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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Over three hundred years ago (A.D. 1650), Archbishop James Usher (or Ussher) worked out a chronology of the Holy Bible and assigned dates to the events of the Old Testament.

Until the latter half of the nineteenth century, his chronology of the Bible had been neither completely accepted nor rejected. There were not enough archaeological discoveries either to substantiate or to cast strong doubt on his chronological scheme. Some scholars probably regarded everything previous to the Hebrew monarchy of Saul, David, and Solomon as mere folklore.

As will be presented in this thesis, there have been many archaeological investigations that have unearthed some significant things that have changed previous concepts concerning the Old Testament chronology.

In the early part of the twentieth century, these new discoveries naturally produced great speculation, and many new theories and ideas were propounded. By 1938, in books on Biblical archaeology, such statements as this by Stephen L. Caiger were found:

To-day we no longer look on the second millennium, nor even the third or fourth millennium B.C., as "prehistoric." Modern excavation has furnished
plentiful evidence for scientific history which goes back beyond the date (4004 B.C.) fixed by our forefathers as the beginning of Creation itself! Memphis, for instance, dates back to at least 4000 B.C.; while at Kish in Babylonia has been disinterred what was perhaps the oldest civilized city in the world, founded 5000 B.C. And in every case it is no mere rude embryo of human art and organization which the discoveries have revealed, but an advanced stage of progress presupposing hundreds if not thousands of years of still earlier evolution.

Notice that Mr. Caiger supposes that civilization "evolved" for thousands of years previous. Statements like this challenge the accuracy and veracity of Usher's Biblical chronology, which places Adam about 4000 B.C.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints believes the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly. It also believes that Joseph Smith was a prophet and that through him three other revealed works of scripture have come forth—The Book of Mormon, The Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price. In this thesis the truth of these three latter scriptures is assumed, and no attempt will be made to prove them true. The prophet Joseph also revised the Bible by inspiration. This work was not completed but is used as a reference for other possible corrections.

From one of these modern scriptures, the Pearl of Great Price, we find that civilization did not evolve from a

---

low cave-man type to the higher forms of civilization, as Caiger and others have supposed. Adam received a high type of civilization from God in the very beginning and taught his children "to read and write, having a language which was pure and undefiled." (Moses 6:6) Adam was the first man on the earth. Therefore the cave men would have to be degenerate descendants of Adam. This also means that the thousands or millions of years theorized for the evolution of civilization are not necessary.

The problem then is to examine the four standard works— the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price — to see what contributions they make, such as the above illustration to a better understanding of the chronology of the Old Testament. Once this is done, scientific research bearing on the chronology of the Old Testament must be analyzed to see if it will allow the possibility of the Old Testament chronologies being accepted as it is established with the aid of these modern scriptures.

Some scientists\(^2\) have not been satisfied with previous theories and elementary findings and conclusions regarding archaeological investigations concerning the Old Testament chronology. Today with new scientific discoveries in many

---

\(^2\)Melvin A. Cook, "Geological Chronometry" (Salt Lake City: Engineering Library, University of Utah.)
fields, men of science and students of the scriptures are again turning to the scriptures with renewed belief in them as true historical documents, with such statements as the following:

...modern discovery has again acquitted the Old Testament of what once seemed an obvious anachronism ... in so many cases had further information shown that the Old Testament was right, after all... The results of archaeological discovery may quite properly be used to corroborate, supplement, and illuminate the narrative of the Old Testament, especially on its historical side.3

Justification of the Problem

The Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price are accepted by members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as revelations from God. These scriptures shed additional light on the chronology of the Old Testament. As far as is known there has not yet been a published examination of the material in these scriptures with the purpose in mind of revising the Old Testament chronology to conform to the information given in these modern scriptures. An L.D.S. scholar, W. Cleon Skousen, formed a chronology based mainly on parts of the Old Testament.4

Joseph Fielding Smith constructed a chronology on the Old

3Caiger, op. cit., p. 5,6,9.
4W. Cleon Skousen, The First 2000 Years (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1953).
Testament based mainly on the works of other non-L.D.S. scholars.\(^5\) Eric Njord ignored the contribution in the Book of Abraham of the age of Abraham when he left Haran and the synchronisms between the Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel.\(^6\) Mr. Njord told the author that he ignored or discounted the chronological record of the Northern Kingdom of Israel and its synchronisms with the Southern Kingdom of Judah because the Northern Kingdom was a very sinful nation and its records were probably not accurate nor complete.

Through the use of the Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price, a more accurate and more reliable chronology of the Old Testament can be determined.

**Research Pattern**

There are no dates attached to the historical events in the Bible. The dates of these events must be calculated by the process of association first trying to determine the number of years before Christ a certain incident occurred, and then figuring all other incidents and occurrences by measuring how many years before that they took place. Sometimes determining the number of years from one event to the

---


next is not too difficult, using scriptural references, because the number of years is given in the text. For example, "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, . . . and called his name Seth . . . And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enos . . . And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Cainan" (Gen. 5:3,6,9).

Unfortunately there are many gaps where years are not given, e.g., Samuel's reign, Joseph's life span, and other places where the years overlap each other, e.g., coregencies in the Kings' reigns of Israel and Judah. In cases like these, the years must be determined by reading the whole scriptural record covering that period, detouring around a group of events until a total for the events is reached (if possible), and then backtracking to pick up the missing link. An example of this type of problem is found in the discussion of the length of Samuel's reign.

Sometimes we get a statement of a certain number of years but find it is very difficult to determine the point from which this number of years was counted. For example, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years." (Ex. 12:40). Many have supposed that this meant that they dwelt in Egypt 430 years. From an examination of the ages of Moses's ancestors and other scriptural references, we find it almost impossible to conclude that they were in Egypt 430 years. Then what does the 430 years really represent? Is it the time from Abraham's
entrance into Canaan to the departure from Egypt? Is it from God's covenant with Abraham to the Exodus? Is it from the birth of Isaac to the Exodus? Is it from the near sacrifice of Isaac to the Exodus? This problem will be discussed and possible conclusions presented in more detail in this thesis.

As to the method and order of this study: first, all the references to "year" or "years" in the four standard works were noted from complete concordances, read and studied, noting the agreements and discrepancies in the accounts.

Second, since it is generally recognized that the Bible has many mistranslations in it, while the other three standard works are considerably more accurate, any contradictory references to years were adjusted in favor of the modern scriptures and teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith. Changes made in the Inspired Revision of the Holy Bible, except in any places where they may have varied with the three modern scriptures, were included.

Third, where there was no definite record of years given in any of the scriptures, in many instances it was possible to figure out the time by adding and subtracting other references given elsewhere in the scriptures, as illustrated in the case of Samuel's reign.

Fourth, after the most accurate chronology possible was constructed from the available references in the four standard works, the teachings and lectures of the Prophet
Joseph Smith were searched for statements that might shed some light or information that would contribute to a correct understanding of the subject.

Fifth, where there were no references of years that could be added or subtracted to arrive at a number of years for a given period, nor statements from the Prophet Joseph Smith that would help, other statements of the General Authorities of the Church, past and present, were searched that might also contribute without contradicting unreasonably what had already been established.

Sixth, chronologies of other scholars were analyzed and areas of agreement or disagreement were noted in an attempt to determine the cause and reasoning for such discrepancies.

Finally, the books on archaeology of the Old Testament, and other recent histories and scientific discoveries were searched for information that might add to our knowledge and understanding of the times and ages of the Old Testament period.
CHAPTER II

SCRIPTURAL CHRONOLOGY FROM ADAM TO MOSES

The chronology from Adam to Abraham is not open to many alternatives. The main question in that period is whether one accepts the scriptural record or not. The main problem in accepting the record as it stands is that it only takes Adam back to about 4000 B.C. and on the face value of this it seems that that is not far enough to satisfy many modern scientific, historical, and geological theories and hypotheses. However in this study evidence is presented to show that the scriptural record agrees closely with modern revelation and that the scientific theories and hypotheses have many possible errors that may be logically and scientifically adjusted to fit into the picture of the scriptural record.

Adam to the Flood

One of the most significant events in a person's life was his birth. Most of the scriptures in this early period referred to the age of a man when the next son in the genealogical line was born.

The King James Version of the Bible, the Book of Moses and the "Inspired" revision of the Bible by the Prophet Joseph Smith, all agree on the ages from father to son from Adam to Noah. Adam was 130 years old when his son Seth was born
(Gen. 5:3; Moses 6:10), Seth was 105 years old when his son
Enos was born (Gen. 5:6; Moses 6:13), Enos was 90 when Cainan
was born (Gen. 5:9; Moses 6:17), Cainan was 70 when Mahalaleel
was born (Gen. 5:12; Moses 6:19). Mahalaleel was 65 when
Jared was born (Gen. 5:15; Moses 6:20). Jared was 162 when
Enoch was born (Gen. 5:18; Moses 6:21). Enoch was 65 when
Methuselah was born (Gen. 5:21; Moses 6:25). Methuselah was
187 when Lamech was born (Gen. 5:25; Moses 8:5). Lamech was
182 when Noah was born (Gen. 5:28; Moses 8:8).

The Bible says Noah was 500 years old "and Noah begat
Shem, Ham, and Japeth" (Gen. 5:32). These three sons were not
triplets. Japheth was "the elder" brother (Gen. 10:21). The
Inspired Revision states "unto Shem also, which was the elder"
(Gen. 10:12) intimating that Shem was the oldest brother.
However Gen. 7:25 of the Inspired Revision tells that Shem
was born second. Therefore "the elder" cannot mean the oldest
brother of the three. The Book of Moses as well as the Inspi-
red Version records that "Noah was four hundred and fifty
years old, and begat Japheth, and forty two years afterward
he begat Shem of her who was the mother of Japheth, and when
he was five hundred years old he begat Ham" (Moses 8:12).
Therefore Noah was 492 years old when Shem was born.

The three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth had
daughters born to them before the flood came, but these girls
"sold themselves" and married men that would "not hearken" to
the voice of the Lord (Moses 8:15). Therefore they were not
saved from the flood. These men may have had many children in the hundred years before the flood came, but there is no indication that any of their children were saved from the flood.

The flood occurred in the 600th year of Noah's life. According to the Book of Moses then, Japheth was 150, Shem was 108 and Ham was 100 years old when the flood came.

The next person in the genealogical line is Shem's son Arphaxad, born "two years after the flood" (Gen. 11:10). There is a small problem here because the Bible says "Shem was an hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood" (Gen. 11:10). According to the Bible's own account this could not be true because the Bible said Shem was born when Noah was 500 years old and the flood came when he was 600 years, so that according to the Bible Shem would have been 102 or 103 years old two years after the flood and not 100.

We have already seen from modern scripture that Shem was 108 years old when the flood came. It seems that Arphaxad really was born two years after the flood for the scriptures in the Bible and the Inspired Version both say that unto Noah's three sons "were sons born after the flood." (Gen. 10:1). So Shem was 110 years old when his son Arphaxad was born two years after the flood began.

W. S. Auchincloss has a different interpretation. He says:

According to the Hebrew text Arphaxad was born
two years after the flood, Josephus says twelve years. The latter number is by far the most probable because Arphaxad was not the eldest son of Shem, on the contrary he was his third son born after the flood.\(^1\)

Auchincloss supposes that twelve years after the flood is better because Arphaxad may have been the third son born after the flood. The Bible does not say he was the third son. It merely lists the sons of Shem in two places and mentions him third so as to give the impression that Arphaxad was the third son. (Gen 10:22; I Chron. 1:17). Sons were not always listed in order of birth. The sons of Noah are listed Shem, Ham and Japheth (Gen. 5:30). However we know that Japheth was the oldest so that even if Arphaxad was listed third he could still have been the oldest.

Considering the information given in the Book of Moses, the record seems to indicate that Shem was 110 years old when his son Arphaxad was born two years after the flood began.

The Flood to Abraham

Unfortunately the Book of Moses ends its record with the flood so that from that point to Abraham we are left without its' invaluable help. However, the Book of Moses corroborates the accuracy of the Biblical account from Adam to Noah changing it only in the case of Enoch's length of life and in Noah's age when his three sons were born. Therefore, there seems to be no good reason to suspect that the

rest of the book of Genesis should not also be substantially correct. In this period from the flood to Abraham, the "Inspired" revision of the Bible and "The Lectures on Faith" prepared for publication by the Prophet Joseph Smith agree with the King James Version of the Bible.

From these records, then, we find that Arphaxad was 35 when Salah was born (Gen. 11:12). Salah was 30 when Eber was born (Gen. 11:14). Eber was 34 when Peleg was born (Gen. 11:16). Peleg was 30 when Reu was born (Gen. 11:18). Reu was 32 when Serug was born (Gen. 11:20). Serug was 30 when Nahor was born (Gen. 11:22). Nahor was 29 when Terah, the father of Abraham was born (Gen. 11:24). Terah was 70 when Abraham was born.

"Terah lived 70 years and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran." (Gen. 11:26). Obviously they were not all born the same year, so that the scripture should more properly read, "Terah lived 70 years and in this time begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran." This same problem occurs in the genealogy of Noah and his three sons and is resolved the same way. (See Gen. 5:32 and Moses 8:12). Haran, though mentioned last, was probably the oldest since Abraham and Nahor married Haran's daughters. (Abraham 2:2 and Gen. 11:29).

Gen. 11:31,32 says that Terah took his family and went to Haran where they lived until Terah died being 205 years old. Then the following scripture (Gen. 12:1-4) says that the Lord had told Abraham to leave his country and his kindred and
his father's house and go to a land He would show him. Verse four says Abraham "departed out of Haran" to go to Canaan when he was 75 years old, and since this statement follows the account of Terah's death, it is presumed by many including the writer of Acts 7:4 that Abraham left Haran "when his father was dead." However, if this were true, since Terah was 205 years old when he died, Abraham would have been born when Terah was 130 years old instead of 70 as a previous reference stated. To solve the problem some have disregarded the statement in Gen. 11:26 that Abraham was born when Terah was 70, since all three brothers were mentioned as being born at the same time, and have held to the other view that he was born when Terah was 130. Then seventy-five years later when Terah died at the age 205, Abraham supposedly left Haran and came to Canaan.

Gen. 12:1 said "the Lord had said" for Abraham to leave and go to another land. When had he said this and when had Abraham left Haran? Abraham said that the Lord had told him in Ur to get out of his country, kindred and from his father's house and that he took Lot and his wife and his own wife and his father "followed after" him to the land "which he denominated Haran." (Abr. 2:3,4). Abraham said his father "tarryed in Haran" and "turned again unto his idolatry, therefore he continued in Haran." (Abr. 2:5). But Abraham and Lot prayed to the Lord and the Lord appeared to him and told him to take Lot and leave Haran. It seems from this
account that Abraham left Haran before his father died. On the way to Canaan Abraham built an altar in the land of Jershon and prayed that the famine might be turned away from his "father's house, that they might not perish" (Abr. 2:17), indicating that his father and some others were still alive in Haran.

In Lecture #2, verse 46 of the "Lectures on Faith" it states "Terah was 70 when Haran and Abraham were born (xi.26)." Then in verse 47 it states:

There is some difficulty in the account given by Moses of Abraham's birth. Some have supposed that Abraham was not born until Terah was 130 years old. This conclusion is drawn from a variety of scriptures, which are not to our purpose at present to quote. Neither is it a matter of any consequence to us whether Abraham was born when Terah was 70 years old, or 130. But in order that there may no doubt exist upon any mind in relation to the object lying immediately before us, which was to show how many were contemporaneous with each other from Adam to Abraham, in presenting the present chronology we will date the birth of Abraham at the latest period, that is, when Terah was 130 years old.²

The latter date was chosen not because it was considered more correct but so that no one could accuse the lecturer of shortening the time from Adam to Abraham.

W. Cleon Skousen assumed that Terah was 70 when he "began having the three sons" because Gen. 11:26 says "And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran." Since Haran was the father of Abraham's wife who was only 10 years younger than he, Skousen supposes that Abraham must have been born twenty or thirty years later when Terah was 90 or 100 years old. However, if this passage is interpreted and recorded the same as the statement that "Noah was five hundred years old: and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth" (Gen. 5:32), then when Terah was 70 years old he was not beginning to have these three sons but had finished or had begotten them. We know that Noah was 450 when Japheth was born, 492 when Shem was born and 500 when Ham was born. Therefore he was 500 years old when he had begotten his three sons.

Although we do not know exactly how old Terah was when Abraham was born, if we were to be consistent with the other records we would have to suppose that he was born when he was seventy or before, rather than after. This passage probably should read like the Noah passage should have read; that Terah lived seventy years and in this time begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

Skousen quotes Adam Clarke as saying that Abraham was the youngest of the three brothers. There is no way to tell for sure whether Abraham was the second or the youngest son.

---

but if he really was the youngest, then following the previous line of reasoning, Terah was 70 years old when Abraham was born.

In conclusion Terah was about 70 years old when Abraham was born. Abraham was 62 years old when he left Haran as it says in Abraham 2:14. The writer of the book of Acts must have misinterpreted Genesis, chapters 11 and 12 and assumed that Abraham left Haran after Terah died when actually, as shown from Abraham's own account, he left Haran long before his father Terah died.

There is one other possible solution to this problem. The Samaritan text of Gen. 11:32 says Terah was 145 years old when he died not 205. If this is correct then Abraham may have left Haran after his father died and still have been born when Terah was 70 years old.

Abraham to Joseph and Levi

Abraham was 100 years old when his son Isaac was born (Gen. 21:5). Isaac was 60 years old when Esau and Jacob were born (Gen 25:26). The Bible doesn't tell directly how old Jacob was when his twelve sons were born, but in a round about way we can tell how old he was when Joseph was born. Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh to interpret his dream and become ruler of Egypt during the seven years of plenty and seven years of famine (Gen. 41:46). There were seven years of plenty (Gen. 41:47,48), and two years of famine (Gen. 45:6), making Joseph 39 when his father Jacob came to
Egypt to live. Jacob was 130 years old (Gen. 47:9) when he arrived in Egypt and stood before Pharaoh and Joseph was 39. Therefore Jacob must have been 91 years old when Joseph was born.

Joseph was the eleventh son of Jacob. These eleven sons were born during a period of about thirteen years. There is no way of knowing exactly how old Jacob was when these other sons were born. They were born consecutively, therefore we would not be far off if we counted back about one year for each of these sons. The one we are especially concerned with from Jacob to Moses is Jacob's third son, Levi, who was the great grandfather of Moses. If we figure back eight sons from Joseph to Levi and count each son about one year as previously mentioned, Levi must have been born when Jacob was about 83 years old.

**The Four Hundred and Thirty Year Sojourn**

The period from Joseph to the Exodus from Egypt has one major problem; namely, whether the Israelites lived in Egypt 430 years or not. If not, from what point was the sojourn measured?

The Bible says, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years" (Ex. 12:40). Notice that it doesn't state implicitly that they lived in Egypt 430 years. The record of Josephus states,

They left Egypt in the month of Xanthicus, on the fifteenth day of the lunar month: four hundred
and thirty years after our forefather Abraham came into Canaan. But two hundred and fifteen years only after Jacob removed into Egypt. . . .

The Septuagint records "Now the sojourning of the Israelites which they and their fathers had sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Chanaan was four hundred and thirty years."  

The American translation states "The length of time that the Israelites lived in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. . . ." Like the American translation many people have supposed that the Israelites lived in Egypt from the entrance of Jacob and his family from Canaan until the Exodus under Moses 430 years. The life span of the men from Jacob to Moses makes this very improbable. If Jacob was 83 years old when Levi was born, then Levi would have been 47 years old when he and his father Jacob and brothers went to Egypt. The Lord said there would be four generations after Abraham’s death to the Exodus from Egypt (Gen. 15:16). Abraham died when Jacob was fifteen and the four generations after Jacob would be

---


Levi, Kohath, Amram and Moses. The scriptures do not tell us how old Levi was when his son Kohath was born, nor how old Kohath was when his son, Amram, was born, nor how old Amram was when his son Moses was born. However, they do tell us how old each of these men were when they died, which is significant. If we divide the 430 years about equally among these three men from the time that Jacob and family came to Egypt (subtracting 80 years for the age of Moses when the Exodus occurred), we find that Kohath would have been born when Levi was about 133 years old and that Levi lived only 137 years (Ex. 6:16); Amram would have been born when Kohath was about 131 years old and Kohath lived only 133 years (Ex. 6:18); and Moses would have been born when Amram was about 133 years old and Amram lived only 137 years (Ex. 6:20). (See Chart #1)
four generations from Levi to the Exodus. Levi had three sons including Kohath before Levi and Kohath went to Egypt with Israel and his descendants (Gen. 46:11). Levi was born when Jacob was about 82 or 83 years old as near as can be determined from the scriptures. Therefore Levi could not have been much more than 47 or 48 years old when Kohath was born before they all went to Egypt to live. Assuming that this is an accurate genealogical record, this in itself rules out any possibility of there being 430 years between Jacob’s entrance into Egypt in Levi’s 47th year and Moses’s 80th year.

Regarding the Septuagint passage about the 430 years sojourn being in Egypt and in Canaan, Marston comments:

"...some authorities have halved the period of the sojourn in Egypt, and included the days of the Patriarchs, before the children of Israel, the sons of Jacob, were even born! ... If the Septuagint addition of the words 'and in Chanaan' means anything, it must refer to a time when Jacob or Israel's children were born, perhaps when Joseph was carried away into Egypt at the age of seventeen (Gen. xxxvii. 2)."  

Merrill F. Unger also commented on the Septuagint version as follows:

"...the Septuagint reading of Exodus 12:40 allows only 215 years for the Egyptian sojourn half the time in Egypt and half in Canaan. Now the time that the children of Israel dwelt in Egypt and in

the land of Canaan was 430 years. But the Masoretic Text is the reliable one and not the Septuagint tradition, as is plain from the emphatic language of Ex. 12:41 and the round number (or actual period when oppression first began) of 400 years given in Genesis 15:13 and Acts 7:6.

A Stranger In A Land That Is Not Theirs

The scripture in Gen. 15:13 states:

And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.

Let us analyze the scripture:

First of all, the Lord said this to Abraham before Abraham had any children. He said his "seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs." Some believe that being "a stranger in a land that is not theirs" refers to the Israelites sojourn as strangers in Egypt which was not their land of inheritance, and at first thought this seems to be the obvious interpretation. However, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the twelve sons were also strangers in the land of Canaan. Abraham told the sons of Heth after his wife's death in Hebron, "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you: ..." (Gen. 23:4). The Lord told Abraham that he and his seed were strangers in Canaan; "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all

---

the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Gen. 17:8). Isaac told Jacob he hoped he could "inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham" (Gen. 28:4). Gen. 37:1 tells us that Isaac was also a stranger in Canaan.

Therefore, in the light of these scriptures, being strangers in a land which was not theirs can also include their sojourn in Canaan. Someone might object to this thought because they feel that Canaan was not a land that was not theirs since God had promised it to them, so they feel it must mean Egypt. From Abraham's entrance into Canaan to Jacob's exit into Egypt "all the land of Canaan" (Gen. 17:8) never was in their possession. This was a promise to Abraham and "to thy seed after thee" (Gen. 17:8) that was not fulfilled during Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph's lifetime because the "iniquity of the Amorites" (was) "not yet full." (Gen. 15:16) The promise of all the land of Canaan as their inheritance was not fulfilled until the children of Israel returned to Canaan from Egypt and conquered it beginning with the conquests under Joshua. The people in the land of promise, when the Israelites came from Egypt and conquered it, were driven out because they were not righteous. (I Nephi 17:32-35).

The Book of Abraham adds significantly to our understanding of the question of what is meant by being a stranger in a land that is not theirs. The Lord told Abraham he would
"make of thee a minister to bear my name in a strange land which I will give unto thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession, when they hearken to my voice" (Abr. 2:6). This revelation bears out the idea that Canaan was the "strange land" and that Jacob was a stranger in Canaan as well as Egypt and that the land was promised to Abraham but not given to him but to his seed after him when they hearkened to the voice of the Lord as they did under Moses and Joshua.

There is another scripture that seems to indicate that not only Canaan but also the part of Egypt called Goshen where the twelve tribes lived, was the strange land of their inheritance. In Gen. 15:18 the Lord told Abram he had given the land "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:." Some say that the "river of Egypt" here does not mean the Nile but another river about half way between the Nile and Canaan. Smith's Bible Dictionary gives the Nile for this scripture as the river of Egypt but the other river for the rest of the Bible references about the river of Egypt. Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible also gives the Nile for this reference, "Once in O. T. (Gen 15:18) the 'river of Egypt' [Hebrew characters given here] means the Nile. If MT is correct . . ." If this river identification is right, then even though Jacob and his twelve sons lived in

Egypt, they were still living on land that the Lord had promised them as an inheritance someday.

**The Point From Which the 430 Year Sojourn Was Measured**

Having established the strong probability of the sojourn in a strange land including some of the time they lived in Canaan, the next question is from what period or event in Canaan was the count begun for the 430 year sojourn?

Paul said something to the Galations that seemed to indicate that he thought the count of the 430 years was measured from a promise the Lord made to Abraham (Gal. 3:16,17). The Lord promised Abraham many blessings while he was still living in Ur of Chaldea (Abr. 1:16-19). The Lord promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and his descendants as their inheritance many times during Abraham's life, and it is difficult to know which time the count may have started from or whether or not any of them were the starting point at all. The Lord told Abraham in Haran he was going to give his seed a strange land (Abr. 2:6). This promise was repeated again when he arrived in Canaan when he was about 62 or 75 years old (Abr. 2:14; Gen 12:17). Then after Abraham returned from Egypt and separated himself from his nephew Lot, the Lord again told Abraham that he would inherit the land (Gen. 15:7, 18). Then after Abraham had married Hagar and Ishmael was born the Lord appeared to Abram when he was 99 years old and again told him he would give the land that he was a stranger in to him and to his seed after him for an
"everlasting possession" (Gen. 17:8). Nothing in any of these occurrences gives any clue to whether or not they mark the starting point of time until the Exodus from Egypt 430 years later.

Paul also said something about a covenant the Lord made with Abraham (Gal. 3:17). The Lord established his covenant with Abraham when he was 99 years old as recorded in Genesis, Chapter 17. This was the time he changed Abram's name to Abraham and Sarai's name to Sarah. This was also the time Abraham and Ishmael and all the men in his household were circumcized. This may have been an event of sufficient importance to mark the beginning of the 430 year sojourn. The promise was made in Haran, but the covenant wasn't actually established until Abraham was circumcized and his name changed (Gen. 17:2).

If the phrase "children of Israel" has any literal significance in the sojourn period, then as mentioned previously, it would have to be started from the time that Jacob came out of Haran with his children into Canaan and his name was changed to Israel, when he was about 94 or 95 years old. However, this does not allow enough time for the generations from Levi to Moses as was illustrated on Chart #1.
Some, like Eric Njord,¹¹ and Josephus¹² believe that the time was measured from the age of Abraham when he actually entered Canaan. However, Josephus, holding to the Biblical account (Gen. 12:4), gives Abraham’s age when he left Haran and entered Canaan as 75 years old and measures the 430 years from that point. Ussher also counts the sojourn from that point. Njord, accepting the statement in the Book of Jasher (81:3), measures the time in Egypt as two hundred and ten years thus making Abraham seventy years old when he left Haran and entered Canaan from which point he measures the beginning of the four hundred and thirty year sojourn.

The Book of Abraham in the Pearl of Great Price states that Abraham was 62 years old when he departed out of Haran and journeyed to Canaan (Abr. 2:14). Accepting this latest, most authentic record, neither Josephus nor Njord are correct in their suppositions of the age of Abraham when he left Haran and came to Canaan.

If the covenant was made with Abram before he left Haran at age 62 and if this was the real starting point for


counting the 430 years, we would have to subtract 113 years from the total chronology as it is given at the conclusion of Chapter IV. This would reduce Adam's mortal beginning to c. 3887 B.C. This 113 years might be added to the period from the flood to Abraham or in the periods of the Judges or Kings. However, from a close analysis of these three periods, it seems highly improbable that this could be accomplished without undue disregard for the scriptures and contemporaneous history.

After examining this problem from all the possible view points as previously shown, the problem was approached from an entirely different direction and the result was especially interesting. The following is the method used.

