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PREFACE

The history of the ancient Near East in the 12th–10th centuries BCE is still an unsolved riddle. At times the veil is lifted and tiny components of this elaborate puzzle glow in a new light. But many questions are as yet unanswered, and most details are still vague. Nevertheless, the broad outlines of this age are fairly well agreed by most scholars: the three superpowers Egypt, Hatti and Assyria gradually lost their hold and their influence in the area: first the Hittites, just after 1200 BCE, and a few dozens of years later, Egypt and Assyria. Historians generally concur that after the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243–1208 BCE), Assyria plunged into a prolonged decline, gradually losing its western territories to the Aramaean invaders. This process is clearly demonstrated by the ‘Chronicle of Tiglath-pileser I’ and by the ‘Broken Obelisk’ (see Zadok’s and Fales’s articles). The rare complete silence of the Assyrian annals between 1055 and 934 BCE is the best indication that the Assyrians, under immense pressure from the Aramaeans, retreated to their homeland and fought a protracted and bitter war of survival. Concurrently, there are good indications that the Egyptians forfeited their influence in Canaan (the Wenamun report; see Kahn’s and Stern’s articles). Most Canaanite city states gradually disappeared, and by the end of the 10th century BCE only few survived as independent city states, mainly on the Phoenician coast. The ‘newcomers’ (the Aramaeans, the Sea Peoples, the Israelites and the Transjordanian peoples) became the masters of the land from the Sinai Peninsula to the sources of the Tigris, and from the Amuq Plain to Assyria.

The studies presented in this book touch on diverse aspects of human activities (political, social, economic, and cultural), and refer to different parts of the ancient Near East: from Melid and Hanigalbat in the north to Egypt and Kush in the south and from Assyria and Babylonia in the East to the Kingdom of Taita and (southern) Philistia in the west. They do though center mainly on the Bible and the history of ancient Israel and its western and eastern neighbors, as compared with other ancient Near Eastern cultures. The papers present an extensive vista of views—from biblical and archaeological perspectives and indeed most of them were written from an interdisciplinary standpoint.

The Syro-Mesopotamian and Anatolian spheres are the subjects of papers by Liv-erani (on Melid), Fales (on Hanigalbat), Zadok (on the Aramean diffusion into the Upper Jazira), Bloch (on the Assyrian-Babylonians conflicts during the reign of Aššur-rēša-išš I), and Nielsen (on Nebuchadnezzar I’s wars to the east).

Outlooks on Egypt and her imperial holdings are presented by Theis and van der Veen (New Kingdom epigraphic finds in the Jerusalem area), Kahn (on the 19th and 20th Dynasties in Canaan), Zwickel (second paper on Egyptians and Philistines) and Sagrillo (Šīṣaq’s army).

The history of ancient Israel and its eastern neighbors is the focus of several papers. Galil and Hurowitz deal with various aspects of the Solomonic Temple. Haiman studied the phenomenon of the ‘Negev Fortresses’; and Jordan in Iron Age I and IIA is discussed by Herr. The papers by Dietrich, Garsiel, Avioz, Levin and van Bekkum analyze the composition, ideology and historicity of the books of

The *‘Sea Peoples’ phenomenon* is the topics of several papers. Various aspects of the Philistines are discussed by Dietrich (literary evidence for relations with David), Faust (identity vs. the Israelites), Maeir (excavations at Philistine Tell eš-Šafi/Gath), Yasur-Landau (iconographic aspects of Philistines at Medinet Habu), and the second paper by Zwickel (Philistines vs. Egyptians). Old and new evidence on this issue in the Syro-Cilician sphere is the topic of Singer’s paper, and Stern discusses ‘Sea Peoples’ other than the Philistines in Canaan/Israel. Artzy’s paper rather emphasizes elements of continuity over the Bronze/Iron Age transition both in Canaan/Israel and in Cyprus.

*Several ideological and legal aspects of biblical vis-à-vis ancient Near Eastern texts* are the focus of papers by Achenbach (holy wars), Hess (value of human life), Koller (the term *kos*), and Jacobs ("a life for a life").

*Scripts and literacy* in this time span are overviewed by Lemaire (the west Semitic sphere) and Millard.

We wish to express our deep thanks to all the scholars who have contributed to this volume, most of whom participated in the conference held at the University of Haifa. Others who were unable to attend that meeting—Reinhard Achenbach, Mario Fales, Richard Hess, Mario Liverani, John Nielsen, Itamar Singer, Christoffer Theis, Koert van Bekkum and Peter van der Veen—kindly accepted our invitation to publish their important studies in this volume. We also thank Dr. Kai A. Metzler for his editorial comments. Dr. Ruth Fidler and Mr. Murray Rosovsky improved the English style; Ms. Galit Rozov and Ms. Maya Mokady took care of the indices.

Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren Maeir, and Dan’el Kahn
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<td>Mémoires publiés par les membres de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMJ</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>Madaba Plains Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABU</td>
<td>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Near Eastern Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEASB</td>
<td>Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIBC</td>
<td>New International Biblical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICOT</td>
<td>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJPS</td>
<td>New Jewish Publication Society Translation of the Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC</td>
<td>Orientis Antiqui Collectio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Oslo Archaeological Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBO</td>
<td>Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBOSA</td>
<td>Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECT</td>
<td>Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Oriental Institute Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJA</td>
<td>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLP</td>
<td>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTL</td>
<td>Old Testament Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PÅ</td>
<td>Probleme der Ägyptologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEF</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Fund Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIHANS</td>
<td>Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul. Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Palästina-Jahrbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>Quaestiones disputatae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBL</td>
<td>Review of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RdE</td>
<td>Revue d’Égyptologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMA 1</td>
<td>A. K. Grayson, <em>Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (To 1114 BC)</em>, (Toronto, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMB 2</td>
<td>G. Frame, <em>Rulers of Babylonia from the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157–612 BC)</em>, (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Babylonian Periods 2; Toronto, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGG</td>
<td>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGTC</td>
<td>Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHA</td>
<td>Revue hittite et asiatique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>field numbers of tablets excavated at Ras Shamra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSF</td>
<td>Rivista di Studi Fenici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSou</td>
<td>Ras Shamra – Ougarit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>State Archives of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAB</td>
<td>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAS</td>
<td>State Archives of Assyria Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGA</td>
<td>Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK</td>
<td>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAB</td>
<td>Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Stuttgarter Bibelstudien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCNH</td>
<td>Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIEM</td>
<td>Synchronization of Civilizations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 2nd Millennium BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGKAO</td>
<td>Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJAJ</td>
<td>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHCANE</td>
<td>Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJOT</td>
<td>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Scripta Mediterranea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA</td>
<td>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEA</td>
<td>Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSN</td>
<td>Studia Semitica Neerlandica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGIA</td>
<td>Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWBAS</td>
<td>Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Ta’yinat Archaeological Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAVO</td>
<td>Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients (University of Tübingen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tyndale Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Theologische Bücherei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS</td>
<td>Texts from Cuneiform Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThPr</td>
<td><em>Theologia Practica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td><em>Ugarit Forschungen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMM</td>
<td>University Museum Monograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk.</td>
<td>Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTB</td>
<td>Uni-Taschenbücher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAS</td>
<td>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td><em>Vetus Testamentum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAS</td>
<td>Wiener Alttestamentliche Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMANT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>N. Avigad and B. Sass, <em>Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals</em> (Jerusalem, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUB</td>
<td><em>Welt und Umwelt der Bibel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVDOG</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yale Egyptological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Assyriology und Vorderasiatische Archäologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBKAT</td>
<td>Zürcher Bibelkommentar zum Alten Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDPV</td>
<td>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction

The biblical narrative in 1 Kgs 14:25–27 and 2 Chron 12:1–12 concerning the Egyptian invasion of the land of Israel by Šîšaq—the Libyan founder of Dynasty 22 known in Egyptian as Shoshenq I (minimally circa 944/943–922 BCE)1—has been of interest to both biblical scholars and Egyptologists since well-before the 19th century, and that interest has not abated. While questions such as the route of Shoshenq’s army, his motivations for invading, and the relationship between the biblical and Egyptian textual records have long dominated the discussion,2 less attention has been paid to the composition of his army in light of the Egyptian record vis-à-vis the

*The author expresses his thanks to the organizers of “The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History” conference, particularly Gershon Galil and Dan’el Kahn, for their kind invitation to speak, as well as the generous hospitality extended to him. He would also like to thank Dan’el Kahn and Martina Minas-Nerpel for their pertinent criticism and comments on earlier drafts of this paper.


