

survived for many days adrift in the floodwaters. Some of these were pregnant females, and held their eggs inside themselves until a suitable time for laying. During quieter spells, these dinosaurs crawled onto any available land and laid their eggs in nests quickly dug out of the ground. This process may well have happened a number of times as fresh sediment was laid down, with other dinosaurs coming onto the land to lay their eggs and leave footprints in higher sedimentary layers. In fact the evidence from footprints, and so many *unhatched* dinosaur eggs in different layers, and from multi-shelled eggs, some containing partly grown embryos, provides good evidence for this process.

Bearing this in mind, I do not see the problems that Garner *et al.* raise as being insurmountable. But by placing the Flood/post-Flood boundary much lower down the stratigraphic column only creates a lot more difficult problems to solve. I would respectfully urge those who struggle to come to terms with evidence from dinosaur footprints and eggs to reconsider their views in light of the evidence from living reptiles.

Andrew Sibley
Cardiff
UNITED KINGDOM

References

- Garner, P.A., Garton, M., Johnston, R.H., Robinson, S.J. and Tyler, D.J., Dinosaur footprints, fish traces and the Flood, *TJ* 17(1):54–57, 2003.
- Woodmorappe J. and Oard M., Letter, reply to Garner *et al.*, Dinosaur footprints, fish traces and the Flood, *TJ* 17(1):57–59, 2003.
- McIntosh, A., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., The Floods as the major biblical cataclysm, *TJ* 14(1):101–109, 2000.
- McIntosh, A., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., Letter, reply to Garner *et al.*, Flood models, *TJ* 14(3):79–82, 2000.
- Bristol University UK, <www.palaeo.gly.bris.ac.uk/palaeo/eggs/Evolution.html>, 28 May 2003.
- BBC UK Walking with Dinosaurs, <www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/index.shtml>, 3 June 2003.
- Scientific American article on the Komodo dragon, <www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID=000EFE16-865C-1CD6-B4A8809EC588EEDF&pageNumber=3&catID=2>, 1 June 2003.
- BBC UK Walking with Dinosaurs, <www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/q6.shtml>, 3 June 2003.

The landing place

I have enjoyed reading Bill Crouse's *The landing place* in *TJ* 15(3). One ancient reference that wasn't mentioned is that written by the Christian chronographer Julius Africanus (AD 160–240). Africanus had completed a 5 volume history of the world in AD 221.¹

The following is an excerpt from chapter IV of Africanus' chronography, which survived in fragmented portions because of the work of George Syncellus, who died about AD 814.

'And when the water abated, the ark settled on the mountains of Ararat, which we know to be in Parthia [that is, in Armenia]; but some say that they are at Celaenae of Phrygia [for there was a hill Ararat in Phrygia, from which the Marsyas issued, and the ark was declared to have rested there by the Sibylline oracles] and I have seen both places. And the flood prevailed for a year ...'

I came across this reference when writing my booklet on ancient non-Christian sources referring to Jesus.

Could either of these locations (Parthia and Phrygia) possibly be located near Cudi Dagh?

Jonathan Clerke
Brisbane, Queensland
AUSTRALIA

References

- English translations of his extant fragments can be found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writing of the Fathers down to AD 325, Vol. VI*; Roberts, A. and Donaldson, J. (Eds), W.B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids MI, 1978–1979. Notes in parentheses are sup-

plied by A. Cleveland Coxe as featured in the English book.

Wisdom teeth

I read, with a great deal of interest, your article on wisdom teeth.¹ Since I am a retired dentist I wanted to comment on this article in a couple of respects.

I graduated from Dental School in 1973. I was taught that it was unnecessary to remove wisdom teeth unless there was a specific health reason to do so; i.e. there had to be an impaction, pericoronitis, etc.

However, it has been very common for orthodontists to insist on their removal for reasons of providing more room for re-alignment of the teeth, reducing forces that would push teeth forward, etc. As your article pointed out, these ideas have been somewhat discounted today.

One idea that wasn't really explored is the genetic selection problem. Our Western ideals of beauty tend toward the heart shaped face, at least in women. This will tend to select for people with smaller mandibles and therefore less space for the 3rd molars. I have had the opportunity to work with Eastern European and African individuals and they generally have more of a square face with (usually) more room for the third molars.

I would like to say that (at least in my practice) keeping the third molars was very useful for a number of reasons. Many parents often don't do much to take care of their children's teeth, and as a result, permanent six year molars are often lost at an early age.

In some cases, (with the help of an excellent oral surgeon) we were able to transplant the third molars into the space where the six year molars had been lost. This negated the need for more expensive treatments such as bridgework. (Just an example of one reason to keep those 'unnecessary' teeth.)