President Joseph Fielding Smith accepts 4000 B.C. for Adam.\textsuperscript{13} This seems reasonable enough in view of the "seven thousand years" of the earth's "temporal existence" and some statements by the Prophet Joseph Smith as will be discussed in a later Chapter. Starting from that point, 4000 B.C., and following the chronology as previously outlined, it was found that Abraham's birth would be 2052 B.C. Next, as will be shown more fully later on, according to excavations of Jericho, Egyptian history and the Biblical record, the Exodus from Egypt occurred right after the death of Thotmes III in about 1447 B.C. Four hundred and thirty years were added to

\textsuperscript{13}Smith, Joseph Fielding, "Our Gospel Dispensations"\textsuperscript{	extregistered} \textit{The Instructor} (Salt Lake City: Deseret Sunday School Union November, 1959), back cover.
1447 B.C. which places the beginning of the 430 year sojourn in 1877 B.C. What happened in 1877 B.C. that would have been of sufficient importance to warrant marking the beginning of the sojourn of the children of Israel in Canaan and Egypt? Subtracting 1877 from 2052 (the birth of Abraham), it was found that whatever it was it happened when Abraham was 175 years old. Abraham was 175 years old when he died. Death and burial was the most important event in the life of the Hebrews. What event could be more important than Abraham's death? Abraham was the father of the Covenant Race. The phrase "Children of Israel" belongs to all those that are members of the covenant race which would naturally include Abraham and Isaac. The scriptures tell about his seed being "afflicted". When Abraham died the Philistines filled his wells with earth and afflicted Isaac so that he had to move away from them and dig more wells (Gen. 26:14-21). Gen. 15:15,16 said Abraham would "be buried in a good old age" and that his descendants would come back to Canaan "in the fourth generation". It seems as if his death was to mark the starting point of the 430 year sojourn. Jacob was fifteen years old when his grandfather Abraham died so the "fourth generation" would be the fourth man in a genealogical line from Jacob and that man was Moses (see Chart #2). Ussher and many other chronologists measured the 430 year sojourn from the death of Terah, Abraham's father when Abraham was supposedly 75 years old. It seems more reasonable to measure
it from the death of Abraham, the father of the covenant race than from the death of Terah, an idolator.

Until stronger evidence points to another time of greater significance that fits in with the sacred record in the scriptures and the archaeological discoveries as discussed in this thesis, the author accepts the death of Abraham, the father of the covenant race, to mark the beginning of the 430 years sojourn of the children of Israel. The phrase "sojourn of the children of Israel" may therefore be thought to mean the sojourn of Abraham's descendants from his death to the time of the Exodus from Egypt under Moses. Chart #2 shows how this adjusts the approximate ages of Levi, Kohath and Amram when their sons were born, to a much more realistic picture than was shown in Chart #1.

Chart #2

```
Abraham 100 175
    Isaac 60 180
    Jacob 15 83(?) 147
    Levi 47(?) 137
    Kohath 117(?) 133
        Death of Abraham
        Amram 118(?) 137
        Moses 80
            Exodus

430
```
CHAPTER III

THE EXODUS TO SOLOMON'S TEMPLE - THE JUDGES

The key to this period is found in I Kings 6:1

"And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord."

Let's look at this period to see how this 480 years was divided or counted.

Following the Exodus from Egypt, the Israelites journeyed in the wilderness of the Sinai peninsula for 40 years (Jos. 5:6). Six years after crossing the Jordan and conquering Jericho the land was divided. This six years was determined by data from Caleb's life. Caleb was 39 years old when they left Egypt (Joshua 14:7). After 40 years in the wilderness he would be 79 years old. Caleb was 85 years old when the land was divided (Joshua 14:10) showing that the land was divided six years after they entered Canaan.

From the division of the land to the servitude to Mesopotamia is not recorded and is a difficult period to measure. Auchincloss estimated this period to be 60 years (40 years for Joshua and 20 years for the elders of Israel) through the following reasoning.

He arrives at the figure 40 years for the time from the division of land to the death of Joshua from a statement
about a celebration described in the 23rd chapter of Joshua. It seems that this celebration took place at the end of Joshua's life. He was a strong leader beloved by his people and could enlist the interest of all and bring them to unite in a patriotic demonstration. The 40 years is an assumption drawn from the phrase "And it came to pass a long time after that the Lord had given rest unto Israel from all their enemies round about, that Joshua waxed old and stricken in age" (Joshua 23:1). It seems that he is connecting the phrase "a long time" with the phrase in the 24th chapter of Joshua where Joshua reminds them "Ye dwelt in the wilderness a long time," since they were in the wilderness 40 years the phrase "a long time" may have similar significance. Another reason for Auchincloss accepting the 40 years period is that "their periods of celebration seem to have been 40 years long and were patterned after their years in the wilderness."¹

In as much as Joshua was 110 years old when he died (Joshua 24:29; Judges 2:8) then Auchincloss concluded that he was "25 years old when Israel left Sinai for Canaan, 64 years when they crossed the Jordan, 70 years when the land was divided and 110 years at the time of his valedictory address."²

Auchincloss gives references to support these conclusions that show that Joshua really was a young man when they left

¹W. S. Auchincloss, op. cit., p. 8.
²Ibid., p. 9.
Egypt and journeyed in the wilderness (Ex. 33:11; Num. 11:28).

Following the death of Joshua "In those days there was no King in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 17:6) Auchincloss judges this period of the Elders to be 20 years in length. He reasons that the Elders must have been at least 20 when the land was divided from the statement in Num. 32:11 that shows that the Hebrew youth reached their majority at 20 years old. Since the average length of life was about 80 years (Psalm 90:10) the Elders may have outlived Joshua about 20 years. This period is still indefinite and may never be better worked out, but these conclusions give approximately 60 years from the division of the land to the end of the righteousness of Israel under Joshua and the Elders and the beginning of the servitude to Mesopotamia. (Judges 3:8).

The period of the Judges presents somewhat of a problem, for the sum of all the years given consecutively would require about 623 to 658 years from the Exodus to Solomon's temple instead of the 480 years as recorded in I Kings 6:1. And, in addition, the Exodus from Egypt would be thrown back about 178 years to a date which does not fit any chronology, scriptural or archaeological. Therefore the period of the Judges cannot be accepted as it seems to be recorded but must be examined closely and adjusted to a reasonable and logical arrangement so as to preserve the scriptural and archaeological records.
First we must separate the periods of years that are given in the scriptures from those that are not definite and seem questionable and then adjust the questionable periods to fit into the whole scriptural picture.

It seems quite certain that the children of Israel served Chushanrishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, eight years (Judges 3:8). After this Othniel delivered them and was Judge, but the actual length of his reign is not given. It says that "the land had rest 40 years" but this does not mean that Othniel was a judge 40 years. It appears that the first five judges, Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah and Gideon, did not actually judge very long for the people "would not hearken unto their judges, but they went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them: They turned quickly out of the way which their fathers walked in, obeying the commandments of the Lord; but they did not so." (Judges 2:17).

Therefore the phrases "the land had rest 40 years" (Judges 3:11) "the land had rest fourscore years" (Judges 3:30) "the land had rest 40 years" (Judges 5:31) and "the country was in quietness 40 years" (Judges 8:28) must not really have reference to the number of years these five judges reigned, but may have been memorial exercises observed by the Israelites for about 200 years after they came out of Egypt in memory of their wilderness wanderings.

Auchincloss says concerning this:

The experience of Israel in the Wilderness made such a deep impression on the mind of the nation,
that for 200 years they continued to observe memorial exercises.

They had the best of reasons for omitting the 2nd Memorial, because from B.C. 1359 to 1341, a period of 18 years, Israel served the King of Moab. It is significant, however, that they preserved their count with that of the 3rd Memorial and speak of the time as having been 80 years.

After Othniel judged Israel an unknown number of years there was an 18 year period of servitude to the Moabites (Judges 3:14). Then Ehud and Shamgar judged Israel for an unknown number of years after which the Israelites served the Canaanites 20 years (Judges 4:3). Deborah was Judge of Israel next followed by the servitude to the Midianites for seven years (Judges 6:1). Gideon judged an unknown number of years next followed by Abimelech who judged for 3 years (Judges 9:22) and Tola who judged for 23 years (Judges 10:2). Jair judged Israel 22 years (Judges 10:3) after which there was the servitude to the Philistines and Ammonites 18 years (Judges 10:8).

Jephthah delivered the Israelites from the Ammonites and judged Israel 6 years (Judges 12:7). After Jephthah Israel was judged by Ibzan 7 years (Judges 12:9), Elon 10 years (Judges 12:11) and Abdon 8 years (Judges 13:1). Samson was the judge of Israel for the last 20 years of the 40 year servitude to the Philistines (Judges 15:20). Then Eli judged Israel for 40 years (I Sam. 4:18).

Samuel's period as a judge is not given directly but

can be computed from other scriptures. According to Acts 13:20 the period from the division of the land to the reign of Saul was 450 years. The period from the division of the land to the reign of Jephthah as judge was 300 years (Judges 11:26). The combined 111 years of the judges from Jephthah to Samuel added to the 300 years from the division of the land to the reign of Jephthah, and this 411 years subtracted from the 450 years from the division of the land to the reign of Saul shows that Samuel reigned as judge 39 years.

Saul was king for 40 years (Acts 13:21). David was king for 40 years (I King 2:11). Solomon began to build the temple in the 4th year of his reign which was "the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt" (I Kings 6:1).

The known lengths of years for reigns and servitudes subtracted from the 479 years given from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's temple leaves the approximate number of years of unknown length to divide among the judges whose length of reign is not given. There were 46 years from the Exodus to the division of the land, the servitudes and the known judges' reigns from the division of the land to the reign of Jephthah total 119 years, and from the reign of Jephthah to the fourth year of Solomon is 233 years. These three known lengths cover 398 of the 479 years from the Exodus to Solomon's temple leaving 81 years to be accounted for. If we accept Auchincloss's hypotheses of 40 years for Joshua's leadership
after the land was divided and 20 years for the elders of Israel who outlived Joshua, then there remain 21 years to be divided between the five judges, Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah and Gideon. This gives each about 4 years for the period of their reign as judge of Israel, instead of 40 each as is intimated in the record.

There is, however, another possibility for the 60 years for Joshua and the Elders. Concerning Joshua's age Marston says "...Josephus clearly states that he was the leader for twenty-five years (Antiq., V, 1.29); and since he died at the age of one hundred and ten (Joshua xxiv. 29), Joshua was eighty-five when Jericho fell." If we accept this statement of Josephus, then Joshua would have only ruled for about 19 years and the elders about 41 years. This 41 years could also be arbitrarily divided up between the elders and the five judges. However then the Second 40 year memorial period that was omitted would not come during the servitude to the Moabites as was previously assumed in this section. Josephus has made many mistakes in his works and his statement of Joshua's age cannot be accepted without reservation. Auchincloss, as previously mentioned, felt that Joshua lived forty years after the land was divided and united all Israel in the first great memorial just before he died because of his outstanding leadership.

Concerning the time of the administration of the five judges, Othniel to Gideon, Auchincloss also has an interesting comment:

Strange to say, some writers count the administration of Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah and Gideon as having lasted 200 years and wipe out the servitudes, making them equal to zero, on the assumption that only "years of Divine favor" should enter into the problem. Now it is a well known fact that Nahshon, the father of Salmon, died before Israel crossed the Jordan, also that from the crossing to the birth of David was by least calculation 366 years. After Salmon came Boaz, Obed and Jesse, making four generations from Jordan to David with an average of about 90 years to a generation.

Auchincloss explains that this shows it unreasonable to add 200 years on the reign of the judges because this would make the generations of Salmon, Boaz, Obed and Jesse about 135 years to a generation.

In examining the period of the judges using 480 years from the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon as our guide (I Kings 6:1), we noticed a 100 year mistake in two references. First, Acts 13:20 said from the division of the land to the beginning of the reign of Saul was "about the space of four hundred and fifty years." However if we add the 46 years from the Exodus to the division of the land and the 84 years from the beginning of Saul to the 4th year of Solomon to this supposed 450 years we have 580 years instead of 480, which is not in accord with any other findings, scriptural or archaeological. Therefore Acts 13:20 should read 350 years instead of 450 years.

5W. S. Auchincloss, op. cit., p. 13.
Second, Judges 11:26 says from the division of the land to the reign of Jephthah was 300 years. However if we add to this the known lengths of 46 years from the Exodus to the division of the land and the 234 years from Jephthah to the 4th year of Solomon we have again 580 years instead of 480 years from the Exodus to the building of Solomon’s temple. Therefore Judges 11:26 should read 200 years instead of 300 years. Concerning this error Auchincloss said the writer of the record found a gap of 100 years between the Exodus and the Temple, which he tried to fill by adding 100 to the Ammonite period, making it 300 years instead of 200. This only produced confusion, because the time belonged:

40 years to Joshua’s government,
20 years to the Elders government,
20 years to Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah, and Gideon,
20 years to final servitude to Philistines.
Total 100 years.

The following Table #1 shows the plotting of the period of the Judges from the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon with question marks by the unrecorded lengths.

Table I

THE EXODUS TO SOLOMON’S TEMPLE - THE JUDGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Moses and the Exodus and wilderness wandering, (Jos. 5:6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>The land was divided, (Jos. 14:10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 years</td>
<td>From the Exodus to the division of the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years (?)</td>
<td>Joshua’s leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years (?)</td>
<td>The elders leadership, (Jos. 24:31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Mesopotamia, (Jud. 3:8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years (?)</td>
<td>Othniel, (Jud. 3:11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Moabites, (Jud. 3:14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years (?)</td>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar, (Jud. 3:30).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Canaanites.</td>
<td>(Jud. 4:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years(?)</td>
<td>Deborah.</td>
<td>(Jud. 5:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Midianites.</td>
<td>(Jud. 6:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years(?)</td>
<td>Gideon.</td>
<td>(Jud. 8:28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Abimelech.</td>
<td>(Jud. 9:22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Tola.</td>
<td>(Jud. 10:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>Jair.</td>
<td>(Jud. 10:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Philistines and Ammonites.</td>
<td>(Jud. 10:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 years</td>
<td>- From the division of the land to the reign of Jephthah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Jephthah.</td>
<td>(Jud. 12:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Ibzan.</td>
<td>(Jud. 12:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Elon.</td>
<td>(Jud. 12:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Abdon.</td>
<td>(Jud. 12:14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Philistines.</td>
<td>(Jud. 13:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Servitude to Philistines and Samson as Judge.</td>
<td>(Jud. 15:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Eli.</td>
<td>(I Sam. 4:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 years</td>
<td>Samuel.</td>
<td>(See discussion on Samuel's reign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 years</td>
<td>Reign of Jephthah to Saul and the United Kingdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>King Saul.</td>
<td>(Acts 13:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>King David.</td>
<td>(I Kings 2:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>To the 4th year of Solomon's reign, the 480th year after Exodus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 years</td>
<td>- From Saul to the beginning of the temple building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 years</td>
<td>From the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon.</td>
<td>(I Kings 6:1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that some judges may have reigned at the same time, thus shortening the period of the Judges. However it is not intimated anywhere in the Bible and this supposition is not necessary. The scriptural record of the Judges should be accepted preserving as much as possible the record as recorded in the sacred narrative.
CHAPTER IV

THE KINGS - SOLOMON TO ZEDEKIAH - THE DIVIDED KINGDOM

If the Exodus occurred as presented in this discussion in 1447 B.C., following the reign of Thotmes III, King of Egypt and in the first year of the reign of Amenhetep II, then 480 years after that date would place the beginning of Solomon's temple 967 B.C. in the fourth year of the reign of Solomon. Stephen L. Caiger stated "The date of the foundation of Solomon's Temple is 'scientifically fixed as 967 B.C.'"¹ This places the beginning of Solomon's reign in 971 B.C. Yahuda places the fourth year of Solomon's reign in about 965 B.C.,² thus judging the beginning of his reign to be 969 B.C.

Solomon reigned for 40 years (I Kings 11:42) which places the beginning of the divided kingdom in 931 B.C.

The period of the divided kingdom seems to be one of the most perplexing problems of the Old Testament chronology, in spite of the fact that it is the most recent of the history of the Old Testament and parallels many other contemporaneous events. The following tables show nineteen different


chronologists' compilations of the beginning date for the reign of the Hebrew kings of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, with no two exactly alike.

The numbers at the top refer to writers as follows:
1-Ussher, 2-Anstey, 3-Kamphausen, 4-Ruhl, 5-Kugler, 6-Coucke, 7-Lewy, 8-Begrich, 9-Mowinckel, 10-Albright, 11-Thiele, 12-Hales, 13-Lane, 14-Auchincloss, 15-Beecher, 16-Hastings, 17-Price, 18-Kraeling, 19-Barrois. The writers' chronologies from No. 1 through No. 11 are found in the book The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings by Edwin R. Thiele. Hale's chronology is found in the book A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography. Auchincloss' chronology is found in the book Auchincloss' Chronology of the Holy Bible. The other chronologies were found in various family Bibles and books, sources unknown.

---

4 William Hales, A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography (London: Gilbert and Rivington Printers, 1830) Vol. II.
### The Dates of the Hebrew Kings According to Modern Chronologists

#### Kings of Israel -- Table II

|   | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    | 17    | 18    | 19    |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Jeroboam I | 975   | 962   | 937   | 951   | 929   | 931   | 922   | 926   | 931   | 931   | 990   | 931   | 961   | 982   | 939   | 931   | 929   | 922   |
| Nadab     | 954   | 961   | 915   | 910   | 909   | 910   | 902   | 907   | 911   | 901   | 976   | 910   | 939   | 961   | 918   | 911   | 910   | 901   |
| Baasha    | 953   | 960   | 914   | 909   | 908   | 904   | 909   | 910   | 900   | 909   | 910   | 909   | 958   | 960   | 917   | 910   | 909   | 900   |
| Elah      | 930   | 937   | 891   | 886   | 885   | 886   | 878   | 883   | 887   | 817   | 843   | 887   | 915   | 937   | 894   | 886   | 885   | 877   |
| Zimri     | 929   | 936   | 890   | 885   | 884   | 885   | 877   | 882   | 886   | 876   | 851   | 914   | 937   | 994   | 885   | 886   | 876   |
| Tibni     | 929   | 936   | 890   | 885   | 884   | 885   | 877   | 882   | 886   | 876   | 851   | 914   | 937   | 936   | 893   | 881   | 885   | 876   |
| Omri      | 929   | 936   | 890   | 885   | 884   | 885   | 873   | 878   | 886   | 876   | 851   | 914   | 937   | 936   | 893   | 881   | 885   | 876   |
| Ahab      | 918   | 925   | 878   | 874   | 873   | 875   | 876   | 871   | 875   | 869   | 874   | 931   | 874   | 803   | 825   | 882   | 874   | 874   | 869   |
| Ahaziah   | 897   | 905   | 857   | 853   | 854   | 853   | 847   | 852   | 852   | 850   | 853   | 909   | 852   | 882   | 905   | 862   | 853   | 851   |
| Joram     | 896   | 904   | 854   | 853   | 852   | 846   | 851   | 851   | 849   | 852   | 907   | 851   | 881   | 904   | 861   | 852   | 850   | 849   |
| Jehu      | 884   | 893   | 842   | 841   | 842   | 846   | 841   | 845   | 843   | 842   | 895   | 841   | 869   | 892   | 849   | 842   | 842   | 842   |
| Jehoahaz  | 856   | 864   | 814   | 814   | 814   | 820   | 815   | 818   | 821   | 815   | 867   | 815   | 864   | 821   | 814   | 820   | 815   |
| Jehoash   | 841   | 850   | 797   | 798   | 798   | 804   | 799   | 802   | 805   | 801   | 798   | 850   | 800   | 826   | 847   | 798   | 804   | 801   |
| Jeroboam II | 825   | 832   | 781   | 783   | 783   | 789   | 784   | 787   | 790   | 786   | 793   | 834   | 785   | 810   | 832   | 804   | 785   | 789   | 786   |
| Interregnum | 784   | 792   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Zachariah | 773   | 769   | 741   | 757   | 743   | 749   | 748   | 747   | 749   | 746   | 753   | 771   | 745   | 772   | 769   | 763   |       |       | 748   |
| Shallum   | 773   | 768   | 741   | 757   | 743   | 749   | 747   | 747   | 749   | 745   | 752   | 771   | 772   | 768   | 763   |       |       |       | 748   |
| Menahem   | 772   | 766   | 740   | 757   | 742   | 747   | 747   | 746   | 749   | 745   | 752   | 770   | 744   | 771   | 767   | 762   | 749   | 748   | 745   |
| Pekahiah  | 761   | 757   | 737   | 748   | 757   | 757   | 757   | 756   | 756   | 756   | 742   | 760   | 735   | 761   | 758   | 752   | 738   | 736   | 738   |
| Pekah     | 759   | 755   | 736   | 747   | 756   | 736   | 734   | 734   | 734   | 734   | 740   | 758   | 734   | 759   | 755   | 750   | 737   | 735   | 737   |
| Interregnum | 739   | 735   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
### The Dates of the Hebrew Kings According to Modern Chronologists

#### Continuation

**Kings of Judah -- Table III**

|    | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Rehoboam | 975 | 982 | 937 | 931 | 929 | 931 | 921 | 926 | 930 | 928 | 931 | 900 | 931 | 961 | 982 | 939 | 931 | 929 | 922 |
| Abijam    | 958 | 965 | 920  | 915 | 912 | 914 | 905 | 910 | 914 | 915 | 913 | 973  | 915 | 943 | 965 | 922 | 914 | 913 | 915 |
| Asa       | 955 | 963 | 917  | 913 | 910 | 903 | 908 | 912 | 913 | 911 | 970 | 913  | 941 | 961 | 918 | 912 | 911 | 913 |
| Jehoshaphat | 914 | 922 | 976  | 873 | 872 | 870 | 865 | 872 | 873 | 873 | 929 | 873  | 899 | 921 | 876 | 871 | 871 | 873 |
| Jehoram   | (Joram) | 897 | 905 | 851  | 849 | 849 | 854 | 848 | 852 | 854 | 848 | 849  | 853 | 904 | 849 | 876 | 900 | 857 | 871 | 850 |
| Ahaziah   | 885 | 894 | 843  | 842 | 843 | 842 | 844 | 842 | 842 | 841 | 896 | 842  | 870 | 893 | 850 | 871 | 843 | 842 |
| Athaliah  | 884 | 893 | 842  | 842 | 846 | 841 | 845 | 844 | 842 | 841 | 895 | 841  | 869 | 849 | 892 | 849 | 842 | 842 |
| Joash     | (Jehoash) | 878 | 886 | 836  | 835 | 836 | 841 | 835 | 839 | 843 | 837 | 835  | 889 | 836 | 863 | 886 | 843 | 836 | 837 |
| Amaziah   | 839 | 846 | 797  | 796 | 797 | 803 | 798 | 800 | 804 | 800 | 796 | 849  | 797 | 824 | 847 | 797 | 803 | 800 |
| Interregnum | 817 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Azariah   | (Uzziah) | 825 | 806 | 777  | 783 | 789 | 775 | 785 | 785 | 776 | 783 | 791  | 809 | 792 | 810 | 806 | 801 | 770 | 775 | 783 |
| Jotham    | 758 | 754 | 750  | 733 | 751 | 735 | 758 | 758 | 749 | 750 | 750  | 757 | 740 | 757 | 754 | 749 | 735 | 748 | 750 |
| Ahaz      | 742 | 739 | 734  | 729 | 736 | 731 | 742 | 742 | 734 | 735 | 735  | 741 | 736 | 742 | 739 | 735 | 735 | 735 |
| Hezekiah  | 427 | 725 | 714  | 714 | 721 | 728 | 725 | 715 | 715 | 715 | 725  | 721 | 727 | 723 | 727 | 727 | 714 | 715 |
| Manasseh  | 598 | 696 | 685  | 691 | 693 | 698 | 697 | 696 | 697 | 697 | 696  | 696 | 693 | 698 | 694 | 697 | 696 | 687 |
| Amon      | 643 | 641 | 640  | 637 | 639 | 643 | 642 | 641 | 642 | 642 | 641  | 639 | 642 | 639 | 642 | 642 | 642 | 642 |
| Josiah    | 641 | 639 | 638  | 638 | 641 | 640 | 639 | 640 | 640 | 639 | 640  | 638 | 640 | 638 | 659 | 639 | 640 |
| Jehoahaz  | 610 | 608 | 608  | 608 | 608 | 610 | 609 | 609 | 609 | 609 | 608  | 608 | 609 | 608 | 609 |
| Jehoiakim | 610 | 608 | 607  | 606 | 608 | 610 | 609 | 609 | 609 | 609 | 608  | 608 | 609 | 608 | 609 |
| Jehoiachin | 599 | 597 | 597  | 597 | 598 | 599 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 597  | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 |
| Zedekiah  | 599 | 597 | 596  | 596 | 597 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 598 | 597  | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 | 597 |
The most extensive analysis of the period of the kings was made by Edwin R. Thiele and published in 1951 under the title "The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings." Through a critical examination of this period Mr. Thiele discovered many reasons for the confusion that has baffled the chronologists that have attempted to examine and determine the lengths of time of the reign of each king.

Accession and Non-accession Year Systems

One of the most important discoveries was that there were two methods of counting the beginning year of a king's reign, the accession-year system and the nonaccession-year system. Under the accession-year system a new king would not begin reckoning events under his own reign until the beginning of the next new year. The year he began to reign was counted the last year of the preceding king so that there were no duplication of years. However under the nonaccession-year system, the new king would begin counting the years of his reign from the year or part of a year that he first started ruling so that under this system there was a duplication with each king counting his first year and his last year for himself even though he reigned only part of the year. Under the nonaccession-year system, there was always at least one more year counted than the actual years of the king's reign.  

Through his analysis of the kings, Mr. Thiele

discovered that Israel used the nonaccession-year system from Jeroboam to Jehoash and then through the growth and influence of Assyria who used the accession-year method, Israel changed to this method from Jojoash to the rest of its history. He also discovered that Judah, unlike Israel, used the accession-year system from Rehoboam to Jehoram. At this time Israel and Judah united in a friendly relationship. Jehoram of Judah married Jezebel, daughter of Ahab, king of Israel and through the powerful influence of Israel of the North, Judah changed under Jehoram over to the nonaccession-year system used in Israel. Judah returned to the accession-year system about the same time Israel did when Amaziah became king, again probably due to the strong influence of Assyria and Israel, and continued using this method to the close of its history. This understanding of the accession and nonaccession-year systems has helped greatly to resolve many of the irritating discrepancies in the synchronisms between the two kingdoms.

Co-regencies

Another important contribution to a correct understanding of the reigns of the Hebrew kings was the realization that there were quite a number of co-regencies that were not recorded as such in the sacred record but were discovered through an examination of the chronological data. Often the

king would have his son reign with him during the last years of his life, but the son would not actually become king until his father died. However, in counting the total number of years of his reign, the son would often also count the years he was a co-regent with his father and thus give a double count for his reign without any explanation of the co-regency.

The Calendar Years

Thiele also discovered that there were two calendar years among the Hebrews, "one beginning with Nisan in the spring and the other with Tishri in the fall."

Thiele stated, "Most Biblical chronologists have followed a Nisan-to-Nisan year in dealing with the Hebrew kings. The statement in the Mishna tract Rosh Hashana that the first of Nisan is the New Year for kings is no doubt largely responsible for this point of view."

Thiele demonstrated through the data of the building of Solomon's temple that Judah used a Tishri-to-Tishri year for their reckoning. Thiele said:

For the nation of Israel there seems to be no scriptural evidence as to the time of the beginning of the regnal year. However, when a Nisan-to-Nisan regnal year is used for Israel together with a Tishri-to-Tishri year for Judah, the perplexing discrepancies disappear and a harmonious chronological pattern results.

---

9Ibid., p. 35, 36.  
10 Ibid., p. 15.  
11 Ibid., p. 29, 30.  
12 Ibid., p. 31.  
13 Ibid., p. 33.
Interregna

Thiele discussed briefly one other problem, the use by some chronologists of interregna or periods when a nation was without a king in their chronological schemes. He concluded, "There is no evidence anywhere in the Old Testament record of the existence of a single interregnum in either Israel or Judah during the period of the divided monarchies." He said the interregna were invented by chronologists who failed to "understand the basic principles of chronological procedure involved." He said the interregna were invented by chronologists who failed to "understand the basic principles of chronological procedure involved."  

Kings Reigns From Jeroboam and Rehoboam to Joram and Ahaziah

Rehoboam was the first king of Judah and Jeroboam was the first king of Israel. The histories of these two kingdoms run parallel to each other, therefore they will be considered together.

"In the 18th year" of Jeroboam, Abijam, 2nd king of Judah began to reign and reigned for three years (I Kings 15:1,2). There are two things important to understand what this statement means. First, the 18th year does not mean after 18 years had gone by but after 17 years had gone by and during the 18th year. A current example of this principle is found in the fact that this is the 20th century even though it is only 1961. Nineteen hundred years have gone by and we are now in the 20th hundred year period. Second, Abijam did not reign three whole years but to reign three

\[14\text{Ibid., p. 36.}\] \[15\text{Ibid.}\]
years means that he reigned during at least part of three years.

