merciful ... and His seed is blessed ... for the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not His saints, ... but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off."
Psalms	69:35-36	"For God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah: that they may dwell there ... The seed also of his servants shall inherit it"
Psalms	89:3-4	"I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations. Selah."
Psalms	89:29, 30 32 33-37	(Re "David my servant" from verse 20.) "His seed also will I make <i>to endure</i> for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven If his children forsake my law then will I visit their transgression with the rod nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him ... my covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips, Once I have sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven. Selah."

Psalm	105:5-6	“Remember his marvellous works that he hath done; his wonders, and the judgments of his mouth; O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen.”
Psalm	106:23 26 & 27	“Therefore he said that he would destroy them, had not Moses his chosen stood before him Therefore he lifted up his hand against them, to overthrow them in the wilderness: To overthrow their seed also among the nations, and to scatter them in the lands.”
Psalm	126:4-6	“Turn again our captivity ... he that goeth forth and weeping, bearing precious seed , shall doubtless come again with rejoicing ...”
Proverbs	11:21	“... the wicked shall not be unpunished: but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered.”
Isaiah	1:4	“Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evildoers ... they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger.” (Note: verse 7: “Your country is desolate”. Presumably this relates more to the northern kingdom for Judah under Hezekiah still obeyed the Law.)
Isaiah	6:10 11 12 13	“Make the heart of this people fat shut their eyes; lest they see .. and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, until the cities be wasted without inhabitant ... and the land be utterly desolate, And the Lord have removed men far away but yet ... it shall return ... so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof.”
Isaiah	41:8	“But thou, Israel , art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.”
Isaiah	43:1 5	“But now, thus saith the Lord that created (בראך) thee, O Jacob , and he that formed (יצרך) thee, O Israel , Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called <i>thee</i> by thy name, thou art mine. Fear not: for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west;”
Isaiah	44:1-3	“Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant; and Israel , whom I have chosen: Thus saith the Lord that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, <i>which</i> will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant; and thou Jeshurun, whom I have chosen. For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed , and my blessing upon thy offspring.”

Isaiah	45:18-19	<p>“For thus saith the Lord that created (בּוֹרָא) the heavens; God himself that formed (יִצַר) the earth and made (וּעִשָּׂה) it; he hath established it, he created (בְּרָאָה) it, not in vain, he formed (יִצְרָה) it to be inhabited: I <i>am</i> the Lord; and <i>there is none else</i>.</p> <p>I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right.”</p>
Isaiah	45:25	“In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.”
Isaiah	48:17, 19	<p>“Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I <i>am</i> the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way <i>that</i> thou shouldest go</p> <p>... O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments ...</p> <p>... Thy seed also had been as the sand ...</p> <p>... his name should not have been cut off nor destroyed from before me.”</p>
Isaiah	53:10	“Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put <i>him</i> to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see <i>his seed</i> , he shall prolong <i>his</i> days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.”
Isaiah	54:3	“ ... and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolated cities to be inhabited.”
Isaiah	57:3-4	“But draw near hither, ye sons of the sorceress, the seed of the adulterer and the whore. Against whom do ye sport yourselves? Against whom make ye a wide mouth, <i>and</i> draw out the tongue? <i>Are</i> ye not children of transgression, a seed of falsehood?”
Isaiah	59:21	“As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that <i>is</i> upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed , nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed , saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.”
Isaiah	61:9	(Speaking of Zion/Israel:) “And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they <i>are</i> the seed <i>which</i> the Lord hath blessed.”
Isaiah	65:9	“And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob , and out of Judah and inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there.”
Isaiah	65:23	“ ... for they <i>are</i> the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them.”
Isaiah	66:22	“For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make (עֲשֶׂה), shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain.”
Jeremiah	2:21	“Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed : how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?”

