New Test. Stud. 48, pp. 314–331. Printed in the United Kingdom © 2002 Cambridge University Press

What has Cana to do with Capernaum?

PETER RICHARDSON
University College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1

The significant differences on geographical matters between the Synoptics with their sources and John with its sources – especially the question of Jesus' 'place' – should not be resolved simply in favour of Mark. Cana as a place in John is almost as significant as Capernaum in Mark; this is the case in the first century, the gospel narratives and the pilgrim tradition. Both Cana and Capernaum show the continuing vitality of Jewish and Christian communities into the Byzantine period, so that the archaeological investigation of Khirbet Qana will be increasingly significant for historical questions.

Introduction

The third quest of the historical Jesus has helped to create an explosion of research into Jesus' geographical setting, much of it focused on the Galilee.[1] The

1 Eric M. Meyers, ed., *Galilee Through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999); Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000); Mordechai Aviam, *Jews, Christians and Pagans in the Galilee* (USF Studies in the History of Judaism, forthcoming); Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCullough, *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997); Lee I. Levine, ed., *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (New York/Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992); Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1995); *idem*, *Archaeology, History and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1996); Sean Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1988); Halvor Moxnes, 'The Construction of Galilee as a Place for the Historical Jesus – Part I', *BTB* 31 (2001) 26–37; 'Part II', *BTB* 31 (2001) 64–77. Relatively little work has concentrated on Gaulanitis; indeed, it has often been considered merely a subdivision of the Galilee. Yet it too is important for the historical Jesus. Though I do not deal with Gaulanitis, distinctions between the two northern regions in character, culture, history, social and religious make-up should be recognized. See Robert C. Gregg and Dan Urman, *Jews, Pagans, and Christians in the Golan Heights* (USF Studies in the History of Judaism 140; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996); Shimon Dar, *Settlements and Cult Sites on Mount Hermon, Israel: Ituraean Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1993). On Et-Tel, possibly ancient Bethsaida, see Rami Arav and Richard A. Freund, *Bethsaida: A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

present study aims in general terms to link evidence from texts and material culture, from 'the dirt and the word'.[2] Its particular approach is prompted by three interrelated concerns: (1) an interest in the geography and chronology of the historical Jesus; (2) archaeological, architectural and social-historical investigation of Galilean villages, especially Khirbet Qana and Yodefat;[3] and (3) uneasiness about archaeological claims concerning Capernaum's veneration site. These *realia*-related concerns are linked to the Gospel of John (especially the Signs Gospel), though my interest in the latter is less acute than the former. The main goal of this essay on the importance of place[4] is to draw Cana as a real 'place' more fully into discussions of historical Jesus traditions.

Josephus, like the NT, mentions Cana, Capernaum and Bethsaida in connection with events of 66–67 CE. After an injury near Bethsaida/Julias (*Life*, 399–403), he was taken to Capernaum, stayed one day and left for Tarichaea. Cana, however, was his centre for part of the time he was in Galilee while preparing for the expected Roman counter-attack: 'Now at this time my abode was in a village of Galilee, which is named Cana' (*Life*, 86; *Life*, 207 says he lived in the Plain of Asochis, or the Beth Netofa valley).[5] Cana was strategically sensible, since neither Tiberias nor Sepphoris was fully under Josephus's control, and Cana – unlike Yodefat, whose defences he was strengthening – easily overlooked Sepphoris and controlled the Beth Netofa valley. Though the incident is set a generation after Jesus' activity, Josephus writes at about the same time as the gospels. Though the differences may have more to do with circumstances than the character of the

2 The title of Emily Dickinson Townsend Vermeule's address as President of the American Philological Association; see Sarah Morris and Cynthia W. Shelmerdine, 'Emily Dickinson Townsend Vermeule, 1928–2001', *AJA* 105 (2001) 513–15.

3 Mordechai Aviam and Peter Richardson, 'Josephus' Galilee in Archaeological Perspective', Appendix A in Steve Mason, *Life of Josephus* (*Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary* 9; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 177–209; Peter Richardson, *Herod, King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) chap. 6; *idem*, 'First-Century Houses and Q's Setting', *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David Catchpole* (ed. David Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 63–83; *idem*, 'Enduring Concerns: Desiderata for Future Historical-Jesus Research', *Whose Historical Jesus?* (ed. William Arnal and Michel Desjardins; ESCJ 7; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997) 296–307; *idem*, 'Khirbet Cana (and other villages) as a Context for Jesus', *Jesus and Archaeology* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, forthcoming); *idem*, 'Khirbet Qana's Necropolis and Ethnic Questions', *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class and the 'Other' in Antiquity* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough, forthcoming).

4 Like Halvor Moxnes, 'Placing Jesus of Nazareth: Toward a Theory of Place in the Study of the Historical Jesus', *Text and Artifact: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (ed. S. G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins; ESCJ 9; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 2000) 158–75, I understand place as both 'village and region'.

5 Other references in Josephus to Cana refer to other sites or are textual errors.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

villages, Josephus uses Cana for administrative purposes and Capernaum for an emergency.

While recent studies of geographical 'place' have broadened the discussion to include regional, ethnic, urban, economic, social, symbolic, political and religious factors, there have also been studies of textual 'place'. Earlier studies are still important for stressing the texts' handling of geographic markers as aspects of the authors' theological purposes and constructions of reality, whether in the Synoptic Gospels or the Gospel of John.[6] Yet the Synoptics' emphasis on Capernaum has been little challenged as a kind of archaeological bedrock of gospel study.[7] Since its relevance has long been emphasized, I will say little about Capernaum. I aim instead to underscore Cana's potential significance, in part by setting Cana and Capernaum alongside each other as literary rivals for Jesus' home base: the Cana tradition is as early and almost as strong as the Capernaum claim. Whether Cana was actually a centre of Jesus' activity is a separate but related question.