Asa, 3rd king of Judah, began to reign in the 20th year of Jeroboam (I Kings 15:9). Notice that that only gives Abijam two full years and maybe part of a 3rd year. Nadab, 2nd king of Judah began to reign in the 2nd year of Asa (I Kings 15:25), which gives Jeroboam 20 full years and part of a 21st year. Baasha began his reign in the 3rd year of Asa (I Kings 15:33), which gives Nadab one full year instead of two. Elah, the 4th king of Israel began to reign in the 26th year of Asa 3rd king of Judah which gives Baasha 23 full years instead of 24. Zimri began to reign over Israel in the 27th year of Asa (I Kings 16:15), which gives Elah one year instead of two. Zimri reigned for only 7 days and Omri and Tibni assumed the leadership (I Kings 16:21), each reigning over half of the people of Israel for four years when Tibni died and Omri reigned over all Israel (I Kings 16: 21,22). In the 38th year of Asa, Ahab began to reign over Israel (I Kings 16:29) which gives Omri 11 full years as king.

The reign of Asa was terminated in the 4th year of Ahab, King of Israel, which gives Asa 41 years total rule (I Kings 15:10). "Jehoshaphat, the son of Asa, began to reign over Judah in the fourth year of Ahab, king of Israel" and reigned 25 years (I Kings 22: 41,42). However the first three years of his 25 year reign were as a coregent with his
father Asa due to the fact that his reign ended in the 5th year of Joram, king of Israel (II Kings 8:16) and this was only 22 years from the time Jehoshaphat became king after his father's death in the 4th year of Ahab. Ahab was king for 21 years. I Kings 16:29 says Ahab reigned for 22 years, however since this is according to non-accession year reckoning which is always one year more than the actual years, as explained previously, Ahab's reign was only 21 years. Following Ahab, Ahaziah reigned in Israel for one year. Again I Kings 22:51 records Ahaziah's reign was two years but according to non-accession year reckoning it was one year. We find in the record here a good example of this one year difference. It says that Ahaziah began to reign in the 17th year of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and reigned two years over Israel (I Kings 22:51) and that the next king Jehoram, son of Ahab, began to reign over Israel in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat (II Kings 3:1). How could Jehoram begin to reign in the 18th year if Ahaziah began to reign in the 17th year and reigned two years? This is an example of the duplication of years under the non-accession year method of reckoning used in Israel. Again it says that Jehoram reigned for 12 years in Israel (II Kings 3:1) which is really 11 full years.

After Jehoshaphat in Judah, Jehoram began to reign and reigned 8 years in Jerusalem (II Kings 8:17). However it seems that Jehoram actually started to reign as coregent with his father Jehoshaphat 5 years before that because Joram of

\[\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 65.}\]
Israel started to reign in the 18th year of Jehoshaphat (II Kings 3:1) which was also the 2nd year of Jehoram (II Kings 1:17). However, Jehoram's eight year reign was counting only his sole reign.

At the time of Ahaziah's reign in Judah, a change was made in the method of reckoning in the southern kingdom from the accession to the non-accession year system. This influenced a change in the years of Jehoram and Ahaziah's reign. Jehoram's eight year reign would actually be about seven years according to non-accession-year reckoning. Ahaziah's one year reign would be about one-half year which would bring the end of Ahaziah's reign to the end the same year Joram of Israel's reign was ended when Jehu killed both of them (II Kings 9:23-37).

The First Fixed Date in the Chronological Scheme

Up to this point no date B.C. has been established for any event. The dating of Hebrew events is established now by tying them in with dates of Assyrian history.

It is at this period of Israel's history that accurately dated events in Assyrian history can for the first time be definitely tied into Hebrew history. Ahab was listed among the western allies who fought against Shalmaneser III at Quarqar in the eponym-year of Daan-Assur, the sixth year of Shalmaneser III, 853. Unfortunately, no record has been preserved of the exact year of Ahab's reign.

---

17 Ibid., p. 61.  
18 Ibid., p. 65.  
19 Ibid., pp. 37-39, 63-64.  
20 Ibid., p. 63.
when Qarqar was fought, but, as we have already seen, this must have been in his last year, since it is known that twelve years after Qarqar, in the eighteenth year of Shalmaneser III, the latter received tribute from Jehu, and there is also an interval of exactly twelve years between the last year of Ahab and the first year of Jehu. We thus secure 853 as the year of Ahab's death, and 841 for the accession of Jehu.\footnote{Ibid., p. 63.}

The dates from Adam to Jehu will be computed on this basis using 841 B.C. as the year of Jehu's accession. In Chapter Three of his book, Thiele discusses the reliability of the Assyrian chronology and states:

Assyrian chronology back to the beginning of the ninth century B.C. rests upon a highly dependable basis. The various items essential to the establishment of a sound chronology were present, and as a consequence scholars have been able to produce a chronological system for that nation which may be received with full confidence.\footnote{Ibid., p. 42.}

The Assyrians "followed the well-known custom of lunar months and solar years."\footnote{Ibid., p. 42.} They also possessed a system of eponymous years.

From some period very early in their history -- possibly from the very beginning of the kingdom -- to the end, the Assyrians followed the practice of each year appointing to the office of eponym or limmu, some high official of the court, the governor of the province, or the king himself. The limmu held office for a calendar year, and to that year was given the name of the individual then occupying the position of limmu. Historical events in Assyria were usually dated in terms of the year of the reign of the king, and on occasions both the year of reign and the eponymous year were given.\footnote{Ibid., p. 44, 45.}
Many copies of Assyrian eponym canon have been found. On one of these it lists

• • • • an eclipse of the sun which took place in the month Simanu, in the eponymy of Bur-Sagale. Astronomical computation has fixed this as June 15, 763. With the year of the eponymy of Bur-Sagale fixed at 763 B.C., the year of every other name of the complete canon can likewise be fixed. 25

This is how the 6th year of Shalmaneser III was calculated to be 853 B.C., the year also that Ahab died, 12 years before the accession of Jehu in 841 B.C.

Jehu and Athaliah to Pekahiah and Azariah

Continuing the chronology of Israel and Judah, Athaliah, mother of Ahaziah, began to reign in 841 which was also the year of Jehu’s accession in Israel. The length of her reign is not given but her son Joash was hidden in the temple for six years (II Kings 11:3) and was then made king when Athaliah was put to death (II Kings 11:4,12,16,20). Since her son Joash began to rule in the seventh year of Jehu (II Kings 12:1), Athaliah reigned for 6 years. Joash began to reign in 835 and reigned 40 years (II Kings 12:1; II Chron. 24:1), and according to non-accession-year reckoning would actually have reigned 39 years or to 796 B.C. 26

Jehu was king for 28 years in Israel (II Kings 10:36) and was succeeded by his son Jehoahaz in 814 B.C. in the 23rd

25 Ibid., p. 44, 45.
26 Ibid., p. 67
year of Joash of Judah (II Kings 13:1). Jehoahaz reigned for 17 years, 16 years or actually to 798 B.C., when he was succeeded by his son Jehoash in the 37th year of Joash (II Kings 13:10).27 Actually the 37th year of Joash non-accession-year reckoning was 799 not 798. However, at this time Israel changed back to the accession year system due to the increased influence and power of Assyria who also used the accession year system in contrast to non-accession-year system used in Egypt. Therefore the 37th year of Joash was according to accession-year reckoning which made it 37 actual years to 798 B.C.28 The Kingdom of Judah also changed back to the accession-year system at this time with the beginning of the reign of Amaziah, son and successor of Joash, coming in the 2nd year of Jehoash of Israel (II Kings 14:1), 796 B.C.

Amaziah ruled in Judah for 29 years (II Kings 14:2; II Chron. 25:1). According to accession-year reckoning his reign ended and his successor Azariah's reign began in 767. About the same time, Jehoash in Israel reigned 16 years (II Kings 13:10) and was succeeded by Jeroboam II in 782. Jeroboam II of Israel came to the throne in the 15th year of Amaziah of Judah (II Kings 14:23). Fifteen years later Amaziah of Judah died and Azariah began to reign. However the

27 Ibid., p. 67
28 Ibid.
record states that Azariah began to reign in the 27th year of Jeroboam II instead of the 15th year. Amaziah actually did reign 15 years after Jehoash of Israel died (II Kings 14:17), so that the statement that Azariah began to reign in the 27th year of Jeroboam II indicates that Jeroboam II must have started to reign with his father Jehoash 12 years before Jehoash died which shows a 12 year coregency of Jeroboam II with his father Jehoash that is not mentioned as such in the Bible. Therefore instead of beginning his reign in 782 at the death of Jehoash, Jeroboam II started to reign in 793 jointly with his father and his 27th would be 767, the year Amaziah died and Azariah began to reign.29

Jeroboam II ruled 41 years. This 41 years is also counting his 12 year coregency with his father so that his reign ended 753 B.C. He was succeeded by Zachariah in the 38th year of Azariah's reign (II Kings 15:8). However if Azariah began to reign after his father's death in the 27th year of Jeroboam II, Jeroboam's forty-first year when Zachariah began to reign would only be Azariah's 14th year instead of his 38th year. Therefore Azariah must have started his reign 791 B.C. This, of course, would indicate a coregency with his father for 23 or 24 years which is not recorded in the scriptures. What would cause the people of the kingdom of Judah to place sixteen year old Azariah on the throne when Amaziah had reigned for only 5 years?

29Ibid., p. 69-70.
It will be remembered that Amaziah had engaged in an ill-conceived and unprovoked war against Jehoash to Israel, in which he suffered a humiliating defeat resulting in his own capture by the enemy, the entrance of the armies of Israel into the capital of Judah, the breaking down of a section of the wall of Jerusalem, the plunder of the treasures of the palace and temple, and the taking of hostages to Samaria (II Kings 14:8-14; II Chron. 25:17-24). In all likelihood it was this totally uncalled for war and entirely unnecessary disaster which so stung the people of Judah that they turned against their foolhardy monarch and forced the elevation to the throne of his sixteen year old son. Amaziah in all probability never regained his popularity or his kingdom, for the record is that he ended his days after a conspiracy and a flight to Lachish where his assassination took place (II Kings 14:19,20; II Chron. 25:27,28).30

Zachariah was king for 6 months (II Kings 15:8), and was followed by Shallum who began to reign in the thirty-ninth year of Azariah and reigned for one month (II Kings 15:13). This brings the accession of the next king, Menahem, in the year 752 B.C. during the thirty-ninth year of Azariah (II Kings 15:14,17). Menahem reigned for ten years (II Kings 15:17) to 742 when Pekahiah came to the throne in the 15th year of Azariah (II Kings 15:23), and ruled for two years (II Kings 15:23).

Pekahiah ruled two years (II Kings 15:23), to 740/39. Since his accession year synchronized with the fiftieth year of Azariah, his second and final year would synchronize with the fifty-second year of Azariah, who ruled fifty-two years (II Kings 15:2; II Chron. 26:3), to 740/39.31

30 Ibid., p. 72.
31 Ibid., p. 74.
Contact Between The Hebrew and Assyrian Kings

At this period another contact was made between the nations of Israel and Judah and Assyria. Menahem paid tribute to Pul of Assyria (II Kings 15:19,20) and the names of Pul and Tiglath-pileser are given as conquerors of Israel (I Chron. 5:26). Some scholars thought for a while that Pul and Tiglath-pileser were different persons. However from a close examination of the Bible text (I Chron. 5:26), the Babylonian King List, Col IV and the Babylonian Chronicale, Col. I, it was discovered that "Pul and Tiglath-pileser are two names for the same individual. Pul evidently is the name assumed by Tiglath-pileser when he took the throne of Babylon, just as Shalmaneser V was known in Babylon as Ululid." 32

From the preceding it is clear that Menahem and Tiglath-pileser were contemporaneous since Menahem paid tribute to Pul who was Tiglath-pileser. According to astronomically established Assyrian Chronology, Tiglath-pileser came to the throne in 745 B.C. Menahem reigned from 752 to 742 so that there is about a three year gap in the reigns of the two kings which makes possible the contact between them.

The record of Tiglath-pileser tells of a campaign to the Mediterranean sea-coast to put down an uprising started by "Azriau of Yaudi" who is probably Asariah, King of Judah, who was king until 740 B.C. At the same time, Tiglath-pileser claims to have received tribute from "Menihimmu of Samerina"

32 Ibid., p. 77.
who is undoubtedly Menahem of Samaria, king of Israel.\(^\text{33}\)

**Problems From 740 to 716 B.C.**

Probably the most difficult period of the chronology of Israel and Judah is from 740 to 716 B.C. during the reigns of Pekah and Hoshea of Israel and Jotham and Ahaz of Judah. Of this period Thiele says:

> In the many chronological systems that are now afield, almost every type of adjustment has been attempted in the Biblical data for this period, yet in all of them something is wrong, and it is frankly admitted that the final solution has not been found.\(^\text{34}\)

Rather than to go into a lengthy discussion of Thiele's 37 page analysis of these four kings reign's, some observations and conclusions will be presented here and the length and dates of their reign's given.

Something is wrong with the synchronism of II Kings 18:1 which says that Hezekiah began his reign in the third year of Hoshea. Hezekiah was 25 years old when he began to reign (II Kings 18:20; II Chron. 29:1) but if he began to reign in the third year of Hosea he would be only one year younger than his father Ahaz who was twenty-six in the third year of Hosea. This discrepancy is discovered when we see that Ahaz was twenty years old at the time of his accession (II Kings 16:2; II Chron. 28:1) in the seventeenth year of Pekah (II Kings 16:1). Pekah was killed and succeeded by

\[^{33}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 78.}\]
\[^{34}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p 99.}\]
Hoshea three years later (II Kings 15:27, 30) which would make Ahaz twenty-three when Hoshea became king. Three years later in Hoshea's third year Ahaz would be twenty-six years old when his son Hezekiah was twenty-five which surely could not be. Therefore the synchronism of II Kings 18:1 cannot be true. This shows that Ahaz and the two kings of Israel, Pekah and Hoshea's reigns must be shifted back from Hezekiah's reign.

Another seeming discrepancy in the record is found in the length of Jotham's reign. Jotham's reign was sixteen years (II Kings 15:33), but Hoshea of Israel is supposed to come to the throne in Jotham's twentieth year (II Kings 15:30). How could Hoshea's accession be in Jotham's twentieth year if he only reigned sixteen years?

Now let us look at the record from Azariah to Hezekiah in the Kingdom of Judah and see what we discover. Azariah's 52 year reign ended as previously shown in about 740 B.C. His son Jotham began to reign and in his twentieth year Hoshea began to reign in Israel (II Kings 15:30) which year was also the 12th year of Jotham's son and successor Ahaz (II Kings 17:1) which would be 720 B.C. Ahaz reigned for sixteen years (II Kings 16:2; II Chron. 28:1) and was succeeded by his son Hezekiah in about 716/15 B.C. This date for the accession of Hezekiah is significant for in his (Hezekiah's) 14th year (701 B.C.) according to Hebrew and Assyrian history.

\[35\text{Ibid., p. 104.}\]
Sennacherib made his famous attack on Judah (II Kings 18:13; Isa. 36:1). Here then is another check on the accuracy of the dating of Assyrian and Hebrew history, for they both give the date of 701 B.C. for this contact between Hezekiah and Sennacherib.

Now to consider the reign of Hoshea. If his reign began in the 20th year of Jotham (II Kings 15:30) which is also supposed to be the 12th year of Ahaz (II Kings 17:1) then there would be a 12 year overlap in the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz and Hoshea's reign would begin in 720 or 719.

It will be immediately apparent to those acquainted with the history of this period that 720/19 cannot be the year of Hoshea's accession, for by that time his reign was over and the nation over which he once had ruled was no longer in existence... On the basis of the Assyrian inscriptions, the date of Pekah's death and of Hoshea's accession can be almost certainly given as 732 -- twelve years before 720/19. 36

Thiele has secured harmony among the reigns of these kings and contemporaneous Assyrian history by moving Pekah, Hoshea, Jotahm and Ahaz back 12 years. In his discussion of these kings, he pointed out that there was a 12 year mistake. 37 His arrangement follows:

The events of contemporary history provide certain rather definite dates for each of these kings: 732/31 as the terminal year of Pekah and the accession of Hoshea; 716/15 as the accession year of Hezekiah; and an accession of Ahaz early enough to make possible contacts between him and

36Ibid., p. 106.
37Ibid., pp. 102-104, 107-117, 136-152.
Tiglath-pileser in 734 to 732. Given a terminal date of 732/31 for Pekah, the beginning of his twenty-year reign would be 752/51, and in such a case we would have 735/34 as his seventeenth year. The accession of Ahaz at that time would be in keeping with the requirements of Assyrian history for his contacts with Tiglath-pileser in 734 to 732. If each of these kings is allowed to stand in the position just indicated, the impossible situation in the age relationships between Ahaz and Hezekiah otherwise called for will be avoided, but the synchronism of II Kings 18:1 must be faced as a problem for later consideration. 38

If Pekah began to reign as previously shown twelve years earlier than originally supposed this would cover exactly the reign's of Menahem who reigned for ten years and Pekahiah who reigned two years, so that Pekah's reign would start the same year Menahem began to rule and Pekah would be a coregent with Menahem and Pekahiah. However Thiele says that Pekah was not a coregent but may have been a "person of some prominence" in Menahem's court,

and it might be that at the time of Menahem's seizure of the throne, Pekah was one of the co-conspirators, possibly even hoping to take the kingdom for himself. Now, having taken it upon himself to wipe out the house of Menahem, Pekah may have decided to take to himself the credit for the years that that house had ruled. 39

If this assumption is correct then Pekah began to number his years not from the commencement of his sole reign but from his first assumption of power. We have already noticed that Azariah and Jeroboam II, predecessors of Pekah, also measured

38 Ibid., p. 105.
39 Ibid., p. 114.
their period of reign including their coregencies with their predecessors.

Accepting this proposition as the possible solution to this perplexing period, let us see what this does to the synchronisms and contemporaneous history.

Jotham came to the throne in the second year of Pekah (II Kings 15:32). If Pekah began in 752 B.C., then his second year would be 751-750 B.C. and this would be the accession year of Jotham. Jotham's reign is recorded three times as being sixteen years in length (II Kings 15:33; II Chron. 27:1, 8). Therefore, Ahaz would succeed Jotham 735 B.C. Hoshea the last king of Israel, came to the throne in the twentieth year of Jotham which would be 732 B.C. (II Kings 15:30). Jotham reigned sixteen years in Judah but the accession of Hoshea of Israel is synchronized with Jotham's twentieth year. Therefore, Ahaz the successor of Jotham must have come to the throne in Jotham's sixteenth year and reigned as coregent with Jotham for about four years. If this is true then Ahaz began to reign in about 735 B.C. and reigned for about twenty years until Hezekiah's succession in 715 B.C. II Kings 16:2 and II Chron. 28:1 give the length of Ahaz's reign as sixteen years. This sixteen years would be counted from Ahaz's sole reign from 732 to the beginning of the reign of Hezekiah about 716/15.

The beginning of Ahaz's reign in 735 B.C. is also attested to by Assyrian evidence. As Thiele says "it was in
the three-year period terminating in 732 that the crisis of Ahaz involving Pekah of Israel, Rezin of Syria, the Philistines, and Tiglath-pileser III took place. Ahaz is said to have come to the throne in the seventeenth year of Pekah (II Kings 16:1). 735 B.C. is the 17th year of Pekah as discussed previously providing another check on the accuracy of Ahaz's accession 735 B.C.

Hoshea and The Captivity of The Kingdom of Israel

Now let us discuss the conclusion of the kingdom of Israel and the reigns of the last two kings Pekah and Hoshea. As previously discussed, Pekah reigned twenty years (II Kings 15:27). This twenty year reign was counted from 752 B.C. and ended in about 732 when Hoshea became king and reigned for nine years (II Kings 17:1). Hoshea's nine year reign ended in about 723 when the city of Samaria fell and Israel was carried captive to Assyria.

There is one problem in dating here. Sargon II claimed that he captured Samaria at the beginning of his rule which would be about the last of December, 722 B.C. This date is about nine months after the date for the end of Hoshea's reign. There are two translations of Sargon's statement. One says "At the beginning of my rule, in my first year of reign." The other one by Lie says, "At the beginning of my government." A. T. Olmstead stated that all the available evidence points to the fall of Samaria in 723 and that Sargon's claim to have
captured the city was not true. As pointed out by Thiele Sargon is not mentioned in the Biblical account of the fall of Samaria. Sargon's predecessor Shalmaneser is the one mentioned as the king of Assyria in the account of the fall of Samaria and Israel. In the Babylonian Chronicle, 1:28, concerning the reign of Shalmaneser, it is recorded that he destroyed the city of Shamarain. It seems evident therefore that Shalmaneser was the king of Assyria when Israel and Samaria were captured, and not Sargon. However, Sargon may have been a captain or general in the king's army and may actually have led the army in the capture of Samaria although it was during the reign of Shalmaneser, and therefore may have taken credit for the victory.

One other item of interest is that Sargon made no record of this victory in the early years of his reign. Many other things were recorded in his first and second years but it was not until his fifteenth and sixteenth years that he finally claimed the fall of Samaria to his credit. If Samaria actually was conquered in the first year of his reign, why did he wait so long to mention it or write it in his record? It seems evident then that Samaria was destroyed during the last year of the reign of Shalmaneser 723 B.C. which ended the reign of Hoshea and the northern kingdom of Israel.

---

42 Ibid., p. 123.
43 Ibid., p. 126.
Hezekiah to Zedekiah

In the remaining history of Judah from Hezekiah to Zedekiah, the first problem encountered, as previously worked out, is the improbable synchronisms of II Kings 18:9,10, that said the siege and capture of Samaria and Hoshea occurred when Hezekiah was King of Judah. If the chronology of this period as previously established is true, then the siege and capture of Samaria took place eight to ten years before Hezekiah became king.

Six things seem to indicate that this date is correct and that Hoshea and Hezekiah were not contemporaneous after all. First, as has been previously discussed, the impossible age relationship between Ahaz and Hezekiah indicates that Hezekiah must be placed about twelve or thirteen years later than the text indicated or Ahaz, Hezekiah's father would only be one year older than Hezekiah. Second, according to Assyrian records, the capture of Samaria occurred about 723 B.C. during the ninth year of Hoshea, and Sennacherib's Campaign against Hezekiah occurred in 701 B.C. in Hezekiah's fourteenth year, showing a break between the end of Hoshea's reign and the beginning of Hezekiah's reign of about eight years. Third, there is no record of any contacts between these two kings, Hoshea and Hezekiah, as there is in the case of almost every other contemporaneous king of Israel and Judah during the period of the divided kingdoms. Azariah is the only king during the divided kingdoms other than Hezekiah.
that is not mentioned as making some contact with Israel.

Fourth, in the first year of his reign, Hezekiah sent invitations for the people of both Judah and Israel to attend a feast of the passover in the second month at Jerusalem. The letters sent to the people of Israel indicated that they were the ones that "escaped out of the hand of the kings of Assyria" (II Chron. 30:6) when their "fathers" and their "brethren ... trespassed against the Lord God" and the Lord "gave them up to desolation" (II Chron. 30:7). Hezekiah also said to these Israelites who escaped the captivity "if ye turn again unto the Lord, your brethren and your children shall find compassion before them that lead them captive, so that they shall come again into this land: ..." (II Chron. 30:9).

It seems evident that this feast was planned after most of Israel had been captured by Assyria. Fifth, after the feast was over, the people went throughout the land of Israel and Judah and broke down the images, cut down the groves, and threw down the altars (II Chron. 31:1). This surely could not have been done if the kingdom of Israel was flourishing under the reign of Hoshea. Sixth and last, Hezekiah adopted the anti-Assyrian policy of Isaiah, and had he been king when Assyria came against and captured Israel, there surely would have been some conflict between Hezekiah and the Assyrian armies. However Hazekiah's predecessor, Ahaz, maintained a pro-Assyrian policy, and therefore through this friendly neutrality with Assyria, the Kingdom of Judah was not bothered
in Assyria's campaign against Israel.  

Many chronologists have looked on the synchronisms of different kings of Israel and Judah during the period of the divided kingdoms as very confusing and of very little value. In fact some chronologists like Eric Njord have ignored almost completely the synchronisms and compiled their chronology almost solely on the total reigns of the kings of the kingdom of Judah. However these synchronisms when understood provide very valuable information to check the accuracy of the chronology of the period of the divided kingdoms.

This final period from Hezekiah to Zedekiah is lacking in valuable information because the Kingdom of Israel had been destroyed by the Assyrian conquerors. The only synchronisms that exist for this period of history are those between Judah and Assyria and Babylon.

As Thiele points out, the first synchronism in this final period is between Sennacherib's third year and Hezekiah's fourteenth year which was about 701 B.C. The next synchronism is between Nebuchadnezzar's first year and Jehoiakim's fourth year (Jer. 25:1). Thiele takes the date 605 for the accession of Nebuchadnezzar from Parker and Dubberstein's Babylonian Chronology. This date seems to be

Ibid., p. 128-132.


the most universally accepted date. However, Eric Njord has established the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign as 608 from data found in *The World's Scope Encyclopedia.*

Mr. Njord points out that this encyclopedia

... credits Nabopolassar with having conquered Babylonia in 625 B.C. If this is correct, the 30th year of the founding of the Chaldean rule over conquered Babylon (see Ezekiel 1:1) would be 595 B.C. This same year was the fifth year of King Jehoiachin's captivity (Ezekiel 1:2) ... and this again indicates 600 B.C. as the first year of Zedekiah's reign.

This is a significant date because according to the Book of Mormon "in the commencement of the first year of the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah ... there came many prophets, prophesying unto the people that they must repent, or the great city Jerusalem must be destroyed." (I Nephi 1:4). It was then that Lehi left Jerusalem with his family and came to the American continent. Six hundred years later Jesus Christ was born in Jerusalem. Three times Nephi prophesied Jesus Christ the Messiah would be born "six hundred years from the time that my father left Jerusalem" (I Nephi 10:4; 19:8; 2 Nephi 25:19). The signs on this continent representing the time of the birth of Christ occurred when "the ninety and first year had passed away and it was six hundred years from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem" (3 Nephi 1:1). It was in that year that there came a day when the Lord spoke to Nephi saying, "Lift up your head and be of good cheer; for behold, the time is at hand, and on this night shall the sign be given.

---

47 Njord, op. cit., p. 252  
and on the morrow come I unto the world." (I Nep. 1:13).

Therefore, with this valuable help from modern scripture we find that Zedekiah began to reign 600 years before Jesus Christ was born, and reigned for eleven years to 589 (II Kings 24:18). Now let us look at the chronology from Zedekiah back to Hezekiah and see what we find.

Jehoiachin, the predecessor of Zedekiah, reigned only three months (II Kings 24:8) and was taken captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, so his reign began and ended in 600. Jehoiakim was king before Jehoiachin and reigned for eleven years (II Kings 23:36) from 611 to 600 B.C. Jehoahaz, the predecessor of Jehoiakim, reigned for three months in Jerusalem during 611 B.C. (II Kings 23:31). Before Jehoahaz, Josiah was king of Judah for thirty-one years from 642 to 611 B.C. (II Kings 22:1). Ammon, predecessor of Josiah, reigned for two years (II Kings 21:19) from 644 to 642 B.C. Manasseh reigned before Ammon for fifty-five years (II Kings 21:1), therefore his reign began in 699 and terminated in 644 B.C.

There is one special problem for this period from Hezekiah to Zedekiah. Hezekiah's reign, established by Biblical and Assyrian records, began in 715 and terminated in 686. His fourteenth year synchronized with Sennacherib's third year which has been astronomically established as 701 B.C. If Manasseh began to reign in 699 as has been established by modern scripture and historical evidence, then
there is a coregency between Hezekiah and Manasseh of thirteen years from 699 to 686. The Bible does not say anything about this coregency. Thiele pointed out that due to the relationship and circumstances of the beginning and end of the other kings from Manasseh to Jehoiakim, and the synchronisms between Hebrew, Assyrian and Babylonian chronology, there must have been a coregency between Hezekiah and Manasseh. 49

In Thiele’s chronology the accession of Nebuchadnezzar was 605, the date being taken from another source as mentioned previously. This date for the accession would make the coregency between Manasseh and Hezekiah nine or ten years. However, with the additional evidence of modern scripture, placing the first year of Nebuchadnezzar three years earlier in 608 and the first year of Zedekiah in 600, we must add three years on to the coregency of Hezekiah and Manasseh making it thirteen years in length.

What justification is there for a thirteen year coregency between Hezekiah and Manasseh? Thiele points out that Manasseh began to reign when he was twelve years old (II Kings 21:1), and Hezekiah, his father, was fifty-four when he died. If Manasseh began to reign after his father died, then this first son would have been born when Hezekiah was forty-two years old. If, however, there was a coregency of ten to thirteen years, then he would have been born when

Hezekiah was twenty-nine or thirty-two years old which seems much more reasonable for the birth of the first son at this period of history.

There is another possible reason for a coregency between these two kings. Fifteen years before Hezekiah died, he became "sick unto death." Isaiah came to him and told him "thus said the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." (II Kings 20:1). But Hezekiah prayed to the Lord, and through Isaiah the Lord told him that he would be healed and that he would live fifteen years more (II Kings 20:5,6). Two years later, according to our chronology, his oldest son, Manasseh, turned twelve and became a "son of the law" and passed from the days of childhood to youth. It is possible that it was then that Hezekiah, realizing he had only thirteen years to live and that his oldest son was old enough to concern himself with the serious affairs of life, decided to "set his house in order" and placed Manasseh on the throne with him so that he could learn how to be a good king after his father's death.

