ḤQ/GR-BASED TOPONYMS ON THE SHOSHENQ-INSCRIPTION OF KARNAK'S BUBASTITE PORTAL: SOME PHONOLOGICAL, SEMANTIC, AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS*

PRESTON L. ATWOOD

Introduction

The decipherment of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs in the 1820s unshrouded the meaning of the mysterious characters inscribed on Karnak's Bubastite Portal, but the nature and function of Shoshenq I's topographical lists still remains heavily debated.[1] Since the lists reveal dozens of toponyms (or "name rings") encompassing both Israel and Judah, scholars immediately delved into the task of establishing phonetic correspondences between the inscription's name rings and Iron Age II archaeological sites, including place names mentioned in the biblical text (e.g., the district lists provided in Joshua 15-19).[2] Some geographical identifications proved to be obvious, but many still remain unclear.[3]

Of the 155 extant (sometimes very fragmentary) name rings written in Egyptian syllabic script, seven (possibly eight) entries in the inscription's lower register (lines 6-10) include variant orthographies of the lexeme ḥq/gr. As ḥq/gr is not an Egyptian word, it must be a transcription of an underlying Semitic lexeme, the precise etymology, phonology, and semantics of which are disputed.[4] As scholars eventually observed, these entries are in fact double entries, standing in construct relation with the following name rings (e.g., Pꜣ-ḥá-q-rú-ā [no. 77] + ʿA-ṣa-ya-ta [no. 78], "the ḤQR of ʿA-ṣa-ya-ta").[5] The claim that these double entries refer to sites in the southern part of the country (i.e., the biblical Negev) rests on three widely established observations: 1) two of the name lists with ḥq/gr refer to well-attested sites in the

* I am indebted to Jeff Blakely, Adjunct Professor of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, for suggesting the topic of this essay to me, pointing me to much of its bibliography, and offering constructive criticism during my initial stages of writing. I am also grateful for *JEOL*'s two anonymous reviewers who provided valuable feedback on the paper. All remaining errors in this manuscript are my own.

[1] For Epigraphic Survey's *editio princeps* of the Karnak inscription, see plates 2-9 in Hughes *et al*. Porter and Moss (1937-52) provide bibliography for publications appearing before OIP 74. Le Jeune (1868, 80-81) was the first to identify that the triumphal relief belonged to Shoshenq I.

[2] For the complete bibliography of scholars' early proposals, see Wilson's section on the history of scholarship in his recent "Introduction" (2005, 1-15). Kitchen's appendix (1986, 442-447 [§409.2]) is also helpful.

[3] Wilson's Appendix, "Shoshenq's Topographical List" (2005, 101-133), succinctly summarizes and rates the identifications offered by most scholars.

[4] I will summarize the dispute over these semantic denotations below. Aharoni (1979, 28-29) identifies nine ḥq/gr-based toponyms, but he lists only eight transcriptions, one of which is highly disputed and not marked as such in the list of Rainey and Notley (2006, 187-188).

[5] The linguistic proposal for understanding ḥq/gr as the *nomen regens* in a construct chain was offered cautiously early on (see Hoch 1992, 262-266; 1994, 237), but now most scholars agree on the morphosyntax of the collocation. My transliterations come from Rainey and Notley (2006, 185-189).

southern part of the country (Kh. Fuṭeis/Ifteis and Tell ʿArâd);[6] 2) several other well-attested toponyms without *ḥq/gr* as its *nomen regens* appear in Karnak's lower register; and 3) three double entries (nos. 84-85, 90-91, 92-93) in Karnak's lower register include the root √*ngb*, designating geographical locations in "the Negeb" (= Hebrew נֶגֶב).[7]

Readings of the inscription in the 1930s engaged the text in a *prima facie* manner, believing the topographical lists to reflect the itinerary of an actual campaign led by Shoshenq I, the pharaoh to whom the Bubastite Portal was erected.[8] The phonological correspondence between Egyptian *ššnq* (Shoshenq) and biblical *šîšaq* (*Kethiv*: שׁוּשַׁק; *Qere*: שִׁישַׁק)[9] and the alleged similarity between the accounts on the inscription and those in 1 Kgs 14: 25-26 and 2 Chron 12: 2-9 provided scholars with what they believed was a firm date ("in the fifth year of king Rehoboam") for identifying the archaeological sites behind the inscription's name rings in the Iron Age II period.[10] However, the burgeoning scholarship on the inscription from a variety of academic fields and the wealth of conflicting opinions have proven that the inscription cannot be read straightforwardly.

Despite the numerous debates regarding the Karnak inscription and its relationship to the biblical text, using the inscription as an historical aid in identifying archaeological sites still has strong appeal.[11] This remains true for the *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms, especially since some scholars—on the basis of certain phonological correspondences—have argued for a cognate relation between the transcriptions' underlying root and Hebrew *ḥāṣēr*. As a lexical constituent of many geographical designations and a more general designation for different yet related conditions of topography in the Hebrew Bible, the lexeme *ḥāṣēr*, its precise denotation(s), and its etymology have played a major role in the debate. In this paper I enumerate several complicating factors that arise when one attempts to identify Iron Age II archaeological sites with the assistance from the *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms in Shoshenq's lists. First, I will explore the phonological and semantic difficulties associated with Hebrew √*ḥṣr* and the root's possible relation to the *ḥq/gr* name rings inscribed on the Karnak inscription. Second, I will recount the main sociopolitical and anthropological problems the Karnak inscription poses for those who wish to use the inscription to assist in *ḥṣr*-based site identifications. And last, I will attempt to integrate these factors and offer a few concluding reflections that serve as a caveat in relating *ḥṣr*-based toponyms to Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings.

---

[6] Obviously, other proposals have been offered for the remaining entries (see below), but only two are generally agreed upon by scholars.

[7] Rainey and Notley (2006, 188). Albeit, there is no consensus on the identification of the toponyms with *ngb* as the head noun. Nos. 90-91 (*Pʾ-Nag[bu]/ʾAu-ha-t-rú-au-ka*) are the most obscure, though Kitchen (1997, 40), reading *wḥtwrk*[], argues that the lexeme comprising no. 91 could be a two element name, *wḥt-wrk*. Wilson (2005, 121, 123) points out, however, that the initial *w-* is not what we expect for a Semitic word. Aharoni (1979, 328) sees the *ngb* toponyms as resembling biblical clan names, arguing that nos. 84-85 (*Pʾ-Nagbu/ʾAṣanʾt*) refer to "the Negeb of Ezni," that is, the Negeb of the Eznites (*Kethiv*: הֶעְצְנוֹ; *Qere*: הָעֶצְנִי) mentioned in 2 Sam 23: 8, and nos. 92-93 (*Pʾ-Nagbu/ʾAšaḥata*) refer to "the Negeb of the Shuhathites" (שׁוּחָה) mentioned in 1 Chron 4: 11. Later, B. Mazar (1986, 148) affirmed Rainey's designations.

[8] For these views, see the second section below.

[9] Whether this phonological correspondence is legitimate has recently come into dispute. See the competing views in James and Van der Veen (2015). Sagrillo (2015, 61-81) offers the conventional view, which Van der Veen rebuts (2015, 82-97).

[10] Rainey and Notley (2006, 186-189) provide a summary of the most likely geographical identifications.

[11] See most recently Hardin, Rollston, and Blakely (2012, 20-35) and their "tentative" identification of Tel-Ḥesi as "El-gad" in nos. 96-97 of the Karnak inscription and "Migdal-gad" in Josh 15: 37.

