

KEVIN A. WILSON

The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine

*Forschungen zum
Alten Testament 2. Reihe*

9

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Bernd Janowski (Tübingen) · Mark S. Smith (New York)

Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen)

9



Kevin A. Wilson

The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine

Mohr Siebeck

KEVIN A. WILSON, born 1968; 1990 B.A., Carson-Newman College; 1993 M.Div., Yale Divinity School; 1994 S.T.M., Yale Divinity School; 2001 Ph.D., The Johns Hopkins University; currently teaching biblical studies at Lithuania Christian College in Klaipeda, Lithuania.

ISBN 3-16-148270-0 978-3-16-157859-5 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

© 2005 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Held in Rottenburg.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

In January of 1997, I had the privilege to be a part of the Johns Hopkins excavations in Luxor, Egypt. I had already done several years of graduate work in the Old Testament, but this was my first hands-on experience with Egyptological field work. I was in the second year of my doctorate and had decided to focus on the connections between Egypt and Israel as part of my studies for a degree in Hebrew Bible. My decision to combine Egyptology with biblical studies was in large part due to the urging of my advisor, P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., who recognized that research in Egyptology was becoming increasingly important in biblical studies.

In the afternoons, after our excavation work had come to a close for the day, Betsy Bryan, the director of the dig, would often take us around for tours of the many temples, tombs, and other monumental works in the area. Karnak Temple was one of our stops. After showing us the forecourt, she made a point of directing us out a door known as the Bubastite Portal in the south-east corner. Upon exiting the forecourt, we turned around to view the massive relief on the wall to the right of the door.

Dr. Bryan said she had made a point of coming out here so that I could see the famous Shoshenq relief. I was impressed, but I had to admit that I had never heard of Shoshenq. She then related to me the story of the campaign into Palestine and its connections with the biblical passages in the books of Kings and Chronicles. It was my first encounter with a pharaoh who would occupy a large part of my life for the next few years.

Back in Baltimore, as I finished the three years of class work required by the Near Eastern Studies department, I was searching for a dissertation topic. Richard Jasnow agreed to a readings course where he and I would survey the parade examples of Egyptian texts that are related to the Levant. Over the course of the semester, we read such texts as the Annals of Thutmose III, Merneptah's Victory Stele (the "Israel Stele"), the Report of Wen-amun, Seti I's Beth-Shean stelae, and, of course, the Shoshenq relief. In reading scholarship on the campaign, we decided that although previous reconstructions were thorough, enough questions still remained to justify more research. Kyle McCarter concurred, and a dissertation topic was born.

To these three professors – Dr. McCarter, Dr. Jasnow, and Dr. Bryan – I owe my gratitude. Without them, this book and the ideas it contains would never have come to fruition.

This book would also not have been possible without numerous friends. Among these are my classmates at Johns Hopkins, including Susanna Garfein, Nozomu Kawai, Daniel Kirchner, Alice Petty, Annalisa Azzoni, Bruce Wells, Joel Burnett, and Chris Rollston. My conversations with each of them have enriched my understanding of the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Near East. I have no doubt that they may recognize ideas in these pages that we have discussed before. To each of them I send my thanks.

Recognition for friendship above and beyond the call of duty goes to Bess Garrett, who made her guest room available for those nights when I needed to stay in Baltimore to do multiple days of research. She also endured many dinners where the topic of conversation was invariably the difficulties and dead ends I encountered in my research. I am sure Bess learned far more than she ever wanted to know about Shoshenq.

My greatest gratitude goes to my family. It was from my father Keith that I first learned to love history and languages, and his death shortly after I returned from Egypt in 1997 is the greatest loss I have ever faced. My mother Kathleen instilled in me a love of the Scriptures and a desire for knowledge and education. I owe her more than I can ever express. My brother Kenyon, a scholar in his own right, also deserves credit.

My children Duncan and Emma also played a large part in this book, mostly through constantly reminding me by their presence that there are more important things in life than dead pharaohs and ancient wars. Neither of them paid the slightest attention to me when I said I had to be working on my dissertation, so backyard baseball games, wrestling matches in the hall, and horsy rides were welcome breaks from writing.

My thanks also go to Karamat, although I am sure she would rather have dog treats. I got Karamat at the pound just as I began the dissertation, which explains why she is named after Shoshenq's wife. She was constantly by my side during the writing, and because she has no concept of personal space, my typing was often interrupted by a cold nose looking for a belly rub. *Filicita catulus calidus est.*

Finally, my greatest thanks go to my wife, the Rev. Stephanie C. Wilson. My deepest gratitude pales in comparison to the debt I owe her for her assistance and support throughout my graduate career. She has been my strength and my companion along the way, and without her I could never have come this far or enjoyed the journey so much.

מה"יפית ומדהנעמת אהבה בתחתענוגים

Kevin A. Wilson
Klaipėda, Lithuania
Holy Cross Day, 2005

Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
History of Scholarship	2
Summary and Critique	13
Chapter Two: Triumphal Reliefs	16
Overview	17
Inscription	19
Relief Scene	21
Topographical List	26
Interpretation and Purpose	36
Sources of the Topographical Lists	40
Implications for Historical Reconstructions	46
Chapter Three: Triumphal Relief of Shoshenq I	48
Inscription	48
Relief Scene	57
Topographical List	60
Interpretation	63
Conclusion	65
Chapter Four: Related Egyptian Texts	66
Gebel es-Silsilah Stele no.100	66
Karnak Stele of Shoshenq	68
The Biographical Fragment of <i>hrw</i>	70
The Megiddo Stele Fragment	70
Conclusion	74
Chapter Five: Relevant Biblical Texts	75
Biblical Accounts of the Campaign	75
Additional Texts	87
Summary	96

Chapter Six: Conclusion	97
Appendix: Shoshenq's Topographical List	101
Section One	102
Section Two	104
Section Three	118
Bibliography	135
Indexes	145
Source Index	145
Site Index	149
Subject Index	150

Chapter One

Introduction

The campaign of pharaoh Shoshenq I¹ into Palestine around the year 926 B.C.E. plays an important role in the study of the tenth century B.C.E. in the southern Levant. One reason is that it provides the only chronological anchor for that century, because the campaign took place in the fifth year of Rehoboam of Judah, thereby indicating that Shoshenq and Rehoboam