The following chart shows the plotting of these kings as discussed in this chapter.
CHART OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH - CHART III (Cont.)
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Conclusion of Old Testament Chronology Scriptural Analysis

The study of the chronology of the Old Testament according to the scriptures from Adam to Zedekiah is now completed. Years and dates have been established as far as possible for each period from the Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price. The following Table has been compiled from data obtained from this analysis. It should be remembered that with all the help of modern scripture and scientific discovery there are some areas in the Old Testament chronology where there is not enough material to come to an absolute conclusion.

Thiele makes a very significant statement about dates of Hebrew and secular history.

Accepted dates, however, both in Hebrew and secular history, are not always absolute dates. It is true in every field of endeavor that that which has long been accepted as truth is not always truth. In our own present quest it must be kept in mind that it is entirely possible that we will find dates, in Assyrian as well as Hebrew history, which have long been accepted but which careful investigation will reveal are not entirely correct.50

This Table is constructed as a scriptural foundation from which to work and test our findings and conclusions from an archaeological and historical standpoint.

50Ibid., p. 75.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Event</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Years to Next Event</th>
<th>References for Years to Next Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam &quot;Beginning of mortality&quot;</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Gen. 5:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth's birth</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3870</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Gen. 5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos's birth</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Gen. 5:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan's birth</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gen. 5:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalalee's birth</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3605</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Gen. 5:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared's birth</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Gen. 5:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch's birth</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Gen. 5:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methuselah's birth</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Gen. 5:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech's birth</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Gen. 5:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's birth</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Moses 8:12; Gen. 5:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem's birth</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Moses 8:12; Gen. 7:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gen. 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arphaxad's birth</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gen. 11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salah's birth</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gen. 11:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eber's birth</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gen. 11:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleg's birth</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gen. 11:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reu's birth</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gen. 11:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serug's birth</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gen. 11:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahor's birth</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>2151</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gen. 11:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terah's birth</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gen. 11:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham's birth</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Gen. 21:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac's birth</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Gen. 25:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob's birth</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Gen. 41:46-8; 45:6; 47:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph's birth</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>See Exodus discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses's birth</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ex. 7:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE OF CHRONOLOGY - TABLE IV (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Event</th>
<th>A.M.</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Years to Next Event</th>
<th>References for Years to Next Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exodus from Egypt</td>
<td>2553</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ex. 16:35; Num. 14:33; 32:13; Deut. 2:7; Jos. 5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing the Jordan</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Josh. 14:7; Josh. 14:10; Deut. 2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The land divided</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>40(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua's death</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>20(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude in Mesopotamia</td>
<td>2659</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jud. 3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel, Judge</td>
<td>2667</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>4(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude to Moabites</td>
<td>2671</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jud. 3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar, Judges</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>9(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude to Canaanites</td>
<td>2698</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jud. 4:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah, Judge</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>4(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude to Midianites</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jud. 6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon, Judge</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>4(?)</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech, Judge</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jud. 9:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tola, Judge</td>
<td>2736</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jud. 10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jair, Judge</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jud. 10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude to Philistines and Ammonites</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jud. 10:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah, Judge</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jud. 12:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibzan, Judge</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jud. 12:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon, Judge</td>
<td>2812</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jud. 12:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdon, Judge</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jud. 12:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servitude to Philistines</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jud. 13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson and Philistines</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jud. 15:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli, Judge</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I Sam. 4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel, Judge</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>See Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul, King</td>
<td>2949</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Acts 13:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, King</td>
<td>2989</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I Kings 2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon, King</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I Kings 11:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name or Event</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Years to Next Event</td>
<td>References for Years to Next Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KINGDOM OF ISRAEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam, King</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>See Discussion in Chapter IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadab</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baasha</td>
<td>3091</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elah</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimri (7 days), Tibni and Omri</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omri (sole reign)</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahab</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah</td>
<td>3147</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joram</td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehu</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>3186</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash (Joash) (sole reign)</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoash &amp; Jeroboam II (coregency)</td>
<td>3207</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam II (sole reign)</td>
<td>3218</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachariah</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallum (1 month)</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menahem</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekahiah</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekah (sole reign)</td>
<td>3260</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoshea</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Hoshea and Kingdom of Israel</strong></td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>723</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KINGDOM OF JUDAH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam, King</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>See Discussion in Chapter IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>3087</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>3089</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa &amp; Jehoshaphat (coregency)</td>
<td>3127</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name or Event</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Years to Next References for Years Event to Next Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat (sole reign)</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>17 See Discussion in Chapter IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat &amp; Jehoram (coregency)</td>
<td>3147</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram (sole reign)</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaziah (about 4 months)</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athaliah</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah (sole reign)</td>
<td>3204</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah &amp; Azariah (coregency)</td>
<td>3209</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (sole reign)</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah &amp; Jotham (coregency)</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham (sole reign)</td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham &amp; Ahaz (coregency)</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz (sole reign)</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah (sole reign)</td>
<td>3285</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah &amp; Manasseh (coregency)</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh (sole reign)</td>
<td>3314</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz (3 months)</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiachin (3 months)</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedekiah</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Zedekiah and Judah, Jerusalem destroyed</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

THE DATE OF THE BEGINNING OF
ADAM'S TEMPORAL EXISTENCE

One of the most difficult problems of Old Testament chronology is the possibility of the beginning of Adam's mortal existence being as early as 4000 B.C. Through developments of science and archaeological discoveries, many scientific theories and hypotheses have been propounded that seem to discount the idea that life on earth could have existed for only about 6000 years.

God's Time and the Creation of Life

One of the oldest records of scripture in existence is the Book of Abraham, translated by the Prophet Joseph Smith from papyrus obtained from some Egyptian mummies.¹ On page 35 there is an explanation of a facsimile from the Book of Abraham represented on the preceding page in the Pearl of Great Price. In this explanation of Fig. 1, we find the following quotation that helps us to understand the relationship of God's time and man's time:

Kolob, signifying the first creation, nearest to the celestial, or the residence of God. First in government, the last pertaining to the measurement of time. The measurement according to

¹Pearl of Great Price, p. 30
celestial time, which celestial time signifies one day to a cubit. **One day in Kolob is equal to a thousand years according to the measurement of this earth, which is called by the Egyptians Jah-oh-eh.** (Pearl of Great Price, p. 35) (Italics by author)

Abraham received many revelations from God. While telling about the revelation of the stars and planets and about the great star Kolob that was "nearest unto the throne of God" he said,

And the Lord said unto me, by the Urim and Thummim, that Kolob was after the manner of the Lord, according to its times and seasons in the revolutions thereof; that one revolution was a day unto the Lord, after his manner of reckoning, it being one thousand years according to the time appointed unto that whereon thou standest. This is the reckoning of the Lord's time, according to the reckoning of Kolob. (Pearl of Great Price, p. 36, verse 4.) (Italics by author)

The apostle Peter seems to have understood this also as he said, "But Beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." (2 Peter 3:8). It seems that King David also may have understood this point as he wrote, "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." (Psalm 90:4). The Lord again reminded the Prophet Joseph Smith on December 27, 1832, that God's time is different from man's time. He said the heavens and earth and planets "give light to each other in their times and in their seasons, in their minutes, in their hours, in their days, in their weeks, in their months, in their years...all these are one year with God, but not with man." (D. & C. 88:44)
We also learn from Abraham that the creation and beginning history of the earth and Adam till about the Fall of Adam were measured after God's time each day being 1000 of our years. In discussing the story of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden, Abraham records,

And the Gods commanded the man, saying: of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the time that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. Now I, Abraham, saw that it was after the Lord's time, which was after the time of Kolob; for as yet the Gods had not appointed unto Adam his reckoning. (Abraham 5:12,13.) ( Italics by the author)

In the account of the creation recorded by Abraham we find the word "time" used in referring to the different days of creation. "...and this was the second time that they called night and day." (Abraham 4:8). "...and it came to pass, from the morning until the evening they called day; and it was the third time." (Abraham 4:13). Time here, therefore, seems to refer to the Lord's time, as mentioned above which was a thousand years, indicating that each day, "time," of creation was about 1000 years. The idea that each day of creation was about 1000 years seems to be supported also by a revelation from God to the Prophet Joseph Smith at Hiram, Ohio, March, 1832.

Q. What are we to understand by the sounding of the trumpets, mentioned in the 8th chapter of Revelation?
A. We are to understand that as God made the world in six days, and on the seventh day he finished his work, and sanctified it, and also formed man out of the dust of the earth, even so, in the beginning of the seventh thousand years will the Lord God
The Second Coming of Christ at the "Beginning of the 7th Thousand Years"

In the previous revelation a comparison is made between the seven days of creation and the seven thousand years of the earth's temporal existence, and from this revelation it seems that the "time of his coming" may be "in the beginning of the seventh thousand years." Let us examine other revelations to get a better understanding of this.

Concerning the exact "day and hour" of the Lord's second coming, we know that only one person knows this. Jesus said to his followers, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." (Matt. 24:36) It would be foolish for anyone to attempt to predict the exact day and hour of the Lord's second coming. However, the Lord has given us many signs in the 24th chapter of Matthew and many other scriptures, whereby we may know the approximate time of this great event and "watch" and be "also ready" for it.

The prophet recorded in the Doctrine and Covenants,

I was once praying very earnestly to know the time of the coming of the Son of Man, when I heard a voice repeat the following:

"Joseph, my son, if thou livest until thou art eighty-five years old, thou shalt see the face of the
Son of Man; therefore let this suffice, and trouble me no more on this matter."

I was left thus, without being able to decide whether this coming referred to the beginning of the millennium or to some previous appearing, or whether I should die and thus see his face.

I believe the coming of the Son of Man will not be any sooner than that time. (D.&C. 130:14-17).

In Joseph's own discussion of this, recorded in his history of the Church, he makes the following very interesting comments:

Were I going to prophesy, I would say the end (of the world) would not come in 1844,5, or 6, or in forty years. There are those of the rising generation who shall not taste death till Christ comes.

I was once praying earnestly upon this subject, and a voice said unto me, "My son, if thou livest until thou art eighty-five years of age, thou shalt see the face of the Son of Man." I was left to draw my own conclusions concerning this; and I took the liberty to conclude that if I did live to that time, He would make His appearance. But I do not say whether He will make His appearance or I shall go where He is. I prophesy in the name of the Lord God, and let it be written -- the Son of Man will not come in the clouds of heaven till I am eighty-five years old.²

Joseph then said to read Rev. 14:6,7 about the angel coming with the everlasting gospel etc. "And Hosea, 6th chapter, After two days, etc.,--2,520 years; which brings it to 1890."³ It's a puzzle what Joseph's reference to Hosea 6:2 "After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight," has to do with


³Ibid.
2,520 years bringing it up to 1890. Of course Joseph would be 85 years old in 1890 but 2,520 years back from that date would not bring us back to Hosea's prophecy but to 630 B.C. in the time of Zephaniah, Habakkuk and Jeremiah, 150 years after Hosea's prophecy was made in about 780 B.C. Hosea's prophecy may refer to two things: it may refer to the resurrection of Jesus Christ and many other righteous people that were resurrected at that time, or Joseph may have been thinking of the two days as 2,000 years, a day to God being a thousand years to us, and "in the third day he will raise us up" meaning that in the third thousand years from that time he will raise all the righteous up at his second coming.

From Hosea's prophecy in about 780 B.C. to 1890 A.D. when Joseph would be 85 years old is 2,670 years. This of course is in the third thousand years or the "third day," but it still remains a mystery where and how Joseph figured the 2,520 year period he referred to, unless it is a mistake in recording or printing, or he computed it from a different time for Hosea.

It is very evident that the Prophet Joseph did not know the exact day, month or year of the second coming even though he did know that it was not far off.

Later on Joseph again recorded some about the time of the second coming of the Lord in his history:

"I have asked the Lord concerning His coming; and while asking the Lord, He gave a sign and said, "In the days of Noah I set a bow in the heavens as a sign and token that in any year that the bow should..."
be seen the Lord would not come; but there should be seed time and harvest during that year; but whenever you see the bow withdrawn, it shall be a token that there shall be famine, pestilence, and great distress among the nations, and that the coming of the Messiah is not far distant.

But I will take the responsibility upon myself to prophesy in the name of the Lord, that Christ will not come this year, as Father Miller has prophesied, for we have seen the bow; and I also prophesy, in the name of the Lord, that Christ will not come in forty years; and if God ever spoke by my mouth, He will not come in that length of time. Brethren, when you go home, write this down, that it may be remembered.

Jesus Christ never did reveal to any man the precise time that He would come. Go and read the scriptures, and you cannot find anything that specifies the exact hour He would come; and all that say so are false teachers.

I think we should note a difference between "the precise time", "the exact hour" and the approximate time, and the approximate year, for Jesus and Joseph both gave signs and made statements to indicate the approximate time and year of his coming. It seems that Jesus wanted us to know and try to understand and be aware of the approximate time of his second coming, for, as mentioned previously, he revealed many signs and events by which we could discern the nearness of this great event and be prepared for it.

There are a number of different scriptures and revelations in the Doctrine and Covenants that if accepted as recorded, make it very difficult not to know today, at least within about a forty or fifty year period the approximate time of the second coming of Christ.

4Joseph Smith, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 254
First we know that the Second coming of Christ will herald in what is known as the Millennium and that this millennium will be 1000 years in length (Moses 7:64 and D.&C. 29:11).

Second, we know that this earth is going through 7000 years of a temporal existence and that the Lord will reveal his "will", "mysteries", "works", and "the hidden things of his economy concerning this earth during the seven thousand years of its continuance, or its temporal existence." (D.&C. 77:6). In an interview on July 17, 1962, Joseph Fielding Smith stated that the earth started its temporal existence with the fall of Adam and in a talk to Seminary and Institute men the same day, he said "this earth was not a mortal earth before the fall of Adam."

Third, we know that there were certain things that happened in each of the thousand year periods (D.&C. 77:7) and that during the "sixth thousand years" Elias "was to come to gather together the tribes of Israel and restore all things." (D.&C. 77:8,10) Elias has come (D.&C. 110:12) and remnants of the tribes have been gathered and are still being gathered and all things have been restored in this "dispensation of the fullness of times" today. According to Bible and modern scripture, as shown in this thesis as far as we can interpret it, today we are possibly about forty years from the end of the sixth thousand years of the world's history since Adam.
Fourth, the Lord revealed to Joseph Smith at Kirtland, Ohio, December 27, 1832;

For not many days hence and the earth shall tremble and reel to and fro as a drunken man; and the sun shall hide his face, and shall refuse to give light; and the moon shall be bathed in blood; and the stars shall become exceedingly angry, and shall cast themselves down as a fig that falleth from off a fig-tree. (D.&C. 88:8?)

The Lord continues to describe the things that will happen at the second coming of Christ. After the Lord has been revealed, the righteous have been "caught up to meet him" and the wicked have been judged, the seven angels have sounded their trumps, and the second coming "is finished,"

And then shall the first angel again sound his trump in the ears of all living, and reveal the secret acts of men, and the mighty works of God in the first thousand years.

And then shall the second angel sound his trump, and reveal the secret acts of man, and the thoughts and intents of their hearts, and the mighty works of God in the second thousand years. . .

And so on, until the seventh angel shall sound his trump; and he shall stand forth upon the land and upon the sea, and swear in the name of him who sitteth upon the throne, that there shall be atime no longer; and Satan shall be bound, that old serpent, who is called the devil, and shall not be loosed for the space of a thousand years. (D.&C. 88:100-110)

From these scriptures we conclude that the millennium will start about the beginning of the seventh thousand years.

The Prophet Joseph Smith believed that the life of man on earth has been about 6000 years and that the seventh thousand years will be the millennium of peace. In the "Evening and Morning Star", published August 1832, there was
an article by the Prophet in which he calls the millennium "the Sabbath of creation." In another editorial by the Prophet ten years later on July 15, 1842, he stated, "The world has had a fair trial for six thousand years; the Lord will try the seventh thousand Himself."  

Conclusion

From these scriptures in the Doctrine and Covenants and the statements of the Prophet Joseph Smith and many of the general authorities, we come to the conclusion that Adam could not have lived as a mortal being much more than 4000 years B.C. or the second coming of Jesus Christ would have already occurred and we would be living in the millennium.

6Ibid., p. 252
CHAPTER VI

SOME SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATIONS BEARING UPON THE DATE OF ADAM'S MORTAL BEGINNING c. 4000 B.C.

It may often seem that some scientific discoveries connected with chronology and ages of things contradict the scriptural chronology which dates Adam about 4000 B.C. Some very outstanding scientific discoveries do support the scriptural chronology of the Old Testament as discussed in previous chapters.

The Reliability of Radioactive Clocks

A special contribution has been made in this field of Biblical and scientific chronometry by Dr. Melvin A. Cook of the University of Utah Engineering Experiment Station, Department of Metallurgy. Dr. Cook wrote to President Smith, April 25, 1955 expressing his views on the subject of radioactive clocks. Dr. Cook said,

... I undertook the study of the "Atomic Clock" situation. So far I have not had time to finish this study to the point where I am able to make any definite contributions. However, I have gone far enough to be able to see that these famous clocks may actually be running backwards.

No one really knows the origin of the elements from any scientific studies yet made. Theories of their origin are in every case unsatisfactory in that no theory explains even the best known facts. Many competent scientists do not agree with the idea in vogue that elements were laid down in the so-called "beginning of the universe" in the same ratios that we find them today, even aside from
the decay over long periods of time. Dr. Ter Haar in a recent article in "Review in Modern Physics" says quite correctly that we do not even know whether radioactive elements are decreasing or increasing in relative abundance. I believe that further study will show that elements grow by accretion of more elementary materials, and that despite the decay process that goes on simultaneously the relative abundance of the radioactive substances like uranium may actually be increasing rather than decreasing. This is what I mentioned above that the "atomic clocks" may be running backwards.

One of the most important scientific studies of recent times, I feel is that of the famous astronomer Hoyle who has shown (quite conclusively as far as I am concerned) that the sun is not dying or running out of energy at all, but is actually growing by a process of accretion of Hydrogen.\(^1\)

Only a few months ago an article appearing in Scientific Monthly pointed out that scientists may have to abandon their originally most promising "atomic clock", carbon 14, because it is proving unreliable owing to rapid fluctuations of background radiation. \(\ldots\) it takes into account merely our ability to measure the radioactivity at a given time but tells nothing of fluctuations over a period of time. It is possible that such fluctuations could have caused the "clocks" to be in error by many powers of ten.\(^2\)

Dr. C. C. Riddle also investigated the reliability of these "atomic clocks" and in a "Report on Radiocarbon Dating," Dr. Riddle lists six "minor limitations" and six "more difficult" problems of the C\(^{14}\) method of "age determination \(\ldots\) which as yet must force us to deny full

\(^1\)Unpublished letter \(^2\)Ibid.
acceptance of the method. ^3

1. Does the C^{14} - C^{12} exchange between living matter and the atmosphere stop at death?
2. Is there any transfer of carbon in carbonates after crystallization?
3. Can we be sure our sample has not been intruded upon by younger or older carboniferous materials?
4. Can we assume that most C^{14} produced by cosmic radiation actually does become C^{14}O_{2} and thus able to enter and combine with living organisms?
5. Is the mixing of C^{14}O_{2} from the upper layers of the atmosphere where it is formed rapid and thorough?
6. What effect has the fact that plants absorb bicarbonates from ground water as well as directly from the air?
These problems are more or less routine. But the next series of problems are more difficult, for they involve matters not so easily decided.
7. It is known that neutron density is not the same at all places on the earth, since it is very low at the equator and rises toward the poles. Will not this affect the production of C^{14} and consequent affection of living organisms; or has the phenomena some relation to the relative success and failure of the neutrons to combine with elements of the air at different latitudes? (Simpson, J. A., Physical Review, 73, 1277, 1947)
8. Is there now and has there always been a constant proportion of O_{2}, CO_{2}, and other gases in the atmosphere of our earth? If not, that might have a serious effect on our calculations. Actually having at least at present no means of determining just what happened in the unrecorded past, we are forced to rely on a postulate of uniformity.
9. Can we be sure that cosmic radiation has been relatively the same in the geologically recent past of the earth? Here again we have no present means of answering the question. We have no physical evidence to make us seriously consider adopting an hypothesis of this kind of a change, but we must not forget, this is perhaps the weakest link in the theoretical structure that supports carbon dating.

---

^3Chauncey Riddle, "Report on Radiocarbon Dating" Unpublished Article. B.Y.U.
10. Can we assume that life on the earth is older than the life of Cl\textsuperscript{14}? If it isn't, then equilibrium has not been established. This was a necessary part of Libby's original hypothesis.

11. Can we assume that Cl\textsuperscript{14} atoms actually do mix with all forms of life and achieve an equilibrium not alone with the whole mass of nature, but with each individual? Is it not entirely possible and indeed probable that we shall discover that at least some forms of life treat isotopes preferentially, not retaining their proportionate share of the Cl\textsuperscript{14} burden?

12. And closely related to that, this method of age determination presupposes that we shall assume not only that each individual will have a proportional and uniform share of the total Cl\textsuperscript{14} which theoretically is produced, but that this share is quantitatively determinable, that for a given weight of carbon in the body of any living organism, the number of Cl\textsuperscript{14} atoms is specifiable, thus providing the standard necessary for age determination.

Looking at the process of radiocarbon dating from its theoretical aspects there seem to be a great many loopholes and gaps and assumptions. But viewed from the empirical standpoint, we must concede the very apparent successes of the method in producing data which correlate within the limits of experimental error both with prior theoretical predications and with independent time determinations through historical study. One thing seems fairly certain: Cl\textsuperscript{14} dating does give us a very valuable means of establishing the relative ages of organic materials.

**Carbon Dating and "Geological Chronometry"**

Dr. Cook continued his research in the field of carbon dating and Bible chronology and in about 1956 he published an article entitled "Geological Chronometry" found in the University of Utah library which was later printed in bulletin #83 of the Utah Engineering Experiment station, published by the University of Utah Department of Metallurgy, December, 1956.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid.
1956. The original report was a little different from the published bulletin as it contained some references to Bible scriptures that were omitted in the bulletin. The following quotations were taken from the original report and are given here especially for those scientifically trained to understand the equations while parts of special importance are underlined for added emphasis. $10^9$ means 1 billion, $10^{10}$ means 10 billion, $3 \times 10^9$ means 3 billion, etc.

**ABSTRACT**

Noting that $\text{C}^{14}$ may not yet have reached its steady state concentration in our atmosphere this and other methods of geological chronometry were reexamined in some detail. It is here shown that the radiocarbon method taken exactly as it stands without modification of its basic postulates appears to date our atmosphere at less than 15,800 y, the best value taking into account ocean circulation being about 12,600 y. This is based on the assumption that Libby's evaluations are correct for the rate of formation of $\text{C}^{14}$. (W. F. Libby, "Radiocarbon Dating", University of Chicago Press, Second Edition (1955). This surprising result led us to reexamine the helium situation in the earth and atmosphere. Both total $\text{He}^4$ and the $\text{He}^3/\text{He}^4$ ratio appear from this examination to show an age of $10^4$-$10^5$ y. for the atmosphere in approximate confirmation of the $\text{C}^{14}$ nonequilibrium theory. Moreover, the measured rates of accumulation of uranium in the ocean from river water suggest an age of less than $10^6$ y., perhaps less than $10^5$ y. for the oceans.

The uranium - thorium decay methods are next reexamined in light of (1) the experimental methods and basic assumptions, (2) current knowledge of the importance of cosmic radiation in universal transmutation processes, (3) accretion through micrometeorites, (4) crystallization processes in the theoretical magmatic history of the earth, (5) measured isotopic abundance of common lead and (6) the requirements of the "nuclear shell model". The results seem to show that the various methods involving radioactive decay of uranium and thorium do not provide satisfactory measures of age in the earth's crust.
The ocean salt method for age determination is shown to be merely a steady state circulation of salt. Sodium chloride leaves the ocean via ocean spray, is precipitated from the atmosphere in rain water and runs back into the ocean in river water. The excess sodium in river water comes from leaching of the igneous rock. However, this excess sodium is extracted from the ocean in the deposition of deep sea clay sediments. Certain aspects of other methods including heat balance, astronomical chronometry, tidal friction, the ionium method and sedimentation are also considered; all seem from present knowledge to be inadequate in geological chronometry. The only results which seem from present evidence to necessitate geologically long times appear to be those of fossil deposition. While fossil deposition still seems from direct evidence to require the long times of the geologists, this time honored method of geologists is complicated by many unanswered and perhaps unanswerable questions. Moreover, if the atmosphere of the earth proves to be no older than $10^4-10^5$ y., considerable modification of our ideas on sedimentation and fossil deposition will no doubt be required. 

Table I Methods of Chronometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Materials Analyzed</th>
<th>Ages Assigned (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Radioactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U$^{238}$/Pb$^{206}$ Ratio</td>
<td>0.1 % U Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U$^{235}$/Pb$^{207}$ Ratio</td>
<td>0.1 % U Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb$^{206}$/Pb$^{207}$ Ratio</td>
<td>0.1 % U Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th$^{232}$/Pb$^{208}$ Ratio</td>
<td>0.1 % Th Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Lead</td>
<td>Galena Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rb$^{87}$/Sr$^{87}$ Ratio</td>
<td>Rb Rich - Sr poor Minerals</td>
<td>$10^6 - 2\cdot10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$^{40}$/A$^{40}$ and K$^{40}$/Ca$^{40}$ Ratios</td>
<td>Igneous &amp; Metamorphic Rocks</td>
<td>$10^6 - 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium</td>
<td>Igneous Rocks</td>
<td>$10^6 - 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionium</td>
<td>Deep Sea Sediments</td>
<td>$0 - 4\cdot10^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$^{14}$</td>
<td>Carbon Bearing Substances in Biosphere</td>
<td>$0 - 45,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritium</td>
<td>In water</td>
<td>$0 - 100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5Melvin A. Cook, "Geological Chronometry" (Salt Lake City: Engineering Library, University of Utah, 1956), p. I & II.
Table I Methods of Chronometry (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Materials Analyzed</th>
<th>Ages Assigned (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Tidal Friction</td>
<td>Earth - Moon</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Salt in Ocean</td>
<td>Total Sodium</td>
<td>$1 \times 8 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sedimentation</td>
<td>Rates and Total Sedimentation</td>
<td>About $3 \times 5 \times 10^8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Astronomical Expansion of universe</td>
<td>Red Shifts</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galactic Clusters</td>
<td>Features or structure</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative abundance of elements</td>
<td>U, Th in meteors</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellar Energy</td>
<td>spectroscopy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Temperature in Crust of Earth</td>
<td>H/He Ratio</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fossil Deposition</td>
<td>Sediments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The most significant feature of this method is the order of deposition; one usually calibrates the apparent time scale by a radioactive method from the rocks of formation.*

Dr. Cook continues with his explanation of the experiment.

Owing to the fact that the various methods for dating the formation of the earth and the universe give apparent ages of comparable magnitude, namely $10^9$-$10^{10}$ years, today scientists appear to be in general agreement that the earth formed in the "event" that created the universe about $3 \times 10^9$ years ago. On the other hand the Biblical "Story of the Creation" is considered by many to be simply an outline of the correct order of events with the meaning of "day" as used in that account as an indefinite period of time. It is interesting, however, that the Bible carries its own definition of this "day" and assigns its length as 1000 years of man's time. (Cf. II Peter 3:8) See also (Abr. 3:4; 5:13; Facsimile, "Pearl of Great Price", No. 2, Fig. 1.). A "literal" interpretation might thus lead one to assign a period of 12,000 - 13,000 years since the "beginning" of the present earth. This is, to be sure, an extreme interpretation, especially in the light of the general (theoretical) agreement in the field of science that the age of the earth (and the universe) is approxi-
mately $3 \times 10^9$ y, the discrepancy amounts to a factor of more than $10^5$.

It is not intended that the viewpoint expressed in this article should be considered unequivocally correct because the scientific evidences are still inadequate to render an unequivocal answer. However, we shall present some evidence that suggests that, despite the current overwhelming disfavor of short time answer, this answer may yet prove to be the correct one. 

The "radiocarbon" or C$^{14}$ method of Libby is no doubt the most nearly quantitative method of scientific dating yet developed. It is based on the fact that C$^{14}$ is produced by the reaction of the nitrogen of the atmosphere with neutrons generated by cosmic radiation, and that radiocarbon enters the carbon cycle which circulates through the hydrosphere, the atmosphere, and the biosphere. The method includes the following assumptions:

1. The cosmic ray level and therefore the rate of formation of C$^{14}$ in the atmosphere (via the reaction N$^4$ (n, p) C$^{14}$) is constant and has remained constant at least over the period of applicability of the C$^{14}$ method (about 45,000 y).