ḤṢR in Biblical Hebrew

A synchronic semantic analysis of the Hebrew √*ḥṣr* as it appears numerous times in the biblical text yields several denotations of the lexeme, as evidenced by the many glosses provided in *HALOT*.[12] Of the three roots provided in *HALOT*, only the third is applicable, as it provides the base(s) from which the Hebrew word *ḥāṣēr* (plur: *ḥăṣērîm*) is derived.[13] As *HALOT* notes, √*ḥṣr* is derived from two roots: 1) √*ḥḍr*;[14] and 2) √*ḥṣ/ẓr*.[15] This observation originated with the comparative Semitic philology of A. Malamat, who argued that each independently goes back to its own Proto-Semitic root: 1) **ḤḌR*; and 2) **ḤẒR*.[16] *HALOT* reflects both roots by providing two main glosses: 1) "permanent settlement, yard without walls" (← **ḤḌR*); and 2) "court, enclosure" (← **ḤẒR*).[17] The former is found over two dozen times in the district lists of Joshua 15-19, most often in the following formula: Zenan, Hadashah, Migdal-gad … and Makkedah: sixteen towns with their villages (חַצְרֵיהֶן; LXX: κῶμαι; Josh 15: 37-41).[18] Such *ḥăṣērîm* seem to have referred to rural settlements that lack large structures, since they are distinct from the place names listed.[19]

Malamat also argued that *ḥăṣērîm* (from **ḤḌR*) carried a second meaning in contexts in the biblical text involving semi-nomadic tribal groups. He pointed to occurrences of *ḥaṣirātum* in the eighteenth-century Mari archives where the term refers to the dwelling places of semi-nomadic tribes that resided on the fringes of the city-state. He found correspondences with this meaning in a few biblical texts that mention nomadic-like groups (e.g., the sons of Ishmael [Gen 25: 16]; the Avvites who dwelled in the Negev [Deut 2: 23]; the Kedarites [Isa 42: 11]).[20] Malamat's contention that **ḤḌR* came into biblical Hebrew meaning either "permanent settlement" or "nomadic settlement" has been accepted by A. Faust and Levin.[21] However, Faust adds that Malamat's second meaning of **ḤḌR*, "nomadic settlement," is similar to but distinct from the field houses mentioned in Lev 25: 29-31, which are also called *ḥăṣērîm*-houses.[22] Thus, if Orlinsky, Malamat, Faust, and Levin are correct, then Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* can, depending on context, mean either "court, enclosure," "rural, permanent settlement," "nomadic settlement," or "farm-house."

By virtue of the phonological and semantic proximity *ḥāṣēr* seems to have with the Karnak inscription's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms, it is understandable why so many scholars have argued

---

[12] Koehler and Baumgartner (2011, s.v., "חצר").

[13] See Orlinsky's detailed discussion of the etymology of Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* and its cognates (1939, 22-37). Levin's more recent yet succinct summary also is helpful (2010, 198-200).

[14] *HALOT* lists Arabic *ḥaḍara* (to be present) and *ḥaḍar* (place of residence = Bedouin camp); and Old South Arabic *ḥaḍar* (dwelling-place) and *mḥḍr* (yard).

[15] *HALOT* lists Arabic *ḥaṣara* (to narrow down, confine) and *ḥiṣār* (blockage); and Eth. and Tigr. *ḥaṣ(ṣ)ara* (enclose) and *ḥaṣūr* (hedge).

[16] Malamat 1962, 147.

[17] For the notion of a "permanent settlement," see Gen 25: 16; Exod 8: 9; Josh 13: 23; Isa 42: 11; Lev 25: 31; Neh 11: 25-30; 12: 28f; 1 Chron 9: 16; Isa 34: 13; 35: 7. For "court, enclosure," see Exod 27: 12-19; 1 Kgs 6: 26; 2 Chron 20: 5; Ezek 40: 17; Neh 13: 7; Zech 3: 7.

[18] The translation of חַצְרֵיהֶן with "villages" is common (see NRSV).

[19] Levin 2010, 199.

[20] Malamat 1962, 147.

[21] See the summaries of Malamat's work both in Levin (2010, 199-200) and Faust (2009, 357-367).

[22] Faust 2009, 357-367.

(or merely assumed) that the two terms are etymologically related.[23] However, a relation in the two words' semantics does not imply a cognate relation.

ḤQ/GR: Proposals for the Semitic Phonemes Underlying the Egyptian Graphemes

In this section I briefly summarize and critique the different arguments scholars have mounted to understand the meaning and underlying Semitic word of *ḥq/gr* in Shoshenq's Karnak inscription. I concentrate more on how some of these scholars have tried to establish a phonological relation between these *ḥq/gr* transcriptions and the attestations of √*ḥṣr* in the Hebrew Bible. I then draw a few implications from the current state of the evidence to problematize facile use of Karnak's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms to assist in site identifications. I divide the following sections by the proposed Semitic phonemes and their Egyptian graphemic correlates. The designations "SW" (Southwest) and "NW" (Northwest) are not intended to demarcate strict geographic boundaries as much as they are to elucidate the languages of the alleged cognates scholars have proposed to identify Karnak's *ḥq/gr*.

Semitic ḤGR → ḤQ/GR

Many scholars who initially argued that the Karnak inscription reflects a campaign itinerary (M. Noth, Y. Aharoni, B. Mazar, K. Kitchen, and S. Aḥituv) often assumed that *ḥq/gr* is a transcription of the underlying West Semitic lexeme *ḥgr*, which they believed to mean "fort."[24] While this argument from phonology had earlier realizations,[25] later users of it were also influenced by the proposed date and function of the earliest fortified strata at Arad (stratum XI) and the theory of IA "Negev Fortresses,"[26] the archaeological evidence for which has been heavily criticized.[27] More significantly, there are no clear attestations of the meaning "fort" or "fortification wall" during this time period.[28] However, a SW Semitic origin for the *ḥq/gr* transcriptions cannot be dismissed easily and would seem both logical

---

[23] The transcriptions of the *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms are as follows: *Pʾ-ḥá-(q)-rú-ā* (no. 68); *Pʾ-ḥa-(q)-rú-ā* (no. 71); *Pʾ-ḥá-q-rú-ā* (no. 77); *Pʾ-Ḥá-q-rú-(ā)* (no. 87); *Pʾ-Ḥá-g-rú-ya* (no. 94); *Pʾ-Ḥa-g-ru-ā* (no. 96); *(Pʾ)-(Ḥá)-(g-rú-ā)* (no. 101); *Ḥá-q-rú-ma* (no. 107).

[24] See Noth 1938, 295-300; Aharoni 1967, 1-17; 1979, 238-239; B. Mazar 1986, 148-149; Kitchen 1986, 439; and Aḥituv 1984, 109-111.

[25] The phonological suggestion was made as early as 1909 by Burchardt (1909/1910, §156.2), who argued that Karnak's *ḥgr* is a derivation from √*ḥgr*, meaning "to surround" (or "fortress," as a substantive). Also, in 1915, Maspero (1915, 147-202) noted an association between Karnak's *ḥgr* and the Talmud's חגרא (stone wall).

[26] For example, Cohen (1979, 61-79) argued that in the tenth century BCE the central Negev comprised a network of fortresses, most of which were eventually abandoned. However, at the end of Iron Age, the fortresses were rebuilt by the kings of Israel into a "towered" type, functioning as defenses for the Negev road system, thus strengthening Solomon's southern border. Cohen asserted that the fortress network was destroyed by Shoshenq, thus establishing a connection between the *ḥgrm* in the list of Shoshenq and the *ḥṣrm* ("fortified settlements") which are mentioned in biblical sources.

