Pa-Canaan in the Egyptian New Kingdom: Canaan or Gaza?

Michael G. Hasel
Institute of Archaeology, Southern Adventist University

Abstract

The identification of the geographical name "Canaan" continues to be widely debated in the scholarly literature. Cuneiform sources from Mari, Amarna, Ugarit, Aššur, and Hattusha have been discussed, as have Egyptian sources. Renewed excavations in North Sinai along the "Ways of Horus" have, along with recent scholarly reconstructions, refocused attention on the toponyms leading toward and culminating in the arrival to Canaan. This has led to two interpretations of the Egyptian name Pa-Canaan: it is either identified as the territory of Canaan or the city of Gaza. This article offers a renewed analysis of the terms Canaan, Pa-Canaan, and Canaanite in key documents of the New Kingdom, with limited attention to parallels of other geographical names, including Kharu, Retenu, and Djahy. It is suggested that the name Pa-Canaan in Egyptian New Kingdom sources consistently refers to the larger geographical territory occupied by the Egyptians in Asia.

By the 1960s, a general consensus had emerged regarding the extent of the land of Canaan, its boundaries and geographical area.[1] The primary sources for the reconstruction of this area include: (1) the Mari letters, (2) the Amarna letters, (3) Ugaritic texts, (4) texts from Aššur and Hattusha, and (5) Egyptian texts and reliefs. Most scholars have concluded that "Canaan" in these texts, particularly during the Egyptian Nineteenth Dynasty, referred to the entire area of Palestine.[2] This view was recently challenged by N.-P. Lemche, who insists there is a "correspondence between the imprecise and ambiguous Egyptian use of the geographical name Canaan and the likewise imprecise understanding of Canaan displayed by the inhabitants of Western Asia themselves."[3] In conclusion to his study of the Amarna letters, he writes, "evidently the inhabitants of the supposed Canaanite territory in Western Asia had no clear idea of the actual size of this Canaan, nor did they know exactly where Canaan was situated."[4] In essence, "the Canaanites of the ancient Near East did not know that they were themselves Canaanites."[5] Lemche's conclusions have been challenged by N. Na'aman and A. Rainey from the perspective of the cuneiform sources,[6] but Lemche continues to maintain his interpretation of historical sources, which he calls "imprecise" and "ambiguous."[7]

In 2001, O. Tammuz readdressed the identification of Canaan in a 41-page article focusing primarily on the cuneiform sources. However, his very brief overview of non-cuneiform Egyptian texts leaves a number of unanswered questions.[8] He states categorically that "some Egyptian texts name the city of Gaza, which held the main Egyptian administrative center in the Levant, *P3-Knˤn (the Canaan)*," but provides no analysis or supporting evidence.[9] Regarding the Merenptah Stele, Tammuz says it "contains no information on [Canaan's] geography."[10] He submits that Egypt's perception

of Canaan varied: that it was a territory in Asia, that its boundaries were fluid, and that it also referred to Gaza itself.[11] He concludes, "No wonder that Lemche's review of the evidence uncovered so many difficulties and finally led him to conclude that Canaan was a vague term."[12]

These revisionist positions leave open the possibility for a very loose interpretation of the toponym Canaan. One is left with unresolved questions regarding the meaning of this toponym for the Egyptians themselves and what, if any, connection it has with contemporaneous Near Eastern sources. This study seeks to investigate the terms Canaan, Pa-Canaan, and Canaanite from the Egyptian perspective in the Eighteenth through Twentieth Dynasties. How did the Egyptians understand the designation Canaan/Pa-Canaan during the New Kingdom? What parameters were assigned to the place name? How did the term relate to other contemporaneous terms like Kharu, Retenu, and Djahy? The detailed study of several New Kingdom sources will provide the basis for establishing the Egyptian perception of Pa-Canaan during the period in question.

Egyptian Occurrences of Canaan, Pa-Canaan, and Canaanite

The place name Canaan or ethnicon Canaanite is found a total of sixteen times in Egyptian texts; of these, twelve are preserved from the New Kingdom.[13] Three of these occurrences are found on topographical lists and are consistently written without a determinative. The term Canaan appears five times in the narrative context of monumental inscriptions and four more times on papyri dating to Ramesses II, Merenptah and Ramesses III. Each of the occurrences will be listed briefly in chronological order.

Occurrences: *kynꜣnw* (Canaanite)

The ethnicon *kynꜣnw* appears only early in the reign of Amenhotep II and late in the reign of Merenptah. The two occurrences of the term *kynꜣnw* as an ethnicon are found on the Amenhotep II's Memphis and Karnak stelae.[14] In both instances they refer to captives that are brought back after Amenhotep II's Year 9 campaign. Here they appear without determinatives, a characteristic often found throughout these stelae when referring to a people group.[15] In the reign of Merenptah, the term occurs as an ethnicon in Papyrus Anastasi IIIA and IV where *ḥmw knnꜥnꜣw n H̱ꜣrw*, "Canaanite slaves of Kharu," are mentioned.[16] The orthography of Canaan in Papyrus Anastasi III is superior to that of IV, where it lacks the final *n*.

Occurrences: *kꜣnꜥnꜣ* (Canaan)

The place name *kꜣnꜥnꜣ* is first found written in Egyptian hieroglyphic sources during the reign of Amenhotep III. It becomes more frequent beginning in the Nineteenth Dynasty, when it is used for the first time as a territorial name.

Amenhotep III. Canaan appears on the topographical list from Soleb.[17] It also may occur on a short list written on a fragment of a statue pedestal with only three surviving names. According to Giveon, this statue may date to Amenhotep III.[18] Neither of the two occurrences have determinatives, which is common of other toponyms on both lists.

