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Shoshenq I and Biblical Šîšaq: a philological defense of their traditional equation*

Troy Leiland Sagrillo

Since the late 1980s, as part of proposals to lower the conventional chronology of pharaonic Egypt by one to three hundred years, a number of scholars have identified biblical Šîšaq (1 Kings 11:40, 14:25; 2 Chronicles 12:2-9) with Ramesses II or III, rather than the conventional Shoshenq I, on the basis of rare hypocoristica for ‘Ramesses’, ssysw, ssw, and ss. Without addressing the chronological issues, this paper examines this proposed re-identification from a philological perspective, concluding that the proposal to identify biblical Šîšaq with any king named ‘Ramesses’ are unwarranted and implausible.

Introduction

In a letter dated 24 November 1828, Jean-François Champollion (1868, 80-81) described his thoughts on viewing the triumphal relief near the Bubastite Portal depicting the 22nd-dynasty king Shoshenq I smiting Asian captives before Amon-Re and the goddess Waset[1]:

ailleurs, Sésonchis traînant aux pieds de la Trinité thébaine (Amon, Mouth et Khons) les chefs de plus de trente nations vaincues, parmi lesquelles j’ai retrouvé, comme cela devait être, en toutes lettres, Ioudahamalek, le royaume des Juifs ou de Juda. C’est là un commentaire à joindre au chapitre XIV du troisième livre des Rois, qui raconte en effet l’arrivée de Sésonchis à Jérusalem et ses succès: ainsi l’identité que nous avons établie entre le Sheschonck égyptien, le Sésonchis de Manéthon et le Séscac ou Scheschôk de la Bible, est confirmée de la manière la plus satisfaisante.

While it has long been recognized that Champollion’s ‘Ioudahamalek’ is a misunderstanding of one of the toponyms (C29) in the geographic list (W. M. Müller 1887),[2] the communis opinio within Egyptology holds that Shoshenq I and biblical יִשְׁנַק šîšaq (1 Kings 11:40, 14:25[3]; 2 Chronicles 12:2-9) are identical, a view that continues to prevail today with little objection.

However, since the late 1980s and 1990s, a minority of researchers (primarily from disciplines outside of Egyptology) have argued that the equation of biblical יִשְׁנַק with Egyptian ššnq [Shoshenq] is invalid upon closer examination,[4] and that if this correspondence is without foundation, then any number of alternative chronological schemes may be proposed, free of the need to synchronize the ‘two’ kings. Leaving aside the chronological arguments,[5] the question remains as to


[3] Note well, ketîb יִשְׁנַק in 1 Kings 14:25 (only): confusion between the letters $w$ and $y$ in the Masoretic tradition is particularly common (Würthwein 1995, 108).


how valid these alternative theories regarding the identity of biblical שִׂישָק are in the first place, in terms of the philological issues.

**Šīšaq and Ramesses**

In rejecting the correspondence between biblical שִׂישָק and Egyptian šīsq, these scholars argue that the Hebrew derives from one of a series of closely related *hypocoristica* for the Egyptian name from Egyptian ṣtms-sw (Ramesses) – namely ssysw, ss, and ss – used in a handful of texts by Ramesses II and once by Ramesses III (Sethe 1904, 53-57; Gardiner 1920, 103; Malaise 1966, 248), rather than the conventional identification with the 22nd-dynasty king, Shoshenq I.[7]

The first of these, ssysw, refers to Ramesses II and occurs as part of three different toponyms mentioned in pBritish Museum EA 10247 [pAnastasi I]:

\[\text{pi dmr n ssysw ūnh} <w>di s<nb>\]


\[\text{ti t n ssysw ūnh} <w>di s<nb>\]


\[\text{m ss af nḥt uvr mšr n ssysw ūnh} <w>di s<nb>\]


A fourth example is attested on a fragmentary lotiform frit bowl from Serabit el-Khadim (University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology E12114 [Petrie & Currelly 1906, pl. 156/5; McGovern, Fleming & Swann 1993, 18]):

\[\text{hqt ss}<y><sv}\]

(the) ruler Sesu

A variant form, apparently to be read as ss, rather than ssysw, is attested in pBritish Museum EA 10243 (pAnastasi II, 5,5 [Gardiner 1937, 15/6]):

\[\text{ps ḥhn n st sw ūnh} <w>di s<nb>\]


Finally, Ramesses III made use of a shortened form, ss, but this is known only from a single example on the Eastern High Gate at Medinet Habu (Kitchen 1969-1990, 5:295/3; The Epigraphic Survey 1970, 13, pl. 636, line 1):

\[\text{<n> k}<k> ss ps nsw ntr}y <ps> \text{r n ti nb} \]

<to> your ka, oh Ses<i>, the divine king, the sun of every land.

**Difficulties**

There are a number of significant problems with this suggestion. First of all, contra van der Veen’s (1999, 23) assertion that these *hypocoristica* of the name ‘Ramesses’

[209]b; Brockman 2011. While they differ most notably with regard to Dynasty 23, in broad terms Dynasties 22-25 (from the accession of Shosheng I to the sacking of Thebes by Aḥšur-bāni-apli [Ashurbanipal]) run from *circa* 943-664 BC.


[10] A nḥtw-stronghold was typically used for housing and integrating non-Egyptian prisoners of war designated for service (usually military) in the Egyptian state (Morris 2005, 699-701, 731-734, 820-821). Outside of Egypt they are only securely attested along the ‘Ways of Horus’ (Morris 2005, 821).


