Shoshenk and Shishak
A Case of Mistaken Identity?

The currently accepted framework for Egyptian chronology during the Third Intermediate Period is supported by a key synchronism with biblical history. The identification of the biblical Shishak with Shoshenk I of the 22nd Dynasty is the only generally accepted synchronism with western Asia from the beginning of the TIP until the late 8th century and has been one of the major factors in determining Egypt’s high chronology. This paper questions the validity of the identification and proposes that it should no longer stand as an obstacle to a radical revision of the chronology of the Third Intermediate Period.
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Introduction
The Importance of the Question

Recent research into Egypt’s Third Intermediate Period (hereafter TIP), comprising the 21st to 25th Dynasties, has revealed a number of chronological anomalies which throw the conventional scheme of TIP history into serious doubt. In an early discussion of the problem it was noted that:

Taken together such ‘anomalies’ might suggest that there were far greater overlaps between the 20th to 26th dynasties than the conventional chronology allows.

Both Peter James and David Rohl have since elaborated on this issue, publishing in outline an alternative chronology for the TIP. However, an increased overlapping of dynasties within the TIP inevitably shortens the period and lowers its starting-date. Thus any revision of TIP chronology which aims to remove the anomalies will also pull down the dates for the preceding eras of Egyptian history. In short, a revised scheme for the TIP requires a revised chronology for the whole of pharaonic history before the Saite 26th Dynasty. The New Chronology, being developed largely in the pages of this journal, is precisely such a revision. David Rohl has recently extended the New Chronology as far back as the 12th Dynasty.

However compelling the case may be for the New Chronology, one factor can be expected to remain an obstacle to its widespread consideration. I refer to the identification of Shoshenk I (Hedjheperre-setepenre Shoshenk), founder of the Libyan 22nd Dynasty, with the biblical ‘Shishak king of Egypt’ who invaded Judah in the 5th year of Rehoboam (1 Kings 14:25-26 and II Chronicles 12:2-9).

Since this identification has long been axiomatic among Egyptologists and biblical scholars alike, it is important to examine carefully the evidence on which it rests. Superficially the identification seems assured by a combination of three factors: (i) the kings’ names are evidently similar; (ii) Hedjheperre Shoshenk has left an inscription attesting that he campaigned in Palestine, and (iii) there is harmony between Shoshenk’s place in Egyptian chronology and the date indicated by the biblical data for Shishak’s invasion of Judah. However, a close examination of these three factors reveals that things are not so simple.

Before testing them, however, it will be helpful to outline the nature of Shoshenk’s inscription and to sketch briefly the origin of his identification with Shishak.

**This paper is an updated version of an article (with the same title) by the author published in Chronology & Catastrophism Review VIII (1986), pp. 36-46.
Part One
Shoshenk’s List
and his Identification with Shishak

It may have been only a few months after undertaking his expedition into Palestine that the pharaoh Hedj-kheperre Shoshenk initiated a building programme at Karnak. His plan (as deduced from a rock-stela in the quarries of Gebel es-Silsila, from which the stone was to be taken) was to construct a court and pylon on the west of the great Hypostyle Hall built during the 19th Dynasty. The work would have given the Temple of Amun a new and magnificent frontage facing the Nile. Shoshenk died before the project was completed, but the work done included the so-called Bubastite Portal. This was the southern side-entrance into the new court, constructed between the Second Pylon (of Ramesses II) and a small temple of Ramesses III. On the exterior south face of this portal, continuing eastwards partially along the south wall of the Hypostyle Hall, is the scene commemorating Shoshenk’s successes in Palestine.

The relief shows the god Amun, accompanied by a female figure representing ‘Victorious Thebes’, leading captives for presentation to the king. The two figures face to the right, where the king himself (perceived only in vague outline) smites a host of cowering foes. Each captive being led to the king by Amun and ‘Victorious Thebes’ is represented by a human head and shoulders surmounting a name-ring. Five rows of captives are led by each figure, the lower rows being badly damaged. An eleventh row, which extended along the base of the scene to the right of the centre, is almost entirely lost. Although there were originally over 150 name-rings, the number of places listed was somewhat less than this, since some names occupy two (occasionally even three) rings. A discussion of the names which can still be read, and their identification (sometimes speculative) with places known from the Bible or other texts, can be found in Kenneth Kitchen’s very full treatment.

Although it was suggested in the late 19th century that Shoshenk’s list may have been compiled artificially from campaign lists left by his predecessors, it is now clear that this is not the case.

The campaign relief of Shoshen I at Karnak (left half) showing the list of captured cities. [Photo: D. Rohl]
In point of fact, Shoshenq’s list is the most original and non-derivative list in the whole corpus of 40 or 50 assorted lists, having runs of names attested nowhere else in these…. The orthography of Shoshenq’s list also distinguishes it sharply from all its predecessors….  

In view of its assumed connection with an event in Old Testament history, the list is thus regarded as a document of very great historical value.

But when and how was its connection with the Old Testament first proposed? The first translator of Shoshenq’s list, and also the first to proclaim its biblical associations, was Jean François Champollion (1790-1832), who claimed the discovery of the key to the decipherment of Egypt’s hieroglyphic script in 1822. Shoshenq’s list was one of the inscriptions documented by Champollion and Ippolito Rosellini during their joint project to record Egypt’s monuments in the late 1820s. However, in spite of Champollion’s rapid progress in the translation of Egyptian texts, his understanding of Shoshenq’s list was, by today’s standards, relatively unsophisticated. Instead of recognising all the name-rings as the names of towns and cities in Palestine, he believed the list included ‘the leaders of more than thirty vanquished nations’. Among the names, he read No. 29 as ‘ludahamalek’, which he took to be the name ‘Judah’ followed by ‘the kingdom’ (cf. Heb. ha(m)malca). Consequently, he translated this name-ring as meaning ‘the kingdom of the Jews, or of Judah’. Champollion therefore concluded that Judah was among the many ‘nations’ which the pharaoh claimed to have conquered.

