



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in :

The ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE: Culture and history

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa11246>

Book chapter :

Sagrillo, T. (2012). *Šīšaq's army: 2 Chronicles 12:2–3 from an Egyptological perspective*. Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren M. Maeir, Danel Kahn (Ed.), *The ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE: Culture and history*, (pp. 425-450). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

This article is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Authors are personally responsible for adhering to publisher restrictions or conditions. When uploading content they are required to comply with their publisher agreement and the SHERPA RoMEO database to judge whether or not it is copyright safe to add this version of the paper to this repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/iss/researchsupport/cronfa-support/>

**The Ancient Near East
in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE**

Culture and History

Proceedings of the International Conference
held at the University of Haifa,
2–5 May, 2010

Edited by

Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa,
Aren M. Maeir, and Dan'el Kahn

Alter Orient und Altes Testament

Veröffentlichungen zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients
und des Alten Testaments

Band 392

Herausgeber

Manfried Dietrich • Oswald Loretz • Hans Neumann

Lektor

Kai A. Metzler

Beratergremium

Rainer Albertz • Joachim Bretschneider
Stefan Maul • Udo Rütterswörden • Walther Sallaberger
Gebhard Selz • Michael P. Streck • Wolfgang Zwickel

2012
Ugarit-Verlag
Münster

**The Ancient Near East
in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE**

Culture and History

Proceedings of the International Conference
held at the University of Haifa,
2–5 May, 2010

Edited by

Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa,
Aren M. Maeir, and Dan'el Kahn

2012
Ugarit-Verlag
Münster

The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History.
Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa,
2–5 May, 2010

Edited by Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren M. Maeir, and Dan'el Kahn

Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 392

© 2012 Ugarit-Verlag, Münster

www.ugarit-verlag.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

All rights preserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photo-copying, recording, or otherwise,
without the prior permission of the publisher.

Herstellung: Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-86835-066-1

Printed on acid-free paper

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Preface | ix |
| Abbreviations | xi |
| | |
| <i>Reinhard Achenbach</i> Divine Warfare and Yhwh's Wars: Religious Ideologies of War in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament | 1 |
| | |
| <i>Michal Artzy</i> Continuation and Change in the 13 th –10 th Centuries BCE Eastern Mediterranean: Bronze-Working <i>Koiné</i> ? | 27 |
| | |
| <i>Michael Avioz</i> The Davidic Covenant in 2 Samuel 7: Conditional or Unconditional? | 43 |
| | |
| <i>Yigal Bloch</i> Assyro-Babylonian Conflicts in the Reign of Aššur-rēša-iši I: The Contribution of Administrative Documents to History-Writing | 53 |
| | |
| <i>Walter Dietrich</i> David and the Philistines: Literature and History | 79 |
| | |
| <i>Frederick Mario Fales</i> “Ḫanigalbat” in the Early Neo-Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: A Retrospective View | 99 |
| | |
| <i>Avraham Faust</i> Between Israel and Philistia: Ethnic Negotiations in the South during the Iron Age I | 121 |
| | |
| <i>Gershon Galil</i> Solomon's Temple: Fiction or Reality? | 137 |
| | |
| <i>Yosef Garfinkel, Saar Ganor and Michael G. Hasel</i> The Iron Age City of Khirbet Qeiyafa after Four Seasons of Excavations | 149 |
| | |
| <i>Moshe Garsiel</i> Ideological Discordance between the Prophets Nathan and Samuel as reflecting the Divergence between the Book of Samuel's Authors | 175 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Moti Haiman</i> Geopolitical Aspects of the Negev Desert in the 11 th –10 th Centuries BCE | 199 |
| <i>Larry G. Herr</i> Jordan in the Iron I and IIA Periods | 207 |
| <i>Richard S. Hess</i> The Distinctive Value of Human Life in Israel's Earliest Legal Traditions | 221 |
| <i>Victor Avigdor Hurowitz</i> Yhwh's Exalted House Revisited: New Comparative Light on the Biblical Image of Solomon's Temple | 229 |
| <i>Sandra Jacobs</i> נפש תחת נפש "A Life for A Life" and <i>napšāte umalla</i> | 241 |
| <i>Dan 'el Kahn</i> A Geo-Political and Historical Perspective of Merneptah's Policy in Canaan | 255 |
| <i>Aaron Koller</i> The <i>Kos</i> in the Levant: Thoughts on its Distribution, Function, and Spread from the Late Bronze to the Iron Age II | 269 |
| <i>André Lemaire</i> West Semitic Epigraphy and the History of the Levant during the 12 th –10 th Centuries BCE | 291 |
| <i>Yigal Levin</i> Ideology and Reality in the Book of Judges | 309 |
| <i>Mario Liverani</i> Melid in the Early and Middle Iron Age: Archaeology and History | 327 |
| <i>Aren M. Maeir</i> Insights on the Philistine Culture and Related Issues: An Overview of 15 Years of Work at Tell eš-Šafi/Gath | 345 |
| <i>Alan Millard</i> Scripts and their Uses in the 12 th –10 th Centuries BCE | 405 |
| <i>John P. Nielsen</i> Nebuchadnezzar I's Eastern Front | 413 |
| <i>Troy Leiland Sagrillo</i> Šiṣaq's Army: 2 Chronicles 12:2–3 from an Egyptological Perspective | 425 |
| <i>Itamar Singer</i> The Philistines in the North and the Kingdom of Taita | 451 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Ephraim Stern</i> Archaeological Remains of the Northern Sea Peoples along the Sharon and Carmel Coasts and the ‘Akko and Jezreel Valleys | 473 |
| <i>Christoffer Theis and Peter van der Veen</i> Some ‘Provenanced’ Egyptian Inscriptions from Jerusalem: A Preliminary Study of Old and New Evidence | 509 |
| <i>Koert van Bekkum</i> Coexistence as Guilt: Iron I Memories in Judges 1 | 525 |
| <i>Assaf Yasur-Landau</i> Chariots, Spears and Wagons: Anatolian and Aegean Elements in the Medinet Habu Land Battle Relief..... | 549 |
| <i>Ran Zadok</i> The Aramean Infiltration and Diffusion in the Upper Jazira, 1150–930 BCE..... | 569 |
| <i>Wolfgang Zwickel</i> Cult in the Iron Age I–IIA in the Land of Israel | 581 |
| <i>Wolfgang Zwickel</i> The Change from Egyptian to Philistine Hegemony in South-Western Palestine during the Time of Ramesses III or IV..... | 595 |
| Index of Authors | 603 |
| Index of Biblical Sources | 619 |
| Index of Subjects | 629 |

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 Liverani (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-iši 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 (Šišaq’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

Judges and Samuel, *inter alia* in light of historical/archaeological testimony. Garfinkel, Ganor and Hasel summarize the excavation results of Kh. Qeiyafa, and Zwickel (first paper) offers a synthesis of early Israelite cult.

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

ABBREVIATIONS

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---------------|---|
| A | siglum of texts in the Aššur collection of the Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzerleri |
| B | siglum of objects in the Beirut Museum |
| ca. | circa |
| cf. | compare |
| col(s). | column(s) |
| ch(s). | chapter(s) |
| DeZ | siglum of texts in the National Museum of Deir ez-Zor |
| Dtr | Deuteronomistic editor(s) |
| DN | divine name |
| ENA | early Neo-Assyrian |
| <i>et al.</i> | <i>et alia</i> = and others |
| etc. | and so on; and the rest |
| esp. | especially |
| EV | English Versions |
| ff. | following |
| Fig(s). | Figure(s) |
| FS | Festschrift |
| G | Greek (versions) |
| ibid. | <i>ibidem</i> = in the same place |
| idem | the same |
| K | siglum of texts in the collection of the British Museum |
| km | kilometer |
| l(l). | line(s) |
| LXX | Septuagint |
| m | meter |
| MA | Middle Assyrian |
| MLC | siglum of a tablet collection in the Yale Babylonian collection |
| N.B. | <i>nota bene</i> = note well |
| n(n). | note(s) |
| no(s). | number(s) |
| obv. | obverse |
| op. cit. | <i>opere citātō</i> = in the work cited |
| OT | Old Testament |
| P | Priestly Document |
| par | parallel |
| PN | personal name |
| p(p). | page(s) |
| pl(s). | plate(s) |
| r. | reverse |

| | |
|-------------|---|
| <i>Sam.</i> | <i>Samaritan Targum</i> |
| v(v) | verse(s) |
| VAT | siglum of texts in the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin |

ABBREVIATIONS OF BIBLICAL BOOKS

| | | |
|---------|------|------------------------|
| Gen | Hos | Ps (<i>pl.</i> : Pss) |
| Ex | Joel | Prov |
| Lev | Amos | Job |
| Num | Obad | Ruth |
| Deut | Jona | Cant |
| Josh | Mic | Eccl; Qoh |
| Judg | Nah | Lam |
| 1–2 Sam | Hab | Estr |
| 1–2 Kgs | Zeph | Dan |
| Isa | Hag | Ezra |
| Jer | Zech | Neh |
| Ezek | Mal | 1–2 Chron |

ABBREVIATIONS OF DEAD SEA SCROLLS

| | |
|-----|--|
| CD | Cairo (Geniza text of) Damascus (Document) |
| 1QM | Milḥāmâ (War Scroll) |

