

The Times of the 'Great Kings' of Persia

DR CHARLES V. TAYLOR

INTRODUCTION

Even in the latter part of the twentieth century, the history and archaeology of the second half of the Achaemenid period of ancient history of the Middle East remains insecure in many details. The standard undergraduate text for introducing this study states quite unashamedly:

The entire period between the accession of Xerxes (485 BC) and the conquest of Alexander (331 BC) is exceedingly poor in architectural remains and building inscriptions.¹

Roux is saying in effect that

- (1) archaeology has little to contribute here; and
- (2) the period was historically one of turmoil.

The **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, for example, directs the reader to the article on the Greco-Persian Wars, said to have lasted 100 years.

As for dating, the traditional date for the accession of Xerxes (485 BC) is based on one source only, namely Ptolemy's Canon (no connection with the Ptolemy kings!), and this is eventually aligned with General Egyptian dating, which over recent years has been revised again and again. Thus, to the extent that Egyptian dating is unreliable, so is our dating of the Mesopotamian and Persian histories.

This raises a very serious problem. Since the Achaemenid period is so late in ancient history, any date adjustment of this period throws all the earlier dates out. For this reason, many scholars are not game to attack the traditional dating, lest they incur the wrath of the main body of scholars whose chronology depends on that dating.

In this article I take as my main source the dates supplied by Scripture and the dynastic data in terms of numbers of rulers which goes with the quantitative information. The primary text is Daniel

9, which, though cast in the form of prophecy, is nevertheless as secure, coming from the hand of God, as a historical record would be. In Daniel 9:24-26, as understood in conjunction with the 'day for a year' principle in Old Testament prophecy,² we find a prophecy that from a certain decree concerning the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Exile to the 'cutting-off of Messiah, there are to be something over 483 years. Yet the traditional dates involve us in some 80 years above this figure for the period in question.

The other biblical reference is Daniel 11:2. Verse 3 is usually taken to refer to Alexander, hence from 'the first year of Darius the Mede' (11:1) to Alexander, Daniel sees a maximum of five Persian rulers. The first of these is the Susa ruler of the time when 'Darius the Mede' was king in Babylon. Whitcomb, who has researched this thoroughly, equates him with Cyrus II, the Great.³ Next we have Cambyses II, then Darius Hystaspes, then Xerxes his son. We are left with one more to find, but at this stage tradition supplies five more, three of whom are called 'Artaxerxes'. This is the problem. I shall try to show that, because 'Artaxerxes' is an ambiguous name, we can dispense with four of these five kings.

A.H. Strong in his Concordance Appendix states that Artaxerxes is:

A title (rather than name) of several Pers. Kings.⁴ Young's Concordance tells us that:

Ezra 4:7,8,11,23 refer to Cambyses as Artaxerxes

Ezra 7:1,7,11,12,21 and 8:1, and Nehemiah 2:1, and 5:14 and 13:6 refer to 'Longimanus' (Successor to Darius Hystaspes).

Ezra 6:14 may be 'contemporary with Darius'⁵

I will try to show by reasoning that Ezra 6:14 may in fact refer to Darius himself, using the title Artaxerxes in the same way that Nebuchadnezzar used its Babylonian form (English: 'Great King'), probably to strengthen his claim to the throne of the Empire, since he was not in direct succession.

This article is, then,

- (a) a study in chronology rather than of history/archaeology, which disciplines must be subject eventually to synchronisms anyway;
- (b) a study based on a linguistic understanding of the biblical text; and
- (c) a study which places biblical text above discordant dating outside itself. The particular view of prophecy one may hold in connection with Daniel is irrelevant in this matter, since we are not dealing with Daniel's seventieth week as such, but with the previous sixty-nine weeks (literally, 'sevens') of years.

EVOLUTION AND CHRONOLOGIES

The echoes of evolutionary thinking reverberate even down the corridors of late periods of ancient history. Indeed, evolutionary thinking saturates all academic disciplines.

In ancient history, this influence is felt through a refusal to incorporate a worldwide Flood into secular chronology, so that the foundation of that chronometer of all ancient history, the kingdoms and dynasties of Egypt, determines thinking right down to the Persian period. For this reason, as Velikovsky saw, the Persians of the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ are confused with Philistines of the imagined twelfth century, an error of 800 years! I hold no brief for Velikovsky's theology, or lack of it, but one must admit that his chronologies have never seriously been disproved, but rather slandered and libelled without proper examination. Velikovsky strongly refutes this confusion between Persians and Philistines.⁶ However, I believe he has missed one important point, which I will proceed later on to elaborate.

