

Moses the Egyptian? A Reassessment of the Etymology of the Name “Moses”



Thomas Schneider

Abstract Moses scholarship has long held that the name “Moses” is one of the irreducible elements of the Moses narrative and would be an essential link to the exodus tradition, if it indeed is derived from the Egyptian root *mśy*, “to be born”. This article reassesses the long-held Egyptian etymology of the name “Moses”, constituting the first comprehensive treatment of the question since J.G. Griffiths’ 1953 article, *The Egyptian Derivation of the Name Moses*, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12: 225–31. This contribution adds to the debate an evaluation of the name’s vocalization which is a major, hitherto unnoticed problem, and discusses ancient and modern hypotheses relating to Exod 2:10. The article concludes that an Egyptian etymology of the name “Moses” is difficult to maintain and that the debate about the name’s, presumably Semitic etymology needs to be reopened.

Keywords Moses · Exodus story · Personal name · Onomastics · Egyptian morphology/phonology · Semitic morphology/phonology

T. Schneider (✉)

Department of Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies,
The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: thomas.schneider@ubc.ca

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023
E. Ben-Yosef, I. W. N. Jones (eds.), “*And in Length of Days Understanding*” (*Job 12:12*): *Essays on Archaeology in the Eastern Mediterranean and Beyond in Honor of Thomas E. Levy*, Interdisciplinary Contributions to Archaeology,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27330-8_43

1047

1 Introductory Remarks¹

Debates about the historical background of the Moses figure have been prominent since antiquity. In Manetho, Moses is identified with a rebellious Egyptian priest Osarseph as the leader of lepers, maybe in an Anti-Semitic motivation.² Chaeremon gives for both Joseph and Moses Egyptian names: while Joseph is called *Peteseeph*, Moses' Egyptian name is given as *Tisithen*,³ a name that has so far received hardly any academic scrutiny. The debate has continued since the beginnings of Biblical scholarship, but as Rudolf Smend diagnosed in 1995, 'the history of Moses research is comprised of a sequence of subtractions' ("die Geschichte der Moseforschung besteht aus einer Folge von Subtraktionen"; Smend, 1995: 5). Among the very few elements of the textual tradition that are widely seen as irreducible elements of an original, historically genuine layer, the name "Moses" (מֹשֶׁה, *mōšāʾē*) itself figures most prominently. Jörg Jeremias has emphasized that the Egyptian name is one of the fundamentals of the Moses narrative (Jeremias, 2015: 85–86; also Blum, 2012: 49). Most scholars agree that this name has an Egyptian origin and goes back to a form of the Egyptian root *mśy*,⁴ "to be born" (e.g., Hoffmeier, 1999: 140–141; Dijkstra, 2006: 18–20; Frevel, 2018: 59). The personal name would thus represent an essential piece of historical information and implicitly also link Moses to the Exodus tradition. I quote again Rudolf Smend: 'We can most likely exclude later invention [of the name] because how could Israel possibly have given the man whom it regarded as its founder a name precisely in the language of those from whose oppression he had saved the people?' ("Spätere Erfindung dürfte auszuschließen sein; wie sollte Israel dem Mann, den es als seinen Begründer ansah, einen Namen gerade in der Sprache derer beilegen, aus deren Hand er das Volk gerettet hatte?" Smend, 1995: 15–16). The consensus among Biblical scholars has reached such a degree that Thomas Römer goes as far as to say that the name is 'undisputably of Egyptian origin' ('indiscutablement d'origine égyptienne'; Römer, 2015: 75). This is certainly not true; doubts about the name have indeed often been raised. However, as Erhard Blum has concluded, the wide-spread acceptance of the derivation of the name from the root *mśy* is due to the simple fact that no convincing alternative has ever been proposed (Blum, 2012: 38). It is the purpose of the following remarks to

¹Earlier versions of this contribution were presented at the 2016 annual meeting of ASOR in San Antonio, Texas, and at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in December 2018. I would like to thank the Halbert Centre for Canadian Studies for having hosted me at the Hebrew University, and Orly Goldwasser to have facilitated my visit. I am grateful to the audience of these two lectures as well as Ronald Hendel (Berkeley) for feedback on the ideas expressed herein. Hanna Jenni (University of Basel) was kind enough to provide me with an offprint of her pertinent article.