PERIODICALS, REFERENCE WORKS, AND SERIES

| | |
|-------------|--|
| <i>AA</i> | <i>American Antiquity</i> |
| <i>AAA</i> | <i>University of Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology</i> |
| ÄAT | Ägypten und Altes Testament |
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| ABD | D. N. Freedman (ed.), <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , I–VI (New York, 1992) |
| <i>ADAJ</i> | <i>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</i> |
| ADD | C. H. W. Johns, <i>Assyrian Deeds and Documents</i> , Cambridge, I (1898), II–III (1901), IV (1923) |
| ADPV | Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästinavereins |
| <i>AfK</i> | <i>Archiv für Keilschriftforschung</i> |
| <i>AfO</i> | <i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i> |
| <i>AJA</i> | <i>American Journal of Archaeology</i> |
| AKL | Assyrian King List |
| Ä&L | <i>Ägypten und Levante</i> |
| ALASPM | Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens |
| AnBib | Analecta Biblica |
| <i>ANES</i> | <i>Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i> |
| ANET | J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> (Princeton, 1969 ³) |
| <i>AnOr</i> | <i>Analecta Orientalia</i> |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>AnSt</i> | <i>Anatolian Studies</i> |
| AO | Aula Orientalis |
| AOAT | Alter Orient und Altes Testament |
| <i>AoF</i> | <i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i> |
| AOTC | Apollos Old Testament Commentary |
| <i>ARA</i> | <i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i> |
| ARAB | D. D. Luckenbill, <i>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</i> , I–II (Chicago, 1926–1927) |
| ARI | A. K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian Royal Inscription</i> , I–II (Wiesbaden, 1972–1976) |
| ARM | Archives royale de mari |
| <i>ArOr</i> | <i>Archiv Orientální</i> |
| ASAE | Annales du Service des antiquités de l’Égypte |
| ASOR | The American Schools of Oriental Research |
| ASV | American Standard Version |
| AThANT | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| AUSS | Andrews University Seminary Studies |
| <i>AWE</i> | <i>Ancient West and East</i> |
| <i>BA</i> | <i>Biblical Archaeologist</i> |
| BAe | Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca |
| BAH | Bibliothèque Archéologie et Historique |
| BAL | R. Borger, <i>Babylonisch-assyrische Lesestücke</i> (AnOr 54; Rome, 1979 ²) |
| <i>BaM</i> | <i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i> |
| BAR | British Archaeological Reports |
| <i>BAR</i> | <i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i> |
| <i>BASOR</i> | <i>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research</i> |
| BATSH 4 | E. C. Cancik-Kirschbaum, <i>Die mittelassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēḥ Hamad</i> (Berlin, 1996) |
| BATSH 9 | W. Röllig, <i>Land- und Viehwirtschaft am unteren Ḥābūr in mittelassyrischer Zeit</i> (Wiesbaden, 2008) |
| BBSR | Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement |
| BBSt. | L. W. King, <i>Babylonian Boundary Stones</i> (London, 1912) |
| <i>BdÉ</i> | <i>Bibliothèque d’étude, Institut français d’archéologie orientale</i> |
| <i>BES</i> | <i>Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar</i> |
| BEATAJ | Beiträge der Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums |
| BET | Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie |
| BETHL | Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium |
| BHS | Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia |
| <i>BI</i> | <i>Biblical Interpretation</i> |
| BICANE | Bronze to Iron Age Chronology of the Ancient Near East |
| <i>BIFAO</i> | <i>Bulletin de l’institut française d’Arcéologie orientale, Cairo</i> |
| BiOr | Bibliotheca Orientalis |
| BIS | Biblical Interpretation Series |
| BJS | Brown Judaic Studies |
| BKAT | Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament |
| BLS | Bible and Literature Series |
| <i>BN</i> | <i>Biblische Notizen</i> |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| <i>BSA</i> | <i>Bulletin de la Société Anthropologique</i> |
| <i>BSFE</i> | <i>Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie</i> |
| BT | Babylonian Talmud |
| BWANT | Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament |
| <i>BZ</i> | <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> |
| BZAW | Beihefte zur <i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> |
| <i>CA</i> | <i>Current Anthropology</i> |
| CAD | The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of University of Chicago |
| CAH | Cambridge Ancient History |
| <i>CBQ</i> | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> |
| CCCM | <i>Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis</i> |
| CdE | Chronique d'Égypte |
| CDOG | Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft |
| CHANE | Culture and History of the Ancient Near East |
| <i>CHLI</i> | J. D. Hawkins, <i>Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions</i> (Berlin, 2010) |
| CM | Cuneiform Monographs |
| <i>CMAO</i> | <i>Contributi e materiali di archeologia orientale</i> |
| CNWS | Centrum voor Niet-Westerse Studies |
| <i>CRAI</i> | <i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i> |
| <i>CRIPEL</i> | <i>Cahiers de recherches de l'Institut de papyrologie et Égyptologie de Lille</i> |
| CTN | Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud |
| EA | J. A. Knudtzon, <i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . Anmerkungen und Register bearb. von O. Weber und E. Ebeling (Aalen, 1964); EA 359–379: A. F. Rainey, <i>El Amarna Tablets 359–379</i> (Kevelaer, 1970) |
| EHS | Europäische Hochschulschriften |
| <i>EI</i> | <i>Eretz Israel</i> |
| EME | Études et Mémoires d'Égyptologie |
| ERA | Egyptian Research Account |
| FAT | Forschungen zum Alten Testament |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament |
| <i>GM</i> | <i>Göttinger Miszellen</i> |
| GTA | Göttinger theologische Arbeiten |
| HALOT | L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , I–V (Tran. by M. E. J. Richardson; Leiden, 1994–2000) |
| HAT | Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| HSAO | Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient |
| HSS | Harvard Semitic Studies |
| HThK AT | Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament |
| HTR | Harvard Theological Review |
| HUCA | Hebrew Union College Annual |
| IAA | Israel Antiquities Authorities |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |

| | |
|--------|--|
| ICAANE | <i>International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East</i> |
| IEJ | <i>Israel Exploration Journal</i> |
| IFAO | Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale |
| IOS | Israel Oriental Studies |
| JAA | <i>Journal of Anthropological Archaeology</i> |
| JAC | <i>Journal of Ancient Civilizations</i> |
| JACF | <i>Journal of the Ancient Chronology Forum</i> |
| JA EI | <i>Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections</i> |
| JANES | <i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i> |
| JAOS | <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> |
| JAR | <i>Journal of Archaeological Research</i> |
| JARCE | <i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i> |
| JAS | <i>Journal of Archaeological Science</i> |
| JBL | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| JBS | Jerusalem Biblical Studies |
| JCS | <i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> |
| JEA | <i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i> |
| JEN | Joint Expedition (with the Iraq Museum) at Nuzi, 1927–1934 |
| JEOL | <i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"</i> |
| JESHO | <i>Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient</i> |
| JHS | <i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i> |
| JLR | <i>Journal of Law and Religion</i> |
| JMA | <i>Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology</i> |
| JNES | <i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> |
| JNSL | <i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i> |
| JSB | The Jewish Study Bible |
| JSOT | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> |
| JSOTS | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement</i> |
| JSS | <i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i> |
| JSSEA | <i>Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities</i> |
| KAI | H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> , I–III (Wiesbaden, 1971 ³) |
| KAR | E. Ebeling, <i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts</i> (Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Assur; Leipzig, 1919) |
| KBo | Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazgöi |
| KJV | King James Version |
| KRI | K. A. Kitchen, <i>Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical</i> , I–VIII (Oxford, 1969–1990) |
| KS | A. Alt, <i>Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i> , I–III (München, 1953–1959) |
| KTU | M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartín, <i>The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places</i> (ALASP 8; Münster, 1995 ²) |
| LÄ | <i>Lexikon der Ägyptologie</i> |
| LAAA | <i>Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology</i> |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>LdÄ</i> | <i>Lexikon der Ägyptologie</i> |
| LH | Laws of Hammurabi |
| LHB/OTS | Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies |
| MAL | Middle Assyrian Law |
| <i>MARV</i> | <i>Mittelassyrische Rechtsurkunden und Verwaltungstexte</i> |
| MÄS | Münchner ägyptologische Studien |
| MDAIK | Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Cairo |
| <i>MDOG</i> | <i>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i> |
| MEEF | Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund |
| MIFAO | Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire |
| <i>MMJ</i> | <i>Metropolitan Museum Journal</i> |
| <i>MPP</i> | <i>Madaba Plains Project</i> |
| <i>NABU</i> | <i>Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires</i> |
| <i>NBL</i> | M. Görg and B. Lang (eds.), <i>Neues Biblelexikon</i> , I–III (Zürich, 1995–1998) |
| <i>NEA</i> | <i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i> |
| NEAEHL | E. Stern (ed.), <i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i> , I–V (Jerusalem – New York, 1993–2008) |
| <i>NEASB</i> | <i>Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin</i> |
| NIBC | New International Biblical Commentary |
| NICOT | New International Commentary on the Old Testament |
| NIV | New International Version |
| NJPS | New Jewish Publication Society Translation of the Bible |
| <i>NTT</i> | <i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i> |
| OAC | Orientis Antiqui Collectio |
| OAS | Oslo Archaeological Series |
| OBO | Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis |
| OBOSA | Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Series Archaeologica |
| OECT | Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts |
| OIP | Oriental Institute Publications |
| <i>OJA</i> | <i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i> |
| OLA | Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta |
| <i>OLP</i> | <i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</i> |
| OTL | Old Testament Library |
| PÄ | Probleme der Ägyptologie |
| <i>PEF</i> | <i>Palestine Exploration Fund Annual</i> |
| <i>PEQ</i> | <i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i> |
| PIHANS | Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul. Publications de l'Institut historique- archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul |
| <i>PJ</i> | <i>Palästina-Jahrbuch</i> |
| PNA | <i>The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire</i> , I–III/1 (Helsinki, 1998–2002) |
| QD | Quaestiones disputatae |
| <i>RB</i> | <i>Revue biblique</i> |
| <i>RBL</i> | <i>Review of Biblical Literature</i> |
| <i>RdE</i> | <i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i> |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| RIMA 1 | A. K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (To 1114 BC)</i> , (Toronto, 1987) |
| RIMA 2 | A. K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC, I (1114–859 BC)</i> , (Toronto, 1991) |
| RIMA 3 | A. K. Grayson, <i>Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC, II (858–745 BC)</i> , (Toronto, 1996) |
| RIMB 2 | G. Frame, <i>Rulers of Babylonia from the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157–612 BC)</i> , (Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Babylonian Periods 2; Toronto, 1995) |
| RINAP 4 | E. Leichty, <i>The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680–669 BC)</i> ; with a contribution by G. Frame and the editorial assistance of J. Novotny, M. T. Rutz, and A. E. Barron (Winona Lake, IN 2011) |
| RGG | Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart |
| RGTC | Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes |
| <i>RHA</i> | <i>Revue hittite et asianique</i> |
| <i>RIA</i> | <i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</i> |
| RS | field numbers of tablets excavated at Ras Shamra |
| RSF | Rivista di Studi Fenici |
| RSOu | Ras Shamra – Ougarit |
| <i>RSV</i> | <i>Revised Standard Version</i> |
| SAA | State Archives of Assyria |
| <i>SAAB</i> | <i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i> |
| SAAS | State Archives of Assyria Studies |
| SAGA | Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens |
| SAK | Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur |
| SBL | Society of Biblical Literature |
| SBAB | Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände |
| SBS | Stuttgarter Bibelstudien |
| SCCNH | Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians |
| SCIEM | Synchronization of Civilizations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the 2nd Millennium BC |
| <i>SEL</i> | <i>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici</i> |
| SGKAO | Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients |
| <i>SHAJ</i> | <i>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</i> |
| SHCANE | Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East |
| <i>SJOT</i> | <i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i> |
| <i>SM</i> | <i>Scripta Mediterranea</i> |
| <i>SMEA</i> | <i>Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici</i> |
| SSEA | Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities |
| SSN | Studia Semitica Neerlandica |
| <i>SUGIA</i> | <i>Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika</i> |
| SWBAS | Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series |
| <i>TA</i> | <i>Tel Aviv</i> |
| TAP | Ta'yinat Archaeological Project |
| TAVO | Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients (University of Tübingen) |
| <i>TB</i> | <i>Tyndale Bulletin</i> |
| TB | Theologische Bücherei |
| TCS | Texts from Cuneiform Sources |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>TDOT</i> | G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> (Grand Rapids, 1974–2006) |
| <i>ThPr</i> | <i>Theologia Practica</i> |
| <i>ThWAT</i> | G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, I–X</i> (Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln, 1973–2001) |
| <i>TSSI</i> | J. C. L. Gibson, <i>Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions, I–III</i> (Oxford, 1971–1982) |
| <i>UF</i> | <i>Ugarit Forschungen</i> |
| UMM | University Museum Monograph |
| Urk. | Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums |
| UTB | Uni-Taschenbücher |
| VAS | Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler |
| <i>VT</i> | <i>Vetus Testamentum</i> |
| WAS | Wiener Alttestamentliche Studien |
| WMANT | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament |
| <i>WSS</i> | N. Avigad and B. Sass, <i>Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals</i> (Jerusalem, 1997) |
| <i>WUB</i> | <i>Welt und Umwelt der Bibel</i> |
| WVDOG | Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft |
| YES | Yale Egyptological Studies |
| <i>ZA</i> | <i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie</i> |
| <i>ZAR</i> | <i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i> |
| <i>ZAW</i> | <i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> |
| ZBKAT | Zürcher Bibelkommentar zum Alten Testament |
| <i>ZDPV</i> | <i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i> |