As to the confusion itself, it seems to have arisen from misinterpretation of the alphabetic Egyptian characters P-L-S-T found on monuments and in manuscripts, and the failure of scholars to realise that

- (a) Egyptian, like some fifty percent of languages today, does not distinguish in sound or symbol between L and R (compare Chinese, Japanese and many African and South American languages); and
- (b) a final T is (i) unpronounced, and (ii) the sign of the name of a country or nation.

Thus the letters P-L-S-T are equivalent in Semitic languages to either P-L-S or P-R-S. Those familiar with Daniel 5 will recognise the form PeReS, written on the wall to warn one Belshazzar of impending

doom. Daniel interprets it as: '(Your kingdom is) cut up (i.e., destroyed) and (given to the Medes and) Persians'. The written form was a three-way pun, hence the need to elaborate in the interpretation. The most superficial reading of the whole phrase: MENE, MENE, TEKEL, PERES⁷ was 'two mina, one shekel and a part thereof. But far more serious were the two other meanings of each word. In the case of PERES, these were: 'Cut up' and 'Persia' in Aramaic forms.

The house of Nebuchadnezzar, the first man to call himself 'Great King' (as far as our knowledge goes), was due to be replaced by the Great Kings of the Medes and Persians. And thereby hangs a tale. But before we tell it, let us note what had happened to chronology.

Egyptian chronology had been pushed back to about 5000 BC by Wallace Budge at the beginning of this century,⁸ but since that time it has crept steadily forward to some sanity so that the first king, Menes, (whom some scholars have equated with Mizraim of Scripture⁹) is placed somewhere between 3100 and 2850.¹⁰ Biblical chronology is consistently overlooked or elaborately 'interpreted' to fit secular dating, and the Noachic Deluge is just ignored, for no continuity of artifacts could pass through that traumatic event. But, as Velikovsky stated in producing his first chronological bombshell:

It is quite conceivable that historians will have even greater psychological difficulties in revising their views and in accepting the sequence of ancient history as established in **Ages in Chaos** than the astronomers had in accepting the story of cosmic catastrophes in the solar system in historical times. Indeed, a distinguished scholar who has followed this work from the completion of the first draft in 1942, expressed this very idea. He said that he knows of no valid argument against the reconstruction of history presented here, but that psychologically it is almost impossible to change views acquired in the course of decades of reading, writing, and teaching.¹¹

Velikovsky was an evolutionist, yet in this passage he offers an argument which could apply to today's evolution-soaked scholars as they contemplate chronologies related to the Word of God.

Velikovsky also stated that 'Egyptian chronology is the rule and the standard for the entire world history'¹² In an article parallel with this one, Dr John Osgood likewise refers to the false security of Egyptian chronology in dating the times of the Judges of Israel.¹³ Yet, as we shall see, we find startling errors even at the other end of ancient history and,

ignoring Egyptian dating as a measure, we find that the internally derived history of the Persian Empire is some 80 years too long for what appears to be the clear implication of biblical history and prophecy. Naturally, such a revision affects the dates of all previous epochs.

PERSIAN KINGS - TITLES AND REIGNS

Two scholars who have taken biblical chronology seriously in respect of Persia are Mauro and his mentor Anstey.¹⁴ I accept their chronologies to within a few years in this period.

In order to date the Persian kings in accordance with figures found in Scripture, there are two points not appealed to by Velikovsky:

- (a) Daniel's prophecies, and
- (b) the meaning of 'Artaxerxes'.

The former would not be attractive to Velikovsky because of his negative view of prophecy. As to the latter, I propose to go into it in some detail, as I believe it lies at the root of misunderstandings about the number of major kings who ruled the Persian Empire.

The name 'Artaxerxes' is not truly a personal name, but is a titular name like 'Pharaoh' and 'Caesar'. It is the Greek form of the Persian **arta khshashta**, in which **arta** means 'great' and **khshashta** means 'king' and is an ancestral form of today's word 'shah'.¹⁵ In today's language we might call these men 'Emperors'. Also, 'Artaxerxes I' is in fact an anachronism, since Persian rulers did not number themselves in this way. Not even a Greek would talk about 'Emperor the first', but just refer to 'the Emperor' in diplomatic language, though who knows what he called him privately!

