

## Joseph's Zaphenath Paaneah—a chronological key

Patrick Clarke

The origin and meaning of the name Zaphenath Paaneah, given to Joseph during his rise from obscurity to national prominence, has proved to be problematical for translators and Bible historians alike. New research reveals the name's unusual archaic Egyptian roots, giving the true meaning of Joseph's Egyptian name. Joseph's three other titles mentioned in Genesis 45 also help to place him in the Early Middle Kingdom Period and consequently point to the likely pharaoh under whom he served.

Genesis chapters 37–50 recount one of the most amazing stories of the ancient world. It has been loved and attacked in equal measure. Detractors claim that nowhere in the archaeological record is there direct mention of Joseph, or monumental evidence referring to him, and that therefore the Genesis account of Joseph is nothing more than a fairy story. In 2011, Moore and Kelle wrote:

“The majority of current scholars believe that the historicity of the Egyptian sojourn, exodus, and wilderness wandering that the Bible remembers cannot be demonstrated by historical methods.”<sup>1</sup>

A decade before Moore and Kelle's claim, de Hoop commented:

“In conclusion, it is the question for [*sic*] evidence, principally falsifiable, that forms historical probability. This evidence is not found in narratives like the Joseph Story.”<sup>2</sup>

Schenke was convinced that the story of Joseph being buried at Shechem was borrowed from a tradition concerning an ancient Canaanite shrine in that area. In his view:

“... *die Tradition von seinem Grab bei Sichen kann also nur als sekundäre Israelitische, nämlich geschichtliche Deutung eines älteren kanaanäischen Heiligtums bzw. heiligen Platzes verstanden werden.*” (Eng. “... the tradition of his grave at Shechem can therefore only be understood as a secondary Israelite, that is to say, historical explanation of an older Canaanite sanctuary or holy place.”)<sup>3</sup>

During the early–mid 20<sup>th</sup> century in particular, some German scholars were advocating form criticism (Ger. *Formgeschichte*) which taught that the Joseph story was nothing more than a *novella*, a short tale with a moral. Two such scholars, Gunkel<sup>4</sup> and Gressman<sup>5</sup>, developed their form criticism arguments so convincingly that they have caused serious problems for generations of Christians who have wanted to believe the literality of Joseph's story, but have been dissuaded from doing so. Once the authority of Genesis is undermined by ideas like form criticism, it helps the slide into acceptance of other ideas (that Noah's Flood was a localized event, and that God used evolution to create the universe and mankind) to become the norm.

Nowadays, most biblical scholars consider the story of Joseph to be nothing more than reworked legends, datable to between the 8<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries BC. In fact most of these scholars claim that the account is of a genre popular in the Persian period of the Exile.<sup>6</sup>

Others, including some well-meaning Christians, have indulged in conjectural ‘name games’ as they attempt to interpret Zaphenath Paaneah, the name given to Joseph by Pharaoh. However, the true meaning of Joseph's Egyptian name can be deduced from the biblical form of it, Zaphenath Paaneah, with important implications for any revised chronology.

A search of the literature reveals a bewildering number of solutions offered to the meaning of the Egyptian name of Joseph, Zaphenath Paaneah (Heb. צפנת פנח *Tsofnath Pa'neach*—pronounced tsof-nath' pah-nā'akh). Below, in table 1, is a representative sampling of various people's interpretations of Zaphenath Paaneah, showing also the varied spelling of the biblical version of the name itself.

Obviously, these interpretations cannot all be correct, if indeed any are.

