

et Táhta, making inquiries about Azekah, but could hear of no such place except Ez Zak near Khuweilfeh, and Kh. Habeiik, both well-known places.

I came round by Solomon's Pools and the Bethlehem road revising, while Corporal Sutherland took a straighter course; Corporal Brophy revised the road on his way up from Lidd. The revision of 1,700 square miles was therefore completed on the 17th November. We had some very bad weather during the month—six days may be characterised by continuous rain—but the work was carried on the same and no day was lost. Packing up and arranging for the sale of the horses took two days. The men left on the 22nd and sailed next morning with all the luggage. I made some final arrangements and sailed myself for Constantinople on the 26th.

The work done from the end of February to the end of November, nine months, has been 1,340 square miles of country triangulated and surveyed, every ruin examined, and special reports on all villages and water supply; the line of levels between the Mediterranean and the Sea of Galilee completed, 1,700 square miles of country revised, 3,850 names collected and 816 ruins examined and described, 29 special plans and 19 photographs, besides notes on all archæological and geological points of interest in the country gone over.

H. H. KITCHENER, Lieut. R.E.

ITINERARIES OF OUR LORD.—CANA OF GALILEE.

ST. JAMES'S TERRACE, REGENT'S PARK,

March 30th, 1878.

IN trying to lay down the routes by which our Lord made his journeys, nothing is more important than to fix, if possible, disputed sites. A place identified becomes a fixed point, from which other lines may be pushed out. Happily, a few of the more important places—Nazareth, Bethlehem, Bethany, Mount Olivet, Jerusalem, and Jacob's Well—have never been the sport of theorists. But this good fortune has not attended Cana, Bethsaida, Capernaum, and Bethabara. If all these places could be fixed beyond dispute, much would be done towards framing an outline for the Itineraries. In the following notes I venture to submit the case in favour of Cana, and to ask for a verdict on the evidence adduced in favour of the historic site, against the theorists.

Where was this sacred place?

All the native Churches, whether Greek or Latin, Coptic, Nestorian, or Armenian, reply that Cana of the marriage feast lay at Kefr Kana, on the road from Nazareth to Capernaum. Kefr Kana means Village of Cana. Till the days of Robinson there had been no dispute about the locality. Cana was a common name in Palestine, very much like

Ashton in England, Steinberg in Germany, San Lucar in Spain. There was a Cana in Judæa, a second Cana near Mount Tabor, a third Cana near Tyre. There may have been more. Villages of this name rose and perished without a record. One such village flourished in a recent period at a spot some six miles north of Sephoris, and is now called Khurbet Kana, Ruins of Cana. An ignorant Frank confused the new Cana north of Sephoris with the old Cana north-east of Nazareth; but the false suggestion died with the ignorant Frank who made it. Quaresmius, hearing of the suggestion, put an end to it by simple statement of the facts. Robinson revived the doubt.

On going up the hill of Nazareth with his Arab servant, Abu Nâsir, to get a view of the country, Robinson heard of that dead Cana, lying beyond Sephoris. The name was new to him, and the spot indicated was a desert place. Abu Nâsir spoke of it as Kânâ el-Jelil—Cana of Galilee. Robinson adopted the ridiculous heresy which Quaresmius fancied he had crushed. Robinson thought he had caught the monks at their tricks. The real Cana lay out of their way, and they changed the site for their own convenience. Abu Nâsir's word was enough. "The name is identical. . . . On this single ground, therefore, we should be authorised to reject the present monastic position of Cana." When Robinson had made up his mind he found plenty of texts to support his theories—found them by the easy process of misreading and false translation. He never went to see the spot! The place was called Khurbet Kana, Ruins of Cana; but he never asked whether the ruins were new or old—the waste of an Arab village later than the Crusades, or a Syrian hamlet earlier than the birth of Christ. Enough for him that Abu Nâsir called it Kânâ el-Jelil; Abu Nâsir's word outweighed for him the authority of all the native Churches.

This story sounds like farce; and yet, since Robinson's time, Khurbet Kana has for many persons usurped the place of the genuine Cana of Galilee. Karl Ritter adopted Robinson's mistake, and his authority has led to the insertion of his blunder in many maps. A note to the last edition of Ritter's work affords the means of correction; but several map-makers were misled before that correction came; see Chambers's map of Palestine, Hughes's map of Syria, Bædeker's "Galilee," and (I am sorry to add) Murray's far more valuable map of the Holy Land. Let us scan the evidence of fact.

I.—EVIDENCE OF NAME.

