anxiety; for as long as they remain [here], you will be deprived of the places.[1]

After our sincerest greetings to the chiefs of the congregation; blessed be they, [we pray] that God, may fulfil in regard to your excellencies [what is written]: The Lord, the God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many more as you are,[2] and also accomplish for you that which is written: The little one shall become a thousand etc.[3]

[And as for us] we shall verily depart on the morrow of the "Neḥamah."[4]

Written on Tuesday, the twelfth of . . .,[5] the 20th of Siwan.

(Verso)

If God, exalted be He, please, it will reach Cairo, the capital, and be delivered to the Sheikh Al-Rashid Harun ibn Sajir, and verily it will be read before the chiefs of the congregation. We adjure you by God not to deal with any of its contents lightly, and "Shalom."

To be read by the congregation of the "Bnei Miqra."[6]

---

[1] If this Ibrahim be the same one mentioned above, this must be a continuation of the preceeding. The authors of the letter request the Egyptian chiefs to induce Ibrahim and his father to leave Jerusalem, for in case of their staying on more trouble may be stirred up.

[2] Deut. 1 11.

[3] Is. 1 22. May we not infer from these two verses that the Karaite congregation of Cairo was not so very numerous at that time?

[4] Perhaps "שבת נחמו," the Sabbath following the Ninth of Ab, on which the 40th chapter of Isaiah: נחמו נחמו עמי, is read in the synagogue.

[5] Here probably the corresponding Mohammedan month is missing.

[6] *I. e.* the Karaites. See Mann I, 275, and II, 211 etc.

EGYPT AND THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE NEGEB

W. F. ALBRIGHT
(JERUSALEM)

ONE of the most interesting sections of Palestine is the extreme southern part, called *Negeb* (*i. e.*, "dry country") by the early Jews and *Darômâ*, a translation of *Negeb* in the sense of "south," by the Aramaeans of the Christian era. In general these designations seem to have applied to the whole district south of Judah proper, as far as the frontiers of Egypt, but we are here interested only in the portion north of the Naḥal Miṣráyim, now called the Wâdī el-ʿAriš. Although much of it is desert, the northern edges, in the limestone country, are fertile and produce good crops when there is sufficient rain, which is, however, not the case every year. All along this fertile strip are mounds, many of considerable size and height, like Tell ʿArâd, Tell el-Milḥ, Tell el-Mešâš (es-Sebaʿ), Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh, Tell eš-Šerîʿah, Tell el-Fâriʿ, Tell Jemmeh, etc., indicating that the northern Negeb once enjoyed a considerable degree of prosperity. That this was actually the case seems certain, and the causes are not hard to ascertain. Besides the fields of grain and flocks which pastured in the comparatively rich meadows of Simeon, there were great flocks in the semi-arid country to the south, which was also dependent upon the fortified cities of the northern Negeb. Moreover, the western Negeb, being on the caravan road from Asia to Africa, enjoyed an important source of income from trade with commercial travelers.

Because of the position of the Negeb, bordering on Egypt, its history was peculiarly apt to be influenced by the latter. As a matter of fact, the richest part of the Negeb, south of Gaza, was organized as an Egyptian province at a very early date, and was kept colonized with Egyptian mercenaries and their families, placed there to guard

the approaches to Egypt from the east, as well as to defend the military road. Traces of this condition of affairs may be traced throughout the Old Testament, and form one of the most interesting chain of episodes in the history of Israel. Curiously enough, however, so little attention has been paid to the question from this angle that we find ourselves tilling practically virgin soil in studying the history of the Negeb.

Hitherto the topography of the Negeb in pre-Roman times has been seriously neglected, so that a historical study which attempts to avoid topographical discussions must remain superficial, and is likely to miss fire almost entirely. In our case, the study of the topography of Simeon and Southern Judah has formed the basis of our work, and has led us to many new results, which will be defended in the topographical discussion appended to this paper. We will, therefore, plunge *in medias res*, referring for the defense of our identifications to the latter.

Our knowledge of the history of the Negeb begins at the end of the Hyksos period. Yet there is no doubt that Egyptian influence here began very early, since Egyptian Pharaohs began leading armies into Asia at least as early as the First Dynasty, and continued to invade Asia during every period of revival under a strong dynasty.[1] Moreover, the mining operations conducted by the Egyptians in Sinai from the First Dynasty on, and the constant trading relations between Syria and Egypt must infallibly have saturated the Negeb with Egyptian goods and influences. During the Twelfth Dynasty, which followed a period of Semitic penetration into Egypt,[2] the relations between Egypt and Asia became closer still, and Palestine, like Phoenicia, was almost certainly reduced to the status of an Egyptian province. It is true that we have comparatively few allusions to wars in Palestine during the Twelfth Dynasty, but this absence of inscriptions referring to wars in Palestine may be readily explained. As is well-known, our knowledge of the extensive Nubian campaigns of these Pharaohs is almost entirely due to the inscriptions carved or erected by them in Nubia itself. The inscriptions and monuments

[1] Cf. JPOS II, 118ff.—For abbreviations cf. this *Journal*, vol. I, p. 50, n. 1.

[2] Cf. especially Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, Liverpool, 1922, pp. 38f., and the references there cited; also Peet, *Jour. Manchester Or. Soc.*, 1914-15, 27ff.

left in Palestine to commemorate their campaigns there would naturally be placed in the citadels of the principal conquered towns, just as at Beth-shan half a millennium later. The only reason none have yet been found is that not a single citadel of the Middle Bronze Age in Palestine has yet been excavated. At local centers of importance, like Gezer, numerous Egyptian monument and smaller objects were found even in the lower city of this period, a fact proving clearly enough that Egyptian influence was very strong in the Middle Empire.[1]

It has been shown recently by Junker that there were garrisons of Nubian mercenaries in Palestine, especially at Gezer, during the Middle Empire.[2] Though it is possible that these garrisons belong to the Hyksos period rather than to the Twelfth Dynasty, it is very unlikely. The Hyksos only controlled Nubia at the beginning of their domination in Egypt; during the latter part of their rule they were unable to maintain their ascendancy even in Upper Egypt. They were, furthermore, a nation, or rather a group of confederated peoples, who were warriors themselves, and hence not likely to resort to the use of foreign mercenaries to support their empire. In the Twelfth Dynasty, on the other hand, Egypt controlled Nubia up to the Third Cataract, and would have no difficulty in securing as many Nubian mercenaries as desired. From the Sixth Dynasty on down through the Eleventh, Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and later dynasties we find that Nubian troops formed the backbone of the Egyptian army, for the Egyptians themselves have never been a warlike people, however, ambitious their princes may have been. The markedly Nubian character of the population of the western Negeb may thus go back to Nubian garrisons placed there by the Pharaohs of the Twelfth Dynasty; but see below.

During the Hyksos age the importance of the western Negeb must have increased greatly, for the Hyksos Empire was more Asiatic than African, not only in its fundamental character, but also in the extent of its sway. The maintenance of secure communications between Palestine and Egypt was, therefore, a matter of vital consequence

[1] Cf. JPOS II, pp. 121, 136.

[2] See his work, *Der nubische Ursprung der sogenannten Tell el-Jahudîyeh-Vasen*, Vienna, 1921, pp. 115-127. Junker is inclined to date them to the Hyksos period.

for the very existence of the empire. Under such circumstances Ḫayan or another Hyksos monarch must have built a chain of fortresses extending from the Egyptian frontier at Silû (Qanṭarah)[1] past the Hyksos capital at Avaris to Gaza, manned with reliable troops, presumably from the Hyksos body itself. The writer has elsewhere suggested that the mysterious ʿAwwîm or Ghawwîm, who preceded the Caphtorim or Cretans in the western Negeb, south of Gaza, were identical with the later Zagros people of the same name, and represent a military contingent placed there to guard the route by the Hyksos.[2] There is no difficulty in making such an identification, even in the present state of our knowledge, for it is already certain that the Hyksos invaders of Egypt were a motley host of unidentified Trans-Caspians,[3] followed by Indo-European Manda,[4] mixed peoples from the borders of Mesopotamia, and Hebrews.[5] To judge from the way in which groups of Hittites, Manda, etc., were settled in different parts of Palestine, mixing races was as much the settled policy of the Hyksos as it was of the Assyrians later. By settling such groups in different parts of their empire, thus forming an aristocracy attached to the central power, the danger of local revolts might be lessened. In practise, however, the mass proved too unwieldy, and the Hyksos Empire fell to pieces after little more than a century, probably owing to the rivalry between different leaders and racial groups at Avaris.

Yet the Hyksos groups in Palestine were still loyal to their state, now transferred from Avaris to Kadesh on the Orontes, if Breasted's theory is correct, as seems probable. It was precisely in the Negeb that Amosis met the bitterest resistance after the fall of Avaris. For three years Sharuhen (or Shilhon),[6] now probably Tell el-

[1] For Sile or Sele ("Zaru") and its location at Qanṭarah cf. Küthmann, *Die Ostgrenze Aegyptens*, Diss., Berlin, 1911; Gardiner, JEA V, 242-44; for the cuneiform writing *Zilû* in the Amarna age cf. the present writer in the current volume of JEA, "The Town of Sellê (Zaru) in the Amarna Tablets."