Geography of the gospels

The geographical presumptions of various gospels and their sources, especially the Galilean allusions, show considerable variety.

The only specific indication of place in the *Gospel of Thomas* is an incidental reference to 'a Samaritan carrying a lamb on his way to Judea' (*Gos. Thom.* 60),

6 K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969), criticized by David R. Hall, *The Gospel Framework, Fiction or Fact: A Critical Evaluation of* Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu *by Karl Ludwig Schmidt* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998); Ernst Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT 34; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936); R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938). K. Kundsin, *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe im Johannes-Evangelium: Eine Untersuchung* (FRLANT 22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925) 10: 'Alles in allen – die Zeitangaben des Evangeliums sind trotz ihres vielfach minutiösen Charakters nicht ein Teil des historischen Wirklichkeit, sondern gehören überwiegend der literärischen, ideellen, überzeitlichen Sphäre an.'

7 Excavation reports by Virgilio Corbo, *The House of St. Peter at Capharnaum; A Preliminary Report of the First Two Campaigns of Excavations: April 16–June 19, Sept. 12–Nov 26, 1968* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1969); Virgilio Corbo, *Cafarnao*, vol. 1, *Gli edifici della città* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 19; Jerusalem, 1975); S. Loffreda, *Cafarnao,* vol. 2, *La ceramica* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 19; Jerusalem, 1974); A. Spijkerman, *Cafarnao*, vol. 3, *Catalogo delle monete della città* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 19; Jerusalem, 1975); Emmanuele Testa, *Cafarnao*, vol. 4, *I graffiti della casa di S. Pietro* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 19; Jerusalem, 1972). For a sustained critique, much of which I share, of the Bagatti-Testa hypothesis of Jewish-Christian continuity, see Joan Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) esp. 268–94; L. Michael White, *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1997) 2.152–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which merely implies a journey between Galilee and Judea through or near Samaria.[8] The *Gospel of Thomas* as a whole is firmly set in rural villages (note 'in his own village', *Gos. Thom.* 31), presumably but not explicitly in the Galilee.[9]

Q has relatively few references to specific locations, though more than the *Gospel of Thomas*. It opens with John at the Jordan and the temptations; by the time Jesus enters Capernaum (Q 7.1) many of Jesus' sayings have already been reported, but always without setting. Jesus' approval after the Capernaum healing ('not even in Israel have I found such faith') is soon undercut by his woes on Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida (Q 10.12–15), which are compared unfavourably to the Phoenician cities Tyre and Sidon. The setting of the woes on the Pharisees remains unstated, but Jerusalem may be presupposed (Q 11.51; 13.34). Like the *Gospel of Thomas*, Q assumes no centre for Jesus' activity other than generalized rural towns and villages.

Mark knows that Jesus is from Nazareth (Mark 1.9; cf. 'Nazarene' in 1.24; 10.47; 14.67; 16.6), from which he goes to the Jordan to see John. After a desultory reference to temptation Jesus returns to Galilee, but relocates to the area around the Sea, making Capernaum his main location, where he teaches and heals (Mark 1.21, 23).[10] Capernaum is his and his followers' home (2.1; 1.29), from which place he travels around the region by land and sea, including visits to Bethsaida (6.45; 8.22). At the narrative climax, Mark has Jesus travel to the regions of Tyre and Sidon, the Decapolis, Panias and Mount Hermon (7.24–9.32) before returning to Capernaum (9.33–50) and then heading to Judea and Jerusalem (10.1).[11] Since Mark knows nothing of the woes on Bethsaida, Capernaum and Chorazin, his allusions to Capernaum take on additional significance.

In Matthew's more complicated scheme, Bethlehem is both Jesus' birthplace and his home (2.1–8, 16), while Nazareth is merely Jesus' adopted home (2.23; cf. 26.71; 21.11). Following Mark, Matthew has Jesus see John at the Jordan; he settles in Capernaum when he returns, in order to fulfil prophecy (4.13–17; cf. 17.24). Matthew's inclusion of Q's woes on Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida balances his positive notices of those places. He shortens Mark's itinerary outside Galilee (15.21, 29), though Jesus still visits Panias (16.13). Matthew's construction of Jesus' place (born in Bethlehem of Judea, moved with his family to Nazareth,

8 The Synoptics sometimes attribute locales, lacking in *Thomas*, in pericopes both share; depending on the direction of influence, this suggests a process of either localization or delocalization.

9 Others without locales are *Dialogue of the Saviour* and *Apocryphon of James*. *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* describes situations that may take place in Galilee; some manuscripts locate Jesus' home in Bethlehem (near Nazareth; *Inf. Gos. Thom.* 1; cf. also 4, 12 for 'village').

10 J. C. Iwe, *Jesus in the Synagogue of Capernaum* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1999), not available to me.

11 Kundsin, *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe*, 8–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

abandoned it after his baptism, and chose Capernaum as his centre) has been the most influential geographical tradition.

Luke's variant on Matthew's view is complicated by the question of sources. Since the Proto-Luke hypothesis still seems to me persuasive, its geographical thread is relevant. After regional allusions to Judea, Galilee, Ituraea, Trachonitis and Abilene, then the requisite visit to John at the Jordan (Luke 3.1–3; 2.1), Proto-Luke has Jesus return to Galilee (3.14), to Nazareth where he was brought up (3.16). Here he is challenged (4.16–30) to do in his 'own country' works like those he had done in Capernaum (4.23–4, though none has yet been mentioned). He is then in turn at Lake Gennesaret (5.1), Capernaum and Nain (7.1, 11).[12] He perambulates 'through cities and villages' (8.1; repeated in 11.1; 13.10, 22; 17.11) before setting his face to go to Jerusalem (9.51) via Samaria (9.52).[13] The woes on Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, illogically, occur in this section (10.13–15). When Luke revises his first edition by including Mark and other material, he makes Bethlehem Jesus' birthplace (2.4, 15), but retains Nazareth as Jesus' original hometown (1.26; 2.4, 39, 51; 4.16; cf. 'Nazarene' at 18.37 and 7 times in Acts). Luke ignores Mark's itinerary to Tyre, Sidon, Panias and the Decapolis despite its obvious relevance to his theology.

