

that Jebel Suleiman ("Handbook," p. 210), four miles off, cannot be Mount Zalmon, as Abimelech though willing once in a way to be *a hewer of wood*, would naturally demur to carrying his load further than was necessary. It seems to me that Zalmon ("Sinai and Palestine," p. 239) must be some part of Ebal. The curious ruin on whose summit ("Tent Work," i, p. 67) may well be *the hold* (a kind of tower) mentioned in Jud. ix, 46. An altar of Baal might as suitably have stood on the *top* of Ebal as of Carmel.

I propose in the next number to give the arguments for placing the cave of Adullam at Khureitûn, and the rock Etam near it in Wâdy Urtas.

W. F. BIRCH.

EMMAUS.

FIRST of all, Khamësa, which has of late secured some votes as the probable site of Emmaus, is at least $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles, as the crow flies, from Jerusalem, and by any possible road cannot be less than $9\frac{1}{2}$ miles from that city. The distance is therefore too great to tally with St. Luke or Josephus.

Now among the cities of Benjamin, Joshua (xviii, 26) speaks of Musah, as we read it, but in Hebrew **הַמִּצְדָּה** Hammosah, "The Mosah." Fürst gives Musah the meaning "place of reeds," but it seems more probable that it is equivalent to **מַצְוֵה**, a spring. Be this as it may, the Talmud says that this Musah, or Maûza, is the place whence willows were brought to adorn the Altar at the Feast of Tabernacles, and this suggests a valley; and elsewhere again the Talmud says that it was made a colony. (*See Caspari § 242.*)

But Josephus tells us in the well known passage that his Ammaus was colonised by the assignment of the place by Titus to 800 discharged veterans.

We have thus side by side these statements from totally different sources: first, that a place called by Joshua Hammusah became a Roman colony; secondly, that Ammaus became a Roman colony. Hammusah is therefore in all probability identical with Ammaus.

We now turn to the map. We find a well known place on the main road from Jerusalem to the west, called Kolonieh, manifestly from Colonia, and about a mile to the north of this, looking down on a valley which trends at that point south and west toward Kolonieh, a ruin called Brit Muzza.

Here we have another linking of these two, Hammusah, the fountain, and a Roman colony, and we must be near the place we are looking for.

But now let us pass up from Kolonieh along the valley, under Brit Muzza, and pursue our way along the whole length of the valley (Wâdy Bûwai) up to its head. We are then some three miles from Kolonieh, and

about a mile further, on the hill, in Kubeibet, which it is said the Crusaders were informed was the site of Emmaus.

Now the head of this valley is as near as may be 60 stadia from Jerusalem. And it would seem probable that the original Emmaus, or the principal part of its population, originally laid around the head of the valley, giving its name, however, more or less exactly, to the whole: that this valley, and especially its upper part, was originally the *Colonia* of the discharged soldiers of Titus, but that as time went on the chief part of the population gravitated down to the Roman road, not at the nearest point to Jerusalem, but at the junction of the valley with that road.

Travellers from Jerusalem to the upper valley of Emmaus would not pass through Kolonieh, but would leave the main road about two miles from that place, and descend into the Wâdy Būwai just where the roads from Kolonieh on the left, and from Lifta on the right, converge upon it. At such a point as this we may well imagine that the two disciples encountered their veiled and risen Lord, and as they went along that upland path towards what was then the chief part at least of Emmaus, the fountains of a new life were opened out to them.

Joshua and the Talmud, St. Luke and Josephus, the traditions heard by the Crusaders, and the stern requirements of a modern survey fixing distances beyond possibility of mistake, seem all harmonised by the identification thus proposed.
