

at the siege situate towards the southern end of ed-Dhahr, near Siloam (Neh. iii, 16); while, finally, he had long assimilated the fiction that the Akra fort and hill had been wholly removed.

It was obvious that the royal sepulchres could not be in existence in a hill that had long before ceased to exist. Therefore all of these four articles of belief could not then be true. Accordingly, although the Bible said that David "called it (the fort) the city of David" (2 Sam. v, 9), Josephus twice in one passage (Ant. VII, iii, 2) wrote: "David named Jerusalem the city of David." By this perversion or prevarication he sacrificed the valuable precision of the sacred record, and brought vexation on posterity to save his own credit.

#### THE TRADITIONAL "HARBOUR OF SOLOMON" AT JAFFA.

By the Rev. J. E. HANAUER, Jerusalem.

To supplement my remarks on the traditional harbour of Solomon at Jaffa (*see Quarterly Statement*, July, 1903, pp. 258-264), I may observe that I inadvertently omitted to give chapter and verse for my quotation on p. 263 describing the fortified island existing at Jaffa in 1253. The reference is to Bohn's edition of Joinville's memoirs in *Chronicles of the Crusaders*, pp. 486, 495 sq.

When I submitted my notes I emphatically remarked that I did so "pending the time when more expert investigators and the results of excavation throw more certain light on the matter." As a matter of fact, during the spring such excavations and investigations were carried on under the auspices of the American School of Archæology, and in return for references and information furnished by myself, I have just received from Dr. Barton, late Director of the School, a kind note, written from the British Museum, and dated July 18th, containing the interesting information that at a depth of half a mètre below the present level of soil, and at a height of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  mètres (nearly 15 feet) above sea-level, the excavators had re-discovered the wall to which I referred on p. 260.

We must, of course, await the publication of Professor Barton's report for fuller information of details, but I am happy to be able to send the following extract from his letter:—"I am convinced

that the inner harbour was used in the time of Solomon, in the time of Simon the Maccabee, and in the time of Saladin, and that seismic disturbances have changed the level at various times. I believe that Joinville's island was temporarily produced by such a change."

---

## DAJÛN AND BETH-DAGON AND THE TRANSFERENCE OF BIBLICAL PLACE-NAMES.

By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A.

THE report of the discovery of a find of gold coins in the neighbourhood of the modern village of Beit Dejân led Surraya Effendi and myself to pay a visit to the place. With great difficulty we persuaded an inhabitant of the village to guide us to the site of the discovery—the commendable promptness of the Government in dealing with those who attempted to sell the coins had made the inhabitants of the village cautious in their dealing with strangers.

The site is the ruin known as Dajûn, about  $1\frac{3}{4}$  miles south-west of the village. This ruin has for some time been treated by the fellaḥîn of Beit Dejân as a quarry, and they have been actively engaged in taking stones from it either for their own purposes or for sale in Jaffa. It was whilst these operations were being carried on that the find of coins was made.

Holes have been pitted all over the surface of the site, from which it is possible to get a fair idea of its period. There is not more than 6 feet of débris, and the pottery shows that this is to be assigned to the Roman and early Arab periods. No earlier occupation has left any traces on the site. It follows that Dajûn cannot be the Beth-Dagon of Joshua xv, 41, as has been suggested. On the other hand there is little cause for doubt that it is the connecting link between the biblical Beth-Dagon and the modern village of Beit Dajûn.

It is becoming more and more clear, as our knowledge increases, that the transference of names and sites is an element that must be taken into account in attempting to identify biblical places with their modern representatives. It would, perhaps, be too paradoxical to say that (contrary to the general opinion) the persistence of a biblical name is presumptive evidence *against* the fixity of the site; but it is certain that no identification based on a similarity of name can be accepted unless corroborated by other indications.

No doubt many reasons could be assigned for the transference of a village, with its name, to a new site. For example, if an earthquake ruined the village, stopped its well, and transferred its subterranean source of water supply to an inconvenient distance—not an impossible accident—the villagers would naturally rebuild near the new spring.