The regional Galilean ambience for Jesus is deeply, no doubt correctly, rooted in various traditions, even though this regional setting is not always noted specifically; presumably the setting is of less interest to them than to us. There is also wide recognition of time spent in Jerusalem and Judea, even in the *Gospel of Thomas*, though not explicitly in Q.[14] There is no unanimity on the narrower issue of Jesus' central place:

- Q and *Thomas* know no centre, and Q's woes work against Capernaum, Chorazin or Bethsaida.
- Proto-Luke also has no real centre, but balances time in Galilee (Nazareth, the Sea, Capernaum, Nain) with time travelling on the road towards Jerusalem.
- Mark views Capernaum as Jesus' centre, with connections to Bethsaida, Tyre and Sidon, Panias and the Decapolis.
- Matthew imagines Bethlehem as Jesus' home town, Nazareth as his family's adopted home, and Capernaum as his chosen new location, following Mark.
- Luke, however, sees Bethlehem merely as Jesus' birth town, while Nazareth is his family home: he stays in contact with it even after relocating to Capernaum.

12 'People from Judea, Jerusalem, and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon' (5.17–19) should be included in Proto-Luke; these geographical allusions differ from the other gospels.

13 Lightfoot, *Locality*, 133, observes that 'no district receives any notable preference' in Luke: Galilee 275 verses, Samaria 350 verses, Judea 320 verses.

14 Other gospels are explicitly set in Jerusalem: *Papyrus Oxyrhyncus* 840, *Papyrus Egerton* 2, *Gospel of Peter* (with Galilean post-resurrection incidents), *Acts of Pilate* and *Protevangelium of James*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1: General geographical patterns of the gospels

G Thom	**Q**	**Mark**	**Matt**	**Luke**	**Proto-Luke**	**SG-Fortna**	**John**
	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan	Jordan
[Galilee]	[Galilee?]	Galilee -Capernaum -towns -Capernaum -lakeside -hill country -lakeside -Sea + Golan -Capernaum? -Nazareth	Galilee -seaside -Capernaum -Sea + Golan -Capernaum? -towns -lakeside -Nazareth -Sea + Golan	Galilee -Nazareth -Capernaum -remote place Judea (?) -lake -Capernaum -Nain	Galilee -Nazareth -lake -Capernaum -Nain	Golan? Galilee	Golan? Galilee -Bethsaida? -**Cana** -Capernaum
		Villages Bethsaida? Gennesaret	 Gennesaret	Cities and villages	Cities and villages		
		Pagan areas -region Tyre -Sidon -Decapolis -Bethsaida -Panias	Pagan areas -Tyre + Sidon -seaside -Magadan -Golan -Panias	Golan			
	Capernaum	Galilee -Capernaum	Galilee -Capernaum	Bethsaida To Jerusalem	 To Jerusalem		Judea
Samaria				Samaria	Samaria	Samaria	Samaria
				Villages and towns	Villages and towns		Galilee -**Cana**
							Judea
							Sea/Golan
							Galilee
							Judea
							Peraea
[Judea]	[Jerusalem?]	Judea/Peraea	Judea/Peraea	Judea	Judea	Judea	Judea

Two general points. (1) These traditions more or less consistently presuppose a two-part ministry, first in Galilee and later in Judea and Jerusalem. Yet (2) while there is no uniform tradition about Jesus' specific 'place', there is a tendency deriving from Mark that it was Capernaum. Both general propositions have been widely, but perhaps too readily, accepted. (1) While the two-part ministry is a strong tradition, the Fourth Gospel has a back-and-forth pattern between Galilee and Jerusalem, which some scholars deliberately prefer.[15] (2) The support for Capernaum as a centre is not as strong as usually assumed, since early gospels such as Q, *Thomas* and Proto-Luke have a different scheme from Mark's. Both questions are open, and both are viewed differently in John, to which I now turn.

John

Fourth Gospel

British scholars such as C. H. Dodd and John A. T. Robinson have examined Synoptic-like historical traditions underlying the Fourth Gospel.[16] The Cana material is especially important. Robinson argued that 'history belongs to the bedrock of the Johannine tradition' (159). He thought the Fourth Gospel a primary gospel alongside – sometimes as reliable as – the Synoptic Gospels, though not necessarily the earliest.[17] Dodd, whom Robinson followed, found traditional material in the Cana meal and the healing of the nobleman's son (188–95, 223–8), though he was dubious about the Nathanael tradition; it belonged to 'a Jewish environment, and ... [was] barely intelligible to a Hellenistic public', deriving from 'the Christian mission in controversy with Jewish opposition' (312).

Alternation between Judea and Galilee dominates the Fourth Gospel's geographical schematization; indeed, many have noted that in John Jesus' *patris* is not Galilee but Judea. Jesus' Galilean role begins in Cana and only later includes Capernaum and the area around the Sea. Nathanael of Cana plays a special role, bracketing the Fourth Gospel with an introduction (1.43–51) and a flashback (21.2).[18] The primary Cana incident, the wedding (2.1–11), has a village setting, a household, large stone jars for purification, and storage cisterns, to which I will

15 Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* (New York: Knopf, 1999) 197–214, 28–34, believes 'the sort of itinerary that John presents makes much more sense than the one-year, one-way itinerary in Mark'.

16 C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963); John A. T. Robinson, *The Priority of John* (London: SCM, 1985), explicitly rejecting a Signs Gospel as only 'a pale shadow of John's theology' (20).