ŠÎŠAQ'S ARMY

2 CHRONICLES 12:2–3 FROM AN EGYPTOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

TROY LEILAND SAGRILLO

Swansea University

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.

¹ Shoshenq's accession date is based on dead-reckoning back from the securely dated beginning of Dynasty 26; see E. Hornung, R. Krauß and D. A. Warburton (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian Chronology* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 234–264. It is anchored to a lunar date in the “greater Dākhlah stela” (Ashmolean Museum 1894.107A), dated to Regnal Year 5 of Shoshenq I (for which, see note 116, below); this is discussed in R. Krauß, “Das *wrš*-Datum aus Jahr 5 von Shoshenq (I)”, *Discussions in Egyptology* 62 (2005), pp. 43–48; Hornung *et al.*, *ibid.*, pp. 411–412. While this is remarkably close to the widely cited date of 945 BCE for his accession, it is *independent* of any purported biblical synchronism with Regnal Year 5 of King Rehoboam of Judah (1 Kgs 14:25 and 2 Chron 12:2), the date of Šîšaq's campaign (for which, see K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt [1100–650 BC]*, [Warminster, 1996], §§ 58–60). For objections, see *idem*, “The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt: An overview of fact and fiction”, in G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée and O. E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 23; Leiden, 2009), pp. 166–167, § 13; M. A. Leahy, “The Date of the ‘Larger’ Dakhleh Stela (Oxford, Ashmolean 1894.107a)”, *GM* 226 (2010), pp. 45–53.

² The literature on this topic is vast, but see generally Kitchen, *idem*, *Third Intermediate Period*, §§ 241–260, 398–415; K. A. Wilson, *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine* (Tübingen, 2005). Cf. reviews of Wilson's book by J. K. Hoffmeier (*BASOR* 349 [2008], pp. 88–91), and K. A. Kitchen (*JSS* 54 [2009], pp. 274–276). See also T. L. Sagrillo, *The reign of Shoshenq I: Textual and Historical Analyses*, forthcoming.

Bible.³ In particular, the elements of Šīšaq’s forces detailed in 2 Chron 12:3 are worth examining from an Egyptological perspective.⁴

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

[2] וַיְהִי בַשָּׁנָה הַחֲמִישִׁית לְמֶלֶךְ רְחַבְעָם עָלָה שִׁישַׁק מֶלֶךְ־מִצְרַיִם עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַם כִּי מָעְלוּ בֵיהוָה. [3] בָּאֵלֶּף וּמֵאתַיִם רֶבֶב וּבִשְׁשִׁים אֵלֶּף פָּרָשִׁים וְאִין מִסְפָּר לָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּאוּ עִמּוֹ מִמִּצְרַיִם לְיָבִים סְכֵיִים וְכוּשִׁים.

[2] And in the fifth year of King Rehab^cām, Šīšaq, 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, *Sukkiyîm*, and Kushites.

The narrative raises a number of points. First, Šīšaq’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, *Sukkiyîm*, 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

1. The New Kingdom Background

In order to understand the composition and organization of the Egyptian military during the Libyan Period,⁵ 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.⁶ The bulk of the military consisted of infantry (*mnfyt*),⁷ broken up into divisions theoretically totaling 5,000 men each,⁸ 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*, *Sukkīyīm* and *Kušīm* in II Chronicles 12, 3–4”, in È. E. Kormyševa and I. A. Ladynin (eds.), *Культурное наследие Египта и Христианский восток* [Kul’turnoe nasledie Egipta 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.

⁶ In general, see R. O. Faulkner, “Egyptian Military Organization”, *JEA* 39 (1953), pp. 32–47; A. R. Schulman, *Military Rank, Title and Organization in the Egyptian New Kingdom* (MÄS 6; Berlin, 1964); J. Yoyotte and J. López, “L’Organisation de l’armée et les titulatures de soldats au Nouvel Empire égyptien”, *BiOr* 26 (1969), pp. 3–19; A. R. Schulman, “Military organization in ancient Egypt”, in J. M. Sasson *et al.* (eds.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* 1 (New York, 1995), pp. 289–301; A. M. Gnirs, *Militär und Gesellschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte des Neuen Reiches* (SAGA 17; Heidelberg, 1996); A. J. Spalinger, *War in Ancient Egypt: The New Kingdom* (Oxford – Malden, 2005); P.-M. Chevereau, *Prosopographie des cadres militaires égyptiens du Nouvel Empire* (EME 3; Paris, 2001).

⁷ A. H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, I (London, 1947), p. 113*; Faulkner, *ibid.*, pp. 43–44; Schulman, *ibid.*, 1964, pp. 13–14.

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 (*s3w*).⁹ Companies were led by Standard-bearers (*tz3y-sryt*)¹⁰ under the command of an Adjutant or Deputy (*jd3nw*).¹¹ The chariotry (*ssmt*) formed specialist units attached to divisions,¹² as were “recruits” (*nfrw*)¹³ and non-Egyptian auxiliaries (“mercenaries”/prisoners of war).¹⁴ However, as early as Dynasty 21 the rank of “Standard-bearer” disappeared from the textual record for reasons that are not now entirely clear,¹⁵ while conversely, a new military title, “Commander” (*h3wty*), is known since the end of Dynasty 20.¹⁶ The latter was especially favored by Libyan tribal leaders,¹⁷ especially by those holding the rank of Great Overseer of the Army (*jmy-r3 mšc*).¹⁸

During the late New Kingdom, greater emphasis was placed on non-Egyptian auxiliaries (primarily captured prisoners of war forcibly settled in Middle Egypt¹⁹)

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), pp. 31–32; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 156.

¹² Faulkner, *ibid.*, p. 43; K. A. Kitchen, *Ramesseid 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 (*jd3nw t3 n h3tr*); 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-Ismā‘īliyyah, 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.

¹⁴ For discussion regarding foreign soldiers in Egyptian military service, see (among others) Schulman, *ibid.*, pp. 22–25; D. Kessler, “Eine Landschenkung Ramesses III. zugunsten eines ‘Grossen der *thrw*’ aus *mr-mšc*’”, *SAK* 2 (1975), pp. 103–134; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 270–271, 275. See also Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 90.

¹⁵ See the discussion in P.-M. Chevereau, *Prosopographie des cadres militaires égyptiens de la Basse Époque: Carrières militaires et carrières sacerdotales en Égypte du XI^e au I^e siècle avant J. C.* (EME 2; Paris, 2001), pp. 283–284.

¹⁶ Previous to this, *h3wty* was used in a more general sense as “leader”, rather than as a true rank (Schulman, *op. cit.* [note 6, 1964], p. 49).

¹⁷ G. Daressy, “Fragments héracléopolitains”, *ASAE* 21 (1921), pp. 138–144; Yoyotte and López, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 10; K. Jansen-Winkel, “Zum militärischen Befehlsbereich der Hohenpriester des Amun”, *GM* 99 (1987), pp. 19–22; Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 266–267.

¹⁸ Often stereotypically translated as “General.”

¹⁹ S. Sauneron and J. Yoyotte, “Traces d’établissements asiatiques en Moyenne Égypte sous Ramsès II”, *RdE* 7 (1950), pp. 67–70; Faulkner, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 44–45; Kessler, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 117–134; H. W. Helck, “Militärkolonie”, in H. W. Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *LÄ* 4 (Wiesbaden, 1982), cols. 134–135; B. Vachala, “Zur Frage der Kriegsgefangenen in Ägypten: Überlegungen anhand der schriftlichen Quellen des Alten Reiches”, in E. Endesfelder (ed.), *Probleme der frühen Gesellschaftsentwicklung im Alten Ägypten* (Berlin, 1991), pp. 93–101; D. B. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, 1992), pp. 221–227; K. Jansen-Winkel, “Der Beginn der libyschen Herrschaft in Ägypten”, *BN* 71 (1994), pp. 78–97; idem, “Die Libyer in Herakleopolis magna”, *Orientalia* 75 (2006), pp. 297–316; T. L. Sagrillo, “The Geographic Origins of the ‘Bubastite’ Dynasty and Possible Locations for the Royal Residence and Burial Place of Shoshenq I”, in G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée and O. E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 23; Leiden, 2009), pp.