One very popular idea that Joseph was some kind of ‘revealer of godly secrets’ (*Dje(d)-Pa-Nute(r)-('e)f-ankh*)<sup>17</sup> was first postulated by Steindorff<sup>18</sup> over a century ago. This name-type has been attested by scholarship as occurring between the 11<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> centuries BC but not during the time of Joseph, which in both the conventional and the biblical chronology was considerably earlier. What Steindorff did not know at that time was that his *Ddp3ntrfanḥ* 𓄎𓄏𓄐𓄑𓄒𓄓𓄔𓄕𓄖𓄗𓄘𓄙𓄚𓄛𓄜𓄝𓄞𓄟𓄠𓄡𓄢𓄣𓄤𓄥𓄦𓄧𓄨𓄩𓄪𓄫𓄬𓄭𓄮𓄯𓄰𓄱𓄲𓄳𓄴𓄵𓄶𓄷𓄸𓄹𓄺𓄻𓄼𓄽𓄾𓄿𓀀𓀁𓀂𓀃𓀄𓀅𓀆𓀇𓀈𓀉𓀊𓀋𓀌𓀍𓀎𓀏𓀐𓀑𓀒𓀓𓀔𓀕𓀖𓀗𓀘𓀙𓀚𓀛𓀜𓀝𓀞𓀟𓀠𓀡𓀢𓀣𓀤𓀥𓀦𓀧𓀨𓀩𓀪𓀫𓀬𓀭𓀮𓀯𓀰𓀱𓀲𓀳𓀴𓀵𓀶𓀷𓀸𓀹𓀺𓀻𓀼𓀽𓀾𓀿𓁀𓁁𓁂𓁃𓁄𓁅𓁆𓁇𓁈𓁉𓁊𓁋𓁌𓁍𓁎𓁏𓁐𓁑𓁒𓁓𓁔𓁕𓁖𓁗𓁘𓁙𓁚𓁛𓁜𓁝𓁞𓁟𓁠𓁡𓁢𓁣𓁤𓁥𓁦𓁧𓁨𓁩𓁪𓁫𓁬𓁭𓁮𓁯𓁰𓁱𓁲𓁳𓁴𓁵𓁶𓁷𓁸𓁹𓁺𓁻𓁼𓁽𓁾𓁿𓂀𓂁𓂂𓂃𓂄𓂅𓂆𓂇𓂈𓂉𓂊𓂋𓂌𓂍𓂎𓂏𓂐𓂑𓂒𓂓𓂔𓂕𓂖𓂗𓂘𓂙𓂚𓂛𓂜𓂝𓂞𓂟𓂠𓂡𓂢𓂣𓂤𓂥𓂦𓂧𓂨𓂩𓂪𓂫𓂬𓂭𓂮𓂯𓂰𓂱𓂲𓂳𓂴𓂵𓂶𓂷𓂸𓂹𓂺𓂻𓂼𓂽𓂾𓂿𓃀𓃁𓃂𓃃𓃄𓃅𓃆𓃇𓃈𓃉𓃊𓃋𓃌𓃍𓃎𓃏𓃐𓃑𓃒𓃓𓃔𓃕𓃖𓃗𓃘𓃙𓃚𓃛𓃜𓃝𓃞𓃟𓃠𓃡𓃢𓃣𓃤𓃥𓃦𓃧𓃨𓃩𓃪𓃫𓃬𓃭𓃮𓃯𓃰𓃱𓃲𓃳𓃴𓃵𓃶𓃷𓃸𓃹𓃺𓃻𓃼𓃽𓃾𓃿𓄀𓄁𓄂𓄃𓄄𓄅𓄆𓄇𓄈𓄉𓄊𓄋𓄌𓄍𓄎𓄏𓄐𓄑𓄒𓄓𓄔𓄕𓄖𓄗𓄘𓄙𓄚𓄛𓄜𓄝𓄞𓄟𓄠𓄡𓄢𓄣𓄤𓄥𓄦𓄧𓄨𓄩𓄪𓄫𓄬𓄭𓄮𓄯𓄰𓄱𓄲𓄳𓄴𓄵𓄶𓄷𓄸𓄹𓄺𓄻𓄼𓄽𓄾𓄿𓅀𓅁𓅂𓅃𓅄𓅅𓅆𓅇𓅈𓅉𓅊𓅋𓅌𓅍𓅎𓅏𓅐𓅑𓅒𓅓𓅔𓅕𓅖𓅗𓅘𓅙𓅚𓅛𓅜𓅝𓅞𓅟𓅠𓅡𓅢𓅣𓅤𓅥𓅦𓅧𓅨𓅩𓅪𓅫𓅬𓅭𓅮𓅯𓅰𓅱𓅲𓅳𓅴𓅵𓅶𓅷𓅸𓅹𓅺𓅻𓅼𓅽𓅾𓅿𓆀𓆁𓆂𓆃𓆄𓆅𓆆𓆇𓆈𓆉𓆊𓆋𓆌𓆍𓆎𓆏𓆐𓆑𓆒𓆓𓆔𓆕𓆖𓆗𓆘𓆙𓆚𓆛𓆜𓆝𓆞𓆟𓆠𓆡𓆢𓆣𓆤𓆥𓆦𓆧𓆨𓆩𓆪𓆫𓆬𓆭𓆮𓆯𓆰𓆱𓆲𓆳𓆴𓆵𓆶𓆷𓆸𓆹𓆺𓆻𓆼𓆽𓆾𓆿𓇀𓇁𓇂𓇃𓇄𓇅𓇆𓇇𓇈𓇉𓇊𓇋𓇌𓇍𓇎𓇏𓇐𓇑𓇒𓇓𓇔𓇕𓇖𓇗𓇘𓇙𓇚𓇛𓇜𓇝𓇞𓇟𓇠𓇡𓇢𓇣𓇤𓇥𓇦𓇧𓇨𓇩𓇪𓇫𓇬𓇭𓇮𓇯𓇰