Seti I. The war scenes of Seti I at Karnak describe and depict his campaigns into the southern Levant and mention *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* twice. The first phrase is: "The destruction which the sturdy arm of Pharaoh, LPH, made (among) the fallen ones of Shasu, beginning with the fortress of Sile to the Canaan."[19] This description identifies the extent of the campaign from its beginning point to its conclusion. The second reference appears as the description over the fort as *dmi.t n pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ*, "town of the Canaan."[20]

Ramesses II. Canaan occurs once in a topographical list from the temple of Ramesses II at Amara West.[21] It is significant that the name Canaan appears separately after each of place names in the Shasu-land are listed, indicating that this is a separate region. The second occurrence is in Papyrus Anastasi I, where the scribe writes: *dd.i n.k ḥꜣswt mḥ n.tꜣ n pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ*, "I have told you of the northernmost lands/hill countries of the land of the Canaan."[22]

Merenptah. Canaan occurs first in a monumental inscription known as the Merenptah Stele that focuses primarily on that pharaoh's war against the Libyans but concludes with an earlier campaign against Canaan. The text reads: *ḥꜣk pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜥ bint.k*, "Canaan has been plundered into every sort of woe."[23]

Ramesses III. Papyrus Harris I contains a reference to Canaan: "I built for you an inaccessible house (*ḥwt* [fem.]) in the land of Djahy. Equal to the horizon of heaven, that is at the heaven House (*ḥwt* [fem.]) of Ramesses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, LPH, in Pa-Canaan for your name's sake."[24]

THE NATURE AND IDENTIFICATION OF PA-CANAAN

The most frequent translation of the place name *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* is simply the territory "Canaan" or "the Canaan."[25] Others have interpreted this toponym in Seti I's reliefs, the Merenptah stela, and other contexts as the city of Gaza specifically, not a region or territory.[26] J. K. Hoffmeier, for example, has interpreted *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* in the Merenptah Stele as Gaza, concluding that "the cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Gezer represent a nice geographical unit within a limited area of what would later become known as Philistia."[27] The most recent study, by L. D. Morenz, remains fairly neutral but slightly favors Gaza in the context of the stele.[28] The distinguishing factor for the interpretation of the place name *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* is the prefix *pꜣ*, which indicates the use of the definite article. The argument has been made that the definite article provides further specificity to Canaan and thus refers to its capital of Gaza. The implications are wide-ranging: all occurrences of the name Canaan in narrative contexts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties would need to be read as Gaza *whenever written as Pa-Canaan*. This would have major repercussions on the Egyptian understanding of "the land of Canaan" and might also influence the interpretation of other Near Eastern texts, including the Amarna letters. A complete analysis of texts from the late New Kingdom would be most informative in reevaluating this issue.

The Reliefs of Seti I

The primary argument for interpreting *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* as Gaza comes from the reliefs of Seti I, wherein the description over the fort reads *dmi.t n pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ*, "city/town of the Canaan."[29] It has been suggested that because an actual fortified city is being referred to as "city/town of the Canaan," Pa-Canaan should be identified with the city of Gaza. Earlier in the same text, the destruction of the Shasu takes place "beginning with the fortress of Sile to the Canaan (*pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ*)."[30] The road from Egypt to Canaan—known as the "Ways of Horus"—extended from Sile and may have ended in Gaza, which marked the entry point into Canaan.[31] But do these contexts necessitate the interpretation that *pꜣ kꜣnꜥnꜣ* simply *was* Gaza?

Gardiner has often been cited on this point, having been first to suggest a connection with Gaza in his seminal *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* article on the Ways of Horus. "Is it too rash to conjecture," he asked, "that the '*town of the Canaan*,' of which the storming... marked the culmination of the expedition in [Y]ear 1, might be Gaza itself?"[32] However, three points must be recognized here. First, Gardiner recognized that his question was conjecture and not inherent in the text. Second, he in no way equated Pa-Canaan with Gaza; conjecturing instead that "the *town* of the Canaan" might be Gaza. In other words, the fort designated as *dmi* might be Gaza, lying *within* the land of Pa-Canaan. This would be akin to speaking of "the city/town of Amurru" or "the city/town of Hatti." One might offer a hypothesis as to what the city may be within those terri-

tories, but without further textual clarification this could prove difficult. Indeed, in all his translations of the phrase, Gardiner consistently uses "town of (the) Canaan,"[33] and in his specific discussion of the fort inscriptions says there is "sufficient evidence to show that the region designated by the Egyptians as 'Canaan,' 'the Canaan,' was the maritime plain just mentioned."[34] Later scholars have gone beyond Gardiner's intentions in equating Pa-Canaan with Gaza.[35]

Should the later reference in the reliefs, "beginning with the fortress of Sile to the Canaan," be understood as referring to Gaza as well? Not necessarily. In this case, *p3 k3n⁽n3* may refer to the border or entrance to the land of Canaan without specifying the city that is at the border.[36] One might interpret this phrase as: "beginning with the fortress of Sile to the [border of] Canaan." It is even more plausible that *p3 k3n⁽n3* may be an abbreviation for *p3 t3 n k3n⁽n3*, "the [land of] Canaan." There are other parallels to this particular usage. For example, the Year 8 campaign by Ramesses II as recorded on Pylon I at the Ramesseum included *dmi ḫf n ḥm.f m p3 t3 n im⁽rw d3p3wr*, "town which his majesty plundered in the land of Amurru: Dapur."[37] In this case, the city of Dapur is identified as being "in the land of Amurru," just as the city on Seti's reliefs is identified as being in the land of Canaan. Other parallels to this same terminology and syntax include references to *p3 t3 n kmt*, "the land of Egypt,"[38] and *p3 t3 n irs3*, "the land of Alasiya," in the *Report of Wenamun*.[39] If this same meaning holds for Seti's reliefs, then the sense of border or boundary of the land of Canaan remains, fitting perfectly within the context of the reliefs. If Pa-Canaan is understood in this way, then the title on the fortress itself need not be a matter of perplexity; the title *dmi.t n p3 k3n⁽n3*, "city/town of the Canaan," simply identifies this city generically as the first border city encountered by Seti's armies within "the [land of] Canaan." That this *city/town* was the city of Gaza—and it may well be in this context—is still a matter of conjecture, as Gardiner pointed out long ago. Nothing can be stated categorically, for the Egyptian scribe is not specific enough to name the city, only to say it was within the border of Canaan.

One should also note that Seti's campaign of Year 1 did not culminate with this battle at the end of the Ways of Horus. It extended much further into the land of Canaan, for Seti also encountered the cities of Beth Shan, Pella, Rehob, and Yenoam, leaving a commemorative stele at Beth Shan dated to Year 1.[40] The campaign then began when the Egyptian army left the border of Egypt at Sile and continued beyond the border into the land of Canaan.

Papyrus Anastasi I

H. J. Katzenstein suggested in 1982 that because Pa-Canaan and Gaza are referred to in Papyrus Anastasi I, "the scribe is simply playing with the different names of the same town. This double naming of the town fits well the style of Papyrus Anastasi I."[41] But does the contextual setting of these terms and the specific terminology used allow for this equivalency between Pa-Canaan and

Gaza? Because his brief study on the subject is often cited, it is important to look more closely at this passage.