[12] The hieratic sign transcribed by Gardiner as ṭ is merely a dot and likely otiose. For discussion of the orthography, see Sethe 1904, 55-57.

were ‘common currency in the Levant’, ssysw, ssw, and ss are all exceptionally rare in the Egyptian record.[14] As discussed above, the first, ssysw, occurs only in pBritish Museum 10247 [pAnastasi I] and pBritish Museum EA 10243 [pAnastasi II], while ssw is utilized on the bowl from Serabit el-Khadim; ss is known only from a single example at Medinet Habu. Thus there are only four distinct sources for these hypocoristica of ‘Ramesses’, most of which are related to Ramesses II, and of those, the two papyriarescribalexercisesratherthandocumentarytexts.[15]

While in theory (ignoring all other problems) it might be argued that the Hebrew scribe(s) of 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles, writing in the late first millennium BC,[16] may have somehow known of these hypocoristica (making the rather unlikely presumption that they would have made use of them, given that these names were not used by the Egyptians themselves with any real degree of regularity during the New Kingdom or afterwards, and do not seem to have survived beyond the lifetimes of Ramesses II and Ramesses III).[17] It is notable that no other Ramesside king other than Ramesses II and III is known to have made use of these hypocoristica, but this lack of textual evidence for similar usage(s) by other Ramesside kings has not dissuaded some, such as Furlong (2007, 350-357 passim), from making similar arguments with regard to later rulers of Dynasty 20 who are more amenable to their own chronological theories.[18]

Further to this, the full name רָעָמָסָס (derived from Egyptian rʾ-ms-sw, in reference to the Ramesside residence city of Per-Ramesses [modern Qantir][19]) was known to Hebrew scribes (e.g., Genesis 47:11; Exodus 1:11, 12:37; Numbers 33:3; Judith 1:9), so it would be strange for the (supposed) hypocoristic form שיסא to be used elsewhere in the Hebrew bible, rather than רָעָמָסָס, for no clear reason (see further below).[20]

The Akkadian and Hittite evidence

From a philological perspective, there are other serious objections to this proposal. One of the chief difficulties is the putative use of Hebrew ש inם שיסא to record Egyptian /s/ as it generally held that Egyptian /s/ is written by Hebrew ש – Muchiki 1999, 67). This difficulty has been explained by comparison to Akkadian texts containing the name of Ramesses, which seem to suggest there was some variability between Egyptian /s/ and Semitic /š/. Rohl (1995, 162) offers a typical example:

I noted that the Akkadian[21] writing of Ramesses in the Hittite treaty is Riamashesha,[22] and that the hieroglyphic ‘š’ was consistently represented by the cuneiform ‘š’. The problems faced by the Hittite scribes writing the Egyptian name would have not been far removed from those faced by the biblical redactor who gave us the name ‘Shishak’.

Rohl (1995, 162) and van der Veen (1999, 23; 2002, 116-117) argue that since Egyptian /s/ is written in Akkadian with <š>, and since Akkadian and Hebrew are both Semitic languages, it is possible that Hebrew שיסא may be derived from the Egyptian hypocoristica, perhaps via Akkadian (which functioned as a lingua franca during the Late Bronze Age), rather than the conventional identification with Shoshenq I.[23]

There are significant linguistic difficulties in such a proposed correspondence. The Middle Babylonian form cited by Rohl (1995, 162),[24] ʼr-i-a-ma-še-ša (Edel 1997, 6-12, passim), does seem to support the claim that Egyptian שיסא...

---


[17] There is no surviving evidence from Demotic or Greek texts of a folk tradition involving a king ‘Sesi’, or similar; cf. the folk traditions of Greek texts, often with a Demotic Vorlage, involving Kheops, Sesosôtris (including Sesonkhôsis), Nektanebôs, and other Egyptian kings (Malaise 1966; Lloyd 1982; O’Sullivan 1984; Obsomer 1989; Quack 2001; Gauger 2002; Widmer 2002; Ladynin 2010; Ryholt 2010).

[18] For example, Furlong suggests Ramesses IX, but this is solely a consequence of his proposed absolute chronology.

[19] Redford (2009), however, argues the situation may be slightly more complex.

[20] Rohl’s (1989/1990, 63) contention that it is ‘a small step’ to associate these hypocoristica with ‘the legendary king Sesosôtris, the great conqueror of Asia’ of Hêrodotos (History, 2.102-104, 106-108, 110, 111, 137) – whom he regards being at least partially inspired by Ramesses II – on the basis that a parallel text of Diodôros of Sicily (Historical Library, 1.53-58) names the king as Σησόησίς [Sesoësis], is to be rejected, despite a superficial resemblance to ssysw, ssw, and ss (see also Montet 1947, 51). (For discussion, see Sethe 1904, 53-57; Malaise 1966, 247-249.) Indeed, Diodôros’ text is later quoted by pseudo-louvinouso marturos Exhortation to the Greeks, 9.4 [Marcovich 1990, 35], but who replaces the earlier Σησόησίς [Sesoësis] with Σησόηγος [Sesonkhôsis] (Meyer 1914; see also Malaise 1966, 244-249; Obsomer 1989, 38-43; Ladynin 2010), the name used for Shoshenq I in Eusebios’ epitome of Manetho (Waddell 1940, 158; Jacoby 1958, 45; Mosshammer 1984, 83).

[21] Specifically Middle Babylonian.

[22] That is, ʼr-i-a-ma-še-ša (Edel 1997, 6-12, passim).


/s/ is written in Akkadian with <š>, but this is not as simple as it might first appear. In Eastern Semitic languages, such as Assyrian and Babylonian (both dialects of Akkadian), there is not only confusion and lack of consistency between Egyptian /s/ and /š/, but also within the various dialects of Akkadian itself (both Babylonian and Assyrian [M. Müller 2010, § 4.2.3], as well as Levantine Peripheral dialects, and Hittite and Egyptian uses of Akkadian [Cochavi-Rainey 2011, § 5.1.3, cf. §§ 2.4.2.2, 5.1.9]), not to mention diachronic developments within those dialects. For example, standard Middle Babylonian /š/ was very often written with <s> in Middle and Neo-Assyrian, while Assyrian /s/ is often written <š> in Babylonian (von Soden & Mayer 1995, § 30; Buccellati 1997, § 1.3.5; Huehnergard & Woods 2008, § 3.8.1.1; M. Müller 2010, § 4.2.3).

With regard to the use of Akkadian in the Levant in particular, Cochavi-Rainey (2011, § 1.14), following Jucquois (1966, 267), notes

Babylonian š corresponds to Amorite s and to s in Canaanite of the southern Levant and other areas where there was Amorite influence; and in the southern Levant the š comes from the classical orthography in contrast to the s that testifies to outside influence, and thus in Egyptian personal names because s and š in Egyptian names are always transcribed by cuneiform signs with ş.