[2] JPOS I, 187, n. 2.

[3] JPOS II, 121 ff.

[4] *Loc. cit.*; also AJSL XL, 132; Burchardt, OLZ XV, 153f.

[5] *Loc. cit.*; also JPOS I, 64 ff.

[6] That *Šilḥôn* was the original form of the name was suggested JPOS I, 188, but without adequate evidence. In the Egyptian sources the town is twice mentioned, once about 1570 B. C. as *Šrḥn*, and again about 925 B. C., in the

Ḫuweilfeh east of Ḍâhirîyeh, as will be shown below, resisted the Egyptian arms.[1] After it fell, about 1570 B. C., Amosis probably conquered all of Palestine. The strategic value of Sharuhen perhaps lay in the fact that it commanded the approaches to Hebron from the southwest, if our identification with Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh be correct. Hebron was, in any case, one of the Hyksos centers, to judge from Num. 13 22, which represents it as having been built seven years before Tanis in Egypt, one of the foci of Hyksos power there.[2] Its Hittite population—or aristocracy—was evidently planted there by the Hyksos in order to ensure its loyalty. At all events, it seems to have proved loyal, though it is quite possible that the Hyksos fixed their capital at Hebron after the loss of Avaris. When Southern Palestine fell into the hands of the Egyptians, the Hyksos retired into Syria.[3]

Shishak list, as *Šrḥm*. In the Old Testament the name occurs three times: as שרוחן, *Šaruḥen*, in the oldest list, that of Simeon in Jos. 19 6; as שלחים, *Šilḥîm*, in the next oldest list, that of Judah, where Simeon is already included within the borders of the dominant tribe, Jos. 15 32; and as שערים, *Šaʿarâyim*, in the latest passage, 1 Chr. 4 31. The third form of the name may be discounted, since it is obviously due to a scribal confusion of the relatively unfamiliar pre-exilic name with the well-known town of Shaaraim in Judah. It is very interesting to note that the final *n* is replaced by *m* in both the later Hebrew and Egyptian forms of the name. In view of the variants there can be little doubt that *Šaruḥen* is a mistake for *Širḥôn* (or an older *Šarḥôn*), which was changed to *Šilḥôn*, just as Arab. *srḥ* appears as שלח in Hebrew (Barth). The later form *Šilḥîm* illustrates the Hebrew-Aramaic tendency of the endings in place-names to vary.

[1] Cf. Gardiner, JEA V, 49; the reading "six years" instead of "three" is wrong.

[2] Cf. JPOS I, 64f.

[3] An interesting episode, probably belonging to the Hyksos evacuation of Palestine, in mentioned Jud. 1 22-26, in the account of the occupation of the hill-country of Central Palestine by the Benê Yôsef (= Bêt Yôsef). When the Hebrews (here identical with the Ḫabiru!) attacked Bethel, the town was betrayed into their hands by a man who then went into the Land of the Hittites and built a town, also called Luz, after the older name of Bethel. It will be pointed out elsewhere that the fall of Bethel must have taken place at the same time as the fall of Ai, so elaborately described in Joshua. In the latter place Bethel is mentioned with Ai; in Judges the variant account of Joshua has evidently forced the description of the capture of Ai, which may have been radically different, to be excised. The capture and destruction of Jericho and Ai are, however, so closely connected in Joshua that they can hardly be separated. But the excavations at Jericho showed that the fall of the fourth, Middle Bronze town, after which the site was abandoned until well down into Israelite days, cannot be set later than the fifteenth century B. C. at the outside, and probably should be

It is probable that the replacement of the Ghawwîm with the Caphtorim belongs to the period of the conquest of the Negeb by Amosis. The Egyptians doubtless drove the Hyksos garrisons out of their strategic positions on the military road joining Egypt and Palestine. Having expelled them they had to replace them with loyal troops. Since the Caphtorim appear in control of this region long before the occupation of the coastal plain from Gaza north by the Philistines,[1] it seems probable that they were settled here by Amosis or his successors. That they were placed here as Egyptian mercenaries by the Pharaohs of the Eighteenth or Nineteenth Dynasties is, at all events, certain, since the Caphtorim came before the Philistines and the coastal plain remained under Egyptian control down to the

dated in the sixteenth century. The later date suggested JPOS II, 134, was due to the conviction that Joshua took Jericho in his invasion of Palestine about 1230 B. C. (I would now suggest 1223-24 as the probable date of the Israelite invasion), but is irreconcilable with the archaeological data. Again, the potsherds which the writer has collected in successive visits from the top of et-Tell, the site of ancient Ai, are exclusively Middle Bronze, so far as they can be dated at all, and point in the same direction as the pottery from the fourth level at Jericho. Like Jericho, Ai must have been destroyed before the fourteenth century B. C.; the later Israelite and Jewish Ai lay half-an-hour to the southeast, south of Deir Diwân (Ḫirbet Ḥaiyân). If Bethel was also destroyed at the same time, it is hard to avoid connecting its fall and the escape of one of its inhabitants (naturally with his whole clan; otherwise he could not have founded a new settlement) to Northern Syria with the events following the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. At all events since Bethel, Ai, and Jericho are never mentioned at all in the Amarna Tablets, it is very improbable that their destruction took place after 1400, quite aside from the clear testimony of the pottery. It may be added that the writer hopes to treat the whole question much more fully soon. Meanwhile we may recall the fact that there is a sharp break in Joshua between the account of the capture of Jericho and Ai, and the campaign against the other Canaanites, The intervening section (Jos. 8 30-35) presupposes that Joshua has conquered the whole hill country of Ephraim, though nothing about previous fighting to gain it is said. Since this district is found in the possession of the Hebrews (Ḫabiru) in the Amarna letters, there is no difficulty at all in supposing that the Hebrews already in Palestine joined forces with the Israelites under Joshua, and thus saved him the necessity of conquering those parts of the land already occupied by them. This peaceful episode was completely forgotten by a tradition which lumped all the stories of the (gradual) conquest together, attributing the whole process to Joshua. Fortunately, the other books preserve enough of the older material to give us a tolerably clear idea of what actually went on.

[1] See the discussion in my paper "A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries on the Coast of the Negeb," JPOS I, 187—194.

Philistine invasion and occupation at the end of Rameses III's reign or shortly after his death. In David's time the Negeb south of Philistia is called "Negeb of the Cretans (כרתים)" as mentioned I Sam. 30 14.[1] It may be that we have some traces preserved of the old Aegean religion brought with them into the Negeb by the Cretan settlers. As is well-known, the Cretan cult resembled the later Hellenic worship of Dionysus and and Kore very closely; in fact Dionysus and Zeus Cretagenes are the principal heirs of Cretan religion in later Greece. While Zeus Cretagenes was worshiped under the name Marnas, probably of Philistine origin,[2] at Gaza, Dionysus was worshiped at Raphia under the name Eiraphiotes (Εἰραφιώτης), while his sacred animal was the kid (ἔριφος). Whether the by-name, found sporadically in Greek literature, but certainly not Greek, has any connection with the by-name Eriphios, given to Dionysus because of his association with the kid, known elsewhere in the Hellenic world, as well as at Raphia, is not clear, but since the very word ἔριφος itself is not Indo-European, but was evidently borrowed by the Hellenes from their predecessors, we are clearly dealing with connections belonging to the pre-Hellenic world, the world of the Caphtorim. Max Radin has recently pointed out that there must be some connection between the biblical prohibition of the act of boiling a kid in its mother's milk, specifically tabooed three times in the Old Testament, and the Dionysiac rite of sacrificing a kid by cooking it in milk.[3] He wishes to explain the biblical prohibitions as pious interpolations of the post-exilic Jews, directed at the practises of the mystery cults. However, it is far more natural to regard them as leveled at obnoxious cult-practises of the Philistines, who presumably shared the cult of Dionysus, in its pre-Hellenic form, with their fellow-Aegeans, the Cretans.

The Old Testament preserves an interesting episode from the history of the first Hebrew settlements in the Negeb, under the Bené

[1] This explicit statement surely weighs more than the recent objections to the identification of Caphtor and Crete, especially when this equation is also supported by cuneiform sources.

[2] The commonly accepted view that *Marnas* is an Aramaic *Marnâ*, "our Lord," is very unlikely, since cult names are proverbially tenacious, and the Aramaizing of Gaza hardly preceded, if at all, the beginning of the Hellenizing process.

[3] See AJSL XL, 209—18.