The pharaoh’s name was rendered by Champollion as ‘Sheschock’, and he immediately recognised here the Manethonian name Sesonch(os)is. He then connected the conquest of ‘Judah’ by this pharaoh with the invasion of Rehoboam’s kingdom in I Kings 14, and thus saw the identity of ‘Sheschock’ with both Sesonch(os)is and the biblical Shishak as ‘confirmed in the most satisfactory manner’.

Champollion’s reading of name No. 29 was subsequently challenged by Heinrich Brugsch, who made a new and detailed study of the list, producing identifications of the names which have, in several cases, stood the test of time. Brugsch identified names both before and after No. 29 as belonging to Israel as well as Judah, and therefore felt that its position in the campaign list contradicted Champollion’s reading. He also argued that the second part of the name could not represent the Hebrew malkāt (= kingdom), and that it corresponded instead to melek (= king). Finally, he argued that the whole construction assumed by Champollion’s translation was grammatically inadmissible. Brugsch preferred to read Jehud-ha(m)melek, and to treat it as the name of a town.

However, Champollion’s original reading (or variants thereof) continued to be defended (e.g. by Reginald Poole, some adopting Brugsch’s view to the extent that they preferred ‘king of Judah’ to Champollion’s ‘kingdom of Judah’. With this reading, the head surmounting the name ‘seemed to furnish a portrait of Rehoboam’, a view which became ‘as popular as most flagrant errors’. These are the words of W. Max Müller, who was the first (in 1888) to propose the reading now generally accepted – namely a place-name, Yad-ha(m)melek. Literally this is Hebrew for ‘hand of the King’, but it could also be taken figuratively (cf. I Samuel 15:12 & II Samuel 18:18) to mean ‘monument (or stela) of the King’. This place-name is otherwise unattested, but it would seem, from its position in the list (see Fig. 2), to refer to a location somewhere in the north-west coastal plain of the kingdom of Israel.

The rejection of Champollion’s reading of the name No. 29 did not, however, weaken the identification of Shoshenq with biblical Shishak. A considerable number of names in the list had come to be identified with towns in Israel and Judah, establishing that Shoshenq’s forces had indeed campaigned in Palestine. In addition, a scheme of dates for Egypt’s kings had been developed and refined to the point where the identification seemed to be confirmed chronologically. We will return to these two factors below to assess their precise implications. But firstly, we will examine the most obvious similarity between the two kings – their names.
Part Two

The Names of Shoshenk and Shishak

There is undoubtedly some superficial resemblance between the Egyptian name Shoshenk and the Hebrew rendering of the name of Rehoboam's enemy, Shishak. The question we must address is whether the resemblance is anything more than superficial; i.e. are the names sufficiently close to confirm the identity of Shoshenk I and the Egyptian king of the biblical account?

The vocalisation of the Egyptian hieroglyphs as Shoshenk (or Shoshenq) rather than the older rendering, Sheshonk, is based on the spelling of the name Susiniku (Akk. Su-si-in-ku) in Assyrian records from the 7th century BC. (The previously preferred rendering of the name Sheshonk was based on Manetho's Sesonch(os)sis, which, as Kitchen remarks, probably shows metathesis, i.e. an interchange of the sounds of the first two syllables.)

Egyptologists have differed over how close the Hebrew name is to Egyptian Shoshenk and Assyrian Susiniku. Sir Alan Gardiner plainly felt that the Hebrew name was incompatible with the hieroglyphic original: 'the Old Testament gives Shishak wrongly'. On the other hand, Kitchen has defended the plausibility of the Hebrew rendering. Concerning the vocalisation Shoshenk/Susiniku, he says: 'With this agrees the original vocalisation of the Hebrew as Shushaq (rather than Shishaq)', referring to the text of I Kings 14:25.

It is true that the Hebrew here is שְׁוָשְׁנָק, but this instance is unusual. In all other cases (I Kings 11:40, II Chronicles 12:2, 5 (twice), 7 and 9) the Hebrew is שִׁשָּׁק (i.e. the usual Shishak). The Masoretes (the rabbinic textual authorities of the 7th and 8th centuries of our era) clearly regarded the name in I Kings 14:25 as the one in error, because they offer Shishak as the correct reading in a marginal note. It is therefore by no means certain that Shushaq was the original Hebrew form of the name. Indeed, there are enough established instances of a scribal error turning an original yodh (as in Shishak) into a waw (as in Shushaq) to make it quite probable that Shishak is the original form, Shushaq being a corruption.

Then there is the omission of the 'n' from the Hebrew name. Kitchen points to several instances of the 'n' being dropped from cartouches of the name Shoshenk during the 22nd Dynasty. Two of these involve the prenomen Hedjheperre, i.e. the prenomen borne by the Shoshenk normally identified as the biblical Shishak; and two other instances are associated with his known relatives. It is therefore possible that the Hebrew name Shishak represents this abbreviated form of the Egyptian. However, Kitchen's case would be stronger if there were instances of the 'n' being dropped in non-Egyptian sources. The Assyrian Susiniku preserves it, and it is retained in the Greek form employed by Manetho and his exponents (see also Figs. 1 & 2). Therefore we should probably not expect the Israelite scribes to omit it.

