

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 21. Image of Sina | | |
| 22. Rohob | Roob (Onom)..... | Sheikh Reháb, C.R.C. |
| 23. Beithsheal ... | (x.) Betshean (Josh. xvii. 11) . | Beisan, Ch. |
| 24. Keriathaal ... | (xi.) Jezreel (Josh xix. 18) | Zerin, C.R.C. |
| 25. Fords of Jordan or Jelden..... | | W. Jalud, C.R.C. |
| 26. Mageddo | (xii.) Megiddo (Josh. xii. 21)* | Lejjún, Ch. |
| 27. Joppa | (xiii.) Joppa (Josh. xix. 46) ... | Yafa, Ch. |
| 28. Dwelling of Sestsou | | |
| 29. River | | Nahr Rubin, C.R.C. |
| 30. Atsion | | Tell Yasín, C.R.C. |
| 31. Ousormara ... | | Yasur, C.R.C. |
| 32. Sats . . aal... | | |
| 33. Aksakaba ... | ‘Ain | Kasaba, C.R.C. |
| 34. ‘Ainini | | |
| 35. Nekhai | | Lekiyeh, C.R.C. |
| 36. Rehobroth ... | (xiv.) Rehoboth (Gen. xxvi. 22) | Ruheibeh, Ch. |
| 37. Raphia | Raphia (Josephus, Ant. xiii. 15. 4) | Rafah, Ch. |
| 38. Gaza | (xv.) Gaza (Josh. xv. 47)* | Ghuzzeh, Ch. |

* The star represents Royal cities.

PALESTINE BEFORE JOSHUA, FROM THE RECORDS OF EGYPTIAN CONQUEST.

See map. A 140 I.

A VERY important contribution to our knowledge of the topography of Palestine was made last autumn in the publication of the Geographical Lists of the Temple at Karnak by Auguste Mariette Bey.

The lists in question occur on the walls of the pylones of the temple lately excavated, and record the victories of King Thothmes III., in the countries of Upper Ruten, of Kush, and of Pun. The geographical names are inscribed in hieroglyphics on small tablets attached to the necks of figures representing captives from the various towns. The value of the list in the case of the Upper Ruten district is also greatly increased by the fact that it is thrice repeated on different parts of the building; thus Mariette Bey has been able to give variations unknown to M. Rougé in treating only of one list in his "Etude sur divers monuments du Regne de Thouthmés III.," published in the "Revue Archéologique," November, 1861, p. 346.

Other points which render these monuments of the highest value are at once apparent. In the hieroglyphic we have the original text as inscribed at that remote period by the hand probably of a contemporary historian, and unchanged by errors of the copyist or translator. By the separation of each name on a tablet hung to the captive's neck, we have a division made between each which obviates all chance of error in the cutting of one name into two, or the running of two names into one, which often causes so much confusion in the written Hebrew lists of the

Old Testament. The great antiquity of the list (for Thothmes III., according to the ordinary chronology, lived and fought before the conquest of Palestine) secures us the Ancient Canaanite nomenclature for comparison with that of the book of Joshua, and the great number of names in the list, 118 in all, makes the monument of real service for comparison with the Biblical topography. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the Egyptians were not a Semitic people, that their language, it would seem, was softer and less guttural than that of Canaan, and that the names, as represented in hieroglyphics, may in some cases therefore be more or less distorted, as they are at the present day, by English transliterators. Finally it is most natural to suppose that the list refers only to the part of Palestine actually conquered by Thothmes III., which may be to a great extent defined from other monuments.

It is only to a part of the lists that our attention will be given, the conquests in Kush and Pun having no relation to Palestine, and forming only about a third of the total number of names.

The title inscribed above the first copy of the list of Upper Ruten is thus translated by Mariette Bey.

“List of the princes of Upper Ruten whom his Majesty has shut into the miserable town of Megiddo, and from whom his Majesty has led living captives to the stronghold of Suhen at Thebes in his first victorious expedition, in obedience to the order of his father Ammon, who has guided him in the right way.” This inscription, followed beneath by 115 geographical names in five lines, is to be found on the pylon numbered VI. by Mariette Bey.

