

Khalil ibn Sawir, Wali of Ramleh, with the date 673 A.H.; the other the name of "*Melek el Munsir Kalawin*," and the date 693 A.H.

Yebna, like Ashdod and Gaza, had its port, but of this very little remains. Riding down the course of the Nahr Rúbin by the Saint-house of Reuben, where is a courtyard cool and delicious from the shade of nine huge mulberry-trees, I found the ruins some little way south of the river mouth. Very little masonry remains, except on the south, where a square mass of retaining wall shows evidence of Crusading workmanship. This tower is known as Khirbet Dubbeh. Farther north are three ancient tombs in the face of the sandy cliff, one having eight loculi running in from its sides. These are called by the natives *El-dekkakin* ("the shops"), a title often given to such tombs from the fellahin fancy that the loculi, like the cupboards of a modern bazaar, were used to store the goods of the shopman who sat presumably on the sort of divan which often runs round three sides of the chamber.

The port would seem to be naturally better than any along the coast of Palestine south of Cæsarea. There are, however, dangerous reefs hidden beneath the waves, and visible from their dark colour in the beautifully transparent water. A very little trouble in clearing a passage through these would, I imagine, render the Minet Rúbin a better port than Jaffa, as the reefs are farther from the beach.

The river, even in May, was full of water for several miles above the shore, and deep pools exist throughout its course. It is fed by springs at and near the foot of the hills, and is the most formidable natural barrier between the Aujeh and Wady Ghuzzeh. It therefore forms along the latter part of its course such a natural boundary as would be required between the possessions of Judah and of Dan.

CLAUDE R. CONDER, Lieut. R.E.,
In Command Survey of Palestine.

THE SITE OF THE CITY OF ADULLAM.

BY C. CLERMONT-GANNEAU.

FOUR years ago I was led to place the city of Adullam at Ayd el Mieh, a ruin situated north-east of Beit Jibrin, not far from Shuweikeh (the ancient Shocoh), on the road from Jerusalem to Beit Jibrin. I communicated this identification to several persons while it was still a conjecture, especially to Capt. Burton and Mr. C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake,* on their journey to Jerusalem in 1871; to M. Renan, who wished to communicate it to the Academy of Inscriptions; and, later on, to Lieut.

* "Unexplored Syria," 1872, ii. 294. "Adullam . . . site. M. Ganneau pointed out the true site farther east, at the Khirbet Adalmiyeh, pronounced by the people Ayd el Miyya, at a short distance from the well-known Bayt Nutof."

Conder,* to whom at the same time I pointed out several other observations made during the same excursion, when I first saw Ed el Miyé; among others the tomb of the *Daughter of Noah* and El Azhek (=Azéka?) at Ellar, and the sculptured cavern and the inscriptions at Khirbet Za Kariyeh, and several names of localities marked in my route. I propose to state the considerations which decided me to adopt hypotheses in which I am the first to detect certain weak points.

I.

The first appearance of the name of this city in the Bible is found in Genesis xxxviii., in connection with the episode of Judah and Tamar. Judah, who was with his brothers at Hebron, went *down* to Hirah the Adullamite, and married the daughter of the Canaanite Shuah.† Later on, the patriarch, accompanied by his friend Hirah,‡ goes up to Timnath to the sheep-shearing. According to Knobel, this Timnath has nothing to do with the Timnath of the tribe of Dan (=Tibneh, not far from Ain Shems), but would be the Timnah cited by the Book of Joshua (xv. 57), with Hak-kain (Cain) and Gibeah in the *mountains* of Judah.

At the time of Jerome another opinion prevailed, for the Onomasticon (s. v. Thamna) identifies this Timnah, where Judah went for his sheep-shearing, with a great town, Thamna, situated between Jerusalem and Diospolis, and belonging to the common territory of Dan and Judah. The passage is, perhaps, corrupt; at all events, considering the evident theory of the author, we ought to read Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin) and not Diospolis (Lydda).§

* When I arrived at Jerusalem, at the end of 1873, MM. Conder and Drake had just visited the great cave of Umm el Tumaymiyé with Mr. Neil and Dr. Chaplin, thinking that it was the place pointed out by me as the possible Adullam. But I never visited this place. Mr. Drake rectified his error in a subsequent note.

