

Contact Between Egypt and Jordan in the New Kingdom: Some Comments on Sources

Our knowledge of Egyptian relations with Western Asia, when not derived from archaeological excavations of Levantine sites, comes in the main from four major epigraphic sources. They are, in reverse order of importance, 1) incidental references in administrative or private texts (business documents, tax lists, letters, stories etc.), 2) biographical texts and epithets, 3) royal stelae and the like, 4) toponym lists. The first is an amorphous and heterogeneous category, and shall not detain us here, but the remaining three are of prime importance in chronicling and assessing the impact of Egypt on Canaan in the 'Empire Period'.

It is fortunate indeed for modern historians that the Egyptian participants in the Asiatic and Nubian wars of conquests chose to follow the practice of their Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period forebears by sometimes including their military exploits in their biographical statements. The campaigns of Ahmose and Amenophis I into West Asia would scarcely be known at all, were it not for the haply surviving texts of Ahmose Si-Abina and Ahmose pa-Nekhbet. It should be borne in mind, however, that these are intensely personal statements, and however formally structured by the author and his favourite scribe, still essentially products of an oral, formulaic tradition. An old soldier will always wish to put himself in the best light; as a veteran he will always remember the engagements he participated in, and ignore others. Moreover, looking back from the vantage point of advanced age, he may well choose to ignore chronological sequence in favour of some other organizing principle. This is not the case with Ahmose si-Abina, who reminisces about his exploits in unimpeachable historic sequence; but it is the case with Amenemheb whose biographic statement has been so widely used to amplify Thutmose III's Euphrates campaign. Up to line 12, it is true, as Gardiner has demonstrated¹, Amenemheb is speaking of the 8th, or Euphrates, campaign, in which he made three captures (*hfc*) and was once rewarded. The important facts to note about the following section² are 1) the formula involving *hfc* ('[I] captured . . .') is replaced by one

involving *m33* ('[I] witnessed . . .'), and 2) Amenemheb is rewarded no less than three times. In this section Amenemheb is concerned with subordinating his exploits to the mere fact of his presence on the campaign, and his witnessing the mighty deeds of his sovereign. If the number of decorations is a valid indication, we are dealing with three separate campaigns, but on the evidence of the changed format there is no prior necessity to assume they follow in chronological order from the 8th. These are simply campaigns on which the hero distinguished himself less brilliantly than on the glorious 8th³.

Lines 23ff deal with the elephant hunt in Niya, and the attack on Kadesh. Once again the formula changes⁴, and so does the criterion of selection: both these incidents involve *animals*⁵.

One does not, therefore, need to read chronological progression into this series of events in order to make sense out of them. Rather, Amenemheb is grouping his military deeds according to another criterion entirely. First come his most cherished memories, when he distinguished himself on the battlefield on the 8th campaign, next those campaigns in which he 'witnessed' the king's victories, followed by two animal exploits⁶. The second of the latter, viz. the release of the mare among the chariots of the enemy⁷, leads naturally

³ Of the places listed *Sndr* (cf. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien*² [Wiesbaden, 1971], 278) occurs in no known campaign (although admittedly nos. 11 and 12 are a blank in our knowledge, and the Nukhashshe towns taken on the 9th and 13th campaigns are un-named). Kadesh is mentioned on the 6th and 17th campaigns (*Urk.* iv, 689: 7, 730: 9), in the latter, however, only as the designation of a district. *H³[]* (*Urk.* iv, 893: 2) sounds like a remote, little-known district, to judge by the presence of the location *hr.tw r.f.*, '... which they call . . .' (cf. the earliest reference to Mitanni in Egyptian sources: H. Brunner, *MIOF* ⁴[1956], 323ff; F.-J. Schmitz, *Amenophis I* [Hildesheim, 1978], 184). In the 10th campaign the battle took place at Aryan, far to the north; and the king of Mitanni had assembled people from the *phw n r³* (*Urk.* iv, 710: 3-7; cf. 1441: 16). Takhsy is nowhere mentioned in the annals, but Minmose declares he was an eyewitness to Thutmose III's capture of 30 towns therein (*Urk.* iv, 1442: 16-20), and in the earliest of Amenophis II's campaigns Takhsy and its seven chieftains were the main target (*Urk.* iv, 1297: 3ff). One wonders, therefore, whether the Takhsy campaign did not come at the end of Thutmose III's reign, and perhaps postdated the end of the Karnak annals (year 42).