𓇱𓇲𓇳𓇴𓇵𓇶𓇷𓇸𓇹𓇺𓇻𓇼𓇽𓇾𓇿𓈀𓈁𓈂𓈃𓈄𓈅𓈆𓈇𓈈𓈉𓈊𓈋𓈌𓈍𓈎𓈏𓈐𓈑𓈒𓈓𓈔𓈕𓈖𓈗𓈘𓈙𓈚𓈛𓈜𓈝𓈞𓈟𓈠𓈡𓈢𓈣𓈤𓈥𓈦𓈧𓈨𓈩𓈪𓈫𓈬𓈭𓈮𓈯𓈰𓈱𓈲𓈳𓈴𓈵𓈶𓈷𓈸𓈹𓈺𓈻𓈼𓈽𓈾𓈿𓉀𓉁𓉂𓉃𓉄𓉅𓉆𓉇𓉈𓉉𓉊𓉋𓉌𓉍𓉎𓉏𓉐𓉑𓉒𓉓𓉔𓉕𓉖𓉗𓉘𓉙𓉚𓉛𓉜𓉝𓉞𓉟𓉠𓉡𓉢𓉣𓉤𓉥𓉦𓉧𓉨𓉩𓉪𓉫𓉬𓉭𓉮𓉯𓉰𓉱𓉲𓉳𓉴𓉵𓉶𓉷𓉸𓉹𓉺𓉻𓉼𓉽𓉾𓉿𓊀𓊁𓊂𓊃𓊄𓊅𓊆𓊇𓊈𓊉𓊊𓊋𓊌𓊍𓊎𓊏𓊐𓊑𓊒𓊓𓊔𓊕𓊖𓊗𓊘𓊙𓊚𓊛𓊜𓊝𓊞𓊟𓊠𓊡𓊢𓊣𓊤𓊥𓊦𓊧𓊨𓊩𓊪𓊫𓊬𓊭𓊮𓊯𓊰𓊱𓊲𓊳𓊴𓊵𓊶𓊷𓊸𓊹𓊺𓊻𓊼𓊽𓊾𓊿𓋀𓋁𓋂𓋃𓋄𓋅𓋆𓋇𓋈𓋉𓋊𓋋𓋌𓋍𓋎𓋏𓋐𓋑𓋒𓋓𓋔𓋕𓋖𓋗𓋘𓋙𓋚𓋛𓋜𓋝𓋞𓋟𓋠𓋡𓋢𓋣𓋤𓋥𓋦𓋧𓋨𓋩𓋪𓋫𓋬𓋭𓋮𓋯𓋰𓋱𓋲𓋳𓋴𓋵𓋶𓋷𓋸𓋹𓋺𓋻𓋼𓋽𓋾𓋿𓌀𓌁𓌂𓌃𓌄𓌅𓌆𓌇𓌈𓌉𓌊𓌋𓌌𓌍𓌎𓌏𓌐𓌑𓌒𓌓𓌔𓌕𓌖𓌗𓌘𓌙𓌚𓌛𓌜𓌝𓌞𓌟𓌠𓌡𓌢𓌣𓌤𓌥𓌦𓌧𓌨𓌩𓌪𓌫𓌬𓌭𓌮𓌯𓌰𓌱𓌲𓌳𓌴𓌵𓌶𓌷𓌸𓌹𓌺𓌻𓌼𓌽𓌾𓌿𓍀𓍁𓍂𓍃𓍄𓍅𓍆𓍇𓍈𓍉𓍊𓍋𓍌𓍍𓍎𓍏𓍐𓍑𓍒𓍓𓍔𓍕𓍖𓍗𓍘𓍙𓍚𓍛𓍜𓍝𓍞𓍟𓍠𓍡𓍢𓍣𓍤𓍥𓍦𓍧𓍨𓍩𓍪𓍫𓍬𓍭𓍮𓍯𓍰𓍱𓍲𓍳𓍴𓍵𓍶𓍷𓍸𓍹𓍺𓍻𓍼𓍽𓍾𓍿𓎀𓎁𓎂𓎃𓎄𓎅𓎆𓎇𓎈𓎉𓎊𓎋𓎌𓎍𓎎𓎏𓎐𓎑𓎒𓎓𓎔𓎕𓎖𓎗𓎘𓎙𓎚𓎛𓎜𓎝𓎞𓎟𓎠𓎡𓎢𓎣𓎤𓎥𓎦𓎧𓎨𓎩𓎪𓎫𓎬𓎭𓎮𓎯𓎰𓎱𓎲𓎳𓎴𓎵𓎶𓎷𓎸𓎹𓎺𓎻𓎼𓎽𓎾𓎿𓏀𓏁𓏂𓏃𓏄𓏅𓏆𓏇𓏈𓏉𓏊𓏋𓏌𓏍𓏎𓏏𓏐𓏑𓏒𓏓𓏔𓏕𓏖𓏗𓏘𓏙𓏚𓏛𓏜𓏝𓏞𓏟𓏠𓏡𓏢𓏣𓏤𓏥𓏦𓏧𓏨𓏩𓏪𓏫𓏬𓏭𓏮𓏯𓏰𓏱𓏲𓏳𓏴𓏵𓏶𓏷𓏸𓏹𓏺𓏻𓏼𓏽𓏾𓏿𓐀𓐁𓐂𓐃𓐄𓐅𓐆𓐇𓐈𓐉𓐊𓐋𓐌𓐍𓐎𓐏𓐐𓐑𓐒𓐓𓐔𓐕𓐖𓐗𓐘𓐙𓐚𓐛𓐜𓐝𓐞𓐟𓐠𓐡𓐢𓐣𓐤𓐥𓐦𓐧𓐨𓐩𓐪𓐫𓐬𓐭𓐮𓐯𓐰𓐱𓐲𓐳𓐴𓐵𓐶𓐷𓐸𓐹𓐺𓐻𓐼𓐽𓐾𓐿𓑀𓑁𓑂𓑃𓑄𓑅𓑆𓑇𓑈𓑉𓑊𓑋𓑌𓑍𓑎𓑏𓑐𓑑𓑒𓑓𓑔𓑕𓑖𓑗𓑘𓑙𓑚𓑛𓑜𓑝𓑞𓑟𓑠𓑡𓑢𓑣𓑤𓑥𓑦𓑧𓑨𓑩𓑪𓑫𓑬𓑭𓑮𓑯𓑰𓑱𓑲𓑳𓑴𓑵𓑶𓑷𓑸𓑹𓑺𓑻𓑼𓑽𓑾𓑿𓒀𓒁𓒂𓒃𓒄𓒅𓒆𓒇𓒈𓒉𓒊𓒋𓒌𓒍𓒎𓒏𓒐𓒑𓒒𓒓𓒔𓒕𓒖𓒗𓒘𓒙𓒚𓒛𓒜𓒝𓒞𓒟𓒠𓒡𓒢𓒣𓒤𓒥𓒦𓒧𓒨𓒩𓒪𓒫𓒬𓒭𓒮𓒯𓒰𓒱𓒲𓒳𓒴𓒵𓒶𓒷𓒸𓒹𓒺𓒻𓒼𓒽𓒾𓒿𓓀𓓁𓓂𓓃𓓄𓓅𓓆𓓇𓓈𓓉𓓊𓓋𓓌𓓍𓓎𓓏𓓐𓓑𓓒𓓓𓓔𓓕𓓖𓓗𓓘𓓙𓓚𓓛𓓜𓓝𓓞𓓟𓓠𓓡𓓢𓓣𓓤𓓥𓓦𓓧𓓨𓓩𓓪𓓫𓓬𓓭𓓮𓓯𓓰𓓱𓓲𓓳𓓴𓓵𓓶𓓷𓓸𓓹𓓺𓓻𓓼𓓽𓓾𓓿𓔀𓔁𓔂𓔃𓔄𓔅𓔆𓔇𓔈𓔉𓔊𓔋𓔌𓔍𓔎𓔏𓔐𓔑𓔒𓔓𓔔𓔕𓔖𓔗𓔘𓔙𓔚𓔛𓔜𓔝𓔞𓔟𓔠𓔡𓔢𓔣𓔤𓔥𓔦𓔧𓔨𓔩𓔪𓔫𓔬𓔭𓔮𓔯𓔰𓔱𓔲𓔳𓔴𓔵𓔶𓔷𓔸𓔹𓔺𓔻𓔼𓔽𓔾𓔿𓕀𓕁𓕂𓕃𓕄𓕅𓕆𓕇𓕈𓕉𓕊𓕋𓕌𓕍𓕎𓕏𓕐𓕑𓕒𓕓𓕔𓕕𓕖𓕗𓕘𓕙𓕚𓕛𓕜𓕝𓕞𓕟𓕠𓕡𓕢𓕣𓕤𓕥𓕦𓕧𓕨𓕩𓕪𓕫𓕬𓕭𓕮𓕯𓕰𓕱𓕲𓕳𓕴𓕵𓕶𓕷𓕸𓕹𓕺𓕻𓕼𓕽𓕾𓕿𓖀𓖁𓖂𓖃𓖄𓖅𓖆𓖇𓖈𓖉𓖊𓖋𓖌𓖍𓖎𓖏𓖐𓖑𓖒𓖓𓖔𓖕𓖖𓖗𓖘𓖙𓖚𓖛𓖜𓖝𓖞𓖟𓖠𓖡𓖢𓖣𓖤𓖥𓖦𓖧𓖨𓖩𓖪𓖫𓖬𓖭𓖮𓖯𓖰𓖱𓖲𓖳𓖴𓖵𓖶𓖷𓖸𓖹𓖺𓖻𓖼𓖽𓖾𓖿𓗀𓗁𓗂𓗃𓗄𓗅𓗆𓗇𓗈𓗉𓗊𓗋𓗌𓗍𓗎𓗏𓗐𓗑𓗒𓗓𓗔𓗕𓗖𓗗𓗘𓗙𓗚𓗛𓗜𓗝𓗞𓗟𓗠𓗡𓗢𓗣𓗤𓗥𓗦𓗧𓗨𓗩𓗪𓗫𓗬𓗭𓗮𓗯𓗰𓗱𓗲𓗳𓗴𓗵𓗶𓗷𓗸𓗹𓗺𓗻𓗼𓗽𓗾𓗿𓘀𓘁𓘂𓘃𓘄𓘅𓘆𓘇𓘈𓘉𓘊𓘋𓘌𓘍𓘎𓘏𓘐𓘑𓘒𓘓𓘔𓘕𓘖𓘗𓘘𓘙𓘚𓘛𓘜𓘝𓘞𓘟𓘠