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.²⁰

This greater reliance on non-Egyptian soldiers was a fundamental shift in practice, and one that creates a number of problems when attempting to examine military organization at the beginning of Dynasty 22, particularly as there was significant and increasing “Libyanization” of Egyptian society throughout Dynasty 21.²¹ 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.²² 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.²³ For example, an openwork gold pectoral (Cairo JE 72171), discovered as part of the burial of Shoshenq IIa²⁴ in tomb NRT III at Tanis, indicates Shoshenq was entitled Great Chief of the Meshwesh (*wr ʿz n m<šwš>w*), Chief of Chiefs (*wr n wrw*).²⁵ The same two titles

343–346.

²⁰ 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.

²¹ Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 17), pp. 19–22; idem, “Das Ende des Neuen Reiches”, *ZÄS* 119 (1992), pp. 22–37; idem, *op. cit.* (note 19, 1994), pp. 78–97; idem, “Die thebanischen Gründer der 21. Dynastie”, *GM* 157 (1997), pp. 49–74; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 274–275. See also M. A. Leahy, “The Libyan Period in Egypt: An Essay in Interpretation”, *Libyan Studies* 16 (1985), pp. 51–65.

²² For an overview, see Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 282–290.

²³ 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 Paseshor B (Paris Louvre IM 2846). The portion of Paseshor’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 ʿz*). See M. Malinine, G. Posener, and J. Vercoutter, *Catalogue des stèles du Sérapéum de Memphis* 1 (Paris, 1968), pp. 30–31, 2: pl. 10/31; K. Jansen-Winkel, *Inscripfien der Spätzeit 1: Die 21. Dynastie* (Wiesbaden, 2007), pp. 271–272, 28.12; R. Ritner, *The Libyan Anarchy: Inscriptions from Egypt’s Third Intermediate Period* (Writings from the Ancient World 21; Atlanta, 2009), pp. 17–21. A crude generational count of twenty-five years per generation places Buyuwawa towards the end of Dynasty 20.

²⁴ G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée, and O. E. Kaper, “The Numbering of the Kings Called Shoshenq”, *GM* 216 (2008), pp. 9–10.

²⁵ 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 Pektoralen*:

appear on a limestone stela seen on the antiquities market by Daressey,²⁶ 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),²⁷ 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 ʿ3 n wrw*), a title unique to Shoshenq I.²⁸ 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" (*mš^c.k*) (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,"²⁹ 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-r3 mš^c wr*).³⁰ However, a reused stone block from the delta site of Saft al-Ḥinnah—ancient Soped—mentions that an individual named Osorkon, son of Shoshenq and Karamat, held the rank of Overseer of the Army (*jmy-r3 mš^c*) and Commander of Archers of Pharaoh (*h3wty [pd]wt <n> pr-ʿ3*).³¹ This is almost certainly Osorkon I, the son of Sho-

Motive, Sinngehalt und Zweck (Bamberg, 1967), pp. 126–128, 185/59, plate 16; Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 93; F. Tiradritti (ed.), *The Treasures of the Egyptian Museum* (Cairo, 1999), pp. 330, 332–333; A. Bongioanni, C. M. Sole and L. Accomazzo (eds.), *The Illustrated Guide to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo* (Cairo, 2001), pp. 418–419; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 23), p. 159, 10.6. The standard study of the Libyan Great Chiefs remains J. Yoyotte, "Les principautés du Delta au temps de l'anarchie libyenne: Études d'histoire politique", in *Mélanges Maspero* (MIFAO 66/1; Cairo, 1961), pp. 121–181.

²⁶ G. Daressey, "Les parents de Chéchanq I^{er}", *ASAE* 16 (1916), p. 177; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 23), p. 162 (10.8).

²⁷ A. M. Blackman, "The Stela of Shoshenq, Great Chief of the Meshwesh", *JEA* 27 (1941), pp. 83–95; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 159–162:10.7; Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 166–172.

²⁸ Indeed, his father Nimlot A is entitled "Chief of Chiefs" (*wr n wrw*) twice only (posthumously?), in lines x+7 and x+24; he is otherwise only known to be a Great Chief of the Meshwesh.

²⁹ Among these are two "foreigners of Syria" bearing Egyptian names, Akh-Amen-em-nakht (line x+10) and Akh-Ptah-em-nakht (line x+11). E. Gubel has suggested they may be Phoenicians ("Héracléopolis et l'interaction culturelle entre l'Égypte et la côte phénicienne pendant la Troisième Période Intermédiaire", in W. Claes, H. De Meulenaere, and S. Hendrickx [eds.], *Elkab and Beyond: Studies in Honour of Luc Limme* [OLA 191; Leuven, 2009], pp. 334–335).

³⁰ This title is often translated as "Generalissimo", but it would seem best to avoid this as it gives an unwarranted cultural connotation. This and similar titles are therefore translated here in a quite literal manner.

³¹ J. Yoyotte, "Le roi Mer-djefa-Rê et le dieu Sopdou", *BSFE* 114 (1989), pp. 44–45, fig. 9/4; P. Davoli, *Saft el-Henna: Archeologia e storia di una città del Delta orientale* (Archeologia e storia della civiltà egiziana e del vicino Oriente antico: Materiali e studi 6; Imola, 2001), pp.

shenq I and his chief consort, Karamat A.³² 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,³³ his brother Iuput A was established as the First God's Servant of Amun-Re, and—as with the previous dynasty³⁴—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-r3 mš^c wr tp<y> n hm.f*),³⁵ the Great Overseer of the Army of Upper and Lower Egypt (*jmy-r3 mš^c wr šn^cw mhw*), the Great Overseer of the Army (*jmy-r3 mš^c wr*), the Great Overseer of the Army of the South (*jmy-r3 wr n rsy*), the Commander of the Entire Army (*h3wty n mš^c r drw*), the Commander Who is at the Front of the Great Army of the Entire District of Upper Egypt (*h3wty nty h3t ntw mš^c 3^c n šm^cw r drw*),³⁶ and “King's Son of Ramesses” (*s3 nsw r^c-ms-sw*).³⁷

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 (*h3wty n mš^c drw*), Overseer of the Army (*jmy-r3 mš^c*), and Overseer of the Army of Neni-nesu³⁸ (*p3 jmy-r3 mš^c n nnj-nsu*).³⁹

34–35; Jansen-Winkel, *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-Winkel, *op. cit.* [note 23], p. 67:4.129; Chevereau, *op. cit.* [note 15], pp. 50–51).

³² For the genealogy of Osorkon I, see Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 85; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 17), pp. 19–22; Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), p. 21.

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 Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 17), pp. 19–22.

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.

³⁶ Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 12–13; cf. F. Payraudeau, “Nouvelles inscriptions de la Troisième période intermédiaire à Karnak (I)”, *Cahiers de Karnak* 13 (2010), p. 360.

³⁷ P. Collombert, “Les ‘fils royaux de Ramsès’: Une nouvelle hypothèse”, *GM* 151 (1996), p. 27; Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), p. 224; Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), p. 54. For discussion of this title, see below, p. 433.

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

³⁹ K. Jansen-Winkel, *Inschriften der Spätzeit 2: Die 22.–24. Dynastie* (Wiesbaden, 2007), pp. 84–85 (17.1–17.3); Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 43–45; see also K. Jansen-Winkel, “Zu zwei Personen der frühen Dritten Zwischenzeit”, *SAK* 35 (2006), pp. 313–316.

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 Ihnāsiyyah al-Madīnah, 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 Troops⁴⁹ of the <nḥtw-Stronghold>⁵⁰ of User-maat-Re (*p3 ʿ3 n twhrw n <nḥtw>*⁵¹ *wsr-mʿ3<t>-rʿ*; line x+13); the Great-one of the Foreign Troops of Neni-nesu (*p3 ʿ3 n twhrw n nnj-nsw*; line x+13); the Chief of Bowmen of the Ships of War of the Overseer of the Army (*p3 ḥry pḏty n dpwt ʿḥ3 n p3 jmy-r3 mšʿ*; line x+17); the Scribe of the Army of the nḥtw-Stronghold of Mery-mesha-ef⁵² (*p3 sš mšʿ n p3 nḥtw n mry-mšʿ.f*; line x+18); the Great-ones of the [...] ⁵³ of the nḥtw-Stronghold of Mery-mesha-ef (*n3 ʿ3w n <mšwš>w(?) [nḥtw] mrj-mšʿ.f*; line x+18); the Scribe of the Army of the nḥtw-Stronghold of [...] (*p3 sš mšʿ n p3 n[nḥtw n] [...]*; line x+18); the Deputy of the Place of Writings of the Overseer of the Army (*p3 jdnw n t3 st sš<w> n p3 jmy-r3 mš3*; line x+26); and the Craftsmen of Chariots (*n<3> ḥmww mrkbtw*; 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.⁵⁴ Secondly, it makes reference to a number of individuals concerned with

⁴⁹ For this title in general, see Schulman, *op. cit.* (note 6, 1964), pp. 21–22; H. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ÄA 5; Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 490–491; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 171, and the extensive discussion in Kessler, *op. cit.* (note 14).

⁵⁰ For nḥtw-strongholds, see below.

⁵¹ Cf. “the Great (?) nḥt-Stronghold of User-maa<t>-Re” (*p3 nḥtw ʿ3 (?) wsr-mʿ3<t>-rʿ*) mentioned on a Dynasty 22 stela from Ihnāsiyyah al-Madīnah. See W. M. Flinders Petrie *et al.*, *Ehnasya: 1904* (Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund 26; London, 1905), p. 22, plate 27/2; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 433 (45.81). The name refers to Ramesses III.