Beyond dialectical and diachronic issues within varieties of Akkadian, there is another significant issue with "ri-a-ma-še-ša specifically. As Rohl (1995, 162) mentions in passing, while the name indeed occurs in a Middle Babylonian text, it is one composed in a Hittite context – the so-called peace treaty between Ramesses II and Hattušili III (Edel 1997, 6-12, passim). Examples of ‘Ramesse’ in Hittite proper (rather than Akkadian) include "ri-a-ma-ši (Edel 1948, 17/XII) and "ri-a-ma-aš-ya (Edel 1948, 18-19/XIII), as well as a probable further example of "ri-a-ma-še-ša (Edel 1948, 17/XI), albeit not in reference to a king.[32] Another example of the name may possibly occur on a fragmentary tablet from Qantir: ["ri-a-ma]-še-ša (?) (Pusch & Jakob 2003, 148). As with the treaty texts, the tablet is written in Middle Babylonian, but likely in a Hittite context (Pusch & Jakob 2003, 149).[33]

This Hittite context is significant, as Hittite <š> was pronounced /s/ and not /š/ (Gamkrelidze 1961, 409-411 [19]; Melchert 1997, § 28.3.1.3; Hoffner & Melchert 2008, §§ 1.92-1.193). For example, the Hittite royal names "mur-li-li and "ha-at-tu-li-li were respectively recorded in Egyptian as mrsr and ḫtrs (Hall 1922, 219; Edel 1997, passim; see also Edel 1973). Thus, the supposed phonetic /š/ is the result of an orthographic convention in Hittite but does not reflect actual Hittite pronunciation. With respect to the peace treaty of Ramesses II cited by Rohl, Hittite – or more likely, Egyptian[34] – scribes recorded Egyptian names in Middle Babylonian Akkadian, but using Hittite orthographic rules. If this is taken into account, the Hittite orthography of "ri-a-ma-še-ša (and related forms) accurately reflects contemporary Egyptian pronunciation of ṛ-ms-sw ‘Ramesse’ with /š/. Not only does this fail

[26] For an example from an Ugaritic context, see Gröndahl 1967, 300.
[27] cf. "pa-š-ši-ra (Edel 1978; Edel 1994, 1:33 doc. 8 vs. 1, 2:364; Cochavi-Rainey 2011, 4.1.)
[28] See also Cochavi-Rainey 2011, § 4.1, passim.
to support the argument that hypothetical *(ri-a-ma-)še-ši (i.e., Egyptian <šisw, šsw, ss) is reflected in Hebrew פִּֽיָּשׁ šisq, but in fact it would be rather the opposite: *(ri-a-ma-)še-ši would accurately reflect the Egyptian pronunciation using /š/ if recorded according to Hittite orthographic conventions (as well as Assyrian).

The evidence from Hebrew and Northwest Semitic languages

In addition to problems with the Akkadian evidence and interference from both Hittite and Egyptian, there is a complete lack of correspondence between Northwest Semitic /š/ (including Hebrew) and Egyptian /š/, which would otherwise be required if biblical פִּֽיָּשׁ šisq is to be equated with Egyptian šisw, šsw, or ss. Muchiki (1999) concludes in his study of Egyptian proper nouns and loanwords in Northwest Semitic languages – including Aramaic, Hebrew, Phoenician, Punic, and Ugaritic – that there is no evidence of confusion between Egyptian /š/ and /š/ in Northwest Semitic, despite general assumptions to the contrary.\(^{[35]}\) Muchiki (1999, 315) writes

> the difference in the phonetic value /š/ and /š/ was undoubtedly recognized by N[orthwest] Semitic scribes who represented Eg[yptian] š by Sem[itic] š, while in Akk[adian] confusion of /š/ and /š/ is evident. . . . However, again, this confusion should not be extended to the correspondences between Eg[yptian] and N[orthwest] Sem[itic].\(^{[36]}\)

Given that Egyptian /š/ is consistently rendered פִּֽיָּשׁ šisq in Northwest Semitic languages, and not by פשׁ or פשׁ-š, an ostensible Hebrew form of Egyptian šisw, šsw, or ss, should have been written with פשׁ, presumably פִּֽיָּשׁ* šisq, if modeled after פִּֽיָּשׁ šisq. (The פשׁ would still need to be accounted for; see discussion below.)

There is, however, a somewhat potential case where Egyptian /š/ is perhaps rendered in Hebrew by פשׁ (Muchiki 1999, 255-256). The Hebrew word שיֵֽמִין šemīn or šemīn ‘ships’ [Isaiah 2:16] likely derived from Egyptian šktjw ‘ships’ (Erman & Grabow 1926-1953, 4:315.9; Faulkner 1962, 252; Jones 1988, 145-146 [68]; Koehler, Baumgartner, & Stamm 2001, 1:1327). The Hebrew may be a loanword direct from Egyptian, but it is likely that the Egyptian entered Hebrew indirectly via Canaanite (ancestral to Hebrew) during the second millennium BC, a period of time when Egyptian /š/ corresponded to Northwest Semitic /š/ (cf. Ugaritic בק, and only later realized as פשׁ in Hebrew, although פשׁ is expected (Schneider 1992, 385; Hoch 1994, 429-430); if so, the single known example in Hebrew may be a pointing error (פשׁ פשׁ for פשׁ פשׁ).

Peter van der Veen (1999, 22; 2002, 115-116) does point to a few cases he considers to be possible instances where Egyptian /š/ is realized as Hebrew פשׁ. For example, Hebrew פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ [Moses] has long been considered to be derived from Egyptian msj ‘to give birth; to fashion; to create’, and regarded as a hypocoristicon of names such as ‘Ahnose’, ‘Amenmose’, ‘Thutmose’, or the like.\(^{[37]}\)

The disparity between Egyptian /š/ and Hebrew פשׁ in פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ may be accounted for in one of two ways. One, argued by Quack (2000), is that Egyptian msj entered Northwest Semitic during the second millennium BC as /š/, which then shifted in pronunciation (as expected) to /š/ in Hebrew during the first millennium BC (Hoch 1994, 415, 417).\(^{[38]}\) The other possibility, and the simplest one, is that there is no phonological relationship between פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ and Egyptian msj at all. פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ has a perfectly legitimate meaning in Hebrew (‘[one] who is drawn out’; derived from the root פִּֽיָּשׁ to draw’ [van Gemeren 1997, 2:1120-1121 [5406]; Koehler, Baumgartner, & Stamm 2001, 1:642]) and is, therefore, not a priori Egyptian in origin. As has been noted already, this is strengthened by recognizing that in the clear case where Egyptian ms does occur in Hebrew – לָשׁוֹן ra amāsēs from Egyptian rt-ms-sw – the expected פשׁ is encountered (Gardiner 1936, 194; Vergote 1980, 92-93; Muchiki 1999, 217; Redford 2009).\(^{[39]}\) It is therefore unlikely that Hebrew פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ is related to Egyptian msj in any way, save possibly as a bilingual pun of sorts (Garsiel 1991, § 0.1.2.3; Kitchen 2003, 297), but this is unrelated to the phonological issue.\(^{[40]}\)