The Masoretic text of 2 Chron 12:2–3 states:


[2] And in the fifth year of King Rehabˈām, Šîšaq, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem—because they had acted treacherously against Yahweh—[3] with a thousand and two hundred chariots and sixty thousand horsemen, and there was no number to the people who came with him from Egypt—Libyans, Sukkīyîm, and Kushites.

The narrative raises a number of points. First, Šîsaq’s forces consist of infantry (“people who came with him from Egypt”), chariotry, and horsemen (i.e., cavalry), all in exaggeratedly large numbers. Secondly, the ethnic background of his military is composed of “Libyans, Sukkīyîm, and Kushites” (doubtlessly “Egyptians” are to be assumed). How do both points compare with what is known of the organization of the Egyptian military during early Dynasty 22?

II. The Egyptian Military During the Reign of Shoshenq I

I. The New Kingdom Background

In order to understand the composition and organization of the Egyptian military during the Libyan Period, it is important to briefly look at what preceded it. During the New Kingdom a professional, standing army, centered on a chariot-using elite, was established in Egypt. The bulk of the military consisted of infantry (mnfyt), broken up into divisions theoretically totaling 5,000 men each, which were sub-

---

3 This is not to claim there have been none at all. See, for example, A. R. Schulman, “Kings, Chronicles and Egyptian Mercenaries”, BES 5 (1983), pp. 117–133; Wilson, ibid., pp. 80–85; D. Michaux-Colombot, “The Identification of the Lubim, Sukkîyîm and Kušîm in II Chronicles 12, 3–4”, in É. E. Kormyševa and I. A. Ladynin (eds.), Kul’turnoe nasledie Égipta i Xristianskij vostok / Cultural Heritage of Egypt and Christian Orient 4 (Moscow, 2007), pp. 279–296.

4 These details are completely lacking in the narrative of 1 Kgs 14:25–27.

5 Broadly, Dynasties 21–24.


8 Gardiner, ibid.; Faulkner, ibid., p. 42; Spalinger, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 155–156, contra Schulman, ibid., p. 15. It should be noted that no division was ever at its full, idealized
divided into companies (sȝw). Companies were led by Standard-bearers (ṯȝy-sryt) under the command of an Adjutant or Deputy (jdnw). The chariotsry (ssmt) formed specialist units attached to divisions, as were “recruits” (nfrw) and non-Egyptian auxiliaries (“mercenaries”/prisoners of war). However, as early as Dynasty 21 the rank of “Standard-bearer” disappeared from the textual record for reasons that are not now entirely clear, while conversely, a new military title, “Commander” (ḫȝwty), is known since the end of Dynasty 20. The latter was especially favored by Libyan tribal leaders, especially by those holding the rank of Great Overseer of the Army (jmy-r ṭṯwḥms). During the late New Kingdom, greater emphasis was placed on non-Egyptian auxiliaries (primarily captured prisoners of war forcibly settled in Middle Egypt) strength, and smaller-sized units could be involved in any given conflict.

---

9 Faulkner, ibid., pp. 41, 45; Schulman, ibid., pp. 26–30.
10 Faulkner, ibid., p. 45; Schulman, ibid., pp. 69–71.
11 Faulkner, ibid., p. 46; Schulman, ibid., pp. 34–35; Yoyotte and López, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 6–7; Gnirs, op. cit. (note 6), p. 31–32; Spalinger, op. cit. (note 6), p. 156.
12 Faulkner, ibid., p. 43; K. A. Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions Translated and Annotated: Notes and Comments 2: Ramesses II: Royal Inscriptions (Oxford, 1999), pp. 39–40. Chariots were grouped into squadrons of twenty-five chariots each, commanded by an Adjutant of Chariotry (jdnw n ḫṯmr); see Gardiner, op. cit. (note 7), vol. 1, p. 28*; Faulkner, ibid., p. 43; A. al-Ayedi, Index of Egyptian Administrative, Religious and Military Titles of the New Kingdom (al-Iṣmāʿīliyyah, 2006), no. 673.
13 Faulkner, ibid., p. 44; Yoyotte and López, op. cit. (note 6), p. 5; Chevereau, op. cit. (note 6), p. 56; Schulman (op. cit. [note 6, 1964], pp. 20–21) does not regard the nfrw as recruits but rather as elite troops.
15 See the discussion in P.-M. Chevereau, Prosopographie des cadres militaires égyptiens de la Basse Époque: Carrières militaires et carrières sacerdotaux en Égypte du XIe au IIe siècle avant J. C. (EME 2; Paris, 2001), pp. 283–284.
16 Previous to this, ḥȝwty was used in a more general sense as “leader”, rather than as a true rank (Schulman, op. cit. [note 6, 1964], p. 49).
18 Often stereotypically translated as “General.”
as a key part of the military. This was on account of pressure to the west from both Libyans and Sea Peoples—already in Dynasty 19, but especially during Dynasty 20—as well as due to a declining Egyptian population no longer capable of supporting a large military on its own.\footnote{K. W. Butzer, *Early Hydraulic Civilization in Egypt: A Study in Cultural Ecology* (Prehistoric Archaeology and Ecology; Chicago, 1976), p. 83; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 152–154, 271–272, 274–275.}


Another major difficulty is a much smaller pool of evidence, both textual and iconographic, dealing with military matters for the Libyan Period as compared to the rich evidence from the New Kingdom. The result is that it is difficult to speak with any degree of certainty about the structure and nature of the military during the Libyan Period as compared with earlier periods.\footnote{For an overview, see Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 282–290.}

Nevertheless, as long as the evidence is approached conservatively, much that may still be gleaned.

2. Late Dynasty 21

With the establishment of Dynasty 22 by Shoshenq I, the non-Egyptian elements of the military essentially became its primary component. However, even before ascending to the throne as king, Shoshenq I was already intimately part of the Libyan tribal hierarchy, which was at its core highly militarized.\footnote{D. B. O’Connor, “The Nature of Tjemhu (Libyan) Society in the Later New Kingdom”, in M. A. Leahy (ed.), *Libya and Egypt c1300–750 BC* (London, 1990), pp. 66–76, 81–89; C. Manassa, *The Great Karnak Inscription of Merneptah: Grand Strategy in the Thirteenth Century BC* (YES 5; New Haven, 2003), pp. 88–90; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 244. It is perhaps appropriate to call to mind the Serapeum stela of Pasenhor B (Paris Louvre IM 2846). The portion of Pasenhor’s genealogy running from Shoshenq I to Buyuwawa the Tjehe-nu-Libyan, six generations earlier, indicates that all members—with the exception of Buyuwawa—were seemingly entitled “Great Chief” (wr’y nj mn<šwš>w), Chief of Chiefs (wr n wrw).\footnote{For an overview, see Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 282–290.}


For example, an openwork gold pectoral (Cairo JE 72171), discovered as part of the burial of Shoshenq II\footnote{G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée, and O. E. Kaper, “The Numbering of the Kings Called Shoshenq”, *GM* 216 (2008), pp. 9–10.}

\footnote{P. Montet, *Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennès à Tanis* (Fouilles de Tanis; Paris, 1951), pp. 43–44, figure 13, plate 28; E. Feucht-Putz, *Die königlichen Pectorale:*}
appear on a limestone stela seen on the antiquities market by Daressy, but now unfortunately lost. This document additionally states that Shoshenq’s father, Nimlot A, was a Great Chief of the Meshwesh, and his mother, Ta-net-sepeh A, was likewise the daughter of an anonymous Great Chief of the Meshwesh.

A third text, a rose granite stela from Abydos (Cairo JE 66285), establishing a funerary endowment for Nimlot A, entitles Shoshenq as “Great Chief of the Meshwesh, Chief of Chiefs” (x+5, x+7, x+24), while in line x+1 he is called “Great Chief of Chiefs” (wr ḫn wrw), a title unique to Shoshenq I. The unnamed king in this text—certainly Psusennes II—informs Shoshenq that his wish for the establishment of his father’s funerary endowment has been granted by the oracle god, and that “you are True of Voice, Shoshenq, True of Voice, the Great Chief of the Me←shwesh>, Chief of Chiefs, my Great-one, together with all those upon your water (i.e., adherents), (and) your army” (msk) (lines x+5–6). This extraordinary statement reveals that Shoshenq, not yet king, had drawn to himself a sizable body of men serving as “[his] army,” and that the king of Egypt recognized them as a legitimate force.