2. C$^{14}$ decay (which follows the law $\frac{dC^{14}}{dt} = k_1C^{14}$)

is in equilibrium with

C$^{14}$ formation, i.e., $\frac{d(C^{14})}{dt} = k_f C^{14} = 0$

where $k_f$ is the (zero order rate constant for formation) and $k_1$ is the (first order) rate constant for decay ($k_f$ corresponding to a half-life of 5568 years is $1.24 \times 10^{-4}$ years $^{-1}$).

(3) Equilibrium is maintained between biological C$^{14}$ and atmospheric C$^{14}$ as long as the subject is living, but upon death $k_f$ becomes zero and the C$^{14}$ then undergoes simple decay. ($\frac{dC^{14}}{dt} = -k_1C^{14}$)

The C$^{14}$ concentration thus gives a measure of the age of the sample since death through the known C$^{14}$ decay equation.

$$I = 15.3e^{-0.693t/5568}$$

where I is the carbon count of the sample having been

---

\[7\text{Ibid., p. 1,3.}\]
dead for \( t \) years, 15.3 counts/g. min. being the count at \( t = 0 \).

Apparently assumptions (1) and (2) of this method have not been examined in the light of the possibility that the atmosphere of the earth might be as recent as is indicated by the Biblical account of the earth. Libby assumed that the carbon cycle contains 8.3 g/cm\(^2\) of the earth's surface, and computed the value of \( k_1 \) from the known neutron concentration in the atmosphere (2.6\(^{14}\) atoms formed per square centimeter per second, which is for the whole earth \(1.3 \times 10^{-19}$/sec or \(9.5 \times 10^3\) grams/year). (Libby, Chap. I)

He then computed an expected count of 18.8 counts/g. min. for the carbon of a plant or animal at \( t=0\), assuming that:

4. \(^{14}\)C is in equilibrium in the hydrosphere, biosphere and atmosphere where the total carbon is 8.3 g/cm\(^2\) of the earth's surface.

Dr. Cook then explains how the *value 18.8 counts/g.* min. actually represents a lower limit to the required \(^{14}\)C zero time decay count. . . ." He also shows from statistics on a chart

". . . that the ocean's \(^{14}\)C ranges from zero to about 2000 years in age depending on where one samples the ocean with respect to the atmosphere. The value 18.8 corresponds to the assumption of zero effective age for the ocean, i.e., \(^{14}\)C distributed in effectively 8.3 g/cm\(^2\) carbon. But if one corrects this value, for say an average of 1000 years for the "age" of \(^{14}\)C in the ocean, one obtains an expected (equilibrium) count of 20.4 counts/g. min. for any of the carbon samples of zero age taken from any place on the surface of the earth."\(^8\)

Now the actual count is 15.3 counts/g. min. which, corrected by the factor 1.05% for entrance into the biosphere gives \(16.1 = 0.5\) counts/g. min. Since the cosmic ray intensity has been carefully studied

\(^{8}\)Ibid., p. 3,4.
\(^{9}\)Ibid., p. 4,5.
for many years and seems to be known quite accurately, these data could as well (or perhaps definitely should) be interpreted to mean that the assumptions (1) and (2) are not quite correct, but that the rate of decay is not yet as great as the rate of formation of Cl^4. That is, Cl^4 in the atmosphere may be only about 86% as great as it would be at equilibrium, if one adopts (the incorrect) assumption (4), or only 79% as great as the required "steady state" value (20.4 counts/g. min.) allowing for an average 1000 year (circulation) lag of ocean water as far as the Cl^4 cycle is concerned.\(^{10}\)

Here Dr. Cook gives two equations to show the Cl^4 rate of formation which is shown plotted in Chart IV.

\[ \text{from which one finds that } t_0 \text{ (the beginning of Cl}^4 \text{ in our atmosphere was 15,800 years ago, if we ignore the ocean circulation lag (i.e., assuming } 18.8/1.05 \text{ counts/min. for the equilibrium value; or 12,600 years ago, if one corrects approximately for the ocean circulation lag by using 1000 years as the average age of the ocean with respect to Cl}^4. \]

Dr. Cook next gives a Table IV to show how this would effect or correct age determinations for the Non-Equilibrium of Cl^4 (using 1000 y. Average Age of Cl^4 in Ocean); 1000 years would be reduced 180 years etc. to 12,000 years which would be reduced 4,500 years.

Dr. Cook finally compares the results of the non-equilibrium theory with those of the equilibrium one for samples known ("historical") within reasonable limits. (See Table V.) He discusses these and then states "This may indicate a tendency on the part of scientists to overestimate age."\(^{12}\) He concludes this section with

\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 5,6. \quad ^{12}\)Ibid., p. 6

\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 6
The important point is that one must demonstrate whether the value 15.3 counts/min./g. really represents the equilibrium value for $\text{C}^{14}$ in the biosphere, or that $\text{C}^{14}$ is still increasing toward the theoretical level of 18.8/1.05 to 20.4/1.05 counts/g. min. It is perhaps merely coincidental, but nevertheless very interesting, that an exact application of Libby's method and data for the $\text{C}^{14}$ method dates our atmosphere to be about 12,600 years old, which is almost exactly the value computed by applying the scale factor given in II Peter 3:8.  

Dr. Cook then examined the Ionium Method, the Helium Method, Uranium in the Oceans, Tritium, and other Radioactive Decay Methods and pointed out many possible errors and inconsistencies that make these methods not entirely reliable as possible methods of chronometry. Tidal Friction, Salt in Oceans, Sedimentation, Astronomical methods, heat balance in the earth, Helium in Meteorites, Helium in Rocks, Sodium in the Ocean and Rate of Charge Accumulation on the earth are also examined and discussed and many possibilities of error pointed out in equations and charts and graphs.

There are two significant explanatory statements in the bulletin #83 that are somewhat clearer than in the original report concerning the evidence that $\text{C}^{14}$ may not yet have reached a steady state or equilibrium concentration in our atmosphere.

Experimental observations of neutron yield in the atmosphere and $\text{C}^{14}$ concentration in the biosphere indicate that $\text{C}^{14}$ may not yet have reached a steady state or equilibrium concentration in our atmosphere.

\[13\text{Ibid.}\]
TIME (YEARS X 10^{-3})  CHART IV
\[ \text{C}_{14} \]
CONCENTRATION vs. TIME CURVE FOR FORMATION

EQUILIBRIUM LEVEL

PRESENT LEVEL (15,800 years)
(NO OCEAN LAG CORRECTION)

PRESENT LEVEL (12,600 years)
(1,000 YEAR OCEAN LAG CORRECTION)
## COMPARISON OF EQUILIBRIUM AND NON-EQUILIBRIUM THEORY OF C\(^{14}\)

### TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No. (See Ref. 5)</th>
<th>Assigned Age (years)</th>
<th>Equilibrium Theory of Libby Uncorrected</th>
<th>Non-Equilibrium Theory Uncorrected</th>
<th>Non-Equilibrium Theory - Corrected for 1000y C(^{14}) in Ocean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>4650 ± 75</td>
<td>3979 ± 350</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>4575 ± 75</td>
<td>4802 ± 210</td>
<td>3870</td>
<td>3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-81</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>3621 ± 180</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-62</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>2190 ± 450</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-267</td>
<td>4700 - 5100</td>
<td>4883 ± 200</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>3570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-810-C814</td>
<td>Pre-dynastic</td>
<td>Av = 5275 ± 300</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-15</td>
<td>Period III</td>
<td>3212 ± 250</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>2485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-744</td>
<td>Pre-dynastic</td>
<td>5266 ± 450</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>3830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-752</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>3945 ± 106</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-818</td>
<td>3925 - 432</td>
<td>&gt;25,000</td>
<td>≤15,800</td>
<td>≤12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-72</td>
<td>2625 ± 50</td>
<td>(2696 ± 270)</td>
<td>(2295)</td>
<td>(2150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2239 ± 270)</td>
<td>(1920)</td>
<td>(1790)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-576</td>
<td>2050 ± 100</td>
<td>1917 ± 200</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C-819)</td>
<td>(4883 ± 200)</td>
<td>(5317 ± 30)</td>
<td>(4360)</td>
<td>(3870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C-627)</td>
<td>(~ 5000)</td>
<td>(7965 ± 370)</td>
<td>(6315)</td>
<td>(5465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-438</td>
<td>~8000</td>
<td>8631 ± 540</td>
<td>6530</td>
<td>5930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-624</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4964 ± 300</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>3960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-558</td>
<td>Folsom bone</td>
<td>9883 ± 350</td>
<td>7480</td>
<td>6580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-691</td>
<td>&lt;1500</td>
<td>2410 ± 200</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-894</td>
<td>~4000</td>
<td>10,494 ± 510</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>7140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-630</td>
<td>Glacial Wood, Kimberly, Wisconsin</td>
<td>10,676 ± 750</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-260</td>
<td>1450 - 1950</td>
<td>973 ± 170</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C-948)</td>
<td>1220 (a)</td>
<td>1503 ± 110</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample No. (See Ref. 5)</td>
<td>Assigned Age (years)</td>
<td>Equilibrium Theory of Libby</td>
<td>Non-Equilibrium Theory Uncorrected</td>
<td>Non-Equilibrium Theory - Corrected for 1000y $^{14}C$ in Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-949</td>
<td>1470 (b)</td>
<td>$\text{(973 ± 200 to 1070 ± 100)}$</td>
<td>820 - 920</td>
<td>790 - 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-103</td>
<td>1310 - 1400</td>
<td>$\text{(2404 ± 100 to 3045 ± 210)}$</td>
<td>2000 - 2600</td>
<td>1900 - 2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-159</td>
<td>2880 - 2980</td>
<td>$\text{8639 ± 450}$</td>
<td>6740</td>
<td>5840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-485</td>
<td>&quot;Early Man&quot; in Latin America</td>
<td>$\text{3424 ± 230)}$</td>
<td>(2850)</td>
<td>(2575)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Goodman and Thompson; (b) Spinden; (c) Sun Temple, Teotihucan

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 152.
The reason for suggesting the need to modify C\textsuperscript{14} atmospheric equilibrium postulate to a non-equilibrium one is simply that the current experimental neutron yield data are appreciably greater than required to account for the observed C\textsuperscript{14} concentration in biospheric carbon.\textsuperscript{15}

In conclusion according to these studies by Dr. Cook, the atmosphere has been shown to be only about 12,600 years old by the C\textsuperscript{14} method of dating. When we add six or seven days of about a thousand years each for the creation or preparation of the earth for man's entrance upon it, with about 4000 B.C. for Adams beginning, to 1960 A.D. we arrive at 11,960 or 12,960 years since the beginning of creation. We now have reliable scientific support for the position of the scriptures that man's entrance upon this earth may have occurred about 4000 B.C.

Geologic Uniformitarianism

John C. Whitcomb, Jr. and Henry M. Morris wrote an excellent book entitled The Genesis Flood. It seems that their main purpose is to expose the "philosophy of uniformity and evolution" which has possessed the thinking of scholars and influenced the rejection of many of the historical aspects of the Bible, especially in the Book of Genesis. They have devoted their study especially to the fields of "Old Testament interpretation and Biblical criticism and...the fields of Hydraulics, hydrology, and geomorphology." Their 518 page treatise reads more like an advanced course in general science.

\textsuperscript{15}Melvin A. Cook, \textit{Geological Chronometry} (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Department of Metallurgy, Bu #83, 1956), p. 1.
and geology than a discussion of the Biblical flood.

One of the most difficult problems to resolve in establishing more recent dates for the chronology of the Old Testament is the supposed uniform way that fossils and earth layers have been deposited. If the layers of the earth containing fossils of living things were deposited at the same uniform rate that earth layers are being deposited today, it would certainly take hundreds of thousands of years for them to be deposited as we know them today. Therefore this would indicate that life has existed upon this earth for hundreds and thousands of years as many scientists suppose. However if they have not been deposited at a slow uniform rate but quickly through great catastrophic disturbances, then the time span of life on earth is greatly reduced.

Whitcomb and Morris, through scientific study and examination, have shown that the most important geologic processes — (erosion, deposition, glaciation, diastrophism and volcanism) — "without exception, must at some time or times in the geologic past, have acted with tremendously greater intensity than anything measured today."16 Through a close examination and discussion of sedimentary rocks and the fossils they contain, they have shown

... that some kind of catastrophic condition is nearly always necessary for the burial and preser-

vation of fossils. Present-day processes are forming very few potential fossil deposits, and most of these are under conditions of rapid, sudden burial, which are abnormal. Nothing comparable to the tremendous fossiliferous beds of fish, mammals, reptiles, etc., that are found in many places around the world is being formed today.

And yet it is the fossils which are the basis of historical geology and the geologic time scale! It is the fossils which are considered to be the one sure proof of organic evolution, regardless of how they came to be buried. Nevertheless uniformity—modern processes—cannot legitimately account for the fossil deposits.17

This means that the hundreds of thousands of years required for the deposition of these elements by normal present rates of deposition must be drastically shortened through quick cataclysmic events that spanned thousands of years of uniform changes in possibly a few months or years. In fact through tremendous earthquakes, flash floods, and volcanic eruptions, the whole face of the earth could have been changed in a matter of hours.

Concerning the matter of fossils in rock strata, many inconsistencies exist that make their reliability for age determination very questionable.

Numerous fossils have been found grossly out of place in the time scale, despite all its built-in safeguards. Furthermore, many creatures supposedly primitive, have persisted to the present day, including many which apparently skipped all the way from very early periods to the present without leaving any traces in the intervening periods.

17 Ibid., p. 203
It is not at all uncommon for the smaller fossils on which rock identification is commonly based to be found out of place in the expected sequences...

And the rock systems themselves are often found in anomalous relations in the field. It is extremely common to find so-called "disconformities," which are those unconformities (strata with missing ages, supposedly caused by erosion during those ages) which have parallel bedding between the early and recent strata, with no outward evidence that the two were not deposited successively...

But these anomalies are more or less trivial compared to the numerous cases in which "old" formations are found resting conformably on "young" formations. These phenomena are found almost everywhere in hilly or mountainous regions and have been attributed to "thrustfaulting". The concept is that great segments of rock strata have been somehow separated from their roots and made to slide far over adjacent regions. Subsequent erosion then modifies the transported "nappe" so that the young strata on top are removed, leaving only the older strata superposed on the stationary young rocks beneath.\(^{18}\)

Careful study and examination of the contact line of various supposed overthrust areas reveal "no evidence of any grinding or sliding action or slicken-sides" such as one would expect to find on the hypothesis of a vast overthrust.

In the Glacier National Park area fault plane, it was discovered that the thin layer of shale in the contact line were "cemented both to the upper Allyn limestone (oldest of the Pre-Cambrian series) and lower Cretaceous shale layers."\(^{19}\)

Many other interesting characteristics of the Lewis

\(^{18}\textit{Ibid.},\ p.\ 206-9\)

\(^{19}\textit{Ibid.},\ p.\ 189\)
overthrust of Montana, which is 135 miles long and has a horizontal displacement of about 15 miles, are discussed which show that there was no overthrust thus exposing "the grand fiction of the 'Lewis overthrust'" and creating the mystery of how the supposedly older formation came to be deposited upon the younger one.

From the above discussion we can see without proceeding further that "the geologic time scale is an extremely fragile foundation on which a tremendous and unwieldly superstructure of interpretation has been erected." 20 Throughout their scientific analysis Whitcomb and Morris have shown "that a truely Biblical approach will eventually correlate all the factual data of science in a much more harmonious and satisfying way than the uniformitarian assumption can ever do." 21

20 Ibid., p. 209

21 Ibid., p. xxii.
ANCIENT HISTORY AND SCRIPTURAL CHRONOLOGY

If Adam's mortal life began about 4000 B.C., which is the position taken in this thesis, then inasmuch as Adam was "the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also" (Moses 3:7), ancient history of people and nations cannot be correctly dated beyond 4000 B.C. Most historical scholars will admit as did William Foxwell Albright that "Before 3000 we are again reduced to conjecture on the basis of cultural periods and geochronology."¹ Historic times go back to only 3000 B.C. Anything beyond that is prehistorical. The Bible is the only historical book that has no prehistoric times because it goes back to the very beginning of history with the creation of the world and gives genealogies from the first man, Adam, to Jesus Christ. Some are prone to doubt these genealogies as they are recorded and this is where one problem arises.

From a critical standpoint it would be possible to question almost every statement of years or dates of the historical events in the Old Testament so that we would have to conclude that no date or period of years could be

accepted as accurately representing a true historical date. On the other hand, to accept every figure as it stands is inadvisable and in fact impossible because of the mistranslations, deletions, and other errors that have come into the Bible narrative. The objective in this thesis has been to hold to the Biblical record as close as possible unless there is an obvious mistake or contradiction. Some of these even numbered 40 year periods and the like may be approximate and not intended as an accurate record. However, when there is no way of knowing whether the number given is an accurate record or an approximate figure, the safest thing to do is to accept the figure as given. If a contradiction is discovered then the scriptures must be adjusted in favor of the preponderance of evidence. To say that a round number of 40 years or a series of these numbers indicate that they are only symbolic seems to be fallacious reasoning. History of the LDS Church says that the Salt Lake Temple was built in 40 years. This may seem like an approximate figure but we know that it was exactly 40 years to the day from groundbreaking to dedication.

Concerning ancient history some have given an estimate of about 5000 B.C. for the earliest settlements. Some

history books theoretically place the beginning of the Stone Age about 200,000 to 500,000 years ago. These suppositions are derived from a belief that civilization evolved from a lower to higher form. This is not necessary because it is possible that the evidences of a Stone Age could come from some of Adam's descendants who lost their civilized ways and started living in caves and used stone implements. There was a similar case here in America when the highly civilized ancestors of the American Indians -- known as Incas, Aztecs and Mayans by archaeologists, and as Nephites and Lamanites by Mormons -- lost their civilized ways and resorted to savage customs living in caves, huts, etc., and using stone implements instead of the copper and steel implements they formerly used.

**Egyptian History and Biblical Chronology**

Many writers and scholars feel that Egyptian history is very well known and the chronology is accurately established. Some have such great confidence in the archaeological findings of Egypt that they believe as Robert Wilson stated:

> Our archaeologists know beyond the shadow of doubt that in or about the year 4241 B.C. the Egyptians adopted a calendar -- and that, it is significant to note, a calendar of three hundred and sixty five days. Existing Egyptian records refer to this calendar in such astronomical detail that modern science is able to calculate its year within four years of complete accuracy.

---

3 Wright, op. cit., p. 15.

From statements like this even though contradictory in themselves, one might suppose that archaeologists and Egyptologists are completely agreed on the date of the first dynasty of Egypt. However, an examination of Table V will show that Egyptologists and writers of Egyptian History are not agreed upon the chronology of Egypt and there may yet be another chronology that may be more correct than any extant today. James H. Breasted said, "The state of our modern chronology of early Egyptian history is so confused that a brief presentation of the system herein employed seemed indispensable. . . ."5

The numbers at the top of the Table refer to writers as follows: 1-Brugschby, 2-Price, 3-Breasted, 4-Price.

At the turn of the century some Egyptologists placed the beginning of the Old Kingdom of Egypt about 4777 B.C. About 1925 or 1930 this date was shortened to about 4200 or 4300 B.C. Meyer and Breasted placed the first dynasty of Egypt about 3300 or 3400 B.C.

About 1945 Wm. F. Albright said,


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasties And Kings</th>
<th>Writers and Egyptologists</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLD KINGDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Early Bronze Age)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Mena, 1st Pharaoh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>5595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3966</td>
<td>2980</td>
<td>2980</td>
<td>5345</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>3838</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3733</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>5042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>4828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Little Known period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>4163</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2445</td>
<td>3942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE KINGDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Middle Bronze age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 2000-1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>3373</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII ( &amp; Hyksos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV ( &amp; Hyksos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII ( &amp; Hyksos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW KINGDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Late Bronze Age C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aehmos (Ahmose)</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amen-Hotep I</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thut-mose I and</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat-shepsut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasties And Kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII (Cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thut-mose II</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thut-mose III</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amen-hotep II</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thut-mose IV</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amen-hotep III</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amen-hotep IV (Akh-en-Aton)</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smen-kh-ka-Re</td>
<td></td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tut-anhk-Aton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td></td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setymeramen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har-em-hab</td>
<td></td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses I</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses II (The Great)</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mer-ne-Ptah</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti II</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemesu</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tausert</td>
<td></td>
<td>1243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-nakht</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses III</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses IV</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses V</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses VI</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynasties And Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writers and Egyptologists</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX (Cont.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramses XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smendes</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psusenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neferkheres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenofthis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osochor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psinaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psousennes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shishak</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usarken I</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>766</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>663</td>
<td>663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 1938, Mesopotamian chronology has gradually become stabilized until it is probably correct to within half a century as far back as the twenty-fifth century B.C. Egyptian dates for the old Kingdom have had to be rather drastically reduced to agree with the lower Mesopotamian chronology, . . .

For years many scholars fought the 'low Chronology' of Brochardt, Meyer, and Breasted, until overwhelmed by the weight of new evidence. I know of no competent ancient historian today (1945?) who places the beginning of the Middle Kingdom before 2000 B.C. 17

Many writers, scientists and historians today are re-examining the Genesis stories in the light of new scientific discoveries, hypotheses and Egyptian and Babylonian historical records. They are finding that the Biblical stories are not only becoming more plausible but the scientist and historian in their continual adjustments to new discoveries are moving closer and closer to the Biblical record. In addition to discarding old scientific and historical theories that conflicted violently with the scriptures, they are now finding evidence that actually supports Genesis stories approximately as they stand. 18

Leonard W. King and many others have discovered the similarity of the creation, the flood, the laws of Moses, the long lives of the patriarchs and other parts of the pentateuch


18 George M. Price, Genesis Vindicated Review and Herald, 1941)
with ancient Babylonian and Egyptian History.\(^{19}\)

Dudley J. Whitney\(^{20}\) pointed out the many possibilities of error in the theory of evolution, and the geologists dating of the earth by fossil deposition. Chauncey Riddle and Melvin Cook pointed out the unreliability of radiocarbon dating.

One of the finest, most searching and comprehensive works on this subject of scientific vindication of the Genesis stories is "The Genesis Flood" by John C. Whitcomb, Jr. and Henry M. Morris.\(^{21}\) These two men have made a tremendous contribution with their analysis of most all of the scientific problems concerned with the historicity of the Bible and especially the Book of Genesis and the Flood.

Concerning the dates of the dynasties of Egypt, Whitcomb and Morris point out that although some Egyptologists place the 1st dynasty of Egypt about 3200 or 3400 B.C.,

This date is very questionable, as it is based mainly upon the king-lists of Manetho, an Egyptian priest of about 250 B.C., whose work has not been preserved except in a few inaccurate quotations in other ancient writings.\(^{22}\)

---

\(^{19}\)Leonard W. King, *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1918).


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 394.
They also noted that the number of years for each of the kings do not agree in each of the two copies so that it is impossible to determine an accurate Egyptian chronology back to the beginning of Egyptian History. Another problem with Egyptian chronology is that some scholars think that some of Manetho's lists may actually represent simultaneous dynasties in upper and lower Egypt, which would still further reduce the date of the beginning of the period.

There is one very interesting point about Egyptian dates as they are approximately figured today. The Old Kingdom (Dynasties I to VI) is placed as beginning about 2800/4000 B.C. and continuing to about 2100/2400 B.C. This is also known as the Early Bronze Age (3000 to 2000 B.C.). This period of Egyptian History is marked with tremendous intellectual achievements such as the building of the pyramids, etc. Comparing these dates with the dates of the Biblical history we see that this old intellectual kingdom of Egypt would be contemporaneous with the patriarchs from Adam (4000 B.C.) to Noah and the flood (2344 B.C.). This is not impossible, in fact it may be the real solution to the problem instead of trying to place all of Egypt's history after the flood!

Following this period there is a period of Egyptian history that is known as an uncertain period in the Old Kingdom's history comprising dynasties VII to X dated from

\[23\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 394-5}.\]
about 2100/2400 to 2000/2100 B.C. This period is also a fairly uncertain period in the Bible, from the flood (2344) to Abraham (2052 B.C.) which again suggests contemporary history.

The Middle Kingdom, Dynasties XI to XVII again show characteristics that fit in very well with Biblical history for it is during this period known also as the Middle Bronze Age (2000 to 1500) that the lives of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and the early history of the twelve tribes in Egypt occur. This is the period of the Semitic Hyksos kings (Dynasties XIII to XVII) who seem to be related to the Hebrews and as shown in the Joseph stories were very friendly and favorable to Joseph and his father's family.

Inasmuch as Egyptologists still differ in their views respecting the chronology of the Dynasties of Egypt, we must conclude that early Egyptian chronology cannot be accepted as evidence in support or contradiction of the Biblical chronology.

**Comparison of Chronologies from Adam to Abraham**

The number of years of the patriarchs from Adam to Abraham have been preserved in ancient records: the Bible, the Book of Moses, the Septuagint, The Samaritan Bible and the writings of Josephus. Most of the modern chronological schemes have been constructed from one or more of these sources. Table VI is a comparison of these ancient chronologies and some other chronologies that have been computed in modern times.
There are two general schools of chronology of this period of history. The one group used the short chronology as recorded in the Bible, Book of Moses, Inspired Version and Lectures on Faith which recorded the ages of the Patriarchs when the next genealogical heir is born approximately 100 years less in most cases than the other group. This second group uses the long chronology as recorded in the Septuagint and the writings of Josephus which added one hundred years to most of the patriarchs ages when the next son was born.

The Samaritan version used the short chronology from Adam to Noah and in some places recorded an even shorter period than any other record as in the case of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech's ages when their sons were born. Then from Noah to Abraham the Samaritan version followed the long chronology which added one hundred years to each of six men from Arphaxad to Serug.

The long chronology adds about twelve or thirteen hundred years to the period from Adam to Abraham thus placing Adam that many more years before the birth of Christ. This long chronology cannot be accepted, however, because it contradicts the record in the Book of Moses in every instance where the years are longer than is recorded in the King James Bible.

It should be mentioned again here that the number of years from one man to the birth of his son in the genealogical line from Adam to Noah, is recorded the same in the King
## COMPARISON OF CHRONOLOGIES FROM ADAM TO ABRAHAM - Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Bible - King James</th>
<th>Book of Moses</th>
<th>Inspired Version</th>
<th>Lectures on Faith</th>
<th>Samaritan</th>
<th>Ussher</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Hales</th>
<th>Josephus</th>
<th>Auchincloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130 130 130 130 130</td>
<td>130 130 130 130</td>
<td>130 230 230 230 230</td>
<td>930 930 930 930 930</td>
<td>130 130 130 130</td>
<td>130 230 230 230 230</td>
<td>930 930 930 930 930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105 105 105 105 105</td>
<td>105 105 105 105</td>
<td>105 205 205 205 205</td>
<td>912 912 912 912 912</td>
<td>105 105 105 105</td>
<td>105 205 205 205 205</td>
<td>912 912 912 912 912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 190 190 190</td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 90 90 90 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 70 70 70 70</td>
<td>70 70 70 70 70</td>
<td>70 70 170 170 170</td>
<td>910 910 910 910 910</td>
<td>70 70 70 70 70 70</td>
<td>70 70 170 170 170</td>
<td>910 910 910 910 910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalalee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 165 165 165</td>
<td>895 895 895 895 895</td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 165 165 165</td>
<td>895 895 895 895 895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162 162 162 162 162</td>
<td>162 162 162 162</td>
<td>162 162 162 162 162</td>
<td>962 962 962 962 962</td>
<td>162 162 162 162 162</td>
<td>162 162 162 162 162</td>
<td>962 962 962 962 962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 165 165 165</td>
<td>430 430 430 430 430</td>
<td>65 65 65 65 65 65</td>
<td>65 65 165 165 165</td>
<td>430 430 430 430 430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td>500 450 450 500 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japheth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td>500 492 492 502 502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td>500 500 500 500 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adah
- Actual age: 2 years
- After flood began: 102 110 110 100 100 100 100 102 100 102
# COMPARISON OF CHRONOLOGIES FROM ADAM TO ABRAHAM

## TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Bible - King James</th>
<th>Book of Moses</th>
<th>Inspired Version</th>
<th>Lectures on Faith</th>
<th>Samaritan</th>
<th>Ussher</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Hales</th>
<th>Josephus</th>
<th>Auchinloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axphaxad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arphaxad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan born when</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salah born when</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peleg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son born when</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died at age</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Bible, the Book of Moses, the Inspired Version, the Lectures on Faith and Ussher's chronology. The Book of Moses ends with Noah and his three sons. However, the other four records; the King James Bible, the Inspired Version, the Lectures on Faith and Ussher's chronologies, are all the same from Noah to Abraham with the exception of Ussher's notation of 130 years for Terah when Abraham was born. Therefore these records are accepted as authentic and as accurate as it is possible to determine for this period.

