Cities in the Negeb, and Tribal Boundaries

Caleb Hauser

To cite this article: Caleb Hauser (1906) Cities in the Negeb, and Tribal Boundaries, Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 38:3, 213-221, DOI: [10.1179/peq.1906.38.3.213](https://doi.org/10.1179/peq.1906.38.3.213)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/peq.1906.38.3.213>

Published online: 20 Nov 2013.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 8

View related articles [↗](#)

(8) It is my opinion that a "corner" was always a re-entrant angle, and a "turning of the wall" was always a salient angle. Hence I conclude that there was a re-entrant angle at the western end of the "Broad Wall."

A tower at a salient angle was always spoken of as "a tower that standeth out," and a tower at a re-entrant angle was just as invariably a "tower at the corner," or a "corner tower."

(9) In David's day, at least, there must have been two main roads leading to the city from the east, one through the Asmonean gorge and one through the shallow valley now occupied by the street from St. Stephen's Gate.

(To be continued.)

CITIES IN THE NEGEB, AND TRIBAL BOUNDARIES.

By the REV. CALEB HAUSER, Crothersville, Ind., U.S.A.

COMPARATIVELY few of the Biblical sites in the Negeb have been identified, and some of the proposed identifications are, perhaps, untenable. Rehoboth, Beer-sheba, Sheba, Rimmon, Arad, and Aroer are certainly correctly identified. Very probably Kerieth Hezron, Sharuhēn, Jeshua, and Beer-lahai-roi are also correctly located. As to Moladah, Hormah and Kadesh-Barnea authorities differ; although my conviction is, that they have been correctly identified with Khūrbet el-Milh, S'baita and 'Ain Kadis. As the arguments on which these identifications rest are well known, I shall not re-state them here. One argument only, that derived from the order of enumeration, the enumeration of these places among others of the Negeb (Josh. xv, 21-32; Josh. xix, 1-8; I Chron. iv, 28-33) ought to be advanced, and that with a new force. If we can identify Eltolad and Chesil near S'baita, and on a line leading to that site; and if we can furthermore identify Ziklag, Marcaboth and Lebaoth in some other direction from S'baita—all in roughly consecutive order,—then the identification of Hormah (named in the lists between Chesil and Ziklag) with S'baita is verified.

We shall attempt to identify first of all the cities of Simeon, Ziklag, Chesil, and others near them; but before addressing ourselves to this task, we shall premise a few preliminary remarks on the Gezrites, one of three desert tribes, against which David, while at Ziklag, waged a war of extermination.

I. *The Gezrites* were a tribe distinct from the Geshurites. David waged war against *three* tribes; else he would not have named three others in their stead, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10. The Gezrites probably dwelt in the region of *Wâdy el-Ghaidherah*, in the Badiet et-Tih. This accords well with the fact that the Amalekites of El Paran and the Geshurites of the Desert of Shur are named with them as subjected to David's invasion. We may further ask: Was not *Rasa*, or *Gerasa*, a station on the old Roman Road from Jerusalem to Elath, situated just here? The name Gerasa may certainly represent the old Semitic one, and the location seems to be suitable. *Rasa* was 32 Roman miles from Ailah, or Elath: Robinson reached *Wâdy el-Ghaidherah* on the second day after his departure from 'Akabah; 15 hours were spent in travelling the distance; which accordingly would seem to be about 38 Roman miles. But evidently Robinson in ascending from the 'Arabah and crossing the hilly country above, did not travel at the regular rate, and furthermore he seems to have had the Roman Road towards the left, and this perhaps reached *Wâdy el-Ghaidherah* at a place some miles nearer 'Akabah. Here, then, in *Wâdy el-Ghaidherah* we may find the site of *Rasa*.

II. *Ziklag*.—The Greek has *σεκελάκ* (B), *σικελάγ* (A), *σεκελάγ* (L). This seems to be Ptolemy's *Καλγυῖα*.

(1) This name actually preserves three of the radicals of the original name—and where shall we find a name more closely resembling Ziklag? The loss of the *σ* admits of an explanation.

(2) Ptolemy is enumerating cities on or near the Roman Road from Jerusalem to Elath: Maliatha, Calguia, Lysa, Gypsaria, Gerasa. Calguia, between Maliatha and Lysa, was apparently situated in the territory once belonging to Simeon.

(3) The position of Calguia is indicated. One important correction is necessary, however. The longitude of Calguia should be $65\frac{1}{3}^{\circ}$ instead of $66\frac{1}{3}^{\circ}$. Comparing longitudes (Maliatha $65\frac{3}{4}^{\circ}$, Lysa $65\frac{5}{8}^{\circ}$, Gypsaria $65\frac{2}{8}^{\circ}$, Calguia $65\frac{1}{3}^{\circ}$), we ascertain that the last-named city was west of the Roman Road by a number of miles. Comparing latitudes we find that Gypsaria was $\frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$ north of Gerasa,

Lysa $\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ north of Gypsaria, Calguia $\frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$ (?) north of Lysa. This is inaccurate, but Eboda is on the same degree of latitude as Calguia, Elusa is $\frac{1}{3}^{\circ}$ north of it. The site indicated is *el-Aujeh*. The order of enumeration in the lists (Josh. xv, 21-32, etc.) requires such a position near Hormah, or Zephath; which, therefore, is correctly identified with S'baita, near el-Aujeh. From Achish, King of Gath, David, on request, received Ziklag, "the hold to the wilderness," a frontier fortress. Here he was sovereign of all the country round about. At Ziklag, perhaps only at a site like el-Aujeh, in a commanding position far away from Gath, it was possible for David to guard all approach from the south to Gath, and to prevent tidings of the massacre of Amalekites, Gezrites and Geshurites reaching King Achish. Thus David could deceive the credulous king, who believed that David had, as he declared, invaded the Negeb of Judah and his allies, the Jerahmeelites and Kenites; whereas the campaign had really been directed against three other tribes farther to the south-west, tribes perhaps friendly to Achish. The narrative 1 Sam. xxix, 11 *sqq.* also requires a far southern site for Ziklag. Probably the dissatisfaction of the Philistine chiefs, which resulted in the dismissal of David and his men, broke out before the invading armies reached Aphek; perhaps before they had left Philistine territory. But even if David and his men had accompanied the Philistines all the way to Aphek, the return to Ziklag in three days would not be an impossibility. The distance is 100-105 geographical miles; by way of Beth-Horon, perhaps a little less. An early start (which is especially recorded) brought David, early on the second day, near enough to the Negeb for news of the Amalekite raid to reach him. Forebodings, or rumours, of the fate of Ziklag—and forced marches—until the evening of the third day would have brought the little band of hardy outlaws to a site far south of any other that has yet been proposed for Ziklag. The distance travelled in three days must have been very great, since 200 of David's men were so fatigued that they were unable to cross the Brook Besor in pursuit of the raiders.

The present writer once walked a similar distance, 130 geographical miles, in $3\frac{1}{2}$ days; on another occasion, in 18 hours (two spent in resting) about 60 statute miles.

Among the cities, to which David sent of the Amalekite spoils, mention is made of Hormah and of Ramath of the South, both of them near el-Aujeh. An examination of el-Aujeh would be very

desirable. Perhaps vestiges of the fortifications of Philistine times remain. The ruins of the fort which Palmer mentions (*Desert of the Exodus*, pp. 368 *sqq.*) are of later date, being of the same workmanship as the church which he examined; but substructions of older workmanship may remain.

III. *Marcaboth*.—Cheyne (*Ency. Bib.*, col. 2937) regards מַרְכָּבוֹת as a corrupt expansion of מַרְחָבוֹת, suggested by the following name, *i.e.* Hazar-Susah. The order of enumeration indeed seems to require the location of Marcaboth in this region, near Ruḥibeh. And unless we may suppose that Rehoboth remained uninterruptedly in the possession of the Philistines, we could not account for its non-appearance in the lists of Simeon's cities. But there is an alternate suggestion—whatever its value—which I venture to make only with great hesitation: Can Merkeb, between 'Ar'arah and the Dead Sea represent Beth Marcaboth?

IV. *Lebaoth*.—The list of the Temple of Karnak has Lebau, which occurs there after Gerara (Kh. Umm Jerrar) and Harar (Kh. Abu Jerrah?). *Bawaty*, south-west of these and near Tel Refah, is therefore a possible site. If we supply the article and read el-Bawaty, all the radicals of the name Lebaoth appear to be preserved. Compare Lachish = el-Hesy, a complete parallel and an accepted instance.

V. *Ether*, named between Libnah and Ashan, as a city of Judah (Josh. xv, 42) and assigned to Simeon (Josh. xix, 7) was one of the cities to which David sent of the Amalekite spoils. (Athach עֲתָךְ 1 Sam. xxx, 30 is a corrupt form of עֵתֶךָ.) As the cities of the group to which Ether belonged, were all situated on or near the edge of the Judæan mountains, we may safely assume that Ether was situated near their southern edge, where Simeon's boundary passed. Eusebius, correctly assigning this Ether (Ἐθέρ) to Simeon, locates it in the interior of the Daroma and by Malatha: ἐν τῇ ἐσωτέρῳ Δαρωμὰ παρακειμένη Μαλαάθοις. This cannot be the Ἐθέρ assigned to Judah, Jattir, which was 20 miles from Eleutheropolis ἐν τῇ ἔσω Δαρωμὰ πλησίον Μαλαθῶν. Jerome, however, identifies the two. At the foot of the mountains of Judah, very near Khūrbet el-Milh, are the ruins called Khūrbet Hora. Here perhaps, Ether once stood.

VI. *Chesil*.—The reading in Josh. xv, 30 of B (ΒΑΙΘΗΛ = בתיל) A (XACEIP = כסיר) and L (CEIEA = סיל?) implies כסיל. In Josh. xix, 4 Bethul (בתול) is evidently best supported.

Likewise in 1 Chron. iv, 30 Bethul is, I think, better supported than Bethuel. ΒΑΘΟΥΝ (B), ΒΑΘΟΥΛ (A), ΒΑΘΟΥΛΑ (L). Now בתול, like בתיל, implies כסיל. The change from Chesil to the familiar Bethel, and then to Bethul, is more probable than the reverse process. Bethel is uniformly rendered Βαιθηλ; variants could not well arise. Having identified Ziklag with el-Aujeh, we are enabled to confirm Rowland's identification of Chesil with *Khalasah*, some distance north of S'baita. The transposition of the radicals of the name probably occurred in Greek or Roman times. Chesil became Elusa.

VII. *Tolad*.—Perhaps we may identify this with 'Aslûj, less than 9 miles (in a straight line) from Khalasah. The close affinity of *t* and *s* (Greek τ and σ, Hebrew ת and ש) is well known. Thus the Hebrew ת appears as س in the Arabic 'Aslûj. Perhaps we can also account for the change of ד (dh) to ج (j). Sometimes, though rarely, ד is represented by ز (z). This, I presume, could be changed to ج; for the change from Hebrew ז to Arabic ج occurs. El-'Aslûj cannot represent Ziklag (see P.E.F. Maps); but very probably it is the site of Tolad, or Eltolad.

VIII. *Miscellaneous*.—The order of enumeration in Josh. xix, 1-7 and 1 Chron. iv, 29, 32, shows that Beer-sheba is regarded as Simeon's metropolis. Here the enumeration begins, and hence it proceeds in a roughly drawn circle through all parts of Simeon's territory. After Beer-sheba we have Sheba and Moladah, the latter at Khûrbet el-Milh. Between Moladah and Eltolad three names occur: Hazar-Shual, Balah, and Azem. These were probably situated in the region of Kasr es-Sirr and Kubbet el-Baul. Eltolad, Chesil, Hormah, and Ziklag follow in close succession. Finally, we have Lebaath (Bawaty), Sharuhén (Tell esh-Sheri'ah), Rimmon (Kh. Umm er-Rummâmîn), and Ether (Khûrbet Hôra).

IX. *Baalath-Beer*.—Having ascertained that Hormah and Ziklag were in the extreme southern part of Simeon's territory, we readily recognize in *el-Birein* the Baalath-Beer, Ramoth of the Negeb, on the southern boundary of that tribe.

X. *Simeon's Boundary*, it seems, passed southward from Tell 'Arâd along the water-shed, and then between Abdeh and S'baita over to el-Birein, and thence on a natural course to the sea.

XI. *Bealoth*.—This is not, as some suppose, Baalath-Beer, but (as the list in Josh. xv, 21-32 shows) was situated with other cities

grouped with it, near Kerieth-Hezron and east of Moladah. Bealoth is represented by the el-Beyudh of older maps and the Khūrbet Beiyūd of the P.E.F. Map, near Khūrbet Kureitein.

XII. *Hazor-Hadattah* (New Hazor) may perhaps be identified with ez-Zuweirah (et-Tahta) near the Dead Sea, where there are some cairns. The situation is satisfactory, and the Hebrew name may, perhaps, be recognized in the modern Arabic one. By common processes Chazor received vocal assonance (compare Bene Berak = Ibn Ibrāk) and had its first radical (ח) assimilated to the following one (compare Achzib = ez-Zib) and also received the diminutive form Zuweirah (compare Socho = Shuweikeh). Chadattah became et-Tahta (compare Hachilah = el-Kôlah).

XIII. *Shema*.—The reading σαμ(a)a is best attested; but B has σαλμαα. If the latter be correct, the required site is *Rujm Selâmeh*, near Khūrbet el-Milh, or Moladah, which follows in the list.

XIV. *Hazar-Gaddah*.—Clericus supposed this to be Adadah, and very probably the ruins of Hazar-Gaddah have been taken for those of Adadah, which city could not have been as far north as el-Adadah. The Hebrew ג often becomes ג, as in 'Amriyeh, Gomorrah. In the list Hazar-Gaddah occurs after Shema and Moladah, and el-Adadah is near Rujm Selâmeh and Khūrbet el-Milh. As the name Hazor seems to survive in Ras ez-Zuweirah, hard by, on the top of which are some cairns, this might possibly be the earliest site of Hazar-Gaddah. Jerome confirms our identification when he states that the place was situated in the extreme eastern parts of the Daroma, overhanging the Dead Sea: *in extremis finibus Daromae contra orientem imminens mari mortuo*.

XV. *Heshmon*.—On the edge of the 'Arabah there is a spring 'Ain el-Husab, and near it are some ruins in a suitable position, relatively. Here, perhaps, is also Hashmonah, one of the stations in the wilderness.

Now taking into consideration that this list also (Josh. xv, 21–32) requires the location of Hazar-Shual, Baalah and the ruins of Azem in the region immediately south of Moladah, and also taking into consideration that all the cities so far identified were north of a line drawn from 'Ain el-Husab to el-Birein, it becomes apparent that those first enumerated in the list (verses 21 to 23) were really nearest Edom, and the desert.

XVI. *Kabzeel*, the first named in the list, may be identified with *Kul'at Umm Kuseir*, of all sites west of the 'Arabah the

nearest to Petra. The names Kabzeel and Kuseir correspond sufficiently.

XVII. *Jagur*.—Jebel Hadîreh, near Abdeh, cannot be the site of Hezron, named after Kadesh, as a place on the southern boundary of Judah; probably, however, it represents the ἀσῶρ, or Hazor, which B substitutes for Jagur. But is B correct in substituting? In Eli Smith's Tables (appended to the first edition of Robinson) el-Jūghala occurs as the name of a ruined place, evidently between Kul'at Umm Kuseir and Abdeh, and along the Roman Road.

XVIII. *Kinah*.—In Eli Smith's Tables, el-Kuleh occurs next to el-Jūghala. This may be Kinah.

XIX. *Dimonah*.—If B, which has ρέγμα, be correct, the required site would be, it seems to me, Er-Rakhamah. Palmer, however, was inclined to identify the region in which the ruins and the wâdy of this name are found, with Jerahmeel. Perhaps Regmah was the chief city of the Jerahmeelites.

XX. *Adadah*.—Wellhausen and Dillmann consider עֲרַעְרָה a corrupt reading of עֲרַעְרָה 'Ar'ârah, or Aroer. Indeed B's ἀρουήλ seems to imply ערעל (compare ערער, Aroer); but probably this reading owes its origin to the same conjecture that Wellhausen and Dillmann have recently put forth. Indeed, our contention receives support from the omission by B of the final ה, which was ignored—omitted because Aroer was, at the time, not known as 'Ar'ârah. Assuming that Adadah is the correct reading, we venture to identify Adadah with the Eboda of later times, which was situated at Abdeh. Adadah, at Abdeh, is also in a suitable position with regard to

XXI. *Kadesh* (B, καῆης) Kadesh-Barnea, at 'Ain Kadîs.

XXII. *Hazor-Ithnan*.—B, ἀσοριωναιν instead of ἀσοριθναν (compare *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2295). As Hazor-Ithnan follows Kadesh in the list of Judahite cities in the Negeb, and as *Hezron* was a place on the southern boundary next to Kadesh, the identity of both (Hazor-Ithnan and Hezron) is more than probable, and these notices assign the city a place between south and west of Kadesh-Barnea. But is there any Hazor in a suitable position? I am of the opinion that Hazor-Ithnan was the predecessor of Lysa at Kharabat Lussân. In a manuscript (dated A.D. 534) in the library of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem (*Desert of the Exodus*, p. 552, compare p. 423) Lysa,

appertaining to the arch-episcopate, of Gaza, is also called 'Ασόν, which seems to be a corruption of 'Ασώρ. Passing down by way of Kharabat Lussân the boundary would thus follow a natural course.

XXIII. *Southern Boundary* (in part).—As we have identified Kabzeel with Kul'at Umm Kuseir, we agree with Palmer in identifying the Desert of Zin with the eastern part of the Badiet et-Tih. Hence we also assign the Ascent of Akrabbim to the region of the 'Arabah, where Robinson supposed it to be. From the 'Arabah the boundary passed along the face of the Magrah Plateau unto a place just south of Kadesh. Here the natural features of the country invited a turning of the boundary southward to Wâdy Lussân. We can thus make Wâdy el-'Arîsh (Shihor) our point of departure, and trace the western part of the boundary backwards to Hezron. We must find, first of all, near Wâdy el-'Arîsh, the site of Azmon.

XXIV. *Azmon*.—One is tempted to identify Azmon with el-Aujmeh (Burckhardt, Ojmeh), the name of a chain of mountains south-east of Kul'at Nukhl. This, however, is too far south. A satisfactory site exists at *el-Uggabeh*, and the change from Ş (ص) to G, though uncommon, occasionally occurs (Gesenius). From el-Uggabeh the boundary would very naturally go out unto the River of Egypt, Wâdy el-'Arîsh.

XXV. *Karka*.—On the strength of the preceding identification we find the next point at the nameless ruins near the junction of Wâdy Garaiyeh and W. esh-Sheraif. In Num. xxxiv, 4, Karka is omitted; because the boundary, following natural features of the country, could not well have passed elsewhere to Azmon.

XXVI. *Addar*.—That this place was situated at *Contellet Garaiyeh* (Gypsaria) seems very probable from the following considerations:—

(1) From the language used in describing the boundary here; which, passing along the south side of Kadesh-Barnea to Hezron, and going up to Addar, fetched a compass to Karka, Josh. xv, 3.

(2) Such a boundary would be very natural, since it included all of the broad Wâdy Garaiyeh, the pasturage of which pertained to the city at Contellet Garaiyeh, and

(3) Hezron is omitted in Num. xxxiv, 3. This could be done if there would be no deviation of the boundary from Kadesh to Addar caused thereby. And only if the boundary passed to Contellet Garaiyeh, from Kadesh, could Hezron, at Kharabat Lussân be omitted. We therefore hold that Contellet Garaiyeh (Gypsaria) is the site of Addar or Hazar-Addar.

XXVII. *Tamar*.—The Tamar of 1 Kings ix, 18, probably (Cheyne, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 4891) for the protection of the commercial road from Ezion-Geber to Jerusalem, seems to be the Thamara of Eusebius and Jerome and the Thamaro of Ptolemy and the Peutinger Tables, a military station. According to Eusebius Thamara was a day's journey from Mapses, on the road from Hebron to Elath. As Mapses was at Khūrbet el-Meshâsh, Thamara (or Tamar) was probably, as Robinson suggested, at the ruins called Kurnub.

May we not hope that the Negeb may be more thoroughly explored and some of its sites excavated in the near future? Suggestions and identifications could be made with greater boldness then. Some must not be ventured now.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS ON THE MODERN INHABITANTS OF PALESTINE.

By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A., and E. W. G.
MASTERMAN, F.R.C.S., F.R.G.S.

A HISTORY OF THE DOINGS OF THE FELLAḤÎN DURING THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY FROM NATIVE SOURCES.

(Continued from p. 114.)

PART V.

‘Aḳîli Agha.

AḤMED EL-JEZZÂR, to whom we have already made frequent reference, was an Albanian by origin. Some domestic troubles caused him to flee to Constantinople in his sixteenth year, where, unable to make a livelihood, he sold himself to Elias Surhiyah, a purchaser of white slaves. From him he was bought by Muḥammad Bek Abu eth-Thahâb, an Egyptian official, and in his service he showed great skill and bravery, so that his master entrusted him with important secrets and important duties. Among these duties was the getting