While it is clear that Shoshenq held unprecedented power among the Libyan tribal groups as the Great Chief of Chiefs before arising to the throne of Egypt, it is remarkable that he is not known to have held any formal titles associated with the Egyptian military, such as Great Overseer of the Army (jmy-r ḫn mšc wr). However, a reused stone block from the delta site of Šafṭ al-Ḥinnah—ancient Soped—mentions that an individual named Osorkon, son of Shoshenq and Karamat, held the rank of Overseer of the Army (jmy-r ḫn mšc) and Commander of Archers of Pharaoh (ḥȝ wty [pḏ wt <n> pr- cȝ]). This is almost certainly Osorkon I, the son of Sho-
shenq I and his chief consort, Karamat A. If so, the text is noteworthy as it provides clear evidence that Osorkon was both a grown man and serving in the Egyptian military before either he or his father had yet become king.

3. The Military Role of the Royal Family

As is well-known, upon assuming the kingship and establishing Libyan rule over a reunited Egypt as the first king of Dynasty 22, Shoshenq I placed a number of his sons and immediate family into positions of power throughout the country, stripping power from local, hereditary elites. As might be expected, this included the military. While details concerning the Crown Prince Osorkon’s role in the military are not known during his father’s reign, his brother Iuput A was established as the First God’s Servant of Amun-Re, and—as with the previous dynasty—this was coupled with a leading role in the military. In particular, he was the First Great Overseer of the Army of His Majesty (jmy-rj mšwr ḫyty n ḫm.f), the Great Overseer of the Army of Upper and Lower Egypt (jmy-rj mšwr ḫnmw), the Great Overseer of the Army (jmy-rj mšwr), the Great Overseer of the Army of the South (jmy-rj mšwr n rsy), the Commander of the Entire Army (ḫwyty n mšr ḥgw), the Commander Who is at the Front of the Great Army of the Entire District of Upper Egypt (ḫwyty nty ḫḥtn ḫntwr mšr ḥgw), and “King’s Son of Ramesses” (ḥȝ nsw ḥȝmsw).

The brother of Iuput A, Nimlot B, was likewise a King’s Son of Ramesses, as well as bearing the titles Commander of the Entire Army (ḥȝwty n mšwr), Overseer of the Army (jmy-rj mšwr), and Overseer of the Army of Neni-nesu (pȝ jmy-rj mšwr n nnj-nsw).


33 It seems plausible that Osorkon retained his role of Overseer of the Army that he held under Psusennes II (?), but this is not certain.

34–35; Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. (note 23), p. 162 (10.9); Chevereau, op. cit. (note 15), pp. 53–53, (398). The block unfortunately has not been fully published, though a record of it was maintained in the Archives Mission Montet (manuscript 74 c), including photography from the 1930s (Yoyotte, ibid., p. 61, note 74); regrettably the documentation could no longer be located as of 2006. A transliteration of the text, as well as the hieroglyphs of some of the specific titles, is presented in Chevereau, op. cit. (note 15), pp. 52–53 (see also Yoyotte, ibid., p. 45); cf. the silver cup (Cairo JE 87742) of Wen-djeba-en-Djedet (Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. [note 23], p. 67:4.129; Chevereau, op. cit. [note 15], pp. 50–51).

35 It might be wondered if in this role Iuput was responsible for leading his father’s forces into the Levant, on the assumption that the life of Crown Prince Osorkon was too crucial to risk in a foreign military campaign.


38 Modern Ihnäsiyyah al-Madinah, Classical Herakleopolis Magna. If, as has been suggested (note 57 below), Dynasty 22 had its origins in this city, Nimlot’s role as the Overseer of the Army of Neni-nesu would have been quite significant.

Two sons-in-law of Shoshenq I were also active in the Egyptian military. The Second God’s Servant of Amun-Re, Djed-Ptah-iw-ef-ankh A/i, who was the husband of the king’s daughter, Ta-peseshet-net-Bastet, was not only a Royal Scribe of the Army of the South (ṣš nsw mšc n rsy) and a King’s Son of Ramesses, but also an Overseer of the Army of the Land of Upper Egypt (jmy-rȝ mšc nw tȝ ṣm’w), Overseer of the Army of the Place of Beloved of Thoth40 (jmy-rȝ n tȝ st mrj-dḥwty), and Overseer of the Army.41 Another son-in-law, Djed-Hor-iw-ef-ankh, the spouse of the king’s daughter Djed-Inet-nebu-iw-es-ankh, was an Overseer of the Army, Commander (ḥȝ wty), and a King’s Son of Ramesses.42

4. The King’s Son of Ramesses

The title “King’s Son of Ramesses” (ṣȝ nsw r c-ms-sw) first appears during the reign of Shoshenq I and is encountered only during Dynasty 22. Gauthier considered it to be an indication of direct descent from the Ramesside royal family via the female line, or used by Libyan elites married into the Ramesside line,43 while Meeks concluded that the title is similar in use to that of a Minister (“vizier”), limited in influence to the Delta region, and thus equivalent to the King’s Son of Kush in Lower Nubia.44

However, in major reviews of the prosopographical data of eleven holders of this title, both Chevereau45 and (especially) Collombert46 have aptly demonstrated the title is military in nature, very often held by Great Chiefs (wr ’ȝ), Commanders (ḥȝ wty), and other high officers in the Libyco-Egyptian military hierarchy. It was clearly neither hereditary nor tied exclusively to the Delta. The fictional reference to Ramesses is likely due to Ramesses II being the warrior king par excellence in the minds of later generations of Egyptian and Libyan rulers.47

5. The Egyptian Military under Shoshenq I

Although various individuals contemporary with Shoshenq I who held military titles are known, precise details concerning the organization of the Egyptian military at the time remain elusive. One key source of information comes from the so-called “Herakleopolis Magna altar” (Cairo JE 39410).48 A lengthy text inscribed on this

---

46 Collombert, op. cit. (note 37), pp. 23–35.
47 Ibid., pp. 34–35.
object reveals how the king’s son, Nimlot B, (re)established on behalf of his father an annual levy of 365 oxen for the temple cult of Heryshef at Ilnisiyyah al-Madinah, and details the quota the officials and local settlements in the 20th Upper Egyptian nome were responsible for providing in particular months. A large number of officials drawn from the military are specified.

In addition to the Overseer of the Army of Neni-nesu, Nimlot B himself, other military personnel include the Great-one of the Foreign Troops of the <nḥtw-Stronghold> of User-maat-Re (pȝ n wḥtw n <nḥtw>)<sup>49</sup> (line x+13); the Great-one of the Foreign Troops of Neni-nesu (pȝ n twḥrw n mnf-nsw; line x+13); the Chief of Bowmen of the Ships of War of the Overseer of the Army (pȝ bry ḫty n ḫsw [n pȝ jmy-rj mš]; line x+17); the Scribe of the Army of the nḥtw-Stronghold of Mery-mesha-ef<sup>50</sup> (pȝ ṣš mš n pȝ nḥtw n mry-mš; line x+18); the Great-ones of the […] of the nḥtw-Stronghold of Mery-mesha-ef (nȝ pȝ n <ṭšmš<s>}>w(?) [nḥtw] mṛj-mš; line x+18); the Scribe of the Army of the nḥtw-Stronghold of […] (pȝ ṣš mš n pȝ nḥtw n) […] (line x+18); the Deputy of the Place of Writings of the Overseer of the Army (pȝ jdwn n tj st ṣš<n> n pȝ jmy-rj mš; line x+26); and the Craftsmen of Chariots (n<ȝ>c> hmww mrktbw; line x+28).

From a military perspective, this text reveals a number of important things. First of all, it clearly demonstrates the presence of a sophisticated, complex military establishment at the site, not just something newly founded at the beginning of the dynasty.<sup>54</sup> Secondly, it makes reference to a number of individuals concerned with

---


<sup>50</sup> For nḥtw-strongholds, see below.


<sup>53</sup> The signs in question are not at all clear. Tresson (op. cit. [note 48], p. 823, note 9) read this as ḡwmm “repeaters, messengers, heralds”, which has been followed by Ritner (op. cit. [note 23], pp. 181, 184). Kessler (op. cit. [note 14], pp. 132–133, note 69) argues for ṣrw “watchers, guards.” Jansen-Winkeln argues that since the following determinative (Gardiner Sign List A14a) is that of an enemy, the word must be in the same semantic horizon, perhaps ḡwmm “enemies” (K. Jansen-Winkeln, “Zu einer Sekundärbestattung der 21. Dynastie in Kom Ombo”, GM 202 [2004], pp. 75–76).