Similarly, van der Veen (1999, 22; 2002, 116), following Albright (1925, 83-84) and Griffiths (1953, 230), argues that the Hebrew personal name פִּֽיָּשְׁנִי šēn (found on an ostracon discovered at Samaria [Reisner, Fisher & Lyon 1924, 1:234-235, 240 (24)]) is best interpreted as a hybrid Hebrew-Egyptian name meaning ‘(the goddess) Ḡpa-an’ is born’. Despite Albright’s arguments, this is unlikely. There is no good reason for the terminal פשׁ of Ḡpa-an to be dropped – it is always present in both Semitic languages.\(^{[41]}\)


\(^{[38]}\) Cf. Egyptian rt-ms-sw, which entered directly into Hebrew during the first millennium as פִּֽיָּשׁ ra amāsēs.

\(^{[39]}\) Contra Griffiths 1953, 229. For other objections, see Gardiner 1936, 192-194.

\(^{[40]}\) If an Egyptian origin for Hebrew פִּֽיָּשׁ mōšeḥ is insisted upon, Griffiths (1953, 226) lists several possibilities (which he does reject), none of which require Hebrew פשׁ being equated with Egyptian פשׁ.

\(^{[41]}\) For examples, see Huffmon 1965, 201; Gröndahl 1967, 111, 321b, 378a; Hess 1993, 34-35 no. 24, 144-145 no.
and Egyptian borrowings – calling into question an Egyptian personal name “n-m-s ‘the beautiful/pleasing/ kind one is on the lake’” (Ranke 1935, 1:61/15; Lemaire 1977, 54; Muchiki 1999, 220). If so, Egyptian /s/ is written with Hebrew š (Goshen 1987, 127-128) [46]. This is problematic as the hieroglyphs are better read as šsmt and not gšm, on the basis that š is most commonly transliterated šs rather than being a misswrit of šš (Ranke 1935, 1:76). There are also pertinent unresolved questions regarding the relationship between Egyptian gšm and Hebrew ššm ‘vis-à-vis the Septuagint’s Ἰδωρα’ (Gesen), particularly with regard to the terminal letter (n< vs. n<), as the Egyptian is closer to the Greek, not the Hebrew.

Others (Rabinowitz 1956, 6-7; Eph'al 1984, 213; Knauf 1988, 101-102; Redford 1992, 409; Ward 1992, 1076; Hoffmeier 1996, 121-122), however, reject any Egyptian origin for ‘Goshen’. Instead they argue Hebrew ššm and particularly Septuagintal Ἰδωρα (Gesen) are to be connected with Gešem, a ruler of the Arabian Qedarite tribal confederacy, mentioned in Nehemiah 2:19, 6:1-2, 6, and also perhaps in a Liyanic inscription (JS 349 lih. [Rabinowitz 1956, 7; Winnett, Reed & Milik 1970, 115-117]) found at Qabūr al-ʿUmdā, north of the al-Ullā oasis (ancient Dedan), and with an Imperial Aramaic text engraved on a silver bowl discovered in a North Arabian cult center at Tell el-Maskhuta, which names gšm mlk qdr ‘Gešem, king of Qedar’ (Rabinowitz 1956, 9; Eph'al 1984, 212-213; Vittmann 2003, 182). It is generally argued the Hebrews somehow associated his name with the region around Tell el-Maskhuta as the biblical ‘land of Goshen’. If so, there is no reason to expect an Egyptian equivalent. Similarly, Gazelles (1977) connects Hebrew ššm with an area of southern Judah that may have been only confused secondarily with an Egyptian locale in the Exodus tradition.

Given these difficulties, it is perhaps best to set aside any further discussion regarding ššm until a clear Egyptian cognate can be identified, and the š of the Septuagint’s Ἰδωρα (Gesen) relative to Hebrew š< and Egyptian š< can be accommodated (Gardiner 1918; Ward 1992, 1077). At present neither is the case.

Finally, another possible example cited as evidence by van der Veen (1999, 22; 2002, 116) is the personal name ṣrš–šlh, which is Phoenician (as he rightly notes), not Hebrew. He claims that the first element, ṣrš, is perhaps the Egyptian deity wsjr ‘Osiris’. [48] If this were the case, it would be unique as all other examples of wsjr in Phoenician and Punic are categorically written in the expected form of ṣrš (Muchiki 1990, 15-44, passim).


[48] For the second element ššm ‘šlh, see also Tsevat 1954.
The qôp and arguments for a pun

Assuming the problem of Egyptian /s/ not equating to Hebrew šîšaq is completely without an equivalent in Egyptian ṣswn; ṣsw; or ṣs.

Van der Veen (1999, 23-24; 2002, 117-118), followed by Rohl (1995, 162-163),[49] claims this is due to the biblical redactor making a pun on the name of a hated non-Yahwist. A clear example of this phenomenon may be found in the Phoenician name of ‘Jezebel’,[50] נִבְרָה y-h(r)[] – meaning ‘where is the Prince’[52] – which was changed by adversarial Hebrew scribes to יהזבל ‘where is the dung?’ (Garsiel 1991, § 1.1.1.1 [3]; Yee 1992, 3:848; Koehler, Baumgartner & Stamm 2001, 1:39).

In the case of шîšaq, it is suggested that it is a pun on the Hebrew name שׁשָּׁק, attested in a tribal genealogy of the descendants of Benjamin (1 Chronicles 8:14, 25). Van der Veen (1999, 24; 2002, 118) argues this name is derived from a geminated form of the verbal root וָֽשֶׁק šqq,[53] which he would translate as ‘to rush at’ or ‘to rush upon [the spoils]’,[54] explaining this would be ‘a particularly suitable epithet from Ramesses II, the Egyptian pharaoh who plundered Jerusalem’. Rohl (1995, 163) goes a step further, translating the derived meaning of this verb rather theatrically as “‘one who crushes [under foot or under wheel],’ or more simply, ‘The Assaulter’.”

