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

Lemche’s conclusions have been challenged by N. Na’aman and A. Rainey from the perspective of the cuneiform sources, but Lemche continues to maintain his interpretation of historical sources, which he calls “imprecise” and “ambiguous.”

In 2001, O. Tammuz readdressed the identification of Canaan in a 41-page article focusing primarily on the cuneiform sources. However, his very brief overview of non-cuneiform Egyptian texts leaves a number of unanswered questions. He states categorically that “some Egyptian texts name the city of Gaza, which held the main Egyptian administrative center in the Levant, Pi-Kn’n (the Canaan),” but provides no analysis or supporting evidence. Regarding the Merenptah Stele, Tammuz says it "contains no information on [Canaan’s] geography." He submits that Egypt’s perception of Canaan varied: that it was a territory in Asia, that its boundaries were fluid, and that it also referred to Gaza itself. He concludes, “No wonder that Lemche’s review of the evidence uncovered so many difficulties and finally led him to conclude that Canaan was a vague term.”

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

**Egyptian Occurrences of Canaan, Pa-Canaan, and Canaanite**

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

The ethnicon kənɛn ​​appears only early in the reign of Amenhotep II and late in the reign of Merenptah. The two occurrences of the term kənɛn ​​as an ethnicon are found on the Amenhotep II’s Memphis and Karnak steles.14 In both instances they refer to captives that are brought back after Amenhotep II’s Year 9 campaign. Here they appear without determinatives, a characteristic often found throughout these stele when referring to a people group.14 In the reign of Merenptah, the term occurs as an ethnicon in Papyrus Anastasi IIIA and IV where hmw kənɛn 3w n Hwrw, “Canaanite slaves of Kharu,” are mentioned.16 The orthography of Canaan in Papyrus Anastasi III is superior to that of IV, where it lacks the final n.

**Occurrences: kənɛn³ (Canaan)**

The place name kənɛn³ is first found written in Egyptian hieroglyphic sources during the reign of Amenhotep III. It becomes more frequent beginning in the Nineteenth Dynasty, when it is used for the first time as a territorial name.

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

**Seti I.** The war scenes of Seti I at Karnak describe and depict his campaigns into the southern Levant and mention pī kənɛn³ twice. The first phrase is: “The destruction which the sturdy arm of Pharaoh, LPH, made (among) the fallen ones of Shasu, beginning with the fortress of Sile to the Canaan.”19 This description identifies the extent of the campaign from its beginning point to its conclusion. The second reference appears as the description over the fort as dmi₃ n pī kənɛn³, “town of the Canaan.”20

**Ramesess II.** Canaan occurs once in a topographical list from the temple of Ramesess II at Amara West.21 It is significant that the name Canaan appears separately after each of place names in the Shasu-land are listed, indicating that this is a separate region. The second occurrence is in Papyrus Anastasi I, where the scribe writes: dd.₃ n k h₃swt mh n t₃ n pī kənɛn³, “I have told you of the northernmost lands/hill countries of the land of the Canaan.”22

**Merenptah.** Canaan occurs first in a monumental inscription known as the Merenptah Stele that focuses primarily on that pharaoh’s war against the Libyans but concludes with an earlier campaign against Canaan. The text reads: ḫk pī kənɛn³ bint.k, “Canaan has been plundered into every sort of woe.”23

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

**The Nature and Identification of Pa-Canaan**

The most frequent translation of the place name pī kənɛn³ is simply the territory “Canaan” or “the Canaan.”25 Others have interpreted this toponym in Seti I’s reliefs, the Merenptah stela, and other contexts as the city of Gaza specifically, not a region or territory.26 J. K. Hoffmeier, for example, has interpreted pī kənɛn³ in the Merenptah Stele as Gaza, concluding that “the cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Gezer represent a nice geographical unit within a limited area of what would later become known as Philistia.”27 The most recent study, by L. D. Morenz, remains fairly neutral but slightly favors Gaza in the context of the stele.28 The distinguishing factor for the interpretation of the place name pī kənɛn³ is the prefix pī, which indicates the use of the definite article. The argument has been made that the definite article provides further specificity to Canaan and thus refers to its capital of Gaza. The implications are wide-ranging: all occurrences of the name Canaan in narrative contexts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties would need to be read as Gaza whenever written as Pa-Canaan. This would have major repercussions on the Egyptian understanding of “the land of Canaan” and might also influence the interpretation of other Near Eastern texts, including the Amarna letters. A complete analysis of texts from the late New Kingdom would be most informative in reevaluating this issue.

**The Reliefs of Seti I**

The primary argument for interpreting pī kənɛn³ as Gaza comes from the reliefs of Seti I, wherein the description over the fort reads dmi₃ n pī kənɛn³, “city/town of the Canaan.”29 It has been suggested that because an actual fortified city is being referred to as “city/town of the Canaan,” Pa-Canaan should be identified with the city of Gaza. Earlier in the same text, the destruction of the Shasu takes place “beginning with the fortress of Sile to the Canaan (pī kənɛn³),”30 the road from Egypt to Canaan—known as the “Ways of Horus”—extended from Sile and may have ended in Gaza, which marked the entry point into Canaan.31 But do these contexts necessitate the interpretation that pī kənɛn³ simply was Gaza?

Gardiner has often been cited on this point, having been first to suggest a connection with Gaza in his seminal Journal of Egyptian Archaeology article on the Ways of Horus. “Is it too rash to conjecture,” he asked, “that the ‘town of the Canaan,’ of which the storming... marked the culmination of the expedition in [Y]ear 1, might be Gaza itself?”32 However, three points must be recognized here. First, Gardiner recognized that his question was conjecture and not inherent in the text. Second, he in no way equated Pa-Canaan with Gaza; conjecturing instead that “the town of the Canaan” might be Gaza. In other words, the fort designated as dmi₃ might be Gaza, lying within the land of Pa-Canaan. This would be akin to speaking of “the city/town of Amurru” or “the city/town of Hatti.” One might offer a hypothesis as to what the city may be within those terri-
ories, but without further textual clarification this could prove difficult. Indeed, in all his translations of the phrase, Gardiner consistently uses “town of (the) Canaan,” and in his specific discussion of the fort inscriptions says there is “sufficient evidence to show that the region designated by the Egyptians as ‘Canaan,’ the Canaan, was the maritime plain just mentioned.” Later scholars have gone beyond Gardiner’s intentions in equating Pa-Canaan with Gaza.

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

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

Papyrus Anastasi I

H. J. Gelb has suggested in 1982 that because Pa-Canaan and Gaza are referred to in Papyrus Anastasi I, “the scribe is simply playing with the different names of the same town. This double naming of the town fits well the style of Papyrus Anastasi I.” But does the contextual setting of these terms and the specific terminology used allow for this equivalency between Pa-Canaan and Gaza? Because his brief study on the subject is often cited, it is important to look more closely at this passage.

Katzenstein transliterates the key passage as phwy p.t ḵn’ni, which he translates as “the end of the Canaan.” He then writes, “We believe that phwy refers to the northern end of the ‘Ways of Horus,’ which was the main road from Sile in Egypt to Gaza in Canaan.” Katzenstein is correct in interpreting phwy as “equivalent to the most distant end from the point of view of the Egyptian, or, in our case, the most remote north.” The question then becomes: the most remote north or distant end of what? The Ways of Horus/Gaza or the territory of Canaan? But from the outset, Katzenstein has not properly transliterated or translated this passage: he left out a significant portion. H.-W. Fischer-Elfert published a definitive edition of the papyrus in 1993, with a second edition in 1992 that reads: [sDd.n] k ẖswt phwy ṯ n p.t ḵn’ni, “I have described to you the hill countries of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan.” It is evident that this is not simply “the end of the Canaan.” The hill-countries of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan is a description much more comprehensive and far-reaching than a mere city-state like Gaza and its hinterland. In fact, this mention occurs as a summary statement at the end of a long discourse on place names and geographical localities the recipient should have been familiar with, including Hazor, Akko, Shechem, Rehob, Beth-Shan, and Joppa (among others) and beginning with those areas farthest from Egypt. In his conclusion, scribe Hori chastises recipient Amenemope for not knowing the full extent of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan. In this passage, p.t ḵn’ni is clearly defined as ṯ n p.t ḵn’ni, “The land of the Canaan,” a slight rephrasing of what may have been intended by Seti I’s scribe at Karnak (p.t ṯ n ḵn’ni). The passage in Papyrus Anastasi I would make little sense if translated as “I have told you of the northern lands/hill-countries of the land of Gaza.” Contextually it is not possible; Gaza is a city not a land or territory.

Hori concludes the main part of his letter this way: “I have described to you the hill countries of the northern reaches of the land of the Canaan, but you have not answered me in any way, nor have you rendered a report to me.” He then turns his focus in a completely different direction. “Come and [I] will describe [many things] to you. Head toward (?) the fortress of the Ways of Sese, l.p.h.” It is highly significant that the letter now enters an entirely new context—the Ways of Horus. Prior to this, the description centered on “the hill-countries of the northern reaches of the land of Canaan.” When Hori turns to the Ways of Horus, the closest area to Egypt on the coastal road in north Sinai, he begins with the second closest fort to Egypt, the “Dwelling of Sese,” also identified with the “Dwelling of the Lion.” He then lists several of these forts—as on the reliefs of Seti I, starting with those closest to Egypt—and ends with a question: sw lrw n ṯw šm.t t r šp ḵf.t, “How many miles march is it in going to Gaza?” This has nothing to do with the northern reaches or extent of the
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land of Canaan, but rather with the military/trade road from Egypt to the border of Canaan—that is, to the city of Gaza. Katzenstein is mistaken that the scribe simply equates Pa-Canaan with Gaza. In fact, Papyrus Anastasi I indicates just the opposite: there is a distinct differentiation between the extent of the land of Pa-Canaan (27:1) and the city of Gaza at the end of the Ways of Horus (27:8). Gaza is written out syllabically, as it had been since the reign of Thutmose III.50 The two usages are thus discrete, distinguished both contextually and in syllabic orthography.

Merenptah Stele

Perhaps the most decisive reason for understanding pꜣ kꜣnꜣn in the New Kingdom as a region rather than the city of Gaza comes from the structure of the final hymnic-poetic unit of the Merenptah Stele. In 1994, the various structures proposed to date were reviewed and evaluated.51 These included the “ring structure” of G. Ahlström and D. Edelman,13 the “modified ring structure” by Ahlström,14 L. E. Stager’s15 and F. J. Yuco’s16 proposed structures, and the “chiastic structure” of J. J. Bimson.17 Following this critique, a new, independently developed structure was proposed by the present author based on the “parallelism of political and geographical sequences and terms which most accurately maintains the integrity of the text” (Figure 1):18

1) The phrases in A and A’ parallel each other, providing a general description which encloses all the entities mentioned by name in the hymn. Furthermore, it is an inclusio that expresses the major goals of Merenptah’s campaign, namely the “binding” of all enemies (Nine Bows).19

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Table: Proposed Geopolitical Structural Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binding of Enemies</th>
<th>Lands/Nations</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Cities/People</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lands/Nations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The princes are prostrate, saying ‘Peace!’
Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows
Desolation for Tehenu; Hatti is pacified (ḥtp)
Plundered is Pa-Canaan with every evil
Carried off is Ashkelon
Captured is Gezer
Yenoam is made nonexistent
Israel is laid waste, his seed is not
Kharu is become a widow because of Egypt
All lands together, they are pacified (ḥtp)

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

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

(7) This hymnic-poetic unit at the end of the Merenptah Stele functions as a historical summary of the accomplishments of Merenptah during his reign. Most recently, with the welcome publication of J. K. Hoffmeier’s Israel in Egypt, a new “grammatical structure” has been suggested that adds additional support to the structure proposed above.80 Hoffmeier correctly observes that the specific activities concerning the synonymous designations Canaan/Kharu (C-C’) are also syntactically parallel. Notice that Canaan is written with the sdm.f + PN, a pattern repeated for the next two city-states, Ashkelon and Gezer. Yenoam and Israel, however, appear with the PN + old perfective, as does Kharu, the region closing the inclusio C-C’. Thus there is a distinct syntactical change in the very center of this final hymnic-poetic unit dealing with Canaan/Kharu so that the entities within its territory poetically match with the synonymous names used for the region (D):

C. sdm.f + PN
   sdm.f + PN
D. PN + old perfective
   sdm.f + PN
   PN + old perfective
C’. PN + old perfective

Together with Hoffmeier’s grammatical observation, my proposed structure makes clear that Canaan and Kharu must be understood as parallel synonymous terms designating Egypt’s territory in Asia (as many others have agreed).81 This means Pa-Canaan was a regional territory that contained the major cities of Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam; moreover, it also contained the socioethnic entity Israel. As Kitchen has recently stated, Kharu “is a synonym for Canaan,” for “between Canaan and Khurru is sandwiched their content—the four specific entities claimed by Merenptah as captured or destroyed: Ascalon, Gezer, Yenoam, and Israel.”82 This synonymy with Kharu indicates that Pa-Canaan extended to the north and encompassed those territories designated in other texts as Kharu.83

Papyrus Harris I

In 1988, C. Uehlinger suggested that the reference to “The-House-of-Rameses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, -L.-P.-H. in Pa-Canaan” built by Rameses III must also refer to a temple specifically in the city of Gaza.84 But does the text support this interpretation? If versification is to be found in this Egyptian text as in many others,85 one might suggest the following structure:

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

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

The first segment begins with the claim of the king: mst.i, “I built.” This verb, which introduces the action, is followed by the subject of the king’s building: hwt stt, “an inaccessible house.” This house or temple is built in t n Djh, “the land of Djahy.” Djahy is believed to be the Eighteenth Dynasty place name for the territory of Egyptian domination in Canaan (although further study would be advised for this name).86 This text confirms this association. Line 3 of the first segment repeats the subject hwt, “house,” and offers a synonym for Djahy, namely p/k wn n. The segment ends with a phrase indicating why this house was built: “for your name’s sake.”

The second segment fits remarkably well in parallelism to the first, indicating the ultimate results of the building project. It begins with the identical verbal claim of the king (mst.i, “I built”), this time followed by the subject simw.k htp(w), “the large cultic scene.” The last part of the phrase refers to where the large cultic scene was placed. Uehlinger assumes that the pronoun fr, “it,” here refers to the house or temple itself, and supplies that meaning in parentheses.87 But this cannot be the case: the gender of the pronoun must match the noun antecedent. The building or “house” (hwt) is a feminine noun. In order for the pronoun to refer back to the “house” (hwt), the correct gender must be used, yet instead we find the masculine fr. It is more likely that the pronoun refers back to t n Djh, “the land of Djahy,” which is the territory of the building activity. This seems to make more sense when looking at the passage not only from a structural perspective but from the overall context of what follows. Here it is no longer the temple that is named, but rather the cultic scene that is named as “Amun of Rameses-Ruler-of-Heliopolis, L.P.H.” Amun undoubtedly would have been the central figure in this
large cultic scene, which was placed inside the temple. The third line again parallels the first, referring with a pronoun to this cultic scene (again in the masculine, as would be expected). It ends the same way as line 3 in the previous segment, with a third synonym of Djahy: Rtnw, "Retenu." The inhabitants of Retenu bring Amun their offerings "for the sake of his deity," which parallels the previous "for your name’s sake." The focus shifts from Ramesses III to Amun, who is worshipped in the temple.

The issue of toponym usage and determinatives must also be discussed. Uehlinger points out the differentiation between "the land of the Canaan" seems even more likely given the structure of the passage. The same is true for the Ways of Horus extending from Sile to Pa-Canaan. The same form of ti n Dthy (written as ti, "land"), ps klnn (written with the definite article ps), and Rtnw (written with the seated-man determinative followed by three strokes for the plural). He concludes that because they are written differently, with various determinatives and terminology, they cannot be synonymous terms. However, it must be pointed out that there is no discrepancy between the writing of ti n Dthy and ps klnn—both could refer to a territory or land, as indicated above. Moreover, both Dthy and ps klnn employ the hst hll-country determinative, used most frequently with territorial place names. As suggested above, based on the context of Papyrus Anastasi I, ps klnn must be understood in that context as the land of Canaan and not the city of Gaza. The shortened form of ti n ps klnn is preferred here, just as it was on Seti I's reliefs, and the same meaning of "the land of the Canaan" seems even more likely having the structure of the passage.

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

One could cite similar parallels. In the same document, we find the designation and, in the same document, we find the designation and, in the same document, we find the designation .

Connections

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

This essay was written as part of a larger study on Eastern Mediterranean place names in Egyptian accounts during my tenure as a Senior Fulbright Scholar at the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute (CAARI), Nicosia in 2003. Special thanks are extended to Daniel Hadjittofi and the staff of the Cyprus Fulbright Commission and Thomas Davis and the staff at CAARI for making this research possible. Additional appreciation is extended to Thomas Davis along with Kenneth Kitchen and Peter Brand, all of whom read earlier drafts of this manuscript and made valuable suggestions. The author accepts all responsibility for shortcomings and conclusions. An earlier version of this study was presented at the annual meetings of the American Schools of Oriental Research, November 17, 2006, in Washington, D.C. and the American Research Center in Egypt, April 25, 2008, in Seattle, Washington.

Notes


4. Lemche, 39.

5. Lemche, 152.


10. Tammuz, 511.


12. Tammuz, 536.

13. Manfred Görg, “Der Name ’Kanaan’ in ägyptischer Wiedergabe,” Biblische Notizen 18 (1985): 26–27; Shmuel Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1984), 83–85; a later reference to Pa-Canaan is found on a Middle Kingdom stela (see Knaan n prst on a Middle Kingdom stela that was reinscribed in the Twenty-Second Dynasty (Georg Steindorff, “The Statuette of an Egyptian Commissioner in Syria,” Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 25 [1939]: 30–33). Here the title given is wpw n p: knn n prst, “commissioner (or messenger) of Canaan and Philistia. Both Pa-Canaan and Philistia are written with the hst hill-country determinative (see Steindorff, 31), and Steindorff (31) concludes correctly, “By Kn’n is meant here not the city but the country.” Likewise Peleset is to be understood as a country as indicated by (see Steindorff, 31).


15. For st., “Asiatics,” see Urk. IV 1102.5, 1102.9, 1107.7, 1108.7, 11. In some cases on the Karnak stele the captive determinative ב is used, so Urk. IV 11509.16, 11311.4, 11311.11, 11312.4.


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


23. KRI 4: 195; RITA 4: 15.


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


32. Gardiner 1920, 104.

33. Gardiner 1920, 100, 104.

34. Gardiner 1920, 100.


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


42. Katzenstein 1982, 112.


44. Fischer-Elfert I, 150.

45. Fischer-Elfert I, 150.

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

47. Wente, 109.


49. Papyrus Anastasi I: 11,128; Fischer-Elfert I, 153; Wente, 109.

50. Urk. IV: 648, 10–11; references to Gaza as g/qADt occur once in the annals of Thutmose III (Urk. IV: 648, 10–11); once in Papyrus Anastasi I (written defectively with g instead of g; Papyrus Anastasi I: 27,8); twice in Papyrus Anastasi III vers (Papyrus Anastasi III: 6, 66; Gardner, *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 7 [Brussels: Edition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1937], 31 [hereafter LEM]). In all cases, g/qADt is consistently accompanied by g/qADt instead of g, see Ahituv, 97–98; Yurco 1986, 200.


54. Stager 1983, 56*.
57. Hasel 1994, 48, Fig. 1; Hasel 1998, 267, Fig. 15; Hasel 2004; Hasel 2008, 53.
62. The terms Canaanite and Kharu are employed synonymously in two other texts. Papyrus Anastasi IIIA and IV contain parallel texts that describe “Canaanite slaves from Kharu” indicating that at least during part of the period inhabitants of this territory received ethnic names reflecting their home territory. For references, see Gardiner, *LEM*, 33, 52; Papyrus Anastasi IIIA, 5–6; Papyrus Anastasi IV: 16, 4.
63. Most recently Katzenstein, 111–113; Uehlinger, 8; but see Pierre Grandet, *Le Papyrus Harris I, BM 9999*, I (Le Caire: Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, 1999), 212. The identification of ḫrtnw in Papyrus Harris I with Gaza was already suggested by other scholars such as Gardiner 1911, 28* note 23; Helck 1971, 444; Giveon 1971, 57–62; Giveon, *The Impact of Egypt on Canaan*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 20 (Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg und Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 22–27; Ahituv 1984, 84.
68. Faulkner 1962, 149–150.
69. Papyrus Harris I: 58,6; Erichsen 1933, 67,14; Grandet 1999, I, 305; Grandet 1999, II, 189, note 783.
71. *KRI* 1: 12,4; *RITA* 1: 17–19.
72. *KRI* 1: 12,3; *KRI* 1: 12,4; *KRI* 1: 12,5, respectively. Kitchen writes “sic” above 595. However, when understood in its wider context, it appears that this is an intentional writing of the scribe, who is using it in parallel with ṣtḥ, “Asiatics,” in the previous line, which is determined identically. On the other hand, ḫbwy in the following line simply has ḫbw, even though here the chiefs of Kharu are the subject as well.