<sup>54</sup> D. B. Redford, Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study
foreign troops, as well as nḫtw-strongholds established by Ramesses III. These were institutions designated to house and culturally indoctrinate non-Egyptian prisoners of war who were earmarked for service to the Egyptian state. Late Dynasty 21 or early Dynasty 22 texts discovered by the Spanish mission to Ihnāsiyyah al-Madinah make mention of the “5 great nḫtw-strongholds of the Meshwesh” (p3 5 nḥtww 3y n n<γ> m<sš> w), in the region, and it is probably justified in claiming that at least some of the nḥtww-strongholds given in the text of the “Herakleopolis Magna altar” are the same institutions.

III. The Biblical Evidence

The evidence from Egypt, while tantalizing, is nevertheless somewhat vague, especially when compared to what is known of the Egyptian military during the New Kingdom. However, the text of 2 Chron 12:3 at least seems to provide some additional context and data.

1. Chariotry

While the presence of chariots in the forces of Šīšaq is to be expected, the numbers mentioned are surprisingly large. The narrative in 2 Chron 12:3 states that Šīšaq’s host consisted of “a thousand and two hundred chariots and sixty thousand horsemen, and there was no number to the people who came with him from Egypt”. Josephus’ paraphrase of the text (Jewish Antiquities 8:254–255) adds the detail that there were four hundred thousand foot soldiers. While Josephus’ contribution can be safely ignored as impossible, it is worth considering the remaining statistical information, particularly as Kitchen has remarked that a total of 1,200 chariots is “a large but very reasonable chariot-force”. He argues his case by comparing Šīšaq’s chariotry to 2,500 Hittite chariots that Ramesses II claims faced him at Qadeš; 924 chariots captured by Thutmose III at Megiddo; 1,032 chariots brought back to...
Egypt by Amenhotep II as booty from the Levant; 1,200 chariots commanded by Hadadezer (Ben-hadad II) of Aram-Damascus together with 2,000 chariots under Ahab of Israel at the battle of Qarqar.

However, during the New Kingdom the normal ratio was fifty chariots for every five thousand infantry, implying that the Hittite infantry at Qadeš should have numbered over a million men. If the figure of 2,500 chariots were to be taken at face value, this would point to the presence of over five thousand horses (not to mention reserve teams), making the figure highly improbable from logistical and military standpoints. Furthermore, the chariots would have presented a front of about 7.3 km if stretched out for combat. Similarly, if the total of 1,200 chariots given to Šîšaq’s forces in 2 Chron 12:3 is correct, his infantry should have numbered over a hundred thousand men—a figure that is clearly preposterous—while the chariotry alone would have presented a line of just under two kilometers.

Therefore, Kitchen’s assertion that Šîšaq’s chariot force is “very reasonable” on the basis of comparison with the Hittite chariot forces at Qadeš is seriously flawed. If, however, the number given in the biblical text represents the total number of chariots with the Egyptian army on campaign, and not just those directly participating in a single military confrontation outside the walls of Jerusalem (and thus contra the biblical record), this number may perhaps be more reasonable, though it would still represent a significant logistical problem.

It must be noted that numbers in Chronicles are very often inflated for theological reasons. For example, in 2 Chron 13:3 King Abijah of Judah is said to have fielded an army of 400,000 against an army of 800,000 fielded by Jeroboam I of Israel, inflicting some 500,000 casualties. Similarly 2 Chron 14:8 claims King Asa of Judah defeated an invasion of a million men (plus three hundred chariots) led by Zerah the Kushite.

---

66 *apud* Spalinger (ibid.). Organizing the chariots in ranks could of course shorten this distance.
These exaggerated numbers are not limited to the biblical record of course. Esarhaddon claimed to have taken 50,000 strong horses and 60,000 fine bulls as booty from Taharqo’s palace at Memphis.68 As mentioned above, Shalmaneser states that he was opposed at the battle of Qarqar by 3,940 enemy charioteers and over 62,000 infantry, in addition to some 1,900 horsemen and 1,000 cameleers.69 De Odorico70 argues that in the Neo-Assyrian record these numbers were consciously exaggerated by a factor of ten and under no circumstances can any of them be considered to be even close to accurate.

If the same factor of exaggeration is utilized in the biblical record, Šîšaq’s force may have been in the region of 120 chariots with a minimum of 240 horses. While this may seem rather low, it should be noted that the royal stables at Per-Ramesses (Qantīr), thought to be the largest known stables from the ancient world, housed circa 460 horses, while those at Amarna held about 200.71 Of course these are individual stables, not the total for the entire country, but it seems unlikely that number of horses to be found in Egypt at the beginning of Dynasty 22 would have been particularly vast.

2. Cavalry
As with the chariots, the report of sixty thousand horsemen (פָּרָשִׁים)—that is cavalry, as opposed to chariots—in 2 Chron 12:3 is a clear exaggeration. Nevertheless, Kitchen again contends that this is “a large figure, but not totally impossible when compared with the possibly 90,000 men fielded by Teos and the 100,000 deployed by Nectanebo II to defend Egypt in the fourth century B.C.”72

However, as has been noted,73 Kitchen’s figures are for entire armies, not just the cavalry.74 The logistical support required for feeding and caring for 60,000 military equines (which must be healthy for combat) is so immense as to be absurd.

---

69 See note 62 above.
70 M. De Odorico, The Use of Numbers and Quantifications in the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions (SAAS 3; Helsinki, 1995), pp. 104–105.
72 Kitchen, op. cit. (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 289.
74 It is worth noting that, according to Spalinger, at the height of the Egyptian empire during the Ramesside Period, for the entire country the Egyptian military did not number maximally more than 40,000 men, and was likely closer to 30,000 (Spalinger, op. cit. [note 6], pp. 203–204, 229).
Horses require ca. 36 liters of water daily, and fodder equal to about 22 kg per day (although much—but not all—could be provided from pasturage, if it is available). Providing for 6,000 horses would be challenging, particularly in the arid environment of the Sinai and Negev, but doing so for 60,000 would be impossible.

Kitchen does opine that if the figure is exaggerated, it may be a scribal error, and the text should be read as “six thousand horsemen.” Given the number of cases where the Chronicler evidently uses inflated numbers elsewhere in his text (see above), to suggest a scribal error only occurs here seems rather far-fetched. It seems more likely that the number has been purposefully exaggerated for theological reasons.

Beyond the logistical problems of providing for 60,000 horses on campaign (never mind their riders, grooms, and support staff!), the reference to horsemen in 2 Chron 12:3 is debatable for another reason. At the time of Shoshenq I’s campaign cavalry units in Egypt, and most of the Near East, were unknown. Horse-mounted riders who functioned as messengers and scouts are known as early as the New Kingdom, but undisputed evidence for cavalry units in Egypt is not known before the first Persian occupation (Dynasty 27), although arguably they seem to present by Dynasty 26. Redford and Revez have independently drawn attention to a fragmentary Third Intermediate Period text now in the Cheikh Labib magazine (94 CL 1013) at Karnak that mentions how the king took measures against his advisory by equipping a city with “horses and chariot<s>” (lines x+5), among other supplies. While it might be suggested that this refers to cavalry and chariots, the determinatives of each word make clear it is the actual animals and vehicles that are being referred to individually, therefore the

---

76 Engels (*op. cit.* [note 75], p. 126) states that a horse doing moderate work will need 20–24 lbs. (ca. 9–11 kg) of fodder, while 24–32 lbs. (ca. 11–14.5kg) are needed daily for a horse doing hard work, but Spalinger (*op. cit.* [note 6], pp. 35, 42) argues this may in fact be higher; cf. five to seven kilograms of barley fodder provided to Roman cavalry P. Erdkamp, “War and state formation in the Roman Republic”, in P. Erdkamp [ed.], *A Companion to the Roman Army* [Malden – Oxford, 2007], p. 102).
77 This does not take into account the additional 2,400 horses minimum needed for Šīšaq’s 1,200 chariots.
81 D. B. Redford, “Taharqa in Western Asia and Libya”, *EI* 24 (1993), 190; J. Revez, “Un stèle inédite de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire à Karnak: Une guerre civile en thébaïde?” *Cahiers de Karnak* 11 (2003), p. 537. Revez was unaware of Redford’s earlier publication, but published two additional fragments not known to Redford; he therefore reaches a very different conclusion.
82 The hieroglyph of the chariot is damaged, but traces of the wheel are evident (Revez, *op. cit.* [note 81], p. 541).
horses are more likely to be chariot teams rather than cavalry mounts. Neo-Assyrian texts point to the possibility of cavalry existing in Egypt by the reign of Taharqo, if not Shebitqo.