There are significant problems with this suggestion. Firstly, there does not seem to be any reasonable explanation as to why וָֽשֶׁק šqq would have been altered to шîšaq in the first place as both шׁשָּׁק ššnq and шîšaq are meaningless in Hebrew.[55] For puns to be meaningful, there must be wordplay of some sort involved, something impossible if the words are meaningless. Van der Veen (1999, 24, 25 note 19; 2002, 118, 120-121 note 30) argues that the meaning of ‘to rush at’ or ‘to rush upon [the spoils]’ for the Benjaminites name שׁשָּׁק was suggested by Davidson (1855, DCCXXXVIII), who claims that it is written (i.e., a mistake?) ‘for שׁשָּׁק eagerness’. [56] In turn, neither Davidson nor van der Veen offer any further explanation as to why this should be so, failing to account for the missing medial פ or שׁשָּׁק. Assum-
Most recently, van der Veen (2005) proposes a possible explanation for the s → ss. While still (mistakenly) arguing that the Egyptian /š/ in ssyw, ssw, and ss, can be equated with Hebrew š <š>, he suggests that the s → ss of Hebrew šīšaq may be a later misunderstanding or reinterpretation of paleo-Hebrew 1 <w>*, made during a period of time when the forms of both letters were almost identical paleographically. He therefore suggests ‘it is remotely possible’ that the ancient Hebrew scribes mistakenly misread *sysw as *sys(a)q when they wrote it the later Aramaic script. While an ingenious proposal, this does assume that sysw (etc.) was recorded at an early date by a scribe using the linear paleo-Hebrew script (for which there is currently no evidence), in spite of the fact that the full name, רעמסס, raʿamousēš was known. It also does not account for the serious problem of equating Egyptian /š/ with Hebrew š <š>, so while ‘remotely possible’, it is decidedly improbable.

Lastly, the claim made by James, et al. (1992, 127) that the s → ss ‘may have been added by a scribe more familiar with Libyan royal names than with the popular terminology of Ramesside times’ is perhaps a case of special pleading that is best set aside.[61]

In summary, the case for Hebrew šīšaq corresponding to Egyptian ssyw, ssw, and ss involves an excessively high number of rather significant assumptions:

1. The scribes of the Hebrew Bible used the Egyptian name r-nssw [Ramesses] in the form רواجبמש only as a toponym, but referred to a king of this name as שיאק šīšaq on the basis of their supposed knowledge of the rare hypocoristica ssyw, ssw, and ss, despite that these are barely used within Egypt, and written in scripts Hebrew scribes probably could not read.
2. The /š/ of Egyptian šašāq* šīšaq is written with š <š> in Hebrew despite overwhelming and consistent evidence that Egyptian /š/ was realized as š <š> and never š <š> in Northwest Semitic languages. (Evidence from Eastern Semitic Akkadian is irrelevant at best, or contradictory at worst, even without consideration of contamination from the Hittite context from which much of it derives.)
3. The presence of the s → ss is due to either A) the existence of a sophisticated literary pun where the unattested form सिशाक *śaśāq is recorded in a minor Benjamine genealogy as शाशāq (and having no meaning in Hebrew) and subsequently later ‘repunned’ as सिशाक śīšaq; or B) scribal confusion between paleo-Hebrew 1 <w> and p <q>. (Neither explanation accounts for point 2 above.)

The conventional view

As Kitchen (1991, 236) points out, Egyptian ss ‘has not one single consonant in common’ with Hebrew śīšaq, while in the case of ssyw there is only Egyptian semi-vocalic /š/ and Hebrew š /š/. Given the clear correspondence between Egyptian /š/ and Northwest Semitic ššnq, as well as the inadequately explained presence of p <q> in Hebrew, it is highly problematic to suggest any valid correspondence between Hebrew śīšaq, and Egyptian ssyw, ssw, or ss.[62] As summarized above, the sheer number of ‘exceptions to the rule’, supposed misunderstandings on the part of the Hebrews, and other mental gymnastics to support the equation between Hebrew śīšaq and one of the hypocoristica for ‘Ramesses’ make this decidedly implausible.

Conversely, there is very little realistic objection on linguistic grounds to equating Libyco-Egyptian ššnq with Hebrew śīšaq, as has been the conventional stance since Champollion’s day. No other Egyptian royal name can be demonstrated to be as close in philological terms. As is well known, the only minor problematic issue is the lack of š <š> in śīšaq as compared with Egyptian śšnq. However, even in Egyptian attestations of the name, the š <š> is very often omitted in writing (Bonhême 1987, 95-141, passim), including in two texts of Shoshenq I: Karnak Priestly Annals Fragment 4B (Kruchten 1989, pls 3 and 18; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.49) and Gabal al-Silsilah quarry stela 100 (Caminos 1952, pls 10-13; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.27, passim); the latter also has examples where the š <š> is present (lines 4, 5).

[61] It might be argued, however, that Manetho’s Aegyptiac (Waddell 1940, 158; Jacoby 1958, 45; Mosshammer 1984, 83) shows the influence of the name of Shoshenq I (Dynasty 22) on the name of the earlier Senwasret I (Dynasty 12), that is, ‘a scrie more familiar with Libyan royal names’. However, as Ladyinin (2010, 124, 129-139, esp. 134) points out, the use of Σασσισσ ['Sosnkhōs] for Senwasret I occurs rather as a result of a desire to equate both historical kings with Hēroadotos’ legendary warrior-king Sesōstris, who was referred to by later writers, such as Eusebious, as Sesnkōhōs (first encountered in Dikaiarikhos’ Βιος Ἑλλάδος frag. 58 [Ladyinin 2010, 124]). See further, note 20 above.

Despite the variable orthography of Egyptian texts, Rohl (1995, 128) and Bimson (1992/1993, 22-23; 2002, 125-126) have tried to raise an objection on the grounds that the <n> is lacking in Hebrew שׁישאָק, where it might be expected when compared with other non-Egyptian examples, namely Neo-Assyrian =su-su-in-qu and =šu-sa-an-qu.[63] Bimson argues that since the <n> is retained in the Greek form employed by Manetho and his excerptors. . . . we should probably not expect the Israelite scribes to omit it’. He even goes so far as to point out that since the <n> is present on the statue base from Byblos,[64] and the stela fragment from Tel Megiddo,[65] the scribes of the Hebrew Bible should have been aware of it (Bimson 1992/1993, 22, figs 1 and 2; Bimson 2002, 125-126, figs 2 and 3).