Yiṣḥaq, before the tribe of Simeon had been formed.[1] This is the story of Isaac and Abimelech, prince of Gerar, told in Gen. 26; the parallel story told of Abraham in Gen. 20 is only a comparatively late Elohistic doublet to our early Judaic (Eissfeldt's L) account. The Hebrew chief has a dispute with the herdsmen of Abimelech, prince of Gerar, over some wells which his men have dug. He is forced to yield ground until things finally come to a head, and he meets the prince of Gerar and makes a treaty with him, in accordance with which the Benê Yiṣḥaq are permitted to occupy Beer-sheba without molestation. The Hebrews are here represented as nomads who have evidently encroached on lands controlled by Gerar, though the tradition justifies them by stating that they had only redug wells already dug by Abraham. The name "Abimelech" is a typical Canaanite name, borne by the prince of Tyre in the Amarna correspondence, as well as by the half-Canaanite son of Gideon two centuries later. The Cretan settlers had evidently become partially Semitized by the time of Abimelech. His designation as "Philistine" is presumably due to the fact that Gerar later passed into the hands of the Philistines of Gaza, and that the original state of affairs was not accurately known to the writer of our document. But the name of Abimelech's companion, Phichol (פיכל), the commander of his army (שר צבאו), is not Semitic, but Egyptian, as long ago seen. Yet Spiegelberg's explanation of the name as as Egyptian *P3-Ḫ3rw*, "The Syrian," is quite impossible,[2] because Heb. *kaf* never reflects an Egyptian *ḥ* in early names, or conversely. Moreover, Spiegelberg himself has since shown that the word *Ḫ3rw* had an *r*, not an *l*, thanks to a Greek transcription of the very name *P3-Ḫ3rw*. There is, however, a perfectly natural explanation, hitherto overlooked. We should read פילך instead of פיכל; the two final letters have been accidentally transposed, presumably owing the influence of the common

[1] For our purposes it is quite immaterial whether "Isaac" in the episode in question represents a man or a tribe. The fluidity of Old Testament tradition in this direction is naturally due to the fact that a sharp distinction between a man and the tribe which perpetuated his name and memory was not made. Even where a tribe really received its name, not from a human founder, but from a god, regarded also as the eponymous parent of the tribe (like Nebī Jibrîn, *i. e.*, the Prophet Gabriel, at Beit Jibrîn, ancient Bêt-gubrîn), or from a geographical source, or the like, an eponymous ancestor was set up by analogy.

[2] Contrast JPOS I, 189, where the writer accepted this explanation.

word כל, "all," which came automatically into the scribe's mind when he had to write ל and כ together. But *Pilok*, *i. e.*, *Pilokk*, is the only way that Eg. *P3-Rkw* = *Pi-Lukke*, "The Lycian," can be written in Hebrew. The name is found in an Egyptian text of the Nineteenth Dynasty,[1] and the people, called *Rkw* in the Egyptian inscriptions, and *Lukki* in the Amarna Tablets, were well-known as sea-goers and pirates. Names of this type were given commonly by the Egyptians to foreign slaves and mercenaries. There can, therefore, be little doubt that the *śar haṣ-ṣabâ* was the head of the Egyptian garrison in Gerar, just as there was a chief of the Egyptian garrison, usually consisting of Sardinians, Tyrsenians, or Nubians, in the larger Phoenician cities, beside the local *awîlu*, or "prince." The story of Isaac and Abimelech perhaps belongs to the period of friction between the Ḫabiru (Hebrews)[2] and the sedentary population, but its exact date can naturally not be determined with our present resources. At the latest it certainly precedes the settlement of the tribe of Simeon, whose relations with Gerar at a later date we will discuss below.

Interesting light upon the Egyptian military occupation of the Negeb is shed by Gardiner's masterly paper in JEA VI, 99—116, "The Ancient Military Road between Egypt and Palestine." This paper formed the inspiration for my former paper in the *Journal*, frequently referred to above. In it Gardiner showed that the line of fortresses described in the Karnak text of Sethos I and the Papyrus Anastasi I began at Silû (Qanṭarah) and stretched across the desert along the sea to Raphia and Gaza. He also suggested very plausibly (p. 104) that the *dmy n p3 Kn'n*, which was the Asiatic terminal of this chain of fortresses, was Gaza. The correctness of this view can be demonstrated in the following way. The expression *dmy n p3 Kn'n* surely means "capital of Canaan." But Gaza was actually the administrative capital of Canaan during at least two different periods in the Eighteenth Dynasty. In the Taanach correspondence, two

[1] Devéria, *Papyrus judiciaire de Turin* IV, 14: *P3-Rw-k3* (quoted from Burchardt, *Kanaanäische Fremdworte*).

[2] The equation *Ḫabiru* = *'Eber*, now generally accepted, has been vigorously and skilfully attacked recently by Dhorme RB XXXIII, 12—16, as well as in a special paper appearing in the current number of our *Journal*. The writer will discuss the question in another place.

letters are from Aman-ḫatpa,[1] or Amenophis,[2] the Egyptian governor in Palestine, to ʿAštar-yašur,[3] prince of Taanach.[4] In one he demands that the latter send him the tribute and prisoners the very next day (*ûmi maḫari*) to Megiddo, where he is at the time, evidently on a tax collecting tour. In the second letter he scolds the prince of Taanach for having been in Gaza shortly before and not having paid his respects to him (*ina âl Ḫazati ibašati u lâ-mi tellakuna ana maḫrîya*—the persons are handled in typical Canaanite Assyrian fashion). Gaza was thus his residence. At a later date, but still in the Eighteenth Dynasty we find (Amarna, no. 289) that the Egyptian garrison commanders get their troops from Gaza and send them back there. Egyptian officials like Addaya (caritative name of Yapa-Addi, one of the heads of the administration in Palestine) have their house there (line 33). In Amarna, no. 296, Gaza and Joppa appear as the two administrative centers of Yanḫamu's government; Yanḫamu was the Egyptian governor of Palestine in the Amarna period.[5] The fact that Gaza was the administrative capital of Palestine during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, shows that the neighboring Negeb must have been saturated with Egyptian influence. Nor does Southern Palestine ever appear to have staged a general revolt against the Pharaoh after its conquest by Amosis. Even in the great revolt under Tuthmosis III., engineered by the king of Kadesh, only Northern and Central Palestine, as far south as Yurṣa in the central part of the coastal plain, near Gezer,

[1] Hrozný, *Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'annek*, Vienna, 1905, pp. 36ff., read *A-ma-an-ḫa-šir*, but since this name cannot be explained and *ŠIR* is written exactly like *AT-PA*, we should naturally read *Aman-ḫatpa* = Egyptian *ʾImn-ḥtpw*, Amenophis.

[2] The identification of this Amenophis would be very interesting and important. It is perhaps not impossible that Amenophis II. served as viceroy of Palestine during the latter part of the reign of his father Tuthmosis III., though the impression of the writer is that the Taanach correspondence is to be dated in the sixteenth century, considerably earlier than the Amarna Tablets.

[3] This prince's name was read by Hrozný *Ištar-wašur*, while Ungnad preferred *Aširat-yašur*, despite the masculine form of the verb. In view of the fact that Canaanite ʿAštar may have been masculine, as in Moab and Arabia, as well as feminine, I prefer the reading *ʿAštar-yašûr*.

[4] He is not actually called prince of Taanach, but the fact is certain from the context, to say nothing of the place and circumstances of discovery.

[5] Here we have new evidence for the identity of Yarimuta and Philistia; cf. JEA VI, 92; JAOS XLII, 320f.; Langdon in JEA VII, 139, n. 2.

participated in the uprising. It was formerly thought that Sethos I was obliged to reconquer all of Palestine from Gaza north, but the new Beth-shan stela shows that the trouble took place in Northern Palestine and Transjordania alone, and Southern Palestine appears to have been relatively peaceful. It must be admitted that the Egyptian idea of a stable provincial government was not very exacting, as long as the taxes were not too irregularly received.

It was probably not long after the time of Sethos I that the Israelite invasion of Palestine took place,[1] consolidating and extending the Ḫabiru occupation, which had gradually developed during the centuries following the seventeenth. At about the same time, perhaps shortly afterwards, the southern clans, Calebites, Kenites, and Jerahmeelites, etc., moved northward and seized the fortified cities of the Negeb, especially Arad (Tell ʿArâd) and Hormah (probably Tell eš-Šeriʿah; see below).[2] Arad later belonged to Judah, but since Hormah was in the middle of the territory later called Simeonite, there can be little doubt that the origin of Simeon as a tribe dates from this time. It does not follow that the clan of Simeon was not in existence before; its previous origin is practically required by Gen. 34, which represents Simeon as participating in a raid on Shechem during the patriarchal age, perhaps the same raid as referred to in Amarna 289, 23f. That some of the tribes wandered about Palestine before settling down is quite certain; note the traditions regarding the movements of the Patriarchs and the migration of the Danites from the northern Shephelah to the source of the Jordan.[3] The name *Šimʿôn*, "Simeon," originally *Šamʿôn* (by Philippi's Law), occurs in the north as that of an ancient Galilaean

[1] Cf. JPOS I, 62ff. The debate with regard to the date of the Conquest is being carried on now with renewed vigor, and probably will continue to be for some time to come. Thanks to new material, the writer will reënter the discussion with more effective arguments in the near future. It is his present opinion that the correct date is probably about 1223-24 (cf. note above), *i. e.*, the third or fourth year of Meyneptaḥ, who reigned cir. 1225-1215 B. C.; Breasted's dates seem to be definitively confirmed as against Meyer by the new Assyrian chronological material and the Hittite-Egyptian-Babylonian synchronisms.