²For different views on this question, see Schäfer, 1997; Assmann, 2002; Römer, 2008; Thonhauser, 2009; Moore, 2015.

³Barclay, 2007: 341–350 (Appendix 3: Exodus Narratives in Cultural Context); Cook, 2004: 29 and 120; see also Gager, 1972: 121.

⁴For the sake of coherence, I use here <y> as a transcription symbol for IIIy verbs in both Egyptian and Northwest Semitic where scholarship also uses <j> and for Egyptian, <i>.

present a critical summary of the conventional etymology of the name and some recent literature on the topic, which will call that etymology into question, and to call for a reassessment of the name.

2 The Egyptian Name Forms: Meanings and Phonology

As a starting point, let me first provide some clarification on the conventional Egyptian etymology, proposed as early as 1849 by Richard Lepsius (1849: 325–326 n.5). The clarification is needed not only because many scholars provide mistaken translations of the Egyptian equivalents but also because my critique will address two major phonological objections to this proposal of which only one has so far been addressed. The standard explanation sees in *Mōšē* the Hebrew rendering either of an abbreviated name such as “Thutmose”, or of the noun *mšw*, “child”. Many participants of the debate have not understood the first of these alternatives correctly which in turn is essential for its vocalization and the phonological issues.

2.1 Egyptian Names Containing *mšy*: Meaning and Vocalization

2.1.1 Names of the Type “Thutmose” (Divine Name + Stative)

Names like “Thutmose” or “Ramose” need to be kept separate from names such as “Ramses”.⁵ The latter, correctly *R^c-mšy-šw*, is a nominal sentence name comprising an initial noun, an active past participle and the pronominal object *-šw* of the third person singular masculine, with the meaning “(the sun god) Re is the one who has ‘born’ = engendered him” (the newborn boy). By contrast, a name such as Ramose, correctly *R^c-mšy.w*, contains the divine name followed by an Egyptian stative, with a literal meaning “(the sun god) Re is born”. This does not refer to the physical birth of the deity but is a feast name (Ranke, 1952: 217) which can be better paraphrased as “(a statue of) Re has been created = manufactured”. The boy was born during a festival to the sun god and name after the consecration event of a divine statue during that festival.

A name like Thutmose does therefore *not* mean “son of Thoth” (Dozeman, 2009: 81–82; Baden 2019: 11), or “Thoth has born” (Albertz, 2012: 60), nor is it possible to understand a name such as “Ptahmose” as either “Ptah is born” or “Ptah has engendered”, as Greifenhagen (2002: 63) and similarly Geertz (2002: 10) maintain – only the first translation is correct. Such a sentence name could be shortened to just the verbal element, the stative of the verb *mšy*.

⁵The name “Moses” cannot be an abbreviation of either of these names, as Jenni, 2016: 158 states (with an incorrect identification and translation of the name forms).

The vocalization of the stative of the third person singular masculine of third weak verbs can be reconstructed; it was (Paleo-Coptic⁶) $\text{C}\check{\text{a}}\text{C}\check{\text{i}}\text{w} > \text{C}\check{\text{a}}\text{C}\check{\text{i}}\text{y}$ (New Kingdom). The stressed vowel $\check{\text{a}}$ underwent a regular shift to $\check{\text{o}}$ between c. 550 and 450 BCE (Schenkel, 1990: 87), while the final syllable became /e/. I give two examples for which this pattern can be reconstructed: $^{\text{L}}\text{C}\check{\text{a}}\text{C}\check{\text{i}}\text{y} > (\text{Coptic})^{\text{L}}\text{C}\check{\text{a}}\text{C}\check{\text{i}}/\text{e} \text{ } \check{\text{c}}\check{\text{a}}\text{s}\check{\text{i}}/\text{e}$, $^{\text{S}}\text{C}\check{\text{o}}\text{C}\check{\text{e}} \check{\text{c}}\check{\text{o}}\text{s}\check{\text{e}}$ ‘to be exalted’, $^{\text{S}}\text{t}\check{\text{a}}\check{\text{h}}\check{\text{i}}\text{y} > ^{\text{S}}\text{T}\check{\text{a}}\check{\text{z}}\text{e} \text{ } \check{\text{t}}\check{\text{ā}}\text{h}\check{\text{e}}$ ‘to be drunk’ (where /a/ is preserved before the velar /h/) (Peust, 1999: 151 and 236).⁷ Accordingly, and in agreement with name forms preserved in Greek transcriptions such as *Ptahmose*, *Ahmose*, *Thutmose*, we have $\text{m}\check{\text{ā}}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{i}}\text{y} > ^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{o}}\check{\text{s}}\text{e}$ ‘born’.