¹ This pharaoh's name has been variously vocalized as Shoshenq and Sheshonq, plus the biblical variation of Shishak. In the Annals of Assurbanipal, reference is made to an Egyptian individual by the name of su-si-in-ku, who is called the king of Pushiru. Although this is not the same person as the pharaoh, it does appear to be the same name. David Daniel Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (2 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927), 2:293. Knut L. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names* (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 43; Leipzig: August Pries, 1914), 204. The name of the pharaoh is written Σεσωγχις in Manetho. Other Greek forms of the name are Σουσάκιμ in the LXX (1 Kgs 14:25; 2 Chr 12:2, 9–10) and Σεσογχασις in Eusebius. Leslie C. Allen suggests that the μ at the end of Shoshenq's name in the LXX passages came about through dittography with the first letter in the word סלך, which usually follows the name. Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text* (eds. G. W. Anderson et al; VTSup 25; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 1:137. In Josephus, the name is rendered variously as Σουσάκος (Josephus, *Ant.*, 7.105), 'Ισωκος (Josephus, *Ant.*, 8.253–255, 258, 263), 'Ισακος (Josephus, *Ant.*, 8.210) and 'Ασωχαλος (Josephus, *J.W.*, 6.436). A Greek ostrakon from Thebes preserves the name as Σεσογχι. George Steindorff, "Die keilschriftliche Wiedergabe ägyptischer Eigennamen," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (ed. Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt; 10 vols.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1890), 1:315.

In Egyptian, the name is written both as *ššnq* and *šsq*. Jürgen von Beckerath, *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen* (Münchener Ägyptologische Studien; Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1984), 257. The loss of the *n* is common in the Libyan period. Kenneth A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100–650 B.C.)* (2nd ed. with supp.; Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1986), 73, n.356 (henceforth cited as *TIP*). The biblical forms of the name are ששנ and ששק, the former being the kethiv and the latter being the qere' in 1 Kgs 12:25, while 2 Chr 12:2, 9 reads ששק. It seems likely the original name was Shoshenq, as both the Assyrian evidence and the kethiv in 1 Kgs 14:25 point to an o-vowel in the first syllable. The earliest Greek witness to the name, that of the LXX, also preserves an o-vowel, while the later Greek evidence is mixed. The reading of Sheshonq probably came about through metathesis of the vowels. See also Yoshiyuki Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic* (SBLDS 173; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 227.

were contemporaries.² The campaign has also been used to aid in the dating of archaeological strata, because destruction levels found at various sites throughout Palestine have been understood as the result of Shoshenq's attacks. This issue has recently come to the forefront of scholarship once again, with several scholars arguing for redating archaeological layers previously assigned to the tenth century B.C.E.³

Pharaoh Shoshenq I was the founder of the Twenty-Second Dynasty in Egypt, which ruled from approximately 945–715 B.C.E. Of Libyan descent, he gained prominence as leader of the army under Psammeticus II, the last king of the Twenty-First Dynasty, and cemented his claim to the throne by the marriage of his son Osorkon to the daughter of Psusennes II.⁴ The first few years of his reign were spent consolidating his power, including gaining control of Upper Egypt, previously ruled by the high priests of Amun at Karnak during the Twenty-First Dynasty. He was then free to turn his attention to foreign affairs, which included his campaign into Palestine.⁵

History of Scholarship

Prior to the nineteenth century C.E., the only information about the campaign available to scholars was found in the two biblical accounts contained in 1 Kgs 14:25–28 and 2 Chr 12:1–12. But shortly after deciphering hieroglyphs in the 1820s, Champollion recognized that a triumphal relief⁶ at Karnak temple in Luxor, Egypt, belonged to Shoshenq and commemorated his expedition into Palestine.⁷ Up until the late 1930s,

² William F. Albright, "New Light from Egypt on the Chronology and History of Egypt and Judah," *BASOR* 130 (1953): 7; William F. Albright, "Further Light on Synchronisms between Egypt and Asia in the Period 935–685 B.C.," *BASOR* 141 (1956): 26–27.

³ Israel Finkelstein and David Ussishkin, "Back to Megiddo," *BAR* 20.1 (1994): 26–43; David Ussishkin, "Notes on Megiddo, Gezer, Ashdod, and Tel Batash in the Tenth to Ninth Centuries B.C.," *BASOR* 277/278 (1990): 71–91.

⁴ Kitchen, *TIP*, 286.

⁵ Kitchen, *TIP*, 292.

⁶ Harold Hayden Nelson, *Key Plans Showing Locations of Theban Temple Decorations* (OIP 56; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), K K 361, pl.13.

⁷ The identification was made by Champollion in a letter to a friend. Champollion le Jeune, *Lettres écrites d'Égypte et de Nubie en 1828 et 1829* (Paris: Libraires-Académiques, 1868), 80–81. The triumphal relief, treated in-depth in chapter three, comprises three elements: a smiting scene, an inscription, and a topographical list. The scene depicts the king with an upheld mace about to strike a group of kneeling prisoners, while the god Amun holds out the sword of victory to him. The inscription provides labels identifying various elements in the relief and also contains a speech by Amun. The topographical list is a catalogue of towns written in crenelated circles on the sides of bound captives.

however, few scholars accepted that relief as a source for the campaign. Noting that the Hebrew Bible relates an expedition against Jerusalem while the triumphal relief only mentions the Negev and the northern kingdom of Israel, most scholars concluded that the relief was not an accurate account of the campaign.⁸ They therefore continued to use the Bible as the primary source, while discounting the triumphal relief of Shoshenq. The few who did accept the list as reliable read it as a catalogue of captured towns, but did not see it as preserving the campaign itinerary.⁹

Martin Noth

In 1938, Martin Noth published an article that set the stage for the current discussion on the campaign of Shoshenq.¹⁰ Noth rejected the idea that the topographical list in the triumphal relief was without value for historical constructions. He pointed to the fact that the list of Shoshenq is entirely independent and does not rely on earlier topographical lists.¹¹ To him, this was a sign of originality, suggesting that Shoshenq's relief was drawn from contemporary records. He also criticized past scholars for giving the Bible precedence. He pointed out that the passage in 1 Kgs 14:25–28 is not focused on the campaign, but is instead concerned with the bronze shields made by Rehoboam.¹² This, he said, caused the Deuteronomistic Historian to ignore the rest of the campaign. Hence, the fact that the Bible does not mention a campaign against the northern kingdom of Israel cannot be used as evidence that Shoshenq's topographical list is inaccurate. The expedition could have attacked both Israel and Judah, with the Deuteronomistic History¹³ only reporting that portion concerning Judah.¹⁴

They are arranged in rows behind Amun, who holds lead ropes that are attached to the prisoners' collars. The crenelated circles are a stylized representation of a fortified town as seen from above. For reproductions of these name rings, see the appendix.