𓘡𓘢𓘣𓘤𓘥𓘦𓘧𓘨𓘩𓘪𓘫𓘬𓘭𓘮𓘯𓘰𓘱𓘲𓘳𓘴𓘵𓘶𓘷𓘸𓘹𓘺𓘻𓘼𓘽𓘾𓘿𓙀𓙁𓙂𓙃𓙄𓙅𓙆𓙇𓙈𓙉𓙊𓙋𓙌𓙍𓙎𓙏𓙐𓙑𓙒𓙓𓙔𓙕𓙖𓙗𓙘𓙙𓙚𓙛𓙜𓙝𓙞𓙟𓙠𓙡𓙢𓙣𓙤𓙥𓙦𓙧𓙨𓙩𓙪𓙫𓙬𓙭𓙮𓙯𓙰𓙱𓙲𓙳𓙴𓙵𓙶𓙷𓙸𓙹𓙺𓙻𓙼𓙽𓙾𓙿𓚀𓚁𓚂𓚃𓚄𓚅𓚆𓚇𓚈𓚉𓚊𓚋𓚌𓚍𓚎𓚏𓚐𓚑𓚒𓚓𓚔𓚕𓚖𓚗𓚘𓚙𓚚𓚛𓚜𓚝𓚞𓚟𓚠𓚡𓚢𓚣𓚤𓚥𓚦𓚧𓚨𓚩𓚪𓚫𓚬𓚭𓚮𓚯𓚰𓚱𓚲𓚳𓚴𓚵𓚶𓚷𓚸𓚹𓚺𓚻𓚼𓚽𓚾𓚿𓛀𓛁𓛂𓛃𓛄𓛅𓛆𓛇𓛈𓛉𓛊𓛋𓛌𓛍𓛎𓛏𓛐𓛑𓛒𓛓𓛔𓛕𓛖𓛗𓛘𓛙𓛚𓛛𓛜𓛝𓛞𓛟𓛠𓛡𓛢𓛣𓛤𓛥𓛦𓛧𓛨𓛩𓛪𓛫𓛬𓛭𓛮𓛯𓛰𓛱𓛲𓛳𓛴𓛵𓛶𓛷𓛸𓛹𓛺𓛻𓛼𓛽𓛾𓛿𓜀𓜁𓜂𓜃𓜄𓜅𓜆𓜇𓜈𓜉𓜊𓜋𓜌𓜍𓜎𓜏𓜐𓜑𓜒𓜓𓜔𓜕𓜖𓜗𓜘𓜙𓜚𓜛𓜜𓜝𓜞𓜟𓜠𓜡𓜢𓜣𓜤𓜥𓜦𓜧𓜨𓜩𓜪𓜫𓜬𓜭𓜮𓜯𓜰𓜱𓜲𓜳𓜴𓜵𓜶𓜷𓜸𓜹𓜺𓜻𓜼𓜽𓜾𓜿𓝀𓝁𓝂𓝃𓝄𓝅𓝆𓝇𓝈𓝉𓝊𓝋𓝌𓝍𓝎𓝏𓝐𓝑𓝒𓝓𓝔𓝕𓝖𓝗𓝘𓝙𓝚𓝛𓝜𓝝𓝞𓝟𓝠𓝡𓝢𓝣𓝤𓝥𓝦𓝧𓝨𓝩𓝪𓝫𓝬𓝭𓝮𓝯𓝰𓝱𓝲𓝳𓝴𓝵𓝶𓝷𓝸𓝹𓝺𓝻𓝼𓝽𓝾𓝿𓞀𓞁𓞂𓞃𓞄𓞅𓞆𓞇𓞈𓞉𓞊𓞋𓞌𓞍𓞎𓞏𓞐𓞑𓞒𓞓𓞔𓞕𓞖𓞗𓞘𓞙𓞚𓞛𓞜𓞝𓞞𓞟𓞠𓞡𓞢𓞣𓞤𓞥𓞦𓞧𓞨𓞩𓞪𓞫𓞬𓞭𓞮𓞯𓞰𓞱𓞲𓞳𓞴𓞵𓞶𓞷𓞸𓞹𓞺𓞻𓞼𓞽𓞾𓞿𓟀𓟁𓟂𓟃𓟄𓟅𓟆𓟇𓟈𓟉𓟊𓟋𓟌𓟍𓟎𓟏𓟐𓟑𓟒𓟓𓟔𓟕𓟖𓟗𓟘𓟙𓟚𓟛𓟜𓟝𓟞𓟟𓟠𓟡𓟢𓟣𓟤𓟥𓟦𓟧𓟨𓟩𓟪𓟫𓟬𓟭𓟮𓟯𓟰𓟱𓟲𓟳𓟴𓟵𓟶𓟷𓟸𓟹𓟺𓟻𓟼𓟽𓟾𓟿𓠀𓠁𓠂𓠃𓠄𓠅𓠆𓠇𓠈𓠉𓠊𓠋𓠌𓠍𓠎𓠏𓠐𓠑𓠒𓠓𓠔𓠕𓠖𓠗𓠘𓠙𓠚𓠛𓠜𓠝𓠞𓠟𓠠𓠡𓠢𓠣𓠤𓠥𓠦𓠧𓠨𓠩𓠪𓠫𓠬𓠭𓠮𓠯𓠰𓠱𓠲𓠳𓠴𓠵𓠶𓠷𓠸𓠹𓠺𓠻𓠼𓠽𓠾𓠿𓡀𓡁𓡂𓡃𓡄𓡅𓡆𓡇𓡈𓡉𓡊𓡋𓡌𓡍𓡎𓡏𓡐𓡑𓡒𓡓𓡔𓡕𓡖𓡗𓡘𓡙𓡚𓡛𓡜𓡝𓡞𓡟𓡠𓡡𓡢𓡣𓡤𓡥𓡦𓡧𓡨𓡩𓡪𓡫𓡬𓡭𓡮𓡯𓡰𓡱𓡲𓡳𓡴𓡵𓡶𓡷𓡸𓡹𓡺𓡻𓡼𓡽𓡾𓡿𓢀𓢁𓢂𓢃𓢄𓢅𓢆𓢇𓢈𓢉𓢊𓢋𓢌𓢍𓢎𓢏𓢐𓢑𓢒𓢓𓢔𓢕𓢖𓢗𓢘𓢙𓢚𓢛𓢜𓢝𓢞𓢟𓢠𓢡𓢢𓢣𓢤𓢥𓢦𓢧𓢨𓢩𓢪𓢫𓢬𓢭𓢮𓢯𓢰𓢱𓢲𓢳𓢴𓢵𓢶𓢷𓢸𓢹𓢺𓢻𓢼𓢽𓢾𓢿𓣀𓣁𓣂𓣃𓣄𓣅𓣆𓣇𓣈𓣉𓣊𓣋𓣌𓣍𓣎𓣏𓣐𓣑𓣒𓣓𓣔𓣕𓣖𓣗𓣘𓣙𓣚𓣛𓣜𓣝𓣞𓣟𓣠𓣡𓣢𓣣𓣤𓣥𓣦𓣧𓣨𓣩𓣪𓣫𓣬𓣭𓣮𓣯𓣰𓣱𓣲𓣳𓣴𓣵𓣶𓣷𓣸𓣹𓣺𓣻𓣼𓣽𓣾𓣿𓤀𓤁𓤂𓤃𓤄𓤅𓤆𓤇𓤈𓤉𓤊𓤋𓤌𓤍𓤎𓤏𓤐𓤑𓤒𓤓𓤔𓤕𓤖𓤗𓤘𓤙𓤚𓤛𓤜𓤝𓤞𓤟𓤠𓤡𓤢𓤣𓤤𓤥𓤦𓤧𓤨𓤩𓤪𓤫𓤬𓤭𓤮𓤯𓤰𓤱𓤲𓤳𓤴𓤵𓤶𓤷𓤸𓤹𓤺𓤻𓤼𓤽𓤾𓤿𓥀𓥁𓥂𓥃𓥄𓥅𓥆𓥇𓥈𓥉𓥊𓥋𓥌𓥍𓥎𓥏𓥐𓥑𓥒𓥓𓥔𓥕𓥖𓥗𓥘𓥙𓥚𓥛𓥜𓥝𓥞𓥟𓥠𓥡𓥢𓥣𓥤𓥥𓥦𓥧𓥨𓥩𓥪𓥫𓥬𓥭𓥮𓥯𓥰𓥱𓥲𓥳𓥴𓥵𓥶𓥷𓥸𓥹𓥺𓥻𓥼𓥽𓥾𓥿𓦀𓦁𓦂𓦃𓦄𓦅𓦆𓦇𓦈𓦉𓦊𓦋𓦌𓦍𓦎𓦏𓦐𓦑𓦒𓦓𓦔𓦕𓦖𓦗𓦘𓦙𓦚𓦛𓦜𓦝𓦞𓦟𓦠𓦡𓦢𓦣𓦤𓦥𓦦𓦧𓦨𓦩𓦪𓦫𓦬𓦭𓦮𓦯𓦰𓦱𓦲𓦳𓦴𓦵𓦶𓦷𓦸𓦹𓦺𓦻𓦼𓦽𓦾𓦿𓧀𓧁𓧂𓧃𓧄𓧅𓧆𓧇𓧈𓧉𓧊𓧋𓧌𓧍𓧎𓧏𓧐𓧑𓧒𓧓𓧔𓧕𓧖𓧗𓧘𓧙𓧚𓧛𓧜𓧝𓧞𓧟𓧠𓧡𓧢𓧣𓧤𓧥𓧦𓧧𓧨𓧩𓧪𓧫𓧬𓧭𓧮𓧯𓧰𓧱𓧲𓧳𓧴𓧵𓧶𓧷𓧸𓧹𓧺𓧻𓧼𓧽𓧾𓧿𓨀𓨁𓨂𓨃𓨄𓨅𓨆𓨇𓨈𓨉𓨊𓨋𓨌𓨍𓨎𓨏𓨐𓨑𓨒𓨓𓨔𓨕𓨖𓨗𓨘𓨙𓨚𓨛𓨜𓨝𓨞𓨟𓨠𓨡𓨢𓨣𓨤𓨥𓨦𓨧𓨨𓨩𓨪𓨫𓨬𓨭𓨮𓨯𓨰𓨱𓨲𓨳𓨴𓨵𓨶𓨷𓨸𓨹𓨺𓨻𓨼𓨽𓨾𓨿𓩀𓩁𓩂𓩃𓩄𓩅𓩆𓩇𓩈𓩉𓩊𓩋𓩌𓩍𓩎𓩏