† There is a village, Esh 'u, not far from the neighbourhood of these events. The name may possibly preserve some recollection of Shuah, who would be of importance in the genealogy of Judah.

‡ The Septuagint and the Vulgate translate Ro'è, shepherd, which seems to agree with what follows.

§ Nevertheless the Onomasticon places the Timnath Serah of Joshua in the territory of Dan, which adds to our difficulties. Besides, whether the Onomasticon understands in this passage the Timnath Serah of Ephraim (which is extremely improbable) or the Timnath near Ain Shems, neither of these localities is found between Diospolis or Eleutheropolis and Jerusalem, or even on the road from one to the other. If, on the other hand, the Onomasticon has in view an unknown Timnath, that grouped in the Book of Joshua between Gibeah and Hak-kain, the neighbourhood of Gibeah would bring us to the middle

Judah, before arriving at Timnath, meets Tamar at "an open place," or a place called Enaim,* or possibly Patah Enaim, on the road which leads to Timnath. It has been supposed that Enaim was no other than Enam, mentioned in the first group of the towns of the Shefelah (Joshua xv. 36), which would imply the identity of our Timnath with the Danite Tibneh. As we do not know from what place Judah went to Timnath, we cannot deduce from the account much light on the position of Adullam, as some writers have been disposed to admit. The city itself is not once mentioned, except as being the natal place of Hirah.

II.

The Book of Joshua gives more precise indications. In the list of Canaanite kings defeated by the successors of Moses (xii. 15), the king of Adullam figures between those of Libnah and Makkedah.

Farther on (xv. 36) we see that the city of Adullam belonged to the territory of the tribe of Judah; it forms, with Jarmuth, Socho, and Azeka, a group apart among the fourteen cities placed in the first line in the Shephalah.

I once proposed that the Shephalah might be considered, not as the plain, as is generally understood, but as the low country, the second slope of the great mass of hills which forms the territory of Judah and its level undulations in the plains. This idea was adopted by Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake and others to whom I submitted it. I still think it is perfectly borne out by the facts. Shephalah has properly the sense of *low*, and not of *flat*: the word under this form corresponds with the Arabic *asfel*, in the feminine *souflla*. The vulgar form of *souflla*, *siffla*, is applied at the present day in a geographical sense: thus, the village *Ellār es sifla* (the low) as opposed to *Ellār el foka* (the high), is placed near several cities indicated as being in the Shephalah; and about a mile and a half north-east of Zanoa (Zanoah of the Shephalah) there exists a little village called Sifla or Sifala, which may possibly still mark the eastern limit of the Shephalah.

of the road from Jerusalem to Eleutheropolis, only it would be inadmissible to extend the territory of Dan so far. The passage in the Onomasticon leaves the question open whether it meant Timnath near Dan or Timnath near Gibeah.

* The Onomasticon, apparently making itself an echo of the current Rabbinical traditions of the time, indicates Enan as a desert place near the Thamna already quoted, with a spring—whence its name—and an idol held in great veneration. St. Jerome adds that the Hebrews explain the expression by *bivivum*, a word which he adopts in the Vulgate. Perhaps it is best to read "in the entrance of Enaim." Farther on, the people of the place are spoken of, so that it was inhabited. It is to be regretted that Jerome does not explain the nature of the worship paid to the "idol" in his own time. Perhaps it was one of the Canaanite deities—an Astarte, patroness of the class to which Tamar belonged.

We must not, therefore, persist in seeking Adullam in the plain, nor ought we to be astonished if we find the place as high up among the hills as Eshtaol, Zorah, or Zanoah, belonging like itself to the Shephalah.*

III.

In the First Book of Samuel we learn that David, pursued by the unrelenting hatred of Saul, and no longer able to rest at Gath, took refuge in the cave of Adullam. His brothers and his relations *came down* from Bethlehem and joined him there. The little group of exiles was increased by the accession of "every one who was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented," and of such materials the future king formed his first army. On one occasion, David having expressed a desire to drink "of the water of the well of Bethlehem that is at the gate," three of the bravest of the *Gibborim* successfully passed through the lines of the Philistines and brought him the water for which he longed (1 Chron. xi. 19; 2 Sam. xxiii. 13).

