

## Chapter Two

### A Backward Glance: The Late 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty

#### *The Berlin Genealogy: A Second Look*

In chapter one we suggested and briefly defended approximate dates for the 67 year long reign of Ramses II (840-774 B.C.). In support of these dates we referred to the genealogy of Ashakhet, a high priest of Ptah who was born, according to our estimate, around the year 600 B.C. Working backward in time from that date using the Louvre and Berlin stelae, and allowing 16 years per generation, we reasoned that the four ancestors of Ashakhet who served Ramses II must have been born around the years 872, 856, 840, and 824 B.C. respectively. Assuming that their high priesthoods were reached by the age of 35, we concluded that they served Ramses II beginning around the years 837, 821, 805 and 789 B.C., and that the *Berlin Genealogy* was therefore supportive of our assumed dates for this important 19<sup>th</sup> dynasty king.

We recognize the tenuous nature of the assumptions which guided these calculations, but the fact that they produced reasonable correspondences to kings belonging to the 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> dynasties included earlier in the genealogy lent credence to our methodology. And it suggested to us, though we did not immediately act on the suggestion, that the *Genealogy of Ashakhet*, extended further back in time by using additional data provided by the Berlin stela, might be useful in extending our historical revision backward to the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> dynasty, and perhaps even further, touching base with the terminal kings of the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty, Amenhotep III, Akhenaton and Haremheb. We now act on that earlier impulse. Though this backward glance temporarily interrupts our focus on the eighth century, it is expedient that it be undertaken sooner rather than later, if only to answer questions which the discussion in chapter one might have raised in the minds of informed readers.

Several times in the previous two books of our series we have mentioned the revisionist work of Immanuel Velikovsky, who in 1952 published an exhaustive reappraisal of 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty chronology in his pivotal *Ages in Chaos*. In that book Velikovsky argued that the queen of Sheba, a

contemporary of Solomon, was none other than queen Hatshepsut, the predecessor of the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty king Thutmose III. It followed from that identification that Thutmose III must have been a contemporary of Solomon's son and successor Rehoboam and that *he* must therefore be identified as the biblical pharaoh Shishak who sacked Jerusalem early in Rehoboam's tenure in office. It also followed that Amenhotep II, Thutmose's grandson, must be the biblical Zerah, the Ethiopian general who lost a battle to king Asa of Judah around the year 900 B.C. Velikovsky further reasoned, allowing a 55 year reign for Thutmose III, that Amenhotep III, Akhenaton and Tutankhamon must have ruled Egypt in the mid-ninth century, and that the famed Amarna letters, which date from late in the reign of Amenhotep III and run through the reigns Akhenaton and Tutankhamon, must belong in the time frame 870-840 B.C. Clearly our chronology, which fixes the beginning of the reign of Ramses II around the year 840 B.C., stands in conflict with Velikovsky's thesis. Velikovsky's schema leaves us no room for the 30 year reign of Haremheb and the several decades which belong to Ramses I and Seti, the immediate ancestors of Ramses II. Some, though not all of Velikovsky's error results from his assigning to Thutmose III an excessively long reign of 54 years, following the traditional history. As explained in the second book of our series, this king did not author the Karnak annals which bear his name, those which, in conjunction with the memoirs of his army general Amenemheb, assign to him this expansive reign. Thutmose's kingship was much shorter, certainly less than twenty years, a fact soon to be confirmed by the Berlin genealogy where his name occurs only once. This suggested shortening of Thutmose's reign length, in and of itself, does not account for the earlier dating of the Amarna letters which we are about to suggest, but it is without doubt a major contributor.

Returning to the Berlin genealogy, we reproduce below the data from the second row (positions 2.1 through 2.15) and the beginning of the third row (positions 3.1 -3.4) of ancestors, reading, as always, from right to left on the monument. We supply additionally the approximate date of birth and date in office of each of the priests, continuing to use the 16 year and 35 year figures which yielded reasonable results earlier in the genealogy. In evaluating the table we must be mindful of the provisional status of the resulting chronology, the chances of error increasing the further we are

removed from the time of Ashakhet. But as it stands, the suggested chronology is illuminating, and is probably correct to within a few years.

Table 4: The Berlin Genealogy Chronology Extended

Position Number	High Priest/Prophet Named	Name of King Served	Approx. Date of Birth	Approx. Date of the H.P./Prophet
2.1	Ptahemakhet	not named	808 B.C.	773 B.C.
2.2	Neferrenpet	Ramses II	824 B.C.	789 B.C.
2.3	Ptahemakhet	Ramses II	840 B.C.	805 B.C.
2.4	[--]masjemet?	Ramses II	856 B.C.	821 B.C.
2.5	Ptahhotep	Ramses II	872 B.C.	837 B.C.
2.6	Neterwihotep	Menmaatre (Seti I)	888 B.C.	853 B.C.
2.7	Sekeremsaef	Menmaatre (Seti I)	904 B.C.	869 B.C.
2.8	Ty	Tjeserkheperre (Haremheb)	920 B.C.	885 B.C.
2.9	Sekeremsaef	not named	936 B.C.	901 B.C.
2.10	Aypew	Ietnetjeray (?) (Ay)	952 B.C.	917 B.C.
2.11	Wirmer	Nibmaatre (Amenhotep III)	968 B.C.	933 B.C.
2.12	Penpanebes	Nibmaatre (Amenhotep III)	984 B.C.	949 B.C.
2.13	Nekhememptah	not named	1000 B.C.	965 B.C.
2.14	Nebre	Menkheperre (Thutmose III)	1016 B.C.	981 B.C.
2.15	Damaged section		1032 B.C.	997 B.C.
3.1	Ty	not named	1048 B.C.	1013 B.C.
3.2	Pa'emrud	Djeserkare (Amenhotep I)	1064 B.C.	1029 B.C.
3.3	Ty	not named	1080 B.C.	1045 B.C.
3.4	Menet	Nebpetire (Ahmose I)	1096 B.C.	1061 B.C.

It goes without saying that the date assigned to each king in this table represents nothing more nor less than an approximate date at which that particular king was likely reigning in Egypt. It need not imply, for example, that the king in question ruled for the entire sixteen years assigned to that generation, nor that the absolute date associated with the priest's service to a particular king is central in the span of years during which that king actually reigned. But with that in mind the table remains instructive in confirming several assumptions we have made in our earlier discussions vis-a-vis the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty kings.