Jeremiah	7:15	(Referring to Judah. More than one hundred years previously, the northern kingdom, sometimes referred to as Ephraim, had been driven out by the Assyrians.) "And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, <i>even</i> the whole <u>seed</u> of Ephraim."
Jeremiah	22:28	" <i>Is</i> this man Coniah a despised broken idol? <i>Is he</i> a vessel wherein <i>is</i> no pleasure? wherefore are they cast out, he and his <u>seed</u> , and are cast into a land which they know not?
Jeremiah	22:30 for no man of his <u>seed</u> (i.e., Coniah's) shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, ruling any more in Judah." (Matthew 1:12. Joseph, Mary's husband was descended from 'Coniah'. But Jesus is eligible to rule because He is not of Joseph's seed but "born of a Virgin".)
Jeremiah	23:8	"But, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the <u>seed</u> of the <u>house of Israel</u> out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land."
Jeremiah	30:10	"Therefore fear thou not, O my servant <u>Jacob</u> , saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, <u>O Israel</u> : for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy <u>seed</u> from the land of their captivity, and <u>Jacob</u> shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make <i>him</i> afraid."
Jeremiah	31:27	"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will sow the house of <u>Israel</u> and the house of <u>Judah</u> with the <u>seed</u> of man, and with the <u>seed</u> of beast."
Jeremiah	31:31	"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:
Jeremiah	31:32	Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day <i>that</i> I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: (c.f., Hosea 2:2,7 or Lamentations 1:1).
Jeremiah	31:33	But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people (c.f., Deuteronomy 30:6.)
Jeremiah	31:34 and they shall teach no more ... Know (ye) the Lord (?) ... for they shall all know me ... for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more
Jeremiah	31:35	Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, <i>and</i> the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night
Jeremiah	31:36	... if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, <i>then</i> the <u>seed</u> of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever.
Jeremiah	31:37	Thus saith the Lord; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth be searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the <u>seed</u> of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord."
Jeremiah	33:22	"As the host of heaven cannot be numbered ... so I will multiply the <u>seed of David</u> my servant ...

Jeremiah	33:25	... if my covenant <i>be</i> not with day and night, <i>and</i> if I have not appointed the ordinances of the heaven and the earth;
----------	-------	---

Jeremiah	33:20	..If ye can break my covenant of the day .. and of the night..
Jeremiah	33:21	... Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant ...
Jeremiah	33:26	Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob , and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob : for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.”
Jeremiah	36:30	“Therefore thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakim king of Judah; He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David:
Jeremiah	36:31	And I will punish him and his seed and his servants for their iniquity” (c.f., Matthew 1:12 where Joseph, the husband of Mary, the Mother of Jesus, is a descendant of ‘Jeconias’ of whom this curse was said by Jeremiah.)
Jeremiah	41:1	“ ... Nethaniah the son of Elishama, of the seed royal ,” (c.f., II Kings 25:25).
Jeremiah	44:30	“Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will give Pharaoh-Hophra king of Egypt into the hand of his enemies ... as I gave Zedekiah king of Judah into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar (<i>sic</i>) king of Babylon, ...” (c.f., Lamentations 1:21)
Jeremiah	46:27	“But fear thou not, O my servant Jacob , and be not dismayed, O Israel : for, behold, I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be in rest and at ease, and none shall make <i>him</i> afraid.
Jeremiah	46:28	Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant , saith the Lord: for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee , but correct thee in measure; yet I will not leave thee wholly unpunished. ”
Jeremiah	49:10	“ ... I have made Esau bare ... his seed is spoiled ... and he is not.”