**Table 1.** Variations in Joseph's name.

Zaphnath-Paaneah	"Probably Egyptian for <i>God Speaks and He Lives</i> ." <sup>7</sup>
Zaphenat-Pa'aneah	"He who is called Ipiankhu." <sup>8</sup>
Tsophnath Pa'neach	"The man to whom mysteries are revealed." <sup>9</sup>
Tsophnath Pa'neach	"Treasury of the glorious rest." <sup>10</sup>
Zaphnath-Paaneah	"Head of the sacred college." <sup>11</sup>
Zaphenath-Paneah	"Revealer of a secret or preserver of a world (or age)." <sup>12</sup>
Zaphnath-paaneah	Egy. Zaf-nti-pa-ankh, "nourisher of the living one." <sup>13</sup>
Zaphenath-paneah/Zaphnath-paaneah	"The master of the school of learning." <sup>14</sup>
Zoph-ent-pa-ankh	"The one who furnishes the nourishment of life." <sup>15</sup>
Zaphenath Paaneah	Governor of the Sethroite nome (region of Goshen). <sup>16</sup>

### A problematic Egyptological interpretation

In *A Test of Time*, Rohl attempted to decipher the Egyptian name of Joseph, partly using his own scheme, and also quoting significant parts of a seemingly elegant solution put forward by Kitchen.

Rohl asked, "What on earth might 'Zaphenat-Pa'aneah' have been in its original form?"<sup>8</sup>

Both Egyptologists regard Joseph's Egyptian name as being constructed using two elements, Zaphenat and Pa'aneah (their spelling). The name is then analyzed by investigating each element separately and then bringing them together again with the solution. In tackling the first element (their *Zaphenat*), both men appeal to metathesis<sup>20</sup> where, in their opinion, the letters 't' and 'p' have at some point in time been switched.

Rohl and Kitchen both overlook the fundamental differences between a language such as English and either ancient Egyptian or Hebrew. Linguistically, Modern English is quite unlike the two ancient languages, not least because it is in itself a fusion of many different languages and cultures, and most of those come from an entirely different language family<sup>21</sup> to that of the Hebrews<sup>22</sup> and Egyptians.<sup>23</sup> *Zaphenat* is the English transliteration of the Hebrew transliteration of the original Egyptian word. Kitchen, however, goes from the English transliteration directly to the Egyptian word, completely ignoring the Hebrew transliteration, *Tsophnath Pa'neach*, from which the English transliteration comes. Kitchen wrote that:

"[T]he Hebrew 'name' is rather long and falls into two parts. The second half clearly contains the Egyptian word 'ankh, 'life/to live', as is almost universally conceded; before it is some element containing *p* or *f*. The first half, conversely, seems much more 'Semitic' at first sight: *Zaphenath* is directly reminiscent of the common Semitic root *zaphan*,<sup>24</sup> and of very little in Egyptian."<sup>25</sup>

The solution needed to keep this idea intact was to change *Pa'aneah*, not into *Paiankh*, but into (*I*)*p-ankh* or (*I*)*pi-ankh* or (*I*)*pu-ankh*, which Kitchen considered to be closely-related variants of each other.<sup>26</sup>

### Objections

Kitchen believes *Zaphenath* transliterates into Egyptian as *djed(w)-en-ef* (he who is called); he should have correctly transliterated this phrase, minus modern vowel insertions, as 'ddnf' 𓄎𓄏𓄐, for reasons that will become clear (Egyptologists do not know for certain what vowel sounds were used). He is convinced that Joseph's story was written by a later Hebrew scribe rather than the Egyptian-educated Moses. Kitchen expects his readers to believe that a poorly trained scribe felt the need to tamper with an established term, *Zaphenath*, and write *Zatenaph* (Kitchen's original spellings—*Zat(h)nap(h)* for *Zap(h)nat(h)*). It was not, however, some imaginary scribe who was responsible for this rearrangement of a biblical name; it was Kitchen in his desire to make his particular case appear more credible.

The second part of Joseph's new name in Hebrew, *Pa'neach* (Paaneah in English), pronounced *pah-nā'akh*, is not to be understood as Kitchen would have us believe (i.e. *Pa'ankh* or *Ipiankh*). Introducing an 'I' sound at the front of 'Pa' of 'Pi' cannot be justified—the 'I' sound, represented by the hieroglyph 𓄏, has been added by Kitchen only to improve his argument.










Ipiankhu may have been, as Kitchen claims, a common name in the Middle Kingdom Period (MKP), but Joseph's new name and title were of an Archaic Egyptian construction.<sup>27</sup> This would suggest Joseph's placement as being towards the start of the MKP in Dynasty 11, not in the middle of Dynasty 12, as Velikovskiy *et al* claim. There is only one Middle Kingdom vizier by the name of Ipi, and he served the first king of the 12<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, Amenemhet I. Little is known of Ipi,

and what is known comes from his Theban tomb TT315. It is from the surviving tomb texts that we know of his names and titles—neither names nor titles correspond to those of Joseph.


Kitchen’s argument is not sound for other reasons either: ‘He who is called’ is not a title for someone of high office—‘Minister/Overseer/Superintendent of the [high office]’. Two examples of how this naming worked in practice can be seen in *m-r hnw imm-m-h3t* ‘Amenemhet, Overseer of the Chamber’,<sup>28</sup> and *it-ntr ity* ‘Ity, the god’s father’.<sup>29</sup> In each case, due to the word order in the Egyptian, the title precedes the name—exactly the same, as will be shown, in Moses’ choice of Zaphenath Pa’aneah: in English, we would write a comparable title as ‘John Smith, Minister for Internal Affairs’, not the Egyptian way, ‘The Minister for Internal Affairs, John Smith’.