[27] For a detailed criticism of the view that these "fortresses" are, in fact, semi-nomadic settlements, see Finkelstein 1984, 189-209; 1990, 34-50; 1986, 46-53; and Levin 2010, 197-198. More recently, Faust (2006, 135-160) made an argument for the "fortified" settlements in the Negev, but he does not explicitly connect these settlements with the biblical *ḥāṣērīm*.

[28] See Hoch 1992, 262-266; 1994, 236; and Lipiński 2006, 105-106. There is, of course, the attestation of Aramaic *ḥaqrāʾ* (citadel) and its dialectical variant *ʾaqrāʾ* (fortified citadel), but these forms are found in late sources (JLAtg; LJLA).

(for geographical reasons) and favorable (in view of some of the perceived complexities involved in establishing a NW Semitic origin for Karnak's *ḥgr*).

While early attestations of a SW Semitic √*ḥgr* are wanting, a few dictionaries and lexicons provide evidence of the root in Punic (*ḥgr*) and Nabatean (*ḥgrʾ*) with the meanings "wall, enclosure, protecting wall."[29] Admittedly, these attestations are too chronologically distant for accurate comparative analysis, but they could indicate a reflex of an older form.[30] The other "cognate" often mentioned is Arabic *ḥijr* (wall). However, this word is simply unattested, with √*ḥjr* meaning "to hinder, stop," not "to surround, fortify."[31] Thus, while it is theoretically possible on phonological grounds that Karnak's *ḥq/gr* attests a SW Semitic *ḥgr* during Iron Age II (with a meaning approximating "enclosure"), the exact semantics of the alleged Semitic lexeme are presently unverifiable.

NW Semitic ḤǴR → ḤQ/GR

The possibility that the variation in Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings could presuppose the Semitic phoneme /ǵ/ (ghain) was articulated by Rainey and Notley.[32] They argue that /ǵ/ derives from Proto-Semitic *Ḍad* (**ḍ > *ǵ*), one of the original phonemes Malamat and Faust identify as explaining the derivation of Hebrew חצרים.[33] They also provide a couple of examples involving Aramaic lexemes whose variant orthographies attest the phonetic change (**ḍ > ǵ*), whereas in Biblical Hebrew the change occurred differently (**ḍ > ṣ*).[34] Such comparative evidence leads them to conclude the following about Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings and biblical *ḥāṣēr*:

> So the original root of the Hebrew and of the Shoshenq form may have been **ḤḌR*. The Shoshenq orthographic variants would then reflect **ḤǴR* with the typical Aramaic shift of *ḍ > ǵ*. Therefore, the associated places in the Shoshenq list may be "enclosures." One thinks immediately of the many such sites discovered in the highlands south of the biblical Negeb.[35]

---

[29] See Hoftijzer and Jongeling 1995, 348; Donner and Röllig 1971, 81⁴; Jaussen et Savignac 1909, 329; and Clermont-Ganneau 1880, iii 11f. *HALOT* includes Old South Arabic "fence" as cognate evidence under "חגר" (s.v.).

[30] One such cognate could be Phoenician רנח (wall), as listed in *HALOT*. This word has chronological but not geographical proximity to Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings. However, as evidenced by the many places mentioned in New Kingdom texts, the Phoenician coast was of significant interest to Egypt during this time period, especially Byblos, Sidon, Zarepta, Tyre, and Acco. Also, many Egyptian transcriptions of Semitic lexemes betray isoglosses with Phoenician (Hoch 1994, 482-483).

[31] As Hoch notes (1994, 236), Freytag's Arabic lexicon (1830, 345) is the only one to include *ḥijr*, "but there is otherwise no evidence that the word actually existed." Thus, Noth's association of the Arabic √*ḥjr* with *ʿEl-Ḥeju* (= Medāʾin Ṣāliḥ) and the Targum's חגרא (i.e., a reference to Petra) has little to commend it (see also Rainey and Notley [2006, 188], who seem to support this view). Rather, both lexemes are most likely related to Arabic *ḥajar* (stone, rock), signifying the rocky topography of the region (hence πέτρα, "rock").

[32] As evidenced in the variations of the place name *Ǵ-ḍ-t/Q-ḍ-t* (= Gaza).

[33] Lipiński also argues that /ǵ/ is the Semitic phoneme behind Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings; however, he traces the phoneme back to the pharyngealized emphatic **ṭ* (= /ṣ/ in Biblical Hebrew), which was sometimes pronounced as *ǵ* in Ugaritic and, presumably, other Semitic languages during IA I-II. He assumes that a similar development occurred in the "Negebite" language spoken during Shoshenq I's time. I find this last assumption unconvincing, since there is little linguistic evidence to suggest that Egyptian transcription reflects such a "Negebite" language (see Hoch 1994, 482-484). Also, while Karnak's graphemes *q* and *g* could reflect /ǵ/ and be cognate to Ugaritic *ḫṭr* (enclosure), that obviously does not imply that Ugaritic *ḫṭr* is cognate with √*ḥṣr* in Biblical Hebrew.

[34] In support of their argument, they cite the well-known Aramaic passage located in Jer 10: 11a: אלהיא די־שמיא וארקא לא עבדו יאבדו מארעא ומן־תחות שמיא אלה. The variation between ארקא and ארעא here reflects the phonological shift **RḌ > *RǴ*. (Recall that ק was polyphonous in Old Aramaic, representing both /q/ and /ḍ/.) Also, **RḌ* came into Aramaic as *rʿʿ*. In contrast, **RḌ* came into Biblical Hebrew as ארץ. Additionally, the Canaanite verbal root √*RǴD* (smite) became רצץ in Biblical Hebrew. See also Rainey 1979, 158-162.

[35] Rainey and Notley 2006, 188.

While Rainey and Notley's phonological argument is sound,[36] it is not clear why they limit Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings to the meaning "enclosure," which Orlinsky, Malamat, Faust, and Levin rightly assign to Proto-Semitic **ḤẒR*. Given the obvious semantic anachronism this would involve (**ḤDR* ≠ **ḤẒR*), I am inclined to read this element in their argument as a simple mistake.[37] However, one must wonder whether their view of the highland sites has influenced their semantics of **ḤDR* and its relation to Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings.

NW Semitic ḤṢR → ḤQ/GR

In an effort to bridge some of the gaps and sort out some of the scholarly confusion over the meaning of *ḥăṣērîm* and its relationship to Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings, Levin recently summarized and critiqued the different proposals for the meaning of *ḥăṣērîm* as the word appears in the Hebrew Bible. After his evaluation of the arguments, he provides a slightly modified argument to explain the relation between Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings and the biblical *ḥăṣērîm*.[38] As regards the *ḥăṣērîm* in the western Negev, Levin agrees with R. Gophna and Faust that they were a group of small, short-lived, nomadic IA settlements. This description comports with Malamat's second definition of *ḥāṣēr* as derived from **ḤDR*.[39] However, Levin points out that *ḥāṣēr* also denotes actual toponyms in the southern regions of the land (e.g., the well-known Hazor in the upper Jordan Valley; Hazor of Benjamin in Neh 11: 33; Hazor Hadattah, Hazar-Gaddah, and Hazar-Shual appearing in Josh 15: 23, 25, 27; 19: 3; and 1 Chron 4: 23; Hazar-Addar in Num 34: 4). There are also the "Hazeroth" mentioned in texts recounting the wilderness wanderings (Num 11: 31, 35; 12: 16; 33: 17-18; Deut 1: 1). Levin traces both the southern toponyms and the Hazeroth to the plural of **ḤẒR* (enclosures, courts).[40] Levin explains these different nuances of √*ḥṣr* by saying,