[2] The best discussion of the invasion of Southern Palestine by the Hebrews is given by Meyer, *Israeliten*, pp. 74ff.; cf. JPOS 1, 50, 68.

[3] For a full discussion of the wanderings of the tribes cf. Steuernagel, *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*, Berlin, 1901; Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, London, 1919.

town,[1] but we have not the slightest reason to assume a connection; personal and place-names are often enough duplicated in different parts of Palestine.

A landmark in the history of the Negeb is furnished by the Philistine occupation of the five cities of the Pentapolis, between 1180 and 1160 B. C., after a previous repulse.[2] While the Philistine occupation affected primarily only the coastal plain north of the Negeb, their sway was rapidly extended over the Shephelah and the western Negeb. Ziklag (probably Ḫirbet Zuḥeilîqah; see below) in northwestern Simeon became a dependency of Gath; Gerar, just outside the Simeonite border, was counted Philistine, and probably was tributary to Gaza. The Cretan Negeb, about Raphia, must surely have fallen under Philistine domination at the height of their power in the eleventh century B. C. It is true that Raphia was necessary to Egypt, whose chain of fortresses across the desert could no longer be defended without the possession of Raphia, but a supine government such as that described in the Report of Wen-Amôn (cir. 1125 B. C.) was not able to defend it. Moreover, if the Egyptians let Gaza, the capital of their Palestinian province, go without any apparent effort to defend it, they were not likely to care much about Raphia.

The next light that falls on the Negeb is in the reign of Solomon. 1 Kings 9 15f. states that Solomon rebuilt Gezer, which Pharaoh of Egypt had captured, burned, and given to Solomon as his daughter's dowry. This statement has always been difficult. How was it possible that David could have left such a Canaanite enclave in Israelite territory undisturbed? David conquered the remaining Canaanite towns, like Jerusalem and Beth-shan,[3] and extended Israelite sway

[1] Written erroneously שמרון in 𝔐, Jos. 19 15, by confusion with the familiar name of Samaria, but 𝔊 shows that we must read שמעון, the *Šamḫuna* of Amarna 225, 4, and the *Šm'n* of the Tuthmosis list. The site is now called Ḫirbet Seimûnieh, following the Aramaic pronunciation of Talmudic days. While the Graeco-Roman Simonias is situated below the old town, the latter is marked by a mound covered with Bronze Age pottery.

[2] Cf. JPOS I, 54–62.

[3] The destruction of the Egyptian fortress at Beth-shan, which was occupied during the first phase of the Iron Age (twelfth and eleventh centuries) took place before the second phase, according to the pottery finds. Afterwards, Beth-shan was abandoned until Greek times, aside from a wretched village of no consequence. The supposition that Beth-shan was destroyed by David, in revenge for the indignities received there by the body of Jonathan, is highly probable, and is adopted by Fisher.

over Ammon, Moab, and Edom, besides conquering Zobah and subjugating Damascus. Moreover, as is clear from the records of Solomon's reign, he also conquered the coastal plain north of Philistia, including Joppa and Dor, though content with imposing tribute on the Philistines, after dispossessing them of their territory in the Shephelah. But if the Egyptian king really captured Gezer, he must have been in control of Philistia also, since his road to Gezer would otherwise be through country under Jewish control. Of late the difficulty has generally been solved by denying the truth of the reports of David's conquests and the extent of Solomon's kingdom. Some interpreters even deny that Israel was autonomous at this time, holding that it was tributary to Egypt or Tyre, or both in succession. Yet the improbability of such violent modifications of the biblical narrative should be evident, in view of the surprising objectivity with which the priestly compilers looked at their country's past history, because of their primarily religious rather than patriotic motive in writing it. Were Israel really tributary under David and Solomon, these writers would not have denied it any more than they concealed the defeats of Rehoboam and Ahab, or the dependence of the later Jewish kings upon Assyria. We must, therefore, seek the explanation of our riddle in another direction.

Macalister's excavation at Gezer failed entirely to reveal any burned level from this stratum of the city, such as we should expect from the narrative in Kings. He explained its absence by supposing that the conflagration was only partial and local, though his excavations revealed no traces even of this character in the large area dug, which included most of the old city. It seems to me that this negative result demands another explanation of the biblical narrative. Our suggestion is that we should read in 1 Kings 9 15, 16 not גזר but גרר, "Gerar". The corruption is exceedingly slight, and satisfactorily explained as due to the fact that the building of Gezer is actually mentioned in the next verse (9 17), along with that of Lower Beth-horon, etc. As our text stands, the building of Gezer is mentioned twice, a repetition unparalleled elsewhere. Since part of the fortifications of Gezer uncovered by Macalister actually date from the early Jewish period, and are justly assigned to Solomon by him, there can be no doubt that Solomon did build Gezer, or rather fortify it. If the excavations at Tell Jemmeh reveal a burned

layer belonging to about 1000 B. C. or a little later, we shall have the indispensable archaeological confirmation of our theory. That it is correct we can hardly doubt, since the text must obviously be emended, and "Gerar" is by far the most natural, if not the only possible emendation. Historically it is eminently satisfactory. Gerar did not belong to Israel; there is not the slightest indication that David molested the Cretan Negeb, especially since he was on the best of relations with the Cretans ("Cherethim"), from whom he drew his most loyal mercenaries, who served as his own bodyguard.[1] On the other hand, Gerar was not itself a Cretan town, to judge from our rather scanty evidence (see above); it was early Semitized, to judge from the Canaanite name of its prince Abimelech, and may easily have been considered Canaanite, as in the passage under consideration in Kings.

So far as we know, this expedition on the part of Solomon's contemporary was the first invasion of Asia since Rameses III. It is safe to assume that the feeble Ramesids of the Twentieth Dynasty made no serious attempt to regain their power in Asia, and the high priests of Thebes, who were the real rulers of the land, apparently feared the mercenary army too much to employ it in undertakings which might redound too much to its credit, and strengthen the hands of the military leaders. When the priest of Amon finally became strong enough to mount the throne himself, founding the Twenty-first Dynasty, he found his sway limited to Upper Egypt, for the prince of Tanis, Smendes, declared his independence. In the next generation we find the Thebans nominally supreme, but there can be little doubt that the Tanite principality regained its independence, and ruled the Delta without much reference to the nominal line at Thebes. It seems impossible that a Pharaoh of the Twenty-first Dynasty can have demeaned himself to such an extent as to offer his daughter to an Asiatic parvenu prince like Solomon. As is well known, the Pharaohs of the New Empire, whose traditions the Theban priests continued, refused to give their daughters to foreign kings, though quite willing to receive foreign princesses into their own harems. The Pharaoh of our passage was probably,

[1] This fact is a confirmation of our view that the Cretan settlement in the Negeb was a military colony, originally under Egyptian auspices.

therefore, not Siamon (cir. 976—958) or Psusennes II (cir. 958—945), but a prince of the Tanite line, unknown to us by name. "So" or Sewe, the Egyptian *Sby*[1] and Assyrian Sib'e, was also only a Delta prince, though he doubtless claimed the title of Pharaoh and received it from foreigners. Like Sewe, our unknown Tanite evidently wished to strengthen his position abroad. In order to successfully attack Gerar, Raphia must have been already in his hands.

For over a century the Libyan mercenaries of Egypt had been strengthening their position, until their chief, Šošenk, whom the Hebrews called Šûšaq, corrupted to Shishak, seized the throne and founded the Twenty-second Dynasty in Bubastis. His settled policy in Asiatic affairs seems to have been the creation of dissension among the Palestinian [illegible]inces and the support of rebels against their authority. Yet w[illegible] Solomon was alive he seems to have feared to intervene with [illegible]ed force, because of the former's power and prestige. After the [illegible]se king's death, however, he attacked Rehoboam, in the latter's fifth year, cir. 927 B. C. The list of captured Palestinian cities adorned his temple walls in Thebes, but it is a sorry list beside that of Tuthmosis III.[2] Every captured hamlet seems to have been drawn on to swell the number. There has been much difference of opinion as to whether the names of Israelite towns, from Central Palestine, included in the list, are those of places actually captured, or are not rather copied from older lists. The present writer feels convinced of the correctness of the latter view, because the towns given in the Platin of Esdraelon, for example, tally too closely with the lists of Sethos I and Rameses II. Most important, however, in this connection is the fact that Yaḥam,[3] Beth-shan,[4] and Rehob,[5] all mentioned in the list, had been destroyed

[1] Cf. Möller, OLZ XXII, 145 ff.