And the following statements from the “Lamentations of Jeremiah”:

Lamentations 1:1	“How doth the city sit solitary, <i>that was</i> full of people! <i>how</i> is she become as a widow ! she <i>that was</i> great among the nations ...
Lamentations 1:3	... Judah is gone into captivity
Lamentations 1:16	... my children are desolate , because the enemy prevailed
Lamentations 1:18	... my virgins and my young men are gone into captivity ...
Lamentations 1:21	... all mine enemies have heard of my trouble (*) ; they are glad that thou hast done <i>it</i> : ... [* Note: especially Merneptah Baenre Hotepirmaat (Hophra) c.f., Jeremiah 44:30)

Lamentations 1:22		Let all their wickedness come before thee; and do unto them, as thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions:"
Lamentations 2:1		"How hath the Lord cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel , and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger.
Lamentations 2:2		The Lord hath swallowed up all the habitations of Jacob , and hath not pitied ... he hath polluted the kingdom and the princes thereof ...
Lamentations 2:3		... and he burned against Jacob like a flaming fire, which devoureth round about ..
Lamentations 2:5		... the Lord was as an enemy, he hath swallowed up Israel ...he hath destroyed his strongholds ...
Lamentations 2:6		... he hath destroyed his places of the assembly ...
Lamentations 2:13		... What thing shall I take to witness for thee? ... for thy breach <i>is</i> great like the sea: who can heal thee?"
Ezekiel	17:12-13	"... Behold, the king of Babylon is come to Jerusalem, and hath taken the king thereof, ... and hath taken of the king's seed ..."
Ezekiel	20:5-6	" In the day when I chose Israel, and lifted up mine hand unto the seed of the house of Jacob , and made myself known unto them in the land of Egypt ... In the day <i>that</i> I lifted up mine hand unto them, to bring them forth of the land of Egypt into a land ..flowing with milk and honey, which <i>is</i> the glory of all lands ..."
Ezekiel	43:19	"... the Levites that be the seed of Zadok ..."
Ezekiel	44:22	"... but they shall take maidens of the seed of the house of Israel ..."
Daniel	1:3	"And the king (<i>of Babylon</i>) spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring <i>certain</i> of the children of Israel , and of the king's seed , and of the princes;"
Daniel	2:43	(Daniel explaining to king Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of a dream the king had:) "... thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men ..."
Daniel	9:1	"In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes , ..."
Malachi	2:3	"Behold, I will corrupt your seed , and spread dung upon your faces ..."
Malachi	2:14-15	"because the Lord hath been a witness between thee and the wife of thy youth yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? ... That he might seek a Godly seed ."

Reference Table - "Israel's Seed is Destroyed"

Ref	Author	Text
1	Keller, W.	"Canaan is despoiled ... The people of Israel is desolate, it has no offspring ...Palestine has become a widow for Egypt ..." Dated at BC 1229.
2	Marston, Sir Charles.	"The Hittite land is at peace - Plundered is Canaan ... Israel is desolate, her seed is not - Kharu (South Palestine) has become a widow .." Note: in reference to synchronising the Fall of Jericho (to Israelites) in BC 1447 with the Eighteenth Dynasty, he says "Unless the Egyptian chronology of this period ... is quite wrong ... who then was the King of Egypt whose death brought Moses' return from Midian?"
3	Halley, H.	"Plundered is Canaan. Israel is desolated; his seed is not. Palestine is become a widow for Egypt."
4	Wilson, J A.	"Israel is desolate and her seed is not". Dated between BC 1228-1218. Quoted in New Chronological Harmony of History and the Bible by Alvin F. Showalter, page 85.
5	Montet, P.	"Khatti is in peace ... Canaan is captured ... Israel is razed to the ground, and has no more seed. Khor is a widow (kharet) of Egypt." Dated at Year 5 of Merneptah (Merenptah); or about BC 1208 on chronology usually used here.
6	Schaeffer, Claude FA.	"This conclusion is not really inconsistent with what the inscriptions say about the celebrated 'Israel' stele ...". A discussion that considers the invasion of the Sea Peoples in the context of Israel's occupation of "Palestine".
7	Halpern, J.	"The Hittite land is at peace; plundered is Canaan ... Israel is desolated; her seed is not ... Kharu (South Palestine) hath become a widow; ... Dated circa BC 1210". "Merneptah (sic) records his victories in these words The words are boastful and exaggerated ...". [They are not " exaggerated "].
8	Margolis, M L, and Marx, A.	"Chapter II: Moses, The Exodus (1220). A fresh revolt broke out in Palestine. The successor of Ramese, Me(r)neptah (1225-1215) quelled it; in a stele, found near Thebes, he boasts of having destroyed Israel".
9	Israel Pocket Library	"Another possibility is that the Exodus from Egypt occurred during the reign of Merneptah, Ramses II's son. In a stele from the fifth year of his reign (c. 1220) celebrating Merneptah's defeat of his enemies in Eretz Israel, 'Israel' is mentioned as a sedentary element, probably in the process of conquest."