2.1.2 One-Word Name with the Noun *mśw*, “Child”

The other suggested Egyptian form is the noun *mśw*, “child”, preserved in Coptic as $^{\text{SB}}\text{M}\check{\text{a}}\text{C} \text{ } \text{mas}$ and $^{\text{S}}\text{M}\check{\text{a}}\text{C}\text{e} \text{ } \text{mase}$,⁸ used in this late phase primarily for young animals and birds. This late form goes back to a form $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{ě}}\text{s}$ (Schenkel, 1983: 185; Osing, 1976: 228). $\check{\text{ě}}$ itself in stressed syllables is the successor to either Paleo-Coptic $\check{\text{i}}$ or $\check{\text{u}}$; the shift to $\check{\text{ě}}$ occurred between the time of Ramses II and the Neo-Assyrian conquest (Schenkel, 1990: 87). In consequence, the noun was either $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{i}}\text{s}$ or $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{u}}\text{s}$ under Ramses II. This reconstruction of the vocalization of the suggested verbal or nominal forms that are believed to be reflected in the name “Moses” leads to the first, not fully acknowledged (Griffiths, 1953: 228–229; Görg, 2000: 23) problem presented by this equation: the vocalization pattern.

2.2 The Phonological Problems: Vocalization and Sibilants

The vocalization pattern in both possible forms of origin is different from the one in the name Moses, *mōšé*. The proposed nominal derivation from monosyllabic $\text{m}\check{\text{ě}}\text{s}$ “child” or its possible pre-forms $\text{m}\check{\text{i}}\text{s}$ and $\text{m}\check{\text{u}}\text{s}$ do not provide any resemblance to the Biblical name. In turn, the verbal derivation $\text{m}\check{\text{ā}}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{i}}\text{y}$ is bisyllabic but dissimilar to *mōšé*; the similarity is a late phenomenon of the Persian Period when we can assume that the pronunciation had shifted to a form $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{o}}\check{\text{s}}\text{e}$. Even at this time, the position of stress of the two terms was different. Intriguingly, if we purport the name *mōšé* to be an active Hebrew participle, its historically older form during the Late Bronze Age would have been $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{ā}}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{i}}\text{y}$, similar in appearance to the pre-sixth century Egyptian stative form $^{\text{S}}\text{m}\check{\text{ā}}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{i}}\text{y}$ “born”. We will return to this observation below.

⁶“Paleo-Coptic” is a term used since William F. Edgerton (1947) for a (theoretical) stage of earlier ancient Egyptian when the sound developments that led to the Coptic phonological system had not yet taken place.

⁷The uppercase sigla “L” and “S” refer to the Lycopolitan and Saidic dialects of Coptic.

⁸The uppercase sigla “S” and “B” refer to the Saidic and Bohairic dialects of Coptic.