⁵² In all probability one of the old Ramesside “nḥtw-strongholds of the Sherden”; see K. A. Kitchen, *Ramesside inscriptions: Historical and biographical*, 5 (Oxford, 1969–1990), p. 270/11–12; Kessler, *op. cit.* (note 14), p. 130; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 19, 2006), p. 309; Sagrillo, *op. cit.* (note 19), pp. 344 note 21; Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 6), p. 62:9.19–9.20). Sherden are associated with the nḥtw-Stronghold of User-maat-Re on a stela dated to Dynasty 22 (note 51). The full name of the stronghold is “the nḥtw-stronghold of Ramesses III, Ruler of Thebes, Beloved of His Army” (*p3 nḥtw n rʿ-ms-sw ḥq3 jwnw mrj mšʿ.f*); see A. H. Gardiner (ed.), *The Wilbour Papyrus*, 2 (Oxford, 1941–1952), p. 194; and especially Kessler, *op. cit.* (note 14); E. F. Morris, *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases and the Evolution of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom* (PÄ 22; Leiden, 2005), pp. 731–732, as well as P. Grandet, *Le papyrus Harris I (BM 9999) 2* (BdÉ 109/2; Cairo, 1994), pp. 203–204, note 833.

⁵³ The signs in question are not at all clear. Tresson (*op. cit.* [note 48], p. 823, note 9) read this as *wḥmww* “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 *rsww* “watchers, guards.” Jansen-Winkel 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 *ḥrww* “enemies” (K. Jansen-Winkel, “Zu einer Sekundärbestattung der 21. Dynastie in Kom Ombo”, *GM* 202 [2004], pp. 75–76).

⁵⁴ D. B. Redford, *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study*

foreign troops, as well as *nḥtw*-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.⁵⁵ Late Dynasty 21 or early Dynasty 22 texts discovered by the Spanish mission to Iḥnāsiyyah al-Madīnah⁵⁶ make mention of the “5 great *nḥtw*-strongholds of the Meshwesh” (*p3 5 nḥtww ʿzw n n<3> m<šwš>w*), in the region, and it is probably justified in claiming that at least some of the *nḥtw*-strongholds given in the text of the “Herakleopolis Magna altar” are the same institutions.⁵⁷

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”.⁵⁸ He argues his case by comparing Šīšaq's chariotry to 2,500 Hittite chariots that Ramesses II claims faced him at Qadeš;⁵⁹ 924 chariots captured by Thutmose III at Megiddo;⁶⁰ 1,032 chariots brought back to

of the Egyptian Sense of History (SSEA Publications 4; Mississauga, 1986), p. 306; Sagrillo, *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 347; *contra* Kitchen (“The Arrival of the Libyans in Late New Kingdom Egypt”, in M. A. Leahy [ed.], *Libya and Egypt c1300–750 BC* [London, 1990], p. 21) who sees “but very little trace of Libyans” in Middle Egypt.

⁵⁵ Extensively discussed in Morris, *op. cit.* (note 52), pp. 96, 471–474, 731–734, 820–821, (and *passim*). See also note 19 above.

⁵⁶ M. Pérez Die and P. Vernus, *Excavaciones en Ehnasya el Medina (Heracleópolis Magna) 1: Introducción general y inscripciones* (Informes arqueológicos/Egipto 1; Madrid, 1992), pp. 41–43, 81, 122 doc. 15; 43–47, 81–82, 125–126, 154–155 doc. 17; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 165–166 (11.1–11.3).

⁵⁷ Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 19, 2006), pp. 297–316; M. Pérez Die, “The Third Intermediate Period Necropolis at Herakleopolis Magna”, in G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée and O. E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 23; Leiden, 2009), pp. 303–326; Sagrillo, *op. cit.* (note 19), pp. 345–349, but see also F. Payraudeau, “Un linteau de Sheshonq III à Bubastis et les origines de la XXII^e dynastie”, *BIFAO* 109 (2009), pp. 400–403.

⁵⁸ Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 288.

⁵⁹ Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 52), II, pp. 31, 45, 135.

⁶⁰ K. H. Sethe, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie: Historische-biographische Urkunden* (Urk. 4; Berlin, 1961), p. 3 (663–664); D. B. Redford, *The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III* (CHANE 16; Leiden, 2003), pp. 35, 36.

Egypt by Amenhotep II as booty from the Levant,⁶¹ 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.⁶²

However, during the New Kingdom the normal ratio was fifty chariots for every five thousand infantry,⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ Furthermore, the chariotry would have presented a front of about 7.3km if stretched out for combat.⁶⁵ Similarly, if the total of 1,200 chariots given to Šišaq'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.⁶⁶

Therefore, Kitchen's assertion that Šišaq'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.⁶⁷ 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.

⁶¹ H. W. Helck, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*. Heft 17: *Historische Inschriften Thutmosis' III. und Amenophis' II.* (Urk. 4; Berlin, 1955), p. 1309/6.

⁶² J. K. Kuan, *Neo-Assyrian Historical Inscriptions and Syria-Palestine: Israelite/Judean-Tyrian-Damascene Political and Commercial Relations in the Ninth–Eighth Centuries BCE* (Hong Kong, 1995), pp. 29–31, 34–35; G. Galil, "Shalmaneser III in the West", *RB* 109 (2002), pp. 40–56; N. Na'aman, "Ahab's Chariot Force at the Battle of Qarqar", in N. Na'aman (ed.), *Collected Essays*, I (Winona Lake, 2005), pp. 1–12. On the Assyrian army see now F. M. Fales, *Guerre et paix en Assyrie: Religion et impérialisme* (Paris, 2010), and also the review article by G. Galil (*Review of Biblical Literature* 3/2011, pp. 1–10, http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/7802_8508.pdf).

⁶³ A. R. Schulman, "The Egyptian Chariotry: A Reexamination", *JARCE* 2 (1963), p. 83; idem, "Chariots, Chariotry, and the Hyksos", *JSSEA* 10 (1980), pp. 132–133.

⁶⁴ See the analysis of Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 214–215, 232, note 15.

⁶⁵ J. Keegan, *A History of Warfare* (New York, 1993), p. 176; Wilson, *op. cit.* (note 2), p. 83. Using Spalinger's computation of each chariot requiring a space 1.61 meters wide—leaving almost no room whatsoever to maneuver—2,500 chariots would have presented a line of over four kilometers (Spalinger, *op. cit.* [note 6], p. 232, note 15).

⁶⁶ *apud* Spalinger (*ibid.*). Organizing the chariots in ranks could of course shorten this distance.

⁶⁷ R. W. Klein, "Chronicles, Book of 1–2", *ABD* 1, p. 998; idem, "How Many in a Thousand?" in M. P. Graham *et al.* (eds.), *The Chronicler as Historian* (JSOTS 238; Sheffield, 1997), pp. 270–282.

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, Šiśaq'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 chariotry, the report of sixty thousand horsemen (פָּרָשִׁים)—that is cavalry, as opposed to chariotry—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.

⁶⁸ H.-U. Onasch, *Die assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens* (ÄAT 27; Wiesbaden, 1994), I, pp. 25–26; II, p. 23; L. Török, *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 180–181.

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.

⁷¹ For the stables of Ramesses III (?) at Qantīr, see E. B. Pusch, “Recent Work at Northern Piramesse: Results of Excavations by the Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim, at Qantir”, in E. Bleiberg and R. E. Freed (eds.), *Fragments of a Shattered Visage: The Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ramesses the Great* (Monographs of the Institute of Egyptian Art and Archaeology 1; Memphis, 1991), p. 203; idem, in A. Herold, *Streitwagentechnologie in der Ramses-Stadt: Bronze an Pferd und Wagen* (Forschungen in der Ramses-Stadt: Die Grabungen des Pelizaeus-Museums Hildesheim in Qantir-Pi-Ramesse 2; Mainz am Rhein, 1999), p. xii; idem, “Towards a Map of Piramesse”, *Egyptian Archaeology* 14 (1999), p. 13. For the stables at Amarna, see D. J. Brewer, D. B. Redford and S. Redford, *Domestic Plants and Animals: The Egyptian Origins* (The Natural History of Egypt 3; Warminster, 1994), p. 102.


⁷² Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 289.

⁷³ Wilson, *op. cit.* (note 2), p. 83.

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,⁷⁵ and fodder equal to about 22 kg per day (although much—but not all—could be provided from pasturage, if it is available).⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷

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.”⁷⁸ 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,⁷⁹ 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 26.⁸⁰ Redford and Revez have independently drawn attention to a fragmentary Third Intermediate Period text now in the Cheikh Labib magazine (94 CL 1013) at Karnak⁸¹ that mentions how the king took measures against his advisory by equipping a city with  *ssmw wrwt* “horses and chariot<s>” (lines x+5), among other supplies. While it might be suggested that this refers to cavalry and chariotry, the determinatives of each word make clear it is the actual animals and vehicles⁸² that are being referred to individually, therefore the

⁷⁵ D. W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (Berkeley, 1978), p. 127; Spalinger, *op. cit.* (note 6), pp. 38, 41.

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.

⁷⁸ Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 289; cf. 1 Kgs 5:6 (1 Kgs 4:26 in the English translation) with 2 Chron 9:25.

⁷⁹ A. R. Schulman, “Egyptian Representations of Horsemen and Riding in the New Kingdom”, *JNES* 16 (1957), p. 267; A.-P. Zivie, “Cavaliers et cavalerie au Nouvel Empire: À propos d’un vieux problème”, in P. Posener-Kriéger (ed.), *Mélanges Gamal eddin Mokhtar 2* (BdE 97; Cairo, 1985), pp. 379–388; C. Rommelaere, *Les chevaux du Nouvel Empire égyptien: Origines, races, harnachement* (Connaissance de l’Égypte ancienne: Étude 3; Brussels, 1991), pp. 123–133; Schulman, *op. cit.* (note 6, 1995), p. 297.

⁸⁰ Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 264–265.

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.⁸³ Neo-Assyrian texts point to the possibility of cavalry existing in Egypt by the reign of Taharqo, if not Shebitqo.⁸⁴

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.⁸⁵ However, by the mid-9th century BCE cavalries were well established in the Near East,⁸⁶ in thanks to the existence of heavier, stronger horses capable of bearing the weight of an armored rider.⁸⁷ For example, Shalmaneser III records that his cavalry of 5,542 riders⁸⁸ faced enemy cavalry at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE.⁸⁹

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.⁹⁰ 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.⁹¹

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,⁹² 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.

⁸⁴ See L. A. Heidorn, "The Horses of Kush", *JNES* 56 (1997), pp. 105–114; D. Kahn, "I Swear to Pay (Only Part of) My Taxes: Padiese's Oath to Piankhy", *JARCE* 42 (2005–2006), pp. 109–110, note 51. However, cf. S. Dalley, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II", *Iraq* 47 (1985), pp. 31–48.

