

NOTE ON LIEUT.-COL. WATSON'S PAPER ON THE
STOPPAGE OF THE JORDAN.

By the Rev. Canon DALTON, C.M.G.

REGARDING Colonel Watson's enquiry on p. 261, I would like to draw his attention to the two English versions of Joshua iii, 16. The Revised Version reads, "rose up in one heap, a great way off, at Adam, the city that is beside Zarethan."

This rendering follows the Kethib of the Massoretic Hebrew.

The Authorised Version reads, "rose up upon an heap, very far from the city Adam, that is beside Zarethan." This rendering follows the Keri of the Massoretic Hebrew.

Of course the difference depends on whether בְּ or בִּ is read before מַדְנָה:

If we are content with the latter, *perhaps* it would bear the interpretation Colonel Watson desires. "The waters rose one mound a great way off from Damieh, that is (it happened) opposite to Zarethan." But the LXX rendering would appear to show that there must have been a wholly different reading here in their time. They knew nothing of "the city Adam," or "Zarethan" either. The first three letters of מַדְנָה they took for a repetition of תְּנִינָה that precedes, and translated σφόδρα σφόδρως. But how they got εώς μέρους Καριαθιαρέημ out of the subsequent Hebrew letters as they now stand is not clear. However, all Colonel Watson will care for probably is to know that the A·V and the Keri of the Hebrew will *perhaps* bear the interpretation, though not the exact translation, he desires.

The new edition of "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible" gives some further information under the names "Adam" and "Kirjath-jearim."

THE STOPPAGE OF THE RIVER JORDAN, A.D. 1267.

By W. E. STEVENSON, Esq.

In vol. ii, p. 99, of the "Survey," Major Conder mentions that "it has been suggested that the waters of the Jordan were suddenly dammed up by a landslip or similar convulsion: the adherents of this theory might perhaps point to the present appearance of the banks and the curious bends of the river near this place in support of their idea." But till Colonel Watson's paper in the *Quarterly Statement* for July, no evidence has been forthcoming of such a landslip having actually occurred. The passage from the historian Nowairi must have a bearing on the story of the miraculous passage, and in particular on the interpretation of Josh. iii, 16. The Septuagint rendering of this verse, with

the various readings given in Field's "Origenis Hexaplorum," present such remarkable divergencies from the Hebrew that it is desirable to exhibit them side by side.

(a) **וַיַּעֲמֹד הַמִּים הָוֹרְדִים מִלְמָעֵלָה נֶד אֶחָד הַרְחָק מִאָדָם**
בְּאָדָם (מִאָדָם Qeri) הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר מִצְדָּצָרְתָן וְהָוֹרְדִים עַל יַם
הָעָרָבָה יַם הַמֶּלֶח תָּמוֹנְכָרְתָו וְהָעָם עַבְרוֹ נֶגֶד יְרִיחֹו.

(b) Καὶ ἔστη τὰ ὕδατα τὰ καταβαίνοντα ἀνωθεν ἔστη πῆγμα ἐν ἀφεστηκός μακρὰν σφόδρα σφοδρῶς ἡσ ρέους Καριαθιαρίμ τὸ δὲ καταβαῖνον κατέβη εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, Ἀραβία θάλασσαν ἀλλὸς ἡσ εἰς τὸ τέλος ἔξελιπε· καὶ ὁ λαὸς εἰσιτήκει ἀπέναντι Ἰεριχώ.

(c) Sym. for πῆγμα, ἀσκωμα.

(d) LXX alia ex. omit οφοδρῶς.

(e) LXX alia ex. for Καριαθιαρίμ, Σάρθαν.

(f) LXX alia ex. for οφοδρῶς—Καριαθιαρίμ, ἀπὸ Αδάμει τῆς πυλεως ἦ
 ἔστιν ἡσ ρέους Καριαθιαρίμ (τῆς—ἔστιν marked with an asterisk)

(g) Sym. for σφοδρῶς, ἀπὸ Αδορ.

I. The Hebrew (Kethib) must be rendered as follows:—"The waters coming from above stood still and rose in one heap a long way off, at Adam, the city near Zarethan; and those descending to the Sea of the Desert, that is, the Sea of Salt, were utterly cut off."

