

The place became very attractive to the Jews. One, writing in 1607, says that in the community there were "great scholars, saints and men of action full of Divine Wisdom," and about the same time the place is said to have contained eighteen Talmudic colleges and twenty-one synagogues, and also a large school for the children of the poor, with 400 pupils and 20 teachers, maintained by wealthy Jews of Constantinople.

From this time the city appears to have declined, Jerusalem coming increasingly into prominence.

Plague visited the city in 1742, and in 1759-60 occurred the double earthquake described by Rabbi Joseph the Scribe (see *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1914, pp. 67-83). In that interesting account we get so full a picture of the sacred tombs of Safed and of the spirit of the pious pilgrims who visited them, that it is unnecessary to add more on the subject here. A contemporary account states that immediately after the earthquakes there were only seven Jewish families left in the city. In 1776 a number of Jewish families from Russia arrived. Plague again ravaged the place in 1812, and it is said that 80 per cent. of the people died. In 1833 the Jewish quarter was plundered by the Druzes, and on January 1st, 1837, came the great earthquake, so vividly described by Dr. Thomson in the "Land and the Book," when it is said 4000 Jews perished. Sir Moses Montefiore visited the place soon after the earthquake and contributed liberally to the re-building. Between 1837 and 1873 he made no less than seven visits.

*References.*—I would express my indebtedness to the Rev. B. Z. Friedmann of Safed and the Rev. O. Lukyn-Williams, late of Safed, for many facts. To the latter, by referring me to *Crusaders in the East*, by Prof. W. B. Stevenson, and to *Studies in Judaism*, Second series, 1908, by Prof. S. Schechter, I am indebted for most of the historical details.

---

## CANA OF GALILEE.

By Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

SOME years ago I published a paper on this subject in the *Biblical World* (Chicago), but as this is but little read in England I propose to briefly recapitulate here the reasons which appear so convincing

to me for locating this site at *Khurbet Kānā* and not, as most people do, at *Kefr Kenna*. This latter site has the support of modern ecclesiastical tradition, and as both the Greek and the Roman Catholic Churches have committed themselves to this view to the extent of each building monastic establishments at *Kefr Kenna*, I fear it will be very difficult to convince the authorities of these churches. The English guide-books lend themselves also to the support of this site and I suppose at least 90 per cent. of tourists never imagine that another site has any claims at all. I shall be delighted if any one who has looked into this question on the spot, and supports the *Kefr Kenna* site, would undertake to answer the following points:—

1. *The Name.*—*Kānā* (قانا) clearly represents the Hebrew קנה Kanah—the Hebrew *Koph* corresponding with the Arabic hard *Kaf* (ق)—and the Greek *Kava* is but a transliteration of this. *Kenna* on the other hand is written كنا with the soft *Kaf* ك which corresponds to the Hebrew כ *Kaph*. The difference, as all who have studied Semitic languages know, is great. The doubling of the middle letter in *Kenna* also makes the word much more unlike *Cana* than *Kānā*.

2. *Position.*—To the modern tourist the fact that *Kefr Kenna* is on the high road from Tiberias to Nazareth seems to make it fit in with Our Lord's itinerary (*cf.* John iv, 46), but it must be remembered that the course of the modern high road is not a natural one and is due to the needs of modern pilgrims and travellers. Nazareth, then a small village, is now one of the chief centres of traffic in the district. On the other hand *Khurbet Kānā* appears to-day to be entirely off any important route. It lies on the top of a low hill on the northern side of the plain of the *Battāuf*. To reach it the traveller turns off the carriage road near *Meshhed*, passes through that village and strikes almost due north; passes *Rummaneh* on the southern side of the *Battāuf*, leaving *Khurbet Rumeḥ* (the Roma of the Talmud) on his left and crosses the *Sahel el-Battāuf* by a pathway which brings him to the foot of the *Kānā* hill. The following is my account of the ruin written at the time:—"The remains lie on a rounded hill isolated on all sides, though connected by a low neck with the mountains to the north. The site is an important one, easily defended in olden days, as its sides are everywhere steep and the hills around at a considerable distance. On the southern slopes of this hill some half-way up—perhaps two hundred feet above the

plain—are the ruined walls of some fifty or sixty Arab houses, some of which have recently been utilized as cattle pens. Even here are some half-hidden cisterns and traces of an important road. The remains, however, of real antiquity lie at a higher level, a point of which several writers appear to be unaware. Excavated in the strata of softer limestone running some yards below the summit platform are a number of rock-cut cave-tombs; I visited as many as six in a few minutes. The roughly-level hill-top is pierced in all directions with ancient cisterns. I saw over a dozen and many more have their mouths hidden by earth and brushwood. There are extensive wall-foundations in all directions and several large holes where vaults have fallen in. The whole surface is covered with small fragments of Roman pottery. There can be no question that this site was occupied by a very considerable population in Roman, and probably too in earlier, times. The site and the remains reminded me much of *et-Tell*—the site of Bethsaida—in the *Batīnah*. It is certainly one of the strongest natural sites in the neighbourhood. From the base of this steep hill the great plain of *el-Battauf* stretches out east and south and west. From its summit the inhabitants of the town must have viewed all that happened on the whole plain. Its height would save the inhabitants from the greatest dangers to health from the marsh below them.” The position of this place makes it probable that it was the Cana in Galilee where Herod the Great had his headquarters (Josephus, *Wars*, I, 17, § 5, cf. § 3). Josephus too lived here, for he says (*Life*, § 17): “Now at this time my abode was in a village of Galilee which is named Cana,” and (in *Life*, § 41) he states that he lived in “the great plain, the name of which was Asochis”—this has always been considered to have been *el-Battauf*. Some who concede that this may be the Cana of Josephus are still inclined to place a second “Cana of Galilee” at *Kefr Kenna*, six miles off. This seems to be, to say the least, improbable.

