

# ANNOTATIONS (A) TO TABLE XXVI

## EGYPTIAN SYNCHRONISMS WITH KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

### THE INVASION OF SHISHAK:

Comparison of the chronological statements of Tables XXIV and XXV with Annotations (C) to Table XXVIII shows that Solomon was the contemporary of Sa-Amen and later of Pa-Seb-Khanu II of the XXI<sup>st</sup> Egyptian Dynasty at Tanis (Table XXIV). I Kings, iii, 1, states that Solomon at the beginning of his reign married the daughter of the Egyptian king. The Egyptian king referred to can have been no other than Sa-Amen. Solomon began to build the Temple at the beginning of his 4th year = 2992.5 A.K. (I Kings, vi, i, and Annotations (C) to Table XXVIII). He completed the Temple at 2999.5 A.K. (I Kings, vi, 38) and completed his own house at 3012.5 A.K. (I Kings, vii, i; ix, i, 10). Some time before the latter date the Egyptian king (obviously Sa-Amen) had captured Gezer, had burnt it and presented its site to his daughter, Solomon's wife (I Kings, ix, 16). Solomon rebuilt the city as part of his scheme of operations in storing materials and housing workmen and soldiers, and in organising communications during the building of the Temple (I Kings, xi, 15-25). The date of the destruction of Gezer by Sa-Amen lies between 2992.5 and 2999.5 A.K., and obviously about 2994 A.K., to accord with the sequence of operations.

When, therefore, towards the end of Solomon's reign, Jeroboam fled from Solomon, he did not risk seeking sanctuary at the Court of the Tanites, who were allied to Solomon. Jeroboam fled to the Court of a new Dynasty at Bubastis, founded by Sheshanq I (Table XXIV). This occurred not long before the death of Solomon and before Sheshanq (the Shishak of I Kings, xi, 40) was king of All Egypt. For this Sheshanq, originally a powerful chief of Libyan mercenaries under the XXI<sup>st</sup> (Tanitic) Dynasty—and descended from a long line of Libyan chiefs who had settled at Heracleopolis early in the XXI<sup>st</sup> Dynasty—became an independent king in the Delta, by seizing Bubastis, before he actually became king of all Egypt in 967 B.C. (refer Breasted Records, IV, 788, and footnote c; also his "Hist. Egypt," p. 527). A careful examination of all the historical facts will be found to show that the death of Solomon, the return of Jeroboam, and the resulting division of his hitherto powerful kingdom were all factors that formulated the schemes and decided the actions of Sheshanq I in seizing the throne of all Egypt. This is confirmed by the chronology relating to Sheshanq I, which chronology has been established entirely from astronomical data and altogether independently of the data now under consideration.

For, as the reader will observe, Sheshanq, having awaited the result of Jeroboam's bid for the kingship over the 10 tribes of Israel, and probably having awaited the death of the Tanite king, invaded Judah (I Kings, xiv, 25, 26; II Chron., xii, 2) in the 5<sup>th</sup> year of Rehoboam. From Table XXV, the 5<sup>th</sup> year of Rehoboam began at 3033.5 A.K. and from Table XXIV, the reign of Sheshanq I, as king of All Egypt began at 3033 A.K. These two independently established datings confirm the above conclusion relating to the sequence of motives and actions. It is clear that Sheshanq I took advantage of the dissension in the Empire established by Solomon, by taking the kingship of All Egypt from the Tanite Dynasty that had favoured Solomon, and that he immediately hastened to establish his right to the throne by attacking Solomon's son, Rehoboam.

Sheshanq I records his invasion in work belonging to his 1st year and claims to have invaded Israel also. From the date of Sheshanq's work, authorities have inferred that his invasion of Judah was not many years before his 2nd year. The astronomical chronology, however, fixes the facts as above.

It is interesting to read what Dr. H. R. Hall states ("Anc. Hist. Near East," p. 439). "Here again we see that the Egyptian did not strike till he could be fairly sure of victory. Solomon had been too powerful for any attack to be made upon him: but no sooner was he dead, and the tyranny, weakness, and unpopularity of Rehoboam made manifest, than the plans of the Pharaoh who had taken Gaza were resumed by his Bubastite successor." The reference to Gaza here does not relate to a previous expedition against Judah or Israel. The statement refers to Dr. Hall's theory as to Gaza having been captured from the Philistines by Solomon's Egyptian contemporary.

note :—The reader will observe, from the examples cited on this sheet of Annotations, that the Books of Kings and Chronicles, having been originally written up at the end of a king's reign, mention contemporaneous rulers as kings, even when dealing with events preceding their accession to sole rule.