Katzenstein transliterates the key passage as *phwy p3 k'nn⁽*, which he translates as "the end of *the Canaan*." He then writes, "We believe that *phwy* refers to the northern end of the 'Ways of Horus,' which was the main road from Sile in Egypt to Gaza in Canaan."[42] Katzenstein is correct in interpreting *phwy* as "equivalent to the most distant end from the point of view of the Egyptian, or, in our case, the most remote north."[43] The question then becomes: the most remote north or distant end of what? The Ways of Horus/Gaza or the territory of Canaan? But from the outset, Katzenstein has not properly transliterated or translated this passage: he left out a significant portion. H.-W. Fischer-Elfert published a definitive edition of the papyrus in 1983, with a second edition in 1992 that reads: [*sdd.n*] *k ḫ3swt phwy t3 n p3 k3n⁽n3*, "I have described to you the hill countries of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan."[44] It is evident that this is not simply "the end of the Canaan." The *hill-countries* of *the northern reaches* of *the land* of the Canaan is a description much more comprehensive and far-reaching than a mere city-state like Gaza and its hinterland. In fact, this mention occurs as a summary statement at the end of a long discourse on place names and geographical localities the recipient should have been familiar with, including Hazor, Akko, Shechem, Rehob, Beth-Shan, and Joppa (among others) and beginning with those areas farthest from Egypt. In his conclusion, scribe Hori chastises recipient Amenemope for not knowing the *full extent* of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan. In this passage, *p3 k3n⁽n3* is clearly defined as *t3 n p3 k3n⁽n3*, "The land of the Canaan," a slight rephrasing of what may have been intended by Seti I's scribe at Karnak (*p3 [t3 n] k3n⁽n3*).[45] The passage in Papyrus Anastasi I would make little sense if translated as "I have told you of the northern lands/hill-countries of the land of Gaza."[46] Contextually it is not possible; Gaza is a city not a land or territory.

Hori concludes the main part of his letter this way: "I have described to you the hill countries of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan, but you have not answered me in any way, nor have you rendered a report to me." He then turns his focus in a completely different direction. "Come and [I] will describe [ma]ny things [to] you. Head toward (?) the fortress of the Way[s of Horus]. I begin for you with the Dwelling of Sese, l.p.h."[47] It is highly significant that the letter now enters an entirely new context—the Ways of Horus. Prior to this, the description centered on "the hill-countries of the northern reaches of the land of Canaan." When Hori turns to the Ways of Horus, the closest area to Egypt on the coastal road in north Sinai, he begins with the second closest fort to Egypt, the "Dwelling of Sese," also identified with the "Dwelling of the Lion."[48] He then lists several of these forts—as on the reliefs of Seti I, starting with those closest to Egypt—and ends with a question: *sw irt wr.n itrw šm.t r š3⁽ ḳ3d3t*, "How many miles march is it in going to Gaza?"[49] This has nothing to do with the northern reaches or extent of the

Binding of Enemies	A.	The princes are prostrate, saying 'Peace!' Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows
Lands/Nations	B.	Desolation for Tehenu; Hatti is pacified (*ḥtp*)
Region	C.	Plundered is Pa-Canaan with every evil
Cities/People	D.	Carried off is Ashkelon Captured is Gezer Yenoam is made nonexistent Israel is laid waste, his seed is not
Region	C'.	Kharu is become a widow because of Egypt
Lands/Nations	B'.	All lands together, they are pacified (*ḥtp*)
Binding of Enemies	A'.	Everyone who was restless has been bound

Figure 1. Proposed geopolitical structural analysis of the final hymnic-poetic unit of the Merenptah Stele.

land of Canaan, but rather with the military/trade road from Egypt to the border of Canaan—that is, to the city of Gaza. Katzenstein is mistaken that the scribe simply equates Pa-Canaan with Gaza. In fact, Papyrus Anastasi I indicates just the opposite: there is a distinct differentiation between the extent of the land of Pa-Canaan (27:1) and the city of Gaza at the end of the Ways of Horus (27:8). Gaza is written out syllabically, as it had been since the reign of Thutmose III.[50] The two usages are thus discrete, distinguished both contextually and in syllabic orthography.

Merenptah Stele

Perhaps the most decisive reason for understanding *p3 k3n ͨn3* in the New Kingdom as a region rather than the city of Gaza comes from the structure of the final hymnic-poetic unit of the Merenptah Stele. In 1994, the various structures proposed to date were reviewed and evaluated.[51] These included the "ring structure" of G. Ahlström and D. Edelman,[52] the "modified ring structure" by Ahlström,[53] L. E. Stager's[54] and F. J. Yurco's[55] proposed structures, and the "chiastic structure" of J. J. Bimson.[56] Following this critique, a new, independently developed structure was proposed by the present author based on the "parallelism of political and geographical sequences and terms which most accurately maintains the integrity of the text" (Figure 1):[57]

(1) The phrases in A and A' parallel each other, providing a general description which encloses all the entities mentioned by name in the hymn. Furthermore, it is an *inclusio* that expresses the major goals of Merenptah's campaign, namely the "binding" of all enemies (Nine Bows).[58]

(2) The internal structure of B-C-D-C'-B' depicts the details of how the "binding" of enemies has taken place and was accomplished: by subduing the various enemy entities depicted in the chiasm from larger to smaller entities in the form of B-B', the lands/nations of Tehenu and Hatti; C-C', the region of Pa-Canaan/Kharu; and D, the city-state and people entities.

(3) The sequence indicates a progression from those on the edges of Egyptian control with a movement toward those in closer proximity. The nations/lands Tehenu (Libya) and Hatti (Hittite empire) are located in the western and northeastern extremes of Egyptian domination at that time, while the region Pa-Canaan/Kharu (together with its city-state and people entities) appears to be its closest enemy to the (north)east.

(4) The structure of the hymn communicates that the movement of "binding the enemies" is from the more powerful sociopolitical polities to the less powerful ones, such as the city-state and people entities, which are placed in the center of the structure.

(5) The reason that D, with the less powerful sociopolitical and socioethnic entities, is in the center of the chiasm seems to rest in the fact that it details military activities within the region of C—that is, Canaan/Kharu. In other words, the entities of D are located within the Region depicted in C-C'. Therefore, D is in the center.

The central section of the structure D within the region or territory Pa-Canaan/Kharu is presented in the sequence of major city-states (Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam) and a socioethnic people (Israel). Thus the hymnic-poetic unit is structured in the sequence of the general description or binding of the enemies (A), the "pacifying" of lands/nations (B); the plundering of a major region (C); and the subduing of city-state and people entities (D). As I have suggested elsewhere, Pa-Canaan and Kharu (C') correspond to each other in the poetic hymnic structure as a major geographical region which is said

to encompass much of the Egyptian territory of Asia. The clause "Kharu has become a widow because of Egypt" neatly provides a closure for the segment concerning this geographical region. Pa-Canaan/Kharu has become a widow because the listed entities within its area no longer have their previously known existence (D).