⁸⁵ Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study* (London, 1963), p. 310; Schulman, *op. cit.* (note 63, 1980), p. 119, note 41.

⁸⁶ M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crouwel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 1979), pp. 134–139; Dalley, *op. cit.* (note 84), pp. 37–38; R. E. Gaebel, *Cavalry Operations in the Ancient Greek World* (Norman, 2002), pp. 44–53, esp. p. 46.

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.

⁹⁰ Yadin, *op. cit.* (note 85), p. 287; Dalley, *op. cit.* (note 84); R. Drews, *The End of the Bronze Age: Changes in Warfare and the Catastrophe ca. 1200 B.C.* (Princeton, 1993), p. 166; idem, 2004. *Early Riders: The Beginnings of Mounted Warfare in Asia and Europe*. (London), pp. 65–95; see also note 86 above.

⁹¹ Littauer and Crouwel, *op. cit.* (note 86), pp. 134–135, 142; Dalley, *op. cit.* (note 84), pp. 37–38; S. Dalley, "Ancient Mesopotamian Military Organization", in J. M. Sasson *et al.* (eds.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East 1* (New York, 1995), p. 418.

⁹² T. Schneider, "Foreign Egypt: Egyptology and the Concept of Cultural Appropriation", *Ä&L* 13 (2003), pp. 159–160. See also I. Shaw, "Egyptians, Hyksos and Military Technology: Causes, Effects or Catalysts?", in A. J. Shortland (ed.), *The Social Context of Technological Change: Egypt and the Near East, 1650–1550 BC; Proceedings of a Conference Held at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, 12–14 September 2000* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 59–71.

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* = לִּבְיָיִם)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* (פִּט).⁹⁷ The latter is the Hebrew form of the name of a Libyan tribal group known to the Egyptians variously as the *pjd*, *pwd*, *pwdj*, *ptj*, *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 *λίβυες* “Libyans”. It would seem, therefore, that while the Hebrews recognized the *Lûbîm* as being related to the *Pûṭ*, a distinction between the two groups was maintained to a certain

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).

⁹⁵ Gardiner, *op. cit.* (note 7), I, pp. 121*–122*; K. Zibelius, *Afrikanische Orts- und Völkernamen in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten* (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 142–143; J. K. Winnicki, *Late Egypt and her Neighbours: Foreign Population in Egypt in the First Millennium BC* (Journal of Juristic Papyrology Supplement 12; Warszawa, 2009), pp. 396–403.

⁹⁶ For discussion, see J. Osing, “Libyen, Libyer”, in H. W. Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *LÄ 3* (Wiesbaden, 1980), cols. 1015–1016; F. Colin, *Les peuples libyens de la Cyrénaïque à l'Égypte d'après les sources de l'Antiquité classique* (Brussels, 2000), pp. 139–159; Winnicki, *ibid.*, p. 400.

⁹⁷ Libyans occur in 2 Chron 12:3, 16:8; Dan 11:43; Ezek 30:5; Nah 3:9. The *Pûṭ* occur in Genesis 10:6; 1 Chron 1:8; Isa 66:19; Jer 46:9; Ezek 27:10, 30:5, 38:5; Nah 3:9. For discussion regarding the *Pûṭ* in the Hebrew Bible, see Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 406–408.

⁹⁸ E. Graefe, “Eine neue Schenkungsstele aus der 22. Dynastie”, *Armant: Deutsch-arabische Kulturzeitschrift* 12 (1974), pp. 4–5; *idem*, “Der libysche Stammesname *p(j)d(j)/pjt* im spätzeitlichen Onomastikon”, *Enchoria* 5 (1975), pp. 13–17; Osing, *op. cit.* (note 96), col. 1016; Winnicki, *ibid.*, pp. 403–415.

⁹⁹ Cairo CG 1040 (H. Jacquet-Gordon, “The Inscriptions on the Philadelphia–Cairo Statue of Osorkon II”, *JEA* 46 [1960], pp. 17, 20; see also Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* [note 39, 2007], p. 109:18.3/16; Ritner, *op. cit.* [note 23], p. 286).

¹⁰⁰ Ezek 30:5; Nah 3:9.

degree.¹⁰¹ It is possible this was the case with other tribal units as well, though it goes unrecorded in the Bible.¹⁰²

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 (*mhs*),¹⁰³ who are perhaps to be identified with the *Μασσόλιοι* tribe who lived east of Carthage.¹⁰⁴ 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 (*h3wtj*), 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.¹⁰⁵ On chronological grounds, Nesy was a contemporary of Shoshenq I, serving in Thebes under the king's son, the First God's Servant of Amun, Iuput A.¹⁰⁶ 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).¹⁰⁷

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.

¹⁰¹ See also Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 406–407.

¹⁰² However, see the discussion regarding the *Sukkiyîm* below, who are to be regarded as a Libyan group recognized by the Hebrews as being distinct from the *Lûbîm*.

¹⁰³ This name was formerly read as *mhswn*, with the final hieroglyph interpreted as the desert hare (Gardiner Sign List E34; phonetic /*wn*/). K. Jansen-Winkeln (*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.

¹⁰⁴ W. Spiegelberg, "Ein libyscher Stammesname", *ZÄS* 53 (1917), p. 114; Zibelius, *op. cit.* (note 95), p. 126; Winnicki, *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'āzah tribe of the Eastern Desert, see G. A. Legrain, "Sur les  Mahasaou", *ASAE* 8 (1907), pp. 56–57.

¹⁰⁵ Legrain, *ibid.*, pp. 56–57; G. A. Legrain, *Statues et statuettes des rois et de particuliers 3: Nos 42192–42250* (Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire; Cairo, 1914), p. 3 (42–44, pl. 26); Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 103), I, pp. 112–115; II, pp. 490–493; Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), §§ 188, 266; K. Jansen-Winkeln, *Inschriften der Spätzeit 3: Die 25. Dynastie* (Wiesbaden, 2009), pp. 509–510 (52.288); Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 415–416; Chevereau, *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 37–38.

¹⁰⁶ Yoyotte, *op. cit.* (note 25), § 28; Kitchen, *ibid.*, § 188; Winnicki, *ibid.*, p. 416.

¹⁰⁷ H. Jacquet-Gordon, "The Illusory Year 36 of Osorkon I", *JEA* 53 (1967), pp. 63–68; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 59:13.34; Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 261–262; Winnicki, *ibid.*, p. 416.

4. *Sukkiyîm*

Another Libyan component of Šišaq's forces are possibly the *Sukkiyîm* (סַכְיִיִּם),¹⁰⁸ mentioned in the Hebrew Bible only in 2 Chron 12:3.¹⁰⁹ Spiegelberg¹¹⁰ was first to associate them with the Tjekten (*tktn*; singular, *tk*) people of the western oases of Egypt, known only from texts dating to the Ramesside Period.¹¹¹ His view has been adopted and expanded upon by a number of other scholars since.¹¹² However, this has been questioned by Winnicki and Michaux-Colombot (discussed below).¹¹³

The arguments for a Libyan ethnicity for the Tjekten are based primarily on the testimony of papyrus Anastasi IV (British Museum EA 10249): 10,8–11,8,¹¹⁴ 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” (*tktn n p3 t3 wh3t*; p. Anastasi IV:10,9) from their hunting range. As the term “the land of the Oasis” refers collectively to both the Dākhlah and Khārğah oases,¹¹⁵ and makes reference to “their huntings” (*n3y.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 *τρογλοδυται* (Rahlfs, *op. cit.* [note 94], I, p. 829). See note 133.

¹⁰⁹ The word may occur in a singular form (סַכְיִי *sky'*) on an Imperial Aramaic ostrakon (Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum P. 10679), dated to 495 BCE, from the Jewish community on Elephantine. For this ostrakon 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 Achæmenid 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.

¹¹⁰ W. Spiegelberg, *Aegyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament* (Straßburg, 1904), pp. 30–31.

¹¹¹ The earliest certain attestation comes from an unpublished statue discovered at Zāwiyyat 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).

¹¹² See in particular Gardiner, *op. cit.* (note 52), II, p. 81 note 1; R. A. Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* (Brown Egyptological Studies 1; London, 1954), p. 177; K. Zibelius, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 188–189; Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), § 253, note 289.

¹¹³ Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3); Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 69–72.

¹¹⁴ A. H. Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies* (BAe 7; Brussels, 1937), pp. 46–47; translation and commentary in Caminos, *ibid.*, pp. 176–181.

¹¹⁵ That is, the Southern Oasis, Classical *Ὀασις μεγάλη*, *Oasis maior*; see L. Limme, “Les oasis de Khargeh et Dakhleh d’après les documents égyptiens de l’époque pharaonique”, *CRIPEL* 1 (1973), p. 42; G. Wagner, *Les oasis d’Égypte à l’époque grecque, romaine et byzantine d’après les documents grecs (Recherches de papyrologie et d’épigraphie grecques)* (BdÉ 100; Cairo, 1987), pp. 131–134; O. E. Kaper, “Egyptian Toponyms of the Dakhlah Oasis”, *BIFAO* 92 (1992), pp. 119–121.

“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-Rakhām makes

¹¹⁶ See A. H. Gardiner, “The Dakhleh Stela”, *JEA* 19 (1933), pp. 19–30; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), pp. 23–26:12.33–34; Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 173–178.

¹¹⁷ For this title, which is of Libyco-Berber origin, see Gardiner, *ibid.*, p. 23; O. Rößler, “Der semitische Charakter der libyschen Sprache”, *ZA* 50 (1952), p. 122; Yoyotte, *op. cit.* (note 25), p. 123; P. Behrens, “Wanderungsbewegungen und Sprache der frühen saharanischen Viehzüchter”, *SUGIA* 6 (1984/1985), p. 160; G. Vittmann, *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend* (Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 97; Mainz am Rhein, 2003), p. 10. See also O. Rößler, “Die Sprache Numidiens”, in *Sybaris: Festschrift Hans Krahe zum 60. Geburtstag am 7. Feb. 1958, dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen* (Wiesbaden, 1958), pp. 103, 108; K. Jongeling, *Names in Neo-Punic inscriptions* (Ph.D. dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen; Groningen, 1984), pp. 68–71, 87; *idem*, *North-African Names from Latin Sources* (CNWS Publications 21; Leiden, 1994), pp. xiii–xiv.

