

I The Mystery of the Genesis "Begats"

FULLY CLOAKED AND HEAVILY DISGUISED, THE BOOK OF GENESIS HIDES A deep dark secret about the origins of Genesis history and its influence on Jewish beliefs. The chief clue in Genesis consists of two schematically-connected chronological lists of patriarchal births and deaths that begin with the birth of Adam and conclude with the birth of Abraham. Although scholars obviously know these lists exist, they have no idea that such a hidden mystery stands behind the text.

This lack of knowledge is understandable. To recognize that this secret even exists, let alone that it can be uncovered, a biblical scholar must first become fully familiar with two Egyptian fields of study, chronology and mythology. Few, if any, biblical scholars show any interest in either of these Egyptian disciplines.

If you ever go to a major conference of biblical scholars, with dozens (sometimes hundreds) of panels, and, if by chance they might devote one panel to the subject of Egypt and Israel, the conference usually assigns the event to one of the least desirable spots in the program, possibly in one of the least convenient locations, and it is rarely attended by more than a handful of individuals, most of whom do not yet have a degree in biblical studies. The topics will almost never include Egyptian chronology (too complicated) or Egyptian mythology (too alien.)

The two lists I mentioned above, and several others in Genesis that we will eventually study, are often referred to as the "begats" because the King James translation tells us that each parent in the list "begat" a child. The two lists are constructed so that you know how many years passed before each patriarch had a child and how many years each patriarch lived. With some additional information from later portions of Genesis, we can extend this birth-death list from Abraham through Isaac, Jacob/Israel, and Joseph.

If one knew when to date the birth of Adam, one could establish an exact year for each of the Patriarchal births and deaths listed. But establishing a date for creation is the first problem that needs to be solved before this secret can be exposed and solved. Biblical chronology is loaded with contradictions and inconsistencies, and there is no clear agreed-upon chronological record from Creation to an external anchor date. The bible contains major chronological gaps between Genesis and Exodus and between Exodus and the rise of the Hebrew monarchy. Other archaeological gaps and historical conflicts make it difficult to establish any reliable dates prior than about 900 BCE, and even then, there is much guessing involved.

Orthodox Jews date the Creation, and therefore the birth of Adam, to 3761 BCE, but most scholars consider that date a late artificial creation not originally connected to the list, perhaps originating no earlier than about the third century BCE. The Septuagint Greek translation of Genesis contains an altered version of the Jewish text, pushing the date back by a couple of hundred years, often placed at about 4004 BCE, a date which is a late Christian invention of the sixteenth century, calculated by the Archbishop of Armagh,

James Ussher. In Chapter Four, I will demonstrate that the Jewish date of 3761 is almost certainly the intended date of biblical creation, and that is one of the key findings enabling us to unravel the mysterious origin of this Patriarchal Chronology.

The two Genesis lists have several interesting features. The first list, in Genesis 5, gives us a birth-death chronology for dates that fall before the Great Flood. The second list, in Genesis 11, gives us birth and death dates that occur after the Great Flood. Among the lists' many features, two are particularly notable.

First, every one of the patriarchs in this genealogical record, twenty-three in all running from Adam to Joseph, live extraordinarily long lives, with only Joseph's 110-year life span approaching anything resembling a normal human life span. The Genesis 5 patriarchs lived significantly longer than those in Genesis 11. The longest living patriarch was Methuselah at 969 years of age. The second feature of interest is that the list overlaps what would be considered a mythological era (Creation, Flood) and an historical era. I'll provide a more detailed look at the Patriarchal Chronology in Chapter Two.

When faced with such a list, an historian must ask certain questions. Does this list have any sources, and, if so, do we know what they are? Is the list a fictional creation of the author? Does any part of this chronology, even if an author invented the full list, have any relationship to actual historical events? Of course, the religiously orthodox, motivated by theological concerns, would simply say it is an accurate list and should be taken at face value. Other scholars are much more troubled by the nature of these lists.

From an historical perspective, scholars of the ancient near east have pointed out that both ancient Egypt and ancient Sumer (the dominant kingdom of third millennium BCE Mesopotamia) produced major king-lists that, like the Genesis chronology, spanned both a mythological era of god-rulers and an historical era, with many of the king-names from the historical period corroborated from independent archaeological evidence. And, also like the Genesis list, the earlier kings lived much longer lives than the historical kings.