Despite these objections, it is highly doubtful that Hebrew scribes would have had access to these Egyptian texts when they were compiling the biblical record. It is even more unlikely they would have possessed the ability to read the Egyptian even if they did. As pointed out above, it is well known that the name ššnq is frequently written both with and without the <n> in Egyptian,[66] including texts concerning Shoshenq I. Its use, therefore, on two texts from the Levant is not in the least surprising, nor is its lack in some texts from Egypt.

Another example of a non-Egyptian attestation of the name lacking <n> comes from an Akhaemendid marriage contract from Susa. The text, written in Neo-/Late Babylonian, involves several individuals with Egyptian names, including one named “ššnq” (Zadok 1992, 146). It clearly lacks the <n> and is quite close to Hebrew שׁישאָק.[67] In a northern (that is, Assyrian) or Peripheral context, where Babylonian <s> is replaced by <š> (M. Müller 2010, § 4.2.3), this could well have been written *šš-su-qu, a form almost identical to the Hebrew.

A number of possible explanations for the lack of a <n> in Hebrew שׁישאָק can be proposed. It is possible that by the time the Hebrew Bible was written, well after the death of any king named Shoshenq, the /n/ in Hebrew had been dropped in pronunciation. (This may also be the case in the Akhaemendid Neo-/Late Babylonian example above.) The assimilation of a <n> with a following consonant is not uncommon in Hebrew (Gesenius & Kautzsch 1910, § 19/2a) or Aramaic (Muchiki 1999, 203), and while it is not clear if such is the case here, the possibility certainly exists and would not be unexpected. Indeed, in the majority languages where the name is vocalized, the <n> appears in a cluster with the following consonant: -vowel + nq (Neo-Assyrian), -vowel + nk- (Greek), -onk’- (Armenian[68]), or -onch- (Latin[69]). This strongly suggests the pronunciation of Egyptian [nq] was the velar phoneme /ŋ/, particularly in light of the Greek evidence.[70]

As the velar nasal phoneme /ŋ/ is lacking in both Egyptian and Semitic, it is not at all surprising there is a great deal of orthographic variation in recording this non-Egyptian and non-Semitic name (ultimately of Libyan-Berber origin[71]). One particularly telling example comes from Regnal Year 2 of Shoshenq I, Karnak Priestly Annals Fragment 4B (Kruchten 1989, pls 3 and 18; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.49) mentioned above, where the name is recorded in group writing as ššnq. This can be contrasted with the ‘Abydos Stela’ (Cairo, JE 66285 [Blackman 1941, pls 10-12; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 10.7]), which dates to the period before Shoshenq I became king. Here the name is also written with group writing, but in the form ššnq = nq (lines x+1 and x+5), with the <n> clearly present. In contrast, a limestone stela of the Great Chief of the Meshwesh, Chief of Chiefs, Shoshenq (i.e., the future Shoshenq I [Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 10.8]) has both forms with and without the <n>, indicating some confusion on the scribe’s part. Had the <n> been clearly and distinctively pronounced, its presence should have been expected given the nature of the orthography.[72]

Something similar seems to be attested in Sahidic Coptic. Peust (1999, § 3.3.7) observes that ‘the sequence κκ may be replaced by ṻ in native Sahidic words . . . This seems to happen only at the end of a word (or syllable)?’. The phenomenon is unknown in Bohairic. After rejecting


[64] Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum 3361 (Lemaire 2006, 1700); see Montet 1928, fig. 17; Schipper 1999, fig. 11; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, 12.30.

[65] Rockefeller Archaeological Museum 1.3554 (Fisher 1929, figs 7-9; Schipper 1999, figs 7-8; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, 12.29).


[67] It might even be argued that the biblical text is roughly contemporaneous with the Akhaemendid marriage contract.


[69] Sesonchosis (Helm 1956, 1:79; Jacoby 1958, 45).

[70] In this regard, Syriac šalšanīḵš (Brooks 1910b, 12; Brooks 1910a, 23) – with metathesis isḵanūsāš (Chabot 1899-1910, 4:41) – and Arabic sasūnāḥīšī (al-Bīrūni & Sachau 1878, 4*; & Maqrīzī & Wiet 1922, 65) are atypical, but entirely consistent with Syriac practices for recording non-Syriac names from Greek (here, Eusebios), as well as Arabic borrowings from Syriac.

[71] An exact cognate is not known. It is perhaps related to Old Libyan (Numidian) šnk (Colin 1996, 1:71-72, 2:61-88), although this does not seem particularly likely.

[72] See also the writing šŋq on an openwork gold pectoral (JE 72171 [Montet 1951, fig. 13, pl. 28; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 10.6]).
the possibility that this may represent [ng]/[ŋ]. Even if, despite the lack of evidence, other Shoshenqs were to be seriously considered as candidates, none of these later kings had the opportunity or military resources to campaign in the Levant. Heqakheperre Shoshenq IIa was dead before assuming the throne independently (Kitchen 1996, § 269). Shoshenq III’s reign was wracked by division and probable civil war (Caminos 1958, passim; Kitchen 1996, §§ 295-297; Broekman 2008), while almost nothing is known of the reigns of Tutkheperre Shoshenq Ilb (Lange 2004; Effland 2012) and Shoshenq IV (Rohl 1989/1990, 66-67; Dodson 1993; Rohl 1995, 378) save their existence. Shoshenq VI’s reign was localized in Upper Egypt (Kitchen 1996, § 303), and Aakehperre Shoshenq V ruled the rump of Dynasty 22 in the eastern Delta, while in the west the Great Chief of the Libu, Tefnakht, was growing in power immediately prior to the Napatan invasion of Egypt; both Shoshenqs lacked the martial efficacy to engage in conflicts abroad as are described in the biblical record. In short, the only king named ‘Shoshenq’ who had the means and opportunity to invade the southern Levant, and for which there is a great deal of firm evidence that he in fact did so, is Shoshenq I.

Conclusion

Continued debate over the chronology of the Third Intermediate Period among Egyptologists and others is indicative that there is scope for adjustments, particularly as new evidence comes to light or known information is re-examined, leading to new interpretations and discoveries. The existence of Shoshenq IV, for example, had only been hinted at by Montet (1960, 8-9), but placed on firm ground by van der Veen, Rohl (1989/1990, 66-67; 1995, 378) and Dodson (1993), something now accepted by even the most conservative of scholars (Kitchen 1996, § Y; von Beckerath 1997, 94, note 387, 191). However, the evidence must lead the conclusions, not the hoped-for conclusions leading the evidence (or rather its interpretation).