In summary, we may say that if one sets out with the presupposition that Shoshenk and Shishak are the same person, one can present arguments for interpreting the Hebrew name as derived from the Egyptian. However, these arguments are by no means conclusive,
or even compelling. There are good grounds for believing that ‘Shishak’ is the original vocalisation of the Hebrew, and that ‘Shusshak’ in I Kings 14:25 is a scribal error. There is also no reason to believe that the name Shoshenq was familiar in its abbreviated form (i.e. written without the ‘n’ hieroglyph) to non-Egyptian scribes. It is therefore impossible to prove that the names are the same, and there remains an equally strong possibility that they are not. Certainly the names alone can not establish the identity of their bearers. 25

But, of course, the case for identity has never rested on the names alone. We therefore turn to what many will regard as a much stronger argument, the supposed similarity of the two kings’ actions in Palestine.

Part Three
Shoshenq and Shishak in Palestine

Under this heading we consider how closely the Egyptian and biblical records correspond. Writers anxious to find extra-biblical confirmation of biblical history have often played down the differences between the Old Testament account of Shishak’s invasion and the evidence of Shoshenq’s list of conquered cities. Thus Jakob Politeyean wrote:

... There is complete harmony between Shishak’s inscription (sic!) and the Bible record. 24

This is quite untrue. There is in fact considerable disharmony, and the differences between the two records deserve serious attention.

The biblical accounts of Shishak’s invasion (I Kings 14:25-6 and II Chronicles 12:2-9) both speak only of a campaign against Judah, the kingdom of Solomon’s son Rehoboam. But Shoshenq’s list of cities suggests that his focus of interest was totally different. While it is not correct to claim, as some have done, 23 that no towns belonging to Judah appear in the list, the following remark by Yohanan Aharoni is certainly valid:

It is clear from the Egyptian text that the main objectives of the expedition were not the towns of Judah and Jerusalem, but rather the kingdom of Israel on the one hand and the Negeb of Judah on the other. 26

This conclusion raises a problem to which there are three aspects. These will be examined in turn.

(1) Shishak and Rehoboam were allies

On the basis of the biblical material, one would not expect an invasion of Israel by Shishak. During Solomon’s lifetime Rehoboam was already perceived as a threat to his rule, and so Solomon planned to kill him:

... but Rehoboam arose and fled into Egypt, to Shishak king of Egypt, and was in Egypt until the death of Solomon. (I Kings 11:40)

Thus Rehoboam found asylum at the court of Shishak,

and, according to the Septuagint version of I Kings 12, he married either a sister of Shishak’s own wife, or (more probably) one of his daughters. 27 In the light of this, it is somewhat surprising to find that the supposed Egyptian record of Shishak’s invasion attests an extensive campaign into Jeroboam’s kingdom. Theodore H. Robinson remarked:

What does this invasion of the north imply? Jeroboam was Shoshenq’s (sic!) protégé - according to one account his son-in-law. It seems highly improbable that the Egyptian king should have attacked a person he so favoured... 28

Various suggestions have been made to account for this - none of them satisfactory. Poole suggested that the Israelite cities in Shoshenq’s list were ones which remained loyal to Rehoboam, and that Jeroboam had therefore appealed to Shoshenq to capture them for him. 29 Loyalty to Rehoboam on the part of so many Israelite cities is highly unlikely in view of the widespread popular rejection of his rule in Israel, portrayed in I Kings 12:1-18. A variation on this explanation, put forward by Robinson, seems equally improbable. For him, the Israelite towns in the list were ones which Rehoboam had captured from Jeroboam, so that Shoshenq was aiding Jeroboam by recovering them for him:

Jeroboa, confined in the far north and in desperate straits, is rescued by his patron and overlord. 30

This is in flat contradiction to the biblical account. The capture of towns in Israel as far north as the Esdraelon Plain, and on both sides of the Jordan, would have amounted to a virtual reconquest of Israel itself, yet it is plain from I Kings 12:21-4 that Rehoboam never launched any campaign of reconquest, being prevented from doing so by the prophet Shemaiah.

A slightly more plausible argument, offered by Müller 31 and Nicol, 32 is that Shoshenq’s list includes not only cities captured in battle, but also any which paid tribute or in some other way were considered subject to him. Assuming that his protégé, Jeroboa,
If Jerusalem had been recorded in the Shoshenk campaign list, it would appear in Row 2 - between the name-rings of Gibeon (on the left) and Mahanaim (on the right). [Photo: D. Rohl]

had asked him for protection against Rehoboam, this would have been sufficient reason for Shoshenk to include Israelite cities in his list, since Jeroboam had acknowledged some degree of dependence upon Egypt. While this is not impossible, it merely heightens the question as to why Jerusalem is not included in the list, since it certainly submitted and paid tribute, although it was not conquered in battle (I Kings 14:25-6 and II Chronicles 12:1-9). We will return to this problem below.

The inadequacy of the above explanations is now generally acknowledged, and more recent scholars do not doubt that Israel was invaded. As Herbert Donner remarks, the campaign there was extensive:

Shoshenk reached the plain of Megiddo in the north, even sent troops into the region east of the Jordan, and so must have caused severe distress to the kingdom of Israel.

So what is the explanation for this event?

We may ... hazard a guess that Jeroboam failed to keep certain promises he had made to his former protector.