Some chronologists would like to lengthen out the period from Adam to Abraham as far as possible so as to place Adam at least 5000 years B.C. instead of 4000. It seems that Auchincloss tried to do this for he chose the longest number of years for each man.

Some scholars believe that Josephus was a reliable historian and they give preference to his figures in computing a chronology of the Old Testament because Vespasian made him custodian of the "Sacred Books" which Titus captured in Jerusalem and carried in triumph to Rome. However, Josephus' works have many errors in them. One example is in his statement that Methuselah delivered the government to his son Lamech when he died. This could not be true because according to their life span and age when Lamech was born, Lamech died at age 777, five years before Methuselah died. Concerning the reliability of Josephus' works, Auchincloss said,
Beyond all question, Josephus is a hard writer to follow and many often feel when consulting his works as though they were at sea without date or compass. His great fault lies in the fact that being an active man of affairs he did not take the trouble to properly review his own writings, striking out conflicting statements, supplying omissions, and correcting miscalculations; he simply drove ahead and left this heritage of careless composition.\(^{24}\)

Although Auchincloss criticized Josephus for his carelessness in his history, he accepted his figures in preference to the Bible figures when computing his chronology from Adam to Abraham with the one exception of the age of Terah when Abraham was born. Josephus said Terah was 70 but Auchincloss said he was 130.

In discussing reasons for accepting Josephus and the extra hundred years for each of the patriarchs from Adam to Terah, Auchincloss says,

> There is reason to believe that human life matured in those days very much as it does now. With them a man was counted old at 900 years of age, just as a man of 90 years is regarded at the present day. If then the man of 900 had a son at 200 years, the man of 90 would be expected to have a son at 20 years. All of which seems perfectly natural, besides it harmonized with the figures that Josephus copied out of the "Sacred Books."\(^{25}\)

There is nothing in the scriptures that even intimates that these men were the first born of each generation. In fact from the Pearl of Great Price we know that Adam had many sons.


\(^{25}\)Ibid., p. 42.
and daughters before Cain and Abel and that they were born before Seth. There is no way of knowing how old the men from Adam to Noah were when they had their first child. The fact that they lived longer does not mean that they did not mature at the same rate that we do today; it probably means that their bodies were in better condition to last longer before they died. It is entirely probable that they matured at the same rate people do today, were married, and had children when they were twenty, thirty, and forty years old instead of 170 to 200 years old.

The Longevity of the Patriarchs

Many have wondered if the men from Adam to Noah actually lived as long as the Bible says they did. Some have suggested that they may not have measured the length of a year the same as we do today. Others have suggested that the records should not be taken as an accurate number of years but as an approximate number to indicate their greatness. One man suggested that they assigned many years to their lives to impress people with their greatness like the Egyptians assigned many thousands of years to their kings to emphasize their importance.

When the Lord revealed the record of the creation of the world to Abraham, and later to Moses, he indicated that the heavenly bodies, sun, moon, and stars, were used to determine the length of the "days and years" (Gen.1:14) and that the time of each heavenly body was "set" according to
"its' number of days, and of months, and of years."
(Abraham 3:3-10). There is no indication in any of the scriptures that the set time of these heavenly bodies have ever been changed. Therefore, the years assigned to Adam must have been approximately the same length as our years are today.

The book of Moses in the Pearl of Great Price which Latter-day Saints accept as the word of God, confirms the ages of men from Adam to Noah (Moses 6:10-25; 8:5-12). It corrects the one error in the Bible about the age of Enoch when he was translated from 365 years to 430 years of age (Moses 7:68, 69; 8:1; D. & C. 107:49). The Doctrine and Covenants, accepted by the Latter-day Saints as revelations from God, records that Adam ordained Mahalaleel when Mahalaleel was 96 years and 7 days old. According to the Book of Moses and the chronology as previously determined, Adam was 395 years old when Mahalaleel was born; therefore Adam was 891 years old when he ordained Mahalaleel. This shows that Adam really did live as long as the record states and it follows that the record is true concerning the long lives of the Patriarchs.

The longevity of the Patriarchs may be due in some degree to the excellent condition of their bodies following the creation of Adam and Eve who were given bodies so perfect that they would have lasted forever without dying if they had not eaten the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.
Also the world was created in a perfect condition and this condition free from many of the things that pollute and destroy the nutrients in the soil today, may have contributed greatly to their excellent state of preservation. Josephus said the reason they lived so long was because "their food was then fitter for the prolongation of life." He also said that "all those that have written antiquities...relate, that the ancients lived a thousand years." 

Marston discussed the long lives of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses and to establish the credibility of them cited two cases in the 1600's A.D. that lived about the same length:

1621. Iwan Yorath, buried at Llanmaes, Glamorganshire, Sunday, July 17, 1621. He fought at Bosworth in 1485, and was then 20; died aged 156. (Register of Llanmaes.)


Marston points out concerning these early Patriarchs that they lived under conditions that made for longevity and that Palestine was probably the healthiest climate in the world at that time.

27Ibid.
28Marston's, The Bible Comes Alive, p. 54.
29Ibid., p. 55.
The Lectures on Faith and the Chronology from Noah to Abraham

The chronology from Noah to Abraham has been seriously questioned by some because there are no modern scriptures to substantiate it. The writer of this thesis believes it can be accepted as recorded because the Prophet Joseph Smith prepared and published material that discussed in detail this period of chronology from Noah to Abraham.

In the winter of 1834-35, seven lectures were given in the School of the Prophets. Lecture number two was a discussion of the history of the Old Testament from Adam to Abraham and four out of the ten-and-one-half pages of the lecture were devoted to a detailed discussion of the chronology of this period. Six-and-a-half of the nine-and-a-half pages of the questions for lecture two list detailed questions on the chronology of the Old Testament from Adam to Abraham.

It is not known exactly who prepared and presented these lectures to the men in that school. However, the Prophet Joseph Smith was a member of the committee and in January 1835, he was "engaged in the school of the elders, and in preparing the lectures on theology for publication in the book of Doctrine and Covenants, which the committee appointed last September were now compiling." 30

In the history of the Church, Joseph Smith recorded:

A general assembly of the Church of Latter-day Saints was held at Kirtland on the 17th of August, 1835, to take into consideration the labors of a committee appointed by a general assembly of the Church on the 24th of September, 1834, for the purpose of arranging the items of the doctrine of Jesus Christ for the government of the Church. The names of the committee were: Joseph Smith, Jr., Sidney Rigdon, Oliver Cowdery and Frederick G. Williams, who, having finished said book according to the instructions given them, deem it necessary to call a general assembly of the Church to see whether the book be approved or not by the authorities of the Church: that it may, if approved, become a law and a rule of faith and practice to the Church.31

In the afternoon session of the conference Oliver Cowdery introduced the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Latter-day Saints" containing the Lectures on Faith in behalf of the committee. Then various persons such as presidents and leaders of the quorums bore testimony that the book presented to them was true and each quorum in turn accepted it by unanimous vote "as the doctrine and covenants of their faith." Also a written, signed testimony by the twelve apostles to the truth of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants was read by W. W. Phelps. Joseph Smith and Frederick G. Williams were absent on a visit to the Saints in Michigan. "The several authorities and the general assembly, by a unanimous vote, accepted the labors of the committee."32

As to the importance of these lectures and their

31 Ibid., p. 243.
32 Ibid., p. 244-46.
acceptance by the Latter-day Saints as containing true doctrine, the title page and the preface of the first edition of the Doctrine and Covenants published in 1835 state that the things included in the book were "carefully selected from the revelations of God, and compiled by Joseph Smith, Junior, Oliver Cowdery, Sidney Rigdon, Frederick C. Williams, (presiding elders of the church,) proprietors," that "it contains in short and leading items of the religion which we profess to believe," and that the lectures embrace "the important doctrine of Salvation." The preface concludes with the statement that the compilers expected to "be called to answer to every principle advanced, in that day when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed, and the reward of every man's labor be given him."33 The preface was signed by all four compilers in Kirtland, Ohio, February 17, 1835.

It is felt by the author that this information in the lectures and the record of the period from Noah to Abraham in the Inspired Version serve to substantiate to the Latter-day Saints the accuracy and reliability of the scriptural record from Noah to Abraham.

33Ibid., p. 250-51.
CHAPTER VIII

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT CHRONOLOGY

FROM ADAM TO MOSES

No attempt will be made in this thesis to establish the historicity of the Old Testament characters; this has already been done by other writers. The archeology of the Old Testament will be considered only as it bears directly on the dates of the Old Testament people or events and their possible connection with contemporaneous history.

Abraham and Amraphel Identification with Hammurabi

One of the earliest attempts to synchronize the history of the Old Testament with contemporaneous history of neighboring kingdoms involves the story of Abraham's battle with some northern kings in returning his nephew Lot and the people of the cities of Sodom and Gomorah to Canaan as recorded in Gen. 14. One of the kings mentioned in this battle was a king named Amraphel. Many have felt that this Babylonian king was Hammurabi, the sixth king of the Amorite first dynasty of Babylon who united all Babylonia under his rule and extended his conquests as far as the shores of the Mediterranean. Caiger urges the identification of Hammurabi as Amraphel.

Amraphel king of Shinar is clearly a Hebrew rendering of Hammurabi king of Sumer. Shinar,
whether verbally identical with Sumer or not, is the usual designation of southern Babylonia. Some difficulty has been felt in the omission of the initial H from Amraphel, but that it was occasionally omitted by the cuneiform writers is shown by the spelling Ammurabi in some tablets. Further variants are Hammurapi and Ammurapi. As Hammurabi was deified, like most Babylonian monarchs, after his death, his name may have appeared as Ammurapi-ilu or Ammurapil, which brings us as near Amraphel as we could expect.

The actual date of Hammurabi's reign is an extremely controversial subject. Three different dates have been astronomically calculated for the reign of Hammurabi, and a fourth date has been suggested by some leading Babylonologists. Caiger and the authors of the Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary to be between 2123 and 2117 B.C.

The Babylonian List of Kings, discovered by G. Smith, and first published by T. G. Pinches (PsBA, May, 1884), contains the names of the kings of Babylon and the years of their reigns from Sumuabum, the first king of the first dynasty of Nabonassar onward, and agrees with its figures. By means of these two documents it is possible to fix the beginning of Sumuabum's reign in 2225 B.C., and this date is confirmed by astronomical observations recorded in the reign of Hammurabi, 2123 B.C.

---

1 Stephen L. Caiger, Bible and Spade (London: Oxford University Press, 1936) p. 32.
2 Ibid., p. 35.
4 Ibid.
Marston states that the date of Hammurabi's reign has been astronomically calculated to have been about 2067-2024 B.C. He gives a detailed calculation:

A certain king of 1st Dynasty of Babylon, Ammizaduga by name, left behind him cuneiform tablets recording the monthly rising and setting of the Planet Venus over the twenty-one years of his reign. . . , the astronomical date of the King Ammizaduga has been calculated out from the tablets—he reigned from 1921 to 1901 B.C. He was the fourth king of Babylon after Hammurabi. . . Thus, the date of Hammurabi has been definitely ascertained. He reigned from 2067 to 2025 B.C.

Marston says that this date for Hammurabi falls during the lifetime of Abraham and that Hammurabi is the same as Amraphel, one of the kings that battled with the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah and other towns as recorded in G. 14, when Abraham was living in Canaan. He concludes that "Several books recently published are finding later dates for Abraham, and later Amraphels: but readers may agree that it requires very certain evidence indeed to over-ride this really remarkable confirmation."  

On the other hand Price, Sellers, and Carlson, and Wm. Foxell Albright calculated the date of Hammurabi's

---

6 Ibid., p. 49  
7 Ibid., p. 51  
reign from 1728 to 1686 B.C. Albright said this was an astronomically calculated date. Price, Sellers and Carlson say, "Amraphel, king of Shinar, has been identified by some as Hammurabi (1728-1686 B.C.) but this identification, having been seriously questioned, has been given up by most scholars."\(^\text{10}\) They also believe that "the names of the five kings of the city-states in the plain of the Jordan are unlike any Babylonian equivalents, and as yet are beyond the range of satisfactory explanation."\(^\text{11}\)

The authors of the *Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary* question the identification:

Leading Babylonologists, such as E. Meyer, Bezold, Jensen, King, Barton, doubt whether the two names have any connection. F.M.T. Boh., Zatw, XXXVI, 65 ff., suggests that the name should be read Amur-apil that Shin\'ar = Shanhar, a district on the upper Euphrates, and that the episode belongs at the time of the Hittite supremacy ca. 1250.\(^\text{12}\)

According to the Old Testament chronology as established in this thesis, Abraham lived from 2052 to 1877 B.C. These dates do not coincide with any of the four dates just discussed.

In conclusion Hammurabi cannot be identified positively with Amraphel because of the name difference, the

\(^\text{10}\) Price, Sellers and Carlson, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

\(^\text{11}\) Ibid., p. 145-46

\(^\text{12}\) Jacobus, Lane and Zenos, *op. cit.*, p. 245.
confusion concerning the date of his reign, and the difference between the four different dates proposed for his reign and the dates established for the life of Abraham.

Joseph and the Hyksos Kings of Egypt

The problem concerning Joseph is whether or not he was in Egypt during the reign of the Hyksos (Semetic or shepherd kings). These Hyksos kings conquered Egypt and reigned from about 2300 to 1580 B.C. Caiger says their reign ended about 1580;\(^\text{13}\) Marston places the date of their reign from 2371 to 1582;\(^\text{14}\) Duncan says they reigned from 2200 to 1580 B.C.;\(^\text{15}\) and Yahuda reduced their reign to from 1780 to 1580 B.C.\(^\text{16}\) The Joseph Bible stories occurred, according to the chronology in this thesis, from 1801 B.C. to 1691 B.C. and therefore during the period of the Hyksos kings, unless Yahuda is correct in assuming the Hyksos reigns from 1780 to 1580. Yahuda's dates would include only the latter half of Joseph's life during the Hyksos Kings.

There are, however, eight different indications that the events in the life of Joseph occurred during the reign of

\(^{13}\text{Caiger, op. cit., p. 64.}\)

\(^{14}\text{Marston, op. cit., p. 41.}\)


\(^{16}\text{Yahuda, op. cit.}\)
the Hyksos kings and not before or after. First:

\[\ldots\text{It is significant that the first Hyksos ruler was called Salatis, Aramaic Shallit, and that Joseph was called in Gen. 42:6 hash-shallit, and that many centuries afterward the Assyrians named the Pharaoh shiltany, that is, sultan.}\]

Second: Duncan established Joseph in the Hyksos period through two interesting observations of words used in the Joseph stories.

As pointed out, one of the titles used for vizier is "the Man." Now in the old kingdom, which includes the Hyksos period, the masculine form was used; and curiously enough in the New Kingdom the feminine form of the word was used. Here in the Joseph narrative the masculine is used, which is correct, and throws the narrative of Joseph into the Hyksos period. \ldots\text{The word Schar as the name of the prison into which Joseph was thrown further strengthens the idea that Joseph served under the Hyksos kings, for this prison-fortress is known from monuments to have existed from 2000 downwards}\ldots

Third:

\ldots\text{The seal-ring or signet presented to him (Joseph) was a stone or flat surface of gold, engraved for stamping upon soft material. One of the seals which have been found is of special interest in this connection. It is of black jasper, graven in intaglio on both sides. On the front there is a winged serpent and two Semitic signs; on the back a Hebrew inscription, dating from the Hyksos kings of the Seventeenth dynasty. \ldots\text{There is also an inscription telling of Antef, an Egyptian prime minister (i.e., first deputy of the king). In it Antef is called the}'}

\[\text{"functionary of the signet... chief of the}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots}\]


18 Duncan, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 177.
chiefs. ... alone in the multitude, he bears the word to men; he declares all affairs in the double Egypt; he speaks on all matters in the place of secret counsel. When he enters he is applauded, when he issues forth he is praised. The princes hold themselves attentive to his mouth. ... all his words come to pass without (resistance), like that which issues from the mouth of God.

Joseph's authority seems to have been almost identical with that conferred on this prime minister.19

Fourth:

It seems probable ... that the events of Joseph's life and the settlement of his kin in Goshen took place during the Hyksos supremacy. Otherwise, we should not expect such benevolent consideration of their interests at the hands of the ruling power.20

Fifth:

The Egyptian records of this period have also shed much light upon the Biblical story of Joseph. The Tale of the Two Brothers has close analogies with the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and other features of the story of Joseph have Egyptian parallels.21

Sixth: Evidence identifying Joseph with the Hyksos Kings:

A similar notice, the Bell Inscription, has been found, relating to the very period usually assigned to Joseph (c. 1800 B.C.); it runs, "I collected corn as a friend of the Harvest God. I was watchful at the time of sowing. And now, when a famine arose lasting many years, I distributed corn to the city


20 Ibid., p. 164.

each year of the famine." It is quite possible that this was the very famine which the Bible story of Joseph has made for ever famous.

As to the date of Joseph, modern discovery has confirmed the probability that the date indicated in the Bible (and inserted by Ussher in the margin of our Authorized Version) is approximately correct—namely, between 1800 and 1700 B.C.; that is to say, during the Hyksos Dynasty. The Bible itself, unfortunately, never names the Pharaohs of this early period, but there is some corroboration of our theory in a Greek tradition which actually names Apepi III as the Pharaoh of Joseph, Apepi being one of the Shepherd Kings. 22

Seventh:

In discussing reasons for the names of the Pharaohs in the Joseph and Exodus stories not being recorded in the Bible, Yahuda explains:

It has long ago been noted by many Egyptologists that in the Egyptian literature it was customary to speak of the king as "Pharaoh" without mentioning his name. By a great number of examples from the Egyptian literature it can be proved that it was precisely in the New Kingdom (1580-1050 B.C.) that the proper name of the king was given only in solemn inscriptions or in purely historical records, and not in popular stories of the kind of the Joseph and Exodus narratives. Even in royal edicts, in judicial reports and in general records, the king is simply alluded to as "Pharaoh." 23

Yahuda argues against the Joseph periods coming under the Hyksos rule because "all the facts referred to in the Joseph story clearly point to an epoch when Egypt has been under the control of a purely Egyptian king." 24

---

22 Caiger, op. cit., p. 13.


24 Ibid., p. 46
He gives as an example to support this conclusion the statement in Gen. 43:32 that "the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." Yahuda says:

If that happens under the Hyksos rule it would be inexplicable that they should allow the oppressed Egyptians to treat their Semitic kinsmen as outcasts. But this is perfectly natural under an Egyptian ruler. Every touch in the Joseph story indicates the tendency to emphasize the alien character of the Hebrews to the Egyptians, which can only be understood under a purely Egyptian ruler.25

Continuing with his evidences against the theory that the Hyksos kings were the Pharaohs of the Joseph stories he says:

One of the strongest proofs against it is the fact that Joseph was given the daughter of the high priest On (Heliopolis) as a special distinction on the part of Pharaoh (Gen. 41:45). This would be impossible under the Shepherd kings, who did all they could to destroy the Egyptian religion and to weaken the power of the priests. . .26

One final point, on the other hand, in support of a dating during the reign of the Hyksos kings, difficult for Yahuda to explain, is the mention of horses (Gen. 47:17) and horsemen in the convoy of Jacob's funeral (Gen. 50:9). Yahuda admits that "It is contended that horses were not mentioned before the New Kingdom in the 16th century B.C."; therefore, if Joseph's period occurred about 1880 B.C. or before the Hyksos, horses should not be mentioned. Yahuda

25 Ibid., p. 46-47
26 Ibid., p. 50
answers this problem by stating that the story was not written down until about the time of the Exodus in the 15th century B.C. and that the author wrote of horses, having in mind "scenes and ceremonies popular in his time." However, the theory that Biblical stories were not written until about Moses's time is no longer undisputed. Charles Marston devotes many chapters and much investigation to show from archaeological discoveries that writings were made and preserved long before Abraham and that writers of the Bible may have had access to records kept and handed down for centuries. He says:

There is no longer any doubt that the races who inhabited the Euphrates Valley, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, in ancient times, possessed a much higher culture than has been postulated for them by Bible critics. For example we now know that the art of writing in cuneiform on clay tablets was in general use long before the days of Abraham; and discoveries referred to in this work carry even alphabetical script back to before the days of Moses. It would almost seem as though civilized man has always had the means for recording in writing, and did record in writing;--events, laws, customs, rituals, history, etc., everything such as we find recorded in the books of Genesis, Exodus, etc.

To Latter-day Saints the preservation of such ancient records is not a new idea, for the book of Moses states that Adam had a language pure and undefiled and taught his children

---

27Ibid., p. 54.
to read and write. (Moses 6:6)

In conclusion, it seems from the available evidence that Joseph was contemporaneous with the friendly Hyksos Kings and that these kings were driven out about sixty years before the birth of Moses. The new king (about 1580) may have been the one who "knew not Joseph" and put the Israelites in bondage until their exodus under Moses about 1447 B.C.
CHAPTER IX

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE DATE OF THE EXODUS

The names of the Pharaohs of Egypt when the Children of Israel lived there are not recorded in the Bible; therefore, it is difficult to ascertain which of the Egyptian pharaohs were ruling during the life of Moses and the Exodus from Egypt. However, the dates established for the Egyptian kings and for Moses, and archaeological findings give some clues.

According to the chronology established from scripture and archaeology in this thesis, Moses was born 1527 B.C., the Exodus occurred 1447 B.C. when Moses was 80, and Jericho was destroyed about 1407 B.C. The comparative table of Egyptian Dynasties in a previous chapter, shows the kings of this period and the different dates proposed by some writers and Egyptologists for their reign as king. Six writers give Amen-hotep II as the pharaoh of Egypt in 1447. Two writers date Amen-hotep II about 1566 or 1569. Two other writers date Amen-hotep II 1435 or 1436 B.C. Certain circumstances surrounding the life of this king and the kings before and after him indicate that Amen-hotep II was the pharaoh of the Exodus.

The Date of the Destruction of Jericho

One of the most important archaeological discoveries
bearing upon the date of the Exodus is the excavation of the ancient city of Jericho, for if the excavations of Jericho can establish the date of destruction, we will have a confirmation of the dates of Joshua and Moses, and can establish a link between these leaders and the contemporaneous history of Egypt.

Evidence for the date of Joshua's conquest of Canaan has been found in an excavation of three cities, Hazor, Ai and Jericho, which were burned down by Joshua. Professor Garstang and Marston discovered first in the ruins at Hazor that

... the pottery evidence pointed to the fact that the city had been destroyed by fire about the middle of the late Bronze Age (1400 B.C.), ... could this, then, be the destruction recorded in the Book of Joshua (Josh. 11:11,13). The answer to the question appears to be suggested by one of the Tel el Amarna letters written about 1380 B.C. by the Egyptian envoy in the north of Palestine to the reigning Pharaoh. He says 'Let my lord the king recall what Hazor and its king have already had to endure.'

Next Garstang dug into the ruins at Ai which Joshua also destroyed (Josh. 8:25,28) and

... found ample evidence of destruction by fire; and the potsherds like those of Hazor, belonged to the middle of the late Bronze Age. There was nothing later than 1400 B.C.

Garstang then reopened the excavations of Jericho and discovered


2 Ibid., p. 129.
that "potsherds" found there, in this preliminary dig, told the same tale as those of Hazor and Ai. "Here, then, were three ruined cities, Hazor, Ai, and Jericho, all destroyed by fire about 1400 B.C. ... All stated in the Bible to have been captured and burnt by Joshua."

Stephen L. Caiger said,

The excavations at Jericho showed the existence at 1400 B.C. of a compact fortress, scarcely bigger than Trafalgar Square, surrounded by two parallel walls of brick perhaps thirty or forty feet in height. Over the space between these walls it was clear that wooden beams had once been laid, and on them small houses had been built. ...

In remarkable corroboration of the Bible story were the very unmistakable signs of a sudden catastrophe which had overtaken and destroyed the city. The outer wall had collapsed down the slope of the mound on which it had been erected, dragging with it the wall within. At the same time the ruins had been set on fire and burnt to the ground. Reddened masses of brick, fire-cracked stones, charred timber, and ashes bear witness everywhere to a conflagration of the intensest heat. That the Bible had not exaggerated the collapse of the walls of Jericho was evident after all the intervening centuries!

This new evidence for the conquest of Canaan around 1400 B.C. was hard for many scholars to accept because for about a generation there had been a consensus of opinion that the conquest took place about 1220 B.C. Consequently, as recorded by Marston, Garstang made four more expeditions to

---

3Ibid., p. 129. 4Ibid.

Jericho in the early part of 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1933. With about a hundred workers he dug into the ruins of Jericho and in 1930,

Professor Garstang and his wife cleaned and examined no fewer than sixty thousand fragments from the strata of the burned city. At the expedition in the following year (1931) another forty thousand fragments were treated in a similar manner. They all attested to the same date, that of the middle of the late Bronze Age (1400 B.C.) before the infiltration of the Mykenean ware.6

During that same year (1931) the most important discovery was made.

Professor Garstang then succeeded in finding the necropolis, or cemetery, where the inhabitants of Jericho had buried their dead from the earliest times...covered over and concealed by the sand of the plain, the tombs had escaped the notice of countless generations of plunderers, and their contents lay intact.

In 1932, they yielded a rich hoard of fifteen hundred unbroken pottery vessels of all periods of the Bronze Ages...But, far more important than all, was the presence in some of the richer tombs of scarabs inscribed with the royal cartouche of the reigning Pharaoh. These scarabs, eighty in all, served to date the pottery in their particular tombs, which in turn could be compared with the broken ones found in the burnt city.

As the opening of tombs proceeded, it was found that the later dated ones were farther away from the city. Special attention was therefore paid to them in order to find the latest interments. In due course a number of tombs were opened that proved to belong to the century 1500-1400 B.C. and included the royal tombs of the period. There were found a succession of eighty scarabs bearing the cartouches of the eighteenth dynasty Pharaohs. In one was unearthed scarabs bearing the joint names of Princess Hatshepsut and Thotmess III (1501-1487 B.C.) and in another two royal seals of Amenhetep III (1413-1377 B.C.). As the series of dated scarabs all come to an end with the two royal seals of Amenhetep III, there is evidence, quite independent of the pottery

6Marston, op. cit., p. 135.
that the city also ceased to exist during that period. For the two centuries that followed there were no interments, the very distinctive pottery and decoration of the time of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen was not represented at all. Thus everything pointed to the reign of Amenhetep III (1413-1377 B.C.) as marking the period when Jericho fell.7

In his excavations of the city of Jericho, Garstang found that Jericho had been very systematically burnt without being systematically plundered.

There, in the houses, were found foodstuffs, such as wheat, barley, lentils, onions, dates and pieces of dough, all reduced to charcoal by the intense heat of the conflagration. Why had the foodstuffs been left untouched and uneaten by their captors?8

Of course the answer Garstang gives, as we know from the story in the Bible is that Israelites were not to take anything out of the city, but the city and all that was in it was to be burned (Josh. 6:24).

In the palace area in the burned city of Jericho, Professor Garstang found storerooms filled with great pottery vessels that had been broken by falling walls and timber and their contents spilled out and burned. Some smaller vases had been protected by other larger ones and twenty-six whole jars and vases were found in one room. By comparing them with those found in the dated tombs, Garstang says, "They all proved to be types of the fifteenth century B.C., not a single

7 Ibid., p. 135-137.
8 Ibid., p. 148
specimen was found in the palace rooms which could be assigned to the familiar period of Akhenaten (1377-1361 B.C.). 9

Caiger says:

... the excavations showed that after the destruction of the city, there was a distinct break in the pottery and other deposits, proving that the ruin of Jericho had been not only complete but lasting, thus fulfilling Joshua's curse on any one who should rebuild it (Josh. 6:26 JE). There is no trace of any repair of the city between 1400 and the year 860 B.C., when Hiel the Beth-elite rebuild it (I K. 16:34). In other words, if Joshua (as the older view implied) had attacked Jericho as late as 1200 B.C., he would have found no walls to 'fall down flat'.

Concerning this and other excavations of Jericho,

Emil G. Kraeling says:

Pioneer excavations were carried on here by a German expedition under E. Sellin and C. Watzinger in 1907-09. The work done there was later continued in 1930-36 under British auspices by John Garstang and since in 1952-53 under joint American and British sponsorship by Kathleen Kenyon.

He concludes that a fire destroyed the building "above the spring" about 1580-1550 B.C..

The destruction was followed by a period of abandonment of a century and a half. In the late Bronze Age period (City IV), the walls on the north, west, and south sides were withdrawn farther up the hill and on the west side a wall was built on the remains of the Early Bronze Age walls. The new wall was a double brick built rampart with casemates. Built around 1400 B.C., it was subsequently wrecked by an earthquake, at the latest about 1350 B.C., and

---

9 Ibid., p. 149,150.
10 Stephen L. Caiger, Bible and Spade, p. 95-96.
the buildings associated with it were destroyed by fire. The site was not reoccupied by any settlement of consequence until well on in the Iron Age.

