PITHOM AND RAMESES (EXODUS 1:11): HISTORICAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, AND LINGUISTIC ISSUES (PART II)

Gary A. Rendsburg
Rutgers University

James K. Hoffmeier
Trinity International University

ABSTRACT

The present article continues our study of the city-names Pithom and Rameses in Exodus 1:11 (the first part having been published in the *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 33), along with related matters, with particular attention to the linguistic evidence. It is determined that: a) the transcription of *rꜥ-ms-sw* as רַעְמְסֵס "Rameses" coheres with the Semitic evidence of the 13th–12th centuries BCE; b) the word מַס "corvée" is not a borrowing from Neo-Assyrian (or any other Akkadian dialect) but rather constitutes a pure West Semitic word; c) the word מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses" also is patient of a good West Semitic derivation; d) the narrative of Exodus 1–2 should not be divided into separate sources, but rather should be read in a holistic manner; and e) the two chapters are dated on linguistic grounds to the earliest stratum of Biblical Hebrew narrative prose literature.

The first part of this article focused on historical and archaeological material. In this the second part of the article, we turn to the linguistic evidence.[1]

EGYPTIAN NAMES IN SEMITIC TRANSCRIPTION

In his recent article devoted to the city names "Pithom" and "Rameses," Schipper wrote, "All evidence from the first millennium BCE documents that an Egyptian *ś* becomes in Hebrew a *samech*, whereas the older Egyptian loan-words in Hebrew have a *shin* for an Egyptian *ś*.[55] In the following, this principle is illustrated by Egyptian Toponyms and personal names in ancient Hebrew. All of these names document that a *samech* in Hebrew goes back to Egyptian *sin* (*ś*), while a *shin* in Hebrew renders the Egyptian sibilant *shin* (*š*)."[2] His note 55 reads

simply, "See, for example, Hoch, p. 368, no. 548."

Where does one begin to critique this statement? Let us start with n. 55, which directs the reader to an entry in James Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts*.[3] First, Hoch's magnificent book[4] is devoted to loanwords in the opposite direction: Semitic (mainly Canaanite) words which appear in Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, and not to "the older Egyptian loan-words in Hebrew," as Schipper writes in the lead-up to n. 55. Secondly, the example referenced is Hebrew סֹלְלָה *soləla* "siege-mound," a word that appears eleven times in the Bible (2 Samuel 20:15, etc.), and which appears three times in Egyptian texts, with variable spellings: *ṯ-r-r-ya* / *ṯ-r-r-t* / *ṯ-r-ṯ-r*. Nothing about this word is relevant to the discussion at hand: a) it is a

Hebrew/Canaanite word that appears in Egyptian, not an Egyptian word that appears in Hebrew/Canaanite; and b) it involves a Hebrew *samekh* /s/, which is transcribed with Egyptian /t̠/ (Gardiner V13), that is, neither of the processes that Schipper mentions in the sentence to which n. 55 is appended.

Next, although the wording is a bit convoluted, we understand Schipper's contention as follows: Egyptian /ś/ (by which we assume he means both Gardiner O34 and S29) appears as Hebrew *šin* /š/ in older texts, but as Hebrew *samekh* /s/ in later ones. But then he seems to confuse matters a bit, for after repeating the first part of this equation, he adds that Egyptian /š/ enters Hebrew as *šin* /š/. This latter point is true, but it is not quite relevant.

So, if we understand Schipper correctly, he maintains the following. (Note that from this point forward we use the simpler transcription /s/ for Gardiner O34 and S29,[5] as opposed to /ś/ employed by Schipper.)

1. Egyptian /s/ > Hebrew /š/ (at the earlier stage)
2. Egyptian /s/ > Hebrew /s/ (at the later stage)
3. Egyptian /š/ > Hebrew /š/ (throughout)

As examples of the three processes, Schipper provides the following:

1. *ms* "birth" > מֹשֶׁה (as far as we can tell, this is his only example)[6]
2. *p₃-t₃-rsy* "the land of the south" > פַּתְרוֹס (Isaiah 11:11, etc.)
   p₃-nḥsy "the Nubian" > פִּינְחָס (Exod. 6:25, etc.)
3. *ššnq* "Sheshonq" > שִׁישַׁק (1 Kings 11:40, etc.)
   nšm.t "feldspar, amazonite" > לֶשֶׁם (Exodus 28:19; 39:12)[7]

The main point of the philological portion of Schipper's article[8] is to argue that since *rꜥ-ms-sw* "Rameses" appears in Hebrew as רַעְמְסֵס (Genesis 47:11; Exodus 1:11, etc.),[9] with *samekh* rendering Egyptian /s/, then this borrowing fits into category no. 2, during the later stage. Those familiar with the history of research into this issue will know that Schipper advances here the opinion voiced by Donald Redford as early as 1963 (duly cited by Schipper).[10]

The main problem with this scenario is that its underlying assumptions are completely wrong. Since there is such uncertainty about the dating of biblical texts, and since there is so little epigraphic Hebrew that may guide us, the best approach is to broaden the horizon and to look at how Egyptian loanwords were rendered into Northwest Semitic languages during the c. 1,000-year period under discussion.[11] Fortunately, we do not have to reinvent the wheel, for the very research that is required here was conducted by Yoshiyuki Muchiki in his 1990 dissertation to the University of Liverpool (supervised by K. A. Kitchen and Alan Millard), subsequently published as a book, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*.[12] Somewhat astonishingly, Schipper never once cites Muchiki's standard work, with its wide-ranging collection of data.

Let us do so, accordingly, by mining Muchiki's data sets for relevant information, with special attention to the two corpora of Semitic texts reflective of Late Bronze Age Canaanite, *grosso modo*: Ugaritic and Amarna Akkadian.

Unfortunately, there is but very little material forthcoming from Ugaritic. Muchiki registers the following relevant items:[13]

Eg. *snb* "being well" > Ug. *snb* (PN)
Eg. *s₃.t-n.t* "daughter of Neith" > Ug. *snt* (PN)
Eg. *ỉmn-ms* "Amun is born" > Ugaritic syllabic *PRU* IV 17.28 *a-ma-an-ma-ši* (line 0) / *a-ma-an-ma-aš-šu* (lines 16, 27) (PN)

From this limited amount of data, we conclude that Egyptian /s/ was borrowed or rendered with Ugaritic /s/ during the Late Bronze Age. For the one item written in cuneiform script, see further below.

Happily, there is much more material available from the Amarna letters. From this corpus, Muchiki registers the following relevant items:[14]

Eg. *ỉmn-ms* "Amun is born" > EA 113.36, 114.51 *a-ma-an-ma-ša* (PN)[15]
Eg. *ḥr-ms.w* "Horus is born" > EA 20.33 *ḫa-a-ra-ma-aš-š[i]* / 20.36 *[ḫa-a-ra-] ma-aš-ši* / 49.25 *[ḫa]-ra-ma-sa* (PN)[16]
Eg. *p₃-sr* "the prince" > EA 162.71 *pi-iš-ia-ri* (PN)[17]
Eg. *st(ỉ)* "Seth" > EA 5.19 *šu-ut-ti* / 234.14, 234.23 *šu-ta* / 288.19, 288.22 *šu-ú-ta* (PN)[18]
Eg. *ds* "jar" > EA 14.i.48 *da-[š]i*

Eg. *ḥnn sˤḥˤ* "an upright box or chest" > EA 14.ii.52 *ḫa-nu-ú-nu ša-ḫu-ú*

Eg. *nms.t* "a kind of jar" > EA 14 (5x) (i.32, ii.67, ii.50, iii.37, iii.67) *na-am-ša*

Eg. *psḏ* "nine" > EA 368 obv. 14 *pi-si-it*

Eg. *p3-sb3* "the door" > EA 368 rev. 6 *pu-us-bi-ú*

Eg. *sš.šˤ.t* "scribe of letters" > EA 316.16 *ša-aḫ-ši-ḫa*

Eg. *sfḫ* "seven" > EA 368 obv. 12 *šap-ḫa*

Eg. *si(s)* "six" > EA 368 obv. 11 *ša-ú*

Eg. *t3-isb.t* "the stool" > EA 368 rev. 9 *ta-as-bu*

Eg. *wrs* "head support" > EA 5.22 *ú-⌈ru⌉-[u]š-ša*

From this array of Egyptian personal names and loan words appearing in Amarna Akkadian, it is clear that Egyptian /s/ may be rendered with either Akkadian /s/-signs or /š/-signs. There are more of the latter than the former, especially in the domain of personal names, but two additional observations are noteworthy.