The second copy is to be found on pylon No. VII., being a reproduction of the first with a few omissions. Over a group of captives about to be sacrificed is a short title, “Taken from the chiefs of Ruten, and of all the unknown peoples, and of all the lands of Fenekhu.” The captives bearing descriptive tablets are preceded by a goddess having the following inscription:—

“Brought to thee (O Ammon) from all the unknown peoples, and from all the lands of Fenekhu gathered under thy sandals.” The captives who follow are also surmounted by a title forming the third *descriptive* legend.

“All the unknown lands of the coasts of Sati, which his Majesty has brought as living captives.”

—On the walls of the same pylon is a third copy of the list, having four additional names, making 119 in all; the title is the same as that of the first copy on pylon VII., and the variations in the names are generally of little importance.

We have thus at the outset three distinct titles defining the position of these towns—viz., *Upper Ruten*, *Sati*, and *Fenekhu*. Further light may be obtained by the comparison of other Egyptian inscriptions.

The account of the great expedition of Thothmes III., in the 22nd year of his reign, including the victory of Megiddo and conquest of Upper Ruten, is to be found in another inscription at Karnak, on a wall,

near the cella erected by Philip II., or Aridæus. It is unfortunately fragmentary, but supplies much important topographical detail. It will be found translated by Dr. Birch in "Records of the Past," vol. ii. From this text it appears that Thothmes III. assembled his army "in the fortress of the land of Sharuana, commencing from Iuluta (or Iuruta)." He advanced against the rebel chiefs who were assembling at Megiddo, and arrived first at the fortress of Juhem. Various allies from Egypt and Naharaina (Mesopotamia—*Birch*), of the Khita (Chattai, or Northern Hittites), of the Kharu (Syrians), and Katu (also a Syrian tribe), accompanied the Egyptian army.

The advice of the generals appears to have been to advance by a road leading north by Jutta, or Geuta. This was, however, rejected by Thothmes, who preferred a route by "the land Aanaka" (probably the Anakim), leading by a difficult pass, and a fortress called Aaruna.

"I will go," he replies, "on this road of Aaruna if there is any going on it. Be ye on the roads of which ye speak."

The king proceeds accordingly to Aaruna, and a battle occurs in a valley in which the Egyptians are victorious, and immediately advance.

"It was the time of noon when his Majesty reached the south of Maketa, on the shores of the waters of Keneh."

On the following day the army is drawn out against Maketa, or Megiddo.

"The south horn . . . was at the coast of Keneh, the northern wing extending to the north-west of Maketa," joining perhaps the allies, who advanced apparently by the northern road. The conquest of Megiddo follows, and then a long enumeration of the spoils and captives taken.

Among the tributary tribes enumerated in this inscription, are the inhabitants of Katesh (Kadesh), the Kharu (Syrians), the Shasu (also mentioned in the "Travels of an Egyptian," and apparently a Bedouin tribe), those of Aranatu (possibly the Biblical Iron), of Kanana, a fortress, probably that mentioned in the list to be discussed, and identical with Kanah of Asher (Josh. xix. 28), and finally the Kefau and the Rutennu chiefs. It is evident, therefore, that our triplicate list containing the districts of Rutennu and Fenekhu, with the towns of Kanah, Megiddo, and Kadesh, refers to the conquests made in this expedition of the 22nd year of Thothmes III., and it is therefore important to notice all that is known of the districts of *Ruten*, *Sati*, and *Fenekhu*, and of the towns of *Iuluta*, *Geuta*, *Aaruna*, and *Keneh*, in order to obtain a general idea of the part of Palestine in which the names of the triplicate list are to be sought.

Ruten.—It is clearly shown by Mariette-Bey, that *Ruten*, or *Luten*, in the triplicate list where it forms the name of a town, is the Biblical *Lod*, now *Lyd*. Hence he argues the probability that the district of *Rutennu* was near this town.

In the so-called "Statistical Tablet of Thothmes III.," also found at Thebes, *Katesh* is mentioned as a city of *Rutennu*. In the account of the battle of Megiddo, three fortresses are noticed as in the same district

—namely, *Anaukasa*, *Yanuma*, and *Hurankalu*. The Kadesh conquered by Thothmes is undoubtedly Kadesh Naphtali. The other three names unfortunately do not approach near enough to any biblical names to admit of identification. *Yanuma* may, however, be the modern Yanin, which has strong claims to be considered identical with Han-Neiel, a boundary town of Asher (Josh. xix. 27).