17 John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1976) argues for an early date.

18 The implied rivalry in Nathanael's comment on Nazareth may merely reflect the fact that the two villages are within sight of each other.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

return. This first sign, together with a second one also set in Cana but operative in Capernaum (4.46–54), 'led his disciples to believe in him' (2.11; cf. 4.54). The final redaction has slightly altered the role of Cana by having Jesus deliberately return there after a visit to Judea and Samaria (the Signs Gospel implies a continuous stay in Cana). In any case, when the royal officer comes to Cana asking Jesus to go with him to Capernaum, Jesus merely tells him his son is well. Though these are the first two explicit signs, the final redaction has squeezed in others set in Judea, creating *aporias* in 2.23 and 3.2.

Underlying traditions

If the claims about an earlier Signs Gospel behind the Fourth Gospel are correct, as seems likely,[19] that earlier gospel – even more than the finished Fourth Gospel – is dominated geographically in its opening scenes by the conviction that Jesus' own 'place' is Cana.[20] Nathanael-of-Cana is the first genuinely Galilean follower of Jesus,[21] since John locates the earlier three followers (Andrew, Peter and Philip) in Bethsaida-in-Gaulanitis.[22] Then the first sign, water into wine (2.1–11), is followed immediately by the official's son restored to life (2.12a; 4.46–54),[23] and

19 Robert Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970); *idem*, *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); John Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 73–93, considers but rejects Fortna's views. Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Earliest Version of John's Gospel: Recovering the Gospel of Signs* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989). All studies depend on Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931); *idem*, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 22; Göttingen, 1941). See Gilbert van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL 116; Louvain: Leuven University, 1994).

20 *Epistle of the Apostles* 5 may extend the Cana reference beyond 'he made water into wine' to include 'and awakened the dead and made the lame to walk; for him whose hand was withered, he stretched it out again, and the woman who suffered twelve years from a haemorrhage touched the edge of his garment . . .'.

21 John 21.2 lists an inner group of seven followers that includes Nathanael from Cana-in-Galilee (only his origin is specified) who see the risen Jesus and have a miraculous catch of fish on the Sea of Tiberias. The identification of Nathanael as from Cana was probably found in the Signs Gospel. Anthony J. Blasi, *A Social History of Johannine Christianity* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1996) 316 n. 1, observes that 'the absence of a major role for Nathaniel [*sic*] in the FG argues for this [1.47b–48] having been primitive material'. Raymond E. Brown is less sure, *Gospel According to John* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970) 2.1068: 'it is difficult to be sure whether this [21.2] represents traditional knowledge or is a deduction from Nathanael's knowledge of the local Galilean situation in 1:46, combined with 2:1–12'.

22 Bethsaida is incorrectly located in Galilee at 12.21.

23 Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, 39, 102, notes that the awkwardness of the two seams at 2.12 and 4.46 is solved by the healing taking place either in Capernaum (Bultmann) or on the Cana–Capernaum road (Wilkens). But 4.49 ('come down before my child dies') presupposes

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

then by the catch of fish (21.1–14, relocated to a resurrection setting in the Fourth Gospel).[24] Thus, the first Galilean disciple, the first two acts of Jesus, and the catch of fish (through Nathanael's identification, 21.2) are all tied to Cana. The Signs Gospel then puts Jesus on the other side, in Gaulanitis, before he crosses the Sea to Capernaum; when he arrives there the village is unnamed and nothing happens. Fortna's Signs Gospel shifts to Jerusalem where Jesus remains (he supposes a one-way trip to Judea, like the Synoptics).[25] This source narrative emphasizes Cana's role and downgrades Capernaum's, locating Jesus' proper 'place' in Galilee differently from Mark.

John's geography

Earlier studies of the geographical references in John have emphasized redactional and theological factors.[26] Fortna, for example, stresses differences between the geographical patterns of the Signs Gospel and the Fourth Gospel,[27] so that the Galilee/Judea bipolar alternation is characteristic only of the final redaction. Fortna's reconstruction, attractive as it is, is not fully persuasive when it is reordered to conform to the Synoptic pattern; it is arguable that a less extensively rearranged order makes more sense.

---

that Jesus is in Cana, not already on the road; the transition to the second sign is more likely, 'While Jesus was still in Cana . . .'.

24 'Third' in 21.14 may extend the numeration of 'second' in 4.54.

25 See also von Wahlde, *Earliest Version*, who includes more than Fortna and leaves the material in its canonical order, though with some *aporias* unresolved; D. Moody Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel* (New Haven: Yale University, 1965) 111, arguing for preservation of the source's order; Jürgen Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn/Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1979), who thinks only 5.1–18 is out of order, and includes no passion narrative. Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992) 82–4, dismisses a Signs Gospel and argues for a collection of Galilean signs/miracles with a Jerusalem-centred Gospel of Lazarus. See also Van Belle, *Signs Source*, esp. chap. 5; Fortna, 'Signs/Semeia Source', *ABD* 6.18–22.

26 Kundsin, *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe*, table on 11–12; D. Mollat, 'Remarques sur le vocabulaire spatial du quatrième évangile', *Studia Evangelica: The Four Gospels in 1957* (ed. Kurt Aland; TU 73; Berlin: Akademie, 1959) 321–8; R. D. Potter, 'Topography and Archaeology in the Fourth Gospel', *Studia Evangelica: The Four Gospels in 1957* (ed. Kurt Aland; TU 73; Berlin: Akademie, 1959) 329–37; Robert T. Fortna, 'Theological Use of Locale in the Fourth Gospel', in *Gospel Studies in Honor of Sherman Elbridge Johnson* (ed. M. H. Shepherd Jr and Edward C. Hobbs), *ATR Supplementary Series* 3 (1974) 58–95; C. H. H. Scobie, 'Johannine Geography', *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 11 (1982) 77–84.

