

Late-Egyptian Chronology and the Hebrew Monarchy

Critical Studies in Old Testament Mythology, I

K. A. KITCHEN

University of Liverpool

In modern times, but at varying intervals, much scholarly attention has been devoted to the respective chronologies of Late-Period Egypt and the Hebrew Monarchy. A salient feature is that Kings and Chronicles contain a running series of datelines and data from which modern scholars can derive a chronology of the Hebrew Monarchy which, today, varies only within quite narrow limits¹—while from roughly 1100/1070 B.C., Late-Period Egypt before the Saïtes (that is, to 664 B.C.) appears, in contrast, as a period of obscurity, even confusion, with rival lines of little-known kings and seemingly very uncertain dates. However, by patiently collecting, sifting, and setting in order *not* merely a handful of regnal dates from the monuments and Manetho, liberally sprinkled with conjecture, but a whole range of evidence (regnal dates; Manetho; genealogies of officials; Apis-bulls; changes in dating; etc.), it is possible to bring relatively close and coherent order into the entire epoch, and even to set quite narrow limits for the dates of its kings (21st to 25th Dynasties), the contemporaries of the Hebrew Monarchy. This task, the writer has attempted in some detail elsewhere,² but it may be of service here to set out clearly and separately for biblical scholars some salient aspects having especial reference to Old Testament history that are even yet not properly grasped, despite warnings on the subject. In particular, Old Testament scholars are sometimes prone to elevating theories into dogmas, and, even after contrary facts have been made plain, are loth to give up their cherished idols and associated mythologies. It is hoped that this modest exercise in present-day “demythologizing” may entertain the distinguished author of such notable works as *Thespis*, and be of some help and use to others.

I

First, we turn to the celebrated issue of Taharqa and Hezekiah in 2 Kings 19:9 and Isaiah 37:9. It has become axiomatic in Old Testament studies that these passages and their context are involved in insuperable historical difficulties, because they appear to be a Hebrew record

1 E.g., from about a decade variation after Solomon's death (931/930 B.C., with E. R. Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings* [1951/1965]; 922 B.C., with W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 100 (1945), 16-22; J. Bright, *History of Israel*, etc.), to within a year for the fall of Jerusalem (587 or 586 B.C.).

2 K. A. Kitchen, *Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)* (Warminster, 1972). Hereinafter, abbreviated as *TbIP*.

of Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine in 701 B. C., whereas on *no* foreseeable chronology could Taharqa be "king" (of Nubia or Egypt) as early as that year; in fact, it is generally recognized that he became king about a decade later. Hence, some have talked of "anachronisms" here, while others have sought to read *two* campaigns of Sennacherib into the Hebrew narratives—one in 701 B.C., and one within the period 690–681 B.C. (after Taharqa's accession and before Sennacherib's death). Neither solution offers much comfort. For the supposed "anachronism" (especially when combined with the theory that Taharqa was only nine years old in 701 B.C.³) is of itself an anomaly and hard to explain away in such strictly historical contexts. And real, hard evidence for a second, later, Palestinian campaign of Sennacherib stubbornly refuses to appear.

Returning to Egypt, the basic fixed dating material for the 25th Dynasty and its contemporaries may be set out as follows.

First, the beginning of the Saite 26th Dynasty, with the accession of Psammetichus I, is fixed at 664 B.C. (not 663).⁴ The death of his father Necho I of Sais was occasioned by Tantamani, who succeeded Taharqa in 664 and immediately reconquered Egypt from the Assyrian garrisons and their allies (principally Necho I) in that year. That year, 664, saw the death of Taharqa, his reign lasted twenty-six years,⁵ and so Taharqa reigned 690–664 B.C.

Second, at the other, earlier, end of Egypto-Nubian history, the following sequence of events may be thus tabulated

<i>Nubia</i>	<i>Thebes</i>	<i>Sais</i>	<i>E. Delta</i>
Acc(ession of) Piankhy			Shoshenq V (37 yrs.)
(20 yrs.)	Thebes comes into orbit of Piankhy	Tefnakht, chief of Sais, is attested in Sh. V, Yrs. 36, 38. Tefnakht expands S., towards Thebes.	
acc. Osorkon IV			
Year 20: Piankhy invades Egypt, subdues all its rulers, incl. Tefnakht (who stays in Sais)			
Piankhy returns promptly to Nubia, and for good.			