It is clear from the double account of this episode that there was no question of supplying a lack of water, but of satisfying a longing for home quite intelligible in an exile. I insist on this fact because some have been led to understand from this touching episode that Adullam must be near Bethlehem, which is *possible*, but not necessary.†

The narrative in both the Book of Chronicles and that of Samuel clearly implies that Adullam had a strategic importance, so that it is quite natural to find it among the cities fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 7) between Bethzur and Shocho.

It is mentioned in Nehemiah (xi. 30), between Jarmuth and Zanoah, as having been inhabited after the captivity by the sons of Judah. Judas Maccabeus here celebrated the Sabbath at the head of his army

* On the other hand, many names of towns certainly situated in the plain are nowhere classed among those of the Shephalah. The existence of the cities of the Shephalah in the highlands has so much embarrassed commentators, that some of them have had to suppress the difficulty by a gratuitous invention—viz., that the word Shephalah is not Hebrew at all.

† This is the opinion of Thénius (*Die Bücher Samuel*, p. 103). The same commentator supposing that David, after placing his parents in safety in Moab, came back to the cave of Adullam, and that it is to this locality that the words of Gad apply ("Abide not in the hold; depart, and get thee into the land of Judah"), concludes that if the *city* of Adullam was in the territory of Judah, the cave was without, in that of Benjamin. But is it sure that by Eres Yehoudah the text means the territory of the tribe? Is it demonstrated that the events followed as Thénius interprets them? Are there more reasons for placing the cave of Adullam in the tribe of Benjamin than in that of Dan, for example? One thing, however, is quite clear—the cave and the city were quite close to each other; both were in the land of Judah, and both in the Shephalah.

after defeating Gorgias, who fled to Maresha, near Beit Jibrin (2 Macc. xii. 38).

Lastly, in the chapter of Micah (chap. i.) which contains a curious series of *jeux de mots* on different towns of Palestine, Adullam is associated with Mareshah in one of these alliterations, with an apparent tendency to isolate the first syllable of the word, Ad-Adullam.

IV.

If we pass from the Bible to profane texts, we have to remark in Josephus the transcription of the name as Adullamè (Antiq. vi. 12, 3).

The Onomasticon gives us indications on the position assigned to it by tradition in the fourth and fifth centuries, which are extremely involved. We must try to clear them up.

“Eglon, which is also called Adullam, in the tribe of Judah, where king Debir was slain by Joshua. It is still a large town in the region of Eleutheropolis, at ten miles (Jerome says twelve miles) distance.”

The expression *προς ανατολας* may mean, according to the well-established practice of Eusebius, rather the north-east or south-east than direct east. Gezer is thus placed in an easterly direction with regard to Emmaus, *ἐν βορειοις*—in the north. Now I have found it at Tell el Jezer, which is north-west of Emmaus. The plural appears to mark intentionally a direction intermediate to the cardinal points.

How does this confusion between Eglon and Adullam arise? The error must be assigned to a neglect of the Hebrew text, because no Greek copyist could confuse ΕΓΛΩΝ and ΟΔΟΛΛΑΜ. In fact, the fault is due to the Septuagint, which has taken in Joshua x. 5, יגלע for םלג, and has written οδολλαμ (or οδολλα). The *gimel* was taken for a *daleth*, the two letters in the alphabet then in use resembling each other very strongly, and the substitution of the *Mem* for the *Nun* was thus almost forced.*

It is thus that the strange contradiction in the passage of Eusebius may have been caused. Eglon is, without doubt, Khirbet Ajlan, about twelve Roman miles almost due west of Beit Jibrin. Eusebius, harassed by his supposed obligations to the text of the Septuagint, and preoccupied by another locality east of Beit Jibrin, where he placed Adullam, applied to Eglon what he really intended for the former city. Jerome, in his turn, recognising the impossibility that two different places should be the same, and having rightly ascertained that the distance of Eglon from Eleutheropolis was twelve miles and not ten, corrects the narrative of Eusebius, but preserves the orientation applicable only to Adullam. In

* The *Gimel* in the ancient inscriptions that I found at Jerusalem was written very much like the *Daleth*. Lower down, in Joshua xv. 39, the Septuagint gives correctly ΕΓΛΩΝ.