The idea of assigning numbers to ancient kings is a modern one, as Velikovsky is at pains to point out.¹⁶ But strictly speaking, 'Artaxerxes' cannot have a number attached anyway, as it isn't a personal name. It's also important to note that the name Xerxes has nothing to do with the title Artaxerxes. Xerxes stands for the personal name Akhashverosh, to which the Latin **Ahasuerus** of the book of Esther (KJV) bears some resemblance. No doubt the similarity between Xerxes and Artaxerxes gave rise to misunderstandings even among Greek historians and so landed us where we are today in the confusion which all scholars admit exists in the annals of Persia.

One ancient writer, Josephus Flavius, bears witness to the titular form in his **Antiquities**, 11:6:1, where he writes of Xerxes, stating that he was followed by a son Cyrus 'whom the Greeks called Artaxerxes.' This particular Cyrus is not usually

found under that name in Persian histories.

Bearing in mind this important point, we should note further that other factors are often at work in royal dynasties of the past. Recently there has been more attention paid to such things as:

- (a) Co-regencies between (especially) father and son, which reduce absolute chronologies by the overlapping periods.
- (b) The effect of what today we call 'coups', after which a new ruler (often related to a previous ruler) may attempt to alter records, sometimes ascribing part of a predecessor's rule to himself, since he thinks he ought to have been ruler then anyway.
- (c) Dynasties splitting into two or more families, which then rule in geographically separated parts of the country. However, later annalists, seeking to claim antiquity for their rulers, may list them separately, so that today's scholars may understand them in sequential terms.
- (d) Rulers using more than one name: often up to five, for different purposes. Velikovsky makes much of this in synchronising events.

The Persian Achaemenid dynasty does not seem to have been affected much by (d) as regards personal names, that is, apart from the title 'Artaxerxes', but we know very little about the possibilities of (a) to (c). As to (b) some confusion arises wherever struggles for supremacy occur. There's even the case of 'Pseudo-Smerdis', said to be an impostor posing as Cambyses' brother Bardiya, alias Smerdis (one known case of dual naming). It is at such points that we might expect succeeding names to be confused. In this case Darius the Great (Darius Ochus, or Darius I) quelled the rebellion, and it is at this point that I would like to introduce the notion that this Darius is also to be known as Artaxerxes in Scripture. But before we develop that theme we need to turn our attention to the prophecies of Daniel.

DANIELS PROPHECIES

In Daniel 11:2-4, written in the days of Cyrus the Great (Cyrus II), we read a prophecy that there will be three more kings, then a fourth, very rich and anti-Greek. After him would come a 'mighty king', whose kingdom would be broken up into four, none of the rulers of which would be his descendants. All Bible scholars agree that this refers to Alexander the Great. But then this gives us a maximum of five important Persian kings, starting with Cyrus the Great. The resultant Empire is 80 years shorter than the traditional dates suggest.

The traditional dating rests almost entirely on a certain 'Ptolemy' properly called Claudius Ptolemaeus, of the second century AD, that is, about 600 years later than the events he was recording. He wasn't basically a historian and his chronology of Persia is derived in part from calculations by one Eratosthenes of Libya, who devised a calendar on the basis of astronomical figures of doubtful value, and not on written records. Ptolemy's list of ten kings gave rise to the traditional chronology. But the important point to note is that we have no contemporary annals for the times of Imperial Persia after Darius Hystaspes (the Great). Ptolemy's figures produce a total of 205 years, whereas Persian tradition itself gives a total of only 52 for the same period! However, this probably excludes the first 20 years of Cyrus the Great. In my opinion neither is correct, but if the Persians themselves produced such a low figure the truth is more likely to be far less than Ptolemy's apparently inflated length.¹⁷

Daniel 9:24-26 prophesies 483 years to the start of a 'week' of years. In the middle of that week 'shall Messiah be cut off. If this refers to the crucifixion of the Messiah, then that event must be about 486 Vz years from the starting date for the prophecy, which is given as 'the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem'. This edict must have been given round about 457 BC on our calculation. But this date doesn't fit secular dating for Cyrus II, or for that matter Artaxerxes of the times of Ezra-Nehemiah.

In this area biblical scholars are in disagreement as to which 'commandment' is intended. The only clear case of an edict is found in the repeated passage in Chronicles 36:22-23 and Ezra 1:1-3. However, this only mentions the Temple and not the City of Jerusalem. For this reason some biblical scholars look to 'Artaxerxes', who did support the building of the walls of Jerusalem, but for whom we find just letters rather than decrees.