This is, of course, a possibility; it is also conceivable that Shoshenk was simply prepared to override friendship or break an alliance for the sake of political gain. But, as David Payne admits in the above quotation, when we make such a suggestion we are merely hazarding a guess. There is nothing in the biblical account which requires, or even hints at, such a change of circumstances. We should always bear in mind that such conjectures are necessary only because of the identification of the Egyptian pharaoh Shoshenk with the biblical pharaoh Shishak.

(2) There is no invasion of Israel in the biblical accounts

It is entirely consistent with the Bible's portrayal of Shishak as Jeroboam's ally that it contains no reference to an Egyptian invasion of Israel. Yet we have seen that, in recent assessments of Shoshenk's campaign, he 'must have caused severe distress' to the northern kingdom (Donner, quoted above). Siegfried Herrmann remarks:

Jeroboam must have been very hard pressed, but we hear nothing about this in the Old Testament account.

What is the conventional explanation for this silence? Kitchen assumes, following Martin Noth, that it is accounted for by 'the primary interest of the Kings historian (and a fortiorem, of the Chronicler) in what befell Judah more than Israel'. This is also the view of Hendrik Jagersma, who says the silence of the Old Testament 'must be ascribed to the fact that the Deuteronomist [i.e. the writer of I and II Kings] and even more the Chronicler primarily concentrated on events in Judah. Israel appears only rarely, and then above all in a polemical context'.

It is surprising that scholars as familiar with the Old Testament as Kitchen and Jagersma should accept this patently false explanation. While it is true that the writer of the Books of Chronicles is primarily interested in Judah, and largely neglects its northern neighbour, this does not apply at all to the writer of the history found in I and II Kings (conventionally known as the Deuteronomistic historian, or simply the Deuteronomist). Even a superficial reading of the relevant part of that history should be sufficient to dispel such an assumption. Of the chapters dealing with the parallel histories of Israel and Judah (I Kings 12:25 to II Kings 16:20), approximately 650 verses are devoted to events in Israel and only 155 to events in Judah! The implication of these statistics is fully supported by a close study of the way the writer handles his material; this shows that 'for the time of the contemporary Northern and Southern Kingdoms, Judah is not the mainstream interest of the Deuteronomist. This is found in the history of the North'.

Indeed, we can take the argument further, since it would have suited the Deuteronomist's purposes perfectly to have related an invasion of Israel by Shishak. Before recording the Shishak incident, he reports at
length on the failings of Jeroboam (I Kings 12:25-13:10 & 33-4) and the judgement consequently passed on him by God through the prophet Ahijah (I Kings 14:7-16). Shoshenk’s deep penetration into Israel, with its necessarily serious effects (cf. Donner and Herrmann, quoted above), would have made an ideal sequel to this, providing an initial confirmatory fulfiment of the prophet’s words, and foreshadowing their total fulfilment by an Assyrian invasion some 200 years later. In II Kings 17, after describing Israel’s final demise in 722 BC, the Deuteronomist summarises the nation’s history, speaking of how God ‘afflicted them and gave them into the hand of spoilers’ (II Kings 17:20) because of their idolatry, which he traces back to Jeroboam’s sins (II Kings 17:21-3). In short, an Egyptian invasion of Israel in the reign of Jeroboam would have provided an excellent illustration of his theme. Thus, both the content and function of the Deuteronomistic history would lead us to expect the inclusion, not the omission, of an Egyptian invasion of Jeroboam’s kingdom, if one actually occurred. The statements of Kitchen and Jagersma are glib and misleading.

(3) Jerusalem and Judah’s fortified cities are absent from Shoshenk’s campaign list

Far more serious than either of the two problems discussed so far is Shoshenk’s failure to include Jerusalem in his list of cities. The biblical account relates:

In the fifth year of king Rehoboam, Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king’s house; he took away everything. He also took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made ... (I Kings 14:25-6; II Chronicles 12:2-3,9).

Judah’s wealthy capital features as the prime target of Shishak’s expedition, but, as Herrmann notes, when we turn to Hedjkheperre Shoshenk’s campaign list inscription at Karnak:

it is remarkable that Jerusalem does not seem to be mentioned on it, and does not therefore belong among the places seized ...40

---

Rubutì [Gaza] [Makkedah] Intro The Nine Bows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aijalon</td>
<td>Bethhoron</td>
<td>Mahanaïm</td>
<td>[Lost]</td>
<td>Hapharaim</td>
<td>Bethshan</td>
<td>Tanaach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiriathaim?</td>
<td>Gibeon</td>
<td>Shaud[y]?</td>
<td>Adoraim</td>
<td>Rehob</td>
<td>Shunem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socoh</td>
<td>Betharuma</td>
<td>Gath-paddalla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 3:** Rows 1 to 3 of the Shoshenk I campaign list. Using the bustrophedon principle for reading the list, the order of march is from top right to left (starting with the ‘Nine Bows’ – the traditional enemies of Egypt): the first section of the route is Gaza to Rubuti; then down and left to right (from Aijalon to Tanaach); and, on the third row, right to left again (from Megiddo to Bethappuah). [Illustration: D. Rohl]
The omission is not to be explained away by the relatively poor state of the Bubastite Portal inscription today. It is extremely unlikely that Jerusalem ever featured in any of the sections now damaged. As Kitchen points out:

The only probable gaps that might once have contained Jerusalem are in row IV – II:20 was probably in the Jordan Valley or eastern Palestine, and V:61-3 between Zemaraim and Jezreel (i.e. in Israel). And if row IV represented some foray by a task-force going off from the main army, then it is unlikely that Jerusalem even featured in this row. The other rows with lacunae (VIII-XI) were all occupied by place-names in the south and south-west, far from north-central Judah.41