Name and address withheld on request

Pennsylvania,
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Bergman, J., Are wisdom teeth (third molars) vestiges of human evolution? *TJ* 12(3):297–304, 1998.

Carbon dating and Egyptian chronology

There is a chapter on dating methods in the *Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Archaeology* that is very relevant to the problem of Egyptian chronology:

‘When the radiocarbon method was first tested, good agreement was found between radiocarbon dates and the historical dates for samples of known age (for example, from Ancient Egyptian contexts). As measurements became more precise, however, it gradually became apparent that there were systematic discrepancies between the dates that were being obtained and those that could be expected from historical evidence. These differences were most marked in the period before about the mid-first millennium BC, in which radiocarbon dates appeared too recent, by up to several hundred years, by comparison with historical dates. Dates for the earliest comparative material available, reeds used as bonding between mud-brick courses of tombs of the Egyptian Dynasty I, about 3100 BC, appeared to be as much as 600 years, or about 12%, too young.’¹

That the earliest comparative material is 600 years too young and that the differences were most marked in the period before about the mid-first millennium BC is most significant. This is the period of time that Dr Immanuel Velikovsky and Dr Donovan Courville claimed have been erroneously added to Egyptian chronology:

‘The magnitude of the task confronting any one who would at-

tempt to propose a credible altered chronology involving a condensation of this magnitude was becoming increasingly apparent. The discrepancy in terms of biblical chronology is of the magnitude of more than 600 years at the time of the Conquest (of Jericho by Joshua).’²

David Downs
Archaeological Diggings
New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Sherratt, A. (Ed.), *Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Archaeology*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, p. 424, 1980.
2. Courville, D., *The Exodus Problem and Its Ramification* (2 Vols), Challenge Books, Loma Linda, California, vol. 1, p. xviii, 1971.

Biblical chronology

I am thirteen and am in seventh grade. Several days ago my dad showed me an article in *TJ* 15(1) by David Down called *Searching for Moses*.¹ I had read several of Immanuel Velikovsky’s books on a reconstruction of Egyptian history, and Down’s article reflected some of the conclusions I had been coming to. I do disagree with him on his equation of Senusert III with the Pharaoh of Exodus 1:8–10. Before going further, I will clarify this point: I believe 430 years to be the most probable length of the sojourn in Egypt.

As for Senusert III (given in the article as Sesostri III), his reign does not seem to reflect the situation in Exodus 1:10. At this time Egyptian power was supreme and uncontested. Approximately 250 years prior to the reign of Neferhotep I was the reign of Khety III, who ruled from Heracleopolis. Khety III’s reign was fraught with war and civil unrest interspersed with uneasy truces. His main adversaries were the kings of Thebes: Intef II, Intef

III, and Mentuhotep II. Khety III felt himself pressured between Thebes and the Eastern Delta, and finally solved the problem by sending a military expedition into the Eastern Delta. The Eastern Delta is Goshen. With the situation reflected in Exodus 1:9, a large-scale organized resistance to the Pharaoh’s command is not surprising. In fact a military campaign into Goshen would be expected. Shortly after the death of Khety III, Mentuhotep II conquered Egypt. After his death, his son, Mentuhotep III built a row of forts around the Eastern Delta. According to Nicolas-Christophe Grimal in *A History of Ancient Egypt*, this was to ‘keep the Asiatics out’. I don’t know his reasons for saying this, but if one looks at the geography this makes little sense. Why build forts *around* Goshen to keep the Asiatics *out*. Could it have been to keep the Asiatics (namely Israelites) *in*? It would appear that the situation in Exodus 1:12 was already making itself felt in the reign of Mentuhotep III, although he apparently did not enact the drastic measures of the pharaoh a hundred years latter (Exodus 1:15–22).

Down was correct when he stated that we have a big job ahead of us to reconstruct ancient history to fit a biblical time scale. If the Bible is the infallible word of God, we should be able to figure out biblical chronology straight from the Bible, and then figure out in what ways we have to change our understanding of Assyrian, Egyptian, Babylonian, Greek, etc. to fit it into the Bible. This certainly means that the efforts of Thiele and those who try to place the Exodus in the reign of Merneptah or Rameses II are greatly misguided. I will not go into great detail on this issue here, but I will throw out this one set of interesting facts. A papyrus made in the time of the Ptolemys that refers to a seven year famine in the reign of Djoser. If this is the famine of Joseph, this requires squeezing 700 years of conventional timeline down into less than 200. I devised a tentative timeline that does exactly that. According to this timeline Joseph died in the reign of Khufu. In the Papyrus Westcar, as well as other documents,