27 Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*, 36: 'John has made conscious use in his gospel of geography as a theological device . . . It is likely that the places he adopts as pivotal for this purpose (Cana, Bethany, Jerusalem) were simply taken by him in the first instance from the source.' '[E]ach story is inseparably attached to a specific locale and so seems to fit closely into a scheme of the travels of Jesus common to all. By contrast many of the synoptic miracles have only the vaguest geographical reference or none at all . . .' (99).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2: Detailed comparisons, Jesus' itinerary

John	**SG-Becker**	**SG-von Wahlde**	**SG-Fortna**	**Proto-Luke**
Jordan 1.28	Jordan 1.28	Jordan 1.28	Aenon 3.23 + 1.36	Jordan
[Golan?–Bethsaida?] 1.43–4 to Galilee	[Golan?–Bethsaida? 1.44]	[Golan?–Bethsaida? 1.44]	[Golan?–Bethsaida? 1.43–4]	
Galilee–**Cana** 1.45–2.11	Galilee–**Cana** 1.45–2.11	Galilee–**Cana** 1.45–2.11	**Cana** 1.45? 2.1–11	Galilee–Nazareth 4.14–16
Capernaum 2.12	Capernaum 2.12	Jerusalem 2.23	Capernaum 2.12	[Capernaum?] 4.23
Jerusalem 2.13	[Judea 3.22?]	Judea 3.22	Sea 21.2	Sea 5.1
Judea 3.22	Samaria 4.5	Samaria 4.4	Sea + Golan 6.1	Capernaum 7.1
Samaria 4.4	Galilee–**Cana** 4.46	Galilee–**Cana** 4.43, 46	Samaria 4.4	Nain 7.11
Galilee–**Cana** 4.43, 46	Sea + Golan 6.1	Jerusalem 5.1	Judea–Bethany 11.17	[Judea?] 7.17
[Capernaum 4.47?]	Capernaum 6.16–17	Sea + Golan 6.1	Jerusalem 9.1; 5.2; 2.14	To Jerusalem 9.51
Jerusalem 5.1	Galilee 7.1	Capernaum 6.16–17	Bethany 12.1	Samaria 9.52
Sea + Golan 6.1	Jerusalem 5.1	Jerusalem 7.25	Jerusalem 12.12	[Bethany?] 10.38
Capernaum 6.16–17	Peraea 10.40	Peraea 10.40		Nr Jerusalem 19.11
Galilee 7.1	Judea–Bethany 11.7, 17	Judea–Bethany 11.17		Jerusalem 19.37–41
Jerusalem 7.10	Ephraim 11.54	Ephraim 11.54		
Peraea 10.40		Bethany 12.1		
Judea–Bethany 11.7, 17		Jerusalem 12.20		
Ephraim 11.54				
Bethany 12.1				
Jerusalem 12.12				
+ passion narrative	No passion narrative	+ passion narrative	+ passion narrative	+ passion narrative

At a social-historical level, the allusions to specific towns and villages may well mean there were small Johannine communities in Judea, Galilee, Samaria and Peraea in the early period, rivalling, for example, Petrine communities, especially in Capernaum.[28] Cana was a leading Galilean centre of Johannine Christianity; Capernaum was a more conservative centre. Several features of the Signs Gospel and the Fourth Gospel are striking when set alongside the Synoptic Gospels:

- The Fourth Gospel knows, but ignores, that Nazareth is Jesus' home town (1.45–6; cf. 18.5; 19.19).
- Cana is Jesus' main place in John's source. Capernaum is merely a destination in the two instances when it is named, not a centre; in neither instance is it important that Jesus even reaches it.
- Later redaction adds more Capernaum references (especially in chap. 6)[29] and alters the Cana references, relocating the catch of fish to become a resurrection appearance (chap. 21).
- The geographical references in Fortna's Signs Gospel and in Proto-Luke are somewhat similar (see Table 2), though Cana replaces Nazareth; neither makes Capernaum the main centre.
- Gaulanitis's importance is recognized; Bethsaida is the home town of Peter, Andrew and Philip (1.46; cf. 12.21).

These redactional changes in the Fourth Gospel may occur by 'interference' from the Synoptic narratives,[30] especially Mark, in which Capernaum's role is exaggerated, while the Signs Source, with the Fourth Gospel following it, locate Jesus' place distinctively in Cana.[31] The Johannine picture significantly differs from the other gospels in portraying Cana-in-Galilee as Jesus' first centre of activity, prior to any references to Capernaum.[32] What then can we say about this small village highlighted in the Fourth Gospel?

28 So Scobie, 'Johannine Geography'.

29 Boats follow Jesus to the other side, then trace him to Capernaum (6.22–5); the discourse that follows is set in Capernaum (6.59).

30 Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 3–4 and 59–63, sees 'interference' as a better way of reading a text.

31 Schmidt's warning, of course, needs to be taken seriously (*Rahmen*, 17): 'It is illegitimate to proceed automatically from recognition of the historical worthlessness [*historische Wertlosigkeit*) of the Markan outline to endorsement of the Johannine outline' (translation from Hall, *Gospel Framework*, viii).

32 Kundsin, *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe*, 52, 69–71: 'Wie erklärt es sich, dass der Ausgangspunkt der neuen Bewegung in Galiläa nicht mehr Kapernaum sondern Kana ist? Antwort 2, 1–12; 4, 46ff.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cana in pilgrim literature

There are four possible locations for Cana:[33] Kefr Kenna, Khirbet Qana, `Ain Qana and Qana El-Jaleel (Lebanon).[34] Pilgrim literature from the fourth century on refers to visits to Cana, and serious explorers from the nineteenth century on have attempted to identify it. The following are the most important texts for identification purposes:[35]