The different vocalization adds to the second problem on which so far most scholarly attention has focused: the different sibilants. In this respect it is important to underline that the precise phonological nature of Egyptian <š> is unclear; in transcriptions of the New Kingdom (1530–1070 BCE) it is mostly used to render Semitic /š/ and /t/ (while Egyptian /š/ is the regular equivalent of Semitic /š/ (Hoch, 1994: 402–405; 409–410). The reverse situation is not clear, due to the lack of Egyptian-Semitic transcriptions.⁹ Scholars advocating for the Egyptian derivation of the name Moses posit that Egyptian <š> would have been rendered by the voiceless interdental /t/ in Semitic, and that this would have produced /š/ as a result of the regular internal phonetic shift in Hebrew (Quack, 2000; reiterated by Breyer, 2019: 65–66). However, other scholars have maintained that the transcription of Egyptian /š/ by Hebrew /š/ is not regular. Yoshiyuki Muchiki has for this very reason ruled out that the name “Moses” could be Egyptian (Muchiki, 1999: 217; criticized by Noonan, 2019, 277 with n. 13 who considers the equivalence possible), and scholars like Kenneth Kitchen (2003: 296–297) and James Hoffmeier (2016: 19–20) have again expressed doubts. Alternatively, a rendering of Egyptian <š> by Semitic /š/ appears possible in principle and is suggested by a borrowed term for ship, Hebr. *šēkiyyā (or *šēkīt; only the plural form is attested in Isa 2:16) < Eg. šk.tī (as opposed to > Ugaritic tkt) (Muchiki, 1999: 255; 315; Breyer, 2019: 165; Noonan 2019: 205–6).¹⁰ In this case (and disregarding the vocalization pattern), the Hebrew name should thus be *mōšā and not mōšā, with Hebrew Sin and not Shin. In the first millennium BCE, the Semitic equivalent of Egyptian /š/ is Samek, as shown by the rendering of “Ramses” as רַעַמְסֵס in Ex 1:11 – a clear indication that this cannot be a historical reminiscence from the New Kingdom (according to Redford, 2009: 175, not earlier than end of the eighth c. BCE).¹¹

A number of attempts have been made to explain the different sibilants, on the assumption that the Hebrew-Egyptian identification is valid. John Gwyn Griffiths postulated a difference between a temporary borrowing and a permanent adoption of a name (Griffiths, 1953: 229–230). Manfred Görg suggested that the explanation of the name by the root mšy in Exodus 2 could have induced a sibilant change in the Biblical text (Görg, 2000: 23). Other scholars (e.g., James Hoffmeier) claimed dialectal differences for the rendering of /š/ by /š/, maintaining that “these considerations show that we cannot always expect sibilants going between Egyptian and

⁹On account of this situation of Egyptian-Semitic transcriptions, the frequently encountered view whereby the alleged rendering of Egyptian /š/ by Hebrew /š/ in the name Moses is proof of the name’s 2nd millennium date (Schipper, 2009, 1156; cf. Gertz’s, 2008 statement: ‘Additionally, the name’s writing points to its old age since the Hebrew rendering of the Egyptian S-sound reflects the phonetics of the 2nd millennium BCE’ [“Zudem spricht die Schreibweise für ein hohes Alter des Namens, da sich in der hebräischen Wiedergabe des ägyptischen S-Lautes die Phonetik des 2. Jt.s v. Chr. spiegelt”]) is not correct.

¹⁰Noonan adduces the possible loan words māsī (2019: 149–50) and taḥaš (2019: 218–9) in support of a sound correspondence Egyptian /š/ = Hebrew /š/; in both cases, the meaning of the Hebrew terms cannot be derived easily from the Egyptian ones (cf. Breyer, 2019: 143 and 174).

¹¹Note that Hebrew Sin and Samekh coalesced in the later first millennium BCE – according to Bosker, 2013: 558, as late as the second century BCE.

Semitic languages conform to rigid rules set by modern linguists” (Hoffmeier, 1999: 141). I would contend that Egyptian phonology does not set abstract rules but tries to analyze the preserved evidence, which in this case does not readily support the equivalence. At any rate, in addition to the sibilant problem (2), the vocalization divergence (1) would need to be solved.