The nearest place to Jerusalem mentioned in the list is Gibeon (name No. 17), i.e. el-Jib, some 9 km northwest of the capital. It is therefore assumed that it was here that Shoshenq awaited Rehoboam’s decision and received Jerusalem’s tribute.42 Donner suggests that Jerusalem and other cities of Judah do not feature in the list because when Rehoboam handed over the Temple and palace treasures he did so ‘in order to purchase his domain’s independence’.43 This ignores II Chronicles 12:4 which relates that Shishak ‘took the fortified cities of Judah’ as he advanced on Jerusalem. These Judean cities ought therefore to appear in the list. They will be discussed in more detail below. But Donner’s view does not explain the absence of Jerusalem either. An ancient scribe would almost certainly not have recognised Donner’s distinction between handing over a city’s wealth to purchase...
independence and the payment of tribute as a sign of submission. In any case II Chronicles 12:8 makes it clear that the result of the payment was not independence but 'service', i.e. vassaldom to Egypt. Kitchen acknowledges this fact, but nevertheless seems to suggest that Jerusalem does not appear in Shoshenq's list because, although cowed, it remained 'unconquered'. But in what meaningful sense can a city which handed over all its wealth to a foreign ruler and submitted to vassaldom (Kitchen's own word!) be described as 'unconquered'? True, Jerusalem had escaped destruction, but it would be quite unreasonable to suggest that Egyptian monarchs only listed cities which they actually destroyed. It is generally acknowledged that their lists include all places over which they could claim dominion. The plain fact, from which there is no escape, is that Jerusalem submitted to Shishak: therefore, given the identification of Shishak with Shoshenq, Jerusalem ought to appear in Shoshenq's list. Its absence is a major problem for the conventional identification.

As mentioned above, the Chronicler states in his account that, on his way to Jerusalem, Shishak 'took the fortified cities of Judah' (II Chronicles 12:4). He is evidently referring to the 15 cities listed previously as built (or fortified) by Rehoboam for the defence of Judah (II Chronicles 11:1-5). As can be seen from the map opposite, these protected the heart of Rehoboam's kingdom on the west, south and east; other forts lay at important road junctions. The absence from the Chronicler's list of any towns to the north, to protect Rehoboam from his hostile neighbour Jeroboam, is striking and can have only one explanation: when the kingdom split, Rehoboam must have retained Gezer, lower Beth-Horon and Baalath - towns which Solomon had built (I Kings 9:15-18), presumably to guard the northern approach to Jerusalem via the Ascent of Beth-Horon. If we add these three towns to those listed by the Chronicler, we therefore have a total of 18. In the light of the unequivocal statement that Shishak 'took the fortified cities of Judah', we would expect to identify a great many of these in Shoshenq's list - if it really records the same campaign. Yet of the 15 forts named in II Chronicles 11:5-10, only one appears in the Egyptian text (Aijalon, No. 14). Of the three which we may add from I Kings 9:15-18, again we find only one in Shoshenq's list (No. 16 is a Beth-Horon). This is hardly the degree of correspondence we would expect if Shoshenq was the invader who 'took the fortified cities of Judah'.

To account for the fact that only Aijalon is listed by Shoshenq from among the Chronicler's 15 towns, Kitchen suggests that Rehoboam fortified them after Shoshenq's attack. There are three reasons why this argument will not work. Firstly, the Chronicler twice mentions these fortified towns before narrating the Shishak invasion (II Chronicles 11:5-12, 23), and obviously understands them as part of the process by which Rehoboam established and strengthened his rule; he further states that Shishak's invasion occurred after Rehoboam 'sorokk the law of the Lord', which in turn happened 'when the rule of Rehoboam was established and was strong' (II Chronicles 12:1-2). The order of events is therefore quite clear and has significance for the Chronicler. This is not to be treated as a 'dischronologised' narrative and the events rearranged at will.

Secondly, it is extremely unlikely that Rehoboam would have ruled for the 4-5 years which preceded Shishak's invasion without fortifying his kingdom. In the person of Jeroaboam he had a hostile neighbour to the north (I Kings 14:30), and Egypt, to the southwest, had given asylum to that neighbour. In the light of this he would have been very foolish not to fear an Egyptian attack and to take immediate precautions.

Thirdly, it is likely that Rehoboam would have been allowed to fortify the southern and western approaches to his kingdom after he had become a vassal of Egypt. Such a move in that context would surely have been an act of rebellion.

Theoretically a supporter of the conventional view could grant that the invasion took place after Rehoboam's forts had been built, while arguing that, when the Chronicler wrote of Shishak taking 'the fortified cities of Judah', he was referring in fact only to Aijalon and Beth-Horon (i.e. the two places which have been identified in Shoshenq's list), and did not mean to imply that all, or even most, were captured. Although this seems a most improbable reading of II Chronicles 12:4, it is perhaps theoretically possible. However, it brings us to a further difficulty. The inclusion of Aijalon and Beth-Horon in Shoshenq's list indicates that he penetrated the central hills from the coastal plain along the ancient and well-worn route known as 'the Ascent of Beth-Horon'. Near the western approach to this route lay Gezer, one of Solomon's chief fortified towns on the border with Philistia. As argued above, Rehoboam must have retained this strategically important city for Judah, along with Lower Beth-Horon and Baalath. It is therefore inconceivable that Shoshenq would have attempted this route into the hills without first capturing Gezer, if his invasion did indeed correspond to that of Shishak. Yet it seems likely, as Gardiner and Kitchen have affirmed (against earlier statements based on a misreading), that Gezer does not appear in Shoshenq's list.