> Jerome to Marcella in Rome (Letter 46, 392/3 CE): '. . . we shall go to see Nazareth . . . not far off Cana will be visible, where the water was turned into wine'; Jerome to Eustochium (Letter 108, 404 CE): 'Then she went quickly on through Nazareth, the nurse of the Lord; through Cana and Capernaum which witnessed his miracles . . .'
>
> Epiphanius (*Panarion Haereseis* 51.30.1–2; 375 CE) refers to a *martyrium* (probably the cathedral built over a temple to Dionysos) and miraculous fountain in Gerasa [Jerash], where every year the spring ran with wine on the anniversary of the miracle at Cana, i.e. on Epiphany.
>
> Theodosius (*de Situ Terrae Sanctae*, early 6th cent. CE): 'From Joppa it is thirty miles to Caesarea Palestinae . . . from Caesarea it is thirty miles to Diocaesarea, from which came Simon Magus . . .. From Diocaesarea it is five miles to Cana of Galilee. From Diocaesarea it is five miles to Nazareth.'
>
> The Pilgrim of Piacenza (560–570 CE): 'At Ptolemais we left the coast and traveled into the Galilee region to a city called Diocaesarea . . .. Three miles further on we came to Cana, where the Lord attended the wedding, and we actually reclined on the couch. On it (undeserving though I am) I wrote the names of my parents [. . ..] Of the waterpots two are still there, and I filled one of them up with wine and lifted it up full onto my shoulders. I offered it at the altar, and we washed in the spring to gain a blessing.'
>
> Willibald (724 CE; after Hugeburc, late 8th cent.: *The Life of Saint Willibald*, chap. 13): he and his companions 'continued their journey [from Nazareth] and reached the village of Cana, where the Lord changed the water into wine. There is a large church there, and on the altar of the church is one of the six water pots which the Lord ordered to be filled with water, and it was turned into wine; they drank some wine from it.'
>
> *Commemoratorium* (808 CE): 'Summary of a memorandum on the churches and monasteries . . .. In Galilee: In the holy city of Nazareth 12 [monks]. One

33 General overview, James F. Strange, 'Cana of Galilee', *ABD* 1.827, preferring Kh. Qana but putting the shift from Khirbet Qana to Kefr Kenna earlier (with the Piacenza Pilgrim?) than I would. Details of pilgrim accounts in Julián Herrojo, *Cana de Galilea y su localización* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 45; Paris: Gabalda, 1998).

34 `Ain Qana (near Reina, about 1.5 km N of Nazareth) was first suggested as the site of Cana in the nineteenth century because it has a spring; it is not seriously considered today. James Charlesworth has drawn my attention to Youssef El Hourani, *Cana of Galilee in South Lebanon* (Lebanon Ministry of Tourism, 1995), which struggles to locate Cana east of Tyre.

35 John Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1977) for texts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> mile from Nazareth . . ., a monastery and a church built in honour of St. Mary, 8 monks. In Cana of Galilee, where the Lord made water into wine [?] monks . . ..'
>
> Saewulf (1102–1103 CE), the first western pilgrim after the Crusades to leave a narrative, says that 'six miles to the northeast of Nazareth, on a hill, is Cana of Galilee, where our Lord converted water into wine at the marriage feast. There is nothing left standing except the monastery called that of the Architriclinius.'
>
> Burchard of Mount Sion (1283 CE): 'The place is shown at this day where the six water pots stood, and the dining-room wherein the tables were . . .. To the north Cana of Galilee has a round 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 Sepphoris, and is extremely fertile and pleasant . . .. Two leagues to the south of Cana of Galilee is Sepphoris.'

Cana was not yet a customary pilgrims' veneration place at the time of Jerome, but perhaps by the time of Ephiphanius it was so venerated, since Gerasa, which reflected Cana,[36] was already a regularly visited site. Certainly by the sixth century (Theodosius and the Pilgrim of Piacenza) Cana had become important.[37] I will allude to the latter account again, for the excavations at Khirbet Qana may have identified this veneration site; Willibald's circumstantial account is also important. Crusader notices, including two maps,[38] also identified Khirbet Qana with Cana, as does – very clearly – the account of Burchard of Mount Sion.[39] But not all accounts point to Khirbet Qana: a second location for Cana emerges at Kefr Kenna, perhaps at some point in the Middle Ages. By the early seventeenth century Francisco Quaresmius, the papal emissary to Palestine, notes that there are two Canas:[40]

> Cana of the Galilee (the first one) is located West of Nazareth, a little to the North, on the hill that dominates the beautiful and spacious plain of Zabulon [*scil.* Kh. Qana]; it is about 6 miles from Sepphoris and 10 miles from Nazareth; it is a small village of nothing, reduced to a few houses;

36 Jack Finegan, *The Archaeology of the NT* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1992) 123.

37 Wilkinson, *Pilgrims*, 79. The Piacenza Pilgrim's account requires that Cana be Kh. Qana for three reasons: (a) the distance of 3 miles from Sepphoris works better; (b) his route proceeded onwards to Nazareth after Cana, a route that works poorly with Kefr Kenna; (c) archaeology now shows that there was a veneration cave with water pots on an altar with benches around.

38 Reinhold Roehricht, 'Karten und Pläne zur Palästinakunde . . .', *ZDPV* 14 (1891) for map I and *ZDPV* 15 (1895) for map II; so Richard M. Mackowski, '"Scholars' Qanah": A Reexamination of the Evidence in Favor of Khirbet Qanah', *BZ* 23 (1979) 278–84, esp. 282, and n. 6.

39 Burchard saw (a) a round mountain to the north, (b) the Beth Netofa valley to the south, (c) a dining room and water pots in a veneration cave. Text in Mackowski (1978).

40 Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, also described two Canas, but not as rival sites: one is Lebanese Cana near Tyre, a location Quaresmius's comments do not fit.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> there is no church, neither are there signs that there ever was a church . . .. Kefer Cana is located 4 miles from Nazareth; it is located on the mountain in the northern part facing toward the east; all around there is a wide and spacious plain and there are quire a few trees and many houses; and I learned that there, there is a church . . .. Perhaps at the time of Christ it was a small city reduced later to being a village.