In the Sumerian king-list, for example, the first king ruled for 28,800 years and his successor ruled for 36,000 years.ⁱ Among the various Egyptian sources, as preserved in ancient Greek texts, we find allegations that a group of 6 deities ruled for 11, 985 yearsⁱⁱ and another king who ruled for 30,000 years.ⁱⁱⁱ

This has led several scholars to propose that these two Genesis chronologies are fictional, patterned after the Egyptian and Sumerian models, with mythological rulers living longer than the later rulers. Every once in a rare while some scholar comes up with some very contorted effort to twist some data about a king or two in the Sumerian lists and suggests that there might be some sort of possible not far-off parallel with a piece of the Genesis list. But such approaches have not convinced very many scholars of a direct connection between the Genesis lists and the Sumerian list. The Egyptian lists are completely ignored, even though a great bulk of the Genesis narrative takes place in Egypt.

The analogy to the Egyptian and Sumerian lists has a couple of slight flaws in the pattern analogy, not necessarily fatal but worth pointing out. First, in the foreign king-lists, the persons named are kings. Some are gods and some are humans. There is no indication in the Genesis lists that any of the people mentioned were rulers, or kings, and none are gods.

A second problem is that the number of years associated with each of the foreign rulers signified how many years that king reigned. In the Genesis lists, the number of years assigned signify how long a person lived, not how long he ruled, and how old a person was when he had a child. The nature of the numbers assigned in the Genesis lists are different than the nature of the numbers in the Egyptian and Sumerian lists. Third, the foreign king-lists show some mythological rulers with reigns lasting thousands and tens of thousands of years. In the Genesis list, no Patriarch lives more than 969 years.

These differences suggest that Genesis may be presenting something other than a fictional sequence of king-reigns mimicking that of foreign king-lists. What the Patriarchal Chronology actually represents is the subject of the present study.

The Thesis

I have solved the mystery of the “begats.” The solution radically alters our understanding of the origin of the Book of Genesis, and, by implication, the origins of Judaism. The solution is neither obvious nor easy to arrive at. To solve the problem, one needs to do a deep dive into the very problematic study of Egyptian chronology, a subset of Egyptological studies that requires highly specialized attention.

To my knowledge, virtually no biblical scholars have that sort of expertise, and what very few (if any) there are, have no interest in the Patriarchal Chronology. On the other side of the equation, virtually no Egyptologist with a specialty in chronology pays any attention to the Patriarchal Chronology, assuming that at best it is little more than a meaningless fiction. (Kenneth Kitchen, a leading expert on Egyptian chronology, has demonstrated much interest in biblical studies, but to my knowledge has never undertaken a study of the Patriarchal Chronology.)

In this multi-volume work, I will lead you through the evidence step by step and lay it all out in simple easy to follow reviews of the evidence. Let me warn you, though. The breakthrough requires a great deal of simple basic arithmetic, an ability to recognize clear and obvious patterns in numbers, and a good amount of common sense. It will also require a thorough examination of the many problems involved in recovering an accurate chronology of ancient Egyptian kings and dynasties.

Central to this study is the birth-death patriarchal Chronology laid out in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11. When I am done, you will see that it includes (but is not limited to) a record of the starting dates of Egyptian dynasties, that begins in the Egyptian mythological era and continues down to the start of the Eighteenth Dynasty (c. 1576, per this study.) Furthermore, the dates adduced will be consistent with mainstream views of Egyptian chronology (although representing a specific subset of several alternative mainstream views) and the dates provided will signify the exact year (subject to a rounding error of a year or two) that the dynasties began.

When the evidence is fully presented, there should be no reasonable doubt that the Patriarchal Chronology is a document based on Egyptian chronology and that the author must have been working from Egyptian archival records.

I have divided the chronological study of Genesis 5 and 11 into two parts, the historical era, beginning with Egypt’s First Dynasty (c. 3000) and Egypt’s mythological era king-list preceding the First Dynasty. This volume will deal with the historical era. The second volume will deal with the mythological era. A third volume will deal with related chronological issues in Genesis connecting the biblical Creation and Flood accounts to Egyptian Creation mythology and connecting many human characters in Genesis with Egyptian deities.

To make my case, I need to do much more than show that an occasional birth or death date may be no more than a few years or decades off from some possible dated event in Egyptian history. That would simply be irresponsible cherry-picking that has no academic value. As stated above, I will show that the dates in question are the exact years in which a sequence of Egyptian dynasties began.