> If the Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* is indeed an amalgamation of two proto-Semitic roots, by the time Iron Age Hebrew was being spoken and written the two meanings were interchangeable: *ḥăṣērîm* could refer to the settlements of semi-nomads, to their animal enclosures, to fortified settlements and to any small structures or installations in the fields outside of a town or village. As such, *ḥăṣērîm* and places so named were particularly common in the Negev.[41]

---

[36] Their argument is sound insofar as they mean that the *transcribed* Semitic phoneme was /ǵ/ and not /ḏ/, as the latter is a "very rare phoneme, and its Canaanite reflex is attested only three times in Egyptian transcription" (Hoch 1994, 405, 412). The phonemic inventory of Old Egyptian and its correspondence to Proto-Semitic is a matter of significant debate (see Takács 1999, 331-393; 2011, 8-19). The Rösslerian School has revised many of the traditional consonant correspondences, arguing that Proto-Semitic **ḏ* came into Old Egyptian as either ʿ[d] or *ṯ*. Rössler (1971, 263-325) traced *ḳ* [= q] back to Proto-Semitic **q* (or **ḳ*) and *g* back to **g*. However, see Takács' critiques of some of Rössler's more radical revisions. For a summary of the prehistory and development of Egyptian phonology, see Loprieno 1995, 31-50; and Allen 2013, 11-58.

[37] Immediately before their comment that **ḤDR* meant "enclosure," Rainey and Notley refer to "satellite settlements" or "independent desert or steppe-land settlements" as denoting the likely relationship between the meaning of *ḥāṣēr* and Karnak's *ḥq/gr* (2006, 188).

[38] Levin 2010, 189-215.

[39] Ibid., 200-201. See also Gophna 1963, 179; 1964, 243; and Faust 2009, 357-367, as cited in Levin, fn. 44, 46.

[40] Levin 2010, 201-201. He also suggests that the Hazeroth could reflect a by-form (i.e., not a true plural) of **ḤDR*, with the meaning "field-house or semi-nomadic settlement." However, he admits that the difference in meaning is "negligible," as nomads often would build enclosures (and sometimes fortifications) after settling in a certain location (see Num 32: 16, 36).

[41] Ibid., 202.

Addressing the relationship between *ḥāṣēr* in the biblical tribal lists (such as those in Joshua 15-19) and the *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms on the Karnak inscription, Levin argues,

> The *ḥqr*-places in Sheshonq's list and the *ḥaṣar*-places in the biblical Negev references reflect exactly the same reality. In fact, in light of the various meanings that Hebrew *ḥāṣēr* seems to have, it does not really matter whether one interprets *ḥqr* as "enclosure," "field" or even "fort." All three can be encompassed by the various meanings of biblical *ḥāṣēr*.[42]

Levin then proffers the same phonological argument of Rainey and Notley (i.e., that both Karnak's oscillating *q/g* graphemes and Biblical Hebrew's *ḥṣr* go back to an original *ḏ) but takes one step further: "We wish to claim that the Egyptian *ḥqr* in fact reflects the Semitic *ḥṣr*."[43]

While Levin's article helpfully summarizes the various ways scholars have interpreted biblical *ḥāṣēr* in relation to Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings, his own solution is unconvincing. First, the idea that Karnak's *ḥq/gr* is a transcription of *ḥṣr* is untenable simply for the fact that the Semitic phoneme /ṣ/ was always transcribed as *ḏ*, not *q* or *g*.[44] This is probably why Rainey and Notley did not make the same step as Levin, as they understood that the variation in Karnak's *q/g* had to reflect the realization of a post velar phoneme, not an emphatic affricate.[45] One could easily overlook what may have been a lack of clarification on Levin's part, but he states in no uncertain terms, "In our opinion, the Semitic word that the Egyptian scribes transcribed as *ḥqr* was indeed *ḥāṣēr*."[46] Such a statement reflects a basic confusion of possible phonological correspondences with actual Egyptian transcription practice.

And second, Levin's extension of the meaning of biblical *ḥāṣēr* to include "fort" has no semantic justification. He does not marshal any evidence from the biblical text where *ḥāṣēr* clearly denotes or implies as much. His suggestion that the "reality" of *ḥāṣēr* exists in Numbers 32—wherein the Reubenites and Gadites say to Moses that they will build "enclosures" (גדרת) for their flocks (32: 16) and their developed allotments are called "fortified cities/towns" (ערי מבצר; 23: 63)—is irrelevant.[47] Other lexemes are used in this passage to signify the underlying realities. Although he does not say as much, Levin seems to assume that the semantic field of *ḥāṣēr* expands in tandem with the process of urbanization, but that is to make a categorical mistake. The same lexeme can denote a topographical reality as well as function as a toponym; the realities of the latter cannot be assumed to exist in the former.

---

[42] Ibid., 203.

[43] Ibid.

[44] As Hoch notes (1994, 408-409), "the articulation was probably the emphatic (pharyngealized or glottalized) affricate [tsʼ]." We have further evidence of this articulation from Aramaic texts written in demotic script, which consistently rendered Aramaic /ṣ/ with the cluster *ts*. On this phonological correspondence, see the work of Vleeming and Wesselius 1982, 501-509; Steiner and Nims 1985, 60-81; and Nims and Steiner 1983, 261-274.

[45] It is possible, though unlikely, that Biblical Hebrew's *ḥṣr* lies underneath the transcription *ʿanḏara* (from *ʾanz/ ṣara*) in the *Wilbour Papyrus*, but the meaning of this word is contextually unclear (enclosure? court?). Moreover, the existence of *n* is difficult to explain on phonological grounds. Hoch provides another possible correlation between *maḥḏarta* (fish pond) and *ḥṣr* (court, enclosure), but this is one of many explanations he provides. Note, however, that *ḏ* rendered both Semitic affricates. See Hoch 1994, 73-74, 150.

[46] Levin 2010, 203.

[47] Ibid., 202. In this case, Levin admits that *ḥāṣēr* is not used.

Semitic ḤQL/ ḤLQ → ḤQ/GR

Other scholars (W. M. Müller, W. F. Albright, J. Simons, J. E. Hoch, K. Wilson and N. Na'aman) have proposed a derivation of Karnak's *ḫg/qr* from the Semitic √*ḥql* (or *ḫlq*), which has ample attestation in Aramaic (*ḥaqlā'*, "field, territory"; *ḥălāq*, "portion, possession [of land]"), Biblical Hebrew (*ḥēleq*, "portion, plot of land"; *ḥelqāh*, "field" [e.g., "field of Moab"; "field of Amalek"; "field of Amalek"]),[48] and other NW and SW Semitic languages.[49] The Egyptian graphemic correlate *r* for the Semitic phoneme /l/ is not only phonologically possible, it is the standard and expected correspondence in Egyptian transcription, suggesting that Egyptian /r/ was "an apical singly 'tapped' (or 'flapped') *r*, as opposed to vibrating 'trilled' ('rolled') *r*."[50] This relation also accounts for the variation in the vocable **q/g* on the inscription, since Semitic /q/ was primarily transcribed with *q*, and secondarily with *g*.[51]

Summary of Proposals

The ambiguity of the Egyptian *ḫq/gr* transcriptions and their underlying Semitic phonemes allows for more than one hypothesis. Nevertheless, some hypotheses are better than others. First, one can easily rule out Levin's idea that the *ḫq/gr* name rings are transcriptions of Semitic *ḥṣr*. The graphemes *q* and *g* are never used in Egyptian transcription to render emphatic affricates. Second, it is possible that the alternating vocable **q/r* points to an underlying /ǵ/ which developed from Proto-Semitic **ḍ*. If true, then *ḫq/gr* and Semitic *ḥṣr* are partial cognates (**ḤḌR > ḥṣr*), but one cannot impose the meaning of "enclosure" onto *ḫq/gr* if *ḥṣr* received that meaning from Proto-Semitic **ḤẒR*. Third, the proposal that the Egyptian *ḫq/gr* transcriptions derive from SW Semitic *ḫgr* is possible, but the linguistic evidence available for comparison is late and cannot be used to substantiate the meaning "fort." And finally, there is the argument that *ḫg/qr* reflects Semitic √*ḥql/ḫlq* (field, territory). This last argument is the simplest reading of the evidence and seems to have been influenced the least by a concern to relate Karnak's *ḫg/qr* name rings to biblical *ḥṣr*. It is sound on phonological grounds, takes into consideration standard Egyptian graphemic correlates for Semitic phonemes, and has substantial comparative evidence. Nevertheless, Semitic *ḫǵr* and *ḫgr* remain viable options.

