

Some Problems in Ancient Palestinian Topography

GEORGE A. BARTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

SOME recent publications have considerably increased our knowledge of the geography of Palestine in the days of the Egyptian occupation and of the El-Amarna letters; they also present some points for further discussion.

Professor W. Max Müller, to whom Biblical scholars are so much indebted for placing the topographical information of the Egyptian inscriptions concerning Palestine within reach, and whose *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern* has been of such inestimable service, published as Heft I of the *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* for 1907 *Die Palästinaliste Thutmosis III.* Müller has also placed within the reach of one who reads Egyptian the other Palestinian lists in his *Egyptological Researches*, 1906. Breasted's four volumes of *Ancient Records, Egypt*, 1906, also present the scholar with much valuable material.

Meantime Knudtzon's new collation of the El-Amarna tablets in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, and his translation of them in the *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, together with Clauz's article, "Die Städte der El-Amarnabriefe und die Bibel," in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, vol. xxx, 1907, pp. 1-79, have opened a number of points to clearer vision and presented some new problems for discussion.

The object of the present paper is to state the points of topography which seem to the writer to be now definitely settled, and to make a few suggestions about some which are still uncertain.

The following places mentioned in these sources may be

regarded as definitely identified with Biblical sites. In most cases the modern name of the site is also known. Megiddo, Gath, Taanach, Shunem, Gaza, Damascus, Ashtaroth, Hazor, Accho, Joppa, Kadesh in Galilee, Edrei, Beth-Anath in Naphtali, Hammath (near Tiberias), Pella (the **לפד** of the Talmud), Lebonah, Addar in Judah, Socoh, Ashkelon, Tyre, Sidon, and Aijalon are mentioned in more than one source. Thothmes III mentions Abel in Dan, Beeroth, Tob in Gilead, Makkedah (Jos. 15 41), Laish, Chinnereth (Genesaret), Mashal (1 Chr. 6 74), Achshaph (Jos. 11 1, 12 20), Ibleam, Iyyon, Anaharath (Jos. 19 19), Ophra, Aphik, Joppa, Ono, Lydda, Migdol, Ephes-Dammim, Gerar, Rabbith (Jos. 19 20), Naamah (Jos. 15 41), Jokneam (Jos. 19 11), Geba, Zereda (1 K. 11 26), Raqqath, which the Jerusalem Talmud identifies with the site of Tiberias (Neubauer, *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 208).

The El-Amarna letters mention Hannathon in Zebulon (Jos. 19 14), Keilah (Jos. 15 44 and 1 Sam. 23 1 ff.), Cozeba (1 Chr. 4 22), Lachish, Manahath (1 Chr. 8 6), Moresheth, Zorah, Adamah (Jos. 19 36), Jerusalem, Aroer, Bostra, Jabesh, Kanatha, and Sela.

Ramses III mentions Beth-Dagon¹ in Palestine and Carchemish² on the Euphrates.

Sheshonq gives us Rehob, Hapharaim in Issachar (Jos. 19 19), Mahanaim, Gibeon, Beth-Horon, Beth-Anoth of Judah, Beth-tappuah (Jos. 15 53), Sharuhén, Ain Paran (cf. the wilderness of Paran, Gen. 21 21), the Field of Abram somewhere in southern Judah, and the river Jordan.

The following proposed identifications for one reason or another deserve a word of remark.

GINA of EA,³ 164 17. 21 is identified by Clauz with the Biblical Engannim (Jos. 19 21), the modern Jenin, which in Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 6. 1, is called **Γιναν**. This seems very probable, though not certain. Clauz also identifies this

¹ Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, pl. 68, l. 72: *B-ty-d-qw-n.*

² *Ibid.*, pl. 65, l. 29: *K-r-k-my-s.*

³ *I.e.* El-Amarna. The reference is to Winckler's *Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna*, in *KB*, vol. v.

Gina with *Q'inio* (No. 26 of Thothmes III's Palestinian list). Müller (*MVG*), on the other hand, identifies *Q'inio* with KANAH in Asher (Jos. 19 28). Either identification is philologically possible. Jenin suits better the conditions of the El-Amarna letters, but it is not certain whether Gina of EA. is the same as *Q'inio*, of Thothmes.

GINTI-KIRMIL of EA, 181 28, 185 5, Clauz identifies with GETTA on Mt. Carmel—a place mentioned by Pliny in his *Naturalis Historia*, v. 18 74, the exact location of which is not determined. This identification is possible, but as the other places mentioned in these letters are all further south,—Lakish, Keilah, Gaza, and Jerusalem,—it still seems to me that the identification with Carmel in Judah (modern Kirmel) is more probable. The one point in favor of Clauz's identification is the fact that Ginti-Kirmil is mentioned as the boundary of a district. This would beautifully suit a place on Mt. Carmel, but might equally apply to Carmel in Judah.

GATH-RIMMON. Clauz follows Knudtzon (*BA*, iv. 111), in reading Gitirimuni in EA, 164 45, and in identifying it with Gath-rimmon of Jos. 21 25, a city of Manasseh. If it really lay in the territory of Manasseh, however, the suggested identification with the modern *Rumman* is more than doubtful.