Kefr Kana (Village of Cana) and Khurbet Kana (Ruins of Cana) are places in the same district of Galilee, hardly a dozen miles apart. In Greek their names are identical—they are both called *Kanâ*; in our English form Cana. To distinguish either of them from Cana in Judæa it was necessary to add the words "in Galilee" or "of Galilee," as we, in speaking of our northern Richmond, should add "in Yorkshire" to distinguish it from the better known town near London. Robinson's first mistake arose from treating the form "Cana of Galilee" as a proper

name. His whole theory rests on this foundation. "Cana of Galilee," he argues, is the name of a place mentioned by St. John; "Kânâ el-Jelil" is the name of a place mentioned by Abu Nâsir. They must be one and the same. Such is his process—such his proof.

But was "Cana of Galilee" a proper name? Some names of towns are compound, the words wedded and inseparable, like Civita-Castellana, Boulogne-sur-Mer, and Ashton-under-Lyne. Is "Cana of Galilee" such a compound name? If not, Robinson's theory is untenable—his inference unsound.

On this point there is not much room for philological mistake. Cana is mentioned by two authors, and no more. They mention it by the same name, and with very nearly the same descriptive adjunct. These authors are Josephus and St. John. The name is only known in the Greek form *Κανά*, to which the English form Cana corresponds with perfect accuracy. No Hebrew, Chaldee, or Aramaic form of the word is known. All modern forms, whether Arabic or Frankish, are derived from the Greek word, and must be carried back to it in case of variance. Robinson saw an argument in favour of his heresy in the fact that some modern Arabs have rendered the Greek word *Κανά* by two Arabic forms, Kana and Kenna. So he used the form Kana in reference to Khurbet Kana, Kenna in reference to Kef: Kana. There is no ground for such a distinction. Kana and Kenna come from Cana and return into Cana. Such variations as occur in the name of Cana belong to modern Arabic, not to ancient Greek.

Josephus and St. John knew Cana well. While Josephus held his command in Galilee, he lived at Cana; a convenient post from which he could watch Sephoris on one side and Tiberias on the other side. Cana figures in the narrative of his life on at least one very important occasion—that of his night-march on the capital of Lower Galilee. Josephus calls the place in which he lived and from which he started "a village in Galilee called Cana." Nothing in his text suggests that the place was called "Cana of Galilee," as Robinson imagines it to have been called. St. John knew Cana as well as Josephus. He was at the marriage feast. Cana was the home of Nathaniel, his fellow-disciple, and was only a few miles from his own house at Capernaum. He calls the place Cana of Galilee. The name occurs twice in the fourth Gospel—in the second chapter, and in the twenty-first chapter. Our translators render the first passage Cana of Galilee, and the second Cana in Galilee. The texts of Josephus and St. John leave no doubt that Cana is a proper name; Cana of Galilee, or Cana in Galilee, a descriptive phrase. Josephus says "a village of Galilee called Cana," as we should say "a village in Kent called Sevenoaks." He never mentions his dwelling-place as a village called "Cana of Galilee." There being more than one Cana in Palestine, as there is more than one Richmond in England, like causes produced like use of language. A Yorkshire writer mentioning Richmond would describe it as Richmond in Yorkshire, not because "Richmond in Yorkshire" is a proper name, but

because he might otherwise run some risk of being thought to mean Richmond in Surrey. John uses the form Cana of Galilee in order that his ordinary readers may not confuse the scene of the marriage feast with the better known Cana in Judæa. Cana in Judæa had in the days of St. John a fame like that of Sedan in our own days. There Antiochus had given battle to the Arabs. There he had fallen, and his whole army had been destroyed. A Jew writing in those times of "Cana" would be understood to mean Cana in Judæa, the scene of that great disaster to the Jewish arms. Hence, for the sake of clearness, both Josephus and St. John added the name of the province in which his Cana lay—the first saying, simply, a village of Galilee called Cana; the second, no less simply, Cana of Galilee.

When the notion of "Cana in Galilee" being a proper name is set aside, it is waste of time to seek a modern equivalent in Arabic for that unknown form. If any place is now called Kānā el-Jelil—Cana of Galilee—the place is likely to be modern, and the name a mistake. Kefr Kana is an exact Arabic rendering of the Greek words used by Josephus—Village of Cana; so that the whole argument from philology is in favour of the native Churches.

II.—EVIDENCE OF SITE.

Cana (Kefr Kana) is five English miles from Nazareth, in a north-eastern line, on the present main road to Tiberias and the lake district. Sefurieh (old Greek colony of Sefhoris) stands north-west of Kefr Kana, on the road to Acre, the city called in the time of our Lord, Ptolemais. Sefhoris was a walled city, and the Roman road passed through its streets.