another passage (s. v. *χασβι*), the Onomasticon says that Chasbi (Chezib), where the wife of Judah gave birth to Shelah (which is probably the Achzib of the group in Joshua xv. 37), is shown in a desert place near Dollam, or Odollam, in the confines of Eleutheropolis. Procopius of Gaza (Commentary on Joshua)—who seems to have only reproduced a portion of the Onomasticon, with a correction of the distances—after stating that Yerimoth is at the fourteenth mile from Eleutheropolis, near Eshtaol, adds, without any indication of the connection in his own mind, the name of Adullam.*

Lastly, the Onomasticon places Makkedah, a city celebrated for the cavern where Joshua killed the five kings, eight miles from Eleutheropolis in the east, *πρὸς ἀνατόλας*; this is within two miles the distance and the position attributed to Adullam=Eglon. We may imagine that the cave has produced a new confusion between the two cities, like that which we have pointed out above, and we may put down the measure of eight miles to the account of Adullam. It is, in fact, difficult to believe that Adullam and Makkedah, which belong to two distinct series in the lists of Joshua, were no more than two Roman miles apart.

V.

In working upon data so uncertain it is clearly difficult to determine the exact position of Adullam. Nevertheless, a tradition—we may boldly call it a legend—sprang up in after years, which placed the cave of Adullam at the immense grotto known as Moghuret Khureitun, not far from Bethlehem and quite close to Tekoa. The description of this cave has been given a hundred times. The legend was only concerned with the cave, and did not trouble itself to establish the proximity of a city. (See Tobler, II. 509 *et seq.*)

It has long been proved that the name of Khureitun applied to the cave, to the adjacent ruins, to a spring, and to the valley below, is nothing else than that of the ascetic Chariton, who founded in this place one of his two Lauras, called Suka, fourteen stadia from Tekoa. The origin of the word Suka has been a good deal discussed. It is from the Syriac. Tobler and Sepp explain it by the Hebrew *Succah*, a tent or house. I think that they are wrong. We should have in that case a *χ* and not a *κ* in the Greek transcription, the *καρρα* implies a *κορη* in the original, and *upsilon* an *i* rather than an *o* or an *ou*.†

Now why did tradition get hold of this cavern called *κρεμαστον* and

* *περὶ τὴν Εσδαὸλ κώμην Ὀδολλάμ.* Perhaps the phrase may be separated by a stop before the last word.

† We have also *Σουκα*. So the Septuagint gives us *σωχω* and *σωχων* for Socho. So in the Arabic the convent Mar Saba is called Deir es Sik. In the Annals of Eutychius (II. 108, 242, 243) the convent of Chariton and that of Saba are called the old and the new Deir es Sik.

make Adullam out of it? Probably on account of its remarkable dimensions and its proximity to Bethlehem. Perhaps the name of *Suka* went for something. It is probable that this belief took its origin at the time of the Crusades; it is certainly as old as that date; and the confusion of *Suka* with *Sik* and Socho would have been impossible for a Semitic race, but the Crusaders would be helped in their identification by an apparent resemblance, the city of Socho being associated with Adullam in the Bible narrative. This mistake would be quite in accordance with their habits.

We cannot, as critics, accept such a fable. But we ourselves have not been more fortunate. Our own topography has proposed for Adullam in succession, Deir Dubban, Beit Alam, Beit Doula, &c.

Not one of these hypotheses answers to the conditions of the problem.

First of all, the name of Adullam must be considered separately. Whatever its etymology, it is certain that, however preserved by the Arabs, it would have undergone considerable modifications. For example, it might have been Adlûn, under which name we should at once recognise it. This name exists, but unfortunately it is attached to a place very far from the territory of Judah, on the coast of Phœnicia, between Tyre and Sidon. These caprices of Onomastic echoes are not rare in Syria.

We should expect a deviation of the final syllable into *oun*, *în*, or *an*; a disappearance of the *d* by assimilation with the double *l*; and a transformation of the *ain* into *ghain*, and perhaps into *h*.

Starting with this principle, I was struck by the resemblance of the Hebrew word Adullam with that of a ruin called Ed el Miyè* situated on the road from Jerusalem to Beit Jibrin, not far from Shuweikeh or Socho.