The story of the fall of Jericho requires no repetition. The event came about through a very providentially arranged earthquake, which could have been the one mentioned above.  

The Reliability of Pottery Dating

A question often arises in the dating of sites by the fragments found there as to the accuracy of this method, and a brief discussion of the method therefore seems necessary. James B. Pritchard says, "The science of Palestinian archaeology was born in the spring of 1890, when a rare genius, W. M. Flinders Petrie, found an ancient mound of buried cities worthy of his ability to observe and interpret..."  

Petrie went to Eglon in southern Judah to make exploration for the Palestine Exploration Fund of England in 1890. After a search he found a mound the Arabs called "Tell el-Hesi", where broken ancient pottery abounded. "And it was at this site, sixteen miles east of Gaza, that the science of Palestinian archaeology was born."  

For six weeks the excavation was directed by Petrie singlehanded; about thirty men were employed as laborers, each assisted by a woman who carried off the debris in a basket. Then came the harvest season, when his laborers were drawn away to their

---

12 Ibid., p. 135.


14 Ibid., p. 4.
crops. Petrie left with his notes and plans, not to return to dig again in Palestine for over thirty years. 15

Not able to persuade Petrie to continue in Palestine, the officers engaged F. J. Bliss to continue after a short apprenticeship with Petrie in Egypt. At Tell el-Hesi, Bliss "cut away about one-third of the ancient tell, down through 65 feet of debris, laying bare the remains of eight cities." 16

One object in his discoveries served to date a particular layer and the pottery in it: a clay tablet about two by two and one-half inches, in the layer called "City III" mentioned the well-known prince of Lachish, Zimreda and dated the city in the fourteenth century B.C. at the time of the famous Egyptian king Akh-en-Aton. Everything below this level was considered to be older than the fourteenth century and everything above to be later than the fourteenth century.

"The importance of this early excavation in Palestine ... was the demonstration by Petrie and Bliss that the history of ancient Palestine was written in the forms and shapes of broken fragments of pottery." 17

Ancient potsherds have been divided and dated into three main classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>2500-2000 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Middle Bronze Age</td>
<td>2000-1600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Late Bronze Age</td>
<td>1600-1200 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dates have principally been obtained with the

15 Ibid., p. 5.  16 Ibid., p. 6.  17 Ibid., p. 6.
aid of Egyptian scarabs found among the layers of fragments. These scarabs, or seals, have inscribed upon them the names of Pharaohs whose dates are known. So the chronology and, to some extent, the history of a mound of ruins can be reconstructed; not, of course, without other evidence to a specific year, or two years, or even ten, but to, perhaps in certain instances, a quarter of a century. When the scarabs are found engraved with the cartouche of a Pharaoh, they give excellent indications of the date of a particular site, or of a particular stratum of pottery.18

Pritchard states:

The observation that certain types of pottery belonged to certain layers of occupation and the dating of these strata by the presence of objects whose date was known made possible the skeleton for the chronology of ancient Palestine. This trustworthy standard has been checked, revised, and improved since Petrie first proposed the principle that pottery is "the essential alphabet of archaeology," but the principle remains the same. Attention was given first of all to form—particularly the shapes of handles, rims, and bases; then to decoration, such as combing on the wet surface, painting, and burnishing of the leather-hard vessel with a pebble before firing; and finally to the texture of the clay and the way in which the pottery had been fired in the kiln. Combinations of these factors made possible many distinctive variations, each of which seemed to hold for a time and then to be superseded by a new type. The fragile nature of pottery accounts for the great number and variety of broken pieces preserved. Once a pot was broken it had to be replaced, and the preference was for a newer style. Thus it was that changes took place rapidly in form, shape, and decoration. Petrie estimated that during his six weeks at Tell el-Hesi he must have looked over 50,000 or more pieces of pottery.19

This method of dating mounds by the pottery fragments found there, proved to be a fairly accurate method. Albright

---

18Marston, op. cit., p. 49.
19Pritchard, op. cit., p. 7, 8.
once estimated a mound to have been inhabited from 2000 B.C. to 600 B.C. from hundreds of fragments of pottery. Extensive excavation of the site through four successive campaigns established the dates of occupation from 2200 B.C. to 586 B.C., revealing the original estimate through pottery fragments to be amazingly accurate.  

The Early Date for the Exodus

Stephen L. Caiger states:

... nearly every possible and impossible date for the Exodus, from 1580 B.C. to 1144 B.C., has been conjectured by one scholar or another during the past century. But towards the end of it, opinion settled down upon a moderately Late Date, ascribing the Oppression to Ramesses the Great (1292-1225 B.C.), the Exodus to his successor Merenptah (1225-1215 B.C.), and the Invasion of Canaan to the period of anarchy in Egypt preceding the establishment of the XXth Dynasty (1205-1200 B.C.), the era of the Conquest and Settlement being thus shortened to roughly two centuries (1200-1000 B.C.). According to this theory, the chronology given in the Bible itself had to be entirely rejected.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, a different view began to prevail, as the evidence of the recently discovered Tell el Amarna Tablets, the Israel Stele, and other records began to be fully assimilated.

... The Exodus is thrown back to about 1447 B.C., Amenthotep II thus becoming the 'Pharaoh of the Exodus' and his predecessor Thothmes III the 'Pharaoh of the Oppression.'

This 'Early date' view has now been adopted with minor modifications by one acknowledged scholar after another, such as H. R. H. Hall and A. H. Gardiner (1913), E. Peet (1922), C. A. F. Knight (1922), J. W. Jack (1925), J. Garstang (1931), T. H. Robinson.

Ibid., p. 84.
A number of discoveries and historical events support the early date of about 1447 for the Exodus.

First is the date of the destruction of Jericho. As has already been shown from the scarabs in the tombs and rubble of Jericho, the city was destroyed sometime during the reign of Amenhetep III 1413-1377 B.C. Forty years before this (the time of the wilderness wandering) would establish the Exodus sometime between 1453 and 1417 B.C. Exodus 2:23 tells us that the Exodus occurred soon after the death of the king of Egypt. Two kings died during this period; Thotmes III (1447 B.C.) and Amenhetep II (1423 B.C.). The Bible suggests that the king that died reigned a long time and that he was the king from whom Moses fled 40 years before that. Since Amenhetep II reigned for only 24 years but Thotmes III for 54 years, Marston says

... that Thotmes' reign more than satisfies the forty years of Moses' absence. The Exodus must, therefore, have taken place after Thotmes III's death in 1447 B.C. and during the reign of Amenhetep II. 22

A second point supporting this early date for the Exodus is the statement in 1 Kings 6:1 which establishes the

---

21 Caiger, op. cit., p. 191-2.

Exodus 480 years before the founding of Solomon's temple. Solomon's temple was begun between 967-957 B.C. Josephus, the Jewish historian, supplies data that establishes the beginning of Solomon's temple at 966 B.C. Counting back 480 years places the Exodus between 1447 B.C. and 1437 B.C., during the reign of Amenhotep II, just as the Jericho discoveries indicate. As Marston puts it, "It is a testimony to the correctness of our Jericho dating that it preserves the integrity of the sacred text." Yahuda agrees that 1 Kings 6:1 had a strong claim as a "fundamental starting point" for the date of the Exodus.23

A third point in support of the early date is given by Marston as follows:

The Egyptian historian Manetho, quoted though he be somewhat scornfully by Josephus, yet places the Exodus of the Israelites in the reign of a certain king Amenophis. Our own Egyptian authorities, from certain other indications of this monarch, have long identified him with Amenhotep II, in whose reign, according to the Jericho calculations, the Exodus took place.24

A fourth point concerns a favorite daughter of Thothmes I named Hatshepsut. Caiger says she

... may have been the daughter that found Moses in the Bulrushes. In naming the baby as she did, she conferred upon him a name common in her family—as in the compound Thoth-mesu, mesu (or moses) being the Egyptian for son.25

24Marston, op. cit., p. 159.
Moses was about 40 years old when he fled from Egypt. Thotmes III would have reigned in Egypt about 15 or 20 years when he sought Moses's life and Moses escaped to Midian.

... it is a significant fact that for the first sixteen years this monarch was subservient on the throne to the Princess Hatshepsut. This lady was also the real ruler of the kingdom during the whole of the thirteen years' reign of the previous monarch, Thotmes II. Hatshepsut was the only surviving daughter of Thotmes I and his Queen Aahmes or Ahmose. Her mother was a daughter of Amenhetep I, and was of royal blood by both parents. Thus Hatshepsut had a unique claim to the throne, of which only her sex debarred her from taking full advantage... Now both our chronology, and the unique career of this remarkable woman, suggest that she was a daughter of Pharaoh who found Moses in the ark of bulrushes afloat on the Nile (Ex. 2:5)

In his history of the Jews, Josephus mentions the name of the princess that took Moses out of the Nile and adopted him as her own child. He says it was

... 'Thermuthis,' in which we see an echo of the name Thotmes, or Tahutmes, which was borne by each of the three Pharaohs in whose reigns Hatshepsut played such a leading part... And it is also remarkable that the time of her death so closely coincides with the flight of Moses from Egypt to Midian. If Moses had been Hatshepsut's favorite, he had little mercy to expect from Thotmes III. For, after her death, this Pharaoh so detested her memory, that he destroyed or defaced her monuments.

Caiger suggests,

Possibly it was the death of this masterful daughter of Pharaoh (in 1479 B.C.) which released the pent-up resentment of Thotmes III (1501-1448 B.C.)

26 Marston, op. cit., p. 160-161.
27 Josephus, op. cit., p. 162.
for the last phase of the Oppression of the Hebrews. 28

A sixth item of history connecting Moses and the Israelites with Thotmes III, Amenhetep II and Thotmes IV is found in the activities of these last two kings during the Israelites' 40 years of wandering in the desert. Before the Israelites left Egypt, Thotmes III had made seventeen great expeditions into Palestine and Syria, captured the cities, and broken down their defenses. During the Israelites' desert wanderings the two succeeding kings of Egypt,

Amenhetep II and Thotmes IV continued the work of destruction, and so reduced the fighting force of the country, that its inhabitants became dependent upon the power of their suzerain Egypt.

Is there anything in the Pentateuch, or the Book of Joshua, to justify the supposition that these attacks of Egypt paved the way for Israel's conquest of Canaan? There are three remarkable passages, the first of which is in Exodus 23:28-30: 'I will send hornets before thee which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite and the Hittite from before thee.'

A second reference to this mysterious insect the hornet is made in Deuteronomy 7:20: 'Moreover the Lord thy God will send the hornet among them until they that are left and hide themselves, perish from before thee.' And lastly, after the conquest had been made, Joshua reminds the people (Chap. 24:12) of these words: 'And I sent the hornet before you which drove them out from before you, even the two kings of the Amorites: but not with thy sword, nor with thy bow.' Professor Garstang's book contains the illuminating reminder that the Hornet was the badge of Thotmes III and his successors. 29

Price gives a seventh item: "... It is to be noted that the picture of brickmaking found on the walls of

29 Marston, op. cit., p. 165,166.
the temple of Amon at Thebes shows foreign captives of Tuthmosis III as the laborers." 30

The eighth item concerns evidence of the death of the oldest son of Amenhetep II, possibly due to the final plague of Egypt that caused the Pharaoh to let the Israelites go.

The tenth Plague—which smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the first born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne (Ex. 12:29) -- ought, however to be capable of archaeological verification. Is there any record on the monuments that the eldest son of Amenhotep II came to an untimely end?

That he did so certainly seems to be implied by the curious Dream Inscription of Thothmes IV, Amenhotep's immediate successor, showing that Thothmes was not that sovereign's eldest son. On an immense slab of red granite near the Sphinx at Gizeh it is recorded that Thothmes IV, while yet a youth, had fallen asleep under the famous monument, and dreamed a dream. In this the Sphinx appeared to him, startling him with a prophecy that one day he would live to be King of Egypt, and bidding him clear the sand away from her feet in token of his gratitude: which, on his accession, he did.

It is clear from this inscription that Thothmes' hopes of succession had been remote, which proves—since the law of primogeniture obtained in Egypt at the time—that he could not have been Amenhotep's eldest son. In other words, there is room for the explanation that the heir apparent died in the manner related in the Bible. 31

The ninth evidence is one of the most valuable in establishing the presence of the Hebrews in Canaan long before Ramses II and during the reigns of Amenhetep III and his successor Amenhotep IV. In 1888, 350 clay tablets found in a


31 Stephen L. Caiger, Bible and Spade, p. 73-74.
rubbish heap by a woman of Tell el Amarna proved to be letters sent from Syrian and Palestinian kings to the Egyptian monarchs Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV from approximately 1380 to 1360 B.C. The letters were written in Babylonian characters and spoke of the Habiru, or Hebrews, who were menacing Canaan. The fundamental meaning of the word Habiru (the Apiru of the Egyptian sources) seems to be "wanderers, those who pass from place to place." Caiger said the Habiru is a name "which all scholars admit to be letter for letter the exact equivalent of "Hebrew," although scholars still doubt that the Hebrews of the Bible are meant. However, "authorities have long decided that the Tel-el-Amarna Letters were written between 1500-1360 B.C." Yahuda says the date of the Tell-el-Amarna letters can approximately be fixed at about 1370 B.C., considering that Jerusalem was conquered for the first time shortly after Joshua's death (Judges 1:8), the


34 Caiger, op. cit., p. 22.

letters of Abdi-Khiba could without difficulty be brought into line with it.\textsuperscript{36}

In discussing the Tell el-Amarna tablets Price states that one of the tablets describes an invasion of the land by the "Habiri:"

The Habiri are plundering all the lands of the king (of Egypt). The land is falling into the hands of the Habiri. . . . Then in other letters from the cities of Canaan, Syria, and Phoenicia, appeals are made to the Pharaoh to send troops, to assign garrisons, for the defense of such places against the SA-GAZ, the barbarians of the desert and frontier territory. From parallel passages it has been definitely determined that the SA-GAZ and the Habiri of the Jerusalem letters are one and the same peoples, that they are none other than the nomadic Hebrews who were making their first irruption into this Westland, into Canaan their future home. Boehl (Kananaer and Hebraer, p. 87) has found specific proof of the above in the Boghaz-Keui tablets.\textsuperscript{37}

Caiger records:

The letters reveal that the land of Canaan (Kinakhna), while still ostensibly a province of the Egyptian empire, was in a state of extreme turmoil. The vassal kings were sending frenzied appeals to the Pharaohs for help against formidable invaders from the north and east, protesting that unless reinforcements arrived quickly, the country would be lost to Egypt forever. Fortress after fortress was falling into the enemies' hands.\textsuperscript{38}

One group that was invading them was the Hittites of the north. The other group was called the "Habiru". One letter writes, 'The Habiru are now capturing the fortresses of the Pharaoh. Not a single governor

\textsuperscript{36}Yahuda, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{37}Ira M. Price, \textit{The Monuments and the Old Testament}, p. 162.

\textsuperscript{38}Caiger, \textit{op. cit.}, p 97-98.
remains among them to my lord the King: all have perished. Zimrida of Lachish has been killed. May the King send help. Lo, if no reinforcements come this year, all the countries of my lord the King will be utterly destroyed. . . . The land of the King is lost to the Habiru. And now indeed a city of the territory of Jerusalem, Bet-Ninib, has been captured. . . . After taking the city of Rubuda, they are now attempting to take Jerusalem. . . . What have I done against my lord the King, that thou loveth the Habiru, and hastest the governors? . . . The Habiru have wasted all the territory of the King,' . . . 39

. . . it is disappointing at first sight that no Biblical personal names can be identified with certainty in the Tell el Amarna records. There are two main reasons why they have failed to identify any of the names in the tablets with the names of the people of the Hebrew conquest. First, it is next to impossible to identify cuneiform names apart from their context . . . And secondly, the period of the tablets is not that of Joshua so much as that of his immediate successors, about which the Bible tells us very little. There was plenty of time between the Invasion (1407) and the first of the tablets (1380) for the thrones of Jerusalem, &c., to have changed hands half a dozen times. 40

Although Caiger says that no Biblical names can be identified in the Amarna records, he does record a partial identification of Joshua in another book.

Another letter (to Yankhamu the Canaanite) tells how 'The King of Bethel has fled; and there are three men whom the governor should call to account for the defection of those kings, namely Bienenima, Jaddua, and Jashua. . . .' the last being identified by many scholars with the Joshua of the Bible.

For the first time we realize that the Hebrews were attacking not a few isolated forts, but a systematic ring of defences; their enemies were not merely the Canaanites, but the Egyptian suzerain behind them; the invasion was facilitated not only by the courage of the Israelites, but also by the

39 Ibid., p. 101. 40 Ibid., p. 103.
decline of Egyptian prestige, and by the diversion caused by a Hittite invasion on the North. And lastly, since the Tablets are uniformly written in cuneiform, that in spite of the Egyptian supremacy, the culture of Canaan remained predominantly Semitic in character, and was thus in some degree sympathetic to the invading tribes.41

In conclusion of the Amarna evidence, as Caiger says, "... the circumstances of the Habiru invasion are precisely, on the face of it, those of the Hebrew invasion, as regards the date, the locality, the results, and the actual place-names concerned."42

Caiger and Jacobus present a tenth evidence for the early date of the Exodus.

In 1896 A.D., Flinders Petrie found a stele of Merenptah with the name "Israel" on it showing that the Israelites were already established in Canaan during his reign. This inscription, self-dated as "the third year of Merenptah" (i.e., 1223 B.C.), tells in poetical form the glorious victories of the Pharaoh in Canaan:

Devastated is Tehennu;
The Hittite Land is pacified;
Plundered is Canaan with every evil;
Carried off is Ascalon;
Seized upon is Gezer;
Yeonoam is made a thing of naught;
Israel is desolated, her seed is not;
Palestine has become a defenseless widow
for Egypt;
Every one that is turbulent is bound by King Merenptah,

42 Stephen L. Caiger, Bible and Spade, p. 102.
Giving life like the sun every day.

This stele, recording an Egyptian conquest of the lowlands of Canaan, was discovered in Thebes and "contains the first and only mention of Israel found as yet in the Egyptian records." At first this evidence seemed to conflict with the date of the Exodus, and many scholars decided that this Merenptah was the hard-hearted Pharaoh of the Exodus. However, this view did not prevail, and gradually, as new discoveries were made, the oppression and the Exodus were placed far earlier under Thothmess III and Amenhotep II, and Ramesses and Merenptahs' reign in Egypt during the period of the Judges following Joshua. Gaiger summarizes this point:

Since this view alone permits the identification of the Amarna Habiru with the Hebrews of the Bible, interprets the Israel Inscription at its face value, and squares with the Jericho evidence (as we shall see), the older theory of a "Late Date" Exodus is now generally abandoned.

One final point in support of the early date should be mentioned. Jephthah challenged Moab by saying that Israel had held Heshbon and other towns of theirs for 300 years (Judges 11:26). Jephthah's reign near 1100 or 1200 B.C. would mean that according to this scripture the tribes of Israel were in Canaan at least by 1400 B.C.

---
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Statements Refuting the Early Date Evidences

A number of contradictory statements have been made concerning these evidences for the early date of the Exodus and an effort made to hold to a later date for the Exodus after Ramses II.

Those who hold to the late date for the Exodus and Conquest of Canaan say that the Habiru

were not the Hebrews, nor were the Aperiu either. As to Asher and Israel, the appearance of these names on the inscriptions simply proves that part of the Hebrews had never left Canaan at all. 46

They also try to reconcile the differences by saying that there was a double Exodus, "one in 1447 and the other in 1144 B.C." 47

Concerning the statement in I Kings 6:1 that Solomon began to build his temple in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel left Egypt, Duncan assumes that there may have been a mistake of 200 years in the 480 figure. He quotes Sir Flinders Petrie who suggests that the 480 years are

... usually supposed to have been deduced from twelve generations of forty years, while the regular period for generations in Jewish history is twenty-

46 Stephen L. Caiger, Bible and Spade, p. 112.
47 Ibid., p. 113.
two years which would give 264 years instead of 480 and would place the Exodus at 1233. However, to say that from the Exodus to Solomon was a twelve generation period is contradictory to Matt. 1:3-6 that records only twelve generations from Solomon to Judah, a period of at least 700 years in length.

Concerning the length of the reign of the Judges, Duncan argues that the Judges did not rule consecutively but in three different groups—one in the north, one in the east and the other in the south—covering a period of about 122 years. However there are two scriptural checks on the period of the Judges that support the longer period of 350 years: one is the recorded number of years almost all of the Judges rule, and the other is the 40 and 80 year periods of rest.

Duncan rejects the Jericho excavations by Garstang as evidence because this date is based on the dating of pottery fragments on which he says "authorities are not agreed." Also he says that Garstang found two burnt layers indicating destruction between 1600 and 1400 for the one and

---


49 Ibid., p. 181.

50 Ibid., p. 181.
after 1400 for the other, and says that Garstang set down the first one as the destruction by Joshua. He feels that it implies that Jericho was rebuilt immediately after Joshua destroyed it and again burned down in the thirteenth century. This theory seems to conflict with the Old Testament narrative in Joshua 6:26 and 1 Kings 16:34, which states that Jericho was not to be rebuilt, nor re-occupied until Hiel rebuilt it fulfilling the curse of Joshua. Duncan also wonders why the account of the walls of Jericho falling down did not use the dual form for walls instead of "the wall" if Garstang's conclusion through excavation that Jericho had a double wall when Joshua destroyed it was correct.51

In answer to these three objections, first, as shown in a previous chapter, dating by pottery fragments is fairly accurate because they contain cartouches of the last Pharaoh living when the city was destroyed and no cartouches of any Pharaohs thereafter. Second, if Jericho were burned down twice, it is possible that Garstang gave the wrong one for the destruction of Jericho inasmuch as the second one is dated after 1400 B.C. and this is closest to the actual date of the destruction by Joshua. Third, it seems that there were actually two walls around Jericho with houses built across them, because the two spies were let down from a house that was built on the "town wall" when escaping from

51Ibid., p.181-182.
Jericho (Joshua 2:15) and it is difficult to imagine a house built on the top of one wall.

Concerning the statement of Jephthah's that certain towns were occupied for 300 years, Duncan states:

On the other hand, the expression 300 years seems a round number and may cover three centuries, though really even less than 200 years; and the date of Jephthah, the last of the Judges of the east, must be very close to 1030, the beginning of the reign of Saul. Thus the above statement may really put the capture of these Moabite towns no further back than 1230.\(^5^2\)

The logic here is very weak. Both points contradict scriptural record and seem to be an attempt to discredit the outstanding evidence for an early date and to justify the late date theory, which contradicts many scriptures. The argument is obviously built on a shaky foundation.

Duncan presents three other points from scripture in an attempt to refute the evidence for an early date Exodus. First, in Joshua 17:16 chariots of iron are mentioned as if wrought iron was already in use in Palestine, and he contends that iron was not known in Palestine at 1450 B.C., nor was it common there till the twelfth century.\(^5^3\) Of course no one knows for sure when iron came into use in the Old Testament. Years ago it was contended that iron and steel were not known in America before the coming of the white men. However, this concept has now changed because iron and steel implements

\(^5^2\) Ibid., p. 182.
\(^5^3\) Ibid., p. 188
have been found in excavations in Central America.

Second, Bible references indicate the Philistines were in power in Canaan from statements like "the land of the Philistines", but present archaeological results seem to indicate "the Philistines were not present in force till the twelfth century."\(^{54}\) Statements such as "the land of the Philistines" do not indicate the number, size or power of a people, but merely that they lived there and Duncan himself admits "As traders they were in Palestine as early as the time of Abraham, nineteenth century."\(^{55}\)

Third, "Genesis 15:13 prophesies that Israel will be afflicted by strangers for four centuries. If this oppression began in 1585, it would have ended in 1183 B.C., and so an Exodus at 1450 is impossible.\(^{56}\) Here Duncan assumes that the "affliction" here referred to was started by the Egyptians about 1585 and ended when they left Egypt. As has already been shown in a previous section of this work, the affliction more probably started with Isaac as a stranger in the land of Canaan at the death of his father, Abraham, and continued till the Exodus under Moses.

Price makes one statement in refutation of an early date evidence:

\(^{54}\) Ibid., p. 189.
\(^{55}\) Ibid., p. 189.
\(^{56}\) Ibid.
for some time it has been thought that the Habiri were to be identified with nomadic Hebrews coming into Canaan from the east. This is now questioned by Professor George E. Mendenhall of the University of Michigan. He has re-examined the passages where the term habiru or 'piru' appears, and has concluded that it does not refer to a specific ethnic or social class, but to lawless persons who have put themselves out of the jurisdiction of the established authority. The Habiri mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna tablets, he thinks, were not invaders, but rebellious subjects of the Egyptian king. This challenges the whole theory of an invasion of nomads into Canaan during the Amarna period.\footnote{Price, Sellers, and Carlson, \textit{The Monuments and the Old Testament}, p. 152.}

\textbf{The Late Date View of the Exodus}

The late date view of the Exodus is the belief that Ramses II (about 1292 to 1225) is the Pharaoh of the oppression of Israel and Merenptah (about 1225 to 1215 B.C.) is the Pharaoh of the Exodus. H. H. Rowley dates the Exodus "circa 1230 B.C.\footnote{H. H. Rowley, \textit{From Joseph to Joshua} (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 164.} and E. C. Lane \textit{c. 1250 B.C.}\footnote{Jacobus, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 641.} Rowley states that the wandering after the Exodus was only two years instead of 40 and then "Joshua leads these tribes which had come from Egypt across the Jordan into central Palestine, which they occupy."\footnote{Rowley, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 164.}

Yahuda says the main evidences of a late date are the stela of Merneptah that mentions "Israel is desolated; his seed is not," which is the earliest mention of Israel
outside of the Bible and "the mention of Barneses together with Pithom (Ex. 1:11) as the store cities built by the Hebrews for Pharaoh". 61

Duncan says,

... the power of the Hyksos kings had been on the wane, and by 1600 B.C. they were hard pressed. At 1587 Aahmes became the first king of the XVIIIth Dynasty; and in 1582 he drove the Hyksos kings and their people out of the Nile valley completely.

... Did this event take place immediately after Joseph's death, or does the Old Testament imply that many years had passed? If the first is correct, the Hebrews had thus been only seventy years at most in Egypt, when Joseph died, and they became virtual slaves; and if we understand the 430 years' sojourn of Exod. xii. 40 to date from the arrival of Jacob, this would mean 360 years at the period of oppression given in Gen. xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6 as 400 years, and would date the Exodus at 1582 less 360 years, or 1222 B.C.

I believe Exod. xii. 40 is to be taken literally. The Hebrews sojourned 430 years in Egypt from the time of Jacob. If Joseph died about 1585, when the Hyksos were expelled, and we assume they had been seventy years in Egypt at that time, and if we deduct 360 years from 1585, the date of the Exodus would be 1225 B.C.; and, as they were oppressed from 1585, they really spent 360 years in bondage to the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasty kings. 62

Duncan's main error is in supposing that the Israelites spent 430 years in Egypt. As shown in this thesis, some of the 430 year sojourn was spent in Canaan.

Lane says,

In Ex. 1:11 (J) we read that the Hebrews built for the Pharaoh the store-cities of Pithom and Raamses. In 1883, in excavating the mound of Tell el-Maskuta, in the land of Goshen, E. Naville found the name

61 Yahuda, op. cit., p. 121.
62 Duncan, op. cit., p. 146-148
of the place Pi-Tum and the cartouche of Raamses II. This, together with Baamses, the name of the other store-city, seems to indicate that Raamses II (1292-1225 B.C.) was the Pharaoh of the oppression of Israel in Egypt, and this conclusion is confirmed by an inscription of Raamses II, recently discovered by C. S. Fisher at Beisan in Palestine which states: 'I have collected the Semites that they might build for me my city of Baamses.'

Price, Duncan and others assume that these cities were the ones Raamses required the Israelites to build when he had them in bondage, indicating that he is the Pharaoh of the oppression. However, Price mentions that "Even the identification of Tell el-Maskhuta as Pithorn is disputed; for any city where Tum was worshipped could be called Pi-Tum." Caiger contradicts the idea of the identification of these cities with the Hebrews:

The so-called store-chambers were really fortress emplacements. Amongst the quantities of pottery there was 'no type of vessel which could be described as Hebrew'. Though there were traces of Raameses II, the city had clearly been founded centuries earlier. As to the name Pi-tum, it might be used of any temple where Tum was worshipped.

But even if 'Pithom and Raamses' were located and discovered to have been founded by Baamses the Great, it would scarcely suffice to establish an historical argument, for modern critics of the text suspect the names as late insertions in the Biblical narrative.