First, the same personal name, Egyptian *ḥr-ms.w* "Horus is born," could be written as either *ḫa-a-ra-ma-aš-š[i]* / [*ḫa-a-ra-*] *ma-aš-ši* or [*ḫa*]-*ra-ma-sa*, that is, with either /š/ or /s/ to represent Egyptian /s/.[19] Note that the former two examples appear in EA 20, written by Tushratta king of Mitanni, while the third example occurs in EA 49, written by Niqmaddu king of Ugarit. At the same time, though, a Ugaritic scribe from the same chancellery (more or less) could render the latter portion of the Egyptian *ms* element with /š/-signs, for as we saw above *imn-ms = a-ma-an-ma-ši* / *a-ma-an-ma-aš-šu*. Or, to put this in chart form:

Eg. *ms* "born" = *maši* (EA 20 – Mitanni)

Eg. *ms* "born" = *masa* (EA 49 – Ugarit)

Eg. *ms* "born" = *maši* / *mašu* (*PRU* IV 17.28 – Ugarit)

Second, a key text in our discussion is EA 368, a scholarly tablet which transcribes Egyptian common nouns (including numerals) into cuneiform script.[20] The same scribe rendered Egyptian /s/ with cuneiform /š/-signs on two occasions and with cuneiform /s/-signs on three occasions, to wit (with special attention to the transcriptions in bold):

Eg. *si(s)* "six" > EA 368 obv. 11 ***ša****-ú*

Eg. *sfḫ* "seven" > EA 368 obv. 12 ***šap****-ḫa*

Eg. *psḏ* "nine" > EA 368 obv. 14 *pi-**si***-*it*

Eg. *p3-sb3* "the door" > EA 368 rev. 6 *pu-**us***-*bi-ú*

Eg. *t3-isb.t* "the stool" > EA 368 rev. 9 *ta-**as***-*bu*

In light of all the evidence presented here, we echo Muchiki's summary statement: "It seems that there are no fixed correspondences between Eg and Akk sibilants."[21] And while the evidence from Ugarit was more limited, we may assert the same lack of consistency regarding the sibilant correspondences between Egyptian and Ugaritic.[22]

This inconsistency at first may surprise, but parallels abound in the study of loanwords in world languages. To stay within Semitic, from a later time period, we may observe that Arabic loanwords with /s/ appear in Geˤez relatively consistently with /s/, but appear in Tigre, Tigrinya, and Amharic with either /s/ or /š/, with no discernible pattern.[23] Inversely, Arabic loanwords with /š/ appear in Geˤez with either /š/ or /s/, once again with no discernible pattern, though in the other languages consistently with /š/.[24]

Or we may note that Akkadian /š/ may enter Hebrew as either /š/ or /s/; see, for example, respectively, Akk. *šulmānu* "bribe" > שַׁלְמֹנִים (Isaiah 1:23, in the plural form), Akk. *šaknu* "governor" > סְגָנִים (17x, always in the plural).[25] Obviously, in this case, we are able to determine that the former is through the Babylonian dialect, while the latter is through the Assyrian dialect—but that is because we have explicit evidence for this dichotomy in the pronunciation of the sibilants within the two main Akkadian dialects.[26]

Such variability—sometimes explicable as in the Assyrian-Babylonian split, sometimes inexplicable as in the case of Arabic borrowings into Ethiopian languages—occurs throughout world languages, including, for example, when words with English /s/ are borrowed into Korean. Yoonjung Kang, who has studied the topic more intensely than anyone else, concluded as follows: "Loanword adaptation is conditioned by many extragrammatical factors, such as the role of orthography, the channel of borrowing, the degree of bilingualism, etc."[27] Which is to say, variation is inevitable, for there is no single path which delivers a word or proper name from one

language into another.

In fact, another Egyptian matter may serve as a useful illustration. The element *pr* "house," present in numerous Egyptian toponyms, may appear in Greek transcription commencing with either *pi* or *phi*. Note, for example, how *pr itm* becomes *Patoumos* in Herodotus, *Histories*, 2.158, but how *pr grr* becomes *Phagroriopolis* in Strabo, *Geographika*, 17.1.26. True, about three centuries separate the two writers, but chronology alone cannot resolve this issue.

Or to put this in other terms: will a scholar three thousand years from now realize that the initial sound in "English" Chekhov and "English" Tchaikovsky derives from the same Russian phoneme? Will he or she be able to determine that the former was a direct borrowing, whereas the latter traveled from Russian to English via German intermediation?

To return to the topic at hand: the picture presented here demonstrates beyond doubt that the Egyptian term *rꜥ-ms-sw* "Rameses" could have entered Hebrew/Canaanite at any time during the millennium of years under discussion: during the Late Bronze Age, during the Early Iron Age, or during the later biblical period. When Schipper writes as follows, he totally ignores any early evidence: "the Hebrew word רַעְמְסֵס seems to follow the same rules as the general evidence from the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Hebrew inscriptions from the (middle of the) first millennium BCE: an Egyptian *ś* becomes in Hebrew a *samech*, … Therefore, the name 'Raamses' in Ex 1:11 points to the first millennium BCE."[28]

As we have seen, however, and to repeat for emphasis: the use of *samekh* /s/ (2x) in the name רַעְמְסֵס aligns with what we know of Semitic transcriptions of Egyptian /s/ during the Late Bronze Age (as attested at Ugarit and in Amarna Akkadian). There are sufficient examples of Egyptian /s/ = Semitic /s/ during the Late Bronze Age to assume that the name "Rameses" entered Hebrew/Canaanite in such fashion during this time period.[29]

In fact, given the intense presence of the Ramesside pharaohs in the land of Canaan during this time period—from Rameses II through Rameses IV[30]—it would be rather shocking if the denizens of the land did not know the name "Rameses" until the mid-1st millennium BCE, as Redford and Schipper would have us believe.

Nothing that we state here proves definitively that the name רַעְמְסֵס entered the Hebrew language in

such form during the time of earliest Israel (that is, 13th–12th centuries BCE).[31] But the linguistic evidence does demonstrate that the name רַעְמְסֵס *could* have entered the Hebrew language at this period, *pace* Redford and Schipper, who deny such a possibility altogether. When one brings the historical and archaeological evidence into the picture, the scales are tipped in favor of an early (read: contemporary) borrowing of the name "Rameses," when these powerful pharaohs ruled the land of Canaan, as opposed to a later one, when a different geo-political situation obtained.

Until this point, we have resisted using the evidence of Hebrew itself, due to, as indicated above, the uncertainty over the dating of biblical texts and the dearth of epigraphic Hebrew from the 10th century or earlier. That said, one Hebrew word is worth closer inspection, namely, the verb שׁ-ס-ה *š-s-h* "plunder" (Judg 2:14, 16, etc.), presumed to be a borrowing from the Egyptian noun *šꜣsw* "Shasu."[32] Given the proliferation of Shasu references in Ramesside texts,[33] one should assume that this word was borrowed into Hebrew at an early time.[34] And if such be the case, note the correspondence between Egyptian /s/ and Hebrew *samekh* /s/ in this loanword. In fact, we have corroboration of this point from EA 252.30 *šu-sú-mì* "my plunderers," in a letter sent by Labʾayu, king of Shechem.[35] This reference demonstrates both: a) that the verb שׁ-ס-ה *š-s-h* "plunder" entered the patois of the central hill country of Canaan by the 14th century BCE; and b) that an Egyptian word with /s/ would be transcribed by the Canaanite scribe with a cuneiform /s/-sign.

True, the passage just cited is from a 14th-century Amarna tablet, while Hebrew is attested from only the 12th century onward—but given the close affiliation between Amarna Canaanite and Biblical Hebrew,[36] one may see in EA 252.30 the roots of the usage of the verb שׁ-ס-ה *š-s-h* "plunder" in the latter dialect, especially in light of the geography (EA 252 from Shechem/early biblical usages such as Judges 2:14, 2:16, 1 Samuel 14:48, 23:1, set in the central hill country).

In sum, there is absolutely no objection to understanding רַעְמְסֵס as a 13th–12th century transcription of *rꜥ-ms-sw* "Rameses."