In the first instance we cannot help but observe an obvious discrepancy between the length of the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty as indicated by the Berlin genealogy, and the length of that same dynasty as represented in the textbooks sanctioned by the traditional history. Since position 3.5 in the Berlin document is occupied by a priest who served under Apophis, the terminal king of the 17<sup>th</sup> (Hyksos) dynasty, it is clear that the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty patriarch Ahmose I began his rule at the earliest some time around the year 1073 B.C.. At the other end of that dynasty's span of years, the rule of Haremheb, which brought the dynasty to a close, must be dated at latest around 873 B.C.. The resulting 200 years assigned to the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty contrasts markedly with the 267 years assigned these same kings by the traditional history. Contemporary historians typically place the dynasty roughly in the time frame 1575-1308 B.C.

The difference of sixty-seven years cannot be accounted for by simply lengthening the time of each generation in the Berlin genealogy by six or seven years. If we were to make such a change it should apply consistently to all generations. But we have already observed how, at the lower end of the time frame under consideration, any increase would produce serious chronological problems for the four generations of priests who served Ramses II and the two preceding generations who served Seti I, whose independent reign, as is, must necessarily be increased from the ten years assigned it by the traditional history. And at the other end of the spectrum the length of a generation of priests must be correspondingly small. Here we observe that three generations of priests served the combined reigns of Ahmose I and his successor Amenhotep I (positions 3.2-3.4). Since Ahmose ruled around 22 years, and Amenhotep at most an additional 21 years, it follows that the 16 years per generation figure is, if

anything, excessively large. Any significant lengthening of the generation number cannot be justified.

Thus at both ends of the genealogy depicted in table 4, our figure of 16 years per generation seems about right. There is therefore no justifiable reason for adopting an alternative number at any point between the extremes we have discussed.

The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn from table 4 is that the length of the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty as represented in the traditional history is excessive and needs to be reduced by around 65 years. And the table itself suggests the means whereby this reduction should be made. It is clear from even a casual glance at the Berlin chronology that a drastic shortening of the reign of Thutmose III is demanded, and a modest reduction in the combined reign lengths of Thutmose's three predecessors is strongly suggested. The latter can be accomplished in part by allowing only a year or two for the reign of Thutmose I.

The reader will recall from our discussion in *Piankhi the Chameleon* that the mummified remains of Thutmose I and Thutmose III do not support the excessively high number of regnal years assigned them by the monuments which bear their names. The Berlin chronology adds support to our earlier argument that the monuments bearing the names of these two kings, those which support the inflated regnal numbers assigned them in the traditional history, belong instead to 7<sup>th</sup> century namesakes. In table 4 the two generations which precede Menkheperre Thutmose must accommodate the reigns of three kings - Thutmose I, Thutmose II and Hatshepsut. Gardiner credits Thutmose II with 18 years and Hatshepsut with 20. As is, these two reigns more than fill the time allotted to them on our assumption of 16 years per generation. If there existed no co-regency between Thutmose II and Hatshepsut then their reigns must necessarily intrude slightly into the time slots assigned to Amenhotep II and Thutmose III, leaving little if any room for Thutmose I. The reign of Thutmose I must indeed have been brief, as his mummy suggests. We should credit him with perhaps a year or two of independent rule at most. Monuments which suggest otherwise must belong to someone other than the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty king. Either that, or a lengthy coregency with his father and/or with his son must be assumed.

We note also from our table that the generation following the mention of Menkheperre Thutmose must encompass the reigns of Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV, assigned 23 and 8 years respectively by the traditional history. Once again they must intrude on the time slots of Menkheperre who precedes them and Amenhotep III who follows. If our reasoning is correct, the reign of Menkheperre cannot have been even a generation (16 years) in length. If so, there can be no denying the reasonableness of our earlier conclusions regarding the Annals which bear his name. Those Annals must belong to someone else. Under no circumstances can a 54 year long reign for this king be squared with the data on the Berlin stele, regardless of how many years we assign to a generation of priests!

### *The Amarna Age*

The Berlin chronology presented in table 4 tells us that Amenhotep III was ruling Egypt minimally from 949-933 B.C. plus some undetermined years at either end of that span. Since the monuments clearly assign a minimum of 37 years to this king we are compelled to add an additional twenty-one years. And since, according to our table, Ay was on the throne in the year 917 B.C., we are compelled also to assign most of those years to the upper end of the span of years, leaving as much space as possible at the lower end (between Amenhotep III and Ay) in which to insert the reigns of Amenhotep IV (17 years), Smenkhkare (3 years) and Tutankhamun (9 years). Tentatively we assign to Amenhotep III the years 966-928 B.C. Even at that the genealogy all but demands that we assume a lengthy period of coregency between Amenhotep III and his son Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten), a possibility much discussed and disputed in the literature. For the time being we assign to Akhenaten the years 940-923 B.C. The genealogy further suggests that the years of Smenkhkare must have overlapped the reign of Tutankhamon, another subject much debated. We cannot be far wrong in assigning to Tutankhamon a brief 5 year reign in the approximate time frame 923-918 B.C., his remaining 4 years overlapping the reign of Ay who usurped the throne, and to whom we assign the years 918-914 B.C. Only by assuming these co-regencies

can we possibly accommodate the reigns of the three kings in the time available between Amenhotep III and Ay.<sup>10</sup>

Table 5: Tentative Dates for the Late 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty Kings  
(based on the Berlin Stele genealogy)

Name	Regnal Years
Amenhotep III	966-928
Amenhotep IV (Akhenaton)	940-923
Smenkhkare	923-920
Tutankhamun	923-914
Ay	918-914
Horemheb	

Before proceeding we should acknowledge one last time that the suggested absolute chronology for the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty kings which results from the Berlin genealogy can only be considered an approximation. The "iffy" nature of the assumptions which undergirded our reasoning and the vexed questions regarding co-regencies, suggest the need for caution regarding the conclusions that we now draw from an examination of that chronology. In the final analysis it will be the ends that justify our means. The Berlin genealogy as interpreted above clearly places the Amarna age, which ranges from the terminal years of Amenhotep III through the reigns of Akhenaten and Tutankhamon, near the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C., somewhere in the time frame 930-910 B.C., and perhaps a few years beyond. It is incumbent on us to show the reasonableness of those dates, thus vindicating our methodology.

