

Shoshenq at Megiddo

Ernst Axel Knauf – Bern

Regardless of whether Shoshenq I destroyed Megiddo VIA or not¹, it stands to reason that he founded, or embellished, Megiddo VB, earmarking it for the capital of his newly established Canaanite province. In addition to the monumental stela erected there², Megiddo is the final destination of an itinerary originating from Mahanaim (Karnak list, #21-27), and the Jezreel that of another route coming from Penuël (#53-65)³. It is quite unlikely that the two routes documented were taken by various divisions of the Egyptian army in the course of the same campaign; most probably, the Karnak inscription comprises various campaigns to Canaan, undertaken over the course of several years⁴. This assumption is corroborated by a biographical fragment of one of Shoshenq's camp-followers, stating that he accompanied the Pharaoh «on his campaigns (plural!) to Rečenu (Syria-Palestine)»⁵.

The centrality of Megiddo in Shoshenq's schemes for Canaan might receive further light from a closer look at the Megiddo entry in the Karnak list. Megiddo (#27) is preceded by Taanach (#14), but followed by the next road-station only with #32 ('Iron – 'Arūna – 'Āra). Of the entries between #27 and #32, #29 *Yad ham-Malk* «Stela of the King» can hardly refer to any other place than Megiddo, where such a stela was erected indeed. #30 is broken, only a final *rw* is discernible. #31 *h: '-n-m* does not look like a toponym at all; neither does #28, *'-d-ī rw*. Although there are Addars and Adirs attested in Palestinian toponymy from the 3rd millennium BCE to the present, there are too many 'dr's in Shoshenq's list (#28; #100; #116; #117) for any of them to represent a place name – they can all be read as epitheta/predicates. Thus one gains the impression that #28-31 is an epithet, in Canaanite, of Megiddo and/or the stela erected there: 28 *'addirō* 29 *yod ham-malk* 30 [*gud*]=*ō* 31 *hanna=m* «Valiant⁶ is the hand of the King, his Ma[jesty] showed⁷ favour upon them».

In the Negev-section of Shoshenq's list, it is generally accepted that more complex toponyms are distributed over two or more cartouches. The same technique seems to apply to #28-31 and #53f and, also, to #36f: 36 *bēt 'ōlam* 37 *KQRY* «The tomb of KQRY». The sequence of K-Q- is not possible in either a semitic or an Egyptian name. But one may think of an hero of the Sea-Peoples and compare the Salaminian *Κυχρεῦς* (H. v. Geisau, Kleiner Pauli 3, 390).

¹ Cf. BN 103 (2000) 30-35; 33 with fn.10; 34. Whether there was a «public building» of VB under Palace 6000 (A. Kempinski, Megiddo. A City-State and Royal Centre in North Israel [MAVA 40; 1989] 87) will be elucidated by the present Megiddo Expedition in due course.

² B.U. Schipper, Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit (OBO 170; 1999) 129-132; 297 Abb. 7 and 8.

³ Cf. for the Shoshenq-list and how to read it, N. Na'aman, *המבצע הארכיאולוגי*, *ישראל בראי הכתובות המצריות* (תשנ"א), *מסע* 63 (1998) 247-276.

⁴ Cf. H.M. Niemann, The Socio-political Shadow of the Biblical Solomon: L.K. Handy ed., *The Age of Solomon. Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (SHCANE 11; 1997) 252-299, 296-299.

⁵ Schipper, OBO 170, 192f; K. Jansen-Winkeln, *ÄAT* 9, text B 5, 252-54.

⁶ The phonology is more or less Phoenician (cf. also *yod* for *yad*): *'addirō* ← *'addirāt*; Transjordan was linguistically more conservative: #53f Penuël *ḥadaš(a)t*, and cf. E.A. Knauf - S.Ma'ani, *On the Phonemes of Fringe Canaanite: the cases of Zerah-Uđruḥ and «Kamashaltā»*: UF 19 (1987) 91-94. The final vowel might be expressed by the stroke of the determinative under the *rw*-hieroglyph.

⁷ The aleph may serve to indicate the vocalism of the first syllable in order to distinguish *hanna=m* from *hinnām*.