### Solution


Moses spent four decades living as an Egyptian where “[he] was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words (Greek *logos*) and deeds” (Acts 7:22). This clearly implies that Moses was very accomplished in the use of words; and not just in speaking. The Egyptian system of teaching was very thorough and, after four decades of life in the royal household, Moses would have understood the complexities and applications of the Egyptian language and court etiquette. Therefore his choice of the Hebrew, Zaphenath Paaneah, is very likely to be a valid transliteration into Hebrew from the original Egyptian.


The first section of Joseph’s Egyptian name is, as earlier indicated, not a proper name; rather it is a very important and, as far as I can discern, unique title. The Egyptian equivalent of Zaphenath is almost certainly *df3wn’ty*, which translates into modern English as ‘Overseer/Minister of the Storehouse of Abundance’. The title *df3wn’ty*  can be easily broken down into its composite elements of *df3w* ; *n* ; and ‘*ty* . Part one, *df3w*, is a noun derived from the verb *df3*—(to provide for/to abound in supplies), where *df* is the etymological equivalent of the Hebrew *tsaf*. Part two, *n*, is the masculine genitival adjective ‘of’. Finally, part three, ‘*ty*—is a noun expressing the official title ‘Storehouse Overseer/Minister’, which is drawn from the Archaic Egyptian<sup>30</sup> root ‘*t*—storehouse . The second section, *p3nn’i3h*  is a proper name, and like the ending ‘*ty* of *df3n’ty*, exhibits Archaic traits. This name, *p3nn’i3h*, is also composed of three elements—*p3n* ; *n’i* ; *3h* . The first part, *p3n*, ‘he of’ is written but there is no grammatical or historical evidence for it necessarily being vocalized. The second part, *n’i*, and the third, *3h*, combine to express Joseph’s new Egyptian name literally as [*p3n*]*n’i3h* ‘[He of the] Excellent/Gracious Spirit’ where *n’i* translates as ‘excellent/gracious’ and *3h* translates as ‘spirit’.

In the list of proposed names shown earlier, many indicate the belief that the end of Joseph’s name is to be translated as

‘life’ (Egy. *ankh anh*). This is, however, completely wrong. In the Hebrew ‘spirit’ is rendered as  (*ruwach* (pronounced *rü’ah*) with the entirely legitimate understanding of ‘impelling a prophet to utter instruction’ or ‘warning’. Ancient Egyptian has a number of words for ‘spirit’, but it is *3h*, the equivalent of the Hebrew *ruwach*, that confirms the intimate inside knowledge of the writer of the Joseph narrative. The Egyptian *3h* most often refers to spiritual power and/or intellectual ability; both qualities agree with the Hebrew and were abundantly exhibited by Joseph. This accords perfectly, when compared contextually, with Genesis 41:38–39:

“And Pharaoh said to his servants, ‘Can we find such a one as this, a man in whom is the *Spirit of God*?’ Then Pharaoh said to Joseph, ‘Inasmuch as God has shown you all this, there is no one as *discerning and wise* as you [emphases added].”




Pharaoh is clearly asking his courtiers a rhetorical question; in his mind he has already decided the right course of action. Pharaoh wastes little time in conferring upon Joseph a title and a new Egyptian name, *df3n’ty p3nn’i3h* ; the Hebrew *Tsophnath Pa’aneah*, better known in English as Zaphenath Paaneah.

There were many holders of the title ‘overseer of the storehouse’ (Egy. *imy.r.šnw* ), yet Joseph’s particular title appears to be unique in the record as indicated by the etymological link between the Hebrew *tsophnath pa’aneah* and the Egyptian *df3n’ty p3nn’i3h*.

Moses has rendered the Egyptian name almost identically in Hebrew, giving the final part of the name as ‘spirit’—further evidence that Moses had a profound knowledge of the Egyptian language and culture, including spiritual matters—a subject of considerable importance to ancient Egyptians.




Significantly, when Joseph revealed himself to his brothers (Genesis 45) he made no mention of his office of Overseer of the Storehouse of Abundance, but chose to refer to himself by three other titles:

“... a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his house, and ruler throughout the land of Egypt” (Genesis 45:8).

These three titles are consistent with known Egyptian titles from the Middle Kingdom and generally were retained for life. *לָאָב לְפָרְעוֹ* (‘Father to Pharaoh’) was equivalent (though subtly changed by Joseph to avoid any connection with the Egyptian priesthood) to the Egyptian *it ntr*  and as a result became an honorary title denoting not only rank but degree of intimacy with the king; *אֲדוֹן לְבֵיתוֹ* (‘Lord of all his house’), was the equivalent to the Egyptian *imy r pr nsw* (*pr nsw* being of archaic root as with elements of Joseph’s name discussed above) ; and *מֶשֶׁל בְּכָל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם* ‘... ruler throughout all the land of Egypt’ was equivalent to the Egyptian ... *shk3.n i n km t ht t3 pn r dr.f* (... caused me to rule throughout the entire land of Egypt.)  where *t3 pn r dr.f* translates literally as ‘this entire land’.<sup>30</sup>

Joseph may have had many other titles—in keeping with court protocol of the time—both honorary and real (see box

### Merefnebef

The ancient Egyptians loved titles, and although the Bible mentions only four titles in regard to Joseph, there is good reason to suppose that he may have had more. Merefnebef, who was a 6<sup>th</sup> Dynasty high official of Egypt (and not so far removed from Joseph's day) and who served under Teti, Userkare, and Pepi I, amassed no fewer than 34 titles in his lifetime. They varied from the honorific *sole companion* (Egy. *smr w't(y)* ) to the self-explanatory *hereditary noble* (Egy. *rp't -* ) and the all-powerful *vizier/prime minister* (Egy. *t3ty* .

above). But the recorder of these events, Moses, used only those which were relevant to the overall story.

### Joseph's pharaoh

Over the past decade or so, various synchronisms between Joseph and his pharaoh have been attempted. Down proposed that the pharaoh was Sesostris I (Kheperkare Senuseret) and that Joseph functioned under the name Mentuhotep;<sup>31</sup> Rohl proposed Amenemhet III (Nimaatre Amenemhet) and that Joseph functioned as Ipiankhu;<sup>32</sup> Wyatt proposed Netjerykhet Zoser and that Joseph morphed into Imhotep.<sup>33</sup>






There are serious objections to each of these fairly representative attempts to find Joseph's pharaoh. Rohl's idea has been discussed earlier, showing that Ipiankhu is an artificial construct. He also ascribes a date for Joseph's arrival in Egypt<sup>34</sup> that differs from the biblically derived date by c. 80 years.<sup>35</sup>

Down's choice of Sesostris I seems based on little more than unscientific admiration of this pharaoh's statues:

"Judging by his [Sesostris'] statues, he seems to have been an agreeable-looking pharaoh . . . . They depict him with a pleasant face."<sup>36</sup>

Down's choice of Mentuhotep is all the more surprising given that this specifically (and popular) Middle Kingdom name means *Content is Mentu*. How happy would the godly Joseph have been to bear the name of the Egyptian god of war? Sesostris I was served by a Mentuhotep and this official is one of the best attested from the Middle Kingdom. He was 'Overseer of all Royal Works' and this included overseeing Sesostris' construction projects at the Temple of Amun in Karnak; again the question must be asked, 'How happy would the godly Joseph have been to oversee work that glorified the god Amun?' There is also no consensus as to Mentuhotep being a *Vizier*—a dedicatory stele at Abydos gives him the title, yet in contrast the walls of his tomb make no mention of this specific office.