To sum up, there is not a good correspondence between the biblical accounts of Shishak's invasion and the evidence of Shoshenq's list of cities. In fact, the differences amount to serious problems for the usual identification of the two kings. In particular, Shoshenq's failure to mention Jerusalem is a major stumbling block. Whether or not ad hoc explanations may be adopted for the other difficulties, this remains totally inexplicable.
Part Four

Shoshenk’s Place in Egyptian Chronology

The currently accepted dating of Shoshenk I depends to a large degree on his identification with the biblical Shishak. Independent (e.g. astronomical) criteria for establishing his dates do not exist. Thus Edwin Thiele, speaking of his own chronology for the Hebrew kings, laments:

If Egyptian chronology of the ninth and tenth centuries BC could be established upon its own secure and absolute basis, the exact synchronism of I Kings 14:25, describing Shishak’s attack on Jerusalem in the fifth year of Rehoboam, would provide the final answer as to the accuracy of the dates here set forth. But nothing substantial from that period in Egypt is at present available. 55

Instead, the date established by Thiele for the 5th year of Rehoboam (925 BC) has become the fixed point by which Shoshenk’s reign is dated. Thus Kitchen, who (along with many others) accepts Thiele’s statement of Hebrew chronology, writes that Shoshenk I:

... can be closely dated by a synchronism with the Hebrew monarchy, whose dates in turn are closely fixed with reference to Assyrian chronology. 56

Kitchen then proceeds to use the Shoshenk/Shishak synchronism to date the reigns, not only of the 22nd Dynasty, but also of the 21st.

It would be quite wrong, however, to conclude from this that Shoshenk I’s dates are wholly dependent on his assumed identity with Shishak. The precise dates now assigned to Shoshenk I are dependent on this assumed identity, but the identity was supposedly confirmed at an earlier stage by an approximate synchronism between the two kings.

However, before outlining how that approximate synchronism was arrived at, it will help to give the debate some historical perspective if we take one step further back, to before Champollion deciphered the hieroglyphs.

Before Champollion

Even before Champollion’s decipherment of the hieroglyphs, the study of Egyptian chronology had been pursued in some detail on the basis of Manetho and other ancient writers who dealt with the history of Egypt. To get an impression of the progress which had been made by the eve of Champollion’s dramatic breakthrough, we can do no better than turn to the impressively thorough treatment by James Prichard. Prichard was a scholar of immense learning who wrote prolifically on anthropology, ancient history and mythology. In 1819, only a few years before Champollion’s discovery, he published An Analysis of Egyptian Mythology: to which is subjoined A Critical Examination of the Remains of Egyptian Chronology. 57 The latter part of his work was one of the most sophisticated and sensible treatments of Egyptian chronology to appear before the decipherment of the hieroglyphs.

Already in Prichard’s day the Persian conquest of Egypt was (correctly) dated to 525 BC. ‘From this period’, wrote Prichard, ‘we commence our reckoning, and compute upwards towards the more obscure ages’. 58 Therefore, beginning with the 26th Dynasty which terminated with the Persian conquest, Prichard worked backwards through time, carefully assessing the chronological information provided by the various ancient sources.

For the period of interest to us, these sources are primarily Julius Africanus (early 3rd century AD) and Eusebius (early 4th century AD), i.e. the two main transmitters of Manetho’s framework of dynasties and monarchs; also Synesius, a much later (9th century) writer who produced a list of reigns based on Manetho’s material, and Herodotus (5th century BC), who provides some detailed information on the reignlengths of the 26th Dynasty. 59 Other ancient writers provide additional information on the relevant period, though rarely of a precise chronological nature.

Unfortunately, as is well established, the above-mentioned sources often do not agree on the reign lengths which they record, or even over the number of kings assigned to particular dynasties. 60 In the days before their information could be checked against inscriptions material, the selection of figures from these writers was a precarious exercise, involving a large degree of subjectivity. It was therefore inevitable that Prichard’s attempt to reconstruct the chronology, although as objective in its approach as one could wish, involved speculation and error.

Prichard wrongly included the ‘proto-Saites’ Ammeris, Stephinares, Nechehos and Necho (Niku I), in the independent 26th Dynasty, and adopted Eusebius’s figures for their reigns. For Psamtek I onwards he preferred the figures preserved by Herodotus. These two factors combined to give him an inflated total for the 26th Dynasty’s independent rule, the beginning of which he consequently placed in 701 BC instead of 664 BC. Adding to this the totals provided by Eusebius figures for the rulers of Dynasties 21 to 25, and treating those dynasties as entirely consecutive, Prichard arrived at 1012 BC for the start of the 21st Dynasty. We need not concern ourselves with his treatment of earlier dynasties, for it
was within the 21st that Prichard located the biblical Shishak.

Before going further, it should be pointed out that Prichard was not primarily concerned to identify Shishak, or any other pharaoh mentioned in the biblical histories. However, he did frequently look to the biblical references to Egyptian kings to cross-check his emerging chronology. It must also be borne in mind that Prichard was working before the discovery of important Assyrian texts and the decipherment of cuneiform, which brought Assyrian chronology to bear on that of the Old Testament. Synchronisms between the reigns of Assyrian monarchs and those of the kings of Israel and Judah have, since 1857, greatly elucidated the interpretation of the Bible’s chronological data. Working without the benefit of those synchronisms, Prichard arrived at dates for the early Hebrew monarchy period which were some 60 years too high. Thus he dated Shishak’s invasion of Judah to 985 BC, compared with the modern dating of 925 BC.