Of course the available evidence is rarely crystal clear, and indeed there can occasionally be anomalies and ‘exceptions to the rule’ that are otherwise difficult to explain. Nevertheless, these must still fit within general trends, whether historical or philological. Arguments appealing to such ‘exceptions to the rule’ that are further coupled with more ‘exceptions to the rule’ to bolster the initial ones are decidedly less probable than a straightforward reading of the material, no matter how elegant the result.

Who was Šīšaq?

Having established that Egyptian ššnq is doubtlessly to be equated with Hebrew שִׁשָּׁע ‚šīšaq, it remains to determine precisely which Shoshenqide king is to be identified with the Šīšaq of the Hebrew Bible. The traditional candidate has of course been Shoshenq I. Once the objections of Rohl, van der Veen, James, Bimson, and others, are set aside on philological grounds, there is really no reason to seriously doubt this. Of all the kings bearing the name ‘Shoshenq’ only Shoshenq I engaged in martial activities in the Levant, or indeed anywhere outside the borders of Egypt. This is evidenced most prominently by his great topographical list at Karnak (Hughes and Nims 1954, pls 2-9; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.20), as well as the stela fragment from Tel Megiddo (Rockefeller Archaeological Museum 1.3554 [Fisher 1929, figs 7-9; Schipper 1999, figs 7-8; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, 12.29]). The remnants of a topographical list from the praemaeos of the temple at el-Hibe (Feucht 1981; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.16), the cartonnage of Hori III (Cambridge, Fitzwilliam E. 8.1896 [Jansen-Winkeln 1985, 252-253 Text B5; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 17.27]), and (perhaps) the victory stela Cairo TR 3/12/24/1 (Grdseloff 1947, 95-97; Jansen-Winkeln 2007, doc. 12.19), all further point to the king’s activities in greater Palestine. No other Shoshenqide king exhibits any evidence for military activity in the Levant whatsoever, and most definitely not with this level of intensity.

[74] Only the son of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I, may have

[76] The former ‘Shoshenq IV’.
[77] See generally K. A. Wilson 2005, albeit his conclusions vis-à-vis the biblical narrative are not to be accepted (Hoffmeier 2008; Jansen-Winkeln 2008; Kitchen 2009a).
[78] See further the comments of Dodson 2012, ix-xi; 2013.
In the case of identifying Shoshenq I with biblical Šîšaq, Champollion (1868, 80-81) was admittedly on shaky ground in terms of supporting evidence when he wrote his letter in November 1828, barely six years after his famous letter to Bon-Joseph Dacier (Champollion 1822) and only four years after the publication of his Précis du système hiéroglyphique des anciens égyptiens (1824). With our profoundly greater understanding of Egyptian language, history, absolute and relative chronologies, art history, and archaeology, Champollion’s enthusiastic identification of biblical Šîšaq with Shoshenq I is assured on balance of the evidence now available, and with the principle of lex parsimoniae. Conversely, the proposals to equate Šîšaq with Ramesses II or III (or any other Ramesside king) on the basis of the rare hypocoristica ssysw, ssw, and ss, seem far from probable (or even plausible) on philological grounds, never mind the significant problems such an equation creates in both the absolute and relative chronologies for Egypt and surrounding areas.

Addendum

As I was not able to attend the original 2011 workshop in person, Peter van der Veen has kindly allowed me to respond to the views put forth in his paper contained in this volume. I thank him for his generosity. However, despite

[79] For example, Libyan Period texts are more often written in Spätmittelägyptisch (Jansen-Winkeln 1996), rather than ‘high’ Late Egyptian, as was the case during the Ramesside Period. Over time the vernacular develops into early Demotic by Dynasty 26 (el-Aguizy 1992), which is of course significantly different from the grammar utilized in late Ramesside texts.

[80] See note 5 above. To this may be added recent arguments for lunar data that appear to be broadly in line with ‘dead-reckoned’ dates (Krauss 2005; Krauss 2006, 408-414; Broekman 2009b, 91-92; see, however, Leahy 2010). It should be noted that despite claims to the contrary (Chapman 2009, 16; Morkot & James 2009, 43), it is possible to ‘dead-reckon’ the accession date of Shoshenq I exclusively on the basis of Egyptian evidence to circa 941-938 BC, without recourse to biblical synchronisms, save as a ‘check’ (Shortland 2005; Kitchen 2006; Kitchen 2007, §§ 6-10; Broekman 2011). Recent high-precision radiocarbon dates (Bronk Ramsey, Dee, Rowland et al. 2010; Shortland & Bronk Ramsey [eds] 2013; Taylor 2013) rule out the rather extreme adjustments to the conventional chronology that have been suggested.

[81] Although the issue needs to be addressed thoroughly elsewhere, the diachronic development of hieratic paleography between the late New Kingdom and early Saite Period rules out significant chronological overlaps (cf. Möller 1927; Möller 1936; Wimmer 1989; Verhoeven 2001).

[82] For example, the typological development of several object classes, such as coffins (Niwiński 1988; Taylor 2003; Aston 2009a, 269-290; Broekman 2009a; Taylor 2009), funerary stelae (Munro 1973; Saleh 2007; Leahy 2009; Loth 2009), and statuary (Brandl 2008; Brandl 2009).

being afforded this opportunity, I remain unconvinced and do not see the necessity of modify my own views in any significant way.

I do not doubt that there were one or more written sources (perhaps from the Iron Age that ultimately served as some sort of basis for the Šîšaq narrative in I Kings, but what exactly these were remains highly debatable. Whether they were in a narrative format similar to the existing text, as van der Veen argues, is both unknowable and unlikely. (I certainly do not accept van der Veen’s contention [citing 2 Chron. 12:15] that it ‘seems safe to assume that this material was written up by [the prophet Shemaiah] or by one of his pupils at or near the time’ of the Egyptian invasion.) For example, van Seters (1983, 301-302) and Na’aman (1997a; 1997b) have suggested the basis for the biblical text might be something as prosaic as accounting records with some limited historical information – the names of the kings involved when ‘tribute’ was paid out of the temple treasury – and only later ‘filled out’ by the authors of the biblical narrative. In any event, regardless of whether the historical event took place in the Ramesside or Third Intermediate Period, the text of the Hebrew bible referring to Šîšaq’s campaign was not recorded in the form we now have until long after the event itself.