³ Based on the theory of 25th-Dynasty chronology enunciated by M. F. L. Macadam in his invaluable *Temples of Kawa*, vol. 1 (1949), a chronology now rendered obsolete by subsequent discoveries, and by necessary corrections to our understanding of the texts of which he gave a worthy *editio princeps*.

⁴ A matter long since settled by R. A. Parker, *MDIK* 15 (1957), 208–12, and confirmed by E. Hornung, *ZAS* 92 (1965), 38–39.

⁵ See full discussion, *TbIP*, §§ 130–31.

Yr. 21, Great Stela of Piankhy, at Napata.	Dates by Piankhy (yrs. 22, 23)	Power-vacuum in the North: Tefnakht declares himself king in Sais & Memphis. (acc. Tefnakht) Os. IV, ctd.
		7 yrs., min reign of Tefnakht
(yr. 28, P)		Yr. 8, Athens stela; earliest date for death of Tefnakht; acc. of Bakenranef (Yr. 1): <i>Dyn. 24.</i>
Yr. 30, Piankhy	Theban bandage, BM	Yr. 3 of Bakenranef in N. (Os. IV, ctd.)
Yr. 32, death of Piankhy; Yr. 1, acc. of Shabako in Nubia.		Yr. 5 of Bakenranef, Apis-bull dies (born Yr. 37 Sh. V).
		Yr. 5/6 of B; Osokon IV not yet overshadowed by Shabako; this is <i>latest</i> date that can coincide with 716 BC & Shilkanni incident (Os. IV) of Sargon II.
Yr. 2, Shabako invades & reconquers Egypt, ousting Bakenranef, (Yr. 6), and completing Apis-burial. Also annexes estates of Os. IV. ⁶		
For thirteen full years, Shabako rules all of Egypt & Nubia; within this period, is 712 BC, when Sargon II negotiates with the Pir'u of Musri (Pharaoh of Egypt), <i>Nubia belonging to Egypt</i> (not true before Shabako)		
Yr. 15 is latest-attested date (& earliest date-of-death) of Shabako. ⁷		

6 *TbIP*, 379 and n. 771-72 (stelae of Shabako, Years 2 and 3 at Pharbaithos and Bubastis itself). It should be noted, in passing, that Osorkon IV belongs to the 22nd (*not* 23rd Dynasty), and is entirely distinct from Osorkon III of the 23rd Dynasty (who reigned elsewhere and much earlier). The last certain king of the 23rd Dynasty is Osorkon IV's contemporary, Iuput II, unless one accepts a very dubious Shoshenq VI (Wasneterre).

7 Year 15 (unused by Macadam), British Museum statue 24429, published now by J. Leclant, *Enquêtes sur les sacerdoces. . .XXVe Dynastie*, (1954), 15, 16, 18, and pl. V.

It should be stressed that the above scheme cannot readily be tampered with. Thus, Musri can only be Egypt, not an imaginary place in Arabia.⁸ Shilkanni is necessarily a king of Egypt, and an Osorkon,⁹ and in that event only Osorkon IV is eligible—A-kheper-re Osorkon IV of Tanis (Re-nofer) and Bubastis, contemporary of Piankhy and last scion of the 22nd Dynasty.¹⁰ He was, also, the Egyptian ruler closest to the Sinai isthmus and Palestine border. Further, the seven years' reign of Tefnakht as a full king began *after* Piankhy's invasion and retreat; it is not disregarded by Piankhy nor is it a case of "antedating." For Piankhy is scrupulously exact in his terminology for the various rulers of Egypt,¹¹ and would certainly have called Tefnakht a king, had he then been king.¹² (In fact, the titles he *does* give to Tefnakht correlate exactly with those on Tefnakht's pre-royal monuments.) There is no known event from which Tefnakht can be shown to have antedated, a practice otherwise unknown to Egyptian history.¹³ The Apis-bull that died in Year 5 of Bakenranef was buried in his Year 6, the ceremonies being completed under Shabako (Year 2, when he took Egypt).¹⁴ That Piankhy reigned at least thirty years is supported by a British Museum bandage-fragment.¹⁵ The Pir'u of Musri mentioned by Sargon II for 712 B.C. is a "Pharaoh of Egypt," particularly *as Nubia* (Meluḥḥa) "*belongs to Egypt.*"¹⁶ This factor rules out completely all Saite princes (Tefnakht, Bakenranef, etc.), as none of these, or of the Libyan kings, ever ruled Nubia in any sense. Nor did Piankhy have any contact with Assyria on his fleeting campaign into Egypt. Hence, it is only applicable to Shabako (no later king is feasible either).