### The Jewish Background of the Amarna Letters

If Amenhotep III ruled Egypt in the time frame 966-928 B.C., then it must be the case that he ruled as a contemporary of the Israelite king Solomon (970-930 B.C.) and briefly into the reigns of Solomon's son and

---

<sup>10</sup>It is important to note that these coregencies must be assumed even if the generation figure were increased by five or six years.

successor Rehoboam (930-913 B.C.), and Rehoboam's northern rival and antagonist, Jeroboam I (930-908 B.C.). It must also be true that Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten) (940-923 B.C.) began joint rule with his father late in the reign of Solomon, succeeded his father early in the reign of Rehoboam, and ruled as a contemporary of Rehoboam (and Jeroboam) for much of his life. We cannot be more specific than this. There are simply too many variables, including the Jewish chronology which is followed here.

Fortunately this "Berlin chronology" places the Amarna age squarely within the kingdom age of Israel, more specifically, at the beginning of the divided kingdom period (930-722 B.C.). It should be possible therefore to confirm its accuracy by comparison with the political history of Israel as revealed in the Hebrew Bible.

According to Jewish historians, Jeroboam dispossessed Rehoboam as the leader of the northern Palestinian tribal groups immediately following the death of Solomon, an action which began the prolonged period of the divided monarchy. Earlier Jeroboam had had a falling out with Solomon and had fled to Egypt to seek the protection of an Egyptian pharaoh named Shishak. While there, according to one late source, he married a sister of Shishak's wife.<sup>11</sup> When Solomon died Jeroboam returned to Israel and almost immediately led a coalition of northern Israelite tribes in rebellion against Rehoboam, establishing a rival kingdom. It follows that Egypt, whom we assume supported Jeroboam's rebellion, thereby established dominance in the region, receiving tribute from Jeroboam and the other tribal leaders, while Rehoboam for a time maintained the independence of the southern tribes. This temporary independence was brought to an end four to five years later (925 B.C.) when Shishak, for reasons unknown, attacked Rehoboam, overthrew Jerusalem, and pillaged the treasury of the Jerusalem temple (1 Kings 14:25,26). While Rehoboam remained as titular head of the southern tribal region until his death twelve years later, we assume that Egypt maintained a military presence in the Jerusalem area, and perhaps as well imposed

---

<sup>11</sup>This late midrash added to the biblical text is found in the Septuagint version of 1 Kings 12:24. The text of the Sepuagint begins by following the Massoretic Hebrew text, then diverges into a lengthy narrative describing the exploits of Jeroboam, then returns to follow the Hebrew Bible in 1 Kings 12:25.



secondary political control. Thus by the year 925 B.C. we find in Palestine a quite distinctive political situation. The overriding authority is clearly that of Egypt, with whom Jereboam is aligned, possibly by marriage and certainly by sentiment, and under whom Rehoboam served as a reluctant vassal. The land was partitioned into two distinct tribal regions with an east-west boundary line roughly located along the Jezreel valley. For the next fifteen years Jeroboam and Rehoboam clashed ideologically, and at times militarily, as each attempted to unseat the other. The Jewish historians are silent regarding the role of Egypt. Its presence is assumed, but not defined. Two identifications follow directly from this chronology.

In the first place we are compelled to identify pharaoh Shishak with either Amenhotep III or Akhenaton, who ruled jointly during the years immediately preceding the death of Solomon and alone qualify as candidates for the pharaoh who befriended Jeroboam. If we had complete confidence in the regnal dates assigned earlier we should rule out Amenhotep III, whose death in 927 B.C. preceded Shishak's attack on Jerusalem by several years. But those dates remain open to question, as do the precise absolute dates for Rehoboam's reign. We should therefore maintain the viability of both possibilities.

Secondly, the biblical figure Zerah the Cushite who clashed with Rehoboam's grandson Asa around the year 900 B.C. (2 Chron. 14:9-13) must be Horemheb, who succeeded Ay around 914 B.C. and ruled Egypt for 27 years.

We will spend no time defending these identifications. As did Velikovsky fifty years ago, we base our assumptions solely on chronological synchronisms supported on other grounds, leaving defense of this aspect of our thesis to others, or to ourselves at a later date. Sufficient here to note that in the Amarna correspondence from Palestine the pharaoh is never addressed by his cartouche names, rather by some honorific epithet that alludes to his splendour, usually Shimshi, "my Sun". An original alteration of Shimshi to Shimshak "your Sun" (hence over time to Shishaq) may have been a deliberate circumlocution on the part of scribes who passed on the Jeroboam story through the ages until its final post-exilic editing four hundred years after the fact. The fact that the "mem" elided

over time and that terminal "qoph" replaced the "kaph" cannot be considered a strong objection. In the transmission of names it was the sound that was of paramount concern. As for Zerah, we can only surmise a guess that the initial part of the throne name **Hera**-em-heb was the possible source of the biblical phoneme, though we have no explanation for the alteration of "h" to "z". The fact that Zerah is not identified as a pharaoh is consistent with the non-regal status of Horemheb early in his career. He began as a commander of the army under Tutankhamon and Ay. Precisely when he assumed pharaonic status is not known for certain, and ambiguity regarding his rank may explain the lack of title accorded him by the Jewish historians.

There remains for us to summarize the Amarna letters from Palestine and compare the situation therein revealed with the emerging divided monarchy described in the Jewish historical books.

### The Amarna Correspondence

It is most fortunate for our argument that the "Berlin chronology" places the Amarna correspondence in the time frame 930-910 B.C. In that correspondence we find multiple references to the city of Jerusalem, the name assigned to the southern capital by king David, the father of Solomon. The beginning of the reign of David, approximately 1010 B.C. in the Jewish chronology we are following here, thus acts as a *terminus a quo* for the Amarna letters. On the other hand Shechem, the most prominent city of the northern kingdom in the Amarna letters, yielded its dominance in time to Samaria, a city founded by king Omri, a near descendent of Jeroboam, around the year 885 B.C. The fact that Shechem remains dominant in the letters, while Samaria is never mentioned in spite of a prolific correspondence from cities in the same geographical area, implies that the reign of Omri lies yet in the future, providing a *terminus ad quem* for the Amarna correspondence.