3 Exodus 2:10: Speculations About מֹשֶׁה *m^ʿšūihū*

3.1 *Interpretations Relating to the Idea of “Drawing (A Child) from the Water”*

On the assumption that *mōšē* is a transcription of an Egyptian verbal form or noun derived from the root *mšy*, many authors have advanced the hypothesis according to which the author of Exodus 2 (to some scholars, also the readers) knew of this etymology of the name. E.g., Andrzej Strus (1978: 64) and I. Willi-Plein (1991) have surmised that the root יל “to give birth; child” which appears often in Exod 1:15–2:10, is a covert allusion to the Egyptian meaning of the name; an idea reiterated in many recent commentaries (Albertz, 2012: 60; Dozeman, 2009: 81–82; cf. also Jenni, 2016: 158). However, in a birth narrative, the omnipresence of the root יל seems evident without the additional motivation of a covert explication of a name. In this respect, it is conspicuous to observe that no single Jewish or Christian author in the reception history of Exodus in antiquity – when the forms (Egyptian) *mōse* and (Hebrew) *mōšē* had at last almost fully converged phonetically – actually associated the two name forms with each other. In a detailed study, Heinz-Josef Thissen reviewed the antique speculation about the name Moses which focused on the Greek variants of the name, Μωσης, Μωσσης and Μουσης (Thissen, 2004). The ancient etymologists¹² interpreted the Greek forms as “saved from the water”, identifying the first element with Egyptian *mw* (in Komposita, μου-), and the second most likely with -σης < βy, ‘taken’ (thus = ‘water-taken’).

Some scholars skeptical of the derivation of the Moses name from Eg. *mšy* have instead pointed to the explanation provided in Ex 2:10 (וַתִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ מֹשֶׁה וַתֹּאמֶר כִּי מִן-הַמַּיִם מֹשֶׁהוּ: ‘And she called his name “Moses” and said: because from the water I have drawn him’). In their view, the root *mšy* ‘to draw’ would not be a folk etymology but instead provide the correct root underlying the name *mōšē* (Muchiki, 1999: 217; Kitchen, 2003: 296–297). However, from a Hebrew perspective, the name is an active and not a passive participle (Hoffmeier, 1999: 142; Jenni, 2016: 158). Given that the root appears only once more in the Hebrew Bible in a psalm ascribed to David (2 Sam 22:17 = Ps 18:17) where it denotes drawing from water

¹² Thissen lists Ezekiel Tragicus; Philo, *De vita Moysis*; Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata*; Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* and *Contra Apionem*; Cyril of Alexandria, *Glaphyra on Exodus*; (Pseudo-)Eustathius of Antioch, *Commentary on the Hexaemeron*.

as a metaphor for saving, could one possibly argue that the name is an abbreviated form of a theophoric personal name, “(DN) is a saviour”? Or does the name anticipate Moses’ saving of his people from bondage through the waters of the Red Sea (Jenni, 2016: 158)?

3.2 *Hanna Jenni’s 2016 Proposal*

This avenue, however, does not exist, either, according to a recent study by Hanna Jenni (2016). She has mounted the entire Semitic lexical repertoire to demonstrate that a root *mšy* “to draw (from water)” is a lexicological phantom. An Arabic root *masā* “to pull out” is attested exclusively in the specialized vocabulary of bedouin camel breeders where it is used with regard to the cleaning of the uterus of a female camel. A root *mšy* is well attested in Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic with the meaning “to wipe, sweep, take away, gather up”; but this verb was not used in any of the Aramaic, Syrian and Arabic translations of Ex 2:10 for the Hebrew מִשִּׁיתָהוּ *mēšītiḥû*. Evidently, the translators did not associate it with the Hebrew verb and also did not deem it a translation semantically suitable for the described action. This leaves the question open of how to then explain the verbal form מִשִּׁיתָהוּ *mēšītiḥû*.

Hanna Jenni advances an ingenious new explanation. She regards not only the name “Moses” but also the verbal form as derived from the Egyptian root *mšy*; מִשִּׁיתָהוּ *mēšītiḥû* would thus be an inflected Hebrew form of the Egyptian verb *mšy*. This means that the author, knowledgeable of the derivation of the name מֹשֶׁה “Moses” from (purportedly) the root *mšy* “to give birth, engender”, would have used the same Egyptian root to explain the personal name. For the sake of demonstration, we can use a French equivalent in English to exemplify this strategy: “And she called his name *enfant* and said: because from the water I have *enfanted* him”. Since the Egyptian word *mw* “water” can also mean “semen”, Jenni further argues that the verse could actually implicate conceiving a child from divine semen, an idea she then contextualizes within the Egyptian institution of the God’s Wife of Amun. Such a God’s Wife of Amun, an unmarried princess assuming political control in Upper Egypt, would have adopted the Moses child and understood it within the theological concept of the divine birth of royal princes.