Excursus: The Name מֹשֶׁה "Moses"
The name מֹשֶׁה "Moses" is patient of two distinct etymologies.[37]

1. It may derive from Egyptian *ms* "born," minus any theophoric element. As we have seen above, Egyptian /s/ may appear in Semitic transcription with either /s/ or /š/, including side by side. Thus, even though *rꜥ-ms-sw* "Rameses" appears as רַעְמְסֵס (with *samekh*), simple *ms* "born" could appear as מֹשֶׁה (with *šin*). Recall the chart above:

Eg. *ms* "born" = *maši* (EA 20 – Mitanni)
Eg. *ms* "born" = *masa* (EA 49 – Ugarit)
Eg. *ms* "born" = *maši* / *mašu* (*PRU* IV 17.28 – Ugarit)

Two problems arise, however. The first is the lack of any Egyptian PNs consisting of simple *ms* "born" only. There is always another element (typically a theophoric one) preceding the verbal predicate.[38] Of course, the Israelites could have removed such, since they worshipped only the single deity Yahweh, but this requires an extra step in the reconstruction of the name's development.

Secondly, the vowel pattern of מֹשֶׁה (with /o/-vowel in the first syllable) is different from everything we know about the vowel pattern of Egyptian *ms*. Again, the Israelites could have converted the original form into a masculine singular participle form (which is what מֹשֶׁה reflects), although once again this requires an extra step in the name's development.

2. The second option is to consider מֹשֶׁה to be a native Semitic form, cognate to Ugaritic *mṯ* (masc.) "boy, lad, child"/*mṯt* (fem.) "lady, woman." The masculine form occurs once in Ugaritic literature: Baʿal has intercourse with a cow who then conceives and gives birth: *CAT* 1.5 V:22 *w[ṯh]rn wtldn mṯ* "and [she concei]ves and bears a boy."[39]

The feminine forms occur repeatedly with reference to the two noble women of Ugaritic lore: *mṯt ḥry* "Lady Ḥurray" in the Epic of Kirta (*CAT* 1.14 III:39 and parallels) and *mṯt dnty* "Lady Danatay" in the Epic of Aqhat (*CAT* 1.17 V:16 and parallels).[40]

Also related, most likely, is Akkadian *māšu* "twin" (also the constellation "Gemini").[41]

The Semitic noun *mṯ*, accordingly, is a kinship term, with attention to the special member of the family, including: special child (twin, Baʿal's offspring) and honored lady (Ḥurray, Danatay). In the Hebrew tradition, מֹשֶׁה would be rather fitting: the special child born to his parents, adopted and raised by the Egyptian princess, and yet nursed by his mother still.

In theory, and even most likely, the Semitic lexeme could be cognate with Egyptian *ms*,[42] but as such the two vocables descend from Afroasiatic parentage and therefore are less relevant to the present discussion.

Of the two options, we incline towards the latter, although we are not dogmatic on the issue.

THE TWO ALLEGED AKKADIAN LOANWORDS

Schipper contends that two vocables in Exodus 1:11 derive from Akkadian, specifically Assyrian, and more specifically, Neo-Assyrian:[43] a) מַס "corvée" (in the phrase שָׂרֵי מִסִּים "officers of the corvée," i.e., "taskmasters"), purportedly from Akkadian *massu*; and b) מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses" (in the phrase עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת "storage cities") presumably from Akkadian *maškantu/maškanu*.[44] As a historical context for the use of these two words in Exodus 1, Schipper looks to the Assyrian domination of Canaan during the 7th century BCE, along with the subsequent penetration of the Egyptian Twenty-sixth Dynasty into the region. Frankly, we do not quite understand the entire line of argumentation, but that point aside, once again, Schipper omits several very important linguistic data.

Regarding the first word: note that *massu* occurs already both in the Alalakh tablets as LÚ.MEŠ *ma-si* "corvée men," and in EA 365 (lines 14, 23, 25), sent by Biridiya, ruler of Megiddo, in the expression LÚ.MEŠ *ma-as-sà*ᴹᴱˢ "corvée men."[45] It is a clear West Semitic term, especially since it occurs nowhere else in cuneiform documents.[46]

There is nothing, accordingly, to support Schipper's succinct declaration: "The Hebrew word מַס derives from Akkadian *massu*."[47] Note, moreover, the total absence of this lexeme from the standard work by Paul Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*.[48] In fact, one wonders on what grounds Schipper can make such a pronouncement.

In theory, Schipper is on slightly firmer ground when positing מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses" (in the phrase עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת "storage cities") as a loanword from from Akkadian *maškantu/maškanu*[49]—but once again his treatment ignores a major piece of evidence. In a recent article,[50] Krzysztof Baranowski observed that the plural form *maškanātu* occurs in EA 306.31, in a letter sent by Šubandu, ruler of a city somewhere in southern Canaan (probably Ashkelon). The relevant phrase (lines 30–31) reads as

follows: URU.DIDLI.KI.MEŠ-*ka ù* KISLAḪ \ *ma-aš-ka-n*[*a-ti*]*-ka* "your cities and your storehouses." The Sumerogram that precedes the key word, that is, KISLAḪ, means "threshing floor" (in line with one of the key meanings of the Akkadian word), so that the reference is to a place where grain was threshed and stored, hence the rendering "storehouses" is apt.[51]

To be sure, Amarna Akkadian *maškanātu* and Biblical Hebrew מִסְכְּנוֹת do not align perfectly, since the former includes /š/, while the latter evinces /s/.[52] But to focus on the Neo-Assyrian period, when in fact the term was used by a scribe in southern Canaan during the 14th century BCE, to our mind introduces an unwarranted bias in favor of 1st-millennium sources. We recognize, of course, that Baranowski's article appeared after Schipper's, but the evidence from EA 306 has been available for more than a century.

Notwithstanding the above, in theory the Hebrew form מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages" still could derive from the Assyrian dialectal version of the posited Akkadian word, except to note that the desired etymon does not occur in Middle Assyrian or Neo-Assyrian texts. Mankowski noted this difficulty,[53] though in the end concluded as follows: "In spite of the shaky nature of the positive evidence, the loan-hypothesis is still the least unsatisfactory explanation for this word."[54] Hardly a sterling endorsement for the borrowing route that Schipper would like to postulate; and in any case, to repeat, the word was used by at least one Canaanite scribe already in the 14th century BCE.

In addition, there is another possible explanation to the phrase מִסְכְּנוֹת, not necessarily mutually exclusive with the one just presented. As indicated, we accede to the notion of "storage cities" *vel sim.* as the most likely meaning of the term (as opposed to, for example, "fortified cities," based on LXX). Such cities, whatever their specific function may have been, would have required a bureaucratic structure to administer them.

We propose, therefore, that מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses" also be connected to the Ugaritic-Hebrew word *skn*/סֹכֵן "prefect, governor, manager, administrator." The nominal form with prefixed *m-* refers to the place where the actions subsumed under the root *s-k-n* transpire. Naturally, this represents a well-known *Nominalbildung* throughout Hebrew and Semitic more broadly (two examples will suffice: מִדְבָּר "steppe, wilderness" is the place where *d-b-r* "drive flocks" occurs; מִזְבֵּחַ "altar" is the

place where *z-b-ḥ* "sacrifice" occurs).[55] It is true that Hebrew סֹכֵן with the connotation "prefect, governor" is limited to Isaiah 22:15,[56] but the Ugaritic cognate *skn* is exceedingly common, well attested, especially in the administrative texts.[57] Note, moreover, *CAT* 4.609:10–11 *skn qrt* "prefect/manager of the city" (2x). It is but a small step to assume that said individual, or individuals, would supervise the activities conducted in עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת "storage cities," although perhaps more broadly "administrative centers."

Of the two words posited by Schipper as Akkadian loanwords, the first one, מַס "corvée," is clearly a West Semitic word, while the second one, מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses," appears in similar fashion in EA 306.31 and/or is patient of a good West Semitic derivation as well.

Schipper ends this section of his article as follows: "such a theory for the possible historical background of Ex 1:11 [i.e., the 7th century BCE] cannot be more than a hypothesis." We agree, although with both of his key data points removed from the equation, to our mind, the proposal converts from the hypothetical to the purely imagined.