⁴ To something like *whm.[n hm.f irt] ky sp.*

⁵ As Helck has seen (*Beziehungen*², 139f) *Urk.* iv, 894: 16ff is simply an expanded duplicate of the earlier attack on Kadesh (*Urk.* iv, 892: 8ff).

⁶ Note how deeds connected with the hunt are all grouped together on the Ermant stela (lines 6-9): *Urk.* iv, 1245f.

⁷ *Urk.* iv, 894: 5. On the motif of the mare sent out to cause havoc among the stallion-drawn chariots, cf. Cant. 1, 9: M. H. Pope, *BASOR* 200 (1970), 59.

¹ *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* (Oxford, 1947), 1, 156*f.

² Lines 12-22 (*Urk.* iv, 891: 16-893: 13).

into the detailed treatment of the siege of Kadesh in the 6th campaign with which it is inseparably linked.

Similarly in the biography of Minmose⁸, close reliance cannot be placed on the chronology of the deeds recounted. Rather Minmose groups his accomplishments under three heads: 1) military exploits, 2) civil service, 3) construction works.

Minmose first singles out two representative campaigns, the 8th and a campaign against Nubia. He then describes his function as assessor of taxes in Asia and Nubia respectively. A statement follows on the veracity of these descriptive passages; and then Minmose describes a further exploit, this time one in which he distinguished himself as commander of the Braves, in Takhsy. The progression is interesting: only the first four exploits are in Upper Egypt, and the sequence is south-north. Then follow in order seven temples in Lower Egypt.

A far more important source for contact between Egypt and the Levant are the royal stelae, *wd* a term which applies to any formal hieroglyphic inscription, whether on a wall or free-standing stone⁹. A fairly broad number of *genres* may be subsumed under the *wd*, including royal decree (*wd-nsu*), the stela of regulations (*wd hmwt*), the palace directive (*dddt m stp-s3*), the boundary stela, the royal speech (in the context of the court appearance: *hmst-nsu*, *hct-nsu*), the 'song' (*hst*), the stela of victories (*wd n nhtw*) etc.¹⁰ The *wd* is thus basically a *published* text for public consumption, and we may thus expect a varying degree of propagandistic embellishment. Nevertheless there is good evidence that those stelae which display a specific date (regnal year and callendric) often derive their material from a more reliable source than a tendentious mind; underlying stelae of victory and royal speeches (our major source for Egyptian military expansion in the New Kingdom), is the phenomenon of the *hrwyt*, or 'day-book'.

The *hrwyt* is the official journal of an institution, recording day by day the administrative workings of that institution¹¹. We have *hrwyts* of the king's house, of temples, of the treasury, of law-courts, of ships (i.e. logs), of the necropolis, of fortresses, of dockyards, and so on. Each is organized calendrically, and is worded laconically. Common entries include notes on astronomical or meteorological conditions, the arrival and departure of messengers, receipts and disbursements of commodities, verbal declarations, copies of official correspondence, lists of people, the movement of dignitaries and armies. The term *hrwyt* itself seems to have been vernacular. When we are allowed to glimpse the official

⁸ *Urk.* iv, 1441ff; on Minmose see H. Kees, *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat* (Leiden, 1953), 33f; Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des mittleren und neuen Reiches* (Leiden, 1958), 271f.

⁹ The latter could also be termed an *h^c*.

¹⁰ These will be taken up by the author in a forthcoming treatment of literary genres in ancient Egypt.

¹¹ See the present writer's *King Lists, Annals and Day-books: Historical Tradition in Ancient Egypt* (SSEA, forthcoming), ch. 3.

title of a document of this type, an appellation is used which is derived from the specific contents rather than the format (e.g. 'scroll of corn receipts . . .').

One inscription which is always mentioned as a prime example when the *hrwyt* is under discussion is the so-called annals of Thutmose III at Karnak¹². This is the single most important document for the creation of Egypt's Asiatic empire. For the form-critical analysis of the annals it is important to note that no source mentioned is in the form **hrwyt nt mšc* or **hrwyt nt ḥ3*; although I take it that some such prototype was in the minds of the German scholars who coined the term 'Kriegstagebuch'¹³. No passage in Thutmose III's annals, that the writer knows of, speaks of a 'war diary'. Sources are, indeed, mentioned three times: in the account of the 7th campaign the reader is referred to 'the day-book of the king's house' for the specific quantities of food with which the coastal garrisons were supplied¹⁴; the harvest of Syria from the same campaign is said to be kept in a document in the treasury¹⁵; and for further and specific details of the siege of Megiddo one is sent to a special leather roll deposited in the Temple of Amun¹⁶.

If there is no independent evidence for a war journal, are we justified in postulating the existence of any kind of journal behind the inscribed annals of Thutmose III, Amenophis II and others? The answer is, of course, yes. For example the style of Thutmose's 2nd edition (campaign 6 onwards) and that of the Karnak and Memphite stelae of Amenophis II is markedly similar to that of known day-books^{16a}. Now the only day-book mentioned in the annals is the day-book of the king's house. A moment's reflection will suffice to show that, broadly speaking, the content of the Karnak annals is precisely that of known day-books. Bulaq 18 and even the Rollin Papyri are both primarily concerned with receipts and disbursements of commodities. The Karnak annals deal with the same activities, save that now it is the receipt of booty (*ḥ³k*) and benevolences (*imw*), appropriate enough in military contexts, and the disbursement of supplies to garrisons. Bulaq 18 and the Rollin Papyre, as well as the Rhind fragment, also record the whereabouts of the king, his movements from place to place, and upon occasion his activity (which in the well-known example of Bulaq 18, xxx, 2: 13–20¹⁷ is of a

¹² *Urk.* iv, 647ff; H. Grapow, *Studien zu den Annalen Thutmosis des Drotten*, Berlin, 1949; see the forthcoming *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians* (New Haven) by A. Spalinger; provisionally articles by the same author in *MDAIK* 30 (1974), 221ff; *JARCE* 14 (1977), 41ff; *GM* 33 (1979), 47ff.

¹³ The word has become a commonplace in Egyptological parlance: cf. A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel* 1, (Munich, 1959), 97ff; M. Noth, *ZDPV* 61 (1938), 50, n. 4; *idem*, *ZDPV* 66 (1943), 156ff; Grapow, *Studien*, 50; E. Otto, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1, 2 (Leiden, 1952), 143; Helck, *Die Einfluss der Militärführer in der 18. ägyptischen Dynastie* (Leipzig, 1939), 14; R. O. Faulkner, *JEA* 28 (1942), 2.

¹⁴ *Urk.* iv, 693: 8–14.

¹⁵ *Urk.* iv, 694: 7–8.

¹⁶ *Urk.* iv, 661f.

^{16a} H. Grapow, *Sprachliche und schriftliche Formung ägyptischer Texte* (Glückstadt, 1936), 22f.

¹⁷ Grapow, *Studien*, 51f.

military nature); they are not concerned with the activity of anyone outside the purview of the court. Precisely the same concern informs the Karnak annals. The king's whereabouts, his movements from town to town, and his activity (of necessity in this context almost purely military) are the only interests of the recorder: collateral expeditions of detachments sent off on their own, or activity in the Sudan is of no concern, because the scribe keeping the journal stayed with the king. In short, the daybook from which the Karnak annals were drawn is simply the daybook of the king's house.

Hence there is no reason whatsoever in the Karnak annals to separate records of military activity from booty lists, and to postulate 'zwei Gruppen von Unterlagen', viz. 'Tributlisten und die Kriegstagsbücher'¹⁸. Both types of record occur in the same daybook genre, as the examples cited above plainly prove.

The final source of information on contact between Egypt and Canaan in the New Kingdom is that genre of text known as the toponym list. Personified places, lined up in some sort of order, are known from the Old Kingdom, but from the Middle Kingdom comes our earliest examples of the 'captive oval' surmounted by the appropriately-coiffured foreigner¹⁹. Early in the 18th Dynasty the older type of personification with the town-name in a crenellated rectangle on the head of a standing male is occasionally still found²⁰; but with Thutmose III the format employing ovals achieved dominance.

One problem inherent in the study of toponym lists, perhaps the single most pressing problem, is their proper understanding and interpretation, rather than the identification of specific places. How should the archaeologist use the lists of Thutmose III? Too often, it seems to me, the lists are used as a great reservoir from which to draw confirmation that site so-and-so was indeed destroyed by the Egyptians. It is a comparatively simple inference to make, viz. that the wide-spread destruction levels at the beginning of the Late Bronze are the responsibility of the invading armies of Egypt bent on following up the defeat of the Hyksos. A moment's reflection, however, will show the inference to be wrong. The armies Egypt sent into the field in the 18th Dynasty were notoriously inept at siege warfare, and Middle Bronze fortifications would have posed almost insurmountable problems for them²¹. Avaris took *decades* to reduce, and Sharuhēn

three years of siege to capture. Megiddo withstood the largest force Egypt could muster for seven months, and when Thutmose III finally took it there is no evidence that he destroyed the city²². Thus to construe the toponym lists as a roster of captured and destroyed towns simply flies in the face of a mass of circumstantial evidence, and must be rejected^{22a}.

This is not to treat the early Late Bronze destruction levels cavalierly: someone must have destroyed these cities, for the ubiquitous ash cannot in every case have been the product of *accidental* firing. The correct construction, however, to put on these destruction strata is demolition *from within* as it were, either in anticipation of an invasion or at the behest of a successful conqueror. A priceless passage in the later stela of Piankhy enables us to appreciate the logic behind this sort of move²³: 'He (Namlot, king of Hermopolis) tore down the fortified wall of Nefrusy—he demolished his city himself!—through fear of him who might take it from him'. Namlot is afraid of returning from battle one day only to find someone holding his own town against him: a fortified city can be used as a military strong point, but a demolished one cannot. We must seriously reckon with the possibility that the widespread destruction of early Late Bronze sites has to do with the directives of the Egyptian court to the conquered *after* the conquest, and not with the battle itself^{23a}.

A second hypothesis about the origin of toponym lists would have us believe that they are the recorded stopping-places of Egyptian expeditionary forces, extracted from the day-book and transmitted into a list of 'conquered' cities²⁴.

evidence (cf. the scenes from the tombs of Anty at Deshasheh and Ka-em-heset at Sakkarā: W. S. Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East* [N. H. & London, 1965] FIG. 14–15; cf. also Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 22 (1972), 89ff.), the Egyptians were in command of very effective assault tactics including sapping, the use of siege ladders and demolition of (mud-brick?) walls by means of axes. Again, after the campaigns of Thutmose III (sapping techniques are once attested: *Urk.* iv, 894–5), Amenophis II and Thutmose IV, Egypt's northern front was quiescent: if the Asiatic empire had been won without the extensive use of siege tactics, there was no immediate need to develop them. Beginning, however, with the reign of Tutankhamun, campaigns began once more to be mounted in Asia on a scale requiring the assault on cities; and a relief duly attests the education of the Egyptian armed forces in assault tactics (cf. Smith, *Interconnections*, FIG. 210). By Ramesses II's reign the Egyptians had reached the most advanced stage they were to attain in siege warfare until the 25th Dyn. Such cities as Ashkelon (P-M II², 133[493], and Dapur (PM II², 438[18, III]) were taken by a combination of archer fire, sapping and assault ladders (cf. the classic scene of the taking of Tunip by Ramesses III at Medineh Habu: PM II² 520[190–1]), and were undoubtedly destroyed in the process. In general, see A. R. Schulman, *Natural History* 73, no. 3 (March, 1964), 13ff.

²² Cf. W. Shea, *IEJ* 29 (1979), 1ff.

^{22a} Cf. the remarks of W. G. East, *The Destruction of Cities in the Mediterranean Lands* (Oxford, 1971), 15: '... it was not the common fate of fallen cities to meet their end... by complete destruction at the hands of their conqueror'.

²³ Piankhy stela, 7: *Urk.* III, 6.

^{23a} The epigraphic evidence from the Old Kingdom would seem to support the contention that the demolition of enemy cities followed their capture and was a methodical act, rather than the accident of the battle itself. The verb *b³*, 'to demolish' (extensively used of cities: cf. *Urk.* i, 103f) is written with a combination of the *b³*-bird (Gardiner G29) and the hoe (Gardiner U7), the latter being the significant element. The hoe is an implement of peaceful agriculture, and its attested use in the demolition of city walls (cf. the 'City' palette: J. Vandier, *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne* I [Paris, 1952], 590; Tomb of Ka-em-heset: W. S. Smith, *A History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom* [Boston, 1946], 212 FIG. 85) suggests a period after the battle is over.

²⁴ See the present author, *JSSEA* 12 (1981), 57ff.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 50; Noth, *ZDPV* 66 (1943), 156ff.

¹⁹ Breasted, *Ancient Records* I, sec. 510; A. J. Arkell, *A History of the Sudan to 1821* (London, 1961), 59f; B. Porter, R. Moss, *A Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings* VII (Oxford, 1951), 129ff. The oval is in origin a *wnt* (*wntt*), denoting a sort of walled enclosure usually outside Egypt: H. G. Fischer, *JNES* 18 (1959), 260ff; Helck, *Beziehungen*², 16f, and n. 42. Even in the Old Kingdom we find foreign toponyms inscribed within the *wnt*-oval: Fischer, *op. cit.*, pl. 8; Leclant, *Orientalia* 23 (1954), 73; W. M. F. Petrie, *Deshasheh* (London, 1898), pl. 4; cf. W. S. Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East* (New Haven, London, 1965), FIG. 14 (the town is in the form of a *wnt*); cf. also H. Goedicke, *JEA* 43 (1957), 81; for the *wnt*, among other Asiatic fortress shapes, see PT 1837a–b; occasionally it is used of Egyptian fortifications: G. Goyon, *BIFAO* 69 (1971), 13f.; cf. also M. Görg, *Biblische Notizen* 7 (1978), 16f.

²⁰ Redford, 'A Gate Inscription from Karnak . . .', *JAOS* (forthcoming).

²¹ Cf. the author's observation in *Bib. Or.* 30 (1973), 224f. Our remarks apply particularly to the 18th Dyn. It is quite true that in the Old Kingdom, to judge by the

The evidence does not favour such an hypothesis. First, one would have to admit at the outset that the presence of Kadesh and Megiddo at the head of Thutmose III's lists introduces a criterion of organization wholly different from geographic distribution, viz. political posture vis-a-vis Egypt. Second, the sequence of sites, when they can be plotted on a map, produces such a meandering line that one can only wonder whether the Egyptian army was permanently lost. Escape from this embarrassment has been sought in the expedient of divided forces, and the postulate of raiding bands or 'flying columns' operating simultaneously with the main force. But this is a stop-gap solution. There is no proof whatsoever that Egyptian expeditionary forces were in the *habit* of fragmenting themselves into raiding parties which would operate independently of the main force to the extent that this theory would require²⁵. In any case, the examples of extant day-books demonstrate that it is only the date of departure and *return* of person(s) sent off from the headquarters that is noted; no record was apparently kept of their itinerary while absent²⁶.

Finally, in the one known route march recorded in the day-book and thence reflected in the annals, viz. that from the Egyptian frontier to Megiddo on the First Campaign²⁷, the corresponding section in the topographical list (nos. 57 to 71) does not agree at all. Sile and Gaza, which certainly did figure in the daybook account²⁸, are nowhere to be seen in this section of the list, while Aruna occurs²⁹ not here but earlier, as no. 27. On the other hand this part of the list contains places the Egyptians never saw on the First Campaign, e.g. the Negeb (no. 57). One can only conclude that a simple combing of the daybook for toponyms was not the method used in compiling the topographical list.

The real explanation of the lists, or rather those of Thutmose III which established a genre to be imitated³⁰, is given

partly by the superscription to the lists on pylons 6 and 7³¹. This states that the list comprises a 'collection of the lands of Upper Retenu which his majesty shut up in the town of vile Megiddo', that is to say, each land represented by its headman and contingent lent to Kadesh's coalition. Now it is quite clear that there are *many* more names in this list than could possibly have been represented in the great anti-Egyptian coalition at Megiddo; but the superscription does correctly reflect that it was the list of the allies, enfeoffed by the Egyptian crown at the time of Megiddo's fall, that provided the basic inspiration for the list. Additional names came from the roster of those 'chiefs of Retenu' who, from then on, presented themselves year by year at the camp of the expeditionary force on its campaign in Syria to present tribute.

The names were, however, not grouped haphazardly in the list, but were arranged on the basis of accepted itineraries. Routes of travel across Western Asia and Northeastern Africa had been established and known from time immemorial. Since the early Old Kingdom Egyptian messengers had been frequenting the towns and cities of the Levant both by ship and on foot; and by the 15th century BC the roads and stopping places of Palestine and Syria, and even Mesopotamia, must have been very well known. Papyrus Anastasi I proves that an intimate knowledge of the best routes and the cities scattered along them was considered a *sine qua non* in the education of an Egyptian military scribe and courier³²; while the Old Babylonian itinerary to the Euphrates³³ strongly suggests such routes were committed to writing. It seems at least a possibility worth looking into that underlying the topographical list of Thutmose III is a series of written itineraries of Western Asia, known to and used by Egyptian couriers of the day, and kept in the government archives.

If this explanation is correct the topographical lists will yield both the regions subverted to the pharaonic government and the routes through those regions. Interestingly in the case of the territory beyond the Jordan, the area in the north of Gilead, along the Yarmuk, in the valley of the Jordan, and the route leading south from Edrei through Gilead and Moab.

This latter route (the kernel of which is Thutmose III's list nos. 89–100)³⁴ exemplifies some of the problems besetting attempts at specific identification. When one has several candidates for a single Egyptian transcription, what will decide the case³⁵? In the present section the identification of

²⁵ It has been inferred from the biography of Amenemheb that he operated with a small force in the south, and later joined up with the army in Syria: Gardiner, *Onomastica* I, 156*; M. Görg, *JNES* 38 (1979), 199f and n. 10. The *ne'arin* at Kadesh have been considered to be a detached unit of the Egyptian army: R. O. Faulkner, *MDAIK* 16 (1959), 98; O. Zuhdi, *SSEA Journal* 8 (1978), 141f. While these remain in the realm of debate, it must be admitted that the Kamose stela does depict Kamose's auxiliaries ranging far over the desert, independent of the main force: L. Habachi, *The Second Stela of Kamose and His Struggle against the Hyksos Ruler and his Capital* (Glückstadt, 1972), line 29, p. 41.

²⁶ A most significant example is that of lines 9ff of the Bubastite fragment, usually ascribed to Amenophis III (but more likely coming from the reign of Thutmose IV, his predecessor): E. Naville, *Bubastis* (London, 1891), PL. 34; *Urk.* IV, 1734f. Here the entry (a slightly embellished excerpt from the day-book) states: 'His Majesty ordered the despatch of 124 men of the army on foray (*m prt*) to the well which is above [. . .].' But when the text resumes after the short break, the recording scribe is not following this group, but rather describes 'the sailing southward (scil. by the main part of the expedition) to see the height of Hu'a, and reconnoitre the route of sailing.'

²⁷ Noth, *op. cit.*, 26ff; Edel, *ZDPV* 69, 154; Helck, *Beziehungen*², 122ff.

²⁸ *Urk.* IV, 647: 12 and 648: 11 respectively. The style is clearly that of the day-book.

²⁹ *Urk.* IV, 652: 14; again the language is that of the day-book. The identification of no. 27 with *Halumi* of EA 197, 14 (so Helck, *Beziehungen*², 129) seems unnecessarily arbitrary.

³⁰ While some kings, like Amenophis III or Ramesses II, do seem to reproduce first-hand material *de novo*, there is a good deal of imitation and outright copying: cf. R. Giveon, in *Fragen an die alt-ägyptische Literatur* (Wiesbaden, 1977), 180ff.

³¹ *Urk.* IV, 780. Giveon's observation that 'the Egyptians included in the lists cities and enemies they would like to conquer—in the hope that "sacrificing" them in a temple would exert a magic influence on reality' (*The Impact of Egypt on Canaan* [Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 20; Göttingen, 1978], 104) may well be correct as far as it goes; but it contributes nothing to the solution of the problem of structure and content.

³² Cf. 20, 7ff (A. H. Gardiner, *The Papyrus Anastasi I and the Papyrus Koller Together with the Parallel Texts* [Leipzig, 1911], 64). This is an itinerary along the coast (in reverse order, i.e. applicable to a homeward journey) from Byblos to Shechem.

³³ A. Goetze, *JCS* 7 (1953), 51ff; cf. also W. H. Hallo, *JCS* (1964).

³⁴ J. Simons, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists relating to Western Asia* (Leiden, 1937), *ad loc.*

³⁵ Cf. A. F. Rainey, *IDB Supplementary Volume* (Nashville, 1976), 826f.

two names, viz. ³⁶*U-t-r-ca* (no. 91) and *Ti-pu-ne* (no. 98) with Edre'i and Dibon respectively early led to a localization of the whole in Jordan³⁶. Within the last two decades, however, attempts have been made to transfer this part of Thutmose III's list to a Galilean locale³⁷, or, on the assumption that it reflects entries in the army journal of the First Campaign, to the far reaches of Golan and Bashan³⁸. In fact two considerations may well decide the issue. The first is the postulate of formal itineraries, as argued above, as the immediate source of the toponym lists: if this be accepted, specific sections of the lists must show an orderly progression. The second is the correct understanding of the term ³⁹*U-ba-rl*, which occurs three times in the section under discussion (nos. 90, 92, 99). This means quite simply, as the variant in the Onomasticon of Amenemope proves³⁹, 'water-course', and refers to a major stream over which one must cross⁴⁰. Now it is a significant fact that in most itineraries which have come down to us from antiquity, streams and rivers are given an importance equal to that of cities, and are found interspersed at the appropriate points among sequences of town-names⁴¹. The itineraries reflected in *Anastasi* I, mastery of which was necessary for the

military scribes of Ramesseid times, suggest that pharaonic route maps were no different⁴².

Once this understanding of ³⁹*U-ba-l* is accepted, it seems to me that nos. 89–100 cannot help but fall into a Jordanian locale; for the three occurrences of the term correspond to the passage (from north to south) over the Yarmuq, the Zerqa, and the Wady Mūjib. The following is the sequence which emerges: 89. *Hy-k-ra-y-m*, Assyrian *Hukkurina*, north of the Yarmuq⁴³; 90. ³⁹*U-ba-l*, the Yarmuq; 91. ³⁹*U-t-r-ca*, Edre'i; 92. ³⁹*U-ba-l*, Nahr es-Zerqa⁴⁴; 93. *K-n-t-u-t*, ⁴⁵; 94. {M}(?)-(?)*-q-r-pu* (from *𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓* ?)⁴⁶; 95. *ca-y-n*, cAin Musa; 96. *Ke-ra-me-n*, Abel Keramim (Na'cur)⁴⁷; 97. *Bi-t-ya*, ^{47a}; 98. *Ti-pu-ne*, Dibon; 99. ³⁹*U-ba-l*, Wady Mujib; 100. *Ya-ru-tu*, Yarut.

The sequence thus appears indeed to be the route leading due south from Damascus, via Edre'i to the region of Moab and Edom. It further supports the contention, not only that the 18th Dyn. Egyptians were familiar with the land east of the Jordan Valley (their avowed concern with the Shasu would have led to that conclusion in any case)⁴⁸, but also that they knew of a place called Dibon therein⁴⁹.

⁴² The word used is the generic *bd*, 'flowing stream'; cf. 18, 8–19, 1; 19, 7; 20, 8–21, 1; 21, 7; 22, 8–23, 1.

⁴³ The region a day's journey south of Damascus: *ANET*, 299 (Ashurbanipal); Abel, *Géographie* II, 10.

⁴⁴ It is not surprising that between Edre'i and the Zerqa no towns should be listed, in the light of the paucity if not total absence of Late Bronze sites there: cf. S. Mittmann, *Beiträge zur Siedlungs- und Territorialgeschichte des nördlichen Ostjordanlandes* (Wiesbaden, 1970), map; only Şahra (185: *ibid.*, 75f) and Rihāb (311: *ibid.*, 120) show LB I occupation, but they are not on the route.

⁴⁵ Müller's * *𐤓𐤓𐤓𐤓*, 'the "Presses"': *Palästinaliste*, 25.

⁴⁶ Görg, *Untersuchungen*, 156ff.

⁴⁷ Abel, *Geographie* II, 37; Gorg, *JEA* 63 (1977), 180, n.1.

^{47a} Identified as *Bēt-Lōt: Gorg, *GM* 19 (1976), 31ff.

⁴⁸ For the Shasu in Jordan, see R. Giveon, *Les Bedouins Shosus des documents égyptiens* (Leiden, 1971), 235ff; Gorg's remarks (*JNES* 38, 19ff) are salutary, but I do not think they alter the overall picture of the distribution of Shasu.

⁴⁹ Reaction to the identification of no. 98 with Dibon has been mixed: Müller was wary (*Palästinaliste*, 27), Abel confident (*Géographie* II, 38). Albright rejected it (*Vocalization*, 63: 'this equation is phonetically precarious') in favour of Tell Dibbin, 30 km. north of the Sea of Galilee (*AASOR* VI [New Haven, 1926], 19, n. 15), and in this was followed by Jirku (*Listen*, 15, n. 5). Though Helck rejected it (*Beziehungen*², 128) he still declined identification with Dibon. Aharoni located no. 98 in Galilee (*Land of the Bible*, 151) and was supported in this by Ahituv (*IEJ* 22, 141f). The discovery by Kitchen of a *Tnmw* in a Moabite context in a relief of Ramesses II at Luxor (*JEA* 50 [1964], 55; *Ramesseid Inscriptions* II, 181) has re-opened the subject, and lent strong support to the traditional identification of no. 98 with Dibon: cf. Görg, *Untersuchungen*, 162f; *idem*, *Biblische Notizen* 7 (1978), 12f; Kitchen, *Oriens Antiquus* 15 (1976), 313f.

³⁶ The equation of Edre'i with no. 91 has achieved widest acceptance: cf. W. M. Müller, *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III* (MVAG 12; 1907), 25; F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1938), II, 9 and n. 4; M. Noth, *ZDPV* 61 (1938), 56; Helck, *Beziehungen*², 127; E. Edel, *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III* (Bonn, 1966), 11; W. Boree, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Hildesheim, 1968), sec. 17.1; M. Görg, *Untersuchungen zur hieroglyphischen Wiedergabe palästinischer Ortsnamen* (Bonn, 1974), 11ff; Aharoni, on the other hand, opts for a location in Galilee (cf. Nos. 19, 37): *The Land of the Bible, a Historical Geography* (London, 1967), 150.

³⁷ Cf. Aharoni, *ibid.*, 144ff; S. Ahituv, *IEJ* 22 (1972), 141f; Kaplan suggested the Yabneh region: *BIES* 21 (1957), 206.

³⁸ Helck, *Beziehungen*², 125ff.

³⁹ Gardiner, *Onomastica* I, 9*(41).

⁴⁰ Albright, *The Vocalization of Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (New Haven, 1934), 39; cf. Heb. *יִרְבֵּל* (Jer. 17, 8), or *אִבְּל* (Dan. 8, 2, 3, 6); it is not *אִבְּל* (cf. L. Köhler, *ZDPV* 60 [1937], 135ff; Noth, *ZDPV* 61 (1938), 53, and n. 3; nor is there any reason to combine two entire, thus 92 and 96, or 90 and 91: Abel, *Géographie* II, 37; A. Jirku, *Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Ortsnamen* (Leipzig, 1937), 14, n. 9.

⁴¹ Cf. Herodotus iv, 18ff, 47–58 (Scythian itinerary); vii, 29ff (itinerary of Zerxes' army); in the itinerary of Cyprus and the Greeks to the Euphrates, rivers are always carefully noted: Xenophon *Anab.* i, 1–5; the itinerary underlying Strabo's trip down the Levantine coast may be extracted from his account, and runs as follows: Arvad-Orthosia-river (Eleutheros)-Byblos-river(Adonis)-Palaeobyblos-river(Lycus)-Beyrut-Sidon-Tyre-river-Palaeotyre, etc. (Strabo xvi, 2.14–25).