Yet slightly later Henry Maundrell (20 April 1697) locates Cana at Kh. Qana:

> The next morning we took our leave of Nazareth . . .. We directed our course for Acra, in order to do which, going first northward, we crossed the hills that encompassed the vale of Nazareth on that side, after which we turned to the westward, and passed in view of Cana of Galilee, the place signalized with the beginning of Christ's miracles. In an hour and a half more we came to Sepharia.

Later still, Edward Robinson[41] says that 'the Cana of the New Testament' is not at Kefar Kenna but rather at

> a ruin called Kâna el-Jelil, on the northern side of the plain el-Buttauf . . . in the time of Quaresmius, the church and the convent at Nazareth were first built up, after the desolations of many centuries, and this circumstance conspired to give currency among travelers, to the view which monks adopted respecting Cana.

Quaresmius's account underscores how a tourist preference for Kefr Kenna, the rival site, arose and has been maintained more or less continuously since.[42] The modern turning point was Robinson's use of scientific – particularly linguistic – criteria to establish the geography of the Holy Land; though his views were strongly contested, they have stood firmly. Recent analyses have generally confirmed that Khirbet Qana is the site of the Cana of Josephus and the NT.

Cana in archaeology

Excavations at Khirbet Qana have demonstrated the vitality of settlement at Cana from the Hellenistic to the early Arab periods, concentrating to date on a Byzantine veneration cave, a possible Jewish synagogue with *beth midrash*, housing and tombs.[43]

Cana's extensive necropolis contains 13 tombs, at least 18 chambers, and up to about 100 loculi or *kokhim*.[44] The plan and interior forms show that these are

41 Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine: Mount Sinai and Arabia Petraea, Vol III* (Boston, MA: Crocker & Brewster, 1841) 204–6.

42 The site is not altogether implausible, for recent excavations have found first-century material.

43 Douglas Edwards directs the University of Puget Sound excavations (beginning 1998). The site was occupied from the Neolithic period and the Iron Age through to the nineteenth century.

44 For details, photographs and drawings, see Richardson, 'Qana's Necropolis'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mainly Second Temple tombs, a rural, undecorated, plainer and simpler form of the tombs found in Jerusalem and elsewhere. The shaft design of the tombs, however, is unusual, and is possibly influenced by cultural and/or ethnic influences from Phoenicia. In all but one case the entrance is not a *dromos*, as was common (Jerusalem and Beth She`arim, for example); instead they have shafts a couple of metres deep without stairs or other means of entry. Nevertheless, the tombs show that this is a Jewish village with Jewish tombs that, even though there may be other cultural influences at work, conform to details in the *Mishnah*.[45]

There are three types of housing at Cana in three different areas of the site. (1) Terrace houses occupy the steep east and west slopes, similar to terraced housing at Gamla and Yodefat (both destroyed by Vespasian in the year 67 CE). While the early date of such houses is clear, the case of Kh. Qana is more complicated, for unlike Gamla and Yodefat, the village was not destroyed. Its housing was in virtually continuous use from the late Hellenistic period through to the Byzantine period, so that the walls remained standing while the floors show in some cases nicely stratified occupational levels through a sequence of periods. These terrace houses are simple, two-floor houses, without courtyards, densely packed, with adjacent houses using common party walls; the higher-level house used the roof of a house lower down as an extension of its living space, as Josephus describes at Gamla.[46]

(2) Side courtyard houses occupy less steep ground, mainly on the north at Cana; these too are simple houses, having less complex floor levels and an extension of the living space in a courtyard, with a cistern. One carefully excavated house (though in fact from the Byzantine period) has a courtyard with an enormous cistern, and contiguous to the cistern a *mikveh* that, while used in the Byzantine period is dated, from plaster samples, to the Early Roman period. This is an important indication of Judaism's continuing vitality at Cana. The main level of the house has a very nicely built bench or kitchen counter and a storage cave complete with Byzantine pottery. As more houses are excavated higher up the hillside, we expect to find the same type of houses from earlier periods.

(3) Central courtyard houses occupied the hilltop and the saddle to the north. Excavation of an elite house on the hilltop has been crucial to understanding the occupation sequence. The house was occupied over a long period, and while it is not yet clear when it was first built, much of the structure is early Roman. Several stages are visible in walls and floors, especially in the main courtyard, which has

45 The priestly course of Eliashib settled in Cana; see S. Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas* (Leipzig, 1909) 93.

46 Aviam and Richardson, 'Josephus' Galilee'; Richardson, 'First-Century Houses'; Peter Richardson, Charles Hixon and Ann Spurling, '3 D Visualizations of a First-century Galilean Town', *Virtual Reality in Archaeology* (ed. Juan Barceló, Maurizio Forte and Donald H. Sanders; BAR International Series 843; Oxford, 2000) 195–204.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a large rock-cut cistern and rectangular pit. The courtyard was entered from a street or lane through an entrance, fronting on which was a monumental room with plastered walls and floors, which at a later stage had a beautifully carved capital on a pilaster. The pilaster must have supported an arch spanning the width of the room and supporting a second floor.

Rectangular walls (about 45 × 75 m) suggested initially that a monastic complex covered the whole hilltop, including the elite house, with the pilaster being from a formal room in the monastery. But it is now apparent that the hilltop walls were probably defensive walls from the time of the Persian invasion or Muslim conquest (614/634 CE). Another part of the wall, however, which is early Roman, is finer and more monumental than the rest; it is from a public building of some sort, perhaps a synagogue. Attached to it is a smaller room that may be a *beth midrash*. The main room measures 10 × 15 m, with intermittent benches, column bases laid out precisely on a 5 × 5 m nave, and 2.5 × 5 m side aisles. The adjacent room is about 3 × 5 m, with continuous benches on three (probably four) sides. A monumental capital and monumental doorsill all cohere with this interpretation, but there is still no clear proof of its identification as a Jewish public building. The building is unusual architecturally, though some features have parallels with public buildings at Chorazin, Gamla and Khirbet Shema`, all of which have a room that functioned as a study house.