¹¹⁸ Stela main section, lines 1, 3, 17–20.

¹¹⁹ J. J. Janssen, “The Smaller Dākhla Stela (Ashmolean Museum no. 1894.107b)”, *JEA* 54 (1968), p. 166; O. E. Kaper and R. J. Demarée, “A Donation Stela in the Name of Takehot III from Amheida, Dakhleh Oasis”, *JEOL* 39 (2005), pp. 23, 28, 35. Winnicki (*op. cit.* [note 95], pp. 420–421) suggests the Shamin might be the *Σάμοι* mentioned in Herodotus’ *Histories* 3.25–26. For the Dākhlah Oasis during the Libyan Period generally, see O. E. Kaper, “Epigraphic Evidence from the Dakhleh Oasis in the Libyan Period”, in G. P. F. Broekman, R. J. Demarée and O. E. Kaper (eds.), *The Libyan Period in Egypt: Historical and Cultural Studies into the 21st–24th Dynasties* (Egyptologische Uitgaven 23; Leiden, 2009), pp. 149–159.

¹²⁰ Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 52), IV, p. 18/7, 9.

¹²¹ Gardiner, *op. cit.* (note 7), I, pp. 73*–89*; G. Andreu, “Polizei”, in H. W. Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *LÄ* 4 (Wiesbaden, 1982), col. 1069; J. Černý, *A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period* (BdÉ 50; Cairo, 2004), pp. 261–284; K. Zibelius-Chen, “Die Medja in altägyptischen Quellen”, *SAK* 36 (2007), pp. 391–405; K. Liszka, “‘Medjay’ (no. 188) in the *Onomasticon of Amenemope*”, in Z. Hawass and J. Houser-Wegner (eds.), *Millions of Jubilees: Studies in Honor of David P. Silverman*, I (Cairo, 2010), pp. 315–331; cf. D. Michaux-Colombot, “The *mdꜣy.w*, not policemen but an ethnic group from the Eastern Desert”, in C. Bonnet (ed.), *Études nubiennes, Conférence de Genève: Actes du VII^e Congrès international d’études nubiennes, 3–8 septembre 1990* 2 (Genève, 1994), pp. 29–36; D. Michaux-Colombot, “Qui sont les Medjay et où se situait leur territoire?”, in M.-C. Bruwier (ed.), *Pharaons noirs: Sur la piste des quarante jours* (Morlanwelz, 2007), pp. 85, 91.

¹²² Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 52), V, p. 70/4–5.

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 Zāwiyyat 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 *ikt̄n* may in fact utilize the Libyco-Berber plural suffix *-t̄n*.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 *Pût*, the Hebrews recognized the *Sukkiyîm* as being a tribal group distinct from the *Lûbîm* (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 *îk*, conveyed in a list of foreign toponyms on a statue of Amenhotep III from his mortuary temple at Kawm al-Haytān.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 *îkss*, 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.

¹²⁵ J.-B. Lefébure, “Le sacrifice humain d’après les rites de Busiris et d’Abydos”, *Sphinx* 3 (1900), pp. 151–152.

¹²⁶ Masculine form; feminine is *-tin* (A. Basset, *La langue berbère* [Handbook of African Languages 1; London, 1952], p. 25).

¹²⁷ A. Varille, “Fragments d’un colosse d’Aménophis III donnant une liste de pays africains (Louvre A 18 et A 19)”, *BIFAO* 35 (1935), pp. 166, no. 25.

¹²⁸ Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 69–70.

¹²⁹ G. Posener, *Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie: Textes hiéroglyphiques 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.”¹³¹ 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 *Sukkiyīm* comes from Michaux-Colombot.¹³² Like Winnicki, she argues that the Septuagint's use of *Τρωγ(λ)οδύται*¹³³ for “*Sukkiyīm*” should be connected with the Classical *Τρωγ(λ)οδύται* of the Eastern Desert,¹³⁴ who are possibly the descendants of the ancient Medjay.¹³⁵ She furthers her argument by drawing attention to Medjay scouts present in the Wādī al-Ṭumaylāt, in an area known as “Tjeku” (*tkw*) in Egyptian,¹³⁶ and ostensibly related to the *tktn* people. On this basis, she ultimately concludes that the *Sukkiyīm* “were a leading Trogodyte tribe” who are to be identified with the Medjay and not Libyans.¹³⁷

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 Wādī al-Ṭumaylāt, with the implication that since this area was located in the region of ancient Tjeku, the *Tjekten* (*i.e.*, the *Sukkiyīm*) of Shoshenq's army may have originated there.¹³⁸

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 71.

¹³² Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3).

¹³³ For the secondary writing *Τρωγλοδύται*, see D. Meredith, “Berenice Troglodytica”, *JEA* 43 (1957), p. 56; E. Hefling, “Trogodyten (Troglodyten)”, in H. W. Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *LÄ* 6 (Wiesbaden, 1986), col. 767, note 1; Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp. 288–289.

¹³⁴ J. Desanges, *Recherches sur l'activité des méditerranéens aux confins de l'Afrique (VI^e siècle avant J.-C.–IV^e siècle après J.-C.): Thèse principale présentée à l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne pour le doctorat d'État* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 38; Roma, 1978), pp. 80, 82, 90, 120, 180, 213, note 91, 230, note 74, 248–249, 271–279, 295–302, 308, 325–328, 379, 394; Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), pp. 373–378.

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], p. 464–465). See also Meredith, *op. cit.* (note 133), p. 56.

¹³⁶ In p. Anastasi V (British Museum EA 10244) 18,6–19,2 and 25,2–27,3 (Gardiner, *op. cit.* [note 114], pp. 66, 70–71); see also Caminos, *op. cit.* (note 112), p. 294; J. S. Holladay, “Tell el-Maskhuta”, in K. A. Bard (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* (London – New York, 1999), p. 879. This probably referred to the *hṫm*-fortress of Tjeku located at Tall al-Raṭābah rather than the entire *wādī*, after which the fortress was named (Morris, *op. cit.* [note 52], pp. 46, 176, 420–424, 487–488, 491–498, 504–508, and *passim*). For *tkw* in general, see H. Goedicke, “Tjeku”, in H. W. Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *LÄ* 6 (Wiesbaden, 1986), col. 609. Egyptian *tkw* is equivalent to Hebrew סֻכּוֹת (*Sukkôt*) of the Exodus narrative (Ex 12:37, 18:18; Num 33:5–6). See D. B. Redford, “Exodus I 11”, *VT* 13 (1963), pp. 404–405; J. K. Hoffmeier, *Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Wilderness Tradition* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 65–68.

¹³⁷ Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3), p. 294.

¹³⁸ Michaux-Colombot, *ibid.*, p. 294; for the text, see É. Naville, *The Store-city of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus* (MEEF 1; London, 1903), pp. 4, 15; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 2:12.6.

However, despite an abundance of inscribed Ramesside and Dynasty 22 materials from the site,¹³⁹ Tall al-Maskhūtah was not inhabited between the Second Intermediate Period and Dynasty 26, as is demonstrated by the long break in the stratigraphic and ceramic seriation evidence¹⁴⁰; the stone was brought from elsewhere—likely Tall al-Raṭābah—only much later when the site was re-inhabited.¹⁴¹ Furthermore, the toponym Tjeku most often—though not exclusively—refers to a *ḥtm*-fortress (that is, a settlement) located within the Wādī al-Ṭumaylāt at Tall al-Raṭābah, rather than the entire *wādī* (which was, however, itself named “Tjeku”).¹⁴²

Further, Michaux-Colombot suggests the toponym *Τρωγοδύται* may have stemmed from the name of *ṭghdw*, a Medjai chieftain mentioned in Middle Kingdom execration texts¹⁴³; 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 of 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.¹⁴⁴ In fact, one of the titles recorded on the jamb is the “Overseer of the Foreign-lands of God’s Land” (*jmy-r3 ḥ3swt t3-ntr*),¹⁴⁵ which Michaux-Colombot translates as “overseer of the foreign countries of God’s Land Oasis.”¹⁴⁶ Despite her claim, the text does not mention an oasis (*wh3t*) 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,¹⁴⁷ nor attempt to

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-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 103), I, pp. 269–271; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), pp. 126–127 (18.54).

¹⁴⁰ P. Paice, “A Preliminary Analysis of Some Elements of the Saite and Persian Period Pottery at Tell el-Maskhuta”, *BES* 8 (1986/1987), pp. 95–107; J. S. Holladay, “Tell el-Maskhuta”, in K. A. Bard (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* (London, 1999), pp. 959–960; J. S. Holladay, “Pithom”, in D. B. Redford (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, 3 (Oxford, 2001), p. 51.

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.

¹⁴² Goedicke, *op. cit.* (note 136), col. 609; Morris, *op. cit.* (note 52), p. 383, and *passim*; Hoffmeier, *op. cit.* (note 136), pp. 65–67.

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

¹⁴⁴ Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3), pp. 281–282.

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

¹⁴⁶ Michaux-Colombot, *op. cit.* (note 3), p. 281.

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 *wh3t* (“oasis”) is used specifically for either the Northern Oasis *wh3t mḥyt* (modern al-Bahriyyah) or the Southern Oasis (*wh3t rsyṯ*) (al-Dākhlah and al-Khārgāh together), but it was *t3 wh3t* (“the Oasis”) that referred to the Southern Oasis (cf. Greek ἡ Οἴσις (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,¹⁴⁸ they are never directly equated; that is, Tjekten are never said *to be* Medjay.¹⁴⁹

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.¹⁵⁰ 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.¹⁵¹

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-w^c* (§ 123,46/28), *b3t3-htp* (§ 218,77/45), and *p<3>-n-mhy* (§ 218,77/46 and 47); *š3-kt* (§ 150,58/43) and *p3-kt*¹⁵² (§ 187,70/11) may be as well.¹⁵³ One, *krjy* (§ 241,89/17), is clearly non-Egyptian, and it is notable that *kr*, *krj*, *krjw*, and prefix *kr-* are very well-attested in Egyptian as names of Libyans.¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, *kr* is known from Old Libyan (“Numidian”) texts as well.¹⁵⁵

Winnicki has, however, pointed to the existence of two Medjay individuals named in texts from Dayr al-Madīnah (Dynasty 20) bearing the name *krj*.¹⁵⁶ It must be born in mind that the majority of Medjay from the New Kingdom onwards have Egyptian names,¹⁵⁷ 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.¹⁵⁸ 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.