[2] The most recent and best publication of the Shishak list is by Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, Washington, 1906 (vol. I), plates 75-85.

[3] Tell el-Asâwir, shown by Alt to be the site of Yaḥam, was not occupied after the end of the Late Bronze Age; see *Bulletin of the American School*, no. 11, p. 10.

[4] Cf. note 32 above.

[5] Tell eṣ-Ṣârem, the site of ancient Rehob, as pointed out first by Abel, is covered with pottery of the Late Bronze and beginning of the Early Iron. It evidently was destroyed at the same time that Beth-shan was, if not before, since the pottery does not require an occupation after the twelfth century B. C.

and abandoned before Shishak's time, as shown by the testimony of potsherds and excavations. We have, therefore, most cogent evidence against the correctness of these insertions, quite aside from the otherwise inexplicable fact that the chief towns of Samaria are not mentioned at all.[1] Most of the names in the list are, however, genuine, and they appear to belong exclusively to Judah, the Negeb, Edom (then part of Judah), and Philistia.

Among the names from the Negeb in the Shishak list are no. 66, *ʿyṣm* = *ʿEṣem* (Umm el-ʿAẓâm; see below); no. 69, *Ftš* = Greek Photis (H. Iṭeis); no. 70, *ʾrhrr, i. e.* El-hillel (cf. Yehallel-el connected with Ziph, 1 Chr. 4 16); no. 73 or 75, *Šbrt* = Greek Sobila (H. Zubâlah, Abel); no. 108 or 111, ʿArad (Tell ʿArâd); no. 109, *Rbt* = Leba'ôt(?); no. 112, *Yrḥm, i. e.*, Yeraḥḥem (cf. Yeraḥme'el); no. 125, *Šrḥm* = Šilḥîm (Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh); *Rpḥ* = Rapiḫu, Raphia. If our list were not so incomplete, we should probably have a nearly complete list of towns and castles of the Negeb; as it is the list is very defective, though none the less interesting. The number of places beginning with the element *ḥqr, i. e., ḥaql* or *ḥeqel*, "field of," is very interesting, and suggests that Shishak's scribes swelled the list by noting down names of meadows and pastures, in order to impress their master, who may not have accompanied his army at all. It does not seem probable to me, however, that the term *ḥql*, was actually used in the south of Judah instead of *śadeh*; it is much more likely that earlier Aramaean immigrants (Hebrews and others) into Egypt had introduced the word there. The possibility that the Kenites and Jerahmeelites still spoke Aramaic cannot, of course, be denied in the present state of our knowledge, or rather ignorance.[2]

Rehoboam, at all events, must have lost territory, as well as prestige by Shishak's invasion. Gerar, for instance, can hardly have remained in his possession. It is quite possible that Shishak established a buffer state here with a colony of Nubian mercenaries,

[1] This omission seems to prove that Shishak's invasion was directed against Judah alone, and that he remained on the old terms of friendship with Jeroboam; the supposed invasion of Northern Israel thus becomes even less plausible than before.

[2] That the Hebrews originally spoke Aramaic, as held by the majority of scholars, is becoming clearer all the time. thanks especially to the researches of Bauer and Leander; cf. also JPOS I, p. 80, n. 2.

who could be counted upon to remain more or less loyal to their Egyptian masters. The Nubians were not, it would appear, long in justifying their mission of making trouble for Judah; 2 Chr. 14 9—15 contains the garbled account of their invasion of Judah in the reign of Asa. Scholars formerly supposed that "Zerah the Ethiopian," *i. e., Zeraḥ hak-Kûšî*, the Cushite, was Osorkon I of Egypt. This idea has long been recognized as impossible, but since then the whole story has been rejected by the majority of scholars as apocryphal, a tendency which is quite as erroneous as slavish acceptance of the account in Chronicles.[1] If we quietly discard the number of a million men, assigned by the Chronicler to Zerah, but so strangely out of harmony with the not unreasonable number of three hundred chariots, and reduce it to a few thousand, and pass over the pious sentiments ascribed to Asa, the narrative becomes eminently simple and natural. The Nubian prefect, or prince of Gerar, Zerah, makes a raid into Jewish territory, and is met at Mareshah (now Tell Sandaḥanna, south of Beit Jibrîn), in the heart of the Shephelah, a little over thirty miles northeast of Gerar (Tell Jemmeh), by Asa and defeated. The Jews then pursue the beaten Nubians to Gerar and plunder the towns around it; since not a word is said about capture of Gerar itself, it evidently proved too strong for Asa. Among the spoil were camels, so we may infer that Zerah was supported by Bedawîn allies, in addition to his local Nubians.

The Nubian colony continued to occupy Gerar, as we learn from the interesting reference preserved in 1 Chr. 4 39f., which reads: And (the Simeonites) went to the entrance of Gerar,[2] as far as east of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks, and they found rich and good pasture, and the land was extensive and peaceful, for the former dwellers there were of Ham, and these written (above) by name came in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah and smote their

[1] There has been much unmerited criticism of the Chronicler, whose historical knowledge seems to have been greater than he is usually credited with. Of late I have noted many indications of his general trustworthiness, despite his fondness for pious preambles and huge numbers. Of course, he undoubtedly depended upon oral tradition in the main for his additions to the history of pre-exilic Israel and Judah. The present writer is of the opinion that the two books of Chronicles were written about 375 B. C. by Ezra himself (cf. JBL. XL, 104-124).

[2] 𝔐 offers גדר, Gedor, by a confusion with Gedor (Ḫirbet Jedûr) in Central Judah. 𝔊 has the correct reading, Γεραρα.

tents and their dwellings,[1] which were found there, and destroyed them unto this day, and dwelt in their place, for there was pasture for their flocks there. The people of Ham, or perhaps we should read with 𝔊 "children of Ham," are naturally the Cushites or Nubians who still occupied this district, though whether they were now Egyptian subjects or independent does not appear.

About the time of this episode we get a new glimpse of conditions in the western Negeb from the Assyrian sources. The Delta prince, Sewe, Assyrian Sib'e, in pursuance of his intrigues with the Palestinian states came into conflict with Sargon. In the year 720 he and Hanun of Gaza were defeated by Sargon; Hanun was taken prisoner, but Sewe made good his escape. Sargon followed up the victory by storming and burning Raphia, nine thousand of whose inhabitants he carried into captivity. Raphia was thus an Egyptian city at this time, so we may infer that Gerar was also. There can be little doubt, however, that Hanun was independent, and that the Egyptian frontier remained north of Raphia, where it had been so long, and is even today.

Esarhaddon (681—662 B. C.) found a new state established here, with its southern border at the *Naḫal Muṣri*, or the Wâdī el-ʿArîš, so that it presumably included Raphia and Gerar. He calls it *Ar-za-a-ša-pa, i. e. Arṣ-asap*, "Land of Asaph," and its king was then *A-su-ḫi-li, i. e.*, Yašûʿel,[2] who rebelled, doubtless at Egyptian instigation, and was carried prisoner to Nineveh, to share quarters at the city gate with dogs and swine. The name "land of Asaph" is extremely interesting, but, though the name "Asaph" is common enough in the Old Testament, as well as on early Jewish seals, it is hard to explain how the western Negeb came to receive such a name. One thinks of the Philistine giant Ṣaph, whose name may be a corruption of "Asaph" (2 Sam. 21 18). He was slain at Gob, according to 𝔐, but the text may be corrupt, though I would not care to propose the reading "Gerar"!

---

[1] Read מעוניהם for המעונים (Qerê המעונים = Greek Μιναίους), which is syntactically out of the question.

[2] The name *Yašûʿel* probably means "god saves"; *šwʿ* is a by-form of *wšʿ*-ישע, "to save," which may be traced elsewhere in the Semitic languages, as well as in Hebrew.

The western Negeb appears to have passed early under Hellenic influence, evidently because of the splendid opportunities for trading provided by Raphia, Gaza and Rhinocorura. There is a very interesting series of Hellenizing coins of the Persian period, probably from this section. But these problems fall outside the scope of this paper, which we may, accordingly, bring to a close.

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF SIMEON.