While Jenni’s approach is novel and ingenious, it is based on the assumption that both מֹשֶׁה *mōšē* and מִשִּׁיתָהוּ *mēšītiḥû* can be derived from Egyptian *mšy* and that this involves regular sound correspondences. This is far from clear, as could be demonstrated above.

4 Etymological Scenarios: Reopening the Debate

In summary, there are two alternatives we face in assessing the name *mōšē*:

1. The name represents a borrowing of the Egyptian stative form *māśīy* from the period of Iron Age I/II but underwent in its new (Israelite) linguistic context the shift of vowel *qualities* *a-i* > *o-e* like the similar Northwest Semitic active participle, in addition to a change of the vowel *quantity* (short to long /a/), the *sibilant* (/ś/ > /š/; alternatively adopted into Hebrew as /t/ and then undergoing the internal shift > /š/) and the *position of the stress* (first syllable to second syllable). The question arises whether such a scenario is likely for a borrowed name, and whether the name of a legendary hero would be modified rather than retained unchanged?¹³ If we assume a takeover of the name after the vowel shift occurred in ancient Egypt (c. sixth century BCE), we can avoid the secondary vocalization change although the sibilant rendering and the stress position would still be incorrect. This would implicate a similarly late date for the figure of Moses and appears too late with regard to currently proposed dates for the origins of the Moses tradition.¹⁴
2. Alternatively, the name reflects an active participle of a Northwest Semitic root *mšy*; however, such a root is no longer attested in Northwest Semitic onomastics. Since the Canaanite vowel shift *ā* > *ō* occurred gradually after the fifteenth century BCE (Gzella, 2011: 434), the name מֹשֶׁה *Mōšē* could be the genuine form of a name originating in the Iron Age I period – or later. This hypothesis avoids the complex assumptions necessary in scenario 1 (see the end of this paragraph for a proposal).

Given this situation of the linguistic evidence, the conclusion is all but inescapable that the name “Moses” is not likely of Egyptian origin, which means yet another subtraction in the history of subtractions in Moses scholarship (to use Smend’s imagery quoted at the beginning of this article), 170 years after Richard Lepsius proposed the idea of an Egyptian etymology. This would further invalidate the claim of a genuine historical association of Moses with Egypt¹⁵ – “Moses the Egyptian” would indeed be a later construct.

Instead, the name “Moses” would most probably constitute a Northwest Semitic personal name, of uncertain etymology. Thus, it will be mandatory to reopen the debate on its meaning and the significance of the root מִשָּׁה in Exod 2:10 and 2Sam 22:17 = Ps 18:17. From the Semitic inventory, a satisfactory semantic option for the text passages might be offered by Syriac *mšy* “to collect, to glean” (Ex. 2,10:

¹³ Cf. here the interesting parallel debate regarding the – Latin or Celtic? – etymology of the name of the legendary king Arthur (Green, 2009: 18–9).

¹⁴ Gertz, 2002: 14–5 proposes a historical anchor for the origin of the Moses tradition (with the use of older elements) after the end of the Northern kingdom of Israel. Many of the elements seen as genuinely old in the Moses tradition – e.g., the relation to Midian – have been put into doubt by recent scholarship (see, e.g., the contributions by Christoph Berner and Henrik Pfeiffer in van Oorschot & Witte, 2017).

¹⁵ Cf. Blum, 2012: 42 where he emphasizes: ‘Thus, the historical implications of the name “Moses” cannot be dissociated from the history of the exodus tradition’ (“Die historischen Implikationen des Mose-Namens lassen sich mithin von der Geschichte der Exodustradition nicht lösen.”). If the name is not Egyptian, this nexus between the figure and the Exodus tradition vanishes.