As I have argued, once the issue of a midrashic pun is set aside (which van der Veen and I both agree is best abandoned), the remaining philological concerns with the name revolve around the issue of the sibilants /s/ vs. /š/, and the explanation for the <q> in Hebrew מְשַׁמָּשׁ šīṣaq, if Egyptian ssysw, ssw, or ss is lurking behind it. My view continues to remain that evidence for any definitively attested case of Egyptian /s/ occurring in a Northwest Semitic language as <ṣ> is lacking; the various examples that have been proposed can all be accounted for in other, less radical manners; none of these proposals are definitive and involve (often considerable) doubt.

In principle, van der Veen is correct, however, in pointing out that the orthographic of conventions used to record various sibilants may have been ‘updated’ by a later copyist, regardless of any change in actual pronunciation. As we both recognize, one example of this may possibly be found in Egyptian škwyw ‘ships’, entering Hebrew as יהושע (Isaiah 2:16). However, as I pointed out, this word likely firstly entered Canaanite (cf. Ugaritic ḫkt, and then was retained in what became Hebrew as the ancestral language developed (thus Egyptian /s/ = Canaanite /t/ → Hebrew /š/, or, with a pointing error, /s/). However, using this as an explanation for why Egyptian ssysw, ssw, or ss was written in Hebrew with <ṣ> raises the question of how much time has passed between the lifetime of the Ramesside king and the final form his name takes the Hebrew bible, during which knowledge of just how it was to be pronounced came to be lost. Under the Centuries

[83] While the source material probably dated to the Iron Age, the redacted text of Kings likely dates to the late 7th century BC (Dever 2010, 518), or later.
of Darkness model, this cannot be a great deal, making it less likely. (Compare this with Egyptian /s/ in pr-r-ṣ-m-sw entering Hebrew as samekh (םosomes), roughly 550 years after the foundation of the city on the conventional chronology but far less under the Centuries of Darkness model.)

For purposes of discussion, I fully accept the possibility of van der Veen’s ingenious notion that an Iron Age Hebrew might have misunderstood a Bronze Age waw as qoph, but I very much question the probability of this being so in this case. For this proposal to work we have to assume there was a Bronze Age text to be read in the first place (the purported eye witness account recorded by the Prophet Shemaiḥ?) and that (from our perspective) the Iron Age (or later) redactor was simply – but understandably – confused by what he read. While this is certainly a plausible explanation for this single issue, I certainly would not want to bolster a major reworking of (at a minimum) Egyptian and Levantine absolute chronology upon what van der Veen himself describes as ‘a scribal corruption during the long process of transmission’, particularly when less radical explanations, based on a straightforward reading of the available evidence, remain possible. This becomes even less probable when other objections that have been raised are taken into account.

One point of agreement that I do share with van der Veen is that Shoshenq I was very likely regarded by later generations as the preeminent ‘conquering pharaoh’ of the early first millennium BC, impacting folk traditions in and outside of Egypt, including the Levant. Likewise, I have little doubt that this memory influenced the Sesostris/Sesonkhosis Romance and related stories, including some versions of the Alexander Romance.[85] However, using this as an additional explanation for the <q> in שיאק remains in my mind special pleading to otherwise explain away an anomaly.

A point not addressed by van der Veen, however, is whether such a memory of any Ramesside king with regard to the Hebrew bible may be reasonably claimed. Like their contemporary Assyrian and Babylonian counterparts, several Egyptian kings of the Third Intermediate and Late Periods are mentioned by name in the biblical text, most frequently when their campaigns impacted the Levant.[86]

What is lacking, however, is any clear reference to a single king of the New Kingdom (save as part of a toponym), or indeed, any knowledge of the Egyptian empire whatsoever. If one of the Ramesside kings were to be identified with Siḥaq this gap would be most surprising. For example, if Siḥaq is Ramesses III (as the Centuries of Darkness model favors), it is extraordinary that Merenptah (never mind Ramesses II), who certainty campaigned in the Levant, is unknown to the Hebrew bible, despite reigning only a generation before; if Siḥaq is Ramesses II the issue is even more pronounced.[87] Conversely, if Siḥaq is Shoshenq I, there is no issue at all as the Libyans did not reestablish a permanent presence the Levant beyond (at the very best) Osorkon I, and even this can be accommodated within the sphere of the post-Solomonic kingdoms.

Finally, I wish to briefly emphasize some of my concluding remarks once again. Hebrew שיאק can be – for sake of discussion – equated with Egyptian ss, ss, or ss, but it must be recognized that to do so means acceptance of a significant number of quite intricate explanations to account for what would otherwise be quite anomalous. Conversely, equating it with Egyptian šeq does not necessitate this at all; the reading is straightforward and, indeed, expected. Only the missing <n> in the Hebrew needs to be accounted for, but as discussed in my paper, this is not at all uncommon or unexpected, even in Egypt. The conventional reading as šeq seems, therefore, all the more likely given that the Babylonian example of an Egyptian named *si-su-qu (Zadok 1992, 146) is attested, a form that in Assyrian would likely have occurred as *ši-su-qu, essentially identical to the Hebrew šiq. This seems much more probable (and plausible) than the alternative explanations that have been suggested, both by van der Veen and others.

[84] Redford (2009, 175, and note 9) argues that Egyptian שיאק was rendered as samekh in ‘Hebrew and other West Semitic languages no earlier than the end of the 8th Cent. BC as no certain examples of the equivalence šš with Hebrew samekh occur before this time’.


[86] Excluding Siḥaq, the following are attested: Tirhâqî (i.e., Taharqô [Dynasty 25]; 2 Kings 19:9; Isaiah 37:9); Nakô (i.e., Nekau II [Dynasty 26]; 2 Kings 23:29-35; 2 Chron. 35:20-22, 36:4; Jeremiah 46:2); Hâpâra (Wahibre’ (Greek: Apries) [Dynasty 26]; Jeremiah 44:30). Osorkon IV, as ‘Sô’ (2 Kings 17:4), should be included as well (Dodson 2012, 150-151).

[87] The geographical extent of the Egyptian empire under Ramesses III during the reigns of Solomon and Rehoboam remains to be addressed as well, but this remains outside the focus of van der Veen’s paper.
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