Therefore, we may now turn to the direct consequences of the foregoing facts, using the two Assyrian references. These show that in 716 B.C. the Nubians did not yet rule the East delta—Osorkon IV still reigned there then—whereas by 712 B.C., Osorkon IV had disappeared and it is a Nubian pharaoh (in fact, Shabako) who then treats with Sargon II.

On this basis, we have a four-year maximum margin of error within which must fall the change of rule in the East Delta from Osorkon IV to Shabako (his Year 2, in which he first took Memphis). *At the earliest*, Shabako can have taken over late in 716 B.C. (after the Shilkanni incident), and perhaps better in 715 B.C.; his accession (Year 1) in Nubia will then maximally be 717/716 B.C. *At the latest*, Shabako can have taken over early in 712 B.C. (before Sargon II requested extradition of Iamani) and perhaps better in 713 B.C.; his accession (Year 1) in Nubia will then minimally be 714/713 B.C. Thus the extreme limits for accession

8 On Musri, see P. Garelli, "Musur," in *Supplement au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (1957), 5: 1468-74, and latterly in the Dupont-Sommer volume. Other references, *TbIP*, 143, n. 252.

9 The philological evidence is well stated by Albright, *BASOR* 141 (1956), 24.

10 On whom see *TbIP*, §§ 316 (iii), 333-36, and in Index.

11 See *TbIP*, § 324, p. 362, and n. 688 (also, p. 139 and n. 238-39), following on the crystal-clear demonstration of this fact by Yoyotte.

12 Precisely as he in fact did for that other redoubtable foe, Nimlot of Hermopolis, who was a king and is called a king. Far from Piankhy ending the reign of Tefnakht (as Albright wrongly thought), Tefnakht alone stood aloof in Sais, and never submitted to Piankhy in person (*TbIP*, § 326, with Yoyotte).

13 See *TbIP*, § 112, pp. 138ff. In 3,000 years, there is only the Mose-datum of "Year 58" (or 59) attributed to Haremhab—and this is a *posthumous*, not a contemporary date!

14 *TbIP*, § 114, n. 247; Vercoutter, *Kush* 8 (1960), 65-69.

15 See *TbIP*, § 123 and n. 292; § 330 and n. 732.

16 *TbIP*, 143; Assyrian texts, Luckenbill, *Ancient Records*, 2:62-63; 193-5; *ANET*, 286-87.

of Shabako (and death of Piankhky!) are 717-713 B.C., and the *optimum* limits for his accession are 716-714 B.C. The corresponding extreme and optimum dates for his reconquest of Egypt are then 716-712 B.C. and 715-713 B.C. respectively. We already have the accession of Taharqa in 690 B.C., so from an optimum accession of Shabako in 716/714 B.C., to the death of Shebitku in 690 B.C., these two latter kings are guaranteed twenty-four to twenty-six years between them. Furthermore, Shabako reigned minimally fourteen years (as Year 15 is attested), and perhaps fifteen years. Out of twenty-four to twenty-six years total, this in turn gives beyond dispute a minimum of nine/ten years and a maximum of eleven/twelve years for Shebitku.

Various important facts flow from this result. First, Shebitku reigned, on any reckoning, decidedly longer than the Year 3 otherwise (and accidentally!) his highest monumentally attested so far. Second, with Piankhy dying *at the very latest* in 714-713 B.C. (and in fact at any time back to 717/716 B.C.!), Taharqa could not, as his son, be a boy of but nine years old in 701 B.C.—in that year, he could not be less than twelve years old, and in fact could be anything up to sixteen or seventeen years old *at a minimum*. No child is born three to seven years posthumous! In point of fact, he was pretty certainly twenty to twenty-one in 701 B.C., as we shall see. Thus dies the impossible myth that Taharqa was but nine years old in 701 B.C.