“From the waters I collected/gleaned him”); the name מֹשֶׁה *Mōšé* would then be the equivalent of Syriac *mšwy* (*māšōy*) “gleaner, collector” (cf. CAL s.v.).

I am delighted to offer these gleanings from reflections about the figure of Moses and the exodus narrative to Tom Levy who has been a friend and colleague for many years – particularly in grateful memory of our joint work on the 2013 Exodus conference at his home institution UC San Diego and the subsequent 2015 volume of proceedings (Levy et al., 2015). His research has led scholarship out of the bondage of many preconceived ideas and into the promise of new academic territory.

References

- Albertz, R. (2012). *Exodus 1–18. Zürcher Bibelkommentare*. Theologischer Verlag.
- Assmann, J. (2002). Antijudaismus oder Antimonothismus? Hellenistische Exoduserzählungen. In D. Borchmeyer & H. Kiesel (Eds.), *Das Judentum im Spiegel seiner kulturellen Umwelten. Symposium zu Ehren von Saul Friedländer* (pp. 33–54). Mnemosyne Edition.
- Baden, J. S. (2019). *The book of Exodus: A biography*. Princeton University Press.
- Barclay, J. M. G. (2007). *Flavius Josephus: Against Apion. Translation and commentary*. Brill.
- Blum, E. (2012). Der historische Mose und die Frühgeschichte Israels. *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*, 1, 37–63.
- Bosker, H.-R. (2013). Sibilant consonants. In G. Khan (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Hebrew language and linguistics* (Vol. 3, P–Z, pp. 557–561). Brill.
- Breyer, F. A. (2019). *Ägyptische Namen und Wörter im Alten Testament. Ägypten und Altes Testament* 93. Zaphon.
- CAL = *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. <http://cal.huc.edu/>
- Cook, J. G. (2004). *The interpretation of the Old Testament in Greco-Roman paganism. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum* (Vol. 23). Mohr Siebeck.
- Dijkstra, M. (2006). Moses, the Man of God. In R. Roukema & K. Spronk (Eds.), *The interpretation of exodus: Studies in honour of Cornelis Houtman* (pp. 17–36). Peeters.
- Dozeman, T. B. (2009). *Commentary on Exodus. The Eerdmans critical commentary*. Eerdmans.
- Edgerton, W. F. (1947). Stress, vowel quantity, and syllable division in Egyptian. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 6, 1–17.
- Frevel, C. (2018). *Geschichte Israels. Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie* (Second, Enlarged and Revised Edition). Kohlhammer.
- Gager, J. G. (1972). *Moses in Greco-Roman paganism* (Society of Biblical Literature, Monograph series) (Vol. 16). Society of Biblical Literature.
- Gertz, J. C. (2002). Mose und die Anfänge der jüdischen Religion. *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 99, 3–20.
- Gertz, J.C. (2008). *Mose*. Retrieved January 4, 2022, from <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/28069/>
- Görg, M. (2000). Mose – Name und Namensträger. Versuch einer historischen Annäherung. In E. Otto (Ed.), *Mose. Ägypten und das Alte Testament. SBS 189* (pp. 17–42). Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk GmbH.
- Greifenhagen, F. V. (2002). *Egypt on the Pentateuch's ideological map: Constructing biblical Israel's identity*. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Green, C. R. (2009). The historicity and historicisation of Arthur. In C. R. Green (Ed.), *Arthuriana: Early Arthurian tradition and the origins of the legend* (pp. 3–46). The Lindes Press.
- Griffiths, J. G. (1953). The Egyptian derivation of the name Moses. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 12, 225–231.
- Gzella, H. (2011). Northwest Semitic in general. In S. Weninger (Ed.), *The Semitic languages. An international handbook* (pp. 425–451). De Gruyter.
- Hoch, J. E. (1994). *Semitic words in Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton University Press.