LITERARY UNITY OF EXODUS 1–2
The debate between the source-critical division of Exodus 1 and the unified literary approach is only of tangential interest to our topic, but since Schipper delved into the matter, we take the opportunity to offer some comments on this subject as well.

Schipper writes,

> Although there is currently no consensus on the classification of these different literary components in Ex 1, at least one insight is clear: Ex 1 can be divided into three layers—a priestly source, non-priestly passages, and post-priestly additions. Regardless of which of these literary layers Ex 1:11 should be connected to, the literary evidence itself leads to two insights: because of the plural verb in v. 11a (וַיָּשִׂימוּ), v. 11 (1) is disconnected from v. 10 and instead (2) forms a unit with v. 12. Both v. 11 and v. 12, can be seen as doublets to the priestly verses 13–14. Therefore, some scholars argue that vv. 11–12 should be taken as a post-priestly addition, whereas others plea for a non-priestly source. In a detailed analysis of Ex 1, Jan Christian Gertz has argued convin-

cingly that Ex 1:11–12 was most likely an original part of the introduction to the non-priestly narrative of the exodus.[58]

It truly is remarkable that source critics are unable to agree on the division of the text and the assignment of the verses to whatever source(s). As another indication thereof, note that Richard Friedman assigns vv. 8–12 to the E source,[59] while Joel Baden attributes them to the J source.[60] While these points by themselves do not constitute sufficient cause to dismiss the entire J-E-P enterprise (or other source-critical approaches), they nevertheless raise an eyebrow and suggest that an altogether different approach is worthy of consideration.

In this particular instance, we begin by questioning Schipper's highlighting of the verb וַיָּשִׂימוּ "and they placed" at the start of v. 11. We truly do not understand what the issue is here. Throughout this section, including in the preceding v. 10, all of v. 11, and the succeeding vv. 12–14, Egypt (or the Egyptians) is grammatically plural, while Israel (or the Israelites) is grammatically singular:

v. 10 וְנוֹסַף גַּם־הוּא עַל־שֹׂנְאֵינוּ וְנִלְחַם־בָּנוּ וְעָלָה מִן־הָאָרֶץ:
"and he too will be added to *our* enemies, and he will fight against *us*, and he will go-up from the land"

v. 11 וַיָּשִׂימוּ עָלָיו שָׂרֵי מִסִּים לְמַעַן עַנֹּתוֹ בְּסִבְלֹתָם
"and *they* placed upon him officers of the corvée, in order to oppress him with *their* levies"[61]

1:12 וְכַאֲשֶׁר יְעַנּוּ אֹתוֹ כֵּן יִרְבֶּה וְכֵן יִפְרֹץ וַיָּקֻצוּ מִפְּנֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:
"and as *they* oppressed him, so did he multiply and so did he spread-out, and *they* loathed the children of Israel"

1:13 וַיַּעֲבִדוּ מִצְרַיִם אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָרֶךְ:
"and the Egyptians [*they*] forced-labor on the children of Israel with harshness"

1:14 וַיְמָרְרוּ אֶת־חַיֵּיהֶם בַּעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה
"and *they* made-bitter their lives with hard labor"

If there is something distinctive about the plural verb וַיָּשִׂימוּ "and they placed" at the start of v. 11, as signaled by Schipper, we confess to an inability to apprehend the matter.

More generally, the catalyst for the source-critical division imposed by adherents of the theory onto the text of Exodus 1–2 derives largely from perceived doublets and inconsistencies, such as different notices about the Israelite population increase and different notices about the imposition of forced labor.[62] At the same time, though, scholars with a more literary bent have demonstrated that a unified holistic reading of Exodus 1–2 is not only demonstrable but also preferable.[63] Robert Alter has written as follows most eloquently, not about Exodus 1–2 *per se*, but about biblical literature generally, "As an attentive reader of other works of narrative literature, I have kept I mind that there are many kinds of ambiguity and contradiction, and abundant varieties of repetition, that are entirely purposeful, and that are essential features of the distinctive vehicle of the literary experience."[64]

In the case of Exodus 1–2, two specific points toward the literary unity of the narrative may be observed. The more major issue is the presence of the *Leitwort* בַּת "daughter" (plural בָּנוֹת "daughters"), which occurs 11x in the opening chapters of Exodus: 1:16, 22; 2:1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 20, 21. Additional support is provided by בָּתִּים "houses" in 1:21 and תֵּבַת "basket of" in 2:3, used to echo the *Leitwort*. The repeated use of the *Leitwort* in these chapters serves to unite discrete scenes (Pharaoh's decree, role of the midwives, birth of Moses, life in Midian, etc.) into a single engaging narrative. By assigning certain verses to "J" and certain verses to "E," however, source critics denude the text of this important device and thereby fail to appreciate the literary artistry inherent in the employment of this technique.

In addition, through such misguided analysis, much more is lost. The reader of the narrative is supposed to apprehend the irony, namely: Pharaoh decreed that every "daughter" may live (1:16, 22), but then the "daughters" (the daughter of Levi [i.e., Moses's mother], the daughter of Pharaoh, and the daughters of Reuel)—in addition to other females (the royal handmaid and Moses's sister)—are responsible for ensuring the very life of Moses.[65] The story of Exodus 1–14 is the "birth of a nation" (note the expression in Exodus 1:9 עַם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "the people of the children of Israel" [ironically in the mouth of Pharaoh]), with Exodus 1–2 serving as the initial act. Since women are the birth-givers of the world, they therefore play such a prominent role at the outset of the narrative.[66] By placing this bit of a text into one source and that bit of a text into another source, per the source-critical approach, this major theme

evaporates.

The second issue which we raise here is more minor, but it bears discussion nonetheless. The related nouns חֹמֶר "mortar" (Genesis 11:3; Exodus 1:14) and חֵמָר "bitumen" (Genesis 11:3; 14:10; Exodus 2:3), along with the verb ח-מ-ר "caulk" (Exodus 2:3), appear rarely in Biblical Hebrew prose: the verses indicated represent the only attestations within the narrative prose corpus. We call attention to the former noun in Exodus 1:14 and the latter noun and the verb in Exodus 2:3: together the three words create a lexical cluster which further serves to unite the individual scenes.[67] Naturally, once again, the assignment of these verses to different sources negates our analysis, for Exodus 1:14 typically is assigned to "P," while Exodus 2:3 typically is assigned to either "J" or "E."[68]

In addition, the two nouns bring the reader back to the early chapters of Genesis: in this case, the Tower of Babel story (see especially Genesis 11:3). This is not a stand-alone phenomenon, but rather part of a deliberate plan, with Exodus 1–2 evoking Genesis 1–11 with a series of explicit lexical linkages: the expressions in Exodus 1:7; the phrase כִּי־טוֹב in Exodus 2:2; the noun תֵּבָה in Exodus 2:3, 5; etc.[69]

In sum, Exodus 1–2 constitutes a well-integrated unified narrative, not only unto itself, but also with long-range connections to Genesis 1–11. Moreover, once again there is a theological message to be realized: the two most important events in the history of the world were the creation of the world (Genesis 1–11) and the creation of the people of Israel (Exodus 1–2).

The issues raised in this section of our article have taken us off the course of its prime objective, but they are important, both to establish the essential unity of Exodus 1–2 and to set the stage for what follows. With such in mind, accordingly, we turn now to the linguistic dating of these two chapters. As we shall see, the linguistic profile of the Biblical Hebrew prose employed by the author bespeaks an early dating, and not the late 7th century BCE proposed by Schipper (for the single verse of Exodus 1:11, that is) and, of course, even later datings proposed by other scholars.

LINGUISTIC DATING OF EXODUS 1–2

Schipper contends that Exodus 1 is to be dated to the late monarchic period. First, he writes as follows: "Ex 1 can be divided into three layers—a priestly source, non-priestly passages, and post-priestly addition."[70]

He then adds that "the 'non-priestly' exodus narrative can be dated to the late pre-exilic period (late 7th or early 6th century BCE)"[71]—although nowhere does he justify this statement. Finally, as indicated above, Schipper seeks a historical context for the narrative within the geopolitical sphere of the period just mentioned, which he finds in the Assyrian retreat from its western domains and the concomitant increased imperial activity under Necho II (r. 610–595 BCE). Said activities include the building of the canal in the Wadi Tumilat (even if never completed), the incursion into Canaan (2 Kings 23:29; 2 Chronicles 35:22), and the pharaoh's involvement in Judahite political and economic affairs (2 Kings 23:33–35).