(6) This is followed by the phrase, "All lands together are pacified" (B'). The reference to "all lands together" indicates a correlation with the two lands of Tehenu and Hatti (B). It is significant that both B and B' end with the word *ḥtp*, "pacified," which gives further support to the structural correlation with an additional aspect of correspondence. It is now possible to point out a terminological (*ḥtp* = "pacified") as well as geographical correspondence (Pa-Canaan/Kharu) in this hymnic-poetic unit.

(7) This hymnic-poetic unit at the end of the Merenptah Stele functions as a historical summary of the accomplishments of Merenptah during his reign.

Most recently, with the welcome publication of J. K. Hoffmeier's *Israel in Egypt*, a new "grammatical structure" has been suggested that adds additional support to the structure proposed above.[59] Hoffmeier correctly observes that the specific activities concerning the synonymous designations Canaan/Kharu (C-C') are also syntactically parallel. Notice that Canaan is written with the *sḏm.f* + PN, a pattern repeated for the next two city-states, Ashkelon and Gezer. Yenoam and Israel, however, appear with the PN + old perfective, as does Kharu, the region closing the *inclusio* C-C'. Thus there is a distinct syntactical change in the very center of this final hymnic-poetic unit dealing with Canaan/Kharu so that the entities within its territory poetically match with the synonymous names used for the region (D):

C.	*sḏm.f* + PN
	sḏm.f + PN
	sḏm.f + PN
D.	PN + old perfective
	PN + old perfective
C'.	PN + old perfective

Together with Hoffmeier's grammatical observation, my proposed structure makes clear that Canaan and Kharu must be understood as parallel synonymous terms designating Egypt's territory in Asia (as many others have agreed).[60] This means Pa-Canaan was a regional territory that contained the major cities of Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam; moreover, it also contained the socioethnic entity Israel. As Kitchen has recently stated, Kharu "is a synonym for Canaan," for "between Canaan and Khurru is sandwiched their content—the four specific entities claimed by Merenptah as captured or destroyed: Ascalon, Gezer, Yenoam, and Israel."[61] This synonymy with Kharu indicates that Pa-Canaan extended to the north and encompassed those territories designated in other texts as Kharu.[62]

Papyrus Harris I

In 1988, C. Uehlinger suggested that the reference to "The-House-of-Ramses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, -L.-P.-H. in Pa-Canaan" built by Ramesses III must also refer to a temple specifically in the city of Gaza.[63] But does the text support this interpretation? If versification is to be found in this Egyptian text as in many others,[64] one might suggest the following structure:

A. I built for you an inaccessible **house** (*ḥwt* [fem.]) in
      the **land of Djahy**.
    Equal to the horizon of heaven, that is at the heaven
    House (*ḥwt* [fem.]) of Ramesses-Ruler-of-
      Heliopolis, L.P.H. **in Pa-Canaan**
    For your name's sake.

A'. I built **the large cultic scene** [masc.] placed in it
      [masc., the land of Djahy/Pa-Canaan]
    (named) Amun of Ramesses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, L.P.H.
    It [masc., the large cultic scene] is approached **by**
      the inhabitants of Retenu
    Bringing him [Amun] their offerings for the sake of
      his deity.

The first segment begins with the claim of the king: *msi.i*, "I built." This verb, which introduces the action, is followed by the subject of the king's building: *ḥwt št3t*, "an inaccessible house." This house or temple is built in *t3 n Ḏ3hy*, "the land of Djahy." Djahy is believed to be the Eighteenth Dynasty place name for the territory of Egyptian domination in Canaan (although further study would be advised for this name).[65] This text confirms this association. Line 3 of the first segment repeats the subject *ḥwt*, "house," and offers a synonym for Djahy, namely *p3 k3n'n3*. The segment ends with a phrase indicating *why* this house was built: "for your name's sake."

The second segment fits remarkably well in parallelism to the first, indicating the ultimate results of the building project. It begins with the identical verbal claim of the king (*msi.i*, "I built"), this time followed by the subject *sšmw.k ḥtp(w)*, "the large cultic scene." The last part of the phrase refers to where the large cultic scene was placed. Uehlinger assumes that the pronoun *f*, "it," here refers to the house or temple itself, and supplies that meaning in parentheses.[66] But this cannot be the case: the gender of the pronoun must match the noun antecedent. The building or "house" (*ḥwt*) is a feminine noun. In order for the pronoun to refer back to the "house" (*ḥwt*), the correct gender must be used, yet instead we find the masculine *f*. It is more likely that the pronoun *f* refers back to *t3 n Ḏ3hy*, "the land of Djahy," which is the territory of the building activity. This seems to make more sense when looking at the passage not only from a structural perspective but from the overall context of what follows. Here it is no longer the temple that is named, but rather the cultic scene that is named as "Amun of Ramesses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, L.P.H." Amun undoubtedly would have been the central figure in this

large cultic scene, which was placed *inside* the temple. The third line again parallels the first, referring with a pronoun to this cultic scene (again in the masculine, as would be expected). It ends the same way as line 3 in the previous segment, with a third synonym of Djahy: *Rtnw*, "Retenu." The inhabitants of Retenu bring Amun their offerings "for the sake of his deity," which parallels the previous "for your name's sake." The focus shifts from Ramesses III to Amun, who is worshipped in the temple.

The issue of toponym usage and determinatives must also be discussed. Uehlinger points out the differentiation between *t3 n D3hy* (written as *t3*, "land"), *p3 k3nˁn3* (written with the definite article *p3*), and *Rtnw* (written with the seated-man determinative ⟨𓀀⟩ followed by three strokes ⟨𓏼⟩ for the plural). He concludes that because they are written differently, with various determinatives and terminology, they cannot be synonymous terms.[67] However, it must be pointed out that there is no discrepency between the writing of *t3 n D3hy* and *p3 k3nˁn3*—both could refer to a territory or land, as indicated above. Moreover, both *D3hy* and *p3 k3nˁn3* employ the *h3st* hill-country determinative ⟨𓈉⟩, used most frequently with territorial place names. As suggested above, based on the context of Papyrus Anastasi I, *p3 k3nˁn3* must be understood in that context as the land of Canaan and not the city of Gaza. The shortened form of *t3 n p3 k3nˁn3* is preferred here, just as it was on Seti I's reliefs, and the same meaning of "the land of the Canaan" seems even more likely given the structure of the passage.