- Hoffmeier, J. K. (1999). *Israel in Egypt. The evidence for the authenticity of the exodus tradition*. Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmeier, J. K. (2016). Egyptian religious influences on the early Hebrews. In J. K. Hoffmeier, A. R. Millard, & G. A. Rendsburg (Eds.), *'Did I not bring Israel out of Egypt?' Biblical, archaeological, and Egyptological perspectives on the exodus narratives* (pp. 3–35). Eisenbrauns.
- Jenni, H. (2016). Fragen zum Verb *mšj* in der Kindheitsgeschichte Moses (Ex 2,10). In H. Jenni & M. Saur (Eds.), *Nächstenliebe und Gottesfurcht. Beiträge aus alttestamentlicher, semitistischer und altorientalistischer Wissenschaft für Hans-Peter Mathys zum 65. Geburtstag* (pp. 151–175). Ugarit Verlag.
- Jeremias, J. (2015). *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kitchen, K. A. (2003). *On the reliability of the Old Testament*. Eerdmans.
- Lepsius, C. R. (1849). *Die Chronologie der Aegypter. Einleitung und erster Theil: Kritik der Quellen*. Nicolaische Buchhandlung.
- Levy, T. E., Schneider, T., & Propp, W. H. C. (Eds.). (2015). *Israel's exodus in transdisciplinary perspective: Text, archaeology and geoscience* (Qualitative methods in the humanities and social sciences). Springer.
- Moore, S. (2015). *Jewish ethnic identity and relations in Hellenistic Egypt: With walls of iron?* Brill.
- Muchiki, Y. (1999). *Egyptian proper names and loanwords in Northwest Semitic*. Society of Biblical Literature.
- Noonan, B. J. (2019). *Non-Semitic loanwords in the Hebrew bible. A lexicon of language contact*. Eisenbrauns.
- Osing, J. (1976). *Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen* (Vol. 2 vols). Von Zabern.
- Peust, C. (1999). *Egyptian phonology. An introduction to the phonology of a dead language*. Peust & Gutschmidt.
- Quack, J.F. (2000). Review of Y. Muchiki, *Egyptian proper names and loanwords in Northwest Semitic* (1999). *Review of Biblical Literature* <http://www.bookreviews.org>
- Ranke, H. (1952). *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*. Bd. 2: *Einleitung. Form und Inhalt der Namen. Geschichte der Namen. Vergleiche mit anderen Namen. Nachträge und Zusätze zu Band I. Umschreibungslisten*. J.J. Augustin.
- Redford, D. B. (2009). The land of Ramses. In P. J. Brand & L. Cooper (Eds.), *Causing his name to live. Studies in Egyptian epigraphy and history in memory of William J. Murnane* (pp. 175–178). Brill.
- Römer, T. (2008). Moses outside the Torah and the construction of diaspora identity. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, 8(15), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2008.v8.a15>
- Römer, T. (2015). *Moïse en version originale: Enquête sur le récit de la sortie d'Égypte*. Bayard.
- Schäfer, P. (1997). *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the ancient world*. Harvard University Press.
- Schenkel, W. (1983). *Zur Rekonstruktion der deverbale Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen*. Harrassowitz.
- Schenkel, W. (1990). *Einführung in die altägyptische Sprachwissenschaft*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schipper, B. U. (2009). Ägypten und Israel. Erkenntnisse und Perspektiven. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 134, 1153–1164.
- Smend, R. (1995). Der geschichtliche Mose. *Historische Zeitschrift*, 260, 1–20.
- Strus, A. (1978). *Nomen – Omen: La stylistique sonore des noms propres dans le Pentateuque*. Biblical Institute Press.
- Thissen, H. J. (2004). Zum Namen Moses. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 147, 55–62.
- Thonhauser, J. (2009). Das Unbehagen am Monotheismus. Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch der Debatte um Jan Assmann's Thesen zur ‚Mosaischen Unterscheidung‘. In J. Kügler & U. Bechmann (Eds.), *Biblische Religionskritik: Kritik in, an und mit biblischen Texten* (pp. 229–259). LIT Verlag.
- van Oorschot, J., & Witte, M. (Eds.). (2017). *The origins of Yahwism*. De Gruyter.
- Willi-Plein, I. (1991). Ort und literarische Funktion der Geburtsgeschichte des Mose. *Vetus Testamentum*, 41, 110–118.