The aforementioned phonological and semantic difficulties problematize the often-assumed association between *ḥāṣēr* and Karnak's *ḫq/gr* transcriptions. Even more hazardous are

---

[48] Aramaic's metathesized forms (*ḥaqlā'* versus *ḥălāq*) might suggest that Biblical Hebrew's *ḥēleq* and *ḥelqāh* are nominalized forms of √*ḥql*, as opposed to derivations from √*ḫlq*, which means "to divide, apportion." As Hoch notes (1994, 237, fn 63), this would assume a complex development, but is nonetheless possible.

[49] See Müller 1893, 170-171; Albright 1924, 145-46; Simons 1937, 99-100; Wilson 2005; Na'aman 1998, 257. For the other Semitic cognates, see Akkadian *eqlu* (field), Arabic *ḥiqlah* (field, region), Syriac *ḥaqlā'* (field), Old South Arabic *ḥql* (fields, countryside), Ethiopic *ḥaql* (field, district), and Mandaean *hilqa* (lot). In light of this comparative evidence, Levin's criticism that Karnak's *ḫq/gr* cannot be associated with Aramaic *ḥăqal* because it is "attested in much later sources" is simply false. That observation is true with respect to Aramaic *ḥăqar* (citadel, fortified settlement), but not *ḥăqal*.

[50] Hoch 1994, 430-432.

[51] Ibid., 428, 432.

attempts to use Karnak's *ḥq/gr* transcriptions to identify *ḥṣr*-based toponyms in the Hebrew Bible. That *ḥq/gr* and *ḥāṣēr* may be cognate on the basis of *ḤḌR* does not imply that specific denotations of *ḥāṣēr* (e.g., "enclosure") are true of the Semitic word behind Karnak's *ḥq/gr*. In fact, to suggest that *ḥq/gr* means "enclosure" on the basis of *ḥāṣēr* is to impose the latter's meaning from *ḤZR* (rather than *ḤḌR*!). Without attestations of a NW Semitic √*ḥǵr* (i.e., the presumed Semitic word behind Karnak's vocable *q/g*), it is merely conjectural to assume that the *semantic* development of *ḤḌR* was the same for both Karnak's *ḥq/gr* and Biblical Hebrew's *ḥāṣēr*.[52] The disciplines of semantics and phonology should not be confused, though they obviously are related. This caveat aside, the proposal that Karnak's attestations of *ḥq/g* are transcriptions of SW Semitic *ḥgr* is equally as strong as the argument that *ḥāṣēr* and *ḥq/g* are cognates. And more importantly, the argument that Karnak's *ḥq/gr* name rings are renderings of Semitic √*ḥql/ḥlq* (field, territory) should mitigate any attempt to link Karnak's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms with biblical sites including *ḥāṣēr*.

Other Difficulties with the Karnak Inscription

Aside from the debate concerning whether Egyptian *ššnq* (Shoshenq) can linguistically reflect biblical *šîšaq*, there is the question—though not as exacerbating as is often asserted—of whether Shoshenq I actually lived during the "fifth year of king Rehoboam" (1 Kgs 14: 25). Believing the Book of Kings to be a fairly reliable historical record, Kitchen, who represents the view of several Egyptologists, has outlined the traditional chronology, dating Shoshenq's reign to about 945-924 BCE.[53] While some scholars have radically revised the chronology of Egypt's Third Intermediate Period by lowering it half a century,[54] many modern scholars still prefer a date close to Kitchen's original proposal, affirming the historical-chronological identification of biblical *šîšaq* with Shoshenq I.[55] These differences in chronology have no bearing on the phonological and semantic realizations behind Karnak's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms.

More challenging, however, is the question of how to interpret the alleged "campaign" depicted on the Bubastite Portal and recounted in the Karnak inscription. Does the inscription actually reflect a list of places either destroyed or captured by an Egyptian pharaoh? Were the names copied from existing topographical lists on triumphal reliefs of bygone pharaohs? Answers to these questions are important for determining to what extent the inscription can aid biblical scholars and archaeologists in understanding the historical geography of the

---

[52] Even if we could establish a clear etymological connection, it still would not be clear whether the *ḥq/gr*-based designations refer to topographical realities rooted in a settlement's origins, the time at which the toponym name was written down, or a period after some development or urbanization.

[53] Kitchen 1986, 287-302. By saying that Kitchen represents the view of many Egyptologists, I do not intend to suggest that they agree with him on every detail. Several Egyptologists offer their own variants of Kitchen's basic position. See, for example, Shortland 2005, 44.

[54] See, for example, P. James 2015, 3-9. Van der Veen's argument that the chronological disparities in the historical records require a different identification of the *šîšaq* mentioned in the Books of Kings and Chronicles strains credulity (2015, 82-97).

[55] See E. Hornung, R. Krauss, and D. A. Warburton (2006, 496-498) and M. Dijkstra (2016, 83-84) who prefer the dates *ca*. 943-922 BCE for Shoshenq's reign. For a similar view, see also Sagrillo 2012, 428-433. Sheshonq I's involvement in Palestine is most clear in the destruction at Gezer (see G. Moers 2005, 264; and Dijkstra 2016, 85).

Levant. Initially, scholars doubted that the inscription referred to an actual campaign, since the identifiable toponyms on the inscription indicate expeditions in the north and Negev, whereas the biblical account, the more "reliable" account, refers mainly to Shoshenq's advance to Jerusalem.[56] However, beginning in the 1930s scholars began to view the inscription as reflecting an actual campaign itinerary.

M. Noth was the first of many scholars to outline a campaign itinerary, though he did not think the inscription accurately described the campaign.[57] He attempted to track the army's march by identifying and arranging known toponyms, arguing that Shoshenq I launched the campaign as a show of force in order to reestablish Egypt's hegemony.[58] B. Mazar read the inscription in boustrophedon style and held the view that the name rings were listed logically and consecutively, giving the picture of a circular tour of Palestine, the purpose for which was to protect Shoshenq's rear from the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes in the southern desert and to enable the majority of his army to advance along the narrow coastal strip without hindrance.[59] Y. Aharoni's view is essentially the same as B. Mazar's, with the difference of the specific route taken.[60] S. Herrmann, rejecting B. Mazar's boustrophedon reading, adhered to the idea that Shoshenq's main thrust went up the *Via Maris* to Megiddo, while several strike-forces were sent out to tackle various objectives. He understood the topographical list as being made up of groups of connected names, but sometimes more than one group to a row.[61] Kitchen also maintains that there was a main force under the pharaoh, from which he detached and sent out several task-forces to conquer and despoil objectives.[62] G. Ahlström proposes that Shoshenq I, after having taken Gezer, divided his troops into multiple flying columns, with one going to Megiddo, one to Jezreel Valley, and one to the Negev. In doing so, Shoshenq was attempting to regain control over the trade routes.[63] F. Clancy finds two things unlikely about traditional interpretations of the inscription: 1) that Shoshenq I could have taken many of the fortified sites traditionally identified on the inscription (e.g., Gezer, Megiddo, Taanach); and 2) that Shoshenq I would have campaigned in the Transjordan at all. Clancy endeavors to find locations in the Shephelah and Negev that former scholars initially attributed to sites known in the Transjordan and further north.[64]

Despite their discrepancies, all these positions more or less presume that the Karnak inscription reflects a single campaign. Recently, several scholars have challenged this consensus by examining every dimension of the relief (inscription, scene, and topographical list) in relation

---

[56] For example, Lammeyer 1907, as cited in Wilson 2005, 3. Breasted (1906, 4:348-354; 1919, 529-530) viewed the list as a catalogue of captured towns. As is frequently mentioned, "Jerusalem" is not included as a toponym on the Karnak inscription.