The final segment in the passage communicates the ultimate results of finishing the building, with reference now made to the culmination event. The text reads: *ˁiw n.f h3styw nw Rtnw hr inw.sn hr.f mi ntry.f*, "It is approached by the foreigners/inhabitants of Retenu, bringing him their offerings for the sake of his deity." Here it is the *inhabitants* of the territory Djahy/Pa-Canaan/Retenu who come to give offerings to the deity Amun. The scribe clearly indicates these *h3styw* as foreigners with the throw-stick ⟨𓌃⟩ and furthermore defines them with ⟨𓀀𓏼⟩. To emphasize that these inhabitants come from the territory or region of Retenu, the scribe again uses ⟨𓈉⟩ for *Rtnw* while consistently employing ⟨𓀀𓏼⟩. This is in perfect keeping with Egyptian scribal convention to indicate the inhabitants of a territory.[68]

One could cite similar parallels. In the same document, we find the designation *r sˁš3 h3styw thnw*, "to repel the foreigners/inhabitants of Tehenu."[69] Here *h3styw* is accompanied by the identical determinatives (⟨𓌃𓀀𓏼⟩). The stele fragment found at Tell el-Oreimah/Kinneret in 1928 and ascribed by W. F. Albright and A. Rowe to the reign of Thutmose III contains a similar phrase: *sˁš3.n.y h3styw Mtyn my nty nn wn.[f?]*, "I have repelled the foreigners of Mitanni."[70] In this instance, Mitanni is written with ⟨𓈉⟩, as expected.

The first Beth Shan stele of Seti I also contains an interesting parallel: *hdby ptpt wr nw Rtnw*, "cast down and trampled are the chiefs of Retenu."[71] Here *wr* ("chiefs") is not written, but simply contains a standing man ⟨𓀀⟩ with ⟨𓏼⟩ for the plural. "Retenu" like-

wise contains the people determinative ⟨𓀀𓏼⟩, indicating that these chiefs came from among the people of Retenu. This is also the "land of Retenu," as defined by the use of ⟨𓈉⟩. One might translate the *intent* of the scribe thusly: "cast down and trampled are the chiefs of [the people of the land of] Retenu." In this example, ⟨𓈉⟩, which appears in all three parallel designations (*Stt*, *Rtnw*, and *H3rw*), is also relevant to the interpretation of Papyrus Harris I.[72]

==P. Grandet and K. A. Kitchen are correct in seeing Djahy, Pa-Canaan, and Retenu as synonymous terms in this text.[73]== The structure proposed above adds even stronger support to this conclusion. These synonymous terms indicate that in several cases, scribes used different determinatives to highlight a level of specificity already indicated by the context. There is thus every reason to conclude—on the basis of these parallels in terminology, verse structure, and the direct, contextual setting—that *p3 k3nˁn3* in Papyrus Harris I means "the [land of] Canaan" and not the city of Gaza.

Conclusions

The individual analysis of Pa-Canaan in New Kingdom Egyptian sources brings the cumulative picture into better focus. While the fortress in Seti's reliefs is designated "city/town of Pa-Canaan," it remains uncertain which city in Pa-Canaan this was. We might conjecture with Gardiner that this was Gaza, but this is not a certain conclusion. All the text tells us is that the city was within the territory of Pa-Canaan. The same is true for the Ways of Horus extending from Sile to Pa-Canaan. Sile was the beginning point of the Ways of Horus, which ended at the land of Pa-Canaan, but there is no *direct* reference to Gaza here; all that is clear is that the end of the Ways of Horus was at the border or entrance to Canaan. This conclusion is confirmed in the other New Kingdom sources. Papyrus Anastasi I makes a distinct differentiation between the northern extent of the land of Pa-Canaan—containing specific cities such as Hazor, Beth Shan, Joppa, and Rehob—and the city of Gaza at the end of the Ways of Horus in a separate context. The two terms are distinguished both contextually and in syllabic orthography. The Merenptah Stele places Pa-Canaan in parallel with Kharu, a synonymous term for the larger territory of Egyptian domination in western Asia. Within this territory are the conquered city-states of Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam and the socioethnic entity Israel. The inference of Gaza simply does not fit the structure of the final hymnic-poetic unit; ==Pa-Canaan is here best understood as a territory.== Finally, in Papyrus Harris I, Pa-Canaan is again placed in parallel with Djahy and Retenu, indicating that it refers to an entire territory. The cumulative study of these sources makes it evident that the Egyptians were consistent in their conception of the land of Canaan, sometimes abbreviated as Pa-Canaan, which began at the distant end of the Ways of Horus and extended far to the north to the very borders of Egyptian dominion.

Notes

1. Nadav Na'aman, "The Canaanites and Their Land: A Rejoinder," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26 (1994): 397; see also Yohanan Aharoni, The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography, trans. A. F. Rainey (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 61–70; Roland de Vaux, "Le pays de Canaan," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88 (1968): 23–30; Roland de Vaux, *The Early History of Israel,* trans. D. Smith (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 125–139; Manfred Weippert, "Kanaan." In D. O. Edzard (ed.), *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 5/6 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 352–355; F. Stolz, "Kanaan." In Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 17 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988), 539–545.

2. J. Maxwell Miller and John Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 68; Wolfgang Helck, "Hurriter." In Wolfgand Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), 87; de Vaux 1978, 125–139; Stolz 1988, 541; Na'aman 1994, 404; Michael G. Hasel, "Israel in the Merneptah Stela," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 296 (1994): 56, note 10; Hasel, *Domination and Resistance: Egyptian Military Activity in the Southern Levant, 1300–1185 BC*, Probleme der Ägyptologie, vol. 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 258, 270, note 9; Hasel, "Merenptah's Inscriptions and Reliefs and the Origin of Israel." In Beth Alpert Nakhai (ed.), *The Near East in the Southwest: Essays in Honor of William G. Dever*, (Boston, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2003), 19–44; Hasel, "The Structure of the Hymnic-Poetic Unit on the Merenptah Stela," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 75–81; Anson F. Rainey, "Amarna and Later: Aspects of Social History." In William G. Dever and Seymour Gitin (eds.), *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 179; Hasel, "Merenptah's Reference to Israel: Critical Issues for the Origin of Israel," In Richard S. Hess, Gerald A. Klingbeil, and Paul J. Ray, Jr. (eds.), *Critical Issues in Early Israelite History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 47–59.