Among Manetho’s list of kings of the 21st Dynasty, none bears a name strikingly similar to the Hebrew Shishak. However, the year 958 BC fell close to Prichard’s date for the death of the first king of the dynasty, Smedes (Egy. Nesubanebديدة), and the accession of his successor, Psuesennes I (986 BC). Prichard felt that the name Psuesennes ‘bears some resemblance’ to the Hebrew Shishak, but he did not particularly favour the identification. Instead, he referred to the list of Egyptian kings transmitted by Syncellus, in which the predecessor of Psuesennes (there spelt Psenenu) is not Smedes but ‘Soussakeim’, of whom Syncellus wrote that he:

... overcame the Libyans, Ethiopians and Troglodytes, and all the country from Egypt to Jerusalem, which he plundered.

Why Syncellus placed a king of this name at this point in his tables is not known for certain. Perhaps Syncellus himself was following the lead of an extended biblical chronology. His scheme often departs drastically from those of Manetho’s earlier editors, and his information is clearly garbled at many points – this being one example. Be that as it may, this particular piece of information suited Prichard’s scheme almost perfectly. He concluded:

It thus becomes probable that Syncellus was correct in his conjecture that this Soussakeim was the Shishak of the Hebrews. The invasion of Judaea by Shishak may be dated, according to a computation which follows the chronology of the Scriptures, in the year BC 985; which is one year after the death of Smedes [Smedes], according to Africanus; and an error of a single year may, in this case, be regarded as a remarkable instance of accuracy.

Thus, for Prichard, Shishak was another name for Smedes. However, had it not been for Syncellus substituting ‘Soussakeim’ for Smedes, Prichard would presumably have identified Shishak with Psuesennes. It certainly would not have occurred to him to select Manetho’s Sesonch(os)is, first king of the 22nd Dynasty, because, in Prichard’s scheme, this pharaoh would have come to the throne in 882 BC, over a century too late to qualify.

After Champollion

But within a very few years the picture had completely changed, and the scholarly consensus had settled on Sesonch(os)is. This was in two respects a consequence of the decipherment of the hieroglyphs. In addition to Champollion’s influential conclusion (as discussed above), the reading of Egyptian texts threw a flood of new light on the succession of pharaohs and the lengths of their reigns. This supplemented the ancient writers and led to numerous adaptations of Manetho’s figures.

To discover the impact of a few decades of study following Champollion’s breakthrough, we turn to the Egyptologist Reginald Poole, who contributed lengthy interrelated articles on ‘Chronology’, ‘Egypt’ and ‘Shishak’ to a three-volume Dictionary of the Bible published in 1863. By the time Poole wrote these articles, the identification of Manetho’s Sesonch(os)is with Hedjkheperre Shoshenq, already proposed by Champollion, was assured. In addition to the similar names there was the discovery by Lepsius that the highest year-date attested for Shoshenq on the monuments was his 21st, which corresponded with the 21 years given to Sesonch(os)is by both Africanus and Eusebius. The only question was whether Egyptian chronology, refined by the translated monumental inscriptions, would confirm the identity of Shoshenq/Sesonch(os)is with the biblical Shishak.

Poole worked in essentially the same way that Prichard had done earlier, moving back from a fixed point. Poole also made some reference to Sothic dating in relation to earlier dynasties, but he did not employ it to discover absolute dates. Indeed, he remained wary of an astronomical approach, remarking:

What we may term the recorded observation of the monuments cannot be used for the determination of chronology without a previous knowledge of Egyptian astronomy that we have not wholly attained.

Working back from a well-established date therefore remained the major plank in his chronological structure.

By the 1860s Apis stelae and other monuments had shown that the 26th Dynasty began in 664 BC with the reign of Psamtek I, and this date became
Poole’s fixed point. He placed the start of the 25th (Ethiopian) Dynasty at 719 BC (only 4 years higher than the date favoured today). For the 23rd and 24th Dynasties there were still only the figures in Manetho to work from. These totalled (for the two dynasties) 95 years according to Africanus, 88 years according to Eusebius.

This carries us up to BC 814 or 807, supposing that the Dynasties, as here stated, were wholly consecutive.66

When it came to the 22nd Dynasty, the information of Manetho had to be considerably revised in the light of the monuments. The total provided by Eusebius of only 49 years for 3 reigns had to be discarded, as did even the total of 120 years for 9 reigns given by Africanus:

The monuments ... oblige us to raise its sum to at least 166 years.67

Adding this to the previously ascertained date gave either 980 BC or 973 BC for the accession of Shoshenk I.

In his treatise of biblical chronology, Poole calculated that Shishak’s invasion of Judah occurred in 969 BC68 (16 years later than Prichard’s date). If Shishak were Shoshenk, he reasoned, and the invasion occurred near the end of the latter’s 21-year reign, the Bible would indicate c. 988 BC for his accession. Poole’s conclusion was as follows:

The results thus obtained from approximative data are sufficiently near the Biblical date to make it certain that Shoshenk I is the Shishak of Solomom and Rehoboam....69

However, Poole went on to add that ‘the progress of Assyrian discovery’ had led some scholars to propose a shortening of the chronology of the Hebrew monarchies by a further 20 years, which, applied to his arguments, would imply an accession-date for Shoshenk c. 968 BC instead of 988 BC. But he felt that this lower date, if eventually adopted, would cause no difficulty for the identification, because he suspected that the Egyptian dates may themselves require ‘some small reduction’.70 The synchronisations between Israel, Judah and Assyria eventually resulted in the dates for the early monarchy being reduced by over forty years from those adopted by Poole. However, even this did not destroy the synchronism between Shoshenk and Shishak, because Egyptologists were prepared to reduce their dates for the start of the 22nd Dynasty by a similar amount. It became clear that the 22nd to 24th Dynasties had not been ‘wholly consecutive’, as assumed by Poole on the basis of Manetho. When overlaps were allowed for, these produced suitably lower dates for Shoshenk I. The identification has therefore survived major, as well as minor, adjustments to both Egyptian and biblical chronology.