This is some 40 years later than Cyrus.

CYRUS' EDICT

However, Josephus quotes in full a letter sent by Cyrus to the Jerusalem authorities, presumably based on his decree:

I have given leave to as many of the Jews as please, who dwell in my country, to return to their own country and rebuild **their city** and build the temple of God at Jerusalem on the same place as it occupied before. I have also sent my treasurer, Mithridates, and Zerobabel [sic], governor of the Jews.¹⁸ (**emphasis added**)

Besides this, in Nehemiah 1:3 we read that Nehemiah learned that the walls of Jerusalem were

broken down. Now this could scarcely refer to the work of Nebuchadnezzar, about which Nehemiah must have known already (so that it wouldn't come to him as news), which had taken place over 100 years earlier. It therefore must refer to work more recently done, but still before year 30 of 'Artaxerxes', when the news came. This work may also refer to a wall mentioned by Ezra (see below), which existed in the seventh year of the same 'Artaxerxes'. It must, in fact, have resulted from the original decree of Cyrus. Thus it's very difficult to see any other decree than that of Cyrus applying to the rebuilding of the city.

Note also that rebuildings in Ezra cannot be confined to the Temple in the minds of the Jews' enemies, who argue that Jerusalem is a rebellious city. At least they feared that the king was allowing such rebuilding to occur as would regard Jerusalem as a military target.

What is probably more important is the point that the edict of Cyrus was meant 'to fulfil the word of the Lord spoken by Jeremiah' (Ezra 1:2), and this must refer to his prediction of a 70-year exile. The fact that Ezra 2:70 states that the Israelites 'settled in their cities' must surely include Jerusalem. There was a seven-month period between Ezra 2:1 and 3:8 during which they would have built their homes and seen to their security. In addition, Isaiah 44:26 prophesies that '[the Lord] says of Jerusalem: "It shall be inhabited"' and two verses later (44:28) that '[the Lord] says of Cyrus: "he is my shepherd ... he will say of Jerusalem: "Let it be rebuilt"'. Finally, in 45:13 Isaiah (150 years earlier) states that Cyrus 'will build the city and set my exiles free'. For anyone who accepts Scripture at face value, this is a formidable array of prophecy and history to confirm the importance of the **words** of Cyrus, rather than the actual results. Furthermore, as noted above, a wall of sorts must have been erected by the time Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in the seventh year of Darius, for Ezra 9:9 thanks God for it.¹⁹

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PERSIAN KINGS

Josephus reduces the names of Persian kings from the Eratosthenian figure of ten (which has been extended to twelve in modern times, but includes some short reign lengths) to only six. Such a number is close enough to the biblical number of Cyrus plus four mentioned in Daniel, though the names do not all match. Incidentally, the name Mithridates does tally with a name in Ezra 1:8.

In view of Daniel 9:24-26, I prefer the date 457 BC for the 'first year of Cyrus' in Ezra 1.1. Secular historians offer dates 539 (Britannica, Roux) and 535

(Velikovsky). This 'first year' probably means the first year of Cyrus's rule over Babylon, where he had replaced 'Darius the Mede'.

Coming down to detail, we note that in the second year of the Jews' return, Zerubbabel was in charge of the 100,000 or so Jews who must have gone to Jerusalem (judging from the numbers of men quoted). According to Ezra 4:5, building was impeded from soon after its commencement until the days of Darius (presumably 'the Great'). The period of waiting includes the reigns of:

Xerxes	Ezra 4:6
'Artaxerxes'	Ezra 4:7
2 years of Darius	Ezra 4:24

On the basis of secular history, this gives a non-building period of:

Cyrus	9 years to end of reign
Cambyses	7 years (including rebellion at end)
Xerxes	21 years
Darius	2 years
	<u>39 years in all</u>

But we must also note that Zerubbabel was still alive in the time of Darius, according to Haggai 1:1 and elsewhere. We cannot therefore include a separate 'Artaxerxes' ('son of Xerxes', according to some authorities) between Xerxes and Darius, as this would give Zerubbabel a total official life of about 80 years! Therefore 'Artaxerxes' must be someone else, probably Darius. It does seem as if the names Darius and Artaxerxes are interchangeable in Ezra, especially in view of the fact that in Ezra 6:15, the Temple is stated to have been completed in the sixth year of Darius. Then in 7:1 ('after this') we find Ezra arriving in Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. This again would mean a 40-year break which the text doesn't seem to support.

At first sight there seems to be a contradiction between Ezra 4:5-7, where the period from Cyrus to Darius includes Xerxes and 'Artaxerxes', and Ezra 6:14:

Ezra 4:5-7	Ezra 6:14
Cyrus	Cyrus
Xerxes	Darius
Artaxerxes	Artaxerxes
Darius	

In relation to Ezra 6:14, where I suggest a possible translation:

. . . according to the decrees of Cyrus and Darius, that is, Artaxerxes, king of Persia. . .

I refer to Nehemiah 7:2, where a parallel construction occurs, similarly accented in the Hebrew text. The translators of the NIV offer an alternative rendering to the one in their text:

I put in charge of Jerusalem my brother Hanani, that is Hananiah the commander of the citadel.

In such constructions so translated, Hebrew *waw* is equivalent to 'that is'. That it should not always be translated 'and' is well known to Hebrew scholars. Thus Ezra 4:17 in KJV: 'Peace and at such a time' is highly artificial.

Secondly, the troubles of the Jews are variously stated as lasting to Darius (Ezra 6:15) and to Artaxerxes (Ezra 4:6 — by implication). Note also that 'Artaxerxes' in Ezra 4:7 follows immediately on Xerxes in 4:6 and not on Darius.

It is also noteworthy that Ezra 6:14 is immediately followed by 6:15, suggesting that decrees to finish the work on the Temple were not required after Darius, hence those at the time may have understood no conflict here if they knew Darius was 'Artaxerxes', the 'Great King'.

The only reasonable solution seems to be that Darius and Artaxerxes are alternative names for the same person, perhaps used at different times during his reign. By making Darius and Artaxerxes overlap in this way we reduce the Achaemenid period by about 40 years. The other 40 years can be eliminated by ignoring most of the supposed separate rule of 'Artaxerxes IF (45 years). This character may yet be a further **alter ego** of Darius I (Hystaspes), given that it wasn't the Greeks who separated Artaxerxes I from Artaxerxes II.

To illustrate these changes, let us begin by using the traditional dates and eliminating 'Artaxerxes':

BC 559	Cyrus II
529	Cambyses
521	Darius I
486	Xerxes I
464	Great King
425	Xerxes II
423	Darius II
404	Great King
359	Great King
338	Arses
336	Darius III
334	(Alexander the Great takes over)

This gives a total of 225 years, with the 'Great Kings' occupying 105 of them. If we eliminate all three Great Kings we will find ourselves some 25 years too short in biblical terms. However, it may well be that the third 'Great King' should be known as Cyrus, as in Josephus. He might either follow or

precede Darius II. The remaining few years could be accounted for by extending the reign to Darius I to take in the rule of the longest 'Great King'. As this difference is about 10 years, we can again balance up by ignoring Arses and Darius III, who may either have been parallel or contemporary with Alexander in a desperate attempt to maintain the Empire.

In this world of the Persians, no term had yet appeared exactly equivalent to our word 'Emperor' and there was no single word to differentiate 'kings' from 'emperors', so that the standard way was to use *this expression 'Great King'*. Nebuchadnezzar called himself the 'Great King of Hatti', so the idea was not original in Persia. In the Assyrian annals we further find a name 'Sargon', which means 'True King'. This must be halfway between a personal name and a title, for clearly this man was asserting his right to the throne, yet wishing to play down his perhaps obscure or insufficiently distinctive name. Some regard Sargon as having been a priest before seizing the throne, which might also lead to an explanation.

THE PREFERRED CHRONOLOGY

My own solution to the problems of the Persian Imperial chronology is as follows:

In sum, we must in all ancient records allow for such 'pseudonyms' adopted by rulers, or perhaps given as courtesy titles by their subjects. Let us not confuse already complex lists by treating such titles as dynastically given names.

Of the above kings, Gyros II and Darius I have consistently been called 'the Great', though it is not known whether this description actually went back to their reigns. However, the use of the term 'Artaxerxes' for the Head of the Empire seems to have disappeared in Greek times, except as applied

by a few historians to long-past Persian rulers individually. My thesis is that this term became confused with Xerxes, regarded as a personal name, and was then applied by Greek scholars to the great kings of the Achaemenid Empire without regard to any overall or absolute dating. After all, it was only the Jews who appear to have kept up an absolute dating from the Creation, and even their figures became suspect when they departed from Scripture.