[57] Noth 1938, 277-304.

[58] Ibid., 277, 289.

[59] B. Mazar 1957, 57-66. This is also the position of A. Mazar 1990, 395-398.

[60] Aharoni 1979, 323-328.

[61] Herrmann 1964, 55-79.

[62] Kitchen 1986, 443-447. The position of B. U. Schipper (1999, 119-132) is a slight variation of Kitchen's.

[63] Ahlström 1993. Closely resembling Ahlström's position is that of Mayes (2010, 129-144), who uses studies in cultural memory and structural-functionalist sociology to explain the biblical account of Shishak's raids, arguing that the "historical" experiences of the exodus point to the Shishak's invasion and subsequent withdrawal. Ahlström's view also seems to be that of Rainey and Notley 2006, 188-189. Similarly, Miller and Hayes (2006, 279) call Shishak's campaign a "blitzkrieg" intended to boost his power, gather booty, and reestablish Egyptian presence on Arabian trade. Finkelstein (2002, 109-135) also agrees with this purpose for Shishak's campaign; however, he rejects the ability to date Shishak's campaign on the basis of 1 Kgs 14: 25.

[64] Clancy 1999, 3-23. For a detailed summary and critique of all these positions and more, see Wilson 2005, 2-15.

to similar preexisting Egyptian reliefs (e.g., the topographical list of Thutmose III), which celebrate all the victories of the king rather than one particular campaign. E. Lipiński argues that the scene portrayed on the Bubastite Portal is not dated, opening up with the topographical lists with the names of the "Nine Bows." This suggests that the scene gives a "global vision" of Shoshenq I's victorious campaigns during his twenty-one year reign. Additionally, the various sections of Palestine mentioned in the name rings most likely reflect the different years of Shoshenq's campaigns.[65]

Speaking to the rhetorical and sociopolitical functions of the Bubastite Portal, K. Wilson argues that the inscription was created primarily to send the message that the king had defeated all foreign nations, much like the self-promoting propaganda of those pharaohs of the New Kingdom who came before him.[66] The topographical list, he submits, is not helpful for reconstructing a campaign itinerary, since many of the lists—like the scene and inscription—were most likely compiled from preexisting lists. The problematic character of these lists also has been addressed by M. Dijkstra, who adds that many groups of toponyms on the Karnak inscription (VI. 66-150 and XI, 1a-5a) pertain to the region below the line Gaza and the Dead Sea's southern tip. Thus, the idea that a single campaign travelled along the coastal corridor and Megiddo and "flying columns" were dispatched inland to secure the North does not account for the Karnak inscription's summary character.[67] Rather, the list of southern toponyms likely attests one of Shoshenq's southern campaigns to secure copper resources at Wadi Fidan (= Khirbet Feynan, Punon), where scarabs of Shoshenq I have been discovered.[68]

Wilson also examines the Bubastite Portal from an anthropology of religion perspective, arguing that as a whole the artifact served as conventional religious and political propaganda.[69] However, he clearly affirms the inscription's usefulness for historical geography, since various components of the lists were probably drafted from both military records and onomastic tradition. This explains why parts of Shoshenq's list seem to reflect geographical and logical sequences, as they may very well have come from the itineraries of scribes who were charged with the duty of memorizing and charting the landscape of foreign lands.[70]

Wilson's proposal has not gone unchallenged,[71] but the comprehensiveness with which he deals with the subject and his extensive interaction with the recent scholarship of several Egyptologists demands careful consideration.[72] At the very least, the merits of his

---

[65] Lipiński 2005, 100. See also H. M. Niemann 1997, 297; and Dijkstra 2016, 85-87.

[66] Wilson 2005, 36-40. A similar view is expressed in Dijkstra and Vriezen 2015, 90-95.

[67] Dijkstra 2016, 86-87.

[68] Ibid.

[69] This particular point has not been studied adequately by biblical scholars. Wilson (2005, 36-40) demonstrates how the topographical lists performed the apotropaic function of protecting the temple. A specific city's inclusion on the list need not indicate hostile relations of any sort with Egypt. Rather, all foreign cities, be they allies or enemies, served as potential sources of conflict and chaos (*isft*) against which the pharaoh was responsible to defend.

[70] Ibid., 48-65.

[71] See Mayes 2010, 133-134 and his more extensive critique (2011). Mayes seems to be in large agreement with Wilson's general presentation of the inscription as reflecting a particular political genre of propaganda; however, he thinks that the inscription does reflect a campaign, since some of the toponyms on the inscription are not found on other reliefs (e.g., Arad). See also the review of J. K. Hoffmeier 2008, 88-91.

[72] Wilson is sometimes mischaracterized as not affirming any kind of campaign for Shoshenq I or finding the biblical record as the only reliable source on Shoshenq's expedition into Judah; however, these criticisms are unfair. Wilson does affirm a campaign, one that involved a raid only on Jerusalem. This view requires a different "reading" of the Karnak inscription and disagrees with the statement "and Shishak took the fortified cities of Judah" in 2 Chron 12: 4. See Wilson 2005, 96-99 for his reconstruction of Shoshenq's campaign.

study should give archaeologists pause when they examine destruction at certain Iron Age II sites and consider connecting it to Shoshenq I's military exploits. The assumptions made in doing so are not easily defensible without incontrovertible, unambiguous evidence. Moreover, Wilson's study buttresses the work of many scholars (e.g., Ahlström, Mayes, Rainey, and Notley) who have cautioned against viewing the Karnak inscription as reflecting the specific route travelled by Shoshenq I and his army. The preconception of a campaign itinerary has influenced many scholars to see Shoshenq I as responsible for destruction at certain sites as well as to identify the unknown toponyms on the Karnak inscription based on their relation to those known in the archaeological record.[73] But if Karnak's topographical list does not reflect such an itinerary but the amalgamation of scribal itineraries, onomastic tradition, military records, and preexisting topographic lists, then it is methodologically unsound to reconstruct military routes from the Karnak relief. However, judicious readings of the inscription may uncover preservations of geographical sequences that may be useful for historical geography (e.g., Israel's road system), especially if they reflect a kind of scribal itinerary that lists geographical features as they appear along a route.[74]

Conclusion

In my view, the phonological and semantic ambiguities of Karnak's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms and the relief's sociopolitical and religious aims significantly problematize any attempt to establish links between these toponyms and *ḥāṣēr*-based descriptions or toponyms in the Hebrew Bible. Attempts to use both sources together as an aid in site identification is even more perilous. Obviously, the topographical realities of a field or region (*ḥql*), enclosure or wall (*ḥgr*), or semi-nomadic dwelling place or permanent settlement (*ḥǵl*) appear differently in the archaeological record. And while there is probably a linguistic correspondence between one (or more) of these terms with the biblical attestations of *ḥāṣēr*, the underlying physical description of a toponym cannot be equated with the lexeme's semantic range. Similarly, one should not make the assumption that partial cognates bear the same semantics when one lexeme clearly derives from two roots (e.g., √*ḥṣr*).