But not all dates between 1010 B.C. and 885 B.C. would be appropriate contexts for the Amarna letters. That correspondence, as we will soon see, clearly represents Egypt as the dominant power in the Levant, sovereign over the entire eastern coast of the Mediterranean, from the Philistine

cities on the southern coastal plain to Simyra and Biblos on the northern coast, and inland as far as Kadesh on the Orontes. Though its sovereignty is being threatened in the north by the emerging power of the Hittite and Mitannian kingdoms, and by internal feuds wherein at least one powerful family threatens to usurp the authority of the semi-autonomous city nomarchs, Egypt continues to rule the Levant throughout the brief duration of the Amarna correspondence. This situation could clearly not arise during the reigns of kings David and Solomon, whose kingdoms controlled not only the Phoenician coastline, but the Syrian hinterland as far as the Euphrates.<sup>12</sup> The Amarna letters must postdate the reigns of both David and Solomon. They must date therefore between the years 930 B.C. and 885 B.C., the onset of the reign of Omri. And even these limits should be further narrowed. In the tenth year of Asa, who succeeded Jeroboam after the brief tenure of Abijam (Jeroboam's son), thus roughly 900 B.C., Egypt's sovereignty over the Levant was abruptly terminated, when Asa defeated and expelled the Egyptian army led by Zerah. The Amarna letters must date therefore in the thirty year interval from 930-900 B.C. No earlier or later date would be acceptable. Is it mere chance that the Berlin chronology positions the Amarna age precisely in this narrow temporal window of opportunity? Let the reader decide.

The question remains how precisely the data from the Amarna letters fits the known circumstances of the initial decades of the divided monarchy?

### *The Rebel Labaya*

When Velikovsky discussed the Amarna correspondence in his *Ages In Chaos*, and attempted to compare the data contained therein with the historical situation which prevailed during the time of Ahab the son of Omri in the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, he made two serious mistakes. In the first place he read the letters emanating from Sumura, a coastal town near Gubla (Biblos) on the northern shore of the Mediterranean, as if the

---

<sup>12</sup>As for Solomon we are told that "he ruled over all the kingdoms west of the River (i.e. the Euphrates), from Tiphshah to Gaza, and had peace on all sides. During Solomon's lifetime Judah and Israel, from Dan to Beersheba, lived in safety, each man under his own vine and fig tree." 1 Kings 4:24,25.

name referred to Samaria, the inland capital of the northern kingdom of Israel founded by Omri. Sumura in the letters is clearly the Phoenician port city of Simyra, located hundreds of miles to the north. But a more serious error, this time of omission rather than commission, was his failure to discuss the activity of the most prominent character in the southern correspondence - the rebel Labaya. One is hard pressed to find a reference to this individual in the whole of Velikovsky's work<sup>13</sup>, rather surprising, since Labaya figures directly or indirectly in almost every letter. We need to set forth the details relating to this intriguing character, comparing them at every turn with the life and times of Jeroboam, son of Nabat. We state our intention at the outset, namely, to demonstrate that Labaya and Jeroboam are one and the same person. If not, we are seriously mistaken in our temporal placement of the Amarna correspondence.

## Political Background

We have already noted the involvement of Egypt in the split that emerged between the northern and southern Israelite tribes at the time of Solomon's death. Though not discussed in the Jewish historical literature, where the activities of Jeroboam and Rehoboam are summarized in a few succinct paragraphs, the dominance of Egypt in the region is nevertheless understood, particularly in the aftermath of Shishak's conquest of Jerusalem. The Amarna letters provide us a glimpse into this political background as it existed sometime late in the "reign" of Jeroboam. In order to understand much of the discussion that follows the reader needs to be informed concerning the broad details of this backdrop. Sufficient here to quote the words of the late William Albright, one of the world's most renowned experts on the Amarna documents, in his *Cambridge Ancient History* article on the subject:

*As far as practicable the Egyptians had left the local princely houses in control of their own territories, but under the close supervision of Egyptian agents whom*

---

<sup>13</sup>Discussion of Labaya's activity is restricted to a single footnote of page 282 (note 3). Velikovsky views the activity of Labaya as a preliminary phase of the revolt of the town of Libnah which took place following the death of Jehosaphat (2 Chron. 21:10) But Libnah is not mentioned in the Amarna literature and Labaya's actions and influence are far more expansive than suggested by Velikovsky.

we may conveniently designate as 'commissioner' (Akkadian *rabisu*, Canaanite *šokinu*, Hebrew *šoken*) and "envoy" (Egyptian *upitu* [wpwty]). These agents were generally Egyptians, but they were not infrequently Canaanites of Semitic stock, as in the case of Iankhamu and Addayu. Sometimes native princes played an important role in Egyptian administration, as in the case of Iapa-Adda, who was probably prince of Tyre, or Piryawaza, prince of the Damascus region. The chief centers of Egyptian administration in Palestine were Gaza and Joppa on the coast; Gaza is mentioned several times as the residence of an Egyptian commissioner in one letter, and it appears already in that role in an earlier letter from Ta'anach. (CAH 2<sup>nd</sup> II part 2 p. 102) (italics added)

This scenario fits reasonably well the assumed political situation that prevailed in the days of Jeroboam and Rehoboam. From the point of view of the Hebrew Bible these two princes were fully in control of their own territory. Nothing is said about their subservience to a higher authority, a matter of little concern to the Jewish scribes, as elsewhere in the historical literature. The Amarna letters merely augment our understanding of the situation.

While Egypt discouraged rivalry between the local princes, it is clear in the Amarna letters that this rivalry did exist, at times erupting into armed conflict. And in the Palestine area the hostility was between the cities controlled by and loyal to an individual named Labaya, and cities loyal to Jerusalem. Clearly this is a subject of great interest to our thesis. The Hebrew Bible omits the details of the Jeroboam/Rehoboam rivalry, providing only a summary statement. A single paragraph describes the invasion of Shishak in Rehoboam's fifth year. The next paragraph describes Rehoboam's death.

As for the other events of Rehoboam's reign, and all he did, are they not written in the book of the annals of the kings of Judah? *There was continual warfare between Rehoboam and Jeroboam.* And Rehoboam rested with his fathers and was buried with them in the City of David... And Abijah his son succeeded him as king. 1 Kings 14:29-31. (italics added)

For details of the warfare we must read the Amarna letters.