Thus the Rutennu district includes apparently Upper Galilee, in which many of the towns taken by Thothmes lay, and it is possible that this is "Upper Ruten, or Luten," as distinguished from the country round Lydda, which may be supposed to be "Lower Ruten." It is perhaps worthy of remark that another *Lyd* or *Lod* exists in the plain of Esdraelon not far from Megiddo.

Sati.—Under this term Dr. Birch understands to be included "the eastern foreigners, or Arabians." The title occurs in the "Statistical Tablet of Thothmes III" in connection with Rutennu. In the account of the battle of Megiddo, Thothmes is mentioned as taking the title "Holder of the plains of Sati," but there is nothing to show the exact district to which this title referred.

Fenekhu.—There can be but little doubt that this name refers to the Phœnicians, and in the account of the battle of Megiddo the *Kefau* are also supposed to be Phœnician tributaries.

Iuluta.—This fortress is mentioned as in the land of Sharuana (no doubt the biblical Sharon), which seems to have been under Egyptian rule at the time of the Rutennu rebellion. Its position is not a matter of great importance. It may possibly be the *Ilatu* of the triplicate list which will be identified later on.

Geuta.—This fortress Dr. Birch proposes to identify with Gath, but the fact of its being on a road north of that leading through Aaruna (not far from Megiddo) would seem to place it farther north. It may very well be identified with the strong ruined site of *Jett*, on the borders of the plain of Sharon, some fourteen miles from Megiddo, and on the straight road to that town.

Juhem.—The position of this fortress is very doubtful; it would seem to have been near the division of the two roads to Megiddo, in which case it may possibly be the same as the biblical Jokmeam (1 Chron. vi. 68), a city of Ephraim given to the Levites. Jokmeam is not, however, at present identified.

Aaruna is identified by some authors with Aijalon, a city of Dan, but to this there is the objection that it would seem clear from the account of the "Battle of Megiddo" that Aaruna was within a day's journey of Maketa.

In the topographical list of Sheshonk (the Shishak of the Old Testament, see Bible Dictionary, p. 1290) a town called Aarana occurs immediately before the name of Bileam. Bileam was a town near En Gannim (now Jenin), and has been identified by the late Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake with the present ruin of *Bel'ameh*, a position fitting with the order in which the same name occurs in our triplicate list.

Thus Aarana, which is very probably the Aaruna of Thothmes, is to

be sought in the neighbourhood of Jenin, and may be best identified with the strong and important village of 'Arrabeh, the change of *a* into *b* being of frequent occurrence in the Arabic survivals of Canaanite names. There is another site called 'Arâneh which would fit for Aarâna, but not for Aarûna.

Arrabeh stands on high ground west of Dothan, and south of the plain called Merj Arrabeh; it is close to the road by which the Midianites descended to Egypt from Dothan, and the gorge in which the first struggle took place would be that up which the road comes into the plain, the head of Wady Mussîn.

Keneh.—This would answer to the Hebrew קננה, *Genneh*, and Arabic *Jenneh*, "a garden." It was situate south of Maketa, and a stream of water existed at it. It was also not far from Aaruna, nor from Maketa. For these reasons it may very well be identified with the biblical En Gannim, or "Fountain of Gardens."

The deductions from the above arguments are simple. The plain of Sharon did not revolt. The advance of the Egyptians was directed against Megiddo. No towns are mentioned, nor do any details occur in the account of the campaign which would lead us to suppose that the more difficult hill country of Samaria or Judea was attacked. There is no account of the crossing of Jordan, or anything to point to the conquest of the country east of that river. The names are therefore to be sought along the line of the Egyptian advance in Upper and Lower Galilee and Phœnicia, or in the more open country bordering these districts, as well as in the plains of Sati, by which we may understand some district to the north-east of Egypt, such as the biblical Negeb, or "south country," would represent.