Outside of Egypt mounted soldiers who fought from horseback are not known with a degree of regularity until the 10th century BCE, and even then these are attested only in north Syria. However, by the mid-9th century BCE cavalry was well established in the Near East, in thanks to the existence of heavier, stronger horses capable of bearing the weight of an armored rider. For example, Shalmaneser III records that his cavalry of 5,542 riders faced enemy cavalry at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE.

By the 8th century, cavalry units began to appear regularly in the Neo-Assyrian army, especially after the development of the bridle and reins suited for mounted riding. Before the development of bridles and reins for mounted riding, Neo-Assyrian horsemen had to operate in pairs, with one rider controlling the horse of the other while his partner shot his bow.

While it is admitted that cavalry units did not appear de novo—obviously years of training would have been required—the impact of this military strategy inside Egypt is very difficult to access. The introduction of foreign technology in Egypt sometimes proceeded at a very slow pace. For example, while chariots make their first appearance in Egypt at the very beginning of Dynasty 18, they were primarily an indicator of status among the king and the elite, their military function initially being of secondary importance, despite wide usage in the Near East.

---

83 Redford (op. cit. [note 81], pp. 189–190*) dates the text to Taharqo (the king’s name does not appear), which is late enough for the presence of cavalry in Egypt to not be as surprising. Conversely, Revez (op. cit. [note 81], pp. 554–557) dates the text to the period of the Theban civil war during the time of Crown Prince Osorkon B and Padibastet I in mid-Dynasty 22, in which case cavalry would be rather more unexpected.


87 Spalinger, op. cit. (note 6), pp. 10–11.

88 Although it is possible the numbers are exaggerated; see below.

89 Kuan, op. cit. (note 62), pp. 29–31, 34.


Regardless, the development of cavalry occurred outside of Egypt proper, and mostly well after the reign of Shoshenq I. There is no evidence for its presence in Egypt at the time, and therefore it seems implausible that his army included mounted cavalry. While this changed during later parts of the Third Intermediate Period, the fact that Libu-prince Tefnakht fled on horseback at the beginning of Dynasty 25, rather than in a chariot, was noteworthy.93

3. Libyans

As the (former?) Great Chief of the Meshwesh, Great Chief of Chiefs, it is axiomatic that the military forces campaigning with Shoshenq I in the Levant would have included Libyan tribesmen; they formed the backbone of the Egyptian military at the time and were certainly present. What remains uncertain is if references to “Libyans” (Lûbîm)94 in the biblical text and its derivatives indicate members of the Libu tribe (Egyptian rbw)95 specifically, or, as is likely the case, more generically of any Berber-speaking inhabitant of the Western Desert, as comes to be the case in Classical Greek and Latin usage.96

One point arguing against a generic reference to “Libyans” in the Greek and Latin sense is the distinction made in the Hebrew Bible between Lûbîm and Pûṭ (ptest).97 The latter is the Hebrew form of the name of a Libyan tribal group known to the Egyptians variously as the pjld, pwd, pωdj, pjt, pjt, and pjdj,98 who are first attested during the reign of Osorkon II.99 In the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, both groups are encountered in association with one another,100 although in Ezek 27:10, 30:5, and 38:5 the Septuagint replaces Hebrew Pûṭ with ἱφθος “Libyans”. It would seem, therefore, that while the Hebrews recognized the Lûbîm as being related to the Pût, a distinction between the two groups was maintained to a certain extent.

---

93 See the Triumphal Stela of Piye (Cairo, JE 48862, line 89). For this stela see N.-C. Grimal, La stèle triomphale de Pi(ankh)y (JE 48862 et 47086–47089), (MIFAO 105; Cairo, 1981), p. 31*; Ritner, op. cit. (note 23), p. 485.
94 Septuagint Λίβυες (A. Rahlfs [ed.], Septuaginta; id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interprete, I [Stuttgart, 1979], p. 829).
100 Ezek 30:5; Nah 3:9.
degree.\footnote{It is possible this was the case with other tribal units as well, though it goes unrecorded in the Bible.\footnote{This does not answer the question as to what specific tribal group(s) were including under the rubric of Lûbîm. Given the king’s own role as the Great Chief of the Meshwesh, it is certain that his fellow tribal members must have been included, if not the Libu tribe proper. It is not unreasonable that other, smaller groups may have been participants as well.}

One such group is that of the Mehes (\textit{mhs}).\footnote{This name was formerly read as \textit{mhswn}, with the final hieroglyph interpreted as the desert hare (Gardiner Sign List E34; phonetic /\textit{wn}/). K. Jansen-Winkeln (\textit{Ägyptische Biographien der 22. und 23. Dynastie}, I [ÄAT 8; Wiesbaden, 1985], p. 115, note 6) regards this rather as a couchant version of the Set-animal (Gardiner Sign List E21) being used as a semi-phonetic determinative.} who are perhaps to be identified with the \textit{Mannîwî} tribe who lived east of Carthage.\footnote{W. Spiegelberg, “Ein libyscher Stammesname”, \textit{ZÄS} 53 (1917), p. 114; Zibelius, \textit{op. cit.} (note 95), p. 126; Winnicki, \textit{op. cit.} (note 95), p. 417; see, however, Jansen-Winkeln, ibid., II, p. 492, note q. For an older, erroneous view equating them with the Bedouin Ma’ázah tribe of the Eastern Desert, see G. A. Legrain, “Sur les \textit{Mahasaou},” \textit{ASAE} 8 (1907), pp. 56–57.} Three chiefs of the Mehes are known from the Egyptian textual record. The earliest attestation of this title comes from the Great Chief of the Mehes, Fourth God’s Servant of Amun-Re, King of the Gods, Commander (\textit{jwyty}), King’s Son of Ramesses, Nesy. He is referred to posthumously in a genealogical text (Cairo CG 42218) of one of his descendants, Pa-di-Mut, who was himself a Great Chief of the Mehes.\footnote{H. Jacquet-Gordon, “The Illusory Year 36 of Osorkon I”, \textit{JEJ} 57 (1967), pp. 63–68; Jansen-Winkeln, \textit{op. cit.} (note 39), p. 415; Kitchen, \textit{op. cit.} (note 23), pp. 261–262; Winnicki, ibid., p. 416.}

In addition, a third instance is known from the time of Osorkon I, the heir of Shoshenq I. This individual, the Fourth God’s Servant of Amun-Re, King of the Gods, King’s Son of Ramesses, Chief of the Mehes, Commander, Pa-shed-Bastet, is attested on a stela from Abydos (London UCL 14496).\footnote{J. Yoyotte, \textit{op. cit.} (note 25), §28; Kitchen, ibid., §188; Winnicki, ibid., p. 416.}

Given the chronological proximity of both Nesy and Pa-shed-Bastet to the reign of Shoshenq I, and their high ranks in both the military and sacerdotal spheres, it seems probable that the Mehes tribe participated in the campaign. This is not to say that either (Great) Chief participated personally, but rather their tribe members may have.
4. Sukkiyîm

Another Libyan component of Šīšaq’s forces are possibly the Sukkiyîm (סֻכִּיִּים), mentioned in the Hebrew Bible only in 2 Chron 12:3. Spiegelberg was first to associate them with the Tjekten (ṯktn, singular, ṭk) people of the western oases of Egypt, known only from texts dating to the Ramesside Period. His view has been adopted and expanded upon by a number of other scholars since. However, this has been questioned by Winnicki and Michaux-Colombot (discussed below).

The arguments for a Libyan ethnicity for the Tjekten are based primarily on the testimony of papyrus Anastasi IV (British Museum EA 10249): 10,8–11,8, a didactic text for training scribes. This particular section is a model letter conveying a warning from the king to an Egyptian official who has attempted to have his staff remove “Tjekten of the land of the Oasis” (ṯktn n pȝt ṭȝt; p. Anastasi IV:10,9) from their hunting range. As the term “the land of the Oasis” refers collectively to both the Dākhlah and Khârgah oases, and makes reference to “their huntings” (nȝy.w nww; line 10,10), it is reasonable to suggest the Tjekten inhabit the region.