## Geographical Background

Mid-way through his reign, perhaps sensing the possibility of internal revolt or attack from without, Solomon set about fortifying several key cities in the country, including Jerusalem.

Here is the account of the forced labor King Solomon conscripted to build the LORD's temple, his own palace, the supporting terraces, the wall of Jerusalem, and *Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer*. Pharaoh king of Egypt had attacked and captured Gezer. He had set it on fire. He killed its Canaanite inhabitants and then gave it as a wedding gift to his daughter, Solomon's wife. And Solomon rebuilt Gezer.) 1 Kings 9:15-17 [italics added]

From this and other texts we see that in addition to Jerusalem Solomon selected three cities in which to house the chariots and horses used by his standing army - Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer. All three are mentioned in the Amarna letters.

Hazor is located in the far north of Palestine, near lake Huleh. It belonged traditionally to the tribe of Naphtali, and in the division of the kingdom at Solomon's death its allegiance would be with Jeroboam. Either this or it remained unaligned. The two letters which emanate from Hazor are uninformative. The head man of the city, Abdi-Tirši<sup>14</sup>, used the opportunity to convey to the Egyptian king expressions of steadfast loyalty.

Megiddo, the coastal city at the western end of the Esdraelon valley, almost certainly remained part of Rehoboam's southern kingdom when Solomon died, though the Jewish historians are silent on the matter. Considering its strategic location it would have been a prime candidate for conquest by Jeroboam in the years of his warfare with Rehoboam. In

---

<sup>14</sup>Letter 227 is written by an unnamed king (šarum) of Hazor; letter 228 by one Abdi-Tirši, who identifies himself merely as the "man of Hazura" (amêl Hazura). Whether the two individuals are one and the same, what precisely is the meaning of amêl Hazura (Albright would undoubtedly translate "chief of Hazor", a meaning he gives to amêl (Akkadian awilum = "man") elsewhere, and what is the status/rank of a šarum (some translators consider him to be the equivalent of a "mayor") are all important questions, but of little consequence in the discussion at hand. All large towns had a local chief; the more important towns acted as the political center of groups of smaller towns; much as in many countries today. The chief of Hazor proudly declares: "I protect Hazura together with its cities [fo]r the king, my lord." It is a moot point whether or not Hazor lay within the area of influence of Labaya at this point in time.

the Amarna letters its "mayor" was a man named Biridia<sup>15</sup>, the author of at least six letters to the Egyptian king (nos. 242-246, 248a). Letters 244-246 complain incessantly about the threatening activity of Labaya. Letter 244 is typical:

To the king, my lord and my sun (shimshi), say.  
Thus saith Biridija, the faithful servant of the king:  
At the two feet of the king, my lord and my sun (shimshi),  
seven times and seven times I fall down.  
Let the king my lord know that since the archers have returned  
Labaja (Labaya) has made hostility against me.  
And we are unable to mow the plants (kaziga),  
and we are unable to go out of the gate because of Labaja,  
since he learned (this)  
[A]nd (still) thou hast n[o]t [giv]en archers.  
[A]nd, behold, he has, [ver]ily, directed [his] endeavour to take Magidda  
But verily, let the king rescue his city, in order that Labaja may not conquer it.  
(244:1-29) <sup>16</sup>

Biridia goes on to request that Egypt send one hundred garrison troops to save his city from conquest by Labaya, a request ignored judging from later correspondence.

Letter 245 suggests that an Egyptian governor did subsequently intervene and order Labaya (lit "took him and sent him") to return to his home, presumably the city of Shechem<sup>17</sup>, in spite of Biridia's plea that he be taken to Egypt. As we will observe in a moment, Labaya, though a constant threat to cities loyal to the pharaoh, was nevertheless dealt with leniently by the Egyptian king, and for reasons unknown accorded special treatment. If we are correct, and Labaya is indeed Jeroboam, a brother-in-law of the pharaoh, we understand why.

---

<sup>15</sup>The ending of this name should likely be interpreted as a hypocoristic form of the name of Yahweh, the god of Israel. As such the name means "Yahweh thunders/storms". The same should be said for Lab'aia (Labaya), a name which means "Yahweh is a lion". This notion that the Akkadian ending "ia" should be so interpreted is absent from the commentaries for understandable reasons. The Amarna correspondence is typically dated to the 15th century B.C., at a time preceding the arrival of Israel in Palestine. The presence of this attenuated name of Israel's god is just one more indication that the traditional history has misdated the Amarna correspondence.

<sup>16</sup>All quotations from the Amarna letters, unless otherwise stated, are taken from the two volume edition of *The Tell-El-Amarna Tablets* edited by Samuel A.B. Mercer (1939).

<sup>17</sup>The editors supply the interpretive note "The home of Labaia was probably Shechem (cf. 289:22)". We will have more to say on the home of Labaya momentarily.

Gezer is located on the eastern edge of the plain of Sharon, on the important road leading from Joppa (Iapu? in letter 138:6) to Jerusalem. As such it was fortified by Solomon as the last line of defense against an attack from the west. We naturally expect that Jeroboam would invest Gezer at or around the same time he was threatening Megiddo. In fact, he had already conquered the city. Three letters from Labaya to the pharaoh have been preserved in the Amarna archives - numbers 252-254. In all of them Labaya protests his innocence against accusations of insurrection, claims he has been misrepresented, and vows his loyalty to pharaoh. In two of them he acknowledges only one possible "crime". He has captured Gezer. We quote from letter 252 as representative.

[To the kin]g, [my lord a]nd my [sun] (shimshi).  
 Thus saith [L]abaja, thy [servan]t and the d[ust] [whereon thou] treadest:  
 [A]t the feet of the ki[n]g, my [lo]rd,  
 seven times and seven times I fall down.  
 [I h]ave heard the words [whi]ch the king, my lord, has [wr]itten to m[e] [u]pon a  
 tablet.  
 [Ve]ri[ly], I am a servant of the king [as m]y [fathe]r and [g]randfa[th]er, servants  
 of [th]e ki[n]g fo[r]me[r]ly were  
 And I [ have n]o[t] committed a crime nor have I sinned. This is my crime, an[d]  
 this is my [s]in that *I have entered Gazri*.  
 Thus I say: May the king be gracious to us. For, verily, now I have no other  
 intention than to serve the king  
 and to all that [the ki]ng [ha]s said I [ha]ve hearkened (253:1-31) [italics added]

The military siege of Megiddo and the capture of Gezer are entirely consistent with our thesis that Labaya and Jeroboam are the same person. But there are yet other indications that we are on the right track.