10	Asubel, N.	“Canaan is plundered ... Israel is desolated, its seed is not. Palestine is become as a widow for Egypt.” “Quite obviously, the inscription does not refer to the Israelites of the Exodus. It does suggest the possibility that some Israelites were living in Canaan during the Bondage.”
11	Lowenthal, M.	“In the sole mention of the name that has come to light among Egyptian texts - Israel is crushed; it has no more seed.” Dated BC 1212.
12	Roth, C.	“ ‘Israel is desolate, her seed is not’: First mention of Israelites in contemporary records.”
13	Robinson, T H.	“ ... a stele of victory set up by Merneptah (c. 1200 BC) ...: Israel is desolated, her seed is not.”
14	Samuels, R.	“Earliest mention of Israel: Israel is laid waste, his grain (or progeny) does not exist.”
15	Grant, M.	“Israel is laid waste, its (grain) seed is not.”
16	Neubert, O.	“Israel has been levelled with the ground and her posterity exterminated.” Also notes: “Incidentally this is the first reference to Israel in an Egyptian inscription.”
17	Rohl, D.	“Desolation for Tjehenu ... plundered is Pa-Canaan Yanoam is made non-existent; Israel is laid waste - its seed is no more; Kharru has become a widow because of Egypt.” Also notes in a caption under a photograph of the stele: “The world famous ‘Israel Stela’ of Merneptah which contains the only mention of Israel in the whole corpus of surviving Egyptian texts. Cairo Museum.”

References to Table above:

1. Werner Keller. The Bible as History - Archaeology Confirms the Book of Books, page 162. Hodder and Stoughton, GB, 1958. Also second revised edition, page 164. Bantam Books, New York, 1988.
2. Sir Charles Marston. The Bible is True, page 250. Angus and Robertson Ltd, Sydney, 1935.
3. Henry H. Halley. Halley’s Bible Handbook, page 116. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1973. Fourteenth printing of Twenty-Fourth Edition.
4. J A Wilson. The Culture of Ancient Egypt, page 255. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1960.
5. Pierre Montet. Lives of the Pharaohs, page 197. Hamlyn, London, 1974.

6. Claude F A Schaeffer. A Bronze Sword from Ugarit with Cartouche of Mineptah (Merneptah) [Ras Shamra, Syria.]. In *Antiquity*, 1955, pages 228-9.
7. Joseph Halpern. *History of Our People in Bible Times*, page 82. Shapiro, Vallentine & Co, London, 1939.
8. Max L Margolis and Alexander Marx. *A History of the Jewish People*, page 14. The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 5714-1953.
9. Israel Pocket Library (various contributors and compiled from Encyclopaedia Judaica. *History Until 1880*, page 9. Keter Publishing House, Jerusalem, Israel, 1973.
10. Nathan Asubel. *Pictorial History of the Jewish People - From Bible Times to Our Own Day Throughout the World*, page 26. Robson Books, London, 1984.
11. Marvin Lowenthal. *A World Passed By*, page 412. Behrman's Jewish Book House, New York, 1938.
12. Cecil Roth. *A Short History of the Jewish People*, plate 9, between pages 8-9. East and West Library, London, 1969. (Newly revised and enlarged).
13. Theodore H. Robinson. *A History of Israel*, page 75. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1948.
14. Ruth Samuels. *Pathways Through Jewish History*, page 9. Ktav Publishing House Inc., New York, 1977.
15. Michael Grant. *The History of Ancient Israel*, page 37. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1984.
16. Otto Neubert. *The Valley of the Kings*, page 144. Robert Hale Ltd, London, 1957.
17. David M. Rohl. *A Test of Time*, pages 164-9. Century Ltd, 20 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, 1995.