If Exodus 1 were written during this time period, however, we would expect the Hebrew prose to reflect the more intricate style identified by Frank Polak in his decades-long research project—but it does not. In fact, the linguistic-stylistic profile of Exodus 1 demonstrates that it is among the *earliest* biblical texts to be written.

Above we demonstrated that Exodus 1–2 should be considered a literary unit, and thus we extend our analysis here to include both chapters. We do so: a) to expand the database, since any relatively small chunk of text (such as a single chapter or portion thereof) could in theory be linguistically anomalous; and b) because, to repeat, Exodus 1 does not stand by itself but rather is intimately connected to Exodus 2 (see above, with especial attention to the *Leitwort* בַּת "daughter").

The more intricate style of late-pre-exilic and exilic-period Hebrew prose is seen in compositions such as 2 Kings 22–25 and the Jeremiah Vita, as summarized and visualized in TABLE 1.[72]

In TABLE 2 are the data for Exodus 1, Exodus 2, and then Exodus 1–2 together, mapped against the much larger totals for the texts comprising the earlier classical stratum, which includes large portions of Genesis, Exodus, Judges, and Samuel (indicated by "CLASSICAL STRATUM" in TABLE 2):[73]

Clearly, Exodus 1–2 is written at an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew language and its literary prose. The key figure is the low .620 Noun-Verb (NV) ratio for Exodus 1–2, in contrast to the high .721 NV ratio aggregated for the two 6th-century BCE units (see above). The second key figure is the staggering low .084 Nominal-Finite (NF) ratio for Exodus 1–2 vs. the high .250 aggregated for the two 6th-century BCE units (again, see above). As

TABLE 1: Intricate style.

6TH-CENTURY BCE UNITS	NOUNS	VERBS	NV RATIO	FINITE	NOMINAL	NF RATIO
2 Kings 22–25	1119	366	.736	281	81	.224
Jeremiah Vita	2518	1044	.707	773	271	.260
TOTAL	3637	1410	.721	1054	352	.250

TABLE 2: NV and NF ratios of Exodus 1–2

CLASSICAL UNITS	NOUNS	VERBS	NV RATIO	FINITE	NOMINAL	NF RATIO
Exodus 1	123	57	.683	54	3	.053
Exodus 2	148	109	.576	98	11	.101
Exodus 1–2	271	166	.620	152	14	.084
CLASSICAL STRATUM	15,523	9631	.612	7974	1521	.154

Polak has demonstrated clearly, the lower the NV and NF ratios, the earlier the biblical text, while the higher the NV and NF ratios, the later the biblical text.

Polak has built on his earlier research into NV and NF ratios to include other stylistic-syntactic features into the mix. Since he devoted an entire article to an analysis of the Exodus narratives, including Exodus 1–2,[74] we are able to readily present the relevant data extracted therefrom in TABLE 3.

Polak's data reveal that chapter 2 is written in what he calls the *lean, brisk, voiced style* (VoLB-1), while chapter 1 is written in the slightly more developed style, although still within the general VoLB classification (hence VoLB-2). To be sure, none of Exodus 1–2 is written in the later *intricate, elaborate style* (IES). Moreover, when viewed as a single large chunk of narrative, the totals for Exodus 1–2 (see the bottom row in TABLE 3) reveal a narrative written in VoLB-1 style overall.

If the narrative were written at a later date, as argued by Schipper (and many others), one would expect the text to reveal the IES style, with a greater number of explicit lexicalized components per clause, with more hypotaxis generally, and more complex hypotaxis specifically—but such a literary-stylistic-linguistic profile is wanting in Exodus 1–2.

And while the approach developed by Polak allows only for relative chronology and not absolute dating, a setting in the early monarchic period (10th century BCE) or possibly even the pre-monarchic period (11th century BCE) is perfectly reasonable for Exodus 1–2.[75] To be sure, the burden of proof remains with anyone who may wish to date this material to the later biblical period, whether it be ca. 600 BCE, the exilic period, or the Persian period. We know what texts composed during this span of time look like, and Exodus 1–2 (or any part thereof) is not one of them.

Schipper is not alone in ignoring the work of

TABLE 3: Clause analysis of Exodus 1–2. ELC = explicit lexicalized constituent.

PERICOPE	TYPE	TOTAL # CLAUSES	0–1 ELC% (# CLAUSES)	3+ ELC% (# CLAUSES)	ALL HYPOTAXIS % (# CLAUSES)	COMPLEX HYPOTAXIS % (# CLAUSES)
1:1–22	VoLB-2	67	41.8% (28)	6.0% (4)	29.9% (20)	11.9% (8)
2:1–10	VoLB-1	50	52.0% (26)	2.0% (1)	14.0% (7)	4.0% (2)
2:11–25	VoLB-1	68	61.8% (42)	2.0% (1)	11.8% (8)	0.0% (1)
TOTAL	–	185	51.9% (96)	3.2% (6)	18.9% (35)	5.4% (10)

Table 4: Selected verbs in Exodus 1–2.

Semantic Field	Classical Verb	Later Verb	Control Verb
conveyance	*l-q-ḥ* 4x	*hby* ʾ 1x	*n-ś-* ʾ 0x
motion	*h-l-k* 6x	*b-w-* ʾ 6x	*y-ṣ-* ʾ 3x
perception	*r-* ʾ*-h* 8x	*š-m-* ʿ 2x	*y-d-* ʿ 4x

Table 5: Selected verbs in 2 Kings 22–25.

Semantic Field	Classical Verb	Later Verb	Control Verb
conveyance	*l-q-ḥ* 10x	*hby* ʾ 6x	*n-ś-* ʾ 3x
motion	*h-l-k* 8x	*b-w-* ʾ 13x	*y-ṣ-* ʾ 2x
perception	*r-* ʾ*-h* 6x	*š-m-* ʿ 6x	*y-d-* ʿ 0x

Table 6: Selected verbs in Jeremiah Vita.

Semantic Field	Classical Verb	Later Verb	Control Verb
conveyance	*l-q-ḥ* 28x	*hby* ʾ 12x	*n-ś-* ʾ 0x
motion	*h-l-k* 26x	*b-w-* ʾ 45x	*y-ṣ-* ʾ 14x
perception	*r-* ʾ*-h* 9x	*š-m-* ʿ 25x	*y-d-* ʿ 14x

Frank Polak specifically or the major strides accomplished in the diachronic study of ancient Hebrew during the last several decades more generally. To be honest, we do not understand why scholars proceed with their studies without recourse to this material—especially since the linguistic evidence constitutes *the most objective criterion* for the dating of any text. This is true not only for Hebrew, but for virtually every language with a literary tradition.[76]

Let us turn to another data collection which informs our discussion. As Polak also has shown, the various strata of Biblical Hebrew prose also display different lexical choices for key verbs.[77] The data for the relevant verbs in Exodus 1–2 appear in Table 4.

Obviously, in only two chapters one cannot expect to find the full data sets that one would optimally desire in order to produce conclusive results. Nevertheless, as the chart reveals, a clear pattern emerges. In Exodus 1–2, ל-ק-ח *l-q-ḥ* "take" dominates over הביא "bring" (that is, Hiphʿil of ב-ו-א *b-w-* ʾ), with a 4:1 ratio; ר-א-ה *r-* ʾ*-h* "see" dominates over שׁ-מ-ע *š-m-* ʿ "hear," again with a 4:1 ratio; and ה-ל-ך *h-l-k* "go" and ב-ו-א *b-w-* ʾ "come" appear in equal measure, 6x each. This is precisely what one sees in the Classical Stratum analyzed by Polak.

In the later strata, including in the two corpora mentioned above, that is, 2 Kings 22–25 and the Jeremiah Vita, the verbs listed in the "Classical Verb" column decrease in proportional use, while the verbs listed in the "Later Verb" column increase in proportional use, as Tables 5 and 6 indicate. (These trends become more sweeping and more complete in the Persian-period literature.)

If Exodus 1, or Exodus 1–2, were written in the late monarchic period, c. 600 BCE, one would expect the verb choices to more closely emulate the distributions in 2 Kings 22–25 and the Jeremiah Vita. Such is clearly not the case, though.