3. Niels-Peter Lemche, *The Canaanites and Their Land: The Biblical Tradition of the Canaanites*. (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1991), 50.

4. Lemche, 39.

5. Lemche, 152.

6. Na'aman 1994; Na'aman, "Four Notes on the Size of the Land of Canaan," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 313 (1999): 31–37; Rainey, "Who is a Canaanite? A Review of the Textual Evidence," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 304 (1996): 1–15; Rainey 2003, 169–187.

7. Lemche, "Where Should We Look for Canaan? A Reply to Nadav Na'aman," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28 (1996): 267–272; Lemche, "Greater Canaan: The Implications of a Correct Reading of EA 151:49–67," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 310 (1998): 19–24.

8. Oded Tammuz, "Canaan—A Land Without Limits," *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33 (2001): 502–543; for a different view see Hasel, "The Identification of Canaan in Egyptian New Kingdom Sources," *Ugarit-Forschungen*, forthcoming.

9. Tammuz, 510, 534.

10. Tammuz, 511.

11. Tammuz, 533–534.

12. Tammuz, 536.

13. Manfred Görg, "Der Name 'Kanaan' in ägyptischer Wiedergabe," *Biblische Notizen* 18 (1982): 26–27. Shmuel Ahituv, *Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984), 83–85; a later reference to Pa-Canaan is found on a Middle Kingdom statuette that was reinscribed in the Twenty-Second Dynasty (Georg Steindorff, "The Statuette of an Egyptian Commissioner in Syria," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 25 [1939]: 30–33). Here the title given is *wpwty n pȝ knʿʿn n prst*, "commissioner (or messenger) of Canaan and Philistia." Both Pa-Canaan and Philistia are written with the *ḫȝst* hill-country determinative ◠◠, and Steindorff (32) concludes correctly, "By *Knʿn* is meant here not the city but the country." Likewise Peleset is to be understood as a country as indicated by ◠◠ (see Steindorff, 32).

14. Kurt Sethe and Wolfgang Helck, *Urkunden des 18. Dynastie* IV (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1906–1921), 1305,7 (hereafter Urk. IV); Urk. IV 1315,15; for the text, see Urk. IV 1300–1309; for translations and comments, see Elmar Edel, "Die Stelen 'Amenophis' II aus Karnak und Memphis," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 69 (1953): 98–175; Helck, *Urkunden des 18. Dynastie: Übersetzungen du den Heften 17–22* (Berlin: Akademie, 1961), 1300–1309; Barbara Cummings, *Egyptian Historical Records of the Eighteenth Dynasty* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982), 29–33; Peter van der Manuelian, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II*, Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 26 (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1987), 221–229; James K. Hoffmeier,

"The Memphis and Karnak Stela of Amenhotep II." In William H. Hallo and K Lawson Younger, Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture, vol. 2: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 19–22.

15. For *stt*, "Asiatics," see Urk. IV 1302,5, 1302,9, 1307,7, 1308,7, 13. In some cases on the Karnak stele the captive determinative 𓀙 is used, so Urk. IV:1309,16, 1311,4, 1311,11, 1312,4.

16. Alan H. Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7 (Brussels: Édition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1937), 33, 52; Papyrus Anastasi IIIA, 5–6; Papyrus Anastasi IV:16,4.

17. Raphael Giveon, "Toponymes ouest-asiatiques à Soleb," *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964): 239–255; List IX: 6.

18. Giveon, "Three Fragments from Egyptian Geographical Lists," *Eretz-Israel* 15 (1981): 138, Pl. XXII: 1 (Hebrew).

19. Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical*, vols. 1–7 (Oxford Blackwell, 1969–1980) 1, 8–9 (hereafter *KRI* 1–5); Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions: Translated and Annotated*, 1–4 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993–2003), 1, 6–9 (hereafter *RITA* 1–4); Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions: Translated and Annotated, Notes and Comments*, 1–3 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993–2003), 1, 14–15 (hereafter *RITANC* 1–3).

20. *KRI* 1: 8,16; *RITA* 1: 7; *RITANC* 1: 13–17.

21. List XXVIa, 103; *KRI* 2: 217,13; *RITA* 2: 75; *RITANC* 2: 127.

22. Papyrus Anastasi I: 27,1; Text: Gardiner, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts*. Series 1: *Literary Texts of the New Kingdom*. Part 1. *Papyrus Anastisi I and the Papyrus Loller together with the Parallel Texts* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911); H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, *Die Satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I: Textzusammenstellung*, I (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), p. 150; for translations, see Wilson, "A Satirical Letter." In James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 475–478; Fischer-Elfert, *Die Satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I: Übersetzung und Kommentar*, II (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1986); Edward F. Wente, *Letters From Ancient Egypt*. SBL Writings from the Ancient World 1 (Atlanta: GA: Scholars, 1990), 98–110; James P. Allen, "The Craft of the Scribe (3.2) (Papyrus Anastasi I)." In William H. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture, vol. 3: Archival Documents from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 14.

23. *KRI* 4: 19,5; *RITA* 4: 15.

24. Papyrus Harris I: 9,1; W. Erichsen, *Papyrus Harris I: Hieroglyphische Transkription*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 5 (Bruxelles: Édition de la fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1933), 11; cf. Christophe Uehlinger, "Der Amun-Tempel Ramses' III in *p3 Kn‛n*, seine südpalästinischen Tempelgüter und der Übergang von der Ägypter zur Philisterherrschaft: ein Hinweis auf einige wenig beachtete Skarabäen," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 104 (1988): 6; Pierre Grandet, *Le Papyrus Harris I, BM 9999*, I (Le Caire: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1999), 232.