As to HARABU (EA, 164 44), which according to Knudtzon should also be read in 201, Clauz is in doubt whether to identify it with the Rehob of Jud. 1 31, or with the 'Apaβa of Eusebius, *Onomas.* (ed. Lagarde, 237), a village three Roman miles west of Scythopolis. The former of these alternatives involves a transposition of radicals, and is very improbable. The latter is more probable, though not certain, for Eusebius (*l.c.*) mentions an 'Apaβa also in the neighborhood of Dio-Cæsarea.

YARAMI (or Jarami). Knudtzon reads this with the determinative in EA, 219 10, *i.e.* the tablet found at Tell-el-Hesy. This city Clauz regards as the same as the Biblical Kirjath-Jearim, the first element, which means simply "city," being omitted. This identification seems to me very probable.

QANU (EA, 251) Clauz identifies with the Biblical Cana and the modern Kefr Kenna. Both identifications are uncertain. Scholars are by no means agreed that Kefr Kenna is Cana, and as no other topographical data are given by the tablet the town intended might as easily be Kanah in Asher, the modern Kaneh.

MAGDALI and MAGDALIM (EA, 159 23, 237' 26, and 281 14) Clauz places in the Jordan valley, regarding one of them as the Migdal-el of Jos. 19 33, the modern Mejdal. Semitic *Migdots*, or "towers," were, however, common. This renders the identification somewhat uncertain.

MAKAZ (1 K. 4 9) is by Clauz seen in the *Muhazi*, which according to Knudtzon should be read in EA, 205 23. The change of \dot{h} to \dot{k} , while phonetically not impossible,⁴ is doubtful.

Similarly RAQQATH, the forerunner of Tiberias, is tentatively seen by Clauz in Ruḥizi of EA, 139 33. 53. Two of the radicals, however, differ, which seems to me to make identification impossible.

ZEBOIM (1 Sam. 13 13, Neh. 11 34) Clauz finds in *Sabuma*, which Knudtzon reads in EA, 174 16 instead of Winckler's *Sapuna*. The identity is not, however, quite certain.

ŠAKMI, which Knudtzon reads in EA, 185 10 instead of Winckler's *la-a(?)mi*, Clauz takes, as Knudtzon had done, to refer to Shechem. If the reading is secure, this is undoubtedly right.

A certain Egyptian Sebek-khu, an officer under Sesostri III (Useratesen III) of the twelfth Egyptian dynasty, says that he was with Sesostri when he captured Škmm (possibly to be read *Škmkm*) in Retennu, or Syria-Palestine. See Breasted, *AR*, i. § 680. It is tempting to suppose, as Professor Müller once suggested in *OLZ*, that the Egyptian scribe was attempting to spell ŠKM, and that in the list from which he copied, the last radical was accidentally doubled. It is a serious, though perhaps not a fatal objection to this identification, that the meaningless doubling of an *m* at the end of a word is almost without parallel in

⁴ We should have supposed that \dot{h} was changed to \dot{k} , and then sharpened to \dot{k} .

Egyptian. Professor Breasted tells me he knows of but one other instance, and that is in the imperative of a verb. It seems to me possible, however, that the doubling may well have been an accident in copying a foreign name, and may be quite independent of Egyptian analogies. If this supposition is correct, we have a reference to Shechem in twelfth dynasty records some four hundred years earlier than the El-Amarna tablets. Indeed, this campaign of Sesostris is the first Egyptian campaign in Palestine of any length of which we know.

Σιμόνιας, a village in Galilee which Josephus mentions in his life (ch. 24), and which others had identified with the modern Semuniyeh,⁶ Clauz finds in the *Samhuna* of EA, 220. This I believe to be right, and I mention it here for the sake of calling attention to the fact that the same place seems to be mentioned by Thothmes III, as No. 35 of his list (*š'-m'-n'*). Müller had noted (*MVG*, p. 15) that *š'-m'-n'* is the same as *Samhuna*, but was unable to identify it with a Biblical or modern site.

BETH-SHEMESH. In EA, 183 is Abdikheba of Jerusalem says that the city of BETH-NINIB, a city belonging to the territory of Jerusalem, has gone over to the people of Keilah. It has been a great problem to know to what town reference was made. Clauz tentatively suggests that Beth-Shemesh (modern *Ain Shems*) was intended. The suggestion has much in its favor. The locality would admirably suit the circumstances, Beth-Shemesh being relatively near Keilah. The suggestion seems the more probable since Professor Clay has made a strong argument in favor of the view that NIN-IB was the usual Babylonian form of writing the name of the god of the West-land, *i.e.* Syria and Palestine (see *JAO*S, xxviii. 135-144). Since the Baals of this region were all closely associated with the sun, the scribe of Abdikheba may very well have employed it as an ideogram for the god Shemesh. The identification is not certain, but it is more attractive than any hitherto proposed.

In this connection it is of interest to recall the name

⁶ See the references in Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 215.