The writer has recently subjected the topography of Judah to a thorough study, in connection with a tour of Southern Palestine and minor trips in Judaea. The results of this investigation proved unexpectedly successful, and will be given in more elaborate form in the *Annual of the American School*. Meanwhile, it may be well to present more concisely the results in so far as they concern the tribe of Simeon. As is well-known, the topography of this tribe has been extremely obscure and a good deal of hard joint work will be necessary for its elucidation. The appended treatment is not definitive in any sense, but may advance our knowledge somewhat. A thorough study of the archaeological and toponymic remains of the Negeb is still badly needed, after all our researches of recent years. The most notable contributions of late years have been made by Musil, Woolley, and Abel; the latter has prepared a valuable paper entitled "Le sud palestinien d'après la carte de Madaba" (cf. above, pp. 107 ff.) the results of which we are able to utilize in this article, thanks to the author's courtesy in loaning us his paper.[1]

In some respects our situation with regard to the topography of Simeon is unusually favorable; we have no less than three different complete lists of Simeonite towns, besides two partial lists. This duplication gives us an invaluable check, besides suggesting identifications which would otherwise elude us entirely. Our lists are, in order of importance and relative age, the following: 1. Jos. 19 2—7, the catalogue of Simeonite towns, evidently dating from before the absorption of Simeon in Judah; 2. Jos. 15 26—32, 42, from the time

---

[1] Some of the most important new identifications of Abel may be mentioned: Seana = Ḫirbet Siḥân; Sobila = Ḫirbet Zubâlah; Bethagidea = Ḫirbet ej-Jindī; besides several which are either doubtful or open to objection.

of the "Greater Judah"; 3. 1 Chr. 4 28—33, a fourth century list, based upon earlier tradition; 4. Neh. 11 26 ff., a partial list of Simeonite towns reoccupied by the Jews in the fifth century B. C.; 5. 1 Sam. 30 27 ff., based on tradition going back to the tenth century, but the text of Samuel is notoriously corrupt. We shall reproduce the first list, with the most important variants of the versions, below, giving, however, not the original text of 𝔐, but the emended text, with our reasons for all changes.

The first list, Jos. 19 2—7, may be reconstructed as follows:

באר שבע ושמע[1] ומולדה,[2] וחצר־שועל[3] ובלהה[4] ועצם,[5] ואלתולד[6] ובתואל[7] וחרמה, וצקלג ובית מרכבות[8] וחצר־סוסים,[9] ובית לבאות[10] ושר(ל)ן[11] ()[12] ועין־רמון[13] ועתר ועשן.

---

[1] List 1 has שבע after preceding באר־שבע, while 𝔊 offers Σαμαα; 2 reads שמע = 𝔊 Σεμαα; 3, with the same order of names as 1, omits by haplography.

[2] In same order in 1, 2, 3, first in 4.

[3] Same order in 1 and 3; 2 has perhaps interchanged verses beginning with חצר־שועל and חצר־גדה; but cf. discussion below.

[4] 1. בלה, Βωλα; 2. בעלה, Βαλα, Βααλα; 3. בלהה, Αβελλα, Βαλαα. It is a question whether the variants of the Hebrew, upon which the Greek casts no light, can best be explained from original בלהה or בעלה; בלה is in any case secondary. I have chosen the *difficilior lectio*, since בעלה is a common place-name and בלהה is otherwise not found. That it is quite possible, however, is shown by the personal name בלהה (Jacob's concubine) and בלהן, name of an Edomite clan.

[5] This name appears unchanged in 1, 2, and 3; cf. however, below for possible original pronunciation *ʿAyaṣîm*.

[6] So 1 and 2; in 3 the initial consonants אל have been lost.

[7] 1. בתול, Βαθουλ (𝔊A); 2. כסיל, Βαιθηλ (𝔊B), Χασειρ (𝔊A); 3. בתואל, Βαθουλ (𝔊A); 5. בית־אל, Βαιθσουρ (𝔊B), Βαιθηλ (𝔊A). All these forms may be traced back to an original בתאל, probably to be vocalized *Betû'el* since this is here the *difficilior lectio* and an original "Bethel" could hardly have been so generally corrupted.

[8] So 1, 3; 2 has the variant מדמנה (see below).

[9] 1. חצר־סוסה; 2. סנסנה (variant); 3. חצר־סוסים.

[10] 1. בית־לבאות; 2. לבאות (בית also omitted by both recensions of 𝔊); 3. בית־בראי, 𝔊 hopelessly corrupt. The divergent form in Chronicles looks somewhat Aramaic and may be an actual variant.

[11] 1. שרוחן; 2. שלחים; 3. שערים; Eg. *Šr(l)ḥm* and *Šr(l)ḥn*. For pronunciation see note 10 above.

[12] List 1 gives here a summation of the names as thirteen, but our list, which must be correct, offers fourteen. Perhaps the scribe omitted שמע by accident, misled by its resemblance to באר־שבע.

[13] 1. Separates עין and רמון; 2. and 3. ditto; 4 unites them correctly into one name.

This list we may translate as follows: Be'er-šeba' and Šema' and Môladah, and Ḥeṣar-šû'al and Bilhah and 'Eṣem (or 'Ayaṣîm?[1]), and Eltôlad and Betû'el and Ḥormah, and Ṣiqlag and Bêt-markabôt and Ḥeṣar-sûsîm, and Bêt-leba'ôt and Šir(l)ḥôn,[2] (and) 'Ain-rimmôn and 'Eter and 'Ašan. The location of Beersheba is well known, though we must remember that the ancient town of the Old Testament was not located at the site of the Byzantine and Arabic town now called Bîr es-Seba', but at the mound variously called Tell es-Seba', Tell el-Īmšâš (Mešâš), or Tell Abū Maḥfûz, an hour up the wâdī es Seba' to the east. In two visits to this tell the writer has collected an abundance of Hellenistic ware from the top and southern slopes, as well as of Early Iron (ring-burnished, etc.) from the northern slopes and the foot of the mound. The mound is not very large, but this agrees perfectly with the Old Testament references. Shema is replaced in list no. 4 by Jeshua, which is undoubtedly Ḫirbet es-Sa'wī, northwest of Tell el-Milḥ and northeast of Beersheba, as long recognized.[3] Since there is a mound, Tell es-Sa'wī, above the *ḫirbeh*, and the town of Jeshua is not only never mentioned in earlier sources, but also has a specifically post-exilic Aramaic name,[4] we may identify Shema with Tell es-Sa'wī. That this identification is correct is indicated also by the sequence, since the next town, Moladah, is generally, and no doubt correctly identified with Roman Malatha, placed by Eusebius four miles from Arad, *i, e.,* at Ḫirbet Quṣeifeh (Iqṣeifeh); the frequent combination with Tell el-Milḥ is baseless and in my opinion out of the question. The order Beersheba, Shema, Moladah is thus geographically exact.

In this connection the question of the identification of Tell el-Milḥ forces itself upon our attention. The combination with Malatha

[1] Shishak list, no. 66, offers the spelling *'yṣm*, that is, probably 'Ayaṣîm (cf. Assyr. *ayaṣu*, perhaps "mouse").

[2] For vocalization cf. p. 134, note 6.

[3] Cf. PEF Memoirs, vol. III, pp. 409 f. *Yēšû'* (note that it has the same name as *Jesus*) is further to be identified, I would suggest, with the Ασωα of the Beersheba Edicts, which has remained unidentified; cf. Alt, *Die griechischen Inschriften der Palästina Tertia*, Berlin, 1921, p. 8 above.

[4] The form *Yēšû'* for Hebrew *Yôšû, Yehôšû'* is specifically post-exilic. It is well-known that under Aramaic influence there was a marked tendency for Heb. *ḥôlem* to be pronounced like *ṣērê*, especially where there was a dissimilatory or epenthetic (umlaut) impulse.

is precluded by the clear statement of the *Onomasticon*; it cannot be Mampsis because the Byzantine remains are too insignificant; Mampsis is almost certainly Qurnub, with Hartmann.[1] The probable identification is indicated by Neh. 11 26, where we have the order Jeshua, Moladah, Beth-phelet (בית-פלט), followed by Hazar-shual and Beersheba. We must remember that the order of towns within their groups in this passage of Nehemiah is remarkably exact; cf. v. 31: Geba, Michmas, Aija (= Ai), Bethel; v. 32: Anathoth, Nob, Ananiah (= Bethany), etc. We are thus practically forced to identify Beth-phelet with Tell el-Milḥ and Hazar-shual with Ḫirbet el-Mešâš, west of it; the identification of the latter with Mampsis is impossible, because Arab. *mešâš* is an appellative meaning simply "water-hole," and the Byzantine remains there are altogether too insignificant to admit of such a combination (see above). Archaeologically, the identifications are inexceptionable; both Tell el-Milḥ and Ḫirbet el-Mešâš are covered with Early Iron pottery, especially of the characteristic ring-burnished type.[2] The order Beth-phelet, Hazar-shual, Beersheba also occurs Jos. 15 27—28. An objection might possibly be raised because of the fact that Beth-phelet was a town of Judah, not of Simeon; Judah occupied the east of the Negeb,

[1] See ZDPV XXXVI, 110 f.; 196. In the writer's view this is the only possible location for Mampsis; the importance of the Byzantine ruins at Qurnub is generally known. Tamar-Thamara must surely have lain in the southern Ghôr, perhaps at the ruins of el-Qeryeh, not visited by Musil, but circumstantially described on the testimony of Arabs (*Edom*, vol. II, p. 210 f.), who stated that the ruins were extensive and full of broken columns. This el-Qeryeh must not be confused with the other el-Qeryeh of Musil nearly ten miles to the northeast, which we succeeded in identifying with Šeiḫ 'Îsā = Zoar-Zoara, at the northeastern edge of the depression south of the Dead Sea. Ezekiel places Tamar at the southern end of the Dead Sea, while the Mosaic of Madeba and Ptolemy both place Thamara due east of Mampsis, not south as they should if Tamar were really Qurnub. The very name "Palm" should indicate the location in the Ghôr. This question will be fully discussed later elsewhere, and we may content ourselves with these few indications for the present.