Of the 46 birth and death dates in the patriarchal chronology, six (as I will subsequently show) belong to the mythological era and the other forty belong to the historical era. Since there are more Patriarchal dates

in the historical era than there are starting dates for the eighteen Egyptian dynasties that we will examine, the birth and death dates will occasionally coincide with the starting dates for certain kings within a couple of dynasties.

The evidence presented herein will show that almost all of the forty historical era dates in Genesis correspond to either the exact starting dates for each of the Egyptian dynasties or the exact starting date for Egyptian kings within a dynasty. These dates will all be consistent with the Egyptological evidence available for these dates.

Having said that I must explain that there is no simple and easy way to show how the Patriarchal Chronology aligns with the Egyptian historical record.

Any Egyptologist reading this is no doubt smirking or outright laughing at what he (erroneously) thinks of as a ridiculous claim. The Egyptologist knows that the many gaps in the archaeological record, the conflicting interpretations of astronomical correlations, the contradictions in the ancient records, the disagreements over what certain terms mean, and the frequently changing perceptions of Egyptologists mean that no agreed upon precise chronology exists.

Therefore, as part of the solution to the biblical mystery, I must also puzzle out a logical and consistent methodology for solving the conflicts over Egyptian chronology. This presents some very serious challenges but a side effect of solving the mystery behind the biblical chronology also helps resolve many conflicts over Egyptian chronology.

Brief Overview of Egyptian Chronological Problems

In Chapter Three, I'll present a detailed explanation of the chronological problems faced by Egyptologists in reconstructing Egyptian king-lists. Here, I present a brief overview of some of the issues.

For the period running from Dynasties 1–20, (c. 3,000–1000 BCE), based on differing interpretations and opinions of archaeological, astronomical, and written evidence, and with frequent gaps in the record, Egyptologists can be divided into two major chronological camps, High Chronology and Low Chronology. Within each camp there are further disputes as to how to fill in various gaps due to a lack of sufficient evidence. So, we have two schools of thought that present us with multiple chronological solutions.

For most of the twentieth century, the High Chronology had been preferred. Over the last couple of decades, the Low Chronology has been ascendant. No smoking gun has resolved this conflict. Some recent carbon-14 tests have indicated a trend towards the High Chronology, but the results are disputed. In a recent complication, another analysis of carbon-14 testing has suggested the possibility that there is an error in the underlying data for carbon-14 testing in portions of the Middle East and that might lead to a lowering of carbon-14 results. This, too, is contested.

The most important conflict in reconstructing second millennium Egyptian chronology (Dynasties 11–20) revolves around where certain ancient Egyptians were located when they made some astronomical observations. Different locations lead to different dates for the astronomical event under observation. While the dispute remains unresolved, the High and Low Chronologies only differ by about 25–40 years for much of this era.

While that is astonishingly close for such an ancient period, my thesis requires that I hone in even more closely to get precise dates, which is the main problem that we will be examining in this study. Since the astronomical record presents a scientific basis for separating the two schools of thought, any solution to the

problem of Egyptian chronology must be consistent with either one or the other of these two points of view. I can't just mix and match conclusions from the two schools such that they fit a predetermined outcome. This means eventually aligning my conclusions with either the High Chronology or the Low Chronology.

For the Third Millennium (Dynasties 1–10), the further back you go, the more frequent the archaeological gaps and the fewer the chronological records, making conclusions more uncertain and leading to a wider range of chronological disagreements. One major source of conflict in this period concerns the nature of the “cattle counts.” These were censuses of some sort (and not fully understood) and Egyptologists disagree as to whether they were mostly conducted on annual or biennial basis. The reason for conflict is that sometimes cattle counts happened in consecutive years and sometimes they skipped over a year.

The cattle counts play a major role in establishing portions of the third millennium chronology. Whether they were annual, or biennial makes a big difference to the outcome. Did an 18th count of the cattle signify at least an 18-year reign or a 35-year reign (the counts began in Year 1 of a reign)? If you have enough high counts, you can arrive at several decades of difference over the accurate duration of a dynasty and the dates associated with it. Cattle counts, it should be noted, provide only a minimum length of reign, not a maximum. And we don't have enough cattle count data to fill in much of the chronological record.

The cattle count dispute is separate and apart from the High-Low dispute based on astronomical records. Where one stands within the High-Low astronomical dispute is not relevant to where one stands in the High-Low cattle count dispute. As with the High-Low astronomical dispute, any conclusion I reach must also be consistent with either the biennial cattle count theory or the annual cattle count theory. Again, I can't mix and match results based on what works out best for my theory.