1925), p. 203.

¹⁴⁸ For example, on the Victory Stela of Merenptah (the “Israel Stela” [Cairo CG 34025]; see note 120) and p. Anastasi V (note 136 above).

¹⁴⁹ Michaux-Colombot was of course not aware of the text from Zāwiyyat Umm al-Rakhām.

¹⁵⁰ Medjay: Gardiner, *op. cit.* (note 52), vol. 3, § 123,46/40; § 184,69/30; § 190,71/8. Tjek: *idem*, *ibid.*, vol. 3, § 123,46/28; § 150,58/43; § 187,70/11; § 218,77/45–46, 48; § 241,89/17.

¹⁵¹ Gardiner, *op. cit.* (note 52), vol. 2, p. 80.

¹⁵² Cf. *t3-kt<t>* (H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen* 1 [Glückstadt, 1935], p. 371/17). Perhaps read *p3-kt<n>* (*ibid.*, p. 120/17).

¹⁵³ Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), p. 72.

¹⁵⁴ F. Colin, *Les Libyens en Égypte (XV^e siècle a.C.–I^e siècle p.C.): Onomastique et histoire* (Doctoral dissertation, Université libre de Bruxelles; Brussels, 1996), p. 2 (93–102).

¹⁵⁵ J.-B. Chabot, *Recueil des inscriptions libyques* 2 (Paris, 1940) p. xviii. Alternately, it may be connected to Old Libyan *kn-*, which is particularly common in names (*ibid.*, p. xviii; perhaps attested in Latin as *kanni* (Jongeling, *op. cit.* [note 117, 1994], p. 73).

¹⁵⁶ Winnicki, *op. cit.* (note 95), p. 72. The names are given in Černý, *op. cit.* (note 121), pp. 262, 276.

¹⁵⁷ For example, see Černý, *ibid.*, p. 262, note 1.

¹⁵⁸ For references, see note 121. Michaux-Colombot (*op. cit.* [note 121], pp. 29–36) is very much opposed to this stance but it is notable that in the *Onomasticon of Amenemope* (Gardiner, *op. cit.* [note 7], vol. 1, p. 73*), the term “Medjay” appears with other occupational titles, including those involved in policing and protection (Liszka, *op. cit.* [note 121], *passim* but esp. p. 319).

5. Kushites

The biblical reference to Kushites (*Kūšim* = כּוּשִׁים)¹⁵⁹ in the army of Šišaq 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.¹⁶⁰ Two scarabs are known from Nubia that probably name Shoshenq I, but both were found in Napatan cemeteries dated well after his reign.¹⁶¹ With the exception of stereotypical references to the Nubian components of the Nine Bows found on the Bubastite Portal at Karnak,¹⁶² and a mention of *hnty-hn-nfr*¹⁶³ in a similar formulaic context on the same monument,¹⁶⁴ there are few references to Nubian regions that can be dated to the reign of Shoshenq I. Zibelius¹⁶⁵ alleges that the Nubian component of a topographical list on a reused statuette of Thutmose III (Cairo CG 42192)¹⁶⁶ may (with question) date to Shoshenq I.¹⁶⁷ However, as noted by Giveon,¹⁶⁸ the topographical list is most likely an example of Thutmose III copying from his own inscriptions, reproducing the beginnings of his Nubian topographical lists at Karnak.

¹⁵⁹ Septuagint *Aithiopes* (Rahlf's, *op. cit.* [note 94], I, p. 829).

¹⁶⁰ For general reviews of Egypto-Nubian relations following the revolt of Pa-nehesy during the reign of Ramesses XI until the Kushite invasion of Upper Egypt, see K. Zibelius-Chen, "Überlegungen zur ägyptischen Nubienpolitik in der dritten Zwischenzeit", *SAK* 16 (1989), pp. 329–345; Török, *op. cit.* (note 68), pp. 82–130; R. G. Morkot, *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers* (London, 2000), pp. 145–166; L. Török, *Between Two Worlds: The Frontier Region Between Ancient Nubia and Egypt 3700 BC–500 AD* (PdÄ 29; Leiden, 2009), pp. 285–309.

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 *prænomēn* 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 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]).

¹⁶² G. R. Hughes and C. F. Nims, *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak 3: The Bubastite Portal* (OIP 74; Chicago, 1954), plate 3, rhetorical texts, lines 1, 2, 27; topographic list, lines 3, 8. See now Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), pp. 11–14:12.20, *passim*.

¹⁶³ The gold mining territory between the First and Second Cataracts, particularly that of the Wādī al-^cAllāqī (H. Goedicke, "The Location of *hnt-hn-nfr*", *Kush* 13 [1965], pp. 102–111; C. Vandersleyen, *Les guerres d'Amosis, fondateur de la XVIII^e Dynastie* [Mongraphies reine Élisabeth 1; Brussels, 1971], pp. 64–68; see also J. Vercoutter, "The Gold of Kush: Two Gold-washing Stations at Faras East", *Kush* 7 [1959], pp. 120–153).

¹⁶⁴ Hughes and Nims, *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*, plate 3, rhetorical texts, line, 27; Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 13 (12.20).

¹⁶⁵ Zibelius, *op. cit.* (note 95), p. 59; Zibelius-Chen, *op. cit.* (note 160), p. 337.

¹⁶⁶ Jansen-Winkeln, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 58 (13.33).

¹⁶⁷ The statuette's back pillar has been (re)inscribed with a text for Shoshenq I.

¹⁶⁸ R. Giveon, "Remarks on the Transmission of Egyptian Lists of Asiatic Toponyms", in J. Assmann, E. Feucht and R. Grieshammer (eds.), *Fragen an die altägyptischen Literatur: Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto* (Wiesbaden, 1977), pp. 176–177.

It has long been thought that a block from Karnak inscribed with an oracular decree of Shoshenq I¹⁶⁹ 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” ($p<3> t3 nḥsj$), “Kush” ($jkš$ 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 Taharqo,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 Šišaq'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

¹⁶⁹ W. M. Müller, *Egyptological Researches 2: Results of a Journey in 1906* (Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication 53/2; Washington, DC, 1910), pp. 143–153; P. Vernus, “Inscriptions de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire: I. Les inscriptions de la cour péristyle nord du VI^e pylône dans le temple de Karnak”, *BIFAO* 75 (1975), pp. 10–20; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), pp. 19–20 (12.23); *idem*, *op. cit.* (note 105, 2009), p. 86 (48.33); Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 213–215.

¹⁷⁰ Müller, *ibid.*, pp. 143–153; Kitchen, *op. cit.* (note 1, 1996), §§ 251, 260 (cf. §§ 471, 509, 511). For recent examples of this, see Török, *op. cit.* (note 68), pp. 109 note 93 (however, cf., *idem*, *op. cit.* [note 160], p. 290); N. Na'aman, “מסע שישק לארץ ישראל בראי הכתובות המצריות”, *המקרא והממצא הארכיאולוגי*, *Zion* 63 (1998), p. 264; P. S. Ash, *David, Solomon and Egypt: A Reassessment* (JSOTS 297; Sheffield, 1999), p. 55; J. Lull García, “En torno a la campaña palestina de Sheshonq I”, *AO* 19 (2001), p. 227; Wilson, *op. cit.* (note 2), p. 10, note 49.

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

¹⁷² Vernus, *op. cit.* (note 169), pp. 1–12, 26–59; T. Eide *et al.* (eds.), *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD 1: From the Eighth to the Mid-fifth Century BC* (Bergen, 1994), pp. 181–190; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 105, 2009), p. 86 (48.33); Ritner, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 505–510.

¹⁷³ D. Kahn, “Taharqa, king of Kush, and the Assyrians”, *JSSEA* 31 (2004), pp. 109–128 regards the text as a prayer of Taharqo 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.

¹⁷⁶ Zibelius-Chen, *op. cit.* (note 160), *passim*; D. A. Aston and J. H. Taylor, “The Family of Takeloth III and the ‘Theban’ Twenty-third Dynasty”, in M. A. Leahy (ed.), *Libya and Egypt c1300–750 BC* (London, 1990), pp. 147–148; M. A. Leahy, “‘May the King live’: The Libyan Rulers in the Onomastic Record”, in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths* (Occasional Publications 8; London, 1992), p. 161, note 22; R. G. Morkot, *Economic and Cultural Exchange between Kush and Egypt* (Doctoral dissertation, University College London; London, 1993), pp. 197–200; Török, *op. cit.* (note

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.¹⁷⁷ 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 late date,¹⁷⁸ may have fully expected Nubians to be part of the Egyptian army; such was certainly the case during Dynasty 25. Although the Napatans 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.¹⁷⁹ 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 Šišaq's military undoubtedly included infantry and chariotry, 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 Mehes. 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 *Pûî* 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

68), p. 108 (§ 3.2); Morkot, *op. cit.* (note 160), p. 163; Jansen-Winkel, *op. cit.* (note 39, 2007), p. 120 (18.33), 172 (20.15); Török, *op. cit.* (note 160), pp. 177, 288–290.

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

¹⁷⁸ J. M. Myers, *I Chronicles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12; Garden City, 1965), p. lxxxix; P. R. Ackroyd, *The Chronicler in his Age* (JSOTS 101; Sheffield, 1991), pp. 7–8; Klein, *op. cit.* (note 67, *ABD* 1), pp. 994–995; S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville – London, 1993), pp. 24–28.

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 Šīšaq'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 chariotry 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,¹⁸⁰ 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 Achæmenid 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 Šīšaq narrative as he may have fully expected cavalry units to make up the bulk of Šīšaq'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 Šīšaq'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 about the Time of the Persian Wars: A Speculative Essay", *The Classical Journal* 82 (1987), pp. 97–106.

¹⁸³ Littauer and Crouwel, *op. cit.* (note 86), pp. 134–136.

¹⁸⁴ In a similar fashion, Japhet (*op. cit.* [note 178], pp. 677–679) has suggested the Chronicler formulated the narrative of Šīšaq'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 Shīshaq à Shēshak: À propos de 1 Rois XIV 25–26", *VT* 49 (1999), pp. 186–190.

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.