In 1871 I resolved to visit the place in order to verify conjectures resting upon nothing more than appearances which might be vain, and I included this place in the programme of a little excursion—the same in which I discovered Gezer. The following are some of the notes which I made on the journey:—

“Starting from Jerusalem on the 30th of January, in a pelting rain, we pass (my companion being Frère Liévin) by Bettir, Houbin, and Ella el Foka. Facing this latter place, on the other side of the valley, towards the south, exists a place called El Azhek,† whose name singularly resembles that of the city, hitherto unknown, of Azeka. It is a

* It will be found that Lieutenant Conder spells the word Ayd el Mieh.

† Azeka, we know, is a *crux interpretum*. If we fix it at Ellar, there would be among other advantages—(1) That it would remain in the group of Joshua xv. 36. (2) It would agree with the fixing of the Philistine camp (1 Sam. xvii. 1) if Vandevelde's Damûn is Dommim. (3) It would be half-way between Jerusalem and Beit Jibrin, in accordance with the Onomasticon. Khirbet Za Kariyeh has been proposed; one might also think of Beit Iska and of Khirbet Haska.

rocky plateau, surrounded by hills of greater elevation, with no other trace of ruins than a great circle of shapeless stones called *Dar el Kibliyé*.

“Then Khirbet Hanna, Khirbet Harik esh Shekhaleb, with the tomb of Noah’s daughter, Khirbet Jairieh, the Spring of Tannur (legend of the Deluge), Ellar es Siffa, or Bawajj (medieval ruin). From thence we directed our course due south-east, and arrived a little before sunset at the broad valley on one of the sides of which are the ruins which I wished to see. They were called Ed el Miyè, or Id el Miyè. Like most of the ancient sites in Palestine, they have no determined character, but appear to cover a fairly large extent of ground, as well as could be made out among the late grass with which they were covered; there is also a large well, surrounded with several troughs, where they bring the cattle to drink.

“The place is absolutely uninhabited, except in the rainy season, when the shepherds take refuge there for the night. These peasants are here at present in large numbers.

“We climb the hill at the foot of which these ruins extend. Other ruins lie on the top of it, and a small monument dedicated to the Sheikh Madkur.

“The hill is perforated with natural grottoes, where the shepherds are already housed for the night. It is easy to imagine David and his companions lodged in these large caves; from them one commands the plains and valleys to a great distance round, and a *ghazziu* once effected, this natural fortress would offer a sure and commodious shelter.

“As we journey without tent, with our horses alone, and with what our *khordjes* hold, we seek a shelter in the rocks, and leave our beasts in a neighbouring cave. But the fellahin, who make no difficulty about number, protest against the profanation by our animals of a grotto sacred to Madkur.

“We install ourselves as well as we can in this rustic sanctuary, taking certain precautions, for the country is at the moment a prey to famine. We divide our provisions with the little circle of curious visitors who surround us, near a great fire lit in the *liwan*. The bread is a welcome gift to these poor wretches, who have been living for weeks on leaves of *khoubbeije* (a kind of mallow). So that I get from them without any trouble valuable information on the place. Local tradition says that the city of Ed el Miyè once—but a long while ago—suffered total destruction and a general massacre. Men, women, children, nothing was spared. They massacred, among others, eighty couples of brothers, reminding one of the eighty couples of (*Gozot*) brothers, priests, spoken of in the Talmud.

“Sheikh Madkur—some call him Mankûr—was the son of the Sultan Beder. His descendants are settled at Beit Natif—they have built and keep up the wely.

“We pass the night with a little distrust of the vagabonds round us—hunger is a bad adviser. But Sheikh Madkur, or the ancient divinity

whom he represents, watches over us, and the morning arrives without accident. We set off immediately, casting one rapid glance at the hill, which is full of caves, tombs, and cisterns, and covered over with great blocks of cut stone. We have to get as quickly as possible to Beit Jibrin, for the sake of our horses, who have had nothing to eat but grass."