Sometime after the start of the Sixth Dynasty and overlapping the start of the Eleventh Dynasty, for a period of one to two hundred years (c. 2300–2100, dates to be more precisely defined in later chapters), Egypt experienced a major period of political disruption known as the First Intermediate Period, with rival claims for the right to rule Egypt. Egyptologists disagree over how long the period lasted. Apparently, ancient Egyptian record keepers felt a keen sense of embarrassment over these events and attempted to whitewash the period out of the country's history. Several king-lists omit that period from the chronological record, jumping from the Sixth Dynasty to the Eleventh Dynasty.

A second, and even more embarrassing political disruption, known as the Second Intermediate Period (c. 1800–1550, dates to be more precisely defined in later chapters,) occurred between the end of the Twelfth Dynasty and the start of the Eighteenth Dynasty, when foreign rulers managed to take military control over portions of Egypt and set up rival dynasties in opposition to the existing line of Egyptian kings. Again, record keepers attempted to whitewash and limit knowledge of this era and much of the chronological record is in a state of disarray.

One other problem that pops up from time to time is that sometimes ancient king-lists or portions of king-lists or inscriptions or writings disagree with each other about how long a king ruled, what sequence kings ruled in, how many kings belonged to a dynasty, and whether a king or group of kings mentioned in a source even existed. Such disputes must be considered in context with other evidence.

As you can see, attempting to establish a precise chronological record of Egypt that can be placed alongside the Patriarchal Chronology for one-to-one comparisons presents more than a simple challenge. If the problems of Egyptian chronology, as outlined above, were solely as I explained them, I would have

insufficient data to prove my thesis. There is one more important piece of evidence that affects the study of Egyptian chronology and it causes a lot of grief among Egyptologists trying to resolve chronological issues.

The Manetho Problem

In the third century BCE, an Egyptian priest named Manetho wrote a history of Egypt that began with the Gods, spirits, and humans that ruled in the mythological era and continued down to the human rulers from the First Dynasty and continued further down to his own time. It was replete with king-lists, chronologies, biographical sketches, military conquests, political intrigues, and many other historical elements. Most importantly, for our purposes, it contained a chronological record of rulers that began in the mythological era and continued down to his own time, the end of the dynastic era. From an historical perspective, Manetho probably produced the longest continuous chronological record ever prepared by an ancient writer. But his work presents problems.

The first issue we face is that no original version of Manetho's chronology exists. What we do have are badly redacted, frequently inconsistent, and filled with chronological problems. The evidence suggests that Manetho's history was quite popular and possibly widely-circulated in his time and thereafter. Jews and Christians were especially interested in it because of the chronological listings, which they wanted to compare to the Genesis chronologies and other overlapping portions in other books of the bible. I strongly suspect that the altered form of Genesis chronology in the Septuagint, with a much earlier Creation date, may have been the result of Hellenistic Jewish writers trying to adapt the Genesis chronology to Manetho's historical record.

The second problem we face is the poor quality of the preserved portions of Manetho's history as transmitted by later writers. The Jewish historian Josephus, in the first century, provides our earliest extracts of Manetho's text, but it encompassed only a portion of Egyptian history, running approximately from the Fifteenth through Nineteenth Dynasties (c. 1680–1200).

In the third century, a Christian writer named Africanus provided a chronological record of ancient Egypt that he claimed was based on writings from Manetho, but it focused almost exclusively on what purported to be Manetho's lengths of reign for dynasties and kings. In the fourth century, the church historian Eusebius presented a similar list, also claiming it was based on Manetho, although portions were probably based on Africanus's text. Excerpts from Africanus and Eusebius were transmitted by later writers.

All three versions of the text attributed to Manetho, while appearing to come from a common source, are frequently wildly inconsistent with each other and contradict each other in many places. Nevertheless, for much of post-Eusebius history until about the early twentieth century, the preserved portions of Manetho's history were accepted as the primary reference for the chronology of ancient Egypt. It is these writings that led later Egyptologists to divide Egypt's dynastic period into thirty dynasties.

This leads to the third major problem. As our archaeological record evolved in the twentieth century, and more records were frequently discovered, modern Egyptologists obtained a reasonably good sense of the parameters of Egypt's dynastic history. They began to realize that the purported lengths of reign for

many of Manetho's dynasties and kings, in each of the three versions, were much too long to reasonably fit in with the independent archaeological and written evidence.