[2] Cf. Woolley and Lawrence, *The Wilderness of Zin* (PEF Annual, vol. III), pp. 49—51. Woolley had the strange idea that the ring-burnished ware belonged to the Bronze Age, especially to the Second Semitic (1800—1400 B. C.). As a result he found settlements of the Patriarchal Age everywhere, but virtually nothing from the period of the Divided Kingdom (!). All who know Palestinian pottery understand that ring burnishing is characteristic of the Early Iron Age, especially of its second phase (10th to 6th centuries B. C.).

leaving the West to Simeon. When we recall that Arad (Jos. 15 21)[1] and the towns around it, as well as Ararah (Jos. 15 22), modern Bîr ʿArʿarah, southwest of Tell el-Milḥ, belonged to Judah, the difficulty vanishes; Tell el-Milḥ is between Arad and Ararah. Nor is there any difficulty in locating Moladah at Quṣeifeh, which is west of a line joining Arad and Tell el-Milḥ. Since, therefore, our archeological and documentary indications coincide, the identifications just given may be regarded as very probable.

The second group of Simeonite towns is formed by Hazar-shual, Bilhah, and Ezem (it should perhaps be observed that the names of the towns are given ordinarily in the best A. V. form, unless a philological discussion is necessary, in which case scientific transliteration is employed). Hazar-shual has already been identified with Ḫirbet el-Mešâš, and Bilhah (or Baalah; see note above) is quite unknown. Ezem (ʿEṣem or possibly ʿAyaṣîm, as apparently on the Shishak list) has been identified with Ḫirbet Umm el-ʿAẓâm, southwest of ʿArʿarah (Musil, *Edom*, vol. II, p. 73, 246); the further identification with עצמון is probably erroneous, since the Targum identifies it with קיסם = el-Quṣeimeh (proposed by Trumbull, accepted by Abel). There is no geographical objection to the identification of Ezem with Umm el-ʿAẓâm; since the latter means simply "Mother of Bones," a typical Arabic designation, the combination seems to me so problematical that I have not ventured to adopt it. There are many sites, some of which may be ancient Jewish, in the country west of Beersheba, indicated on the maps of Musil and the British War Department, though the Survey left this region a blank, and Bilhah and Ezem may easily be located here, in full agreement with the sequence.

The third group is composed of Eltolad, Bethuel, and Hormah. Eltolad is obscure. Bethuel, however, is clearly to be identified with the Βηθελεα, Βεθελια, Βιτυλη, Betilium, of the Patristic Age (cf. the references to it collected by Musil, *Edom*, vol. II, pp. 244 f.), then identified with Bethulia (Theodosius). Musil has convincingly identified

[1] Jos. 15 21 in 𝔐 offers the reading עדר, but since Arad is otherwise not mentioned in this list, despite its importance, and Heb. *dalet* and *rêš* are interchangeable in form the emendation to ערד is obvious, and confirmed by 𝔊B: ΑΡΑΔ and ΑΡΑ = ΑΡΑ(Δ).

it with Šeiḫ Nūrân, which is actually twelve miles from Raphia, agreeing with what is stated by Theodosius. The obvious combination with Bethuel (or Bethul, Bethel) of Simeon has apparently not been made. The objection may be raised that Šeiḫ Nūrân is actually slightly to the southwest of Tell Jemmeh (Gerar), and therefore not likely to be Jewish. But since Šeiḫ Nūrân is ten miles from the sea, while Tell Jemmeh is only seven, and the Gentile settlements along the coast were all near the sea, this difficulty is not serious. In the absence of a thorough archaeological examination, we must also reckon with the possibility that Betilium was situated at Tell el-Fâriʿ, which is sufficiently to the east to be well inside Simeonite territory. The third town, Hormah, is probably to be identified with Tell eš-Šerîʿah, a fine mound in northern Simeon. Hormah was one of the Canaanite royal cities, originally called Zephath, if we may accept the biblical tradition. It was destroyed by the Israelites in one of their first raids on Southern Palestine (Num. 21 1—3; Jud. 1 17). It has been thought from the obscure context of the passage in Judges that Hormah lay near Arad, but a comparison of Jud. 1 16 with 1 17 will show the baselessness of this view, since the latter statements, which come from the oldest source, (J 1 Eissfeldt's L) are explicit; the seizure of Arad and Hormah were distinct episodes. From these references, then, it follows only that Hormah was a strongly fortified Canaanite city which lay in the extreme south of Palestine, in the territory assigned to Simeon (Jud. 1 17). In three lists (1, 2, 3) Hormah is mentioned just before Ziklag, in an order running apparently from south to north. Since Ziklag, if not Ḫirbet Zuḥeilîqah, as generally believed, with reason, must have been located in the northwestern part of Simeon, in territory easily accessible from Gath, this indicates a similar location for Hormah. In the western part of Simeon there are only two other mounds which could come into consideration, Tell el-Fâriʿ, which is too small (cf. Musil's description, *Edom*, vol. II, pp. 61—2), though near Bethuel (Šeiḫ Nūrân), and Tell Abū Ḥareirah, west of Tell eš-Šerîʿah, also too small. Archaeologically, there is no difficulty whatever, in the light of the writer's careful examination of the mound. During the War, a railway was built by the Turks from Beersheba to Ramleh, running around the foot of Tell eš-Šerîʿah. In order to build an embankment a large quantity of débris was removed from the

northwestern edge of the tell, doing little harm, but exposing the stratification for a considerable distance. Three strata are clearly distinguishable: (1) Late Bronze, with characteristic wish-bone handled bowls, metallic rimmed and similar types; (2) Early Iron, with all typical forms; (3) Hellenistic-Roman. The second period is the best illustrated by pottery, but the first period was probably even more important, to judge from the height of the mound. Nearer the heart of the mound earlier levels still may be found, carrying us back at least to the Middle Bronze Age. The archaeological evidence thus tallies fully with the literary record, and the identification with Hormah becomes probable.

There is one point which must, however, be very seriously considered. No less an authority than Père Abel has recently adopted the identification of Gerar with Tell eš-Šerîʿah, proposed originally by Guérin and endorsed by Clermont-Ganneau. With all respect for the weight of these three names, it seems impossible to accept their contention. Guérin's idea was first suggested to him by the name of the *welī* on the summit of the tell, given him as *Cheikh Abou Gherara*. But Guérin was wrong; the *welī* on Tell eš-Šerîʿah is called eš-Šeiḫ ʿAmmâr (secured independently by Père Abel and the writer), while Šeiḫ Abū Ḥarârah or Abū Ḥareirah (both pronunciations are heard) belongs some distance southwest of Tell eš-Šerîʿah. Abel's argument is derived from the disposition of names on the Mosaic of Madeba, and would be very telling if it were not for the irregularity of arrangement on the Mosaic, where Arad, for example, is placed south of Beersheba instead of northeast. Moreover, the present location of Gerara on the Mosaic is easily explained as due to the lack of room, preventing it from being placed nearer Gaza, where the field is entirely taken up with the names of small towns in the district of Gaza. Similar displacements may be observed in a large number of instances, especially in the district of Jerusalem, where the names are too thick. But aside from the Mosaic, the evidence seems to me strongly against the identification. In the first place, Tell eš-Šerîʿah is in the heart of Simeon, while Gerar lay unquestionably (cf. the collection of material above) to the west of Simeon, in territory which was not reckoned to Israel at all. Tell Jemmeh is in just the location which best fits the biblical references, and the name, *Umm ej-Jerrâr*, attached to a large Byzantine ruin

in the vicinity, is exactly equivalent to *Gerar-Gerara*.[1] Gen. 10 19 can only be explained as meaning that Gerar lay near the coast, south of Gaza, a localization that fits Tell Jemmeh, but never Tell eš-Šerîʿah. Archaeologically, Tell Jemmeh is eminently satisfactory. It is a very large mound, much larger than Tell eš-Šerîʿah, and containing remains of all periods from the Early Bronze to the Hellenistic, especially Late Bronze and Early Iron, which were clearly in evidence during Phythian-Adams' brief sounding of the mound. The suggestion has been made that Tell Jemmeh represents the Gemmaruris of Ptolemy, but since the latter is otherwise wholly unknown, the combination of it with so exceptionally large a mound as Tell Jemmeh seems in the highest degree precarious, entirely aside from the philological difficulty. On the other hand, Tell eš-Šerîʿah is archaeologically unsuited to be identified with Gerar, since there are apparently no Byzantine remains on the site or in the neighborhood, certainly none of sufficient extent and character to represent the important town of Gerara. We may, therefore, identify it with Hormah, in view of the evidence presented above.