---

63 Jacobus, _op. cit._, p. 246.
64 Price, _op. cit._, p. 116.
65 Duncan, _op. cit._, p. 168-169.
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Caiger mentions the discovery of Egyptian inscriptions indicating that Seti had captured some people called "Apriu" which is probably "Hebrew" in hieroglyphics and that Rameses the Great had forced some "Apriu" to do some building in Egypt. Some have thought that this was evidence of the oppression in Egypt, but since the Hebrews were already in Canaan at that time this must refer to "Hebrew prisoners captured from the Judges of Israel, and carried back to the Egypt from which their forefathers had escaped some two centuries earlier." This is especially reasonable since Seti said he had captured these "Apriu" in Canaan and that among his captives from Canaan were some from Megiddo and from Asher. "Asher, being at that time athwart the coast-road to the North, would naturally be the first to clash with Egypt." Of course the Israelites did not come to Egypt as captives under Joseph, therefore this does not refer to the sojourn in Egypt before the Exodus.

During his excavation of Bethshan in 1923, Fisher of Pennsylvania was reported to have found an inscription of Rameses the Great whereon it was stated that a Semitic people named the Apriu (i.e. probably the Hebrews) were employed by him in building his Delta capital at Rameses. This statement has been frequently repeated in archaeological works, but it is a complete misunderstanding. The text of the Rameses inscription contains no mention whatever of any such building operations, nor of the Israelites' (A. Rowe).

---

Genesis 47:11 mentions Joseph settling his father and brothers in the "land of Rameses as Pharaoh had commanded." Of course Joseph lived long before Rameses the Great so that this passage is evident that the name of Rameses may have been applied to a section of land in Egypt and used to designate that section even with stories and events that occurred long before the reign of the Pharaoh Rameses. Two other passages have the name of Rameses in it that would seem to indicate that the events occurred after the man Rameses lived. Exodus 1:11 says the Israelites built the cities of Pithom and Raamses for the Pharaoh and Ex. 12:37 mentions them journeying from "Rameses to Succoth." Marston suggests that the place Rameses may have been so called at a later date as New York is a later name for New Amsterdam, "yet later writers, although dealing with events which occurred when it was New Amsterdam, ... still call it New York." Another possibility is that the name Rameses "may have been an old name dating from the reign of Aohmes I, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty."  

Efforts to locate the cities of Pithom and Rameses have all been unsatisfactory, so far as throwing any clear light on the problem goes. Rameses II was a notorious appropriator of the work of past generations, and habitually erased the names of his predecessors, and inserted his own.  

71 Marston, op. cit., p. 152.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
Yahuda says "The very fact that Merneptah boasts to have 'annihilated the seed of Israel' is a clear indication that the Israelites have already long before been settled in the land having attained a strong hold in the country."  

I personally can see no strong ground why "the land of Rameses" or the City of Rameses must necessarily be associated with the name of Rameses II, only because it happened that we do not know another previous king of the same name.  

Yahuda reasons that there were many kings between 1900 and 1600 B.C. whose names are not known and one may have been named Rameses; that there is no good reason for the city and land of Rameses to be connected with the name of a king, and that the way Rameses is spelled and pronounced in Hebrew may not be the same form as the name of the king. "In Egyptian it sounds ramesse as well as ramessu, meaning: Ra-has-given-birth or ra-has-been-born. Thus the name of Rameses could have existed long before Rameses II."  

Another explanation Yahuda proposes is that the name Rameses for the city and land of Rameses could have been introduced later into one of the manuscripts of the Joseph and Exodus narratives by a copyist, or a reader, who lived hundreds of years after they were written. They either replaced an old name of the district and the store city, because they were better known at a later time; or they are only marginal additions by a copyist, or a reader, and were then incorporated into the text of the next copy, because they were thought to belong to the original text.  

---
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In conclusion, Yahuda discusses the evidences of I Kings 6:1, the tablets of Tell-el-Amarna and the Jericho finds as opposed to the mention of Baamseyes which he says "if taken as evidence, would fit none of the suggested theories and dates and would lead nowhere." He feels that "the statement of I Kings 6:1 has definitely more claim to be considered as a fundamental starting point than the mention of Baamseyes" and "from all the theories suggested, the Biblical data prove to be the best founded and to provide the simplest solution to the whole question."79

Another evidence that Baamseyes II is the Pharaoh of the oppression comes from inscriptions which seem to indicate that Baamseyes son, Meneptah, who would be the Pharaoh of the Exodus, had a son in his old age who died suddenly when about 18 years old. The tomb of the young man was found unfinished at Thebes. Price claims that this son may have been the first born killed in the final plague; however, he hastens to add that this was Dr. Paine's interpretation and that not all Egyptian scholars agree with him.80

James Hastings says, in arguing against an early date:

The view of some writers (F. C. Cook, Conder, Kohler, Sharpe, and others) who have assigned the
Exodus to earlier periods, is refuted, by Naville's discovery of Pithom, built by Ramses II, by the Tel el Amarna tablets, which show that Palestine was thoroughly an Egypt province during the 18th dynasty; and by the fact of the control exercised by Seti I and Ramses II over Palestine within the 19th dynasty.  

One of the main objections to the earlier date for the Exodus from Egypt and conquest of Canaan is found in the history of conquests of the Nineteenth Dynasty of Egypt. Ramses I (1318-1317) built a temple at Bathshean in northern Palestine, a difficult accomplishment if the Israelites occupied the land. Seti I, second king of this dynasty, made an expedition into Palestine, occupied Bethshean and took Yenoam and Hamath as well as Acre on the seacoast, but this expedition is not mentioned in the Book of Judges. Ramses II continued and increased the Egyptian presence in Palestine. His inscription can still be seen at the Dog River, a few miles above Beirut, and he again occupied, re-fortified, and adorned Bethshean with temples and monuments. Following Ramses II's 65 year reign, Merneptah continued expeditions into Palestine. A stele in the British Museum records that: "Israel is desolated."  

Whatever may be deduced from the silence of the Bible regarding this campaign, it is evident that it took place when Israel was already in occupation of Canaan; and its record is fatal to the claim that Merneptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But if

Joshua conquered Canaan nearly two centuries before this Pharaoh's campaign, how has it come about that all mention of Egypt, except in connection with the Exodus, is excluded from Joshua, Judges and two Books of Samuel?\textsuperscript{83}

Marston gives the following possible explanations:

\ldots the Egyptian army followed the coast corridor route along the shore of the Mediterranean. \ldots Both Joshua and Judges contain admissions \ldots that Israel could not always drive out the existing inhabitants. The occupation by Israel was therefore not complete, except perhaps in the Hill Country and Highlands. \ldots the main body of the Israelites held aloof from the trade routes. \ldots Egypt \ldots held the coastland corridor for through communications with Syria and the north; \ldots The fact that it was this coast corridor which was used by the Egyptians, left the interior of Palestine intact for the Israelites.

A summary of the contents of the Book of Judges throws further light on the absence of references to Egypt. Here is a book, covering a period of nearly four centuries, composed of folklore stories all pieced together, with long intervals of rest between them.

\ldots How could their scribes be expected to write down, that Egypt was often their protector after the occupation of their Promised Land? Or if the scribes did write it down, was it not certain that some of their successors, when they copied their writings, would omit it? Historians, who write from a patriotic standpoint, are ever prone to disregard benefits received from other nations. And this history of the Israelites was written by men imbued with an intensely patriotic religion. \ldots \textsuperscript{84}

Many have wondered why Seti I did not capture and possess the land of Canaan where the Hebrews were. In all of his campaigns there is no trace

\ldots of any occupation of Central or Southern Palestine, which would be the territory in which the

\textsuperscript{83}Ibid., p. 221. \textsuperscript{84}Ibid., p. 220-224.
Hebrews of the Exodus were settled at this time... practically all the places taken possession of by Egypt after the time of Amenhotep II were located either in the far north or in the Maritime Plain and Shephelah.\textsuperscript{85}

The conquest recorded in the Israel Stele apparently refers to a conquest of parts of Canaan during the administrations of Tola and Jair, who judged at that time and who gave no details of their combined 45 years as judges. Their reign as judges consecutively followed Gideon during a period of spiritual and moral decline where "the children of Israel turned again, and went a whoring after Baalim, and made Baalberith their god. And the children of Israel remembered not the Lord their God, who had delivered them out of the hands of all their enemies on every side" (Judges 8:33,34). Details of their rule are conspicuously absent in the record as if there were no good news to write and as if they were ashamed to admit defeat to the Egyptians, from whom God had delivered them many years earlier.

... it is a strange fact that though the Pharaohs from Shishak onwards (about 931 B.C. on) never ceased (as the Old Testament informs us) to meddle in Hebrew politics, not a single allusion to any of the Kings of Israel or Judah has been found as yet upon the Egyptian monuments.\textsuperscript{86}

The lack of external records to substantiate the historicity of the Bible has constantly been one of the hardest problems of Bible scholars. Some discoveries have been made in this

\textsuperscript{85}Caiger, The Old Testament and Modern Discovery, p.27.

\textsuperscript{86}Caiger, Bible and Spade, p. 108.
field through archaeology and the search still continues. The Bible is incomplete and many "plain and precious things" (I Nephi 13:28) have been taken out of the Bible. Therefore it is not surprising that there is not a more complete record available.

One other problem in accepting an early date for the Exodus concerns the history of the land east of the Dead Sea through which the Israelites traveled going to Canaan.

Nelson Glueck says,

In all the areas we have thus far explored in Transjordan from South Gilead southward, not a single tell or other site had been found containing an uninterrupted sequence of pottery from before 2200 B.C. to and through about 600 B.C.87

... the particular Exodus of the Israelites through southern Transjordan could not have taken place before the 13th century B.C. It will be recalled that the Israelites begged the Edomites and Moabites in vain for permission to travel through these kingdoms on their way to the Promised Land. The Israelites were compelled to go around them, and finally force their way westward to the Jordan on the north side of the Arnon, which at that time was part of the territory of Sihon, king of the Amorites. Had the Exodus through southern Transjordan taken place before the 13th century B.C., the Israelites would have found neither Edomite nor Moabite kingdoms, well organized and well fortified, whose rulers could have given or withheld permission to go through their territories. Indeed, the Israelites, had they arrived on the scene first, might have occupied all Edom and Moab themselves, and left the land on the west side of the Jordan for late comers.88

Glueck suggests there were no inhabitants beyond the

88 Ibid., p. 146-147
Dead Sea before the 13th century B.C. However, in other places he indicates that it is "impossible to say definitely" whether some of the ruins were there "at the time of Moses" or not. Some of the sites were so delapidated that they could only "sketch the course of the outside walls of the fortress." Some of the sites were not extensively excavated to be able to tell of their occupation and "if stratigraphic excavations were attempted, several successive layers of occupation might be revealed."

Concerning excavations in and around Palestine Duncan states:

None of the sites excavated have revealed any evidence of Hebrew occupation earlier than the twelfth century. Some of them show no traces of it till a much later date, and several are towns captured by Joshua. One town at present being excavated shows no occupation from the fourteenth to the twelfth century. ..

His question then seems to be, if the Hebrews captured and occupied Canaan from about 1400 to 1100, why there are no broken pottery and other archaeological evidences of occupation during that period. It is interesting to note that he answers his own question in his discussion. "The excavations at Jericho seem to bear out the Old Testament statement that the Hebrews destroyed utterly, but did not occupy. .." Notice also that he said one town had not

---
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been occupied from the 14th to the 12th century. This change is another evidence that the Hebrews came in and destroyed the town in the 14th century and that it remained unoccupied until the 12th century, when the Hebrews left their nomadic ways for a more stable way of life.

This idea is again substantiated by Duncan's own statements:

• • • Tell el Hessy (Lachish) also showed a complete destruction followed by a period of squatter occupation of the ruins, with a later refortification and rebuilding of the stronghold in the period of the Kings.

• • • the conquest of the country by the Hebrews was a long and tedious operation extending through the period of the Judges down to the days of David, when, for the first time in their history, the land may be actually described as being in the hands of their nation.

I have elsewhere suggested that the Hebrew occupation was at first nomadic, and that they settled in the Hilly and wooded parts of the country, not occupying even the towns which they captured; but even on hill sites which they must have occupied no Hebrew potsherds have so far been found. Petrie agrees that the early Hebrew occupation must have been nomadic, and suggests that the Hebrews followed the nomadic habit of using skins and wooden vessels instead of breakable pottery.94

In conclusion, the evidences for a late date for the Exodus violently contradict the scriptural record and cannot be accepted without ignoring many important archaeological discoveries or drastically altering the interpretation of them without justification. The early date view coincides

94Ibid., p. 186, 187, 188.
with the scriptures in every respect and also fits archaeological discoveries. Therefore, the early date view is accepted as the most accurate dating of the oppression and Exodus of the Israelites, with Thotmes III (about 1501 to 1447) as the Pharaoh of the oppression and Amenhetep II (about 1447 to 1423 B.C.) as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.
ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE PERIODS OF THE JUDGES AND KINGS OF ISRAEL

Contacts Between the Judges and Neighboring Nations

During the period of the Judges of Israel, contacts with other contemporaneous nations are conspicuously absent in the record. It almost seems as if the writers purposely avoided recording any single significant event connecting them with their neighboring nations. Of course this was a period of adjustment for Israel. The Israelites were trying to establish their power and prestige as a nation, and any event that did not support this objective may have purposely been left out of the record. The Tel-el-Amarna tablets discovered in Egypt, the Jericho excavations and the Mernepthah stele are about the only archaeological evidences of contact between the two nations. Concerning the conquest of Canaan by Joshua and his successors, Caiger says,

The indifferent policy of the Pharaohs from 1407 to 1358 toward the Canaanites conditions gave the Hebrews the opportunity to conquer the Canaanite forts without any Egyptian interference.

... the older School would postpone Joshua's invasion of Canaan until the reign of Merenptah (c. 1200 B.C.); but we may safely say that just as opinion is hardening in favour of an early date (c. 1447 B.C.) for the Exodus, so inevitably it is coming to accept an early date (c. 1400 B.C.) for the Conquest.1

---

Caiger and Marston suggest a connection between the 40 and 80 year periods of rest in Israel and the rise and fall of Egyptian domination.

After the Amarna period, for instance, there came a forty-year-long revival of Egypt (1358-1314 B.C.) under Sakere, Tutankhamen, Eye and Harmhab, during which time she was doubtless able to keep the peace in her Palestinian province. With Seti I and Rameses the Great, again, came a further eighty years of the Pax Egyptiaca (1301-1221 B.C.). The coincidence in the dates of these revivals has tempted some scholars to identify with them the "forty years" and the "fourscore years" during which "the land had rest," as noted in Judges. It is suggested that during these intervals the enemies of Israel were compelled by the Pharaoh to hold their hand.²

Marston says,

When the date Jericho has given us, is used as a basis for the chronology of the Book of Judges, it is found that the periods when "the land had rest," coincide with the periods of time when Egyptian history represents the Pharaohs as exercising effective suzerainty over Palestine.³

The following Table⁴ from Garstang's The Foundations of Bible History--Joshua, Judges shows how the history of Egypt and the events in Palestine during the 440 years following the fall of Jericho might fit together.

Marston's compilation of the period of the Judges as

---

⁴Ibid., p. 226-227.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Leader</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Space of Time</th>
<th>The Bible Story</th>
<th>The Egyptian Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>After 1447 to circa 1407</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Wandering in the Wilderness</td>
<td>Egyptian invasion and domination of Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>1407 to 1367</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Invasion and penetration of Palestine</td>
<td>Habiru revolt (see Tel el Amarna letters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cushan)</td>
<td>1367 to 1359</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Israel oppressed by Hittites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel</td>
<td>1359 to 1319</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>Egyptian domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eglon)</td>
<td>1319 to 1301</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Oppression of Eglon, king of Moab</td>
<td>Egypt occupied with various rebellions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud</td>
<td>1301 to 1221</td>
<td>80 years</td>
<td>Rest, Period of Shamgar</td>
<td>Egyptian domination by Rameses II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sisera)</td>
<td>1221 to 1201</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Oppression of Sisera</td>
<td>Anarchy in Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>1201 to 1161</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>Egyptian domination by Rameses III, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Midianites)</td>
<td>1161 to 1154</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Midianite oppression.</td>
<td>Egypt's power declines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Leader</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>Space of Time</td>
<td>The Bible Story</td>
<td>The Egyptian Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>1154 to 1114</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech</td>
<td>1114 to 1111</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Oppression</td>
<td>Withdrawal of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonites</td>
<td>1111 to 1110</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>1110 to 1105</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Israel had occupied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heshbon 300 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Philistines)</td>
<td>1105 to 1065</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Philistine oppression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Samson 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>1065 to 1045</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Philistine oppression.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1045 to 1025</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul</td>
<td>1025 to 1010</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Monarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>1010 to 970</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>Relations with Amenempest.</td>
<td>Siamon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>970 to 967</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years</td>
<td></td>
<td>482 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shown in Table No. VII presents some problems. In giving Othniel, Deborah and Gideon each 40 years and Ehud 80 years for the period of their reign during these periods of rest, he ends with too many years for the period of the reign of the judges and must subtract these years from other places in order to arrive at the scriptural 482 years from the Exodus to Solomon's fourth year. He does this by eliminating entirely any mention of the consecutive reigns of Tola, 23 years (Judg. 10:2) and Jair 22 years (Judg. 10:3) and assigning only one year to the servitude to the Ammonites instead of 18 (Judg. 10:8). Then he eliminates completely the reigns of Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon totaling 25 years; reduces Eli's 40 year reign to 20 years, Samuel's 39 year reign to 20 years and Saul's 40 year reign to 15 years. The number of years for all these are stated definitely in the Bible, as discussed in a previous chapter, and cannot be eliminated without undue disregard for the scriptural record. The length of Samuel's reign is not definitely stated but can be positively calculated from other known lengths as discussed in a previous chapter of this thesis.

Contacts Between the Kings of Israel and Neighboring Nations

Some contacts between the kings of Israel and neighboring nations have already been discussed in Chapter IV. Concerning the accuracy of dates in this period and the dating of certain events, the writers of the Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary state:
The Assyrian Eponym Canon was discovered by G. Smith at Ninevah in 1875. It is a list of dignitaries of the Assyrian Empire who were chosen to give their names to a series of 227 consecutive years. This list overlaps both the Babylon list and the Ptolemaic Canon, so that the precise date of each year can be determined. For the year which according to these calculations, should be 763 B.C., the Canon adds the remark, 'In the month Sivan the sun was eclipsed.' Modern astronomy calculates that on June 15, 763 B.C., an eclipse of the sun occurred at Ninevah. Thus the strict historical accuracy both of the Ptolemaic Canon and of the Eponym Canon is demonstrated, and it becomes possible to date exactly all the events of Assyrian history from 889 B.C. onward. This puts the chronology of the contemporary Hebrew Kings and prophets on a sure footing.5

In the annals of the Assyrian kings found at Ninevah, "Shalmaneser records that he fought with Ahab, king of Israel, in 858 B.C., and that he received the tribute of Jehu in 842."6

A newly discovered tablet fixes the date of the fall of Ninevah in 612 B.C. (see C. J. Gadd, The Fall of Ninevah, 1923) and helps to determine the chronology of Nahum and of some of the prophecies of Jeremiah.7

The dating of events by astronomical calculations seems to be quite prevalent during this period of the Kings and prophets of Israel. Caiger says,

It is a striking fact that, with the help of modern astronomy and these ancient inscriptions, we can date to the very day the Eclipse which terrified Amos so many centuries ago (Amos vii, 9). It happened on June 15, 763 B.C.8

Thiele discusses a problem of Tiglath-pileser III contacts with Azariah and Menahem in Chapter V of his book.

---

5 Malancthon Jacobus, Elbert C. Lane, and Andrew Zenos (Editors), Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary (New York: Garden City Books, 1936), p. 243

6 Ibid., p. 247. 7 Ibid. 8 Caiger, The Old Testament
He established the reigns of Menahem and Azariah so that they overlap the reign of Tiglath-pileser three to five years. The problem is that the usually accepted date of 738 for the expedition of Tiglath-pileser and his contact with Menahem and Azariah is four years after Menahem died and two years after Azariah died. Thiele places their contact at 743 instead of 738. In a lengthy and involved discussion of this problem, Thiele pointed out many things concerning errors in the analysis that produced the 738 date.

First,

The historical records of Tiglath-pileser were mainly engraved upon stone slabs which originally lined the walls of his palace at Calah (Nimrud), but which were later removed by Esarhaddon to be used in his palace in the same city. Here they were found by Layard in his excavations of what he termed "the Southwest Palace of Nimrod." Layard gives a vivid description of the mutilated and disordered condition in which these slabs were found, some sawn in two with only a portion of the original slab remaining, many with the original carvings completely chiseled away to be replaced by new inscriptions, and yet others that had been exposed to fire with the stone nearly reduced to lime and too cracked and fragile to permit removal. A number of slabs were still in the center of the room, piled upon each other and ready to take their place in the new palace under construction.9

Second,

It should be noticed that the section of the palace annals dealing with Menahem's payment of tribute immediately precedes a section denoting the events of Tiglath-pileser's ninth year, ... 737. It is

---

therefore presumed that the immediately preceding section of the annals must deal with the immediately preceding year, and that 738 must thus be the year of Menahem's payment of tribute. Simply because the section of the annals dealing with Menahem's payment of tribute immediately precedes the section of the annals dealing with Tiglath-pileser's ninth year, 737, does it necessarily follow that that section must deal with Tiglath-pileser's eighth year?10

Third, after showing that many records of campaigns were not listed by chronological arrangement alone but often grouped together with a geographical arrangement, Thiele says:

In fact we may have here the real secret of the arrangement not only of Tiglath-pileser's annals but of the other documents as well, and that is chronological-geographic for all rather than strictly chronological for some and strictly geographic for others. In other words, events were not arranged on the basis of a strict sequence of years but according to a sequence of activities in certain geographical areas, or campaigns. Thus when Azariah and Menahem were introduced into the record, they were not introduced in that section dealing with Tiglath-pileser's first campaign which took place in Babylonia in his first year, nor in the section dealing with his second campaign which took place in the northeast in his second year, but in that section of the annals dealing with his third campaign which took place in the regions of the northeast and was carried on from his third to his eighth years of reign.11

Later on in this discussion Thiele draws another conclusion:

In brief, a careful survey of the section of the annals dealing with Azariah makes it clear that this section demands a time when the king was present in the west, when his campaign was thought of as an integral part of the campaign of his third year against Urartu, and when Arpad was under Assyrian

10 Ibid., p. 80. 11 Ibid., p. 91.
power. The year 743 meets all these requirements.\textsuperscript{12} Thiele says that "places from which captives were transported at the time of Menahem's payment of tribute to Tiglath-pileser" were places that were captured immediately prior to his third year, and "places in which these captives were settled were places that were taken in the great campaign of the third year."\textsuperscript{13} He concludes,

\ldots it seems only logical to conclude that this section of the annals dealing with Menahem's payment of tribute must be closely related to the third year. And, while there are such definite connections of this section with the third year, the internal evidence shows no such connection with the material of the ninth year, which immediately follows the Menahem section in the Assyrian annals.

It was previously noted that there are indications that the Azariah section of the annals is very closely related to the events of Tiglath-pileser's third year, and that the Azariah-Menahem sections of the annals are very closely related to each other. Now we have seen that there is also strong evidence pointing to a close relationship between the Menahem section of the annals and the events of "Tiglath-pileser's third year--exactly the result that was to have been expected if the Azariah-Menahem sections of the annals are so closely related to each other.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 94
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
CHAPTER XI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There are many places in the chronology of the Old Testament without positive verification of the time interval; therefore, there is no absolute chronology of the Old Testament obtainable at this time.

According to modern scripture (The Book of Mormon, The Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price) which the L.D.S. Church accepts as true, the King James version of the Bible is not completely correct but is more accurate than the Septuagint, Samaritan and Josephus versions of the same history. From an examination of the King James Bible, the three modern scriptures and the Inspired Version, the chronology from Adam to Joseph is established practically without question. There is still no positive identification of the starting point of the 430 year sojourn before the Exodus under Moses. There is no scriptural record for the length of Joshua’s reign nor for the reign of the five Judges, Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah and Gideon; therefore the only connection in number of years between the Exodus under Moses and the reign of the Kings of Israel is the statement that in Solomon’s fourth year he began to build the house of the Lord, that year being the “four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of
the land of Egypt" (I Kings 6:1). The length of the reign of the Kings of Israel and Judah, though carefully examined and compiled may still not be correct due to the confused condition of the Biblical record.

As to the archaeological discoveries, there are no archaeological evidences for people or events from Adam to Abraham. Abraham's connection with Hammurabi, the Babylonian king is not conclusive. Joseph was probably contemporaneous with the friendly Hyksos Kings of Egypt but some scholars and writers still question this. Although there are problems involved in the history of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, the preponderance of evidence, scriptural and archaeological, leans very heavily toward the early date of about 1447 B.C. for the Exodus when Amenhotep II was Pharaoh instead of 1225 under Rameses II. The findings of the excavations of the ancient city of Jericho are some of the most outstanding archaeological contributions to the historicity and dating of Biblical events of that period. The records of astronomical calculations of some neighboring kingdoms help to establish more accurate dates for the events of the kings of Israel and Judah and their contacts with these nations.

With the exception of the few problems herein discussed, the author believes the chronology of the Old Testament as established in this thesis is accurate as far as we can determine with available evidence from scripture and science.
The revelations in sections 77 and 88 delimit the time of the world's temporal existence to 7000 years including the thousand year millennium. Recent scientific discoveries delimit the age of the atmosphere to about twelve or thirteen thousand years as discussed in chapter VI. Other scientific findings question the validity and accuracy of scientific theories propounding many more thousands of years for the existence of life on the earth. Therefore the date 4000 B.C. for Adam, although contested by some scientists, writers and scholars, can be accepted as fairly accurate to within about fifty or one hundred years.

The authors conclusions relative to the dates and number of years of events is given in a table at the conclusion of chapter IV of this thesis.
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ABSTRACT

Objectives

The first objective of this thesis was to examine the Old Testament chronology carefully to see how it is computed. The second objective was to examine the modern scriptures to see what contributions they make in establishing a more accurate, reliable chronology. The third objective was to examine certain hypotheses in archaeology, carbon dating processes, and geology that seem to conflict with the Old Testament chronology with the purpose in mind of learning how accurate their findings are and what possibilities exist for a closer harmony between these sciences and the Old Testament scriptural chronology.

Method of Study

All references to "year" or "years" in the four standard works were noted from complete concordances, read and studied, noting the agreements and discrepancies, if any, in the accounts. The truth of the three modern scriptures (The Book of Mormon, The Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price) is assumed and no attempt is made in this thesis to establish the veracity of the records. These three works are used as a basis for constructing the most accurate scriptural chronology available; therefore, when they are quoted, it is assumed that what is recorded is true. Periods
of time for the chronology were established by noting the number of years from one event to another from Adam to Zedekiah. This is not an attempt to date every event in the Bible but only to establish a dated chronological line from Adam to Zedekiah from which other Biblical events can be calculated. When there was no statement in the Bible of the number of years from one event to another, it was often possible to determine the number of years of the event by adding and subtracting other figures covering the same period as in the case of Samuel's reign.

Problems Detected

There are some places in the chronology of the Old Testament without positive verification of the time interval. Although many possible events and periods of time have been suggested and discussed in this thesis for the 430 year sojourn, there is still no positive identification of the starting point of this 430 year sojourn of the children of Israel before the Exodus under Moses. There is no scriptural record for the length of Joshua's reign nor from the reign of the five Judges: Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah and Gideon.

One of the main problems found in the analysis of other writers' compilations of Old Testament chronology, is their frequent disregard for the number of years recorded in the Bible for an event or person's reign. Too often writers and scholars will change the number of years recorded in the scriptures to suit their own particular chronological scheme.
without presenting sufficient evidence to justify changing or ignoring the Biblical record. The reigns of the Kings of Israel and Judah have perplexed chronologists for years because of the confused condition of the Biblical record making the synchronisms between the reigns of the Kings of Israel and Judah seemingly impossible to corroborate.

Conclusions

From an examination of the King James Bible, the three modern scriptures, the Inspired Version of the Bible by the Prophet Joseph Smith, and the Lectures on Faith, the chronology from Adam to Joseph is established, placing the beginning of Adam's temporal existence about 4000 B.C. This date does not coincide with certain scientific theories; however, these theories have been shown to be lacking in positive verification and contain many circumstances and problems that question their accuracy. The Exodus from Egypt occurred about 1447 B.C., 430 years after the death of Abraham during the reign of Amenhotep II. According to the Bible record, the period of the Judges from Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon was 480 years. The period of the Kings of the divided kingdoms have been calculated to be from 931 to 600 B.C., in the first year of Zedekiah. The Book of Mormon establishes the beginning of Zedekiah's reign 500 years before the birth of Jesus Christ. The chronology of the Old Testament from Adam to Jesus Christ, therefore, is completed. The author's conclusions concerning the dates and
the number of years of events is given in a table at the conclusion of Chapter IV of this thesis.
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