Wyatt creates far greater problems by linking Joseph to the famous Imhotep. Firstly, Wyatt, like several other supporters



of this idea, believes that Imhotep's name means 'he who comes in peace'. Imhotep's name is attested on the base of a statue of Zoser as *iy m htp*  unearthed at Saqqara. Certainly there is a verb *ii m htp*  but the very manner that Imhotep's name was written indicates a different meaning to that claimed. The sign M18  is vocalized as *iy*, which is an epithet of the god Horus (all the Egyptian gods and goddesses had multiple epithets which people incorporated into their personal names); the sign G17  signifies *who is*; the sign R4  is *hotep* which means *content*. Brought together, Imhotep translates as *Content is Horus* (lit. Horus who is content). Again the question must be asked, 'How happy would the godly Joseph have been to bear the name of the Egyptian sky god, Horus?'

Secondly, since the biblical timeline is fixed—which includes Joseph—Wyatt (using the conventional Egyptian chronology as the guide) must move Imhotep and Zoser around seven centuries nearer the birth of Christ. Since Zoser did not exist in isolation, logically the great pyramid builders of the 4<sup>th</sup> Dynasty—along with their mighty pyramids—must move by a similar amount since history is not composed of events punctuated by non-event vacuums.

How such chronological tensions are typically relieved is demonstrated by Down in *Timing is everything*.<sup>37</sup> His solution is to place dynasties in convenient blocks and have them rule more-or-less contemporaneously. This is nothing more than an *ad hoc* hypothesis to save the Velikovskian model from falsification; for if this model were true, the likes of the Great Pyramid builder Khufu (4<sup>th</sup> Dynasty) would have lived and ruled at the same time as the powerful pharaohs of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Dynasties.

Given the unsuitability of the choices of pharaohs and names for Joseph above, is there a suitable pharaonic candidate who meets the biblical requirements? Mentuhotep II appears to meet these requirements perfectly, needing a movement of three centuries rather than the stress-inducing seven centuries required by Wyatt above.

For Mentuhotep II, whom I propose to have been the pharaoh of the Great Famine during Joseph's time in Egypt, there is a huge variation in regnal dates between the secular and my revised proposal—see table 2 below.

When Nebhepetre Mentuhotep began his reign, the south of Egypt was ruled from Thebes—from Asyut (Egy. Sawty *s3wty* ) to the First Cataract of the Nile. The remainder of the country was ruled by a different king at Heracleopolis (Egy. Henen-nesut; *nni nsw* ). Mentuhotep re-established the foreign policies of the Old Kingdom, sending military expeditions against the Libyan tribes to the west, and the Bedouin to the east in Sinai. He began the process of bringing Nubia back under Egyptian control, for the purposes of mining and trade.<sup>38</sup>

Mentuhotep's first fourteen years of reign are thought to have been generally peaceful. In the 14<sup>th</sup> year of his reign, an uprising occurred in the north, probably connected with the

**Table 2.** Variance in regnal dates.

Variations in dates for Mentuhotep's reign	
Source	Date
ib205.tripod.com/mentuhotep2.html	2117–2069 bc
Dodson, A., <i>Monarchs of the Nile</i> , gives the name as Montjuhotpe II	2066–2014 bc
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mentuhotep_II	2061–2010 bc
diggingsonline.com/pages/rese/dyns/middle.htm (calculated from chart)	2061–2010 bc
Clayton, P.A., <i>Chronicle of the Pharaohs</i> , gives the name as Mentuhotep I (not II)	2060–2010 bc
Shaw, I., (Ed.) <i>Oxford History of Ancient Egypt</i> , gives the name as Mentuhotep II	2055–2004 bc
British Museum	2055–2004 bc
metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/07.230.2	2051–2000 bc
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mentuhotep_II (same page as the above wikipedia ref.)	2046–1995 bc
digitalegypt.ucl.ac.uk/chronology/mentuhotepII.html	2046–1995 bc
Grimal, N., <i>A History of Ancient Egypt</i> , Mentuhotpe II (original spelling)	2040–2009 bc
britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/375448/Mentuhotep-II	2008–1957 bc
Rohl, D., <i>A Test of Time</i> , gives the name as Montuhotep II	2007–1956 bc
Clarke, P., new revised date for Mentuhotep's reign	c. 1757–1706 bc

ongoing conflict between Thebes and Herakleopolis, which had threatened to invade Upper Egypt. The situation deteriorated when the Herakleopolitan king decided to ransack the ancient royal necropolis of Abydos.

During the period of chaos leading up to Mentuhotep II's reign, the nomarchs or provincial rulers held important powers over Egypt. Selve noted:

“At the end of the Old Kingdom, central power, and in particular Pepy II [Pepi II], developed the regional particularisms whose rivalries had progressively excited a thirst for dynamic power, by the heredity of the nomarch responsibility: the rights and the advantages acquired in one period were passed on to the successor who supplemented them with new privileges. The state, weakened by the political situation, was unfit to manage the overflow of regional confrontation, which again weakened it more.”<sup>39</sup>

The nomarch office had become hereditary during the 6<sup>th</sup> Dynasty of Egypt and the collapse of central power gave all nomarchs tremendous power over their domains.

### How the nomarchs were tamed

When the famine predicted by Joseph arrived, his first political move, acting on Pharaoh's behalf, was to offer grain for ‘money’ (Genesis 47:14—Heb. כֶּסֶף *keceph* i.e. silver<sup>40</sup>). All the monetary silver was placed in Pharaoh's treasury. A year later the people exchanged their second-most-valuable commodities—their livestock—for grain. In the third year,

all the people clamoured for more grain (Genesis 47:19) and offered their most valuable commodities—their bodies and land—in exchange for grain. In the space of just three years Joseph had achieved what decades of internal struggles had failed to do. In an amazing *tour de force*, he handed the land of Egypt, along with its people, back into Pharaoh's power, as in the days of the Old Kingdom; only the temples, their estates, and the priesthood were exempted.<sup>41</sup>

The actual cost in all of this to Pharaoh? Nothing? The gain for Pharaoh? Everything—absolute control of Upper and Lower Egypt.

It is not unreasonable to say that Joseph had, in the process, helped create a semi-feudal system not dissimilar to the later European feudal system of the Middle-Ages; and this almost 3,000 years before the Europeans.

Coupled with Joseph's grain policies, Mentuhotep II was free to initiate a strong policy of centralization, reinforcing his royal authority by creating the posts of Governor of Upper Egypt *imy r sm'w* 𓄏𓄏𓄏 and Governor of Lower Egypt *imy r t3 mhw* 𓄏𓄏𓄏𓄏, who had power over the broken nomarchs.<sup>42</sup> Mentuhotep also, importantly, created a mobile group of royal court officials who further controlled the activities of the nomarchs. Eventually nomarchs who had supported the Herakleopolitan kings of Lower Egypt, such as the governor of Sawty (modern Asyut), lost their power to the benefit of the pharaoh.