25. Wolfgang Spiegelberg, "Der Siegeshymnus des Merneptah auf der Flinders Petrie-Stele," *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und*

Altertumskunde 34 (1896): 1–25; Wolfgang Spiegelberg, "Zu der Erwähnung Israels in dem Merneptah-Hymnus," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 9 (1908): 403–405; James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906), 326; Ronald J. Williams, "The 'Israel Stele' of Merenptah. In D. W. Thomas (ed.), *Documents from Old Testament Times* (London: Nelson, 1958), 137–141; John A. Wilson, "Egyptian Historical Texts." In James B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 248; Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* II (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 77; Helck, "Hurriter." In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* III, 87; Görg 1982, 26; Gerhard Fecht, "Die Israelstele, Gestalt und Aussage." In Manfred Görg (ed.), *Fontes atque Pontes. Eine Festgabe für H. Brunner*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 5, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 120; Erik Hornung, "Die Israelstele des Merneptah." In Manfred Görg (ed.), *Fontes atque Pontes: Eine Festgabe für H. Brunner*, Ägypten und Altes Testament 5 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 232; Ahituv 1984, 83–85; Ursala Kaplony-Heckel, "Die Israel-Stele des Mer-en-ptah, 1208 v. Chr." In D. Conrad et al. (eds.), *Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden: Historisch-chronologische Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* I (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1985), 544–552; Lawrence E. Stager, "Merneptah, Israel and Sea Peoples: New Light on an Old Relief," *Eretz-Israel* 18 (1985): 56*–64*; Hourig Sourouzian, *Les Monuments du roi Merenptah* (Mainz: Philip von Zabern 1989), 150; Frank J. Yurco, "Merenptah's Canaanite Campaign," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23 (1986): 189–215; Yurco, "3,200-Year-Old Picture of Israelites Found in Egypt," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 16 (1990): 20–38; Yurco, "Merenptah's Wars, the 'Sea Peoples', and Israel's Origins." In J. Phillips, (ed.), *Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Near East: Studies in Honor of Martha Rhodes Bell* I (San Antonio: Van Siclen, 1998), 497–506; Na'aman 1994, 397; A. Niccacci, "La Stèle d'Israël: Grammaire et Stratégie de Communication." In *Études Égyptologiques et bibliques à la Mémoire du Père B. Couroyer* (Paris: Gabalda, 1997), 41–107; Kitchen, "The Physical Text of Merenptah's Victory Hymn (The 'Israel Stela')," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 24 (1994–1997), 74; Hoffmeier, "The (Israel) Stele of Merneptah." In William H. Hallo and K Lawson Younger, Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture, vol. 2: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 41; B. Lurson, "Israël sous Merenptah ou le sort de l'ennemi dans l'Egypt Ancienne." In *Étrangers et exclus dansle Monde Biblique. Colloque International à l'Université Catholique de l'Ouest, Angers, les 20 et 21 février 2002* (Angers, 2003), 45–62; Rainey 2003, 179; Hasel 1994, 48; Hasel 1998, 259–271; Hasel 2003; Hasel 2004, 78–81; Kitchen, "The Victories of Merneptah, and the Nature of Their Record," *Journal for the Society of the Study of the Old Testament* 28 (2004), 259–272; Hasel 2008, 50–53.

26. Raymond O. Faulkner, "The Wars of Sethos I," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33 (1947): 35–36; Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens*

zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr., 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971), 196; Raphael Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou des documents Égyptiens*, Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 57; H. Jacob Katzenstein, "Gaza in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982): 111–113; Uehlinger, 6; Redford, "The Ashkelon Relief at Karnak and the Israel Stela," *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 (1986), 197; Ellen Fowles Morris, *The Architecture of Imperialism: Military Bases and the Evolution of Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 22 (Leiden, Brill, 2005), 345, note 12.

27. Hoffmeier, *Israel in Egypt* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1997), 29.

28. Ludwig D. Morenz, "Wortwitz – Ideologie – Geschichte: 'Israel' im Horizont Mer-en-ptahs," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 120 (2008): 1, note 3.

29. *KRI* 1: 8,16; *RITA* 1: 7; *RITANC* 1: 12–15; Epigraphic Survey, *The Battle Reliefs of King Sety I. Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak* IV (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986), Pl. 3; W. Wreszinski, *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte* II (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1935), Pl. 42. On the order and chronology of the campaigns, see Hasel 1998, 119–124. On Seti I in general, see Peter J. Brand, *The Monuments of Seti I: Epigraphic, Historical, and Art Historical Anaylsis*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

30. *KRI* 1: 8,9; *RITA* 1: 7; *RITANC* 1: 14–15; Epigraphic Survey, Pl. 3; Wreszinski, Pl. 42.

31. Gardiner, "The Ancient Military Road Between Egypt and Palestine," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 6 (1920), 99–116; Eliezer Oren and J. Shereshevsky, "Military Architecture Along the 'Ways of Horus'—Egyptian Reliefs and Archaeological Evidence," *Eretz-Israel* 20 (1989), 8–22 (Hebrew); William Murnane, *The Road to Kadesh: A Historical Interpretation of the Battle Reliefs of King Seti I at Karnak*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 42, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Oriental Institute, The University of Chicago, 1990); Hasel 1998, 96–99; see most recently Hoffmeier and M. Adb-el-Maksoud, "A New Military Site on 'The Ways of Horus'—Tell el-Borg 1999–2001: A Preliminary Report," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 89 (2003): 169–197; Hoffmeier and Ronald D. Bull, "New Inscriptions Mentioning Tjaru from Tell el-Borg, North Sinai," *Revue d'Égyptologie* 56 (2005): 79–84; Hoffmeier, "The Walls of the Ruler in Egyptian Literature and the Archaeology Record: Investigating Egypt's Eastern Frontier I the Bronze Age," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 337 (2006) 1–20; Hoffmeier, "Recent Excavations on the 'Ways of Horus': The 2005 and 2006 Seasons at Tell el-Borg," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 80 (2006), 257–279; Morris 2008.

32. Gardiner 1920, 104.

33. Gardiner 1920, 100, 104.

34. Gardiner 1920, 100.

35. Faulkner 1947, 35–36; Spalinger, "The Northern Wars of Seti I: An Integrative Study," *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 16 (1979), 30; Katzenstein 1982, 112; Epigraphic Survey 1986, 5; Murnane 1990, 40, note 13; Hoffmeier 1997, 29; Morris 2005, 345, note 12; Helck 1971, 196, incorrectly translated, "von der Festung Sile bis zur Stadt [*sic*] *P3 K3n*ⁿ*n*." The term *Stadt* (city) is not there in the description of the Ways of Horus. Giveon 1971, 57, who also equated the two, pointed out that the topography of the fort on the relief is at variance with the environs of Gaza.

36. Na'aman 1994, 405.

37. *KRI* 2: 148,12, 172–175; *RITA* 2: 45–47; *RITANC* 2: 56, 82–84; on the campaigns against Dapur, see Hasel 1998, 42–48 with literature cited; Scott Morschauser, "On the 'Plunder of Dapur'," *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 7 (1985–1986), 15–28.

38. Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, Bibliotheca Aegyptica 1 (Brussels: Édition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1932), 69,2 [2,20], 73,3 [2,59], 73,12 [2,64] (hereafter *LES*).