Before proceeding to the detail of the names, a few remarks as to the changes to be expected may be noted:—

1. *Pe*, the Egyptian article, is often prefixed to the name of an important town, and must not be considered an integral part of the Semitic word.
2. *Mar* is sometimes prefixed to names of places of the second rank, although it is not certain that any instance occurs in these lists.
3. *Na* is constantly added by the Egyptian scribe. An instance of the occurrence of this with the article is found in the "Travels of an Egyptian," where Pe-Kana-na represents the biblical Kanah.
4. *L* and *R* are letters indistinguishable in the hieroglyphic character used.
5. *T*, equivalent to the Hebrew ט, often stands also for *D* (ד). This is because the Egyptian language has apparently no *D* sound.
6. The gutturals of the Semitic names are often confused. This is not distinctive of Egyptian transliteration. The confusion of the various gutturals was a constant reproach against the Galileans, and the substitution of one Arabic guttural for another in Hebrew, of which it is not the exact equivalent, is generally recognised in many accepted identifications.
7. *K* often stands for *G* and *J* in the Hebrew.

These seven points are generally known to students, and only inserted here for the sake of clearness.

The lists which are to be considered contain 119 names. Of these Mariette Bey proposes identifications for 83 in all, leaving 36 as unknown. He does not, however, fix the exact position of many of these, and he supposes the list to include places as far north as Beyrout, and east of Jordan in Moab and Ammon, as well as in the hill country of Judæa. He divides the names into six groups. (1) In the plain of Sharon. (2) In the Hauran, east of Galilee. (3) In Galilee, Phœnicia, and east of Jordan. (4) In Moab and Ammon. (5) In Benjamin and Judah. (6) In the plain of Sharon, and the Negeb or Beersheba country.

The order of these groups is not consecutive, nor is that of the towns in each group as identified by him. It may further be urged that the districts are not apparently for the most part those through which the Egyptians advanced before and after the battle of Megiddo. Considering also that so large a list of places could scarcely have been written down from memory, it would seem most natural to suppose, as I have before urged in the topographical list of the book of Joshua, that some sort of consecutive order is to be expected.

The following twenty-eight identifications, which seem well established by Mariette Bey or by M. Rougé, agree with the theory of a consecutive list, and occur within the districts to which it would seem proper to confine our search. They may, therefore, be taken as the framework into which other identifications are to be fitted.

	EGYPTIAN.	HEBREW.	
No. 1.	Katesu.	Kadesh Naphtali.	1
2.	Maketa.	Megiddo.	2
16.	Hamut.	Hammath.	3
21.	Sarana.	Lasharon.	4
23.	Batua.	Beten.	5
26.	Kaana.	Kanah.	6
27.	Arana.	Iron.	7
31.	Lauza.	Laish.	8
32.	Hazara.	Hazor.	9
34.	Keneratu.	Chinnereth.	10
39.	Mashala.	Misheal.	11
42.	Taanak.	Taanach.	12
43.	Iblaamu.	Ibleam.	13
52.	Anuheru.	Anahareth.	14
62.	Iapu.	Joppa.	15
64.	Luten.	Lod.	16
65.	Aana.	Ono.	17
66.	Apuken.	Aphek.	18
67.	Suka.	Shochoh.	19
69.	Khabatza.	Chezib.	20
80.	Kerara.	Gerar.	21
86.	Ani.	Ain (Rouge).	22
89.	Hiklaim.	Eglon.	23
94.	Makerput.	Beth Markaboth.	24
95.	Aina.	Anim.	25
96.	Keraman.	Carmel.	26
113.	An Kenamu.	En Gannim.	27
114.	Kebâu.	Gibeah.	28

Of these twenty-eight identifications, nineteen have been fixed by former travellers at existing towns, or ruins of towns. The identifications may be divided into two groups. (1) The northern group as far as No. 60, north of Joppa. (2) The south; the Shephelah and Negeb country. The number of names is sufficient to indicate very clearly the districts, and these may very probably be divided into (1) Ruten and Fenekhu on the north, (2) the plains of Sati in the south. It is in these districts answering to the Biblical, Galilee, Shephelah, and Negeb, that I propose to search for the remaining names.

II.

FIRST GROUP.

Upper Ruten and Fenekhu.

Section I.

The list commences with the names of the important towns forming the objective (to use a military term) of the campaign. Under the forms *Maketa* and *Ketesh* we recognise undoubtedly Megiddo and Kadesh Naphtali. No. 5 being apparently Beth Tappuah, and No. 16 Hammath, we have indications that the intervening names are to be sought to the south and east of Megiddo.