But there is a more striking thing about this *Kānā*, and that is that it lay in the centre of the most thoroughly Jewish population of Galilee, as we see by the account of the campaign of Josephus, and we can see by various indications that it was on a high road which was in a special degree Jewish. This can be traced to-day from Capernaum through Gennesaret, up the *Wādy Hamān*, past the Jewish city Arbela (now *Irbid* with its ancient ruined synagogue), past *Huttin*, the Caphar Hattin of the Talmud, and through the town

of which the old name is lost whose ruins, including a fine synagogue, are called *Umm el-'Amed*. Thence it runs along the northern edge of the *Battāuf*, past *Kānā* and up the *Wādī Jafāt* to Jolāpatā and Cabul (the Cabolo of Josephus) or from *Kānā* past *Kefr Menda* through Asochis to Sepphoris or to Ptolemais. This road is actually mentioned in Josephus (*Life*, § 71), who says that Sylla, the commander of the Roman troops, "pitched his camp at five furlongs distance from Julias" (*i.e.*, Bethsaida), and he "set a guard upon the roads, both that which led to Cana and that which led to the fortress Gamala." All the indications point to this as a characteristically *Jewish* road, as contrasted with the great Roman highway from Sepphoris to Tiberias. We have therefore a special reason for Our Lord's going by way of Cana. He instructed His disciples: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles" (Matt. x, 5), and what He taught by precept He must have taught by example. His mission was entirely to Jewish centres. He never seems to have visited Roman Sepphoris—the capital of the province—or pagan and defiled Tiberias.

Galilee had a very mixed population, but from the account of the rebellion it is evident that here—around Cana—was the centre of Jewish life. It seems, therefore, the most probable that about here should have been the ministry of Him who said: "I am not come but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

But if this conclusion is correct, students of the New Testament must revise their ideas of the route of several of Our Lord's journeys.

3. *Tradition*.—It is a strange thing that although those who lay much stress on tradition probably believe that this is their strongest argument in support of *Kefr Kenna*, yet, as a matter of fact, none of the records of the earlier pilgrims unequivocally support the *Kefr Kenna* site, while several of the most important seem to me to clearly point to *Khurbet Kānā*. Thus Saewulf (1102-3) says:—

"From Nazareth, Chana of Galilee—where Our Lord changed the water into wine at the marriage—is distant about six miles to the north, situated on a hill. There is nothing left there except the monastery which is called Architriclini ('The house of the ruler of the feast'). Between Nazareth and Chana of Galilee, about half-way, is a village which is called Roma where all pilgrims going from Accaron to Tiberias are entertained, having Nazareth on the right and Galilee (? 'Cana of Galilee') on the left."

Any one consulting the map will, I think, see that this account cannot possibly apply to any place but *Khurbet Kānā*. The position of Roma, now *Khurbet Rūmeh*, is conclusive.

The German monk Burkhard (about 1280) is even more clear :—

“In the second division of the eastern quarter, starting from Acre to the south-east, four leagues from Acre, one comes to Cana of Galilee, where the Lord turned water into wine. . . . . To the north Cana of Galilee has a tall mountain on whose slope it stands. At its foot on the south side it has a very fair plain which Josephus calls Carmelion ; it reaches as far as Sephora and is exceeding fertile and pleasant. About two leagues to the south of Cana of Galilee on the road from Sephora to Tiberias is a village named Ruma, wherein the prophet Jonah is said to have been buried. This village stands beneath the mountain which comes from Nazareth and bounds the aforesaid valley of Carmelion on the south.” The map again will show that this description clearly points to *Khurbet Kānā*. Forty years later Marino Sanuto gives the same account almost in Burkhard’s words. There is not a single early pilgrim who gives the name Kenna.

How did the tradition change ? It, like many such changes, was due largely to the monk Quaresmius who in the beginning of the seventeenth century came to re-investigate these traditional sites, as many of them had been lost through the break in the succession of pilgrims to this district, on account of the dangerous state of the land. He knew of both sites but apparently gave his vote in favour of *Kefr Kenna*—with some misgivings—because it was more accessible from Nazareth and because he found there extensive remains of a monastery, which, as we gather from earlier writers, was really not connected with any events in the Gospel but was to the honour of Jonah. I think—as he is practically the one and only authority before quite modern times—I cannot do better than quote the actual words of Quaresmius :—

“Posterior haec sententia mihi vali probabilis videtur (licet alteram rejicere non audeam) quoniam proximior Nazareth . . . . . at quia potest adinveniri memoria ecclesiae constructae in loco miraculi.”

---