In the squares associated with these two rooms, roof tiles – some embedded in constructions from obviously later periods – and one small piece of fresco[47] reinforce the picture of a monumental building. Hasmonean coins, a majority of the coins found on the site, and pieces of stoneware, the majority of which were found in the vicinity of the putative synagogue, strengthen the sense of a first-century Jewish community at Kh. Qana.

Reports since the 1950s have referred to a pilgrim cave halfway up the hill.[48] There are four interconnected caves with two entrances to permit a flow of traffic. The main cave has four layers of plaster, three of which have graffiti and inscriptions, some of which are Christian; the other three caves have no graffiti. The floor has several layers of plaster, interspersed with layers of cobbles, and the cave is surrounded by benches on the south and west sides. The east side had a kind of mini-apse. The main interest attaches to an altar or bench on the north side of the cave, formed in part by a turned-up sarcophagus lid that has at least one, and more likely three, incised crosses on what was originally the underside of the lid.

47 It has pink, red, grey and yellow-ochre paint in a geometric pattern, not unlike the fresco in a large first-century house at Yodefat; other analogies are the frescoes found in Herodian palaces!

48 Bellarmino Bagatti, 'Antichità di Kh. Qana e Kefr Kenna', *Liber Annuus* 15 (1965) 251–92, esp. 256–8, 291. See also B. Bagatti, *Antichi Villagi Cristiani di Galilea* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Publications, 1971) 121–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the altar, still *in situ* and held in place by the plaster covering the altar that was continuous with the plaster on the ceiling, were the bases of two stone jugs; a third was on the floor of the cave. There is room for six jugs.

This cave corresponds rather closely to circumstantial details of the veneration cave in the pilgrim accounts of Cana (see above), supporting the identification of Kh. Qana as pilgrim Cana (and thus the likely site of the Cana of the NT and Josephus). Some pilgrim accounts imply that there should be a monastery on the site.[49] As noted above, there is no monastery on the hilltop, but one corner of its walls may have been located immediately beside the veneration cave below later Arab housing, in the village halfway up the hill: the intersection of a north–south wall of over 2 m width with an east–west wall of over 1 m width implies a major building contiguous to the cave. In sum, we have a town or village whose main periods of occupation were late Hellenistic, early Roman and early Byzantine, with an important Christian pilgrimage installation, probably a monastery and possibly a synagogue/*beth midrash* complex.

Cana and Capernaum

Cana was agriculturally based and Capernaum was fishing based, but in other respects they were somewhat similar and their development from the early Roman to the early Byzantine periods was similar.[50] Both were small peasant villages, each within sight of a capital of Galilee; in the first century both were associated with Jesus and with events of the Great Revolt. Both may have had early Christian Jewish communities, though evidence for this is slender and later. The character of the housing is similar, though that at Cana is more varied. The presence of a later synagogue is similar, though that at Cana is still hypothetical. The evidence of social and religious life is somewhat similar, though there is more evidence of observant Judaism at Cana than at Capernaum (*mikvaoth*, stoneware, Hasmonean coinage, *columbaria*). The development of Christian veneration at each is similar,[51] though we have no proof of a church structure yet at Cana.

49 Piacenza Pilgrim, Willibald, *Commemoratorium*, possibly Nasir-I Khusrau, Saewulf, Burchard, Sanutus. The church at Kh. Qana must have been destroyed between 1321 CE (Sanutus) and the early 1600s (Quaresmius).

50 Capernaum's excavations are very popular, with a fifth- (possibly sixth-) century limestone synagogue, now rivalled in impact by a flying-saucer church hovering above an octagonal fifth-century church. Neither church nor synagogue is from the time of Jesus. Corbo has claimed first-century CE precursors for both: a basalt synagogue below the limestone building and a fourth-century rhomboidal church below the octagonal structure, with a first-century venerated room from the house where Jesus healed Peter's mother below that.

51 The claim that Capernaum's Christian veneration site goes back continuously to the first century is doubtful. The detailed excavation reports do not allow certainty on the matter, for the stratigraphy is unclear and the drawings include details not founded on the reports. It

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Three comments can form a conclusion. (1) Khirbet Qana, like Yodefat and Gamla (which lack connections with Jesus) and Capernaum, gives an accurate sense of 'place' for the historical Jesus. All were small, densely occupied rural villages, apparently thriving and self-confident in the first century, with observant Jewish inhabitants across a range of status levels. The relationship between the villages and the adjacent cities is still not clear, nor is it clear why both Josephus and Jesus should seem to have made Cana a base of operations.

(2) Christianity developed in Cana, though there is no archaeological evidence earlier than the fourth century. Textual evidence appears to make Cana and Capernaum rival claimants as the village of Jesus, possibly one associated with John and one with Peter, probably each proclaiming a variant form of Christian belief. Each may have had its own traditions that eventually resulted in such texts as John and Mark, though it is not likely that these sites are the provenance of those gospels.

(3) Finally, Khirbet Qana, like Capernaum, challenges popular assumptions of an early and sharp cleavage between Judaism and Christianity. The material evidence of the fourth–sixth centuries suggests that Cana had Jewish and Christian communities living in proximity to each. Khirbet Qana had a venerated site and, if present indications hold, a synagogue/*beth midrash* complex together with a thriving Jewish community well into the Byzantine period (note the Byzantine house with a *mikveh* on the northern slope). This is similar to Capernaum, whose physical evidence is now more rather than less controversial, with its Jewish and Christian communities. The number of sites with contiguous communities but without material evidence of conflict between them is limited: Capernaum, Beth Yerah, Nazareth, and now Cana. All are around the Sea of Galilee and in the Lower Galilee, and three of the four are intimately associated with Jesus' ministry.

In sum, Kh. Qana will begin to assume substantial importance (1) as a rival setting to Capernaