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2. Gerard Leval, “Ancient Inscription Refers to the Birth of Israelite Monarchy,” *Biblical Archaeological Review*, March/April 2010, pp. 43, 70. Puech believes that the Khirbet Qeiyafa inscription dates to the reign of King Saul and not to the reign of David. However, the “Elah Fortress” at Khirbet Qeiyafa was almost certainly built to protect Jerusalem from Philistine attack, and since Jerusalem did not fall under Israelite control until David captured it, Puech’s suggestion that Saul built the Elah Fortress at Khirbet Qeiyafa should be dismissed.


5. Ibid., p. 44.


8. Jerusalem is not mentioned in the surviving portions of Shoshenq’s inscription on the Bubastite Portal, but it almost certainly was mentioned in the parts that have not survived.


10. 2 Samuel 5:17–24

11. Chaim Herzog and Mordechai Gichon in their book *Battles of the Bible: The Military History of Ancient Israel* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1997), pp. 102–103 indicate that they believe that David moved his troops from Hebron to attack the Philistines in the First Battle of the Rephaim Valley. While David may have indeed moved some of his troops from Hebron to the Elah Fortress, 2 Samuel 5:9 states that David himself was living in the fortress (“metsudah”) in Jerusalem when the Philistines began their invasion.

12. Ibid.


14. Herzog, p. 104. The Hebrew text has “Geba”/Gibeah in place of Gideon. It appears that David first drove the Philistines north from Jerusalem to Gibeah, and then west along a road from Gibeah to Gideon and from Gideon to Gezer and Ekron.


16. Leval, p. 42.

17. See Christopher A Rollston, “What’s the Oldest Hebrew Inscription?,” *Biblical Archaeological Review*, May/June 2012. Following the lead of Frank Cross, Rollston rejected the identification of the Khirbet Qeiyafa Inscription as Hebrew and maintained that it is Phoenician/Canaanite, p. 68. However, as will be seen, other more recent discoveries made by Garfinkel at Khirbet Qeiyafa have destroyed Rollston’s position.


Currid, p. 184.
Currid, pp. 191, 193.
Currid, p. 191.
Garfinkel, Ending, p. 44


Currid, p. 197. While it is beyond the scope of this present paper, Currid several times makes statements about what an Egyptian scribe(s) would have or would not have written on the Bubastite Portal. For example, he makes the very questionable statement that “the Egyptian scribe of the Shoshenk I relief always translated the Hebrew article into the Egyptian article,” pp. 192, 198. However, the six examples that Currid gives are nearly all—with the possible exception of the identical (Hebrew?) location repeated in Rings 90 and 92—Egyptian definite articles attached to Egyptian words and not Egyptian definite articles attached to Hebrew words.
Incidentally, we suspect that the name “Hapharaim” in Ring 18 has the Hebrew definite article “ha” attached to “pharaim.” Certainly the “-im” ending on this word is the Hebrew plural, and the Egyptian scribe clearly did not bother to translate this Hebrew plural into an Egyptian plural. Hence, it is also very likely that he did not bother to translate the Hebrew definite article “ha” into the Egyptian definite article. It is very likely that the “Hapharaim” people were from “Ha-parah” which is mentioned in Joshua 18:23. Ha-parah was apparently located just to the north of Jerusalem. The Hebrew definite article “ha-” attached to –parah is missing in most English translations of the Bible, which simply translate this site as “Parah.” Ring 23 is almost certainly Gibeon, so the location of the Hapharaim fits Ha-parah. Incidentally “Hapharaim” was a site that was almost certainly take by Shoshenq since it appears with the strange glyphs ia which are mentioned above in the main body of this paper. Name Ring 89 also appears to have a Hebrew definite article attached to it, contrary to Currid. The fact that the Hebrew definite article is apparently attached to at least one and probably two locations in Shoshenq I’s campaign list should be kept in mind when drawing conclusions against its appearance in the name ywdhmwrk in Name Ring 29. The H in Name Ring 29 is almost certainly the Hebrew definite article in a Hebrew construct chain. In other words, it is very likely that ywdhmwrk should be translated as either “the Kingdom of Judah” or as “Judah of the King,” contrary to what W. M. Muller has written in his outdated article “The Supposed Name of Judah in the List of Shoshenq,” Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, 10 (1888): 81–83.