⁸ Martin Noth, "Die Wege der Pharaonenheere in Palästina und Syrien, IV," *ZDPV* 61 (1938): 280–82. See, for example, the dissertation of Joseph Lammeyer, who provides a transcription and translation of the inscription in the relief but does not treat the topographical list. Joseph Lammeyer, *Das Siegesdenkmal des Königs Scheschonk I.* (Neuss am Rhein: Buchdruckerei H. Goder, 1907).

⁹ Among others, see James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (5 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1906), 4:348–354 (henceforth cited as *ARE*); James Henry Breasted, *A History of Egypt* (2nd ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919), 529–530.

¹⁰ Noth, "Wege," 277–304.

¹¹ Noth, "Wege," 280–81. This is in contrast with the lists of previous pharaohs, such as Ramesses III who copied most of his list from the triumphal relief of Thutmose III. Jan Jozef Simons, *Handbook of the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia* (Leiden: Brill, 1937), 79.

¹² Noth, "Wege," 279–80.

¹³ The Deuteronomistic History (henceforth abbreviated as DtrH) comprises the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings in the Hebrew Bible. Though it contains material from earlier periods, the DtrH reached its present form through the work of two sets of

Having established the reliability of the Shoshenq relief as a historical source, Noth proceeded to reconstruct the route of the army's march from the topographical list. His method set the tone for scholarship on the campaign since that time. First, he attempted to identify as many toponyms in the list as possible with sites in Palestine.¹⁵ Having done so, he then arranged those toponyms in an order which he thought represented the line of the army's march. Finally, after examining the army's route, he drew conclusions about the extent and purpose of the campaign.

Noth divided the topographical list into three sections. The name-rings contained in the first section (row I–V) he located primarily in the coastal plain, the Valley of Jezreel, the Ephraimite hill country, and the northern Transjordan. He suggested that the pharaoh had first proceeded to the Plain of Jezreel, where he conquered Megiddo and the surrounding towns. He then marched south through the Samaritan mountains, apparently remaining on its edge without penetrating into the center. He also made a brief foray into the Transjordan to attack Mahanaim and other towns in that region.¹⁶ The second part of the list (row VI–X) unfortunately does not allow a route to be reconstructed, but Noth located most of these toponyms in the Negev and Edom.¹⁷ The third section of the list (the row that runs under the smiting scene) was too fragmentary for him to make more than preliminary identifications.¹⁸ On the basis of this reconstruction, Noth concluded that the campaign seems to have been primarily a show of force designed to reassert Egypt's power, but without any lasting effect.¹⁹

Benjamin Mazar

Since the study by Noth, scholars who have worked on this problem have adopted his method of identifying sites, arranging the toponyms to reconstruct the army's march, and drawing conclusions about the purpose of the expedition. The next major study appeared in 1957, when Benjamin Mazar published an article on the campaign of Shoshenq, an article later

editors who labored at the end of the seventh century and during the middle of the sixth century B.C.E. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 287–89. Hereafter cited as *CMHE*.

¹⁴ Noth, "Wege," 279–80.

¹⁵ The identification of toponyms is a major part of the study of the campaign, but the issue of the suggestions made by various scholars is far too complex to be included in this review of scholarship. For identifications, see the appendix.

¹⁶ Noth, "Wege," 282–90.

¹⁷ Noth, "Wege," 290–303.

¹⁸ Noth, "Wege," 303–304.

¹⁹ Noth, "Wege," 277, 289.

updated and reprinted in an anthology of his works in 1986.²⁰ The primary feature of his reconstruction is the suggestion that the first four rows of names should be read boustrophedon, i.e., with the first line being read right to left, the second from left to right, the third from right to left, and the fourth from left to right.²¹ This is different from standard practice in Egyptian hieroglyphs, where each line is read from the direction the hieroglyphic characters are facing.²² Mazar advocates reading the second and forth lines from left to right, even though the characters are facing right. He proposes this on the grounds that doing so allows cities close together geographically to be kept close together in the text. For instance, row II ends with the city Ta'anach (no.14) when read left to right, while row III begins with Megiddo (no.27) when read right to left. This method gives a more coherent order to the names, in his opinion, and allows the reconstructed route to flow more smoothly. He also inserts the cities from row V into row II between nos.22 and 23, where he thinks they make more sense from a geographical point of view.²³

The route Mazar proposes for Shoshenq's march took him up past Gaza to Gezer and Rubate. From there he sent out a detachment into the Negev, while he took the main army into the hill country via the well-known ascent of Beth-horon.²⁴ He made his way to Gibeon, then turned to the northeast to proceed into the Jordan Valley. The pharaoh crossed the Jordan at Adam for a brief foray into the Transjordan, then returned to the

²⁰ Benjamin Mazar, "Pharaoh Shishak's Campaign to the Land of Israel," *VTSupp* 4 (1957): 57–66; repr. in *The Early Biblical Period: Historical Studies* (ed. Shmuel Abituv and Baruch A. Levine; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1986), 139–150. Page citations in the current work refer to the reprinted version. Shortly after the original publication of Mazar's work, another article on Shoshenq appeared, which only summarized Mazar's conclusions without adding anything new to the discussion. E. Vogt, "Expediit Pharaonis Šošenq in Palæstinam a. 927 A.C.," *Biblica* 38 (1957): 234–36.

²¹ Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 144.

²² Boustrophedon readings are known from as early as the Old Kingdom, becoming more frequent in the Middle Kingdom and later periods. Henry G. Fischer, "Hieroglyphen," *LÄ* 2:1192. In most known examples of boustrophedon readings, however, the hieroglyphic characters are reversed, so that the line is still read according to the orientation of the characters, i.e., read from the direction the characters are facing. Mazar's proposal, however, would have the hieroglyphs read contrary to normal practice. Henry G. Fischer, *The Orientation of Hieroglyphs* (Egyptian Studies 2; New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1977), 1:6. Fischer points out that orientation of the hieroglyphs was reversed in certain circumstances for reasons of confrontation, symmetry, and concordance. H. Fischer, *Orientation*, 1:9. None of these reasons apply to the topographical list in the Shoshenq relief, which suggests that Mazar's boustrophedon theory is implausible.

²³ Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 144. Mazar theorized that the cities in row V were originally to be included in row II, but were accidentally omitted.

²⁴ Josh 10:10–11.

Cisjordan and worked his way up to Tirzah. From there he marched to Beth-Shean to enter the Jezreel Valley, and then moved on to cities surrounding Megiddo. Afterwards, his route took him back down the sea coast, where he rejoined the Negev contingent before returning to Egypt. Mazar sees the campaign as a continuation of Shoshenq's policy of interfering with any rule in Jerusalem, a policy attested in the Bible through his harboring of Jeroboam and inciting Edom against Jerusalem.²⁵ Mazar notes, however, that the main thrust of Shoshenq's campaign was against the Northern Kingdom. This leads him to suggest that Jeroboam may have made an agreement to be a vassal of Egypt during his stay in Shoshenq's court, but had subsequently broken that agreement once he ascended to the throne in Israel. The pharaoh's campaign may therefore be explained as a punitive attack against an unfaithful vassal.²⁶

Up to this point in the history of scholarship, research had to rely on hard-to-obtain photographs and copies of the Shoshenq relief, most of which reproduced only sections of the relief.²⁷ Mazar, for example, had to consult with Bernhard Grdseloff in order to get access to photographs.²⁸ A major advance in the research was made with the publication of good photographs and excellent drawings by the Epigraphic Survey of the Oriental Institute.²⁹ This work contains what are still the best photographs available.³⁰ In addition, the drawings in the volume are immensely helpful.³¹ This publication has not only made the relief available to a

²⁵ Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 139.

²⁶ Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 147.

²⁷ See Simons, *Topographical Lists*, 92–94 for a list of the earliest photographs and drawings. Another list of photographs and drawings is found in Bertha Porter and Rosalind L.B. Moss, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*, (7 vols.; 2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973–75), 2:34–35.

²⁸ Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 144.

²⁹ The Epigraphic Survey, *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak III: The Bubastite Portal* (OIP 74; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954). Henceforth cited as *RIK* III.

³⁰ Better photographs will likely never be taken, as the relief has undergone further weathering since the work of the Epigraphic Survey.


³¹ It is instructive to note the method by which the drawings were produced. The first step is to photograph the relief. After the photographs are developed, an artist traces the lines of the relief in pencil on the photographs themselves in front of the wall. The photographs are then bleached to dissolve the photographic image while leaving the traced drawings intact. The blueprints are then taken back to the site of the relief, where two epigraphists correct them in turn, then compare their works to produce the best possible readings. Those changes and corrections are then incorporated into the original drawing. (The author was able to observe this process being used on other projects while visiting Chicago House in Luxor in 1997.) This is a somewhat abbreviated description of the process involved. A complete account may be found in *The Epigraphic Survey*,

much larger number of scholars, but has improved several readings in the text.³²

Siegfried Herrmann

In a 1964 article, Siegfried Herrmann once again addressed the question of Shoshenq's campaign, although he confined his study to the first five rows of the topographic list.³³ Herrmann takes issue with Mazar's reading of the list, which in his opinion relied on the unproven hypothesis of a boustrophedon reading.³⁴ He also points out that previous pharaohs who had campaigned in Palestine usually split their armies into several detachments. He therefore rejects a linear reading of the topographic list that seeks to reconstruct one long march. Instead, he notes that the city names fall into groups, which indicates to him that Shoshenq had followed long established practice and split his army into various segments.³⁵ He suggests that Shoshenq led the main part of his army up the Via Maris and established a main camp around Megiddo. During the march along the coast, one group was dispatched into the Negev while another made its way into the hill country via Aijalon and Gibeon. Once at Megiddo, Shoshenq sent another contingent into the Transjordan. After its sortie, this group crossed back over the Jordan and made its way into the hill country, where it probably met with the Gibeon detachment before

Medinet Habu I: The Earlier Historical Records of Ramses III (OIP 30; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), 10.

³² Although many of the improved readings made only minor changes, one of the most important corrections was to no.12 in the topographic list. Mazar as well as a few Egyptologists had read the figure as "Gezer." Mazar, "Shishak's Campaign," 144. Other Egyptologists had argued against that reading. Wilhelm M. Müller, *Egyptological Researches: Results of a Journey in 1904* (Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1906), 1:pl.76; Simons, *Topographical Lists*, 180. The publication of *RIK III* showed that the translation could not be "Gezer," since the first character is clearly , while the final letter is broken off, giving a reading of *m[]*. "Gezer" is written *qdr* in Egyptian, and occurs in the Thutmose III lists at Karnak. Simons, *Topographical Lists*, 112, no.104.

³³ Siegfried Herrmann, "Operationen Pharao Schoschenks I. im östlichen Ephraim," *ZDPV* 80 (1964): 55–79.

³⁴ Herrmann, "Operationen," 56.

³⁵ Herrmann, "Operationen," 72. Herrmann gives the examples of Thutmose III at the Battle of Megiddo and Ramesses II at the Battle of Kadesh. But these two instances do not refer to different divisions carrying out operations in separate areas as Herrmann suggests for the Shoshenq campaign. Instead, both Thutmose III and Ramesses II split their armies into several wings in order to operate on different flanks during one battle. Kurt Sethe, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie* (6 vols.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1904–29), 4:657:10–12 (henceforth cited as *Urk*); Kenneth A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical* (8 vols.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1975–1990), 2:21:5–23:11 (henceforth cited as *KRI*).

returning to Megiddo.³⁶ Shoshenq then led his forces back down the coast, where they picked up the returning Negev force before heading to Egypt.

Wolfgang Helck

A section in Wolfgang Helck's *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien* contains a study of the Shoshenq topographical list.³⁷ Helck accepts Mazar's idea of a boustrophedon reading, though he rejects the idea that row V of this list should be inserted at an earlier point. He thinks that when the first five rows of the list are read boustrophedon, they make sense without rearrangement.³⁸ He reconstructs a campaign that began in the coastal plain and entered the southern Ephraimite highlands at Aijalon. The army then marched down into the Jordan Valley, where it crossed the river to campaign in the Transjordan. The pharaoh then led his troops back across the Jordan to Beth-Shean, where they passed through the Valley of Jezreel to attack the cities of the Plain of Megiddo. Afterwards, the army marched northwest from Megiddo to pass by Mt. Carmel, before continuing down the coastal plain. Helck deals with the second section of the list (row VI–X) in a unique way. He points to the fact that the toponyms in this part of the list are of a different character and appear to belong to a different area. He therefore suggests that they may belong to a separate campaign from the one contained in row I–V.³⁹

Yohanan Aharoni

A part of Yohanan Aharoni's 1979 monograph on the geography and topography of the Bible is devoted to the campaign of Shoshenq.⁴⁰ He adopts the boustrophedon reading proposed by Mazar and his reconstruction of the route draws heavily on the work of Mazar. Like Mazar, Aharoni inserts row V (nos.53–65) of the Shoshenq relief in between nos.22 and 23 in row II. His justification of this move is that it placed the cities from line five in their "proper geographical position."⁴¹ He thus reconstructs a route for the campaign that entered the hill country above Gezer and continued to Gibeon, where the pharaoh probably

³⁶ Herrmann, "Operationen," 73–74.

³⁷ Wolfgang Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ÄgAbh 5; 2nd ed.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971), 238–245. Helck's study contains a useful survey of name-ring identifications made by scholars prior to his work. He offers few new identifications himself, though he does correct some of the earlier readings of signs.

³⁸ Helck, *Beziehungen*, 239.

³⁹ Helck, *Beziehungen*, 239, 242.

⁴⁰ Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: A Historical Geography* (trans. and ed. Anson F. Rainey; rev. and enl. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979), 323–30.

⁴¹ Aharoni, *Land*, 325.

received the submission of Rehoboam.⁴² He then crossed over into the Transjordan and returned to march through the Valley of Jezreel, on to Megiddo, and then south by way of the coastal plain. As for the Negev portion of the campaign, Aharoni is unable to reconstruct a complete itinerary, but does envision Shoshenq penetrating as far as the Gulf of Aqaba. The aim of Shoshenq's campaign, according to Aharoni, was for the purpose of "strengthening the Egyptian domination of Philistia, while gaining control of the important trade routes that pass across Palestine."⁴³

Kenneth Kitchen

Kenneth Kitchen is one of the few Egyptologists other than Helck who have done a thorough study of the Shoshenq relief with an eye towards reconstructing the campaign. In his monumental work on the Third Intermediate Period in Egypt, Kitchen devotes a section in the main body of the book to the campaign, as well as an excursus dealing with the reconstruction of the routes the army followed.⁴⁴ Although Kitchen appreciates the simplicity and comprehensive nature of Noth's reconstruction, he rejects it on the grounds that it does not fit with the biblical account in 2 Chr 12:1–12, which states that Shoshenq captured the fortified cities of Judah and came up at least to the vicinity of Jerusalem, if not to the city itself.⁴⁵ Kitchen criticizes the reconstruction of Mazar (followed by Aharoni) on several points. The boustrophedon reading should be discarded, he says, not only because it is not found in other Egyptian topographic lists, but also because it cannot be carried through the entire Shoshenq list. He also does not accept Mazar and Aharoni's reconstruction of the march, since it contradicts known Egyptian military tactics. Kitchen observes that Egyptian kings never made circular tours of Palestine like the one proposed by Mazar, but instead led the main attack themselves while sending out flying columns to deal with lesser encounters.⁴⁶ Herrmann's reconstruction suffers from the least problems, according to Kitchen, but still contradicts the Chronicles account of the campaign, which has Shoshenq attacking Jerusalem.⁴⁷

Kitchen's own reconstruction of the march assumes the well-known practice of the pharaohs of sending out flying columns while leading the

⁴² Aharoni, *Land*, 326.

⁴³ Aharoni, *Land*, 329.

⁴⁴ Kitchen, *TIP*. The main section is found on pp.292–302, while the excursus is found on pp.432–47.

⁴⁵ Kitchen, *TIP*, 442–43. One of Kitchen's methodological assumptions is that the information contained in the biblical accounts is accurate. This influences his use of the biblical materials and his interpretations of conflicting data in other documents, as his reconstruction must remain strictly consistent with the biblical accounts.

⁴⁶ Kitchen, *TIP*, 444.

⁴⁷ Kitchen, *TIP*, 445–46.

main army themselves.⁴⁸ In order to use the data in Chronicles literally, he sees Shoshenq having taken the army directly from Gaza to Rubutu (Beth-Shemesh?). From there he dispatched a Negev expedition, while he himself continued up past Aijalon to Gibeon, where he suspects that Rehoboam paid his tribute. The pharaoh then headed north to Megiddo through the hill country past Jezreel. As he passed Tirzah, he sent out another detachment to pursue Jeroboam, who had fled across the Jordan to Penuel and Mahanaim. Shoshenq then set up camp at Megiddo, from which squadrons were dispatched for forays into the surrounding area. Once the Transjordanian forces had returned, the main army proceeded down the Via Maris to join the Negev force for the return to Egypt.

Kitchen views the reason for the campaign as part of a wish by Shoshenq to renew Egyptian domination of foreign lands. The Palestinian campaign was not an isolated occurrence, but part of a foreign policy that probably also included an attempt to recapture Nubia by military force.⁴⁹ Such an undertaking was not possible when Solomon ruled the United Kingdom, but the division of the kingdom after his death provided the moment of weakness that Shoshenq sought. Kitchen suspects that Shoshenq used a border skirmish in the eastern Delta, reported in a fragmentary inscription from Karnak, as an excuse to undertake military action in Palestine.⁵⁰ Kitchen also suggests that the pharaoh intended to carry out more raids in the future, and interprets an Egyptian fort uncovered at Tell el Far'ah South as a possible base built by Shoshenq for future campaigns.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Kitchen, *TIP*, 296, 446–47. Kitchen gives no indication of the evidence by which he knows that pharaohs campaigning in Palestine usually split their forces into various detachments that operated in different parts of the country. One suspects that he reaches this conclusion by examining the campaign records of New Kingdom pharaohs such as Thutmose III and Ramesses II (as Herrmann does), but Kitchen does not state this explicitly.

⁴⁹ The evidence for a Nubian campaign of Shoshenq is inconclusive. Kitchen cites the reference to Shoshenq as the one who has “trampled down the natives of Nubia” in the laudatory text that accompanies his triumphal relief, as well as other fragmentary texts at Karnak that list goods brought to the temple from Nubia by Shoshenq. Kitchen, *TIP*, 293.

⁵⁰ Kitchen, *TIP*, 294.

⁵¹ Kitchen, *TIP*, 300. In this he is following the interpretation of Flinders Petrie, the excavator of Tell el Far'a South. The remains associated with Shoshenq are a large outer wall twenty-three feet thick and two building complexes just inside that wall. Petrie assigned some building activities at Gerar to Shoshenq as well. Flinders Petrie, *Beth-Pelet I (Tell Fara)* (Publications of the Egyptian Research Account and British School of Archaeology in Egypt 48; London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1930), 20.

Source Index

I. Hebrew Bible

Genesis

14:5 134
35:19–21 117

Numbers

33:20–21 133
34:4 110, 125

Deuteronomy

1:1 133

Joshua

3:16 116
15:3 110, 125
15:10 106
15:27 125
15:32 130
15:34 111
15:35 107
15:37–39 115
15:40 111
15:41 106
15:52 116
15:55 110
15:59 116
16:2–3 110
16:26 111
18:13 110
18:22 116
19:6 130
19:18 106
19:19 107
19:38 130
19:42 109

Judges

13:25 108
18:12 108

1 Samuel

10:1 88
15:12 110
16:13 88
28:4 106
30:28 122

2 Samuel

2:8–9 108
3:7 76
8:3–8 76
8:4–5 82–83
10:18 82–83
18:18 110
23:8 123
23:11 120
23:33 120

1 Kings

3:1 98
4:26 [MT 5:6] 82–83
7:8 98
9:16 93, 98
9:24 98
10:16–17 77
10:26 82–83
11:1 93, 98
11:14–22 94, 98
11:19 93
11:26–40 87–89, 92, 94
12:1–24 76, 87, 89–95
12:3–5 94
12:3–15 88
12:20 92, 94
12:21–24 95, 98
12:25 1, 115
12:25–14:20 13, 79
14:1–16 88
14:7–14 79
14:21–24 76

14:21–31	76, 82	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
14:25	1	1:4	82
14:25–28	2–3, 14–15, 75–79, 98	8:3–6	85
14:28	81	9:25	82
14:30	95, 98	11:5–9	85
15:27–30	79	11:5–23	81
		11:10	109
<i>2 Kings</i>		12:1–12	2, 9, 15, 75–76, 80–87, 97
9:1–10	88	12:2	1
9:10	120	12:5	85
9:36–37	120	12:9	85
18:13–16	78–79	12:9–10	1
18:13–20	88	14:8–14	70
20:13	116	36:12	86
		36:15–16	86–87
<i>1 Chronicles</i>		36:18	86
2:9	128, 131	<i>Isaiah</i>	
2:26	132	39:2	116
2:27	131	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
2:33	129	40:6–36 76	
2:43	122	<i>Nahum</i>	
2:44	128	3:8–9	81
2:48	132	<i>Daniel</i>	
4:4	12, 116	2:35	110
4:11	124		
4:16	121		
4:20	124		
4:31	130		
8:15	117		
18:4–5	82–83		
19:18	82–83		

II. Septuagint

<i>3 Kingdoms</i>		12:24 ^f	94
11:3–12:20	89	12:24 ^o	87
11:43	89, 92, 94	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
12:1–20	89–90	21:4	88
12:24 ^{a-z}	89–91	21:9	88
12:24 ^b	88		
12:24 ^c	92–93		

III. Egyptian

Does not include the triumphal reliefs of Thutmose III, Seti I, Ramesses II, Ramesses III, and Shoshenq I, each of which is covered in detail in chaps. 2–3

<i>Annals of Thutmose III</i>	29, 41–42, 72–73, 105, 111, 113, 130
<i>Armant Stele of Thutmose III</i>	72
<i>Biography of Ahmose son of Abana</i>	130
<i>Biography of hrw</i>	15, 66, 69–70, 74, 97
<i>Cairo Ostrakon 25222</i>	105
<i>Execration Texts</i>	39–40
<i>Gebel es–Silsilah no.100</i>	15, 59, 66–67, 71, 74
<i>Great Gebel Barkal Stele of Thutmose III</i>	72
<i>Onomasticon of Amenemope</i>	44, 63
<i>Papyrus Anastasi I</i>	43–45, 105, 107, 133
<i>Papyrus Anastasi III</i>	105
<i>Papyrus Anastasi IV</i>	84, 107
<i>Papyrus Anastasi VI</i>	125
<i>Papyrus Harris I</i>	35
<i>Papyrus Leningrad</i>	106
<i>Ramesseum Onomasticon</i>	44–45
<i>Raphia Decree</i>	37
<i>Shoshenq Stele at Karnak</i>	10, 15, 66–69, 74
<i>Shoshenq Stele at Megiddo</i>	15, 66, 70–74, 97–98
<i>Stele of Ramesses II at Beth–Shean</i>	72–73
<i>Stele of Seti I at Beth–Shean (Undated)</i>	30–32, 72–73
<i>Stele of Seti I at Beth–Shean (Year One)</i>	30–32, 72–73, 107
<i>Stele of Seti I at Kadesh</i>	73
<i>Stele of Seti I at Tyre</i>	73
<i>Wilbour Papyrus</i>	84

IV. Amarna Letters

<i>EA 77</i>	73	<i>EA 256</i>	120
<i>EA 89</i>	73	<i>EA 290</i>	106
<i>EA 146–155</i>	73	<i>EA 314–316</i>	131
<i>EA 250</i>	112		

V. Assyrian

<i>Annals of Assurbanipal</i>	1
-------------------------------	---

VI. Josephus

<i>Ant.</i>		<i>J.W.</i>	
7.105	1		
8.210	1	6.436	1
8.235–255	1		
8.258	1		
8.263	1		

Site Index

- Acco 111
Adam 5, 116, 131
Adar 109, 110, 125
Adoraim 85, 107, 127
Adullam 85, 107
Aijalon 7–9, 11, 85, 109
Arad 120, 127, 128, 131
Araru 120
Aruna 29, 111
Azekah 85, 106, 107, 112
- Beth 'Olam 113
Beth–Anath 129
Beth–Horon 85, 109
Beth–Shean 5, 8, 11, 30–32, 42, 72–73, 107
Beth–Tappuah 113
Borim 111–112
- Damascus 43
- El–mattan 130
Eshatol 108
Ezem 118
Ezion–Geber 121
- Gath–Gittaim 109
Gaza 5, 9, 29, 105, 118
Gibeon 5, 7–9, 11, 108–109
Giti–Padalla 111–112
- Hadashah 12, 115, 117
Hagaraim 127
Hapharaim 107, 127
Heliopolis 34, 54, 71
Henam 111
Jarmuth 107, 111, 112
Jehallel 120
Jerusalem 3, 5–6, 9, 12, 14, 69, 75–80, 82, 85–88, 91, 93, 95–99, 101, 106, 117, 127
Jezreel 4–5, 8–9, 11–12, 104, 106–107, 118
- Kadesh 7, 24, 29, 31–33, 60, 73, 83–84, 115
Kiriath–jearim 109
- Laban 133
- Mahanaim 4, 10, 108
Makkedah 12, 105–106, 109, 111
Megiddo 2, 4–5, 7–9, 11–12, 15, 27–29, 41–42, 45, 66, 70–72, 74, 75, 104, 106–107, 109–111
Migdol 117
- Naamah 111
Negev 3–5, 7–9, 11–12, 61, 97–98, 118, 120–126, 130, 132–133
- Peleth 129
Penuel 10–11, 107, 115
Photis 120
- Raphiah 133
Rehob 31, 107
Rubate 5, 106
- Sapek 122
Sharuhem 130, 133
Shunem 106
Socoh 112, 113
- Ta'anach 5, 106
Thebes (Luxor) 1–2, 6, 16, 24, 28, 33, 37, 45, 54, 60, 67, 70
Tilon 120, 126
Tirzah 5, 9, 117
Tyre 73
- Yehem 29, 112–113
Yeroham 127, 128
Yorda 133
Yurza 131
- Zemaraim 116

Subject Index

- Amun 2, 18–22, 24, 27–28, 32–37, 48–49, 51–55, 57, 60–61, 64–65, 68, 70, 103
 annals 1, 29–30, 41–42, 67, 73, 105–106, 111–112, 130–131
 archaeology 2, 73
 Asiatics 20–22, 24, 36, 48, 55, 57–58, 61, 64, 69, 105

 Babylon 32–33, 42, 86
 Bitter Lakes 68–69
 boustrophedon 5, 7–11
 Bubastite 6, 38, 66

 Cush, see Nubia

 David 13, 76, 78, 82–83, 87–88, 93, 98, 120, 123, 126
 day-book 29, 41–42
 Dedwen 22, 24
 Deuteronomistic History 3, 13, 77–78, 82–83, 85, 87

 Egypt 1–4, 6–7, 9–13, 21–22, 24, 28, 30–31, 37–40, 42–44, 46–51, 54–58, 61, 64, 67, 69, 71–74, 75, 80, 83–85, 87, 89–90, 92–96, 98–99, 101–104
 Eighteenth Dynasty 50, 56
 Execration Texts 39–40

 Hadad 93–94, 98
 Hittites 31, 56, 73, 83
 Horus 48–51, 54
hps 22, 24, 50, 52–53

isft (chaos) 38, 47
 Israel 2–3, 13–14, 26, 41, 57, 61, 67–79, 76–80, 87–90, 92–99, 101, 105, 108, 127
 itinerary 3, 8, 10, 13–14, 26, 29, 31–33, 35, 41–44, 46, 61–63, 97, 101–102, 105
 Iuput 68

 Jeroboam 6, 10, 13, 76, 79, 87–99, 117
 Judah 1, 3, 9, 11–14, 69, 76–77, 79–82, 85–87, 92–93, 96, 98–99, 106, 115–116–117, 120, 124, 133

 Karnak 2, 6–7, 10, 12, 15–20, 22–23, 26–29, 31, 35, 45, 54, 59, 61, 66–67, 69, 73–74, 106, 110, 112

 Libya 2, 20–21, 24, 31, 38–39, 58, 67, 80–81, 84, 94, 102–103

mꜥꜥ (order) 22, 34, 39
 Medinet Habu 6, 16–18, 21, 24–25, 33, 35, 38–39, 41, 45, 53, 55
 Middle Kingdom 5, 39
 Mittanni 55–57, 64
 Montu 54, 56

 name ring 3, 17, 27, 30–32, 34, 36–37, 42, 47, 61–62, 65, 102, 104–105, 107, 109–110, 112–113, 115–121, 123–128
 Nebuchadnezzar 86
 Nectanebo II 83
 Nekhbet 49
 New Kingdom 9, 17, 22, 26, 37, 40, 42, 45, 51, 60, 65, 83–85, 93, 103, 105, 110–111
 Nile 44, 49, 66–67
 Nine Bows 20–21, 36, 49, 52–54, 57, 61, 64, 103–104
 Nineteenth Dynasty 84
 Nubia 10, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 34–36, 38–39, 44, 49, 51, 53–54, 57–58, 64, 80–81, 84–85, 102–104

 onomastic lists 44–47, 61–64
 Osorkon I 2, 70
 Osorkon II 49

 Psusennes II 2, 98
 Punt 20–21

- Ra 48–49, 51–52, 54, 61
 Ramesses II 7, 9, 14, 16–18, 20, 22, 24,
 32–33, 35–36, 38, 42, 45, 52, 58–60,
 72–73, 83, 103
 Ramesses III 3, 14, 16–18, 21, 24, 33–
 35, 45, 52, 58–60, 84, 105
 Rehoboam 1, 3, 8–9, 12–13, 69, 75–82,
 85–90, 92–93, 95–97, 99, 109

 sand-dwellers 20–21, 36, 54, 57, 64
 scribes 11–12, 40–46, 63, 70, 104, 109,
 123, 130
 Sea People 35, 38–39, 41, 51
 Second Intermediate Period 39
 Sennacherib 86
 Septuagint 1, 76, 81, 88–95, 122
 Seti I 13, 17, 19–23, 30–33, 35, 38, 42,
 52, 58–60, 72–73, 106–107
 Shephelah 11–12, 14, 104, 106, 109
 Shoshenq I 1–17, 21, 26, 38, 40–41, 45,
 47–49, 51–55, 57–67, 69, 71–72, 74–
 87, 90–91, 93–94, 96–99, 101, 103,
 110, 117, 120–121, 125, 127
 Shoshenq IV 71
 Siamun 98
 Sinai 12, 31, 51, 133
 Solomon 10, 13, 69, 75, 77–78, 81–83,
 85, 87–90, 92–96, 98, 116
 Sukkim 80–81, 84

 Teos 83
 Third Intermediate Period 1, 9, 17, 21,
 40, 49, 63, 70, 101, 110
 Thutmose III 3, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19–20,
 22, 24, 26–30, 32, 35–36, 38, 41–43,
 45, 60–63, 73, 105, 106, 109, 111–
 113, 130–131
 topographical list 2–5, 7, 11–12, 14–19,
 26–36, 39–48, 60–66, 97, 101–105,
 109, 112, 118, 120, 125, 127
 toponym 4, 8, 11–12, 14, 18, 27, 32–34,
 42–46, 60–65, 101–111, 113–119,
 121–122, 124–129, 132–133
 Transjordan 4–5, 7–8, 11–12, 43, 61,
 107–108, 115–116, 120, 125, 133
 triumphal relief 2–3, 10, 13–26, 29–30,
 33, 35–40, 46–48, 52, 57–60, 62–65,
 75, 78, 79, 97, 101, 103
 Twentieth Dynasty 53, 70, 84
 Twenty-Fifth Dynasty 85
 Twenty-First Dynasty 2, 49, 84, 93–94,
 98
 Twenty-Second Dynasty 2, 70, 83–84,
 94
 Wast 22, 24, 28, 32, 52–53, 55, 60