The root of the problem

This brief survey of the chronological argument shows that the synchronism between Shoshenk and Shishak resulted initially from Manetho’s framework of Egyptian dynasties, amplified and adapted by the data of the monuments. This information (as understood in the mid-19th century), when placed alongside the biblical chronology (as understood in the mid-19th century), produced an approximate synchronism between Shoshenk and Shishak. This appeared sufficiently close to confirm their suspected identity.

But how reliable is Manetho’s framework of dynasties? We have seen that early studies of Egyptian chronology treated the dynasties as (in Poole’s phrase) ‘wholly consecutive’, and this is indeed encouraged by the structure of Manetho’s framework. But if careful attention had been paid to various ancient writers, scholars may have treated that framework with greater caution. Introducing his epitome of Manetho’s Aegyptiacae, Eusebius states:

... It must be supposed that perhaps several Egyptian kings ruled at one and the same time: for they say that the rulers were kings of This, of Memphis, of Sais, of Ethiopia, and of other places at the same time. It seems, moreover, that different kings held sway in different regions and that each dynasty was confined to its own name: thus it was not a succession of kings occupying the throne one after the other, but several kings reigning at the same time in different regions.71

Thus one ancient writer, who probably possessed a more complete and less corrupted version of Manetho’s text than any now extant, affirmed his belief that Egypt’s dynasties were, at times, contemporary with each other.

Now, it is true that Prichard did allow the occasional instance of contemporary kings, and later scholars were forced by the evidence of the monuments to overlap the 25th Dynasty with the ‘Propto-Saites’ and the 22nd Dynasty with the 23rd and 24th, but the predominating assumption was that reigns and dynasties should be strung out consecutively. This principle was only abandoned when there was incontrovertible evidence against it. It was the application of this method which caused Poole to place Shoshenk as early as 988 BC. In short, this was the methodology which resulted in Shoshenk being synchronised with Shishak. Yet, as we have seen, there were warnings in the ancient writers that this methodology should not have been applied so vigorously.
As noted in the Introduction to this paper, Rohl and James have presented compelling evidence that the Third Intermediate Period is currently overstretched and in need of shortening. Most of this evidence is by no means new, but its voice has not been heard by conventional Egyptologists. The reason for this can now be spelt out. When the 22nd to 25th Dynasties were treated as ‘wholly consecutive’, the result seemed to confirm the attractive proposal of Champollion to identify Shoshenq I as the biblical Shishak. Once the identification had been accepted it became an axiom in the development of a firm Egyptian chronology. Since the dynasties of the TIP could not be given absolute dates on independent grounds, the biblical chronology, in supplying dates for Shoshenq I and the start of the 22nd Dynasty, became the measuring rod by which the TIP was fixed. This in turn limited the degree to which the TIP could receive future adjustment. As we have seen, evidence requiring overlapping of the 22nd, 23rd and 24th Dynasties of Manetho did indeed emerge, and this overlapping was permissible because the biblical chronology itself was found to be in need of contraction. But no account could be taken of evidence which, on the face of it, suggested a more drastic compression. The identification of Shoshenq with Shishak, arrived at from a too-rigid interpretation of Manetho’s framework, remained the arbiter of TIP chronology even after that rigid interpretation had been abandoned.

It should be evident that the current synchronism of Shishak and Shoshenq does not prove or support their identity. The synchronism was reached, in the relatively early days of Egyptology, on the basis of a faulty methodology. That methodology is now largely discarded, but the synchronism has survived because the identification of Shoshenq with Shishak has been assumed.

Conclusion

An examination of the three main supports for the identification of Shoshenq I with Shishak has shown all three to be weak. Perhaps the most striking conclusion to emerge from this study is how great are the difficulties involved in harmonising the biblical material with Shoshenq’s list. This throws the identification into serious doubt. In the light of this, the uncertainties involved in identifying the two names, and the dubious ways in which the two kings became synchronised, should be given due weight. The identification of the two kings is by no means certain, and it cannot be held to stand in the way of the drastic revision of TIP chronology proposed by Rohl and James. Indeed, to argue that the equation Shoshenq = Shishak proves the correctness of the current chronology would be to indulge in a circular argument, since the chronology has, in its accepted form, been constructed on the basis of the identification.
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1995 Exodus Tour

The Board are actively considering another Middle East extravaganza. Current thoughts - at an early stage of planning - are that it will take place in September 1995 and will have the theme of 'Exodus'. There will be a Nile Cruise aspect together with some days in the Sinai region. A total of around 15/16 days is likely. Again, there will be 'Learned Input' from a small number of experts and numbers will be restricted to a maximum of 50. If you are interested in being kept up-to-date with plans, please let Stuart Carter, 57 Salisbury Road, Barnet EN5 4JL know. At this time there is no obligation but it will help us to judge the level of interest and to plan accordingly.
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