

Appendix A

Nefertem Tirhakah's Rise to Power

The following are excerpts from the “Year 6” inscriptions of Nefertem Tirhakah referring to the history of his rise to power:

“Year 6” stele, Temple T (Merowe Museum, No. 52). TK, 1, pp. 15f, *ℓ.* 7–18.

Now his majesty had been in Nubia as a goodly youth, a king's brother, pleasant of love, and he came north to Thebes in the company of goodly youths whom his majesty King Shebitku had sent to fetch from Nubia, in order that he might be there with him, since he loved him more than all his brothers. He passed to the nome of Amun of Gempaten that he might make obeisance at the temple door, with the army of his majesty (Shebitku)¹ which had traveled north together with him. He found that this temple had been built in brick, but that its sandhill had reached to its roof, it having been covered over with earth at a time of year when one feared the occurrence of rainfall. And his majesty's heart grew sad at it until his majesty appeared as king, crowned as king of Upper and Lower Egypt, (and) when the Double Diadem was established upon his head and his name became Horus Lofty-of-Diadems, he called to mind this temple, which he had beheld as a youth, in the first year of his reign.

Then his majesty said to his courtiers, “Lo, I desire to rebuild the temple of my father Amon-Rē^c of Gempaten, since it was built of brick and covered over with soil, a thing not pleasant in the opinion of men.” The god was in this place, yet it was not known what the rain had done. But he it was who preserved this temple until it befell that I was crowned king. For he knew that his son, namely I, whom he begat, had made a monument for him. For the ‘mothers’ of my mother were committed to him by their brother, the chieftain, the son of Ra, Alara.

¹ “The army of his majesty” is here a reference to the army of King Shebitku. This detail is confirmed above when we are told that Pharaoh Shebitku “had sent to fetch from Nubia” Nefertem and his brothers, “that he might be there with him (Shebitku).”

“Year 6” stele, Temple T (Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek). TK, 1, p. 28, *l.* 13–19.

I came from Nubia in the company of the king’s brothers, whom his majesty had summoned, that I might be there with him, since he loved me more than all his brethren and all his children, and I was preferred to them by his majesty, for the hearts of the people turned toward me and the love of me was with all men. I received the crown in Memphis after the Hawk (Shebitku) had soared to heaven (died), and my father Amun commanded me to place every land and country beneath my feet, southward to Retekhu-Qabet, northward to Qebkh-Khor, and eastward to the rising of the sun and westward to the setting.

[Now she was] in Nubia, namely the king’s sister, pleasant of love, the king’s mother, Abar, may she live. Now further I had departed from her as a youth of twenty years when I came with his majesty to Lower Egypt.² Thereupon she came north to see me after an interval of years. She found me crowned upon the Throne of Horus, having received the Diadems of Ra, the Two Serpents having united with my head, and all the gods protecting my body.

² This passage, showing that Pharaoh Shebitku accompanied Nefertem from Thebes to Memphis in Lower Egypt, demonstrates that the story found in Eusebius (CM, p. 251) cannot refer to Nefertem’s first arrival in Egypt at the age of 20. In Eusebius, Nefertem marched north with his own army and killed Shebitku. In the above texts, Nefertem came north with the army of Shebitku to Thebes and then accompanied Shebitku to Lower Egypt.

Appendix B

The Chronology of Tsawi Tirhakah

The chronology of Tsawi Tirhakah is recovered in the Ethiopian archive list.¹ This list (see Chart E) suffers from some minor problems with dynasty stacking but these instances are easily recognized. Tsawi Tirhakah is adjusted to his proper dates with the rule of Nastossanan (Nastesenen, Nastesen, etc.). In the Ethiopian list Nastossanan's 14 year reign ended in 535 B.C.E. (542 Before Christ, Ethiopian dating).² This date is manifestly incorrect. Nastossanan was the ruler of Meroe in 525 B.C.E., the year that King Cambyses of Persia invaded Egypt and then Nubia.³

Nastossanan's reign ended within three years after Cambyses conquered Egypt. This detail is evident for the following reasons: First, Cambyses continued in Egypt until just before his death,⁴ which occurred in late December, 522 B.C.E. After conquering Egypt in the spring of 525 B.C.E., Cambyses attacked Lower Kush but suffered misfortune in Upper or South Kush. Because of this setback Nastossanan claimed he defeated Cambyses in the area north of Meroe.⁵

Despite this loss, Cambyses' army was later able to conquer Upper Kush and its capital city of Saba (Meroe) before the death of Cambyses. We know this because the city of Saba was renamed Meroe by Cambyses in honor of his sister/wife who died there.⁶ This data demonstrates that Cambyses eventually did win South Ethiopia before his death. Nastossanan would undoubtedly have been removed from power by Cambyses, as Cambyses had earlier removed the king of Egypt—a common political practice utilized by this Persian monarch.

Persian occupation of southern Kush was, nevertheless, short-lived. This point is demonstrated by the fact that only North Ethiopia was counted as a part of the Persian empire by Cambyses' successor Darius.⁷ There was not enough time between autumn of 522 B.C.E. and the death of Cambyses in late December of that year to conduct an Ethiopian campaign, establish Persian power over Meroe, and return to Egypt to prepare for his campaign against Smerdis (upon which journey he died).⁸ The first year of Cambyses

1 CBN, app. A, pp. 266.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 263, 266.

3 CAH, 3, pp. 312f; AHE, p. 561; PW, 10.2, pp. 1816f.

4 Herodotus, 3:14–27, 37, 61–67.

5 PW, 10.2, s.v. Kambyeses, pp. 1816f; CAH, 3, pp. 312f; CAH, 4, p. 21, n. 1; cf. Herodotus, 3:17–25.

6 Jos., *Antiq.*, 2:10:2; Strabo, 17:1:5.

7 Herodotus, 3:97.

8 Herodotus, 3:61–67.

over Meroe, therefore, could be no later than 523/522 B.C.E., autumn reckoning. The earliest year would be 525/524 B.C.E., the year after his defeat.

The Ethiopian list calculates reigns by the nonaccession-year method, counting a king's accession year as his first. Therefore, Handu Wuha Abra, who followed Nastossanan, would begin his reign with the year that Cambyses captured South Kush. The last year attributed to Nastossanan, therefore, could be no earlier than 526/525 B.C.E., the year he was victorious against the Persians. The latest possible date for this Ethiopian monarch would be 524/523 B.C.E., the year 523/522 B.C.E., being the last possible year before Cambyses could have conquered South Kush.

Next, in the third year of Psamtik II, Pharaoh of Egypt (592/591 B.C.E., autumn reckoning), he invaded and conquered Kush.⁹ The Ethiopian kings during this period were Piankhi IV and Aspurta. Psamtik II's great defeat of Kush would signal the humiliation of Piankhi IV and the accession of Aspurta. When we place the first year of Aspurta in 592/591 B.C.E., we find that the last year of Nastossanan was in 526/525 B.C.E., and therefore Cambyses' victory over South Kush occurred in 524 B.C.E.

Using this alignment, Urdamane began his reign over Kush in 664/663 B.C.E. This detail accurately reflects the political situation of that time. In the year 663 B.C.E. Urdamane was forced out of Egypt. It was also the year that his father Shabako gave up Egypt and returned to Kush.¹⁰ According to the Ethiopian list, the death of Tsawi Tirhakah took place that same year (being the first year of Urdamane). With the death of Tsawi Tirhakah, Shabako placed his own son, Urdamane, upon the Ethiopian throne in Kush. Therefore, the dates for Urdamane's accession to the throne of Kush Proper agree with the year Shabako and Urdamane abandoned Egypt to return to Kush.

After the reign of Urdamane, (Ta)-Nuat-Meawn (i.e. Ta-Nuat-Amun) took the throne. The highest date found for Ta-Nuat-Amun in Egypt is "Year 8."¹¹ We also know that he had a short co-regency with Nefertem Tirhakah the year Nefertem died,¹² i.e. early in Nefertem's 27th year (665/664 B.C.E.). This year would be Ta-Nuat-Amun's first. His last year in Egypt, as a result, was 658/657 B.C.E. Remarkably, this was the same year that the above arrangement from the Ethiopian list would have Ta-Nuat-Amun begin his reign in Kush. Therefore, Ta-Nuat-Amun, like his uncle Urdamane, came to power in Kush the same year he vacated Egypt.

The harmony of the various dates found in the Ethiopian king list with known political events of that time adds further assurance that they are accurate. These details confirm that the reign of Tsawi Tirhakah, according to the dates found in the Ethiopian archive list, extended from 713/712 to 665/664 B.C.E., autumn reckoning.

⁹ Herodotus, 2:161; CAH, 3, pt. 3, p. 50; TIP, p. 406.

¹⁰ Herodotus, 2:152; ANET, p. 295; and see Chap. VIII, pp. 87f, p. 88, n. 26, p. 95.

¹¹ EP, p. 349; LR, 4, p. 43, iii.

¹² CAH, 3, p. 284; ARE, 4, #920.

Appendix D

Seder Olam's Date for the Bar Kochba Revolt

The various versions of the Seder Olam present us with some textual problems for the passage in chapter 30, which deals with the chronology of the Bar Kochba revolt. These texts in general suffer from interpolations, missing words, wanting sections, and interposing. It is no different when we come to the passage under consideration. Based upon the best versions, Milikowsky's edition gives the following translation:

From the war of Asverus until the war of Vespasian was 80 years, these were during the time of the Temple; from the war of Vespasian until the war of Qitos was twenty four years; from the war of Qitos until the war of Ben Kozibah was sixteen years; and the war of Ben Kozibah was two and a half years, fifty-two years after the destruction of the Temple.¹

This arrangement, nevertheless, reflects an inadequacy, since it would place the Bar Kochba revolt a mere 40 years (24 plus 16) after the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.); and then it allows for a contradiction by saying that the Bar Kochba revolt took place 52 years after the destruction of the Temple. Another construction, based upon variant texts, is provided by Schürer:

From the war of Asverus to the war of Vespasian: 80 years whilst the Temple existed. From the war of Vespasian to the war of Quietus: fifty two years. And from the war of Quietus to the war of Ben Koziba: 16 years. And the war of Ben Koziba: three and a half years.²

In this reconstruction, based upon several variant texts, the 52 year period is correct, since it is the actual time between Vespasian and Quietus; and we must agree that this was obviously what the original text said. In a number of editions, but not all, it came to be transposed. Nevertheless, this construction does not explain the 24 years given in various accounts associated with the period up to Quietus; and the three and a half years favored by Schürer, as we have demonstrated in our study, is clearly a later interpretation inserted in

¹ SORC, 2, p. 547.

² HJP, 1, p. 534, n. 92.

some variant and less reliable texts as a replacement for the two and one half years found in the best manuscripts.

Based upon all the evidence from the variant manuscripts it is certain that the original text contained a more detailed definition of the chronology, which over time was constricted and partly transposed. Combining the variants with known historical facts the following reconstruction best reflects what the original text said:

From the conflict with As-varus until the conflict with Vespasian: 80 years, while the Temple existed. From the conflict with Vespasian until (*the persecutions began under Domitian: 24 years after the destruction of the Temple. From the beginning of the persecutions by Domitian until*) the conflict with Quietus: 24 years. From the conflict with Vespasian until the conflict with Quietus: 52 years (total). From the conflict with Quietus until the war of Ben Koziba: 16 years. And the war of Ben Kosiba: 2 years and a half.

It would be an easy matter for a scribe to by-pass the entire section relating to Domitian and simply state, “the conflict with Vespasian . . . until the conflict with Quietus.” This deletion would explain the retention of the “24 years” until Quietus, since it was both 24 years after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. until the Jewish persecutions began under Domitian in 94 C.E. and 24 years from the beginning of the persecutions until the dismissal of Quietus. Yet the “52 years” applied as a total from the beginning of the Jewish Revolt of 66 C.E. until the end of the conflict with Quietus would also be retained in numerous copies. The absence of Domitian in this chronology of troubles for the Jews is glaring; but since the figure of 24 years is still reflected in copies, it can hardly be doubted that the original texts contained a reference to it.