 Zedekiah 87

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Edited by Bernd Janowski, Mark S. Smith
and Hermann Spieckermann

Alphabetical Index

- Barthel, Jörg*: Prophetenwort und Geschichte. 1997. *Volume 19*.
–: see *Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen*.
Baumann, Gerlinde: Die Weisheitsgestalt in Proverbien 1–9. 1996. *Volume 16*.
Bodendorfer, Gerhard und *Matthias Millard* (Hrsg.): Bibel und Midrasch. Unter Mitarbeit von B. Kagerer. 1998. *Volume 22*.
Chapman, Stephen B.: The Law and the Prophets. 2000. *Volume 27*.
Diße, Andreas: see *Groß, Walter*.
Ego, Beate: see *Janowski, Bernd*.
Emmendorffer, Michael: Der ferne Gott. 1997. *Volume 21*.
Finlay, Timothy D.: The Birth Report Genre in the Hebrew Bible. 2005. *Volume II/12*.
Finsterbusch, Karin: Weisung für Israel. 2005. *Volume 44*.
Frevel, Christian (Ed.): Medien im antiken Palästina. 2005. *Volume II/10*.
Groß, Walter: Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa. Unter Mitarbeit von A. Diße und A. Michel. 1996. *Volume 17*.
Hanhart, Robert: Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum. 1999. *Volume 24*.
Hausmann, Jutta: Studien zum Menschenbild der älteren Weisheit (Spr 10ff). 1995. *Volume 7*.
Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen: Studien zu Prophetie und Weisheit. Hrsg. von J. Barthel, H. Jauss und K. Koenen 1998. *Volume 23*.
Huwyler, Beat: Jeremia und die Völker. 1997. *Volume 20*.
Janowski, Bernd und *Ego, Beate* (Hrsg.): Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte. 2001. *Volume 32*.
Janowski, Bernd und *Stuhlmacher, Peter* (Hrsg.): Der Leidende Gottesknecht. 1996. *Volume 14*.
Jauss, Hannelore: see *Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen*.
Jeremias, Jörg: Hosea und Amos. 1996. *Volume 13*.
Kagerer, Bernhard: see *Bodendorfer, Gerhard*.
Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi: A Study of Hata' and Hatta't in Leviticus 4-5. 2003. *Volume II/2*.
Knierim, Rolf P.: Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1–9. 1992. *Volume 2*.
Köckert, Matthias: Leben in Gottes Gegenwart. 2004. *Volume 43*.
Köhlmoos, Melanie: Das Auge Gottes. 1999. *Volume 25*.
Koenen, Klaus: see *Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen*.
Kratz, Reinhard Gregor: Kyros im Deuterojesaja-Buch. 1991. *Volume 1*.
–: Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels. 2004. *Volume 42*.
Lange, Armin: Vom prophetischen Wort zur prophetischen Tradition. 2002. *Volume 34*.
Liess, Kathrin: Der Weg des Lebens. 2004. *Volume II/5*.
MacDonald, Nathan: Deuteronomy and the Meaning of „Monotheism“. 2003. *Volume II/1*.
Michel, Andreas: Gott und Gewalt gegen Kinder im Alten Testament. 2003. *Volume 37*.
–: see *Groß, Walter*.
Millard, Matthias: Die Komposition des Psalters. 1994. *Volume 9*.

–: see *Bodendorfer, Gerhard*.

Miller, Patrick D.: The Way of the Lord. 2004. *Volume 39*.

Müller, Reinhard: Königtum und Gottesherrschaft. 2004. *Volume II/3*.

Niemann, Hermann Michael: Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat. 1993. *Volume 6*.

Otto, Eckart: Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. 2001. *Volume 36*.

Perlitt, Lothar: Deuteronomium-Studien. 1994. *Volume 8*.

Podella, Thomas: Das Lichtkleid JHWHs. 1996. *Volume 15*.

Pola, Thomas: Das Priestertum bei Sacharja. 2003. *Volume 35*.

Rösel, Martin: Adonaj – Warum Gott 'Herr' genannt wird. 2000. *Volume 29*.

Ruwe, Andreas: „Heiligkeitgesetz“ und „Priesterschrift“. 1999. *Volume 26*.

Sals, Ulrike: Die Biographie der „Hure Babylon“. 2004. *Volume II/6*.

Schaper, Joachim: Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda. 2000. *Volume 3..*

Schenker, Adrian (Hrsg.): Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament. 1992. *Volume 3*.

Schmidt, Brian B.: Israel's Beneficent Dead. 1994. *Volume 11*.

Schöpfung, Karin: Theologie als Biographie im Ezechielbuch. 2002. *Volume 36*.

Seeligmann, Isaac Leo: The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. 2004. *Volume 40*.

–: Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel. Herausgegeben von Erhard Blum mit einem Beitrag von Rudolf Smend. 2004. *Volume 41*.

Spieckermann, Hermann: Gottes Liebe zu Israel. *Volume 33*.

Steck, Odil Hannes: Gottesknecht und Zion. 1992. *Volume 4*.

Stuhlmacher, Peter: see *Janowski, Bernd*.

Süssenbach, Claudia: Der elohistische Psalter. 2005. *Volume II/7*.

Sweeney, Marvin A.: Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature. 2005. *Volume 45*.

Vos, Christiane de: Klage als Gotteslob aus der Tiefe. 2005. *Volume II/11*.

Weber, Cornelia: Altes Testament und völkische Frage. 2000. *Volume 28*.

Weippert, Manfred: Jahwe und die anderen Götter. 1997. *Volume 18*.

Weyde, Karl William: The Appointed Festivals of YHWH. 2004. *Volume II/4*.

Widmer, Michael: Moses, God, and the Dynamics of Intercessory Prayer. 2004. *Band II/8*.

Willi, Thomas: Juda – Jehud – Israel. 1995. *Volume 12*.

Williamson, Hugh: Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography. 2004. *Volume 38*.

Wilson, Kevin A.: The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine. 2005. *Volume II/9*.

Young, Ian: Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew. 1993. *Volume 5*.

Zwicker, Wolfgang: Der Tempelkult in Kanaan und Israel. 1994. *Volume 10*.

*For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de*