39. Gardiner, *LES*, 74,16 [2,74–75], 75,8 [2,79]. On these contexts, see Hasel, "The Identification of Alasiya in the *Report of Wenamun*," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, forthcoming.

40. *KRI* 1: 11,10–12,15; *RITA* 1: 9–10; *RITANC* 1: 17–19; Faulkner 1947, 36; see also Hasel 1998, 133–137.

41. Katzenstein 1982, 112.

42. Katzenstein 1982, 112.

43. Katzenstein 1982, 112; for the meaning, "der Hintere, das Ende," Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Ägyptische Sprache* I (Berlin: Akadamie, 1955), 536; "the far north," Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford: Griffith Institute, 1962), 92; cf. Urk. IV: 270,8, 617,6.

44. Fischer-Elfert I, 150.

45. Fischer-Elfert I, 150.

46. No modern translator has done this; cf. Wilson, "Satirical Letter," 478; Wente, 109; Allen, 14.

47. Wente, 109.

48. On the identification of the "Dwelling of the Lion/Sese," see Morris 2005, 402–414; Hoffmeier, "Recent Excavations on the Ways of Horus," 2006, 257; Hoffmeier, "'The Walls of the Ruler," 2006, 2–15.

49. Papyrus Anastasi I: 27,8; Fischer-Elfert I, 153; Wente, 109.

50. Urk. IV: 648, 10–11; references to Gaza as *g3dt* occur once in the annals of Thutmose III (Urk. IV: 648, 10–11); once in Papyrus Anastasi I (written defectively with a *k* instead of *g*; Papyrus Anastasi I: 27,8); twice in Papyrus Anastasi III *verso* (Papyrus Anastasi III: 6,1, 6,6; Gardiner, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7 [Brussels: Édition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1937], 31 [hereafter *LEM*]). In all cases, *g/k3dt* is consistently accompanied by ⌒; see Ahituv, 97–98; Yurco 1986, 200.

51. Hasel 1994; see further Hasel 1998, 260–271; Hasel 2004; Hasel 2008, 50–53.

52. Gösta Ahlström and Diana Edelman, "Merneptah's Israel," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 44 (1985): 59–61.

53. Ahlström, "The Origin of Israel in Palestine," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* II (1991): 19–34.

54. Stager 1985, 56*.

55. Yurco 1986, 189.

56. John J. Bimson, "Merenptah's Israel and Recent Theories of Israelite Origins," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 49 (1991): 3–29.

57. Hasel 1994, 48, Fig. 1; Hasel 1998, 267, Fig. 15; Hasel 2004; Hasel 2008, 53.

58. The "Nine Bows" is an Egyptian expression that encompassed all subjugated enemies of Egypt in the New Kingdom. Earlier there were literally nine entities listed that included those surrounding Egypt on all quarters (Williams 1958, 140; Uphill, "The Nine Bows," *Jahrbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 19 (1967): 393–420; Othmar Keel, "Der Bogen als Herrschaftssymbol," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 93 (1977): 141–177; D. Wildung, "Neunbogen." In Helck and Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* IV (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1982), cols. 474–473. On the depiction of the Nine Bows on the footstool and sandals of Tutankhamen, see T. G. H. James, *Tutankhamun* (London/New York: Taruis Parke, 2000), 195, 294. On the symbolism of the bow, see Richard H. Wilkinson, "The Representation of the Bow in the Art of Ancient Egypt and the Near East," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 20 (1988): 83–100; Wilkinson, "The Turned Bow in Egyptian Iconography," *Varia Aegyptiaca* 4 (1988): 181–87; Wilkinson, "The Turned Bow as a Gesture of Surrender in Egyptian Art," *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 17 (1991): 128–33.

59. Hoffmeier 1997, 28–31; but see his official translation in *The Context of Scripture* II; Hoffmeier 2000, 41; see critique by Hasel 2004.

60. Yurco 1986, 189; Yurco 1990, 27; Na'aman 1994, 406; Kitchen 1994–1997, 74; Rainey 2001, 63; Rainey 2003, 179.

61. Kitchen 1994–1997, 74.

62. The terms Canaanite and Kharu are employed synonymously in two other texts. Papyrus Anastasi IIIA and IV contain parallel texts that describe "Canaanite slaves from Kharu" indicating that at least during part of the period inhabitants of this territory received ethnic names reflecting their home territory. For references, see Gardiner, *LEM*, 33, 52; Papyrus Anastasi IIIA, 5–6; Papyrus Anastasi IV: 16,4.

63. Most recently Katzenstein, 111–113; Uehlinger, 8; but see Pierre Grandet, *Le Papyrus Harris I, BM 9999*, I (Le Caire: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1999), 232. The identification of *p3 k3n'n3* in Papyrus Harris I with Gaza was already suggested by other scholars such as Gardiner 1911, 28* note 21; Helck 1971, 444; Giveon 1971, 57–62; Giveon, *The Impact of Egypt on Canaan*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 20 (Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 22–27; Ahituv 1984, 84.

64. Fecht 1983. On *parallelismus membroram* in Egyptian texts, see Jan Assmann, "Parallelismus Membroram" in Wolfgang Helck and W. Westendorf (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 4 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1982), cols. 900–910.

65. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* II (London: Griffith Institute, 1947), 145*, 182*; Kitchen, "Review of Nibbi 1975," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 64 (1978): 170; Grandet, "Deux établissements de Ramsès III en Nubie et en Palestine," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 69 (1983): 108–114; Grandet 1999, II, 50, note 194.

66. Uehlinger 1988, 6.

67. Uehlinger 1988, 7–8.

68. Faulkner 1962, 149–150.

69. Papyrus Harris I: 58,6; Erichsen 1933, 67,14; Grandet 1999, I, 305; Grandet 1999, II, 189, note 783.

70. W. F. Albright and A. Rowe, "A Royal Stele of the New Empire from Galilee," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14 (1928): 282.

71. *KRI* 1: 12,4; *RITA* 1: 17–19.

72. *KRI* 1: 12,3; *KRI* 1: 12:4; *KRI* 1: 12,5, respectively. Kitchen writes "*sic*" above �⌡. However, when understood in its wider context, it appears that this is an intentional writing of the scribe, who is using it in parallel with *štt*, "Asiatics," in the previous line, which is determined identically. On the other hand, *ḫ3rw* in the following line simply has ⌐container⌡, even though here the chiefs of Kharu are the subject as well.

73. Grandet 1983, 111, note 24; Grandet 1999, II, 50, note 194; Kitchen, 1978, 170.