In outlining these complications I do not intend to deny the existence of a campaign of some sort on the part of Shoshenq I, nor do I intend to diminish the value of archaeology.[75]

---

[73] B. Mazar (1957, 63) was among the first to offer such correspondences, mentioning the density of settlement along principle roads (Benjamin; South Ephraim; Jordan Valley; the Valleys in the North; Valley of Sharon), the ruin of certain sites (Gezer; Megiddo; Bethshan; Tell Jerishe [= Gath Rimmon]; Tell Qasile), and the abatement of the importance of the Sukkoth Valley and Mahanaim after the reign of Solomon.

[74] See Redford 1982, 55-74; and Wilson 2005, 43. This hypothesis is consistent with the efforts of those archaeologists who are studying toponyms as they appear in sequence on main routes in Palestine and comparing them to the tribal lists in Joshua 15-19 and the topographical lists on the Karnak inscriptions; see Hardin, Rollston, Blakely 2012 and, most recently, Stillinger *et al*. 2016, 90-107.

[75] Aside from the radical revisionists (who comprise a small minority within the academe) who wish to recalculate the chronology of the Third Intermediate Period by half a century, most biblical scholars and Egyptologists affirm that Shoshenq I launched some sort of campaign in Israel, Judah, or both. Recent studies of trade in the southern Levant during the time of David's "national-building" are continuing to show the lucrative nature of the East to West South Arabian trade traffic; see Stager 2001, 625-638; and Holladay, Jr., and Klassen 2014, 31-46. If Israel and Judah were maximizing the trade routes by the time of Shoshenq I, then this could explain in part why the pharaoh would want to regain control of key trade routes in Palestine. This is consistent with Ahlström's view

What I primarily wish to confront is the stacking of unfounded assumptions which are used to support weighty claims, such as site identifications.

One important area of future research is the religious function of Shoshenq's relief. If Wilson and other Egyptologists are correct in seeing the Bubastite Portal as having served an apotropaic function, then not all the toponyms on the list may have been actual "enemies" of Egypt. Their inclusion would have been to enhance the king's divine-like image as ruler over all forms of potential chaos. This concept, on top of the problems of seeing the inscription as revealing Shoshenq's military route, should be sufficient to forestall injudicious use of the inscription for the historical reconstruction of Israel and Judah.

In conclusion, the cumulative weight of the complications mentioned above should serve as a caveat for those who try to link Karnak's *ḥq/gr*-based toponyms with *ḥṣr*-based toponyms in Iron Age II. By exposing many of the assumptions that scholars make when using the inscription in such a way, I hope to have provided sufficient reason to readdress the phonological and epigraphic dimensions of Shoshenq's triumphal relief so as to mitigate its uncritical employment in establishing geographical connections between it and the biblical and archaeological records.

Bibliography

Aharoni, Y. 1967. Forerunners of the Limes: Iron Age Fortresses in the Negev. *Israel Exploration Journal* 17, 1-17.

——. 1979. *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography*. Trans. and ed. by Anson F. Rainey. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Aḥituv, S. 1984. *Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents*. Jerusalem/Leiden: Magnes/Brill, 1984.

Aḥituv, S., and B. A. Levine, eds. 1986. *The Early Biblical Period: Historical Essays*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Ahlström, G. W. 1993. Pharaoh Shoshenq's Campaign to Palestine. In: A. Lemaire and B. Otzen (eds.), *History and Traditions of Early Israel: Studies Presented to Eduard Nielsen*, 1-16. Leiden: Brill.

Albright, W. F. 1924. Egypt and the Early History of the Negeb. *JPOS* 4, 131-161.

Allen, J. P. 2013. *The Ancient Egyptian Language: An Historical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bimson, J. 2015. Shishak and Shoshenq: A Chronological Cornerstone or Stumbling-Block? In: P. James and P. van der Veen (eds.), *Solomon and Shishak: Current Perspectives from Archaeology, Epigraphy, History and Chronology*, 3-9. Proceedings of the Third BICANE Colloquium Held at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge 26-27, March 2011. BAR International Series 2732. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Breasted, J. H. 1906. *Ancient Records of Egypt*. Vol. 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1919. *A History of Egypt*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Burchardt, M. 1909-1910. *Die altkanaanäischen Fremdworte und Eigennamen im Aegyptischen*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

Clancy, F. 1999. Shishak/Shoshenq's Travels. *JSOT* 86, 3-23.

Clermont-Ganneau, Ch., ed. 1880. *Études d'archéologie orientale*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Philologiques et Historiques, Fasc. 44 & 113. Tome I. Paris: E. Bouillon.

Cohen, R. 1979. The Iron Age Fortresses in the Central Negev. *BASOR* 236, 61-79.

(1993, 13-15) that Shoshenq campaigned against Israel and Judah in order to raise the Egyptian flag again in the old dominion, lend support to the Sea-Peoples, and re-establish Egyptian economic dominion in the area.

Dijkstra, M. 2016. Canaan in the Transition from the Late Bronze to the Early Iron Age from an Egyptian Perspective. In: L. L. Grabbe (ed.), *The Land of Canaan in the Late Bronze Age*, 59-89. London: T&T Clark.

Donner, H., and W. Röllig, eds. 1971. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler*. Band I Texte. 3rd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Et Savignac, J. 1909. *Mission archéologique en Arabie*. Vol. 1. Paris: De Jérusalem au Hedjaz Médain-Saleh.

Faust, A. 2006. The Negev 'Fortresses' in Context: Reexamining the 'Fortresses' Phenomenon in Light of General Settlement Processes of the Eleventh – Tenth Centuries B.C.E. *JAOS* 126, 135-160.

——. 2009. 'But Houses in Villages That Have No Walls Shall be Classed as Open Country': Biblical Settlement Terminology in Light of the Archaeological Evidence. *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* 9, 357-367.

Finkelstein, I. 1984. The Iron Age Fortresses of the Negev Highlands: Sedentarization of the Nomads. *Tel Aviv* 11, 189-209.

——. 1990. Early Arad: Urbanism of the Nomads. *ZDPV* 106, 34-50.

——. 1986. The Iron Age Sites in the Negev Highlands – Military Fortresses or Nomads Settling Down? *BAR* 12:4, 46-53.

——. 2002. The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I to Palestine: A Guide to the 10th Century BCE Polity. *ZDPV* 118, 109-135.

Freytag, G. W. 1975. *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*. Beirut: Lib. Antoine.

Gophna, R. 1963. 'Ḥaṣerim' Settlements in the Northern Negev. *Yediot: Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society (N.S.)* 27, 179.

Hardin, W., C. A. Rollston, and J. A. Blakely. 2012. Biblical Geography in Southwestern Judah. *NEA* 75:1, 20-35.

Herrmann, S. 1964. Pharao Schoschenks I. im östlichen Ephraim. *ZDPV* 80, 55-79.

Hoch, J. E. 1992. The Supposed Ḥgr 'Fort' in Negeb Place Names of the Shishak Toponym List. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd International Congress of Asian and North African Studies*. Vol. 1. Queenston: E. Mellen P.

——. 1994. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton: Princeton University.

Hoffmeier, J. K. 2008. Review of *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine*, by K. A. Wilson. *BASOR* 349, 88-91.

Hoftijzer, J., and K. Jongeling. 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Part One. Handbook of Oriental Studies I/21, 1. Leiden: Brill.

Holladay, J. S., Jr., and S. Klassen. 2014. From Bandit to King: David's Time in the Negev and the Transformation of a Tribal Entity into a Nation State. In: J. M. Tebes (ed.), *Unearthing the Wilderness: Studies on the History and Archaeology of the Negev and Edom in the Iron Age*, 31-46. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 45. Leuven: Peeters.

Hornung, E., R., Krauss, and D. A. Warburton, eds. 2006. *Ancient Egyptian Chronology*. EdO Section One 83. Leiden: Brill.

Hughes, G., *et al.*, eds. 1965. *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*. Vol. III. The Bubastite Portal. Oriental Institute Publications 74. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

James, P., and P. van der Veen, eds. 2015. *Solomon and Shishak: Current Perspectives from Archaeology, Epigraphy, History and Chronology*. Proceedings of the Third BICANE Colloquium Held at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge 26-27, March 2011. BAR International Series 2732. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Kitchen, K. A. 1986. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 BC)*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips.

——. 1997. A Possible Mention of David in the Late Tenth Century BCE, and Deity *Dod as Dead as the Dodo? *JSOT* 76, 29-44.

Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner. 2001. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Ed. and trans. by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: Brill.

Lammeyer, J. 1907. *Das Siegesdenkmal des Königs Scheschonk I*. Neuss am Rhein: H. Goder.

Le Jeune, C. 1868. *Lettres écrites d'Egypt et de Nubie en 1828 et 1829*. Paris: Libraires-Académique.

Levin, Y. 2010. Sheshonq I and the Negev *ḤĂṢĒRÎM*. *Maarav* 17.2, 189-215.

Lipiński, E. 2006. *On the Skirts of Canaan in the Iron Age: Historical and Topographic Researches*. OLA 153. Leuven: Peeters.

Loprieno, A. 1995. *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malamat, A. 1962. Mari and the Bible: Some Patterns of Tribal Organizations and Institutions. *JAOS* 82, 143-150.

Maspero, G. 1915. Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne. *Rec. Trav.* 37, 147-202.

Mayes, A. D. H. 2010. Pharaoh Shishak's Invasion of Palestine and the Exodus from Egypt. In: B. E. J. H. Becking and L. Grabbe (eds.), *In Between Evidence and Ideology*: *Essays on the History of Ancient Israel Read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap Lincoln, July 2009*, 129-144. Leiden: Brill.

——. 2011. The Palestinian Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak. In: J. K. Aitken, K. J. Dell, and B. A. Mastin (eds.), *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, 55-68. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mazar, A. 1990. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000 – 586 BCE*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mazar, B. 1957. The Campaign of Pharaoh Shishak to Palestine. *VT* 4, 57-66.

——. 1986. *The Early Biblical Period: Historical Essays*, eds. S. Aḥituv and B. A. Levine. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Miller, J. M., and J. H. Hayes. 2006. *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Moers, G. 2005. Der Palästinafeldzug Scheschonqs I. In: B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*, 246-271. TUAT NF Bd 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Müller, W. M. 1893. *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*. Leipzig: W. Engelmann.

Na'aman, N. 1998. Shishak's Campaign to Palestine as Reflected by the Epigraphic, Biblical and Archaeological Evidence. *Zion* 63, 247-276.

Niemann, H. M. 1997. The Socio-Political Shadow of the Biblical Solomon. In: L. K. Handy *et al*. (eds.), *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium*, 252-299. Leiden: Brill.

Nims, C. F., and R. C. Steiner. 1983. A Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2-6 from the Aramaic Text in Demotic Script. *JAOS* 103, 261-274.

Noth, M. 1938. Die Wege der Pharaonenheere in Palästina und Syrien. Untersuchungen zu den hieroglyphischen Listen palästinischer und syrischer Städte. *ZDPV* 61.3/4, 277-304.

Orel, V. E., and O. V. Stolbova. 1995. *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for Reconstruction*. Leiden: Brill.

Orlinsky, H. M. 1939. 'Ḥaṣer' in the Old Testament. *JAOS* 59, 22-37.

Porter, B., and R. L. B. Moss. 1937-1952. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*. I-VII. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, Press.

Rainey, A. F. 1979. Toponymic Problems (cont.), Râḫiṣum = Rôḫiṣu?, Canaan and Canaanites, *TA* 6, 158-162.

Rainey, A. F., and R. S. Notley. 2006. *Sacred Bridge*. Jerusalem: Carta.

Redford, D. 1982. A Bronze Age Itinerary in Transjordan (Nos. 89-101 of Thutmose III's List of Asiatic Toponyms). *JSSEA* 12, 55-74.

Rössler, O. 1971. Das Ägyptische als semitische Sprache. In: F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (eds.), *Christentum am Roten Meer*, 263-325. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Sagrillo, T. L. 2012. Šišaq's Army: 2 Chronicles 12:2-3 from an Egyptological Perspective. In: G. Galil, A. Leṿinzon-Gilboʿa, A. M. Maeir, and D. Kahn (eds.), *The Ancient Near East in the 12th-10th Centuries BCE: Culture and History – Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the University of Haifa, 2-5 May, 2010*, 428-433. AOAT 392. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

——. 2015. Shoshenq I and Biblical Šîšaq: A Philological Defense of Their Traditional Equation. In: P. James and P. van der Veen (eds.), *Solomon and Shishak: Current Perspectives from Archaeology, Epigraphy, History and Chronology*, 61-81. Proceedings of the Third BICANE Colloquium

Held at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge 26-27, March 2011. BAR International Series 2732. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Schipper, B. U. 1999. *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit: Die kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems*. OBO 170. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Shortland, A. J. 2005. Shishak, King of Egypt: The Challenges of Egyptian Calendrical Chronology. In: T. E. Levy and T. Higham (eds.), *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating: Archaeology, Text and Science*, 43-54. London: Equinox.

Simons, J. 1937. *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*. Leiden: Brill.

Stager, L. E. 2001. Port Power in the Early and the Middle Bronze Age: The Organization of Maritime Trade and Hinterland Production. In: S. R. Wolff (ed.), *Studies in the Archaeology of Israel and Neighboring Lands in Memory of Douglas L. Esse*, 625-38. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 59. ASOR Books 5. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Steiner, R. C., and C. F. Nims. 1985. Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin: The Tale of Two Brothers from the Aramaic Text in Demotic Script. *Revue Biblique* 92, 60-81.

Stillinger, M., J. Hardin, J. M. Feinberg, and J. Blakely. 2016. Archaeomagnetism as a Complementary Dating Technique to Address the Iron Age Chronology Debate in the Levant. *NEA* 79, 90-107.

Takács, G. 1999. The Egypto-Semitic Consonant Correspondences as Set up by Rössler and His Followers. In *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian: Phonological Introduction*, 331-393. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

——. 2011. *Studies in Afro-Asiatic Comparative Phonology: Consonants*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Van der Veen, P. 2015. The Name Shishaq: ŠOŠENQ or ŠYŠU/Q? Responding to the Critics and Assessing the Evidence. In: P. James and P. van der Veen (eds.), *Solomon and Shishak: Current Perspectives from Archaeology, Epigraphy, History and Chronology*, 82-97. Proceedings of the Third BICANE Colloquium Held at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge 26-27, March 2011. BAR International Series 2732. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Vleeming, S. P., and J. W. Wesselius. 1982. An Aramaic Religious Text in Demotic Script. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 39, 501-509.

Wilson, K. W. 2005. *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I in Palestine*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.