Macadam had obtained this erroneous age for Taharqa in 701 B.C. by postulating he was only twenty in 690 B.C. (corrected date), based on his interpretation of Kawa stelae IV and V. That interpretation is wrong, both on the above dating-factors, and on other facts that need not be repeated *ad nauseam* here.¹⁷ In fact, Taharqa was aged twenty when summoned north by his brother Shebitku, directly following Shebitku's accession. Insofar as twenty years is three to eight years in excess of the twelve to seventeen years already proven above, Taharqa would have been born to Piankhy three to eight years before the latter's death. Furthermore, as Taharqa came north as first of a bunch of brothers, these may fairly be taken as younger, lesser brothers,¹⁸ which would favor the birth of Taharqa being nearer eight than three years before Piankhy's death, with a correspondingly higher accession-date for Shebitku, a date to which we must now turn.

Here, independent of any Old Testament considerations, two further facts stand out: (1) Under Shabako, Egypt dealt with Assyria (willingly or otherwise) as a friendly neutral—repatriating lamani of Ashdod, having diplomatic relations with Assyria (clay seals, Nineveh) and (2) in 701 B.C., on his Palestinian campaign, Sennacherib reports the hostile intervention of Egyptian and Nubian forces, siding with the petty Palestinian kingdoms. From these two points, a third emerges: a drastic change in Egyptian policy from neutrality and passivity to hostile action in or before 701 B.C., although the political situation remained the same as it had been for decades (i.e., Assyria resolutely imposing her rule on Palestine). Thus, one may fairly infer from these facts that, in an unchanged situation, new men in Egypt were adopting new policies. Which means, in effect, a new pharaoh at the helm, with consequent changes in his counsellors. Therefore, one may infer that Shabako had died and was replaced by Shebitku in or just before 701 B.C., and that the ambitious new king had

17 *TbIP* for full details (§§132f.).

18 In contrast to Macadam, cf. *TbIP*, 165 and n. 343.

decided on a more aggressive Egyptian policy in Western Asia.¹⁹ This meant use of armed force. Taharqa, aged twenty, was summoned north *with an army*, as well as his brothers, to meet Shebitku following the latter's accession. And in or just before 701 B.C., this would fit perfectly with Shebitku's new war policy in Western Asia.

The result is that one may set Shabako's reign (fourteen years' minimum) at 716/715-702/701 B.C., and thus Shebitku's reign at 702/1-690 B.C. The year 701 is possible, but to accommodate the events involved, an accession of Shebitku in 702 B.C. makes better sense.²⁰ Hence, these two reigns may be quite closely set at Shabako 716 (in Egypt, 715) B.C. to 702 B.C., and Shebitku in 702 to 690 B.C.²¹

What, then, does this mean for Taharqa? Simply that as a grown young man of about twenty-one in 701 B.C. (because twenty years old in 702), he would be perfectly able to serve as at least nominal leader (and possibly more) of an army-force in Palestine in 701 B.C., doubtless supported by generals. There is, therefore, contrary to popular mythology ("Taharqa, nine years old") *no difficulty whatever* in having Taharqa himself in 2 Kings 19:9 and Isaiah 37:9.

Alone remains that tiny phrase *mēlek Kūš*. It *could* quite simply be removed as a gloss, in the high-handed manner of *Alttestamentler* of the days of yore. But even this is needless. First, let the simple fact be hammered home, once and for all, that it is the phrase, *not* of a speaker in 701 B.C., but of the eventual narrator, distinctly after 701, at a time when Taharqa was principally known as king of Egypt and Nubia (Kush). Second, it may be clearly noted that in both Hebrew accounts, the section is rounded off by the narrator for his own good purposes with a brief account of the death of Sennacherib—an event that occurred in 681 B.C., *a decade after the accession of Taharqa*. In other words, the writers of Isaiah and Kings used (in 681 B.C. at earliest) a title by which Taharqa had been known to everyone for a decade, to identify him as the same man who had been present at the events of 701 B.C. Third, let it be finally grasped that such a method of back-reference, using a current title later, is a universal literary procedure, ancient and modern, a form of mental shorthand. If it is unremarkable and permissible to say "Queen Elisabeth II was born in

19 Cf. already, *TbIP*, 154-55, § 126 (ii), and for Shebitku's "Imperialist" titulary, *ibid.*, § 345 and n. 810-11.

20 *TbIP*, 155 end, 157.