We have noted in passing the association of Labaya with the city of Shechem. Authorities on the Amarna documents are unanimous that this city was Labaya's home, based in part on a letter from a Jerusalem army commandant to the Egyptian pharaoh reporting the situation in Palestine.

Labaja and the land of Shakmi have given (all) to the Habiru (289:22-24)

Shechem, located about thirty miles north of Jerusalem, near Mt. Ephraim, was the capital of Jeroboam's northern kingdom from the beginning of its existence.



Then Jeroboam fortified Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim and lived there.  
From there he went up and built up Peniel. 1 Kings 12:25

The extent of Jeroboam's influence is not clearly spelt out in the Jewish literature, but since he set up shrines in Bethel and Dan, we can assume he "ruled over" territory from a line just north of Jerusalem to somewhere near lake Huleh. The fact that he "built up Peniel" tells us that his influence extended east of the Jordan to the region of Gilead. This is precisely the territory over which Labaya held sway. According to Albright:

By one means or another Labaya was able to extend his control from the Mediterranean to the hills of Gilead and from the plain of Esdraelon to the frontiers of Jerusalem. Milkilu of Gezer and Tagu of Gath in Sharon were more or less faithful allies of his, and he kept the princes of Megiddo and Jerusalem in a perpetual state of apprehension. A son of his (?), Mut-Ba'al, became chief of Pella on the eastern side of Jordan south of Beth-shan. (CAH 2<sup>nd</sup> II part 2 p. 116)

It is interesting that in the Jewish historical books and in the Amarna letters alike, the two rulers, Jeroboam and Labaya, were associated uniquely with two cities which might legitimately be called "theirs", while "controlling" a larger territory which contained numerous other cities. Thus Jeroboam is associated particularly with Shechem and Peniel. And Labaya, in an otherwise confusing passage in one of his letters, declares:

When I was hard pressed, on that very day *my two cities* were conquered (252:20-22) [italics added]

Geographically, the parallels between the rebel leaders Labaya and Jeroboam are nothing short of remarkable. This leaves us only to compare the two men on a personal level.

### Personal Background.

Jeroboam, we know, was a commoner, the son of an otherwise unknown Israelite named Nabat. Solomon, recognizing his potential, had elevated him to a position "in charge of the whole labor force of the house of Joseph" (1 Ki. 11:28) A falling out between the two led to Jeroboam's

flight to Egypt, a (possible) subsequent marriage to the pharaoh's sister-in-law, and to his eventual rebellion. The biblical literature glosses over the details of his personal life.

Jeroboam son of Nebat rebelled against the king. He was one of Solomon's officials, and Ephraimite from Zeredah, and his mother was a widow named Zeruah. 1 Ki. 11:26

That the two individuals, Jeroboam and Labaya, were both rebellious in nature goes without saying. In character they are strikingly similar. Both apparently had humble beginnings yet both exude a confidence/arrogance which suggests they were politically well connected. So Albright writes:

That the latter's (Labaya's) beginnings were insignificant also appears in one of the earliest letters from him to pharaoh ... The truculence of Labaya's tone in writing to the court contrasts oddly with the grovelling subservience of most Palestinian chieftains. (CAH 2<sup>nd</sup> II part 2 p. 115)

It is not only Labaya's untoward confidence vis-a-vis his Egyptian overlord, and the lenient treatment he is accorded, that suggest he is somehow related to the pharaoh. In one of his letters to the Egyptian king Labaya mentions that the king has enquired regarding the well being of either his son (Mercer), or his father-in-law (Albright).<sup>18</sup> In the same letter he makes a statement that translators construe as a declaration of absolute loyalty:

In case the king should write for my wife would I refuse her? (254:38-40)

---

<sup>18</sup>The Akkadian word which describes this person is particularly troublesome to transcribe. Mercer translates it "my son" and adds the following note which summarizes other opinion: " <sup>m</sup>DUMU.MU-ia (also line 33): an unparalleled personal name, Dumuya (Knutzton, Oppenheim, Seux), does not seem likely, and mi-mu-ia, "my father-in-law" (Albright, CAH 2/2, p. 115, n. 7), must be rejected on grounds of grammar (genitive expected in line 31) and especially paleography (the DUMU- and I-signs are quite distinct, and in both instances the sign in question is clearly the former). In view of <sup>m</sup>DUMU-a-ia at contemporary Taanach, most probably Binaya (Glutz, BASOR 204 (1971) p. 20), the same name may occur here. However, the apparent association of ideas - delivery of a son, readiness to deliver a wife - favors a common noun and a display of provincial learning: Sumerian DUMU.MU, "my son," plus Akkadian pronominal suffix." (*The Tell-El-Amarna Tablets*, p. 308 note 4) It should be noted that the interpretation of Knutzton and others to transcribe as a personal name "Dumuya" may not be essentially different than Mercer's opinion, since Dumuya in context is clearly a close relation of Labaya.

Admittedly this could be mere hyperbole, a gesture of absolute allegiance to the Egyptian king. But there may be a deeper meaning behind the words, a suggestion that pharaoh is acquainted with Labaya's wife and an acknowledgment that occasion might arise where she would be summoned (back) to Egypt. This would imply for her an Egyptian origin.

Taken at face value these political, geographical and personal parallels between Jeroboam and Labaya at minimum allow for the possibility that the two names relate to the same person. And considering that they have been placed independently in precisely the same historical time frame, one by a Jewish chronology generally accepted by scholars, the other by the Berlin genealogy chronology which has proved reliable in our earlier revisions, all but seals that conclusion. Only the difference in name seems problematic. If indeed there is a difference.

### Labaya's Name.

It is the opinion of most scholars that the name of Jeroboam means "the people ('am) are multiplied/great (yarab)", a rather unusual name to assign to a young child to say least. Albright, in an attempt to circumvent this criticism, broadened both the verbal and nominal aspects of the name and understood it to mean "the family is extended," but his argument is unconvincing.<sup>19</sup> Problems with this stream of interpretation caused many critical interpreters to take *'am* as a reference to an otherwise unknown pagan god and translate "(the god) 'am is great". The point of this discussion is simply to call in question whether this was indeed Jeroboam's true name.