Unfortunately, most of the tombs of 11<sup>th</sup> Dynasty officials have been vandalized, which makes it impossible to identify a named official of the time as Joseph.

## Summary and postscript

I have shown how the evidence that may be deduced from the title the Bible says Pharaoh conferred upon Joseph fits with the other biblical data about Joseph. It also fits the notion that this took place in the early part of the Middle Kingdom. Consistent with the revised chronology for which I have been laying the foundation via successive papers in this Journal,<sup>43</sup> I propose that Mentuhotep II's reign was c. 1757–1706 BC, and that he was the pharaoh of Joseph's time. This is consistent with the data presented here, as well as with the Egyptological evidence surrounding his reign.

Future papers aim to show that this will point to the pharaoh (and the likely timing) of the Exodus in a manner that is fully consistent with the biblical chronological data without violating Egyptological data—only the faulty Conventional Egyptian Chronology (CEC). This is important, as it has long been known that there are major discrepancies between the CEC and the chronology of the Bible. Previous attempts to reconcile these via chronological revisions have, particularly where they trusted the writings of Velikovsky, suffered from major Egyptological blunders and contradictions. Some of these have already been shown in my papers referenced above. And as will also be shown in papers pending, these attempts lead unintentionally into contradicting the Bible itself.

## References

- Moore, M.B. and Kelle, B.E., *Biblical History and Israel's Past: The Changing Study of the Bible and History*, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, p. 174, 2011.
- de Hoop, R., Genesis 49 in its literary and historical context; in: *Oudtestamentische Studiën (Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland)* 39:420, 1999.
- Schenke, H., Jacobsbrunnen-Josephsgrab-Sychar, Topographische Untersuchungen und Erwägungen in der Perspektive von Joh. 4,5,6., *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 84(2):174, 1968.
- Herman Gunkel (1862–1932) was a German Lutheran pastor, Old Testament scholar and professor.
- Hugo Gressman (1877–1927) was a German Old Testament scholar and friend of Gunkel.
- Smith, M., Jewish religious life in the Persian Period; in: Davies, W.D. and Finkelstein, L. (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Introduction: The Persian period*, SUNY series in Judaica, Cambridge University Press, UK, pp. 243–244, and note 1, p. 268, 1984.
- New King James Version.
- Rohl, D., *A Test of Time*, Century, Post Falls, ID, pp. 350–351, 1995.
- Targum Onkelos.
- blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H6847&t=NKJV.
- answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/does-archaeology-support-the-bible. Also Ham, K. (Ed.), *The New Answers Book—Over 25 Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*, Master Books, Green Forrest, AR, ch. 25, 2006.
- creationwiki.org/Joseph.
- christiananswers.net/joseph.html.
- specialtyinterests.net/joseph.html.
- International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.
- angelfire.com/ma/mhetjf/vieuxsite/Joseph.html.
- For further in-depth study of this subject, see Kitchen, K.A., *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, p. 345, 2003.
- Steindorff, G., Der Name Josephs Sapkenat-Paneach, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde (Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Berlin)* 27:41–42, 1890.
- Schulman, A.R., *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur*, vol. 2, p. 241, 1975.
- Metathesis: *n*. The transposition of letters, syllables, or sounds in a word.
- Indo-European (mainly Germanic and Anglo-Norman influences, but English is essentially a 'borrowing' language).
- Semitic language family.
- Egyptian belonged to the Afroasiatic language family, previously referred to as Hamito-Semitic.
- Kitchen, K.A., Genesis 12 to 50 in the Near Eastern World; in: Hess, R.S. *et al.* (Eds.), *He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12 to 50*, Wipf & Stock, Eugene, OR, pp. 80–84, 1993.
- Rohl, ref. 8, ch. 15, p. 419, note 21.
- Ranke, H., *Die Ägyptische Personennamen*, vol. I, Verlag J.J. Augustin, Glückstadt, Germany, 21:30; 22:16; 23:18, 1935.
- Bard, K.A., Egyptian language and writing; in: *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt*, Routledge, London, UK, p. 325, 1999.
- Collier, M. and Manley, B., *How to read Egyptian Hieroglyphs*, British Museum Press, London, UK, pp. 47, 91, 1998.
- The use of the term Archaic signifies word usage traceable to the Old Kingdom period, but almost never expressed in the Middle Kingdom period and later.
- See: Gardiner, A., *Egyptian Grammar. Being an introduction to the study of hieroglyphs*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, University Press, Cambridge, UK, p. 79, § 100, note 1, 2012. Also: Erdman, A., Die Märchen des Papyrus Westcar; in: *Mittheilungen aus den Orientalischen Sammlungen*, Heft v. Vi, Berlin, Germany, p. 9, line 11, 1890.
- Ashton, J. and Down, D., *Unwrapping the Pharaohs*, Master Books, Green Forrest, AR, p. 83, 2006.
- Rohl, ref. 8, pp. 335, 350.
- Wyatt, M.N. (wife of Ron Wyatt), [arkdiscovery.com/joseph.htm](http://arkdiscovery.com/joseph.htm).
- Rohl, ref. 8, p. 332.
- Jones, F.N., *The Chronology of the Old Testament*, Master Books, Green Forrest, AR, p. 54, 2007.
- Ashton and Down, ref. 31, p. 81.
- Down, D., Timing is everything, *Creation* 27(3):30–35, 2005.
- His son and successor Sankhkare Mentuhotep III sent a 3,000-man expedition to Punt in year 8 (1698 BC) thus re-establishing the earlier trade route last used in the Old Kingdom Period, again demonstrating the desire to reconnect with the Old Kingdom.
- Selve, V., *The Nomarchs of the Old and Middle Kingdoms and Their tombs in Beni-Hassan and Asswan* [Eng. Aswan], OsirisNet, 2007, [osirisnet.net/tombes/assouan/e-nomarques.htm](http://osirisnet.net/tombes/assouan/e-nomarques.htm).
- Clarke, P., Egyptian coins in the time of Joseph, *J. Creation* 26(3):88–89, 2012.
- Since Pharaoh was the ultimate high priest and intermediary between the gods and men, to have included the religious structure would have meant Pharaoh being in debt to Pharaoh. If Pharaoh was exempt, so too must his under-priests and temples be.
- Callender, G., *The Middle Kingdom Renaissance*; in: Shaw, I. (Ed.), *Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford University Press, UK, pp. 140–141, 2000.
- Clarke, P., Why Pharaoh Hatshepsut is not to be equated to the Queen of Sheba, *J. Creation* 24(2):62–68, 2010; Clarke, P., Was Thutmose III the biblical Shishak?—Claims for the 'Jerusalem' bas-relief at Karnak investigated, *J. Creation* 25(1):48–56, 2011; Clarke, P., Was Jerusalem the Kadesh of Thutmose III's 1<sup>st</sup> Asiatic campaign?—topographic and petrographic evidence, *J. Creation* 25(3):48–55, 2011; and Clarke, P., The Stele of Merneptah—assessment of the final 'Israel' strophe and its implications for chronology, *J. Creation* 27(1):57–64, 2013.

**Patrick Clarke** has developed a deep interest in ancient Egypt since early childhood. His speciality is the pharaonic tombs in the Valley of the Kings; their architecture, artwork and afterlife texts. He presently resides with his family in France.