No. 3, *'Ai*.—This at once recalls the scriptural *Ai*, a royal city east of the Judæan watershed, with which Mariette Bey identifies it; but the names which follow lead us to search for the site along the course of the Egyptian march. It may possibly therefore be represented by the modern village of Kefr R'ai, an undoubtedly ancient site some four miles west of *'Arrabeh*, supposing the *r* to have become doubled so as to give an ordinary Arabic meaning to the word.

No. 4, *Kethu(na)*.—The *na* is supposed by Mariette Bey to be an addition, and he identifies this with the Philistine Gath; eight miles west of Kefr R'ai, we find, however, the important site called Jett, which I have noticed on a former page, as probably the Getha against which Thothmes advanced. This northern Gath is not impossibly the *Gitta* of early Christian topography, the birthplace of Simon Magus.

No. 5, *'Ansu*.—For this site no suggestion has been offered, but in the district in which the former towns may be supposed to lie is a village called *'Anza*, some four miles east of Kefr R'ai, undoubtedly an ancient site, and close to the line of the Egyptian advance.

No. 6, *Tebuh*.—This represents the Hebrew Tappuah, and accordingly Mariette Bey identifies it with Beth Tappuah in Judah. We have, however, later on another similar name, *Tapunu* (No. 98) in connection with other names undoubtedly near to the Beth Tappuah of Judah. It seems, therefore, more probable that the present town is the Beth Tappuah of Ephraim identified by Robinson with the present *'Atûf*, fifteen miles south of Jenin, being in a district open to and easily attainable by an army advancing towards the great plain.

No. 7, *Bamai*.—This name only occurs in the third copy of the list, and appears to be a variation or error in transcription of No. 8, which

is absent in the third copy. A town of this name is mentioned in the Talmud, but farther north.

No. 8, *Kamata*.—The direction in which this and the following names should be sought is apparently towards the east of the great plain. Here we find the village of *Kubatieh* in close proximity to Nos. 9 and 10. The change of *m* or *n* into *b* is very common, as in the case of Timnah, now *Tibneh*, &c.

No. 9, *Tuti(na)*.—The village of Umm el Tût, "Mother of the mulberry," is within a few miles of *Kubatieh*. It is apparently an ancient site. Indeed the same might be said of any existing village in Palestine, as the choice of a new site is probably almost without example.

No. 10, *Raba(na)*.—The village of *Raba* will be found close to the last, east of Jenin, near the southern border of the great plain.

No. 11, *Keret Sennau*.—The direction in which we may now be supposed to advance towards the Sea of Galilee suggests the identification of this place with *Beth-shan* in the Jordan valley. The *s* in the Egyptian more properly represents the Hebrew *Samech*, but an undoubted example of a similar confusion of these two sounds will be found given by Mariette Bey in No. 21.

No. 12, *M'arama* or *M'alma* lies probably in a part of the country not yet surveyed. The nearest site in name and position is '*Aulam*.'

No. 13, *Tamesku*.—Mariette Bey suggests Damascus, but this being some eighty miles away from Beisan, and sixty from Hammath, seems at too great a distance. The name may possibly be recovered later.

No. 14, *Atara*.—The proximity of Nos. 15 and 16 would lead us to identify this with the present *et Tireh*, a village overlooking the Jordan valley some ten miles north of Beisan.

No 15, *Abira*, close to the last, is the village of *El Bireh* overlooking the wady of the same name.

No. 16, *Hemut*, Mariette Bey himself identifies with Hammath of Naphtali, mentioned also, it will be remembered, in the "Travels of an Egyptian." The site of this town is known to have been near Tiberias. By Josephus it appears to be called Emmaus, and he mentions hot springs. This makes it probably the present *Hümmîm Tubarîyeh*, south of the town, where the hot-water baths exist still. A place called *Beth-mau* also existed four stadia from Tiberias on the road to Sepphoris, and therefore north of the town. This would seem, however, to be identical with the *Beth M'ain* of the Talmud, and consequently with the ruin of *Ibn Ma'an*, beside the main road to Sepphoris. These two sites must not be confused.