For Adam, Major Conder suggests Khūrbet el Hamreth, the Red Ruin, one mile from Tell es Sarn, which is identified with Zarethan. Such a solution has the advantage of presenting no exegetical or textual difficulties. The translation is obvious and straightforward. Readings (f) and (g) certainly come from an original בְּאָדָם, but the Kethib is to be preferred. For a scribe, after writing בְּרָחָק מִאָדָם, to begin the name of a place with בְּ instead of בְּ would be a most natural mistake. "Far away," he would say to himself, "from," not "at," and write accordingly. But the reverse change, from בְּ to בְּ, would be exceedingly unlikely; nothing would suggest it. Further, בְּרָחָק מִאָדָם is just what one would expect the writer to say. The Israelites had been enabled to cross the Jordan in a very wonderful way. An incident of the wonder could scarcely escape his attention; instead of the waters being dammed up a few miles from where they were stationed, the damming up took place nearly forty miles away. This was certainly worth chronicling. Again, בְּצָדָק, "by the side of," means close proximity. It is used elsewhere only of Ai and Bethel, and though the nearest site for Ai is three miles from Bethel, the furthest is not more than five, so that, at any rate, the expression is correct for Khūrbet el Hamreth and Tell es Sarn.

The objection, and rather a strong one, is that this rendering of Josh. iii, 16, presupposes two cities of the name of Adam. Reading (f) shows that there must have been a town Adami about the Christian era, perhaps some centuries before; and Adami is almost certainly the intermediate stage between Adam and Damieh. But the objection

cannot be pressed too far. There are plenty of cases in all countries of several towns with the same name. And perhaps this was the reason here why Adam was described as near Zarethan, viz., to distinguish it from the Adam on the site of the modern Damieh.

II. By a slight emendation of the text, and falling back on the Septuagint and its various readings, it will not be difficult to get a translation not far removed from that suggested by Colonel Watson. But before examining the text, it is as well to notice two small, yet obvious, deficiencies, apart from all comparison with the Hebrew. If *ἐώς* is to be taken together with *εἰς* so as to form one preposition, and *ἐώς εἰς τὸ τέλος* stands for “utterly” (and it is so rendered in Redpath’s “Septuagint Concordance”), *κατέβη* and *ἔξελιπε* are decidedly awkward without some conjunction. And, anyhow, *κατέβη* is not wanted, and looks as if derived from an interpolated *Ιρρίδη*, itself derived from the previous **חוּרְדִים**. Again, *εἰστήκει* is obviously wrong. The people did not stand opposite Jericho as soon as the river bed was dry, but began the passage at once. It was the priests who stood and the people began to move. Even the Vulgate has “incedebat.” Here is an obvious error of **עַמְדוֹר** for **עַבְרוֹ**.

The deviations of the Greek may be traced as follows:—

(1) *σφόδρα σφόδρως* must have been **בָּמָאָד מָאָד** or **מָאָד מָאָד**. The latter is to be preferred, as, whether a corruption or not, it would account for the ב of the Kethib.

(3) *ἐώς* must stand for *הַעִיר*, the י of *הַעִיר* being dropped out (or inserted), and the ר being changed to ד (or *vice versa*). Schleussner suggests this in the only reference which he makes to the passage.

(3) The *ιαριμ* of *Καριαθιαριμ* was added by a translator or scribe who had, or thought he had, before him *קְרִית* simply. This being unintelligible, the next word, **חוּרְדִים**, suggested the well-known town Kirjath-jearim, and *וַיַּעֲרֵם* was added. The ר and ת of his *קְרִית* are certainly the ר and ת of *צִרְתָּן*, the Koph and Tsadhe of the old character being less unlike and more liable to become corrupted into each other than the modern square letters. Kirjath-jearim being quite impossible, and as (e), the only reading which substitutes *Σαρθαν* leaves out Adam, no existing text will support Colonel Watson’s theory. A combination of (e) and (g) or of (e) and (f) is necessary, and the Greek of the former would run as follows for the disputed sentence:—

ἀφεστηκός μακρὰν σφόδρα ἀπὸ "Άδομ (or 'Άδάμει τῆς πολέως ή εστιν) ἐώς μέρους Σάρθαν.

representing in Hebrew—

הַרְחָק מָאָד מָאָד וְעַד מִצְרָתָן

“A good distance away from Adam (or “Adameh”), even as far as the neighbourhood of Zarethan.”

The Vav of emphasis would come in very well before עַ, as we have four letters in הָעֵיר to account for. τῆς πολέως ἡ εστιν is certainly an interpolation of some scribe who had the original with הָעֵיר before him, and thought it a good addition. εώς must come from עַ, and therefore we cannot have πολέως representing הָעֵיר as well.