Given the frequent disagreements within the three Manetho traditions, as well as the conflicts between the alleged Manetho excerpts and the archaeological record, one might think that the Manetho sources should just be discarded as unreliable. But that brings us to the fourth problem. Egyptologists recognize that some of the Manetho source material shows, even in some of the oldest periods of Egyptian history, that Manetho clearly had accurate knowledge of many events that happened long before his time, and many of the data points in the three sources are consistent with the archaeological record. Manetho, himself, would have had direct access to Egyptian archival material.

The consensus seems to hold that Manetho's original history was based in some significant part on reliable sources and that the three Manetho sources preserved badly garbled redactions of the original Manetho text. Egyptologists frequently use some of Manetho's data to fill in gaps in the chronological record or correct data from other chronological sources. This brings us to the fifth problem. How much credible use can we make of Manetho's data?

It will be the argument in this study that Manetho originally had a reasonably accurate chronological history of ancient Egypt that was consistent with (if not always identical to) the archaeological and written evidence from other ancient Egyptian king-lists and chronological sources and that a very large amount of his original chronological data can be recovered through a process of numerical pattern recognition when examined within the context of the archaeological record.

More specifically, I will be able to show that, frequently, what happened to the original Manetho manuscript came about because the redactors did not fully understand the text. Often, I will argue, Manetho's lines of summation for groups of kings were confused with entries for additional kings or additional groups of kings and the summation lines were mistakenly identified as additional groups of kings ruling for the time indicated by the summation line. (I have published a peer-reviewed article introducing this thesis in *The SSEA Journal*.^{iv}) On other occasions, I will show that summations in the margins by some redactors were later confused by later redactors with additional entries to Manetho's text, who incorporated those comments into the textual transmission as further chronological expansions of what redactors mistakenly thought was Manetho's original text.

My theory, therefore, suggests that if we recognize that the transmitted Manetho sources incorporated summation lines as extra listings of kings, and if we can work out what the actual lengths of reign were from the archaeological and written evidence, then we should be able to show that when Manetho king reigns or dynasty lengths are too long we can back track to show that some of the entries may include summaries of the accurate data that have been added to the text as if they were separate chronological data from what the numbers were summarizing. This will make more sense when we put the practice into play. This thesis will be the lynchpin that brings all the evidence together, showing the Patriarchal Chronology, Egyptian chronology, and Manetho all aligned along the same set of dates.

My Approach to the Chronological Issues

As noted above, there are not only disagreements among modern Egyptologists over the correct chronology, correct sequence of kings, and correct lengths of reign, but such disputes appear in the ancient Egyptian records as well. This means that an ancient Egyptian writer, faced with a conflict in sources or a confused understanding of some terminology might have made a different choice about the correct chronology than one or another of

the ancient or modern scholars might have made. In this study, the thesis is that the Genesis author used Egyptian archival records and may have encountered the sort of conflicts and contradictions that modern Egyptologists have dealt with.

It will be the argument set forth in this book that there is a direct alignment, on a precise year-to-year basis between Egyptian dynastic chronology and the Patriarchal Chronology. In other words, I will show that various birth and death dates align with the exact year in which a dynasty or king began to rule. This means, in part, that we will take dates in the Patriarchal Chronology and then look at the Egyptian records and the Manetho texts and see what we might reasonably conclude about the date in question. As we look at more and more dates, patterns in Egyptian chronology will begin to emerge. That said, it is necessary to note that perfect precision may be impossible and that round-off errors of a year or two occasionally come into play.

This round-off error is due to a couple of factors. An Egyptian solar year began during the month of July. So, an Egyptian calendar year overlaps two different modern calendar years, and a modern calendar year overlaps two Egyptian calendar years. There is also an occasional issue as to whether a king's length of reign was calculated from the day he ascended the throne, or from the beginning of the year in which he ascended the throne, or from the first of the year following his ascent to the throne. This means that there may sometimes be disagreements of a year or two between the Genesis chronology and the Egyptian chronology. It is simply an unavoidable problem. However, if we can show that in just about every single case, the error never goes beyond that range of a year or two, then the pattern is fixed, and indicates that those small discrepancies are the result of rounding off partial years. due to minor roundoff errors.

On some occasions we will see that the Genesis chronology aligns with one of the ancient records as opposed to another that some modern Egyptologists think would make a better fit. So, we will encounter an occasional conflict with modern views. But, in resolving that conflict in favor of the Genesis chronology, that resolution must be rooted in actual records that we know about. I can't cite imaginary sources. It won't do for me to say, "Oh well, this difference is explained by some lost record that we have yet to find." To repeat, any conflict between the reconstruction of Egyptian chronology such that it matches Genesis chronology must be based on known records.

It will be the argument that the form of Egyptian chronology that most closely matches that of the Patriarchal Chronology adheres to the following parameters. If there is a dispute over the dating of an astronomical event, the Patriarchal Chronology aligns with the High Chronology. Wherever we find a dispute within the High Chronology between a higher or lower date, the evidence appears to favor the higher date.

As to the problem of the "cattle count" census, there is also a High versus Low chronology issue. The High Chronology view holds that cattle counts should be assumed to be biennial, although on some occasions a count was conducted in a consecutive year. The Low Chronology holds that we should assume the count was conducted annually, although on some occasions a count skipped over a year. The evidence in this study shows that the author of the Patriarchal Chronology worked from a system in which the cattle counts were primarily conducted on a biennial basis, in line with the High Chronology.

This doesn't necessarily mean that the biennial count theory is the correct understanding of the issue, but if someone using ancient Egyptian records understands the counts to be biennial, it is more likely that the ancient source, given his access and intellectual environment, may have had a better understanding of the term than the Low Chronology proponents do. But, even if the ancient source was wrong in assuming the "cattle counts" occurred biennially instead of annually, we find that on all occasions where it is relevant

that the Genesis chronology consistently aligns with a biennial cattle count. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that the author is working from some archival records that included references to the “cattle counts” and simply misinterpreted it. Such an interpretation doesn’t undermine the idea that the author is constructing a chronological record based on Egyptian archival records.

To summarize: I will argue that the Patriarchal Chronology aligns precisely, year to year, with an Egyptian dynastic chronology based on the High Chronology for astronomical observations, and with a “biennial” understanding of the term “cattle counts.”

Summary

Genesis 5 and 11 each contain a relative chronology of birth and death dates, such that if we had a starting date we could assign a year date to each birth and death. It will be argued in Chapter 4 that the starting date should be 3761. Some of those dates fall into what would be considered a mythical period in Egyptian chronology and some of those dates fall into what would be the historical period of Egyptian chronology. In this volume we will look at the historical period.

Based on different understandings of where certain astronomical events were observed, Egyptologists propose either a High Chronology range or a Low Chronology for the second millennium and portions of the third millennium. Within each grouping there are disputes as to how to fill in the gaps in the record, leading to several slightly different proposed Egyptian chronologies.

For the third millennium, archaeological records show that the Egyptians occasionally made note of how many cattle count censuses occurred during a king’s reign. Occasionally, Egyptians dated an event by referencing how many cattle counts had occurred in a king’s reign when that event happened. Egyptologists disagree over whether the censuses occurred on a mostly annual basis, occasionally skipping a year, or on a biennial basis, occasionally conducting a census in consecutive years.

The evidence in this study will show that the Patriarchal Chronology constitutes a chronological record of starting dates for Egyptian dynasties from the First through Eighteenth Dynasties, and, on a couple of occasions, gives us the starting dates for specific kings with a dynasty. The evidence will further show that the Patriarchal Chronology aligns precisely, on a year-to-year correspondence, with the High Chronology based on astronomical observances and with the biennial occurrence of cattle count censuses.

A key tool in the analysis will be the attempted reconstruction of Manetho’s third century BCE chronology of Egyptian history, in which the wildly large and unacceptable durations assigned to various dynasties or kings were due, per my theory, to redactors confusing summation lines, either in Manetho’s original text or in marginal notations made to a Manetho source, with additional groups of kings or as a record for an additional king.

At the end of this study, we will see that the Patriarchal Chronology and the original Manetho closely align with a traditional defensible chronology of Egyptian history as reflected in other Egyptian chronological records.

A second volume of this study will analyze those Genesis dates that fall into the mythical period of Egyptian history. A third volume of this study will deal with chronological issues associated with Creation and the Flood, and the influence of Egyptian creation myths on those stories.

ⁱ (Pritchard, 1969), 265.

ⁱⁱ (Waddell, 1940; reprint 1980), 13.

ⁱⁱⁱ (Waddell, 1940; reprint 1980), 229.

^{iv} (Greenberg, Manetho's 7th and 8th Dynasties: A Puzzle Solved, 1995)