It might be urged that this article has ignored what appears to be a well-documented period of Greek history. But in actual fact, not only the Persian but also the post-Alexandrian period has no supra-regnal elapsed time markers apart from Ptolemy's canon, which assumed Seleucid rulers never overlapped. I find it hard to believe Seleucus Nicator was fighting at age 73 (some say 77) that a Ptolemy father-son-grandson succession stretched 102 years, and that there were no unrecorded overlaps.

Even if my suggested Achaemenid revisions are incorrect, some telescoping is still possible after Alexander. Scholars agree, for example, that years 321-281 BC are very hazy. What if Nicator, like so many other 'great kings', dated his kingship from 321 BC? This reduces our period by about a decade. All in all, it is quite uncertain whether Cyrus IPs liberation of Babylon should be dated as high as 539 BC.

Most historians today play down chronology as a somewhat puerile exercise. They're more interested, they say, in 'what happened'. Yet history can never be fully appreciated so long as events are placed in the wrong order or false synchronisms are allowed to persist.

REFERENCES

1. Roux, G., 1982. *Ancient Iraq*, p.378.

TRADITIONAL	YEARS	REVISED	YEARS
Cyrus II	30	Cyrus II	30
Cambyses	7	Cambyses	7
Pseudo-Smerdis	½	Pseudo-Smerdis	½
Darius I	35	Xerxes	21
Xerxes I	21	Darius I	45
Artaxerxes I	41	Cyrus III	21
Xerxes II	1½	Darius II	19
Darius II	19	Arses	2
		(Alexander, 334)	
Artaxerxes II	45	Darius III	2
Artaxerxes III	21		
Arses	2		
Darius III	2		
BC 559-334 = 225	<u>225</u>	BC 477-334 = 143	<u>147½</u>

2. See Ezekiel 4:6
3. Whitcomb, J.C.Jr, 1977. **Darius the Mede**, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., passim.
4. Strong, A.H. **Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary** (as appendix to Concordance), entry 783 on p.17.
5. Young, R. **Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible**, entry 'Artaxerxes'.
6. See especially Velikovsky, I., 1979. **Peoples of the Sea**, London, Abacus, p.36. But Velikovsky mentions it several times elsewhere in his writing.
7. The KJV form 'Upharsin' found in Daniel 5:25 but not in 5:28 resulted from a failure by the translators to realise that the first letter 'u' is not part of the original writing on the wall, but merely represents Hebrew/Aramaic 'and'. Thus 5:25 should read: . . . and PARSIN. No vowels were present in the so-called 'alphabetic' scripts of those days, and -IN is a plural suffix on PARS-. Hence all that appeared on the wall was P-R-S, which could be transliterated as the reader required. Because it referred to the Persians, it was probably thought appropriate to add the -IN suffix in 5:25, but the basic consonantal frame remains as P-R-S.
8. Budge, E.A.W., 1906. **Books on Chaldea and Egypt**, Vol. IX, pp.3-4.
9. Hinted at, for example, in Albright, W., 1960. **The Archaeology of Palestine**, London, Penguin, p.21.
10. 3100 BC is the date found in recent editions of **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, but other secular scholars range to dates even below 2850.
11. Velikovsky, I., 1973. **Ages in Chaos**, London, Abacus, p.6
12. Velikovsky, I., 1973. p.114.
13. Osgood, A.J.M., 1986. The times of the Judges: the archaeology (a) Exodus to Conquest. **EN Tech.J.,2:** 56-76.
14. Anstey, M., 1913. **The Romance of Bible Chronology**, London, Marshall Bros. Mauro, P., 1970. **The Wonders of Bible Chronology**, Swengel, Pa, Reiner.
15. If it be objected on linguistic grounds that Persian is Indo-European and closer to Greek than to Aramaic, I would counter this argument by suggesting that (a) belonging to the same language family lexically and grammatically says nothing about phonological features and orthography; and (b) Aramaic was a language contemporary with ancient Persian and the writers were living at the same time and in the same country as the rulers in question. They were more likely to reflect something of the original shape of the words than were those more distant in place and time, the Greeks. Greeks were notable for Hellenising everything in sight, as Egyptian place-names clearly attest.
16. Velikovsky, I., 1973, p.27.
17. The material in this paragraph owes much to P. Mauro (1970), p.87.
18. Josephus: **Antiquities of the Jews**, 11:1:3.
19. The material in this paragraph owes much to P. Mauro (1970), p.90.