No. 17, *Akidu*, is possibly the present *Kadis*, about two miles south of the last, unless it be an error for *Rakkath*, the ancient name of Tiberias down even to the fourth century.

No. 18, *Shem'anau*, may very probably be the present *Seb'ana*, about five miles north of Tiberias.

No. 19, *Bartu*, probably the ruins of '*Ain el Bârîdeh*' ("the cold spring"), two miles from Tiberias. This is generally supposed to be the *Dalmanutha* of the New Testament.

No. 20, *Madna*.—It will appear from the succeeding names that this town is to be sought in the Ard el Hamma, the plateau above the western cliffs of the Sea of Galilee, the title of which has possibly a connection with that of Hammath.

In this district two towns existed, the first being the Domai of the Jewish itineraries, and the present *ed-Dameh*, possibly the Adami of Naphtali; the second, Adamah, which seems undoubtedly the present ruin of *Admah* discovered by the survey party. (Josh. xix. 33, 36.)

Madna, by a very ordinary introversion, may represent either of these towns, but the latter perhaps best. Mariette Bey suggests the royal city Madon (Josh. xii. 19); but there is much reason to suppose that we should read Maron in accordance with the two Septuagint MSS.; the confusion of *d* and *r* in Phœnician or in square Hebrew being of constant occurrence.

No. 21, *Sarâna*.—This site Mariette Bey proposes to identify with the royal Canaanite capital of Sharon, which appears in the English version as Lasharon (Josh. xii. 18). The position of Sharon has never been fixed as yet, but it occurs in the list of Royal cities between Aphek (probably the northern Aphek near Jezreel, 1 Sam. xxix. 1, which may very well be the present *Fukûa*), and Maron (in Upper Galilee). Jerome in the Onomasticon (S. V. Saron) informs us that "even to the present day the region between Mount Tabor and the Lake of Tiberias is called Sarona."

This indication points clearly to the identification of the Biblical Sharon with the present Sirin, a village on the borders of the Ard el Hamma; being situated immediately between the positions of Nos. 20 and 22, it fits well with the Sarana of the present lists.

22. *Tubi*.—This word, having the meaning of "good" in Hebrew, is the exact equivalent of the Arabic *Taiyibeh*. A village of this name exists five miles south of Sirin.

The list so far has been traced in a simple consecutive order, commencing with towns on the line of advance to Megiddo, and enumerating all the most easterly places taken. It is remarkable that these sites all lie in open country easily assailable. The stronger towns on Mount Gilboa, including Jezreel itself, are not noticed. An explanation of this may be taken from the book of Joshua, referring to the conquest of Galilee. "But as for the cities that stood still in their strength, Israel burned none of them" (Josh. xi. 13).

Section II.

The list would now appear to deal with the country conquered in advancing on Kadesh, as indicated by Mariette Bey's identification of Nos. 23, 26, 27 with towns of Asher and Naphtali, on the borders of Fenekhu or Phœnicia.

No. 23, *Batna*, Mariette Bey identifies with Beten a town of Asher. According to the "Onomasticon" this was called Beth-beten in the fourth century, and situate eight miles east of Ptolemais. This position fits well with the order in which Beten occurs in the lists. Vandeveld

suggests *El Baneh* as the site, but the distance from Acca is nearly twelve Roman miles. The true site has probably yet to be found in surveying this district.

No. 24, *Amashna*, and No. 25, *Masakh*, lie in country as yet unsurveyed, and no suggestion can well be hazarded as to their identification. They should, however, be sought between Tyre and Acca.

No. 26, *Kaana*, is no doubt Kanah of Asher, as identified by Mariette Bey. This is apparently the Pa Kanana of the "Travels of an Egyptian."

No. 27, *Arana*.—Probably the Iron of Naphtali, occurring in the Biblical lists between Migdel el (Mujeidel) and En Hazor (Hazzur). Vandevelde identifies it with the present Yarûn, but this position is not altogether satisfactory, either as relating to the Biblical Iron or to the Egyptian Arana, and it may probably be recovered farther north in the course of the survey.

No. 28, *'Astalatu*, and No. 29, *Anaurpaa*, are still to be found in Upper Galilee; the former might possibly be the 'Ailshitha of the Talmud, which seems possibly to be the present *'Atshi:h*, but this identification is very doubtful.