SAMSON (\check{S} -m'-š'-n'), which occurs as a place name in the list of Ramses II (Müller, *Researches*, Pl. 62, 22). The name is also found in the list of Ramses III. Müller (*Asien und Europa*, p. 166) had noted that it might be connected with the name of the Biblical hero Samson. One wonders whether it were not another name for Beth-Shemesh, or of some place in that region.

The 78th name in the list of Thothmes III is Y -š'-p'-r', which Meyer (*ZAW*, vi. p. 8) interpreted as Joseph-el — an interpretation accepted by many other scholars. Müller, who accepted this in 1893 (*Asien*, p. 162), followed Maspéro in 1899 (*OLZ*, 397) in correcting the Semitic equivalent to יְשׁוּב־אֵל — a reading which was accepted by Winckler (*Geschichte Israels*, ii. 68). Müller now identifies it (*MVG*, 23) with יִשׁוּב, a place mentioned in the Talmudic *Tosefta* in connection with Antipatris (modern *Ka'at Rās el-'Ain*), and which Neubauer (*Géographie*, p. 90) identifies with *Arsuf* on the coast north of *Jaffa*. This identification with *Arsuf* Müller rightly rejects. Neubauer had also identified it with a place called *Yūsāf* in the *Samaritan Chronicle*, ch. 47. The geography of that chapter is, however, too vague to afford any clue as to locality, though a situation in the maritime plain is probably indicated. As Winckler had noted, the name occurs in Babylonian as the name of a person in the form *Ya-su-ub-ili* (*CT*, iii. 23, 15). It seems that we have to give up the idea that the name of Joseph occurs in the list of Thothmes, unless, as is possible, the name Joseph is a corruption of *Yašub*, the labial *b* having been changed to the closely related *p*.

The name Y '-q'-bi-'r (No. 102 of Thothmes' list), which also occurs in the list of Ramses II as Y '-'q'-b-*rw* (Müller, *Researches*, Pl. 60, No. 9), was identified by Meyer (*op. cit.*) as Jacob-el. Müller (*Asien*, p. 164) held that this place must be sought in the west of central Palestine, — an opinion which he reaffirms in his latest publication (*MVG*, p. 27). Others, as Toy, *New World*, 1893, p. 131, had not attempted to locate it, apparently considering the topographical indications too vague. Šanda, on the other hand,

argued (*MVG*, vii. 1902, pp. 74-77) that the whole group of names in the list of Thothmes between Nos. 90 and 110 lay in the country east of the Jordan, and suggested that the name was to be connected with Penuel, — the scene of the narrative of Gen. 32, — a view adopted and amplified by Erbt (*Die Hebräer*, 1906, pp. 18-25).

Šanda's claim that twenty-one consecutive names (Nos. 90-110) belong to the country east of the Jordan seems to me untenable. Nos. 90, 92, and 97 of the list refer to places called *Abel*, as does No. 15. Three Biblical *Abels* are known, — Abel Beth Maacah, Abel Meholah, and Abel Shittim — of which Abel Shittim only lay east of the Jordan. Müller is, I believe, right in identifying No. 108 with the Gabatha of Eusebius — the modern *Jebata* in Galilee (see Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 215). He also rightly sees in No. 104 the *Rubuti* of the El-Amarna letters, identified by Clauz with Rabbah (Jos. 15 ω), which lay in the territory of Judah. In No. 109 Müller rightly finds Beeroth in Benjamin, while in No. 110, B'ty-š-'ir, we have, I think, the Biblical Bethshean, *n* being here changed to the kindred liquid, *r*. Paton (*Early History of Syria and Palestine*, p. 81) identifies it with Bethel. All these lie west of the Jordan.

There are nevertheless some trans-Jordanic towns among these names. No. 91 is Edrei. No. 95 is 'Ayun, southeast of the Sea of Galilee. No. 98 is probably Diban in Moab. Müller recognizes the possibility, if not the probability, of these identifications, and of the second of them he speaks confidently (*MVG*, pp. 25 ff.). It is quite possible, therefore, that Šanda is right in placing Jacobel at Penuel. Some slight confirmation of this view may be found in the list of Ramses, in which the next name after Jacobel is apparently incomplete, but the portion of which is clear is *K-r'-k'*, and which may have been *K-r'-k'-r*. This might be Karkor (קַרְקֹר) of Jud. 8 10, a trans-Jordanic town.

The VALE OF SHAVEH (שָׁוֵה), mentioned in Gen. 14 17, Müller has acutely perceived in the 'n-š'-w(-š) (שָׁוֵה שָׁוֵה) of Thothmes' list, No. 5.

Note should also be made of Müller's discovery of an

Egyptian parallel to Bezek, of which Adoni-bezek was king (Jud. 1 5 π.). It is the city *Kir-Bezek*, No. 73 in the list of Ramses III (see Müller, *Researches*, p. 49, and Pl. 68, No. 73).

Clauz identifies the city Rubuti (EA, 183 10) with RABBAH (Jos. 15 60). Although the site is unknown, the identification has much to commend it.