### ZERAH THE "ETHIOPIA" INVADES JUDAH:

The invasion of Zerah, the "Ethiopian" (mentioned in II Chron., xiv, 9-15) happened after the first 10 years of Asa (xiv, i) and before the 15<sup>th</sup> year of Asa (xv, 10) i.e., between 3059.5 A.K. and 3064.5 A.K. (by Table XXV). This synchronises with the reign of Uasarkon I, 3054 to 3083 A.K. (Table XXIV). The account in II Chron., states that the invading army consisted of Libyans and Ethiopians (xvi, 8). Petrie reasonably concludes that Zerah is Uasarkon I. Uasarkon I, however, was of Libyan extraction. This would account for the Libyans in the invading army, but not for Uasarkon I being described as "Zerah, the Ethiopian." The connection is to be explained by the recently discovered fact that the "Ethiopian kings (of the later XX V<sup>th</sup> Dynasty and their Predecessor Piankhi I) were themselves of Libyan Descent" (Peet, "Egypt and O. T." p. 169). Zerah was therefore, in all probability, a Libyan ruler of Ethiopia (and vassal or ally of Uasarkon I) acting for Uasarkon, the Libyan king of Egypt as leader of the combined army of Sudani mercenaries and Libyans. This better explains the facts, for as Peet states, "it is absolutely impossible to get Zerah out of Osorkon (Uasarkon)." (p. 164.) It is to be observed that the narrative in II Chron. neither terms Zerah "king of Ethiopia," nor "king of Egypt" — merely "the Ethiopian."

### So, "King of Egypt" and Hoshea:

During the reign of Shalmaneser (Table XX) 726 to 721 B.C.= 3273.5 to 3278.5 A.K., Hoshea of Israel became vassal of Assyria but conspired with So, king of Egypt (Annotations (C)). Now Sabaka, the Ethiopian noble (of Libyan extraction as above) was commander-in-chief (Petrie, "Egypt and Israel," p. 76) during the reign of Kashta (Table XXIV), and later became king of Egypt. "So," the contemporary of Hoshea and Shalmaneser, therefore, belongs to the period when Sabaka was commander-in-chief of Kashta or Piankhi. From this, Petrie, Hall, and the majority of archaeological authorities now conclude that So, or Seve, is Sabaka, prior to his being king. Petrie states that, as Beth sheba is also Beth shua in Hebrew, Shaba(ka) or Saba(ka) is Shua(ka) or abbreviated Shua or Sua in Hebrew — "So" being merely the rendering to the Authorized Version for "Sua."

Peet, on the other hand, gives what appear to be equally good reasons for concluding that So or Sua was "one of those numerous petty dynasties who ruled in the Egyptian Delta during the years which elapsed between Piankhi's Conquest of Egypt and Shabaka's establishing himself on the Egyptian throne." ("Egypt and O. T." p. 173.)

### TAHARQA, VICEROY IN 14<sup>TH</sup> YEAR OF HEZEKIAH.

This identity follows from II Kings, xviii, 13; xix, 8 and 9, and Annotations (C), and agrees with Taharqa's own p. 296.) Now Taharqa was the younger brother Sabaka and the uncle of Sabataka, and since Sabaka had been viceroy and commander-in-chief under Kashta and previously under Piankhi I (Table XXIV) we see, clearly enough, that these relations, and the age of Taharqa at the beginning of his coregency, fit the narrative of II Kings, xviii, 13; xix, 8 and 9, already confirmed by the identities of Annotations (C).

### JOIAH SLAIN IN ACTION AGAINST NEKAU II:

II Kings, xxiii, 29-35; II Chron., xxxv, 20-24. Nekaou II became king at 3390.5 A.K.= 609 B.C. (Table XXIV), in the 15<sup>th</sup> (2nd reckoning) year of Nabopolassar (Table XXI), and therefore a year after the fall of Nineveh, according to the recently deciphered inscription of Nabopolassar. 4 years later, at the beginning of Nekaou's 5<sup>th</sup> and Nabopolassar's 18<sup>th</sup> year, 3393.5 A.K.= 606 B.C., we find Nekaou II,— obviously anticipating the rise of Babylon,—endeavouring to capture Carchemish from the weakened Assyrian Empire. The later compiled "Annals" of Nabopolassar represent this and similar Egyptian efforts as having been projected to assist Assyria. But this interpretation is unlikely in view of the fact that Psamtek I had but lately thrown off the Assyrian yoke. Nekaou II, at 3393.5 A.K., was clearly seizing what he deemed to be a strategical advantage in the hopes of being able to restore the boundaries of the Egyptian Empire as they had stood in the days of Tahutmes III of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. Josiah opposed him, was defeated and slain. Nekaou II, in turn, was defeated 3 years later in 603 B.C., at Carchemish, by Nebuchadnezzar.