Yet another linguistic issue may be raised here. One of the grammatical features that distinguishes the classical stratum of Biblical Hebrew prose from the later stratum is the former's almost uniform use of *wayyiqtol* to express the narrative past at the head of the clause versus the latter's increased use of *wǝqatal* for the same tense in the same situation.[78]

In the two corpora dated to the early 6th century BCE on which we continue to focus, one notes the use of *wǝ-qatal* in the following instances:

> 2 Kings 23:4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15
> 2 Kings 24:14
> 2 Kings 25:29 (2x)
> Jeremiah 37:11, 15 (2x)
> Jeremiah 38:28
> Jeremiah 40:3

Four examples will suffice:

> 2 Kings 23:14 וַשַׁבֵּר אֶת־הַמַּצֵּבֹת
> "and he smashed the *maṣṣebot*"
> 2 Kings 24:14 וְהִגְלָה אֶת־כָּל־יְרוּשָׁלַ͏ִם
> "and he exiled all Jerusalem"
> Jeremiah 37:15 (2x) וְהִכּוּ אֹתוֹ וְנָתְנוּ אוֹתוֹ בֵּית הָאֵסוּר
> "and they beat him, and they put him in
> prison"

When we look at Exodus 1–2, we find zero instances of this usage, and for good reason: these chapters do not date from the time period of 2 Kings 22–25 and the Jeremiah Vita, that is, late 7th and early 6th centuries BCE, but rather from a much earlier period in the development of ancient Hebrew narrative prose.

In fact, in general one finds in Exodus 1–2 *zero* features of the type identified within Transitional Biblical Hebrew texts (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc.) and Late Biblical Hebrew texts (Ezra-Nehemiah, Chronicles, etc.).[79] To the contrary, when a linguistic contrast may be established, one finds classical features in the opening two chapters of Exodus, including the following:

> 1. adverbial-directional *he* (2x)
>   Exodus 1:1 מִצְרָיְמָה "to Egypt"
>   Exodus 1:22 הַיְאֹרָה "into the Nile"
> 2. paragogic *nun*
>   Exodus 1:22 תְּחַיּוּן "you shall let live"
> 3. עַל + ח-מ-ל
>   "have compassion upon"
>   Exodus 2:6 וַתַּחְמֹל עָלָיו "and she had
>   compassion upon him"

In later Hebrew, the first two features become exceedingly rare and/or disappear altogether (e.g., there are 7 cases of paragogic *nun* out of a potential 372 cases in Jeremiah, and 0 instances of paragogic *nun* out of a potential 46 cases in Ezra-Nehemiah).[80] The third feature continues in the later stages in the language, but one also begins to find אֶל + ח-מ-ל "have compassion upon."[81]

In sum, no matter which diagnostic tool one uses for the linguistic analysis of Exodus 1–2, the conclusion is clear: these two chapters are written in an earlier stratum of Biblical Hebrew prose, and not a later one.

To repeat: we simply do not understand why scholars proceed with their studies without recourse

to material relevant to the diachronic development of ancient Hebrew—especially since the linguistic evidence constitutes *the most objective criterion* for the dating of any text. If Schipper and others wish to date Exodus 1 to the later period, we would expect some discussion along these lines. No Egyptologist would declaim that a text written in Middle Egyptian or even Ramesside Late Egyptian should be dated to the Saite period—without a thorough discussion of the linguistic evidence and without convincing justifications for the late dating.[82] We should expect the parallel argumentation in the field of biblical studies. Ignoring the linguistic evidence may allow the scholar to propose this or that date for a particular biblical text, but in the end such an approach is not very helpful.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The mention of the construction of Pithom and Rameses in Exodus 1:11 fits perfectly into the historical context of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (13th and 12th centuries BCE). See in detail Part I of our co-authored article.

2. There is absolutely no objection to understanding רַעַמְסֵס as a 13th–12th century BCE transcription of *rˁ-ms-sw* "Rameses." Evidence from both Ugarit and Amarna demonstrates that Egyptian /s/ was transcribed by Semitic scribes with either /s/ or /š/.

3. The first key word, מַס "corvée," is not a borrowing from Neo-Assyrian (or any other Akkadian dialect): it is a pure West Semitic word, attested already (and only) at Alalakh and Amarna.

4. The second key word, מִסְכְּנוֹת "storages, storehouses," appears in similar fashion in EA 306.31 and/or is patient of a good West Semitic derivation (cf. especially Ugaritic *skn*). The usage, accordingly, is known already in Late Bronze Age sources from the land of Canaan; once again, there is no need to look to Neo-Assyrian (where, in any case, the word is not attested).

5. The larger account of Exodus 1—and indeed the still larger account of Exodus 1–2—should not be divided into separate sources, but rather

should be read in a holistic manner as a single unified narrative.

6. The two chapters are dated on linguistic grounds to the earliest stratum of Biblical Hebrew narrative prose literature.

ABBREVIATIONS

CAD   Erica Reiner, et al. (eds.). 1956–2011. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, 21 vols. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

CAT   Manfried Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2013. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places*, 3rd ed. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 360/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

EA   El-Amarna Letters (see Rainey 2015).

DULAT   Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, 2 vols., translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.

EHLL   Geoffrey Khan (ed.). 2013. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, 4 vols. Leiden: Brill.

HALOT   M. E. J. Richardson (ed.). 2001. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

PRU IV   Jean Nougayrol. 1956. *Textes accadiens des archives sud* = Claude F.-A. Schaeffer (ed.), *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit IV*. Mission de Ras Shamra 9. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, James S. 1974. "The Literary Context of the Moses Birth Story (Exodus 1–2)." In Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, et al. (eds.), *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, 74–119. Nashville: Abingdon.

Aḥituv, Shmuel. 1999. "Nodedim ba-Negev bi-Mqorot Miṣrayim" (English title: "Nomads in the Desert in Egyptian Sources"). In Robert Chazan, et al. (eds.), *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, 21*–27*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Albright, William F. 1943. "An Archaic Hebrew Proverb in an Amarna Letter from Central Palestine." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 89: 29–32.

Allen, James P. 2013. *The Ancient Egyptian Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alter, Robert. 2019. *The Hebrew Bible*. 3 vols. New York: W. W. Norton.

Baden, Joel S. 2012. "From Joseph to Moses: The Narratives of Exodus 1–2." *Vetus Testamentum* 62: 133–158.

Baranowski, Krzysztof J. 2017. "The Biblical Hebrew 'Store Cities' and an Amarna Gloss." *Vetus Testamentum* 67: 519–527.

Breyer, Francis. 2019. *Ägyptische Namen und Wörter im Alten Testament*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 93. Münster: Zaphon.

Carr, David M. 2006. "What is Required to Identify Pre-Priestly Narrative Connections between Genesis and Exodus? Some General Reflections and Specific Cases." In Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid (eds.), *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, 159–180. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Cassuto, Umberto. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes.

Cochavi-Rainey, Zipora. 2013. "Amarna Canaanite and Hebrew." *EHLL* 1: 96–98.

Fox, Everett. 1995. *The Five Books of Moses*. New York: Schocken.

Friedman, Richard E. 2003. *The Bible with Sources Revealed.* San Francisco: Harper.

Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. 2002. *Reading the Women of the Bible*. New York: Schocken.

Giveon, Raphael. 1971. *Les Bédouins Shosou des Documents Égyptiens*. Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui 18. Leiden: Brill.

Greenstein, Edward L. 1997. "Kirta." In Simon B. Parker (ed.), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 9–48. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings of the Ancient World 9. n. pl.: Scholars Press.

Harrell, James E., James K. Hoffmeier, and Kenton F. Williams. 2017. "Hebrew Gemstones in the Old Testament: A Lexical, Geological, and Archaeological Analysis." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 27: 1–52.

Hays, Christopher B. 2010. "Re-Excavating Shebna's Tomb: A New Reading of Isa 22,15–19 in its Ancient Near Eastern Context." *Zeitschrift für die*

alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 122: 558–575.

Hess, Richard S. 1993. *Amarna Personal Names*. American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series 9. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Hoch, James E. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hoffmeier, James K., and Gary A. Rendsburg. 2022. "Pithom and Rameses (Exodus 1:11): Historical, Archaeological, and Linguistic Issues (Part I)." *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 33: 1–19.