The similarity (both in sound and in meaning) of the name Jeroboam to that of his southern counterpart Rehoboam, the latter name taken by some to be that king's throne name (cf. Albright in AASOR 21-22 (1943), 67 ) suggested to a few scholars that the name Jeroboam may have been adopted as a parody on the name of Rehoboam, what one commentator has called "a defiant alias" on the part of the rebel king.<sup>20</sup> If so then Jeroboam's birth name has been lost in the process.

---

<sup>19</sup>AJSL 38 (1922) 140ff.

<sup>20</sup>Montgomery, *The Book of Kings* ICC 248

A variant of the last hypothesis is the notion that the name of Rehoboam's rival has been supplied by scribes in the process of editing and transmitting the name over the centuries, until the final drafts of the books of *Kings* and *Chronicles* were composed during and immediately following the Exile. The fact that another king of identical name, Jeroboam II, ruled over Israel in that interim, suggests the possibility that the original name of Rehoboam's rival may have been assimilated to that of the later king in the process of transmission, a possibility all the more likely if the original name was vocally similar to that of the later king. The alteration may have been intentional.<sup>21</sup>

This preamble leads us to speculate on the three most reasonable explanations for the difference in name between Jeroboam and Labaya.

In the first place it is possible that the rebel "king" had several names, and that Labaya and Jeroboam are two among these. It is possible that one was Jeroboam's birth name and one a variation of a "throne name". Which is which is immaterial. This alternative name thesis is precisely what Velikovsky, in his *Ages in Chaos*, proposed to explain why biblical personal names do not appear in the Amarna literature.

The kings of Jerusalem, as well as the kings of Samaria and Damascus also had more than one name. Five different names for Solomon are preserved. King Hezekiah of Jerusalem had nine names. In view of this practice, there is only a limited chance of finding in the el-Amarna letters the names of the kings of Palestine as we know them from the Scriptures. (*Ages in Chaos*, p. 234)

Alternatively we could assume that Labaya, the original name (but see below), was altered somehow during the course of transmission, perhaps deliberately changed by scribes to mimic the name of his rival Rehoboam, perhaps intentionally or unintentionally assimilated to the name of the

---

<sup>21</sup>It has not gone unnoticed that the only two sons of Jeroboam mentioned in the biblical text, Nadab and Abijah have names similar to the two sons of the patriarch Aaron (Nadab and Abihu). At least a dozen other parallels between Aaron and Jeroboam I, including their worship of a "golden calf" idol, exist in the Hebrew Bible. Cf. Moses Aberbach and Leivy Smolar, "Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves," *JBL* 86 (1967) 127-140. These close parallels suggests to some scholars that scribes have altered the Jeroboam story in at least minor ways in order to draw attention to the similarity between the idolatry of these two important biblical figures. If so then the likelihood of some comparison between the idolatrous 2<sup>nd</sup> Jeroboam and the idolatrous founder of the northern "kingdom" is also possible.

later Jeroboam, so that in time Labaya became Jeroboam in biblical literature. This is particularly likely because the names, as they now stand, bear a distinct resemblance to one another.

This resemblance, yet to be explained, suggests yet a third possibility, somewhat disguised by the form taken by the two names in transliterations of those names in English translation. The two names properly transliterated may actually be variant orthographic forms of a single name. A word of explanation is clearly in order.

It is the unanimous opinion of translators and commentators of the Amarna texts that the name of Labaya is derived from lb' (lamed, beth, aleph or lamed, beth, yod) the Semitic word for "lion". But the letters which denote this name were written in cuneiform Akkadian, leaving the transliteration less than clear and the original pronunciation of the name even more uncertain. As it stands, if the spelling lb' is correct and if the suffix "ia" is a reference to the Jewish god Yahweh, then the name means something like "Yahweh is a lion". [If "ia" refers to some other Semitic phonetic element then some other word play on "lion" is intended, though it is not clear precisely what that would be.]

But this interpretation is not so certain as we are led to believe by the unanimity among scholars. The Akkadian writing of the name in the Amarna documents typically consists of four cuneiform characters, la-ab-a-ia. It is assumed by scholars that none of these elements is written ideographically.<sup>22</sup> It is further assumed that the third consonant in the name, if indeed there is one, is either an aleph or a yod. That there was a phonetic element following the "b" seems to be indicated in the writing by the presence of an "a", which leaves open the possibility that it represent only a vowel sound, or the vowel indicator "he", or even the guttural 'ayin, rather than an 'aleph. This leaves the interpretation of the name an open question. We cannot even say for sure whether the suffixed element "ia" was actually sounded *at the end* of the name. If it refers to the divine name Yahweh, as we suspect, the possibility remains that it

---

<sup>22</sup>It is possible that the phoneme "la" represents the ideograph "LA " which means "abundance, plentitude" and that the signs following represent a verbal element or nominal complement which contribute to the meaning of the name. We recall that the name of Jeroboam is conjectured to mean "the people are abundant, many".

might have been sounded initially. At least once in the Amarna correspondence the name of Milkilu ("the god (ilu) is king (melek)") is written in reverse order (Ilumelek), leaving open the question how this name was actually pronounced. Thus Lab'aya might be a written representation of Yalaba' without regard to the meaning of the name. Labaya's Egyptian overlords would pronounce the name Yaraba' (Jeraba'), there being no "l" sound (or phoneme) in the Egyptian syllabary. Assuming the biblical spelling is the end result of a lengthy oral tradition, we can see how the name Jeroboam might arise. The names are practically identical.

We have encountered this type of problem before. In the first book of our series we discussed how the name of an Egyptian rebel, likely named Terek, became Tarku in Akkadian texts, Tirhakah in the biblical texts and has come to be transcribed Takeloth or Takeroth by Egyptologists. Names are fluid. In the course of time they change, usually maintaining key consonantal elements, but at times mutating with the addition of superfluous and at times meaningless glide elements.

Regardless of which explanation ultimately holds for the name of the rebel Labaya, we are confident in the identification we have made. But we anticipate at least one critical objection to our thesis. We have discussed the presence of Jeroboam in the Amarna texts. But what about Rehoboam?