General Bibliography for Synopsis

British and Foreign Bible Society. *The Bible*, King James Version.

British and Foreign Bible Society. *The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament - Hebrew and English*, English text in the King James or Authorised Version, Berlin 1903.

Courville, D. 1971. *The Exodus Problem and its Ramifications*. Crest-Challenge Books, P.O. Box 993, Loma Linda, California. 2 vols. 687 pp.

Edersheim, Alfred. 1886. *The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah*. Hendrickson, Peabody, Massachusetts.

Gilbert Martin. *Israel - A History*, Doubleday, London, 1998.

Green, Jay, P., Sr. *The Interlinear Bible Hebrew-Greek-English*, Hendricksen, Peabody, Massachusetts,, 1986.

Herodotus. *Histories*. Penguin Classics, 1974 Edition. Middlesex, England.

James, P., Thorpe, I.J., Kokkinos, N., Morkot, R., Frankish, J., 1991. *Centuries of Darkness*. Jonathan Cape, London.

Josephus, F. 1960. *The Complete Works of Flavius Josephus*. Kregel Publications, Michigan.

Keller, Werner. *The Bible as History - Archaeology Confirms the Book of Books*, Hodder and Stoughton, Great Britain, 1958.

Kees, Herman. *Ancient Egypt - A Cultural Topography*, Faber & Faber, 1961.

Leiblein, J. *Recherches sur la Chronologie Égyptienne d'après les Listes Généalogiques*, Christiana: A.W. Brogger, 1873. (Quoted from *Centuries of Darkness*).

Montet, Pierre. *Everyday Life in Egypt - In the Days of Ramesses the Great*, translated from *La Vie Quotidienne en Egypt au Temps des Ramses*, Edward Arnold Ltd, London 1958.

Newton, I. *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*, London, 1728. (Quoted from *A Test of Time*).

Rohl, D. M. 1995. *A Test of Time*. Century Books, 20 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London.

Strong, James. *The Comprehensive Concordance of the Bible - With Hebrew, Chaldee*

and Greek Dictionaries, World Bible Publishers, Iowa Falls, Iowa, U.S.A.

Taylor, Charles. *Rewriting Bible History (According to Scripture)*, House of Tabor, Unley Park, South Australia, Second Printing (with additions), 1985.

Torr, C. 1896. *Memphis and Mycenae - An Examination of Egyptian Chronology and its Application to the Early History of Greece*. Cambridge University Press. Copy available from Mary Gow, Librarian at Brooklyn Museum of Egyptology Library.

Velikovsky, I. 1953. *Ages in Chaos (1) From the Exodus to King Akhnaton*, Sidgwick & Jackson, London.

Velikovsky, I. 1978. *Ages in Chaos, (2) Ramesses II and his Time*, Sidgwick & Jackson, London.

Velikovsky, I. 1977. *Ages in Chaos, (3) Peoples of the Sea*, Sidgwick & Jackson, London.

Virgil, The Aeneid of -. 1970. Translation by Allen Mandelbaum, Bantam Books (Classic Edition), Fifth Avenue, New York.

Note to Bibliography:

The reader would be well advised to obtain copies of either *A Test of Time* by David Rohl or *Centuries of Darkness* by Peter James *et al* for excellent coverages of the problem. Those publications are excellent background for the reader who might like to study Velikovsky's framework.