The heap of ruins now called Khurbet Kana lies five miles due north of Sefhoris, which walled city cut it off from the whole region in which the Teacher lived. Khurbet Kana is *not* on the road from Nazareth to Capernaum. A man coming up from Capernaum to Nazareth, as in the Gospel, could not have come near the spot now called Khurbet Kana. That spot lay on the road from Sefhoris to Ptolemais, not on the road from Sefhoris to Tiberias. A man coming up from Blackwall to Highgate does not pass through Harrow.

In the time of St. John, Cana was a station at the crossing of two roads; a country road used by Hebrew herdsmen and peasants, and an imperial road used by Roman and other strangers—a fact which gave it value from a military point of view. The country road led from Nazareth, and other open towns and villages, through Cana, to Magdala, Capernaum, Bethsaida, and other water-places on the lake. The Roman road ran from Acre (then Ptolemais) to Sefhoris, the old Greek capital of Upper Galilee, and thence through Cana to Tiberias, the new Roman capital of Lower Galilee. Thus, Cana was a station on the road between Sefhoris and Tiberias, very much as Rochester is a station on the road from London to Dover.

Keeping this position on the map in mind, turn to the several texts

in which Cana is mentioned. Jesus, coming up from the lake country with his disciples, met his mother at Cana (St. John ii. 2). From Cana He goes "down to Capernaum" (ii. 12). The expressions show that Cana stood on the ledge of the hill country, above the lake, and on the road from Bethsaida and Capernaum to Nazareth. The words could not apply to a place standing six miles beyond Sephoris, on the way to Ptolemais. Again, the nobleman of Capernaum, coming to seek Jesus, finds Him in Cana. "Come down, ere my child die," says the father. On being assured that his son lived, the nobleman went down. "As he was now going down, his servants met him." A journey from the spot now called Khurbet Kana could not be described as "going down;" for the road first leads up to Sephoris, the capital, and then through a rough sort of table-land as far as Cana; and it is only from this point that the road begins to drop down. Every word in the Gospel narrative implies that Cana stood near the ledge of the hill country over the lake.

Next turn to Josephus. Happily for us, Josephus had a good deal to do with Cana. Sent from Jerusalem into Galilee, as a delegate of the Sanhedrin, he first went to Sephoris, capital of Upper Galilee, where he found the people excited but at peace. He next went to Tiberias, capital of Lower Galilee, where he found the people in revolt. Josephus raised a large body of men, fortified several strong places, including Mount Tabor, and in a short time became master of the whole province. He saw a good deal of fighting. Twice he had to storm Sephoris; four times he had to storm Tiberias. These populous cities had to be sternly watched. In order to keep effective watch over both, Josephus fixed his camp at Cana, a position in the hill country between the two capitals. When John of Gischala induced the Jews of Tiberias to rise against Silas, Josephus says he left Cana with 200 men, made a night-march down the hills, and came before Tiberias early in the morning. That night-march was possible from Kefr Kana; impossible from the place now marked as Khurbet Kana. The distance from Kefr Kana to Tiberias is about ten miles; and a night march means, in the language of Josephus, a march from midnight watch to morning watch, a period of five hours. Everyone who has walked in Palestine knows that ten miles down-hill are not easily done in less time than five hours. If the camp of Josephus had been at the spot now called Khurbet Kana, the Jewish captain could not have made his secret night-march at all; since he would have had to pass through Sephoris, a walled city, with her gates closed and her sentinels on guard.

The whole argument derived from site is therefore in favour of the native Churches.

III.—EVIDENCE OF REMAINS.

The evidence of existing remains is no less strong than that of name and site. Kefr Kana is an old place and a prosperous place; Khurbet

Kana is a new place and a deserted place. At Kefr Kana there are remains of ancient edifices; at Khurbet Kana, though the buildings are in ruins, there is nothing older than late Saracenic times, even if the broken tanks and cisterns belong to Saracenic times at all.

No one can look at Kefr Kana without a strong conviction that the place is old. Here is a house old enough to pass for that of St. Bartholomew. Here are the foundations of an early church and monastery. The church, built in honour of the miracle, was standing in Cana before the Moslems established their power in Galilee. St. Willibald prayed in that church, then dedicated to the Ruler of the Feast. "A large church stands here," said the English saint in 721. Four hundred years later—that is to say, in 1102—another English pilgrim, Sæwulf, saw that monastic edifice. Five hundred years after Sæwulf, Quaresmius mentioned the monastery. To-day the ruins of that early Christian edifice may be seen. This sort of evidence is, for ordinary men, decisive. Syrian Christians build a church and monastery at Cana, in honour of the marriage feast. Various pilgrims from the western countries see that shrine from time to time during a period of 900 years. The foundations of these buildings are now in site.