### *Rehoboam.*

The Amarna archives contain at least six lengthy letters (nos. 285-90) forthcoming from Jerusalem, all written by a single individual named Abdi-Hiba, and all complaining about the aggression of Labaya, though not always naming the aggressor. In his letters Abdi-Hiba laments that "the lands of the king, my lord, are lost" (286:22,23) and that "Ilimilku has devastated the whole land of the king" (286:36,37). Ilimilku, the editors note, "is to be identified with Milkilu" the author of several letters to the king and an ally of Labaya, apparently installed as "mayor" of Gezer after its conquest by the latter. Abdi-Hiba complains that further losses are imminent. He asks for military assistance.

"The lands of the king are going to ruin." (But) you do not listen to me.  
All regents are lost; there remains not a regent to the king, the lord.  
Let the king turn his attention to the archers  
so that archers of the king, my lord, will go forth.  
No lands of the king remain.  
The Habiru plunder all lands of the king. (286:49-56)

In letter 289 he is more specific on the origins of the threat. The Philistine towns around Gezer are assisting the rebels.

Verily, the land of [G]azri, the land of Asqaluna, and the city of of Lakisi  
have given them food, oil and all (their) needs (mâhziramu)  
So, let the king provide archers.  
Let him send archers against the people who commit evil against the king, my  
lord...  
Verily this is the deed of Milkili and the deed of Labaja  
which have given the land of the king to the Habiru . (289:14-19)

It is assumed by all commentators on the Amarna letters that Abdi-Hiba writes these letters in his capacity as the king of Jerusalem. If so then he must be Rehoboam and we are confronted with the identical problem we had with Labaya, namely, the difference of name. Assuming that the scholars are correct we can do no better than quote Velikovsky's opinion on the matter, in defense of his theory that Abdi-Hiba is another name for Jehoshaphat, king of Judah during the reign of Ahab. At minimum these comments contribute to our discussion regarding the variant names of Labaya/Jeroboam.

The name of the king of Jerusalem of the el-Amarna letters is read Abdi-Hiba. However, the same characters, if regarded as ideographic, permit another reading; at first it was proposed to read it Ebed-Tov ("The Good Servant" in Hebrew), and then Puti-Hiba; others read it Aradhepa or Arthahepa. From this fact we see that names written in cuneiform may be read in many ways, and the reading Abdi-Hiba is only one surmise among a number of others. It would appear that the original reading Ebed-Tov is preferable. (*Ages In Chaos*, pp. 235-236)

Velikovsky goes on to suggest that this laudatory epithet "The Good Servant" may have been another of the names of Jehoshaphat. The argument, regardless of its strength, may well be applied to Rehoboam, the name "good servant" arising in order to contrast his behavior with that

of his evil northern counterpart. Having said that, we proceed to argue otherwise.

In our opinion Abdi-Hiba is not Rehoboam, the king of Jerusalem. These letters certainly date years after the conquest of Jerusalem by Shishak. Rehoboam remained king in the aftermath of that devastating defeat, but we assume that an Egyptian garrison was left behind to administer Egyptian interests in the area. Abdi-Hiba in these letters is clearly an agent acting on behalf of the Egyptian pharaoh, commissioned to receive and transmit tribute from Rehoboam to the Egyptian treasury. Rehoboam remains in the background and apparently has authored no letters, at least none that are extant. We are not guessing. Abdi-Hiba clearly articulates his position.

Verily, I am not a regent;  
I am an officer of the king, my lord.  
Behold, I am a shepherd of the king,  
and one who bears tribute of the king (288:9-12)

All of these references to “king” appear to refer to the Egyptian pharaoh. Nowhere in the letters does Abdi-Hiba refer to himself as king of Jerusalem.

Let the king listen to Abdi-Hiba, thy servant, and send archers  
that they may again restore the land of the king to the king. (289:19-21)

In other contexts Abdi-Hiba speaks of his appointment to office at the initiative of the pharaoh, and makes it clear that his is not an inherited office, passed down from generation to generation as was the case with "kingship" in Israel.

Neither my father nor my mother, (but) the mighty hand of the king  
[has] se[t me] in the house [of my father] (288:13-15)  
[Ve]rily, this land of Urusalim, neither my father nor m[y] mother has given (it)  
to me; the [mi]ghty hand [of the king] gave (it) to me. (287:25-28)

The phrase "of my father" is added by the editors to the quote from letter 288. It almost certainly was not the original wording in the elided portion of text, which may well have referred to Rehoboam by name.



## Addendum

At minimum the preceding discussion allows the possibility that our theory regarding the Berlin genealogy chronology is correct. If we are wrong then even the staunchest critic of our revision must admit that we have been most fortunate. The Berlin chronology for the late 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty was nothing more than an extrapolation of the genealogy already applied successfully to the 7<sup>th</sup> century revisions of our earlier book and to the 8<sup>th</sup> century revisions proposed in the first chapter of the present book. This extension compelled us to place the Amarna correspondence roughly in the time frame 930-910 B.C., the time of the division of the Israelite kingdom. We had no choice in the matter.

Consequently, had we not already read the Amarna letters from the Palestine region, we would have expected to find in them reference to a rebel king, residing in Shechem and in control of the entire region north of that city, ranging from the Mediterranean to the trans-Jordan. We would have expected that he would be in conflict with Megiddo and Gezer and Jerusalem, the cities in the southern region fortified by Solomon several decades earlier and now held by Rehoboam. We would have anticipated that Egypt, the former sanctuary of the rebel king, and more recently the conqueror of Jerusalem, would have an established presence in the area. And we could have predicted that Egypt would be siding with the rebel king, considering his previous liason with the Egyptian court, even if we discounted the midrash contained in the Septuagint regarding a marriage between him and pharaoh's sister-in-law. We would have demanded that the city of Rehoboam be named Jerusalem and that ethnic references to the rebels, if any were given, would allude to them as Hebrews (Habiru). There is nothing in the Jewish historical books describing the actions of Jeroboam and Rehoboam that conflicts with the data in the Amarna letters, in spite of the fact that many dozens of letters are forthcoming from the region of Palestine. The reader can believe, if he/she so chooses, that this is merely a fortunate coincidence. Or he can accept the ever increasing volume of data, by now filling well over 700 pages of closely reasoned text in two books and the beginning of a third, arguing for the accuracy of our revised chronology.