Since that moment the idea that I had seen the ruins and the cave of Adullam dwelt continually in my mind, without, however, becoming a serious conviction. During my last visit to Palestine I proposed, by an excursion in the region of Beit Jibrin, to make another journey to Ed el Miyè. We found the place completely deserted, the whole country being ravaged by a typhoid fever. I ascertained afresh that the plateau was covered with ruins, and had once been the site of a city. Among the tombs cut in the rock was one with a cross.* We explored the large cavern near the wely. We were at a loss because we had nothing to give us light, when, to our surprise and joy, we discovered in the wely a packet of candles still in their blue paper cover, and deposited by some pious hand for the purpose of lighting the sanctuary. Decidedly the good genius of Sheikh Madkur visibly protected us. I made no scruple about appropriating one of these providential candles, and I substituted a small piece of money for the benefit of the pious donor whose offering I had been obliged to use. We were thus able to visit the cavern in all its extent without risk of breaking our necks, as had nearly happened to me already at Shiha.

In a halt at Ellar I picked up a new legend on Ed el Miyè which enables us to fix the orthography of the name.

The day of the great feast of Mussulmans (id) a terrible fight took place, a long time ago, between the hostile *hammoulés* who lived in the city. A hundred (miyé) of the inhabitants were slain. Since that time the place has been called the *Feast of the Hundred*.

It is curious to remark that the explanations in vogue among the rabbis of the fourth and fifth centuries on the etymology of Adullam tended also to separate it into two parts.

St. Jerome, in fact, who was the pupil of the Jewish doctors, translates in his *De Nominibus Hebraicis*, *Adullamitem* by *testificatem*, *sive testimonium aque*; *Adullamim*, by *congregatio eorum*; and *Odollam* by *testimonium eorum*.† He merely separates the first syllable to assimilate it to the Hebrew *ed*, witness. As to the second part, to which he once gives the name of *water*, he has in his mind the Hebrew *maim*. Some of these contradictory interpretations would be very well explained by a form analogous to the Arabic Ed el Miyè.

In spite of the striking resemblance, I have a certain scruple about connecting Ed el Miyè with Adullam. Generally the Arabic names give

* A detail of some importance: if the place was inhabited at the Christian epoch there is a chance of its having preserved its ancient name, and one understands how a survival of the name was found by the writer of the Onomasticon.

† Cf. also on Amwas, Emmaus, *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1874, p. 163.

us contractions rather than the reverse. We should have to admit that Ed el Miyè is connected with Adullam by means of the ethnic form in the feminine *Edelmy*, *Edel Miyè*.

Ed el Miyè is about eight Roman miles from Beit Jibrin, as nearly as can be fixed from existing maps, and north-east of this city. It is exactly the distance of the position assigned by the Onomasticon to Mellkedah; but we have seen that this passage had in view Adullam, placed elsewhere at ten miles.

It is certain that in placing Adullam at Ed el Miyè we not only approach the statements of the Onomasticon, but also satisfy very nearly all the conditions demanded by the texts quoted above, including the expedition of the three *Giborims* who went to fetch water from Bethlehem. The journey from Ed el Miyè to Bethlehem and back, about twelve leagues, would be nothing for the light-footed mountaineers who surrounded David. Those who consider the distance too much have only to remember that it is related as an exploit, and that the fatigue has to be added to the risk. Let us not forget, besides, that when David as a boy killed Goliath he carried provisions to his three elder brethren from Bethlehem to the camp of the Israelites—that is to say towards Sodom, in the valley of the Terebinth—nearly as far and in the same parts as Ed el Miyè.

All these coincidences, then, give a high degree of *vraisemblance* to the identification, but from that to a certainty, such as we have in Gezer, is a long step. I ought to add, in conclusion, without attaching any other importance to it, that two localities might also pretend to the honour of representing Adullam, if we confine ourselves to the phonetic point of view—Ellar, already named, and Beit Ellia, a little to the east of Ed el Miyè; but the phonetic point of view is not anything in topography, and besides, even from these considerations, Ed el Miyè has the advantage.

ANCIENT JEWISH GRAVES.

LETTERS FROM DR. TITUS TOBLER.

The following letters from a well-known veteran in Palestine Exploration will be welcome to all who desire accurate knowledge on an important branch of Jewish archæology. They refer to papers published in different numbers of the *Quarterly Statement* by Major Wilson, Lieut. Conder, and M. Clermont-Ganneau.

I.

MUNICH, 24th March, 1875.

The different kinds of graves are described in the *Quarterly Statement* in such a manner as to justify me in drawing your attention to them.

I recognised four kinds of graves (*Golgatha*, 1851, p. 216, &c.),