Hornkohl, Aaron D. 2014. *Ancient Hebrew Periodization and the Language of the Book of Jeremiah*. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 74. Leiden: Brill.

Hurvitz, Avi. 2014. *A Concise Lexicon of Late Biblical Hebrew*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 160. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2017. *From Genesis to Chronicles: Chapters in the Linguistic History of Biblical Hebrew* (Hebrew). Jerusalem: Bialik.

Isbell, Charles D. 1982. "Exodus 1–2 in the Context of Exodus 1–14: Story Lines and Key Words." In David J. A. Clines, et al. (eds.), *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, 37–59. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Izreʾel, Shlomo. 1997. *The Amarna Scholarly Tablets*. Cuneiform Monographs 9. Groningen: Styx.

Joosten, Jan. 2012. *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Simor.

Kang, Yoonjung. 2011. "Loanword phonology." In Marc van Oostendorp, et al. (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Phonology*, 2258–2282. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kaufman, Stephen A. 1974. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Assyriological Studies 19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1952. "Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 73: 145–155.

Leslau, Wolf. 1957a. "Arabic Loanwords in Amharic." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19: 221–244.

———. 1957b. "The Phonetic Treatment of the Arabic Loanwords in Ethiopic." *Word* 13: 100–123.

Mandell, Alice. 2015. "Glossary." In Anson F. Rainey, *The El-Amarna Correspondence*, William Schniedewind and Zipora Cochavi-Rainey

(eds.), vol. 1, 1269–1313. Handbuch der Orientalistik 110. Leiden: Brill.

Mankowski, Paul. 2013. "Akkadian Loanwords." *EHLL* 1: 82–84.

———. 2000. *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*. Harvard Semitic Studies 47. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Miller-Naudé, Cynthia L. and Ziony Zevit, (eds.). 2012. *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Muchiki, Yoshiyuki. 1999. *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 173. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Noonan, Benjamin J. 2019. *Non-Semitic Loanwords in the Hebrew Bible*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 14. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns.

Parker, Simon B. 1997. "Aqhat." In Simon B. Parker (ed.), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 49–80. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings of the Ancient World 9. n. pl.: Scholars Press.

Polak, Frank. 1997–1998 (5758). "Temurot u-Tqufot bi-Lšon ha-Sipporet ba-Miqraʾ." *Bet Miqraʾ* 43: 30–52, 142–160.

———. 1998. "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 26: 59–105.

———. 2016. "Story Telling and Redaction: Varieties of Language Usage in the Exodus Narrative." In Jan C. Gertz, et al. (eds.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, 443–475. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

———. 2018. "Hidden Protest, Implied Theodicy and Secret Promise in the Opening of the Book of Exodus." In Beate Ego, et al. (eds.), *Theodicy and Protest: Jewish and Christian Perspectives*, 29–44. Studien zu Kirche und Israel, Neue Folge 13. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Quack, Joachim Friedrich. 2000. "Review of Yoshiyuki Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*." *Review of Biblical Literature*. < bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp ?TitleId=408 >, accessed 24 April 2020.

Rainey, Anson F. 1970. "Compulsory Labour Gangs in Ancient Israel." *Israel Exploration Journal* 20: 191–202.

———. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence*, William

Schniedewind and Zipora Cochavi-Rainey (eds.). 2 vols. Handbuch der Orientalistik 110. Leiden: Brill.

Ranke, Hermann. 1935/1952/1976. *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen*, 3 vols. Glückstadt: J. J. Augustin.

Redford, Donald B. 1963. "Exodus i 11." *Vetus Testamentum* 13: 401–418.

———. 2009. "The Land of Rameses." In Peter J. Brand and Louise Cooper (eds.), *Causing His Name to Live: Studies in Egyptian Epigraphy and History in Memory of William J. Murnane*, 175–182. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 37. Leiden: Brill.

Rendsburg, Gary A. 1996. "Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116: 508–511.

———. 2016. "The Literary Unity of the Exodus Narrative." In James K. Hoffmeier, Alan Millard, and Gary A. Rendsburg (eds.), *"Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?" Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives*, 113–132. Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement 13. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

———. 2019. *How the Bible Is Written*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

———. 2020. "Israelite Origins." In Richard E. Averbeck and K. Lawson Younger (eds.), *"An Excellent Fortress for His Armies, A Refuge for the People": Egyptological, Archaeological, and Biblical Studies in Honor of James K. Hoffmeier*, 327–339. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns.

Sagrillo, Tony L. 2015. "Shoshenq I and Biblical Šîšaq: A Philological Defense of Their Traditional Equation." In Peter James and Peter G. van der Veen (eds.), *Solomon and Shishak: Current Perspectives from Archaeology, Epigraphy, History and Chronology*, 61–81. British Archaeological Reports International Series 2732. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Schipper, Bernd. 2015. "Raamses, Pithom, and the Exodus: A Critical Evaluation of Ex 1:11." *Vetus Testamentum* 65: 265–288.

Schneider, Thomas. 2001. "Review Essay of Yoshiyuki Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 92: 155–165.

Sivan, Daniel. 1984. *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th–13th C.B.C. from Canaan and Syria*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 214. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker.

Smith, Mark S. 1997. "The Baal Cycle." In Simon B. Parker (ed.), *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 81–180. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings of the Ancient World 9. n. pl.: Scholars Press.

Smith, Sidney, and C. J. Gadd. 1925. "A Cuneiform Vocabulary of Egyptian Words." *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 11: 230–240.

Weinstein, James M. 1981. "The Egyptian Empire in Palestine: A Reassessment." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 241: 1–28.

———. 2012. "Egypt and the Levant in the Reign of Ramesses III." In Eric H. Cline and David O'Connor (eds.), *Ramesses III: The Life and Times of Egypt's Last Hero*, 164–171. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Young, Ian. Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd. 2008. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 2 vols. London: Equinox.

NOTES

[1] Hoffmeier and Rendsburg 2022. Once again, the authors take the opportunity to thank Charles Loder (M.A. Rutgers University) for his assistance in the preparation of our article.

[2] Schipper 2015, 274.

[3] Hoch 1994.

[4] Rendsburg 1996.

[5] This convention is followed also by Hoch 1994 (see conveniently the charts on pp. 433, 436), and by other authors with standard works in this research area: Muchiki 1999 (see especially the summary charts on pp. 49, 184, 263, 285, 306); Noonan 2019 (see esp. p. 277); and Breyer 2019.

[6] On the derivation of the name מֹשֶׁה "Moses," see the EXCURSUS.

[7] For more on this mineral, see Harrell et al. 2017, 22–23; Noonan 2019, 143; and Breyer 2019, 124–125.

[8] Schipper 2015, 272–276.

[9] The form appears as רַעְמְסֵס in Exod 1:11 (with *pataḥ-pataḥ* sequence at the start), but to keep matters simple herein, we use the dominant form (4x) רַעְמְסֵס (with *pataḥ-shəwa* sequence at the start) throughout.

[10] Redford 1963, 411–412. See also Redford 2009. For similar comments (albeit in brief), see Breyer 2019, 15.

11 After this section of the article was written, we were happy to learn that much of what we state herein was expressed already by Sagrillo 2015, 63–66. The two treatments (that is, his and ours) overlap to a great extent, although they are not totally duplicative. For example, we provide more details concerning Amarna and Ugaritic material, while Sagrillo included some valuable Hittite evidence, to which we did not turn our attention.

12 Muchiki 1999. We are well aware of several critical reviews of this book, and thus we have checked and double-checked every reference—which naturally we would have done anyway, since our method is always to consult the primary sources. See most importantly Schneider 2001, although see also Quack 2000.

13 Material culled from Muchiki 1999, 276–287 (= ch. 4). We do not include here Eg. *sk.t* "boat"/ Ug. *ṯkt* / Heb. שְׂכִיּוֹת (Isaiah 2:16) (listed on p. 283), with the atypical consonantal correspondence, especially between the Hebrew and Ugaritic forms. Most likely we have here either a *Wanderwort* or an Egyptian word that entered the different Semitic languages through different pathways.