No. 39, *Makata*, is to be sought near Laish (No. 31). This would point to its identity with the Biblical town of Beth Maachah, or Abel Beth Maachah (2 Sam. xx. 19), named with Dan and Kedesh. It is supposed to have been recovered by Robinson in the present *Abil el Kumh*, three miles west of Dan. The confusion of the *Ain* and *Aleph* in these lists is of frequent occurrence, hence the fact that the guttural appears in the Hebrew is perhaps not important.

No. 31, *Lauza* or *Rauza*, Mariette Bey identifies with the Biblical Laish, afterwards called Dan. The site of Dan is the present Tell el Kadi. Some remains of the name Lauza may perhaps be found in the ruin of *Luweizeh*, some five miles farther north.

No. 31, *Hatzara*, seems probably to be one of the Galilean Hazors. In spite of the statement of Josephus that the Royal city of that name overlooked the waters of Meron, no trace of the name has there been discovered. The identification of No. 32 makes it probable that the town to be understood in this case is the *En Hazor* of Naphtali, now *Hazzûr*.

No. 32, *Pa Hurah*, a town evidently of importance from the article prefixed, and mentioned also in the list of Rameses II. For this Mariette Bey suggests no identification, but it may very well be identified with the Biblical Horem of Naphtali, which Vandevelde identifies with the modern *Hurah*, a position fitting with that required for Pa Hurah.

No. 32, *Kenneratu*, seems evidently to be the Chinnereth of Naphtali, a town which gave its name to the Sea of Galilee. It is mentioned with Adamah (Khirbet Admah according to my proposed identification), and may therefore be sought in the plateau of the 'Ard el Hamma. This suggests its identity with the present *Beit Jenn* in that district. The name is supposed to mean "garden of plenty," but is of great antiquity, and probably of Canaanite origin. In the later times it was changed to "Gennesar" and "Gennesaret," as noticed in the

Talmud, *Sar* being a Chaldean word, meaning "Lord." It must, however, be observed that there is another *Beit Jenn*, or "house of the garden," much nearer to Hûrah, a Druse village, seeming to fulfil both the requisites of the Egyptian record. The name appears as *Kentu* and *Katu* in the second and third copies on Pylone No. VII.

At this point a certain amount of difficulty occurs in the lists; the names of Nos. 36, 37, 38 bear a close resemblance to the biblical Adamah, Kishion, and Shunem, with which Mariette Bey identifies them; but in this case we retrace our steps over a district already noticed, and a great break will occur between No. 38 and 39. The consecutive order is better preserved by the identifications here proposed.

No. 35, *Semana*, from its position in the lists, is possibly the Selamis of Josephus, identified with the present ruin of *Sellâmeh*.

No. 36, *Atamm* or *Adammim*.—This may probably be the present *ed Damûn*, a considerable village, twelve miles west of the last, in the direction in which the list evidently proceeds.

No. 37, *Kasuna*, would in this case be identical with the ruined site called *Tell Keisan*, some two miles west of the last.

No. 38, *Shenama*, from its position should be sought north of the last, in the country not as yet surveyed. A place called *Abu Sinân* exists, however, according to Murray's map, in the required direction, about five miles north of No. 37.

No. 39, *Mashala*, Mariette Bey identifies with Misheal, a town of Asher, near to Achshaph. Its identification with an existing site has not yet been made in a satisfactory manner.

No. 40, *Aksep*, is identified by Mariette Bey with Achzib, but it approaches nearer to the name Achshaph, a town of Asher mentioned in the "Travels of an Egyptian." I have endeavoured to show that the context of the Biblical list makes the position of Achshaph most probably identical with that of the present *Yusif*, which is situate close to the probable position of No. 39, and only about four miles from No. 37.

The list brings us round, therefore, to the starting-point, No. 23, and enumerates in this second division the towns of Phœnicia and Upper Galilee.

It is evident that the towns in the plain of Esdraelon remain to be enumerated before proceeding to the south. In this direction, therefore, we must seek the names occurring between Nos. 40 and 60, guided by Mariette Bey's identifications of Nos. 42, 43, and 52. C. R. C.

(To be continued.)

Note.—For almost all the remaining seventy-nine places likely sites are found on the new Survey Sheets.