A clear reference Libyan population in the oasis is to be found in the text of the

108 Septuagint Τρωγλοδύται and τρωγοδυται (Rahlfs, op. cit. [note 94], I, p. 829). See note 133.
109 The word may occur in a singular form (סכיא sky’) on an Imperial Aramaic ostracon (Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 10679), dated to 495 BCE, from the Jewish community on Elephantine. For this ostracon see A. L. Vincent, La religion des Judéo-Araméens d’Éléphantine (Paris, 1937), p. 266; B. Porten and A. Yardeni (eds.), Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt, Newly Copied, Edited, and Translated into Hebrew and English 4: Ostraca and Assorted Inscriptions (Jerusalem – Winona Lake, 1999), D7.24; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm, The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition (Leiden, 2001), p. 754. See, however, Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3), p. 287. E. Lipiński (On the Skirts of Canaan in the Iron Age: Historical and Topographical Researches [OLA 153; Leuven, 2006], p. 103, note 36), is of the opinion that the Aramaic notice is better tied to the Sakā, a Scythian tribal confederacy known from Achamenid inscriptions; cf. Herodotus, Histories 7.64. This may possibly be the case for the Aramaic evidence but his argument for holding the same view regarding the Sukkiyîm in the Hebrew Bible is not warranted given the Egyptian context of 2 Chron 12:3; see also E. Lipiński, “Sukkiens”, in P.-M. Bogaert et al. (eds.), Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible (Turnhout, 2002), cols. 1221–1222.
111 The earliest certain attestation comes from an unpublished statue discovered at Zawiyyat Umm al-Rakhām, which dates to the reign of Ramesses II; see note 123. The latest occur in the Wilbour Papyrus, which dates to Regnal Year 4 of Ramesses V; see note 150. An earlier attestation may possibly occur on a statue dated to Amenhotep III (for which, see below).
113 Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3); Winnicki, op. cit. (note 95), pp. 69–72.
114 A. H. Gardiner, Late-Egyptian Miscellanies (BÄe 7; Brussels, 1937), pp. 46–47; translation and commentary in Caminos, ibid., pp. 176–181.
“greater Dākhlah stela” (Ashmolean Museum 1894.107A),116 which dates to Regnal Year 5 of Shoshenq I. It attests to the presence of a son of the mes-chief117 of the Meshwesh, in addition to several other individuals with Libyan names and titles.118 Additionally, another Libyan tribal group, the Shamin (šmjn), is attested in the region at a slightly later date.119 It would appear, therefore, that the Tjekten inhabited a region known to be settled by Libyan tribesmen, including during the reign of Shoshenq I.

There are a number of other, albeit circumstantial, links with western regions. On the Victory Stela of Merenptah (the “Israel Stela” [Cairo CG 34025]120), the Tjekten are associated with the Medjay, a people from the Eastern Desert who served the Egyptian crown as border police121; the Tjekten seem to have functioned in a similar role to the west of Egypt. A further connection with the west and Libyans may be found in the text of the second Libyan war of Ramesses III at Madīnat Hābū, which describes the defeated Libyan chieftain Keper coming to seek peace “in the fashion of a Tjek.”122 Finally, an unpublished Dynasty 19 text on a statue discovered in the Ramesside fortress at Zāwiyyat Umm al-Rakham makes

118 Stela main section, lines 1, 3, 17–20.
120 Kitchen, op. cit. (note 52), IV, p. 18/7, 9.
further reference to the Tjekten.123 Given that the fortress is located in a region regarded by the ancient Egyptians as Libya, this notice argues persuasively for the Libyan origin of the Tjekten people.124

When this evidence is taken together, and particularly with reference to the western oases in p. Anastasi IV and the statue from Zâwiyyat Umm al-Rakhām, it seems certain that the Tjekten were located to the west of the Nile valley, and were therefore Libyans. This conclusion is strengthened by an observation made by Lefébure,125 who suggested the plural form ṭktīn may in fact utilize the Libyco-Berber plural suffix -tān.126 This would explain the lack of -tn in the Hebrew rendering of the ethnonym, as well as the use of the Hebrew plural suffix -îm. However, as with the Pāt, the Hebrews recognized the Sukkiyīm as being a tribal group distinct from the Lūhīm (in Egyptian terms, Libu and Meshwesh Libyans; that is, those Libyans who, from the perspective of the Hebrews, inhabited the Nile valley and Delta rather than oasis regions to the west).

Despite this, there have been objections raised to a western origin of the Tjekten. Winnicki argues they originate in the Eastern Desert and are not Libyan in origin. He bases his argument on the earliest attestation of what is ostensibly the word ṭk, conveyed in a list of foreign toponyms on a statue of Amenhotep III from his mortuary temple at Kawm al-Hayṭān.127 Because the context is “African”—that is, south and east of the Nile valley—Winnicki concludes this toponym is probably not Libyan.128 To bolster this claim, he appeals to one of the execration texts of Senwasret III, which contains the toponym ṭkss, listed with Nubian lands and tribes.129 However, he does not explain how this is actually the same word, only stating that the terminal -ss is “incomprehensible”.130

In order to justify p. Anastasi IV’s testimony regarding Tjekten in the western oases, Winnicki suggests that Tjekten from the Eastern Desert were resettled by the Egyptians in the west, where they served pharaoh as scouts. Lefébure’s observation

---

123 G. Godenho (School of Archaeology, Classics and Egyptology; University of Liverpool), personal communication, 2 February 2011.
124 For the site in general, which was established and maintained only during the reign of Ramesses II, as well as its archaeologically attested Libyan inhabitants, see F. Simpson, Evidence for a Late Bronze Age Libyan Presence in the Egyptian Fortress at Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Liverpool; Liverpool, 2002); S. R. Snape, “The Emergence of Libya on the Horizon of Egypt”, in D. B. O’Connor and S. G. J. Quirke (eds.), Mysterious Lands (Encounters with Ancient Egypt 5; London, 2003), pp. 93–106; S. R. Snape and P. Wilson, Zawiyet Umm el-Rakham 1: The Temple and Chapels (Bolton, 2007); see also L. Habachi, “The Military Posts of Ramesses II on the Coastal Road and the Western Part of the Delta”, BIFAO 80 (1980), pp. 13–30.
126 Masculine form; feminine is -tin (A. Basset, La langue berbère [Handbook of African Languages 1; London, 1952], p. 25).
128 Winnicki, op. cit. (note 95), pp. 69–70.
129 G. Posener, Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie: Textes hiératiques sur des figurines d’envoûtement du Moyen Empire (Brussels, 1940), pp. 48–62, plate 1, 1A; Zibelius, op. cit. (note 95), pp. 188–189.
130 Winnicki, op. cit. (note 95), p. 70.
that -tn may well be the Libyco-Berber plural suffix -tən is “explainable by a certain domination of Libyan population in the oases at that time.” While both views are theoretically possible, neither seems particularly probable, and his rationalization for the -tn suffix is remarkably unconvincing.

Another recent challenge to a Libyan origin for the Tjekten and Sukkyîm comes from Michaux-Colombot. Like Winnicki, she argues that the Septuagint’s use of Τρωγλοδύται for “Sukkyîm” should be connected with the Classical Τρωγλοδύται of the Eastern Desert, who are possibly the descendants of the ancient Medjay. She furthers her argument by drawing attention to Medjay scouts present in the Wâdî al-Ṭumaylāt, in an area known as “Tjeku” (ṯkw) in Egyptian, and ostensibly related to the ṣkt people. On this basis, she ultimately concludes that the Sukkyîm “were a leading Trogodyte tribe” who are to be identified with the Medjay and not Libyans.

Although the evidence marshaled is interesting, it is also almost wholly circumstantial. For example, Michaux-Colombot mentions an inscribed block of Shoshenq I discovered at Tall al-Maskhūṭah in the Wâdî al-Ṭumaylāt, with the implication that since this area was located in the region of ancient Tjeku, the Tjekten (i.e., the Sukkyîm) of Shoshenq’s army may have originated there.