14 Material culled from Muchiki 1999, 289–312 (= ch. 5). We have checked the cuneiform transcriptions against the definitive edition by Rainey 2015 and in a few places have made minor corrections, improvements, etc., with an eye to greater accuracy. We have omitted one item registered by Muchiki, namely, Eg. ¹*nˁr-ms(.w)* "*nˁr*-tree is born" > EA 21.33 *na-aḫ-ra-ma-aš-[š]i* (see p. 293), which we take not to be an Egyptian PN but rather read as three separate lexemes *1 na-aḫ-ra ma-ˁaš¹-ši* "one polished *naḫra*," per the analysis by Rainey 2015, 1.158–159, 2.1354. For an additional lexeme appearing in EA 252.30, not registered by Muchiki, see at the end of this section.

15 See Hess 1993, 30, no. 20. The name also occurs at EA 113.43, although only the first sign is visible.

16 See also Hess 1993, 73–74, no. 69. Hess transcribed the last sign in 49.25 as *ša*, but the correct reading is *sa*, as listed by Rainey and Muchiki. See also Shlomo Izre'el at ORACC:

oracc.museum.upenn.edu/contrib/amarna/corpus.

17 See also Hess 1993, 125, no. 131.

18 See also Hess 1993, 148–149, no. 158.

19 Muchiki 1999, 310.

20 For the *editio princeps*, see Smith and Gadd 1925. For a more recent edition, see Izreʾel 1997, 77–81.

21 Muchiki 1999, 310.

22 Would that we had Egyptian names and loanwords in early Aramaic and Phoenician texts, but all of the available evidence derives from c. 700 BCE. onward (with a great concentration of material during the Persian period), and thus we do not present this material here. See the summary statements in Muchiki 1999, 49, 184.

23 Leslau 1957b, esp. 108. For further details on one of these languages (Amharic), see Leslau 1957a, esp. 224. The extent of the inconsistency may even be seen with single lexemes, for example: Arabic *sūq* "market" > Amharic *suq* and *šuq*, Arabic *sarṭān* "Cancer" > Amharic *särṭan* and *šärṭan*, with the Amharic forms as free variants.

24 Leslau 1957b, 114.

25 Mankowski 2000, 155–157; and more succinctly Mankowski 2013.

26 The same holds, naturally, for Akkadian loanwords in Aramaic, for which see Kaufman 1974, esp. 140–142.

27 Kang 2011, esp. 2275.

28 Schipper 2015, 275.

29 For the record, we note here that Breyer 2019, 99, presents only the bare evidence, without engaging into the issue, though he does provide ample bibliography to earlier studies.

30 See the classic study by Weinstein 1981. Even at a distance of forty years, with new data forthcoming from new excavations, the picture described by Weinstein remains more or less valid. For attention to one particular pharaoh, Weinstein 2012.

31 For further discussion, see Rendsburg 2020.

32 Lambdin 1952, esp. 155; and Muchiki 1999, 257

(although he expresses some qualification about the identification). Not everyone accepts this example, though: see, e.g., Breyer 2019, 151, 164, 193; and Noonan 2019 (where the word appears not at all). Note, however, that the word has no Semitic cognates (the so-called Ugaritic evidence cited in *HALOT*, 2.1608, may be ignored), and therefore a borrowing from Egyptian seems secure.

33 See the survey by Aḥituv 1999. For a more detailed study, see Giveon 1971.

34 We have no evidence of the noun in Hebrew, but the shift from nominal usage to verbal usage has well-known parallels; in English, for example, compare Vandals > "vandalize," Gypsies > "gyp" (with its negative, even racist, overtones), and so on.

35 For the reading and the translation, see Rainey 2015, 1.1024–1025. The interpretation goes back to Albright 1943, 32, n. 27.

36 See the survey by Cochavi-Rainey 2013.

37 There is an enormous bibliography on the subject, mostly well known, and thus we proceed without citing the various studies, especially since this section is an Excursus, and not the main body of our article.

38 Ranke 1935/1952/1976, 3.64–65. The only possible exception would be the New Kingdom name *p₃-ms*, apparently meaning "the one born" = "the child," for which see Ranke 1935/ 1952/1976, 1.105 (no. 11).

39 Smith 1997, 148.

40 For the former, see Greenstein 1997, 17; for the latter, see Parker 1997, 58.

41 CAD 10 [M/1], 401–403.

42 Compare, e.g., Egyptian *snw* "two" = Semitic *ṯn* "two."

43 Schipper 2015, 276–278.

44 Schipper 2015, 278.

45 See Rainey 2015, 1.1242–1243; and Sivan 1984, 245. For extended discussion, see Rainey 1970, 192–194.

46 CAD 10 [M/1], 327. See also Mandell 2015, *apud* Rainey 2015, 1.1305.

47 Schipper 2015, 278.

48 Mankowski 2000.

49 For these two words, along with several related forms, see CAD 10 [M/1], 369–376.

50 Baranowski 2017.

51 See also Rainey 2015, 1.1165.

52 As duly noted and discussed by Baranowski 2017, 526.

53 Mankowski 2000, 99.

54 Mankowski 2000, 100.

55 Technically, the two examples represent different *mišqalim* (nominal patterns), but the informed reader will understand. For succinct treatment, see Lipiński 1997, 217, §29.21.

56 We retain the traditional understanding (and Masoretic pointing) of סֹכֵן in Isaiah 22:15, *pace* Hays 2010, who posited the form *sikkān/sikkōn*, with the meaning "funerary stele" (cf. Ugaritic *skn* "funerary stele").

57 *DULAT*, 2.757–759.

58 Schipper 2015, 276–277 (with footnotes omitted).

59 Friedman 2003, 119.

60 Baden 2012, 151–152.

61 Presumably "their" here refers to Egypt (sc. the Egyptians), which, as indicated, is treated consistently as grammatically plural. In theory, the antecedent could be Israel (sc. the Israelites), although, as indicated, this entity is treated as grammatically singular in this pericope. Hence, the question is: do the סִבְלֹתָם refer to the levies of forced labor imposed by the Egyptians, or are they the burdens to be carried out by the Israelites? Given the dichotomous manner of referencing Egypt as plural and Israel as singular in these verses, the scales are tipped toward the former understanding. Alternatively, the specific form בְּסִבְלֹתָם looks ahead to Exodus 2:11, where "their" refers clearly to the Israelites, and thus it may bear said connotation in Exodus 1:11 as well. On the noun *sēbel, sablum* in Hebrew and other West Semitic sources, see Rainey 1970, 195–197.

62 See, for example, Baden 2012, 134.

63 See Ackerman 1974; and Isbell 1982. Other

relevant works are cited by Baden, 2012, 134–135, n. 1.

[64] Alter 2019, 1.6.

[65] See Polak 2018, 41–42.

[66] See Frymer-Kensky 2002, 24–33, 360–365 = her chapter entitled "Saviors of the Exodus."

[67] For more on these verses, see Rendsburg 2019, 102–103.

[68] Friedman 2003, 119–120, considers Exodus 2:3 to be part of the "J" source; while Baden 2012, considers this verse to be part of the "E" source.

[69] See Rendsburg 2016, 129–130.

[70] Schipper 2015, 276. The footnote to this sentence directs the reader to Carr 2006, 172–175.

[71] Schipper 2015, 277.

[72] Data from Polak 1998 (see especially the summary chart on p. 70).

[73] For these data sets and for others below, we are indebted to Charles Loder (see n. 1) for his invaluable analysis. Data available at github.com/charlesLoder/exodus_1-2.

[74] Polak 2016–with the longer and more detailed

version of the article available at telaviv.acade mia.edu/FrankHPolak.

[75] In general, see Richelle 2016. For the specific literary-political environment during the 10th century BCE, which could have spawned the creation of the ancient Israelite national narrative, see Rendsburg 2019, 443–467 (= ch. 21).

[76] See the collection of essays in Miller-Naudé and Zevit 2012.

[77] Polak 1997–1998 (see conveniently the summary charts on pp. 158–160).

[78] Joosten 2012, 224, 227. For more detailed analysis, see Hornkohl 2014, 287–293.

[79] For the former, see Hornkohl 2014. For the latter, see the many works of Avi Hurvitz, including, most recently, Hurvitz 2014 and Hurvitz 2017.

[80] For adverbial-directional *he*, see Hornkohl 2014, 203–226. For paragogic *nun*, see Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd 2008, 2.123–126.

[81] See Hornkohl 2014, 236, n. 195.

[82] Note the focus on the Twenty-sixth Dynasty in Allen 2013, 3.