With Ziklag, Beth-marcaboth, and Hazar-susim we apparently have a line of towns running in the reverse order, back south again. There is no serious objection against the identification of Ṣiqlag with Ḫirbet Zuḥeilîqah, since the name of the latter may easily be regarded as a popular etymology, with transposition, of the Hebrew *Ṣiqlag* (= **Ṣiglaq* = **Ṣiḥlaq*, by dissimilation; the latter then combined with the stem *ẓḥlq*, "to slip," with subsequent adaptation, giving a plural diminutive *Zuḥeilîqah*, "the place of the little slippery slopes," or the like). Beth-marcaboth has a very interesting name, meaning "House of Chariots"; the suggestion of fortification in the name can perhaps not be taken seriously, but a combination with Tell Abū Ḥareirah, though not susceptible of proof, is plausible enough, and suits the order of names perfectly. However, it must remain for the present only a suggestion. The next name, *Ḥeṣar-sûsîm* (or *Ḥeṣar-sûsah*), "Enclosure of Horses," reminds one so forcibly

[1] Eusebius places Gerara 25 Roman miles south of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrîn). Tell eš-Šerîʿah is about 20 Roman miles in a straight line from the latter, while Tell Jemmeh is some 32. Neither distance agrees with the statement of the *Onomasticon*, but we may safely suppose that Eusebius was estimating the distance, since there was no direct road connecting the two cities.

of the modern name *Hirbet Abū Sûsein,* belonging to a ruin southwest of Tell Abū Ḫareirah and southeast of Tell el-Fâriʿ, that one cannot resist the temptation to make the identification, which seems to be new.[1] The name *Abū Susein,* "Father of Two Worms," is obviously a popular etymology. If these identifications are right, we have a group of towns named in perfect geographical order from north to south.

The remaining five names may be considered together. The names so far discussed seem all to come from eastern, southeastern, southern, southwestern, western, and northern Simeon, leaving only northeastern and central Simeon to be considered. The enumeration has thus swept around the tribe in a clockwise direction. The correctness of this result is confirmed by the remaining names, two of which have previously been identified as actually being in northeastern and central Simeon, respectively: Ain-rimmon = Ḫirbet er-Rammāmein, south of Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh; and Ashan = Ḫirbet ʿAsan, north of Beersheba, identified by Musil (*Edom,* vol. II, pp. 66, 245). The first three names of our group are Beth-Lebaoth, Sharuhen-Shilhim, and Ain-rimmon; Bet-lebaoth cannot be identified, and Sharuhen I would locate at Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh, west of Ḍâhirîyeh. Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh is a fine large mound, larger than Tell eš-Šerîʿah; in fact it is the biggest mound within the certain bundary of Simeon. It is located definitely in the Negeb, however, below the commencement of the hill country proper at Râs en-Naqb, between the latter and ʿAnâb, which is nearly a thousand feet higher and correctly located in the hills by the compiler of the list in Jos. 15. The top of the tell is covered with fine pottery of the Early Iron Age; a member of our party picked up a royal jar handle, of the Hebron category, on the summit. The height of the mound makes it certain that it was occupied early in the Bronze Age, while the total absence of post-exilic pottery shows that it was never reoccupied after its destruction by the Babylonians, about 590 B. C. Since Sharuhen is twice mentioned in the lists with Ain-rimmon, its identification with Tell el-Ḫuweilfeh, the only mound in the vicinity, is practically forced upon us. The archaeological situation is entirely in accord with the

[1] The ruins of Ṣûsiyeh south of Yaṭṭah, often identified with Ḥeṣar-sûsîm, are in the mountains of Judah, a good way from the border of Simeon, and cannot come into consideration at all.

other indications; the mound was occupied during the Bronze Age, like Sharuhen, and continued, like the latter, to be inhabited throughout the pre-exilic period. The fact that it was then abandoned helps us to understand why there is so much uncertainty in the Old Testament regarding its name, which was evidently no longer in use after the Exile. The important rôle played by Sharuhen in the Hyksos period also shows that it must be represented by a large mound.—Between Ain-rimmon and Ashan appears the name of Ether, otherwise unknown, though there are several available ruins between Umm er-Rammāmein and ʿAsan.

The second list, that included in the enumeration of the towns of Judah, presents some interesting variants, as well as a slightly different order. Between Shemah and Moladah, on the one hand, and Hazar-shual on the other, it inserts Hazar Gaddah, Heshmon, and Beth-phelet, as noted above, where we identified Beth-phelet with Tell el-Milḥ. It may be observed further that Heshmon cannot be identified with the Asemona of the Mosaic of Madeba, as pointed out recently by Abel (see above). After Hazar-shual comes Beersheba, in regular geographical sequence. The reason why Beersheba is mentioned first in the Simeonite list is naturally that it was the most important town within the bounds of the tribe. The following ובזיותיה is naturally a mistake for ובנותיה, "and her daughters" (the villages of Beersheba), as shown by 𝔊. The ʿIyyîm inserted between Baalah (= Bilhah; see above) and Ezem is difficult, and may be an erroneous variant, since the first and last letters are shared by עצם (perhaps to be read עיצם with Shishak list) and עיטם (1 Chr. 4 31), while the latter at least, also shares a *yôd* with it. At all events, it cannot be identified. The name כסיל is probably a simple error, of an unusual type, for בתול = Bethul or Bethuel. In place of Beth-marcaboth and Hazar-susah appear real variants, which can hardly be considered mere corruptions, Madmannah and Sansannah. Since, however, these names resemble the others too closely for mere coincidence, I would suggest that the writer of Joshua 15 drew his Simeonite names from a written source, which was damaged at this point, so that the compiler was obliged to supply the names from the indications of the extant letters. In this case, the names will be genuine place-names from Southern Judah, but will probably not fit into the order of the context. Madmannah has often been combined, following

Eusebius and the Mosaic of Madeba, with the Greek Menois or Minois, identified by Musil and Abel with Ḫirbet Ma'în, four miles east of Sûq Mazên = Sycomazon south of Gaza. This identification of Eusebius was so obviously based on a fancied similarity of names that we need not consider it seriously. On the other hand, the identification of Madmannah with Umm Deimneh in the hills south of 'Anâb, which has long been proposed, is probably right; *Umm Deimneh* = *Mudeimneh*, a diminutive adaptation of a not uncommon type. At all events, Madmannah may just as well have been just outside the borders of Simeon, as probably was the case if our identification is correct, as inside; the writer of this list was interested in Judah, not in Simeon. Sansannah has not been identified at all. After Ain-rimmon we find ourselves plunged into a list of towns of Judah proper, but the missing Ether and Ashan duly turn up, after Libnah, in verse 42. Since the other towns in this context all belong to the central Shephelah, they are quite out of place. I would suggest that the displacement was due to the fact that Libnah was originally followed by Ether = Ḫirbet el-'Atr north of Beit Jibrîn, which would be exactly in place here, and that the eye of the scribe was confused by the second Ether, which led him to omit verses 33—42a, which he later inserted in the margin, omitting one Ether entirely in the process. Another exactly similar mistake has taken place in the same list, because of the two occurrences of the name Zanoah, one in the south, the other in the north.

The third list, that of the Chronicler, is another edition of the same old Simeonite list. After Beersheba, Shema has been dropped out by haplography. In general, however, the names appear here in the most accurate form, perhaps owing to the fact that this recension has not been copied so often as the others, since it was considerably later in date.

The fourth list, that of Nehemiah, gives us only towns occupied after the Exile, and is thus of considerable historical interest. Moladah is preceded by Jeshua (ישוע), which thus takes the place of Shema (see above). Between Ziklag and Ain-rimmon, moreover, a new town is mentioned—Mekônah (מכנה), otherwise unknown. By emending *kaf* to *rêš*, we would have a Merônah, which could be identified with Ḫirbet Marrân, north of Ḫirbet Umm er-Rammāmein, but this suggestion is rather precarious, though, since the list in

question is not exclusively Simeonite, the fact that Ḫirbet Marrân is just outside the border of the tribe and in Judah proper offers no difficulty.

The fifth list is also a general list of towns in Southern Palestine occupied by friends of David, and is in no sense complete. The textual state of the list is as bad as that of Samuel generally. The most interesting name is Ramoth-negeb, "Heights of the Negeb," which cannot be identified, despite various speculative suggestions. The other names are either quite unkown, and probably corrupt, or are easily recognizable mutilations of well-known names, and have thus been discussed above. For completeness we ought to mention also Baalath-beer ("Lady of the Well"), mentioned with Ramath-negeb (here singular), in Jos. 19 8, after the end of the enumeration of towns discussed above. Both places should probably be sought far to the south, in the region of Ḫalaṣah (Elusa) and Ruḥeibeh (Rehoboth), but an attempt at identification must wait for a better archaeological survey of this region. Several Jewish forts of the Early Iron Age (misdated, as usual, by the explorer) in this region have been described by Woolley, but it is unlikely that any of them can be identified with the towns in question.