131 Ibid., p. 71.
132 Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3).
135 Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 288–290; see also note 121 above. As pointed out by both Michaux-Colombot and Winnicki (op. cit. [note 95], pp. 375–376), Pliny the Elder (Natural History 4.34) mentions that Trogodytice (that is, the Eastern Desert centered about Berenice Troglodytica) was “called in former times Midoë and by other people Midioë” (Trogodytice, quam prisci Midoen, alii Midioen dixere, Pliny the Elder, Natural History: Libri III–VII 2; [Loeb 350; Cambridge – London, 1999], pp. 464–465). See also Meredith, op. cit. (note 133), p. 56.
However, despite an abundance of inscribed Ramesside and Dynasty 22 materials from the site,\textsuperscript{139} Tall al-Maskhūṭah was not inhabited between the Second Intermediate Period and Dynasty 26, as is demonstrated by the long break in the stratigraphic and ceramic seriation evidence\textsuperscript{140}; the stone was brought from elsewhere—likely Tall al-Raṭābah—only much later when the site was re-inhabited.\textsuperscript{141} Furthermore, the toponym Tjeku most often—though not exclusively—refers to a ḫtn-fortress (that is, a settlement) located within the Wāḍī al-Ṭumaylāt at Tall al-Raṭābah, rather than the entire wāḍī (which was, however, itself named “Tjeku”).\textsuperscript{142}

Further, Michaux-Colombot suggests the toponym Τρωγοδύται may have stemmed from the name of ṣghḏw, a Medjai chieftain mentioned in Middle Kingdom execration texts\textsuperscript{143}, she does not explain how this name of this obscure chieftain was ostensibly perpetuated locally for some two thousand years without further attestations in the Egyptian record. In a similar vein, it is worth noting her contention that a doorjamb from the Dynasty 20 tomb a Ramesside official named Usir-maat-nekhtu of Tjeku, which was discovered at Tall al-Raṭābah, makes a “unique reference to an eastern Oasis Land,” which she holds makes unnecessary the need for a western “Oasis Land” of the Tjekten as referred to in p. Anastasi IV.\textsuperscript{144} In fact, one of the titles recorded on the jamb is the “Overseer of the Foreign-lands of God’s Land” (jmy-rȝḥȝswt ȝṯr),\textsuperscript{145} which Michaux-Colombot translates as “overseer of the foreign countries of God’s Land Oasis.”\textsuperscript{146} Despite her claim, the text does not mention an oasis (wḥȝt) whatsoever, making her conclusion warrantless.

Ultimately Michaux-Colombot fails to adequately address the association between the Tjekten and the western oases in p. Anastasi IV,\textsuperscript{147} nor attempt to

\textsuperscript{139} In addition to the block from Shoshenq I, from Dynasty 22 there is a statue of Ankh-khered-nefer (British Museum EA 1007), dating to the reign of Osorkon II. See Naville, ibid., pp. 15–16; Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. (note 103), I, pp. 269–271; Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. (note 39, 2007), pp. 126–127 (18.54).


\textsuperscript{141} Contra K. A. Kitchen (On the Reliability of the Old Testament [Grand Rapids, 2003], pp. 256–259), who fails to account for the complete lack of New Kingdom–Third Intermediate Period ceramics at the site, despite the inscribed blocks.


\textsuperscript{143} Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3), p. 294; see Posener, op. cit. (note 129), pp. 54, A5.

\textsuperscript{144} Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 281–282.

\textsuperscript{145} W. M. Finders Petrie and J. Garrow Duncan, Hyksos and Israelite Cities (ERA; London, 1906), pl. 31; Kitchen, op. cit. (note 52), V, p. 393/11–12.

\textsuperscript{146} Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. (note 3), p. 281.

\textsuperscript{147} For example, she mistakenly regards Egyptian references to “the land of the Oasis” as being applicable to any oasis in Egypt (Michaux-Colombot, op. cit. [note 3], p. 294), whereas the Egyptian use of wḥȝt (“oasis”) is used specifically for either the Northern Oasis wḥȝt mḥyṯ (modern al-Bahriyyah) or the Southern Oasis wḥȝt rsyṯ (al-Dākhliyah and al-Khārijah together), but it was ṭj wḥȝt (“the Oasis”) that referred to the Southern Oasis (cf. Greek Ἡ Όασις (Wagner, op. cit. [note 115], p. 133); see further above, note 115, and H. Gauthier, Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques 1 (Cairo,
explain the Libyco-Berber plural suffix marker. While it cannot be denied that the Tjekten and the Medjay are occasionally associated with one another, they are never directly equated; that is, Tjekten are never said to be Medjay. It can also be suggested that the association is primarily due to the similar roles that the Tjekten and Medjay played in Egyptian society as border guardians and “mercenaries,” roles that could have put them in proximity of one another. For example, pWilbour lists three Medjay granted allotments in Middle Egypt during the reign of Ramesses V in the same general region as allotments granted to six or seven Tjek soldiers. However, this proves nothing as both peoples served the Egyptian crown as military auxiliaries, as did the sixty-eight Sherden who were likewise granted land in the region. The designation of various individuals as being “Tjek” in pWilbour points to a possible solution. The names of most of them are Egyptian, including nb-wc (§ 123,46/28), bȝt-ḥtp (§ 218,77/45), and pȝ-n-mḥy (§ 218,77/46 and 47); ṣȝ-kt (§ 150,58/43) and pȝ-kt (§ 187,70/11) may be as well. One, kṛjy (§ 241,89/17), is clearly non-Egyptian, and it is notable that khr, kṛj, kṛjw, and prefix kṛ- are very well-attested in Egyptian as names of Libyans. Furthermore, kṛ is known from Old Libyan (“Numidian”) texts as well. Winnicki has, however, pointed to the existence of two Medjay individuals named in texts from Dayr al-Madīnah (Dynasty 20) bearing the name kṛj. It must be born in mind that the majority of Medjay from the New Kingdom onwards have Egyptian names, which has led many scholars to the conclusion that by the New Kingdom the term no longer necessarily referred to a specific ethnic group, but rather had become an occupational title. If so, there is no way of knowing if these individuals were from the Eastern Desert as opposed to being Libyan, a conclusion the prosopographical data favors.
5. Kushites

The biblical reference to Kushites (Kûšîm = כוּשִׁים) in the army of Šîšaq is problematic as the contemporary Egyptian historical record lacks evidence for direct, sustained relations between Egypt and Nubia. Indeed, the existence of direct relations between Egypt and regions south of the First Cataract at Aswan are almost impossible to demonstrate on the basis of available archaeological and textual evidence. Two scarabs are known from Nubia that probably name Shoshenq I, but both were found in Napatan cemeteries dated well after his reign. With the exception of stereotypical references to the Nubian components of the Nine Bows found on the Bubastite Portal at Karnak and a mention of ḫnty-hn-nfr in a similar formuloic context on the same monument, there are few references to Nubian regions that can be dated to the reign of Shoshenq I. Zibelius alleges that the Nubian component of a toponographical list on a reused statuette of Thutmose III (Cairo CG 42192) may (with question) date to Shoshenq I. However, as noted by Giveon, the topographical list is most likely an example of Thutmose III copying from his own inscriptions, reproducing the beginnings of his Nubian toponographical lists at Karnak.

159 Septuagint Αἰθίοπες (Rahlfs, op. cit. [note 94], I, p. 829).
161 One scarab found in the cemetery at Ġabal Mayyah (Gebel Moya) clearly names Hedj-kheper-Re Chosen-of-Re Shoshenq I (F. Addison, Jebel Moya, I [London, 1949], pp. 117–118; II, plate 50/8; Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. [note 39, 2007], p. 29:12.36). A second scarab comes from tomb 316 at Abū Dawn Sannum but gives only the prænomen Hedj-kheper-Re Chosen-of-Re (F. L. Griffith, “Oxford excavations in Nubia”, AAA 10 [1923], p. 112, plate 42/12); nevertheless, this later scarab is best associated with Shoshenq I as the use of this type of object was considerably revived during his reign (W. M. Flinders Petrie, Scarabs and Cylinders with Names: Illustrated by the Egyptian Collection in University College, London [ERA 29; London, 1917], p. 29; see Jansen-Winkeln, op. cit. [note 39, 2007], pp. 27–29 [12.36]).
167 The statuette’s back pillar has been (re)inscribed with a text for Shoshenq I.
It has long been thought that a block from Karnak inscribed with an oracular decree of Shoshenq I\(^{169}\) provided evidence for a military campaign into Nubia.\(^{170}\) This is due to the fact that immediately to the left of the oracular decree—as well as on several other blocks from the area with which it is to be associated—is a text mentioning “the land of the Nubian” (\(p^c\triangledown\, tj\, nḥsj\)), “Kush” (\(jkšt\)\(^{171}\)), and Nubian produce being offered to Amun-Re, ostensibly as tribute.\(^{172}\) However, in a major re-edition of the text, Vernus demonstrated conclusively that the texts are from two different periods, the left-hand side of the block, along with the references to Nubia, being dated to Taharqa,\(^{173}\) while the right hand side is the oracular decree of Shoshenq I.\(^{174}\) Therefore the supposed Nubian campaign under Shoshenq I is completely chimerical.