21 No consideration is here accorded to the supposed co-regency of Shebitku and Taharqa. It is wholly imaginary and was simply an ingenious (but unworkable) hypothesis of Macadam's, and among Old Testament scholars has become not merely stock mythology, but sacred dogma. It is contradicted by the express statements of the Kawa stelae; the ambiguous passages in those stelae now have to be understood quite differently from Macadam's interpretation; the year-dates of Taharqa make no allowance whatever for any such co-regency; and a six-year co-regency would stretch the reign of Shebitku to an impossible eighteen years. Not only the present writer (whose earlier warnings should have sufficed) but practically the whole of Egyptology is solidly opposed to this imaginary co-regency (see list, *TbIP*, 164f., n. 340). Therefore, when (incurably gripped by the mythology) J. Bright, *A History of Israel*, (1972), 298, n. 9, actually stoops to accusing professional Egyptologists (Leclant, Yoyotte, myself) of "evading" a non-existent co-regency, his reaction would occasion much merriment on their part were it not so pathetic.

1926" (rather than with idiot pedantry, that "the princess now known as Queen Elisabeth II was born in 1926"), then it is *equally* permissible for Kings or Isaiah to remark that Taharqa, the Nubian king, was at Eltekeh in what we call 701 B.C. And it is a usage Taharqa himself employs on the Kawa stelae, speaking of himself as "His Majesty" in a passage referring to his being but a prince (of whom, contemporarily, this phrase would *not* be used). Hence, the long-cherished idol of some *Alttestamentler*, this loudly trumpeted "anachronism," must be unceremoniously torn from their grasp and consigned to the dustbin (*auf Amerikanisch* 'garbage can', I believe), where all such false idols belong.

The Hebrew narratives of Kings and Isaiah, therefore, remain relatively unexceptionable records of *one* campaign by Sennacherib in 701 B.C., at which the twenty-one-year-old Taharqa—the later famous Nubian king—was present.

II

Second, a word on the earlier dates of Egyptian and Hebrew history, in particular Shoshenq I (Shishak), vanquisher of Rehoboam. On the dates for Osorkon IV (*fl.* 716), the invasion of Piankhy (728), etc., Shoshenq V (thirty-seven years) may be set at c. 767-730 B.C.; before him, Pimay, six years, and fifty-two years earlier still, the accession of Shoshenq III; before these, twenty-five years for Takeloth II, twenty-four years (twenty-two to twenty-three utter minimum) for Osorkon II, and fifteen years for Takeloth I, putting the death of his predecessor Osorkon I at c. 889 B.C., a date which cannot be reduced by more than a couple of years or so. The reign of Osorkon I is probably to be taken as lasting thirty-five years. 'Year 36' of a monument in University College, London, is illusory,²² but a 'Year 33' was apparently recorded on bandages of a mummy that bore tabs of Osorkon I. Manetho's fifteen years, therefore, should be thirty-five years, by an emendation of a type all too commonly required of his now corrupted text. This long reign finds further support in the number of successive functionaries who held certain offices in this reign.²³ Thus, one may give thirty-five years to Osorkon I, during c. 924-889 B.C. Therefore, the twenty-one well-attested years of his father Shoshenq I (Shishak) can be set at 945-924 B.C. (and his Palestinian campaign at 925 B.C.), in full agreement with a date for Rehoboam's accession in 931/930 B.C., as established by Thiele long since. A date for Shoshenq I a whole decade later (935-914 B.C.), favored by our late-lamented colleague W. F. Albright (and his epigones) is ruled out, and must be discarded together with all its consequent (and needless) emendations of the figures of subsequent Hebrew kings.²⁴

In point of fact, the date 945-924 B.C. is not only a maximal date for Shoshenq I on Hebrew/Assyrian chronology, and nearly minimal on later Libyan chronology,—it is minimal on *earlier* Egyptian chronology as well, a point entirely new to Old Testament

22 As shown by H. K. Jacquet-Gordon, *JEA* 53 (1967), 63f. A forty-year reign for Osorkon I has no support of any kind whatsoever (contrast Albright, followed by Bright.)

23 On this reign, see ThIP, §89 and references.

24 See particularly, Thiele, *Mysterious Numbers* (1951 ed.), 244-52, 253-67.

studies, and made here for the first time.