As far as the text is concerned the objections are but slight. If the Hebrew suggested were the original, the received text might easily have come from it: most likely corruptions would have taken place, and אשר would have been inserted between העיר and מיצד, also a very likely thing to take place. What is really almost fatal, till we know something more about Damieh, is the apparent want of reason for bringing it in. The Israelites were opposite Jericho, and the historian, describing an event about 40 miles away, says it took place a long distance from Damieh, 11 to 12 miles away. He is vague where he ought to be definite, and definite where definiteness is of no use. If he had said anything about Damieh, as, for instance, the natural place of crossing, we should understand; but without that, what is the purport of its introduction here?

III. If we are willing to leave the received version, and fall back on the Greek, (e) is not open to much objection. The Greek, then, would be as in (b), with Σαρθάν instead of Καριαθιαράτη, and the Hebrew as follows:—

הָרָחֵק בְּמִאֵד וְעַד מִצְדָּצְרָתָן

“An exceeding long way off, even near by Zarethan.”

This simply gives up Adam. In the history of manuscript writing are there enough instances of the name of a town merging into an ordinary adverb, to regard it with anything but suspicion?

IV. Colonel Watson's quotation from Nowairi, in which Damieh and Karawah occur as two neighbouring towns, induces me to suggest a slightly amended Hebrew text. Why should not the צ in Zarethan have come from an original ק instead of *vice versa*, as in the original of versions (b) and (f), and the town been קְרִית or קְרוֹת, Kariat or Karawat? On this supposition, the town mentioned by Nowairi would be in existence at the time of the Exodus, its name being derived from فَرِي or فَرُو, or the equivalent in a Semitic dialect. We should then read—

הָרָחֵק מִאֵד בְּאָדָם הָעֵיר אֲשֶׁר מִצְדָּקְרוֹת

“A long way off, at Adam, the city close to Karawat.”

It might be objected that a narrator would not speak of a place 11 or 12 miles away as הָרָחֵק מִאֵד, “very far away,” but we must remember that he was describing a wonderful occurrence, and that 12 miles would seem to him an incomprehensible distance from which

to work the miracle. It will be for Colonel Watson, and those acquainted with the Jordan, to say if a landslip is at all likely near Damieh. We are, indeed, in face of a Providential interference of some sort, and it was no harder to stop the Jordan near Damieh than to let the Israelites know it would be stopped *anywhere*, *c.f.* Matth. ix, 5. Still, the belief that miracles are not a subversion of natural laws, but that the Creator always works by laws, whether known or unknown to us, would be strikingly supported by Colonel Watson's new evidence, and the received interpretation of Josh. iii, 16; and against the latter, as I have said above, no decisive arguments are forthcoming. It is for this reason, as well as for the critical interest, that the passage deserves careful consideration.

THE ROCK OF ETAM AND THE CAVE OF ADULLAM.

By Rev. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.

IN *Quarterly Statement*, 1881, p. 323, I pointed out that this rock or crag was probably in Wady Urtas, near the traditional and true Cave of Adullam; but I could not then positively assert that Samson and David occupied precisely one and the same hiding place.

To some an identification appears incomplete unless the old name survives, or the modern is an admissible corruption of the old name. To me intricate points of topographical agreement seem to have more weight in establishing an identification than any name can have. The term Zion has been applied for fifteen centuries to the south-western hill at Jerusalem; still, the identification of that hill with the Zion or Mount Zion of the Bible is the greatest of errors, and the right position of Zion has been ascertained apart from the name.

The Cave of Adullam has been identified for 750 years with the famous cavern called Magharet Khureitun. M. Ganneau observed in *Quarterly Statement*, 1875, p. 173, that "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." This *ipse dixit* at that time for me closed the point. Afterwards examination (*Quarterly Statement*, 1884, p. 61) satisfied me that the said cave was beyond all question the real Cave of Adullam; but, for the satisfaction of others, I tried last year to find a name to meet what I still consider an exorbitant demand. The large map offered nothing like Adullam near Mugharet Khureitun, yet I observed, with some degree of surprise at my former inattention, that of the word Khureitun the last two syllables, *viz.*, *Eitun*, make a very presentable Etam, and next that *Khur* corresponds equally well to the Hebrew *Chor*, a hole or cave (whence Bethhoron and the Horites or dwellers in caves). Then at last, through its