Are there any remains of ancient buildings at the other Kana? None at all. The village is a heap of rubbish; but the dust and ashes are new—not old. No house there is old enough to be shown as that of St. Bartholomew. There are no foundations of church or convent. All the dwellings are small and mean. The shards of pottery are not of ancient form or colour. Here and there you come on a tank or cistern of later date; but these are seemingly of Arabic construction. The stones used in building are small, and of a modern pattern. Jackals prowl in the ruins, and wild boars grub among the tanks, while the hills around are barren and the plains in front are desert waste. No vestige of an antique world is seen. In truth, from the mere evidence of remains, a traveller without a theory to support would say that Khurbet Kana was a modern village which had sprung up round a potter's field and furnace, and had perished with the trade that gave it birth.

On the other hand, the house of St. Bartholomew and the monastic ruins prove the antiquity of the true Cana; so that from the evidence of existing remains a traveller, without a theory to support, would have no difficulty in identifying Kefr Kana with the Cana of Josephus and St. John.

IV.—EVIDENCE OF HISTORY.

The evidence of history, as regards Cana of the marriage feast, is a chain in which there is no missing link. St. Willibald, visiting Galilee in 722, started from Nazareth on his way to Cana. His route lay eastward, not northward—that is, toward Kefr Kana, not toward the place now called Khurbet Kana. He took Cana on his way from Nazareth to Mount Tabor. "He stayed at Cana one day, and then continued

his journey to Mount Tabor." Khurbet Kana lies in the opposite direction. Sæwulf, who went to Galilee in 1102, is even more precise. "Six miles to the north-east of Nazareth, on a hill, is Cana of Galilee, where our Lord converted the water into wine." Sæwulf uses the Roman mile of 1,614 yards; and his guess of "six miles" is near the actual truth. If our knowledge of the site of Cana had perished as completely as that of Bethsaida or that of Chorazin has perished, the bearings and distances supplied by Sæwulf would enable us to lay it down correctly on a map. When Sæwulf was in Galilee, Cana had been partly but not wholly destroyed. "Nothing is left standing," he says, "except the convent called after the Ruler of the Feast"—Holy Architrclinus. Later in the twelfth century, Phocas, following in the track of Sæwulf, from Acre to Nazareth, describes the points of his journey. Leaving Acre, Phocas comes—first to Sephoris, next to Cana, and then to Nazareth. To all these witnesses, Kefr Kana was the true Cana of Galilee. The distance of Cana from Nazareth is given by Mandeville in 1322: "four miles from Nazareth." Mandeville uses the old English mile; which gives the distance of Kefr Kana pretty accurately, but not the distance of Khurbet Kana, which is fully eleven miles from Nazareth.

Robinson was not original in the mistake corrected by so many proofs. The first blunder is due to Marino Sanudo, a Venetian, who compiled a book on Palestine for the use of Crusading princes. Sanudo lived in the fourteenth century. There is no evidence that he ever visited Palestine, or that he had the use of actual itineraries in making his tract and chart. He placed his Cana to the north of Sephoris, instead of to the south-east. At that time Palestine was closed to pilgrims. Sæwulf and Phocas were the latest authorities on the subject, but their accurate observations seem to have escaped the notice of Sanudo. After Sanudo had put Cana in the wrong place on his map, a Frank pilgrim now and then fell into his error, until Father Quaresmius, a monk who lived in Palestine, took the matter up, and settled the dispute in favour of Kefr Kana.

The only passage which Robinson found in any writer previous to Sanudo that appeared (only appeared) to favour his theory, is a line in Sæwulf. "Cana," says that author, "stands six miles north-east of Nazareth." This is the true text; but Robinson, ignorant of the use of middle-age Latin, translated Sæwulf's *six miliaris ad Aquilonem*, "six miles north," instead of six miles north-east. (See Wright's Vocab., p. 16, for illustrations of the meaning of *aquilo* in the age of Sæwulf.) Contrary to the usage in classical Latin, this word, in the time of Sæwulf, was always used for the north-east wind.

Such is the evidence in favour of Kefr Kana as the true Cana "of Galilee"—identity of name; identity of site; constant record of the Syrian Churches; actual remains of antiquity; and the testimony of a succession of travellers from East and West.

W. HEPWORTH DIXON.