Thus, the 21st Dynasty may now be very confidently given 124 (or 125) years, beginning in 1069 (or 1070) B.C.,²⁵ and ending in 945 B.C. Long before this, as our practical upper limit, the *lowest* date hitherto admitted for Ramesses II (using lunar dates, etc.) is 1290-1224 B.C. For the whole period of the later 19th and the entire 20th Dynasty, this gives (from 1224 to 1069 B.C.) a total interval of 155 years. But the basic regnal dates known to date total only about 141 years.²⁶ A surplus of ten to fifteen years has to be disposed of. Hornung and others have sought to overcome this little problem by assigning up to twenty (not ten) years to Merenptah, successor of Ramesses II. However, this solution may be categorically excluded on multiple genealogical grounds to be presented elsewhere;²⁷ in fact, these ten-plus years can only be dealt with by dispersing them in much smaller amounts over the shorter reigns of the 19th Dynasty after Merenptah and in the 20th Dynasty,²⁸ so as not to perpetrate genealogical monstrosities. Now, with Shoshenq I at 945 B.C., and the 21st Dynasty at 1069 B.C., it is possible to "absorb" the years back to the death of Ramesses II in 1224 B.C., at ten to fourteen years. But if Shoshenq I be set at 935 B.C. (as too commonly done by some), then the 21st Dynasty would only begin in 1059 (or 1060) B.C., and not ten to fourteen but twenty to twenty-four years have to be "absorbed" as additional to the basic 141 years back to Ramesses II. And it is totally impossible to do this. Otherwise Mayors of Thebes will be staggering round the Wady Hammamat at ninety-five (and royal workmen marrying at that age!), and high priests officiating at 105, etc., instead of reaching acceptable maximum of seventy or seventy-five (rarely eighty) years old.²⁹ A "minimal" chronology for Shishak at 935 B.C. that involves us in such freaks is not a minimal chronology, it is plainly an incorrect chronology, and it, too, must be discarded as one more piece of outworn and expendable modern mythology. Time alone will tell whether Old Testament scholars have the will to rid themselves of such errors, or whether they will illogically cling to dates

25 Kitchen, *TbIP*, Table 1 (following Part I), 124 years, 1069-945 B.C.; E. Hornung, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reichs*, (1964), 101-6, 109, has 125 years, 1070-945 B.C.; the difference is one year (fourteen or fifteen years) in reckoning the reign of Psusennes II.

26 I.e., Merenptah, ten yrs.; Amenmesses, four yrs.; Sethos II, six yrs.; Siptah & Tewosret, eight yrs.; no interregnum; Setnakht, two yrs.; Ramesses III, thirty-one yrs.; R. IV, six yrs.; R. V, four yrs.; R. VI, seven yrs.; R. VII, seven yrs.; R. VIII, one yr. (abs. min.); R. IX, eighteen yrs.; R. X, nine yrs. (Parker); R. XI & "Renaissance," twenty-nine yrs. Total, 141 years minimum.

27 By Morris L. Bierbrier, in a work now in advanced state of preparation, covering the interlock of genealogies and chronology for the 19th to 25th Dynasties.

28 There would be a theoretical possibility of lowering the dates of Ramesses II by eleven years to 1279-1213 B.C., which suits the internal genealogical data well enough, which is (so far) still compatible with the minimum known reigns of all his successors (but would not allow of any serious expansion, were it needed), but which is *not* so far easily compatible with contemporary near-eastern dates, even those of Brinkman, *BiOr* 27 (1970), 301-14; details cannot be given here. Even on these dates, 935 B.C. for Shoshenq I would still leave a whole decade excess to be absorbed.

29 These matters are dealt with by M. L. Bierbrier, see n. 27 above.

that condemn Ramesside Egypt to be run by a crowd of nonagenarians enough to make Ramesses II feel jealous! Be that as it may, all the available positive factors at present indicate a date of 945-924 B.C. (or very close thereto) for Shishak.

Other contributions of a revised and closely correlated Late-Egyptian chronology to Hebrew history have been covered elsewhere³⁰ more systematically and in fuller context, (as have the points given above) and that is where Old Testament scholars must seek them, at first hand. But this essay may serve to etch out more clearly some of the basic points not always apparent in a larger survey, and aid appreciation of key facts in a wider context. Our fascinating world of biblical scholarship is peopled by its own myths and idols; it can only gain by eliminating these false gods and unsubstantiated associated beliefs, to reach nearer to the glittering (if oft elusive) truth. May this essay, in due homage, serve (however limitedly) towards that end.

³⁰ E.g., on King So (who is neither "Sibe," Shabako, nor even Sais) and other such issues; see *Third Intermediate Period*.