Given this, the inclusion of Kushites in Šîšaq’s army is surprising if the biblical record is to be taken seriously. Nevertheless, this has not prevented Wilson from claiming that “it is possible . . . that the Chronicler assumed (Nubians) were part of Shoshenq’s army without having direct knowledge of it, but from a historical standpoint there is no reason to doubt the report”\(^{175}\) (emphasis supplied).

On the contrary, there is very little Egyptian historical evidence to support this report at all. While there is growing evidence for Libyan holders of the title “King’s Son of Kush” until at least the time of Takelot III,\(^{176}\) the title seems to have become

---


\(^{171}\) For this late orthography, which appears first during Dynasty 25, see Vernus, op. cit. (note 169), p. 51 note f; cf. Demotic \(jkšt\) (W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* [København, 1954], p. 45). See also Zibelius, op. cit. (note 95), pp. 165–169.


\(^{173}\) D. Kahn, “Taharqa, king of Kush, and the Assyrians”, *JSSEA* 31 (2004), pp. 109–128 regards the text as a prayer of Taharqa to Amun for the protection of his sons and concubines following his defeat by Esarhaddon.

\(^{174}\) Vernus, op. cit. (note 169), pp. 11, 26–59.

\(^{175}\) Wilson, op. cit. (note 2), p. 85.

used at Elephantine primarily by the First God’s Servant of Khnum and/or the Overseer of the Southern Foreign-lands. Title-bearers were presumably responsible for regional trade, but not further south than the Second Cataract, if even that far. Although there is no King’s Son of Kush attested from the reign of Shoshenq I, it could be argued that Kushite mercenaries entered into the Egyptian military in limited numbers, but this is only a supposition currently unsupported by the available evidence.

In the case of the biblical record, Wilson may be justified in proposing that the Chronicler, writing at a later date, may have fully expected Nubians to be part of the Egyptian army; such was certainly the case during Dynasty 25. Although the Napata kings had long been driven back to Nubia by the Assyrians and King Psamtek I of Dynasty 26, memory of their rule during a period when Libyans were also politically active in Egypt may have been known to the Chronicler. Lacking any sound historical and chronological data for earlier periods, he may have simply extrapolated the data backwards. However, contra Wilson, it is the lack of secure evidence forthcoming from Egypt for Nubian participation in the Egyptian military that makes this detail of the report difficult to accept at face value.

IV. Conclusion

The configuration of Šīšaq’s military undoubtedly included infantry and chariots, albeit organized differently than what might have been encountered during the New Kingdom, with a greater emphasis on non-Egyptian troops. This is born out in the statement of 2 Chron 12:3 regarding the ethnic background of the invading military being composed of “Libyans, Sukkiyîm, and Kushites”. It is axiomatic that the Meshwesh-Libyan king of Egypt would have had an army with a significant Libyan component consisting of the Meshwesh and (almost certainly) Libu tribes, if not other, smaller tribal groups such as the Mhes. Indeed, the entire army would have been commanded by one or more members of Shoshenq I’s immediate family, all of whom were Libyans. Likewise, the majority of available evidence suggests that the Sukkiyîm were a Libyan group known as the Tjekten, but one inhabiting regions to the west of the Nile Valley, and therefore distinctive in the eyes of the Chronicler (cf. the Pûṭ Libyans). The fact that the Chronicler had knowledge of a minor tribal group last attested in Egyptian texts during the reign of Ramesses V, some two


177 Morkot (op. cit. [note 160], p. 163) suggest no further south than Qubbān.


179 Similarly in 2 Chron 16:8, an army of Kushites and Libyans is said to have been defeated by King Asa of Judah, who ruled contemporaneously with Osorkon I and Takelot I (This is related to the affair of “Zerah the Kushite” (2 Chron 14:8–14). See I. Hofmann, “Kuschiten in Palästina”, GM 46 (1981), pp. 9–10; A. R. Schulman, “The Kushite Connection”, in P. Der Manuelian (ed.), Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson, 2 (Boston, 1996), pp. 713–715. This might be compared with Nahum 3:8–10, which describes the fall of Thebes to the Neo-Assyrian army during the rule of the Napatan (“Kushite”) Dynasty 25, mentioning specifically that “Put and Libya were her helpers.”
hundred years before Shoshenq I came to the throne, speaks persuasively for the
Chronicler having access to a credible source of information. With regard to the
Kushites, while it is not particularly probable given the rupture between Egypt and
Nubia at the end of the New Kingdom, it does, however, remain possible that they
may have been involved, especially if relations between Egypt and regions further
south were maintained at some rudimentary level. However, on the basis of the
Egyptian evidence, this cannot as of yet be documented.

Beyond their ethnic makeup, the composition of Šîšaq’s forces, as well as their
numeric strengths, is more difficult to justify from Egyptian evidence. While there is
little reason to doubt the presence of infantry and chariots in large numbers, the
notice of 1,200 chariots given in 2 Chron 12:3 is probably an exaggeration, unless
the number represents the total number for the entire Egyptian army on campaign
rather than the total number of chariots (rounded though it may be) at Jerusalem
specifically, as is stated in the Bible.

Much more problematic is the reference to a cavalry component. While the total
number of 60,000 horsemen is doubtlessly an exaggeration, it could be argued
that there may have been a relatively small number of mounted troops acting as
scouts and messengers. However, the existence of a large body of soldiers who truly
fought from horseback seems particularly implausible based on what is known
regarding the development of cavalry in northern Syria and the Neo-Assyrian
empire. At the time of Chronicles’ composition during the late fourth century
BCE,181 cavalry units, not infantry, were the backbone of the Achaemenid Persian
military.182 Alternately, given that mounted troops were already attested under
Ashurnasirpal II, and formed a regular part of the Neo-Assyrian military by the
reign of Sennacherib,183 it is perhaps possible that the Chronicler added this detail
to the Šîšaq narrative as he may have fully expected cavalry units to make up the
bulk of Šîšaq’s forces as he extrapolated back in time several centuries.184 From the
Egyptian evidence, however, the notice of cavalry given in 2 Chron 12:3 cannot be
justified.

The text of 2 Chron 12:2–3 regarding the composition of Šîšaq’s army has been
often pointed to as an example of the Chronicler utilizing extra-biblical
documentation not available to, or ignored by, Dtr in 1 Kgs 14:25.185 From an

---

180 Unless it is taken as a scribal error for “six thousand” (see note 78).
181 See note 178.
182 Schulman, op. cit. (note 3), p. 122, note 16; C. Tuplin, “All the King’s Horse: In Search of
Achaemenid Persian Cavalry”, In G. G. Fagan and M. Trundle (eds.), New Perspectives on
Ancient Warfare. (History of Warfare 59; Leiden), pp. 101–182; J. Wiesehöfer, Ancient
Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD (London, 2001), pp. 89–93; see also J. A. S. Evans, “Cavalry
pp. 97–106.
184 In a similar fashion, Japhet (op cit. [note 178], pp. 677–679) has suggested the Chronicler
formulated the narrative of Šîšaq’s campaign in analogy to the invasion of Sennacherib in
2 Kgs 18–19, passim, and 2 Chron 32:9–21; cf. A. Marx, “De Shishaq à Shéshak: A propos
185 For typical examples of this claim, see Kitchen, op. cit. (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 289;
Japhet, op cit. (note 178), pp. 676–677; A. F. Rainey, “The Chronicler and His Sources:
Historical and Geographical”, in Graham et al. (eds.), op. cit. (note 67), p. 55; A. Malamat,
History of Biblical Israel: Major Problems and Minor Issues (CHANE 7; Leiden, 2001),
p. 205, note 42; Kitchen, op. cit. (note 141), p. 34.
Egyptological perspective, this view seems to be justified. While the biblical text is not completely reliable at every point, as it does contain some anachronisms, it is nevertheless remarkable that the details regarding the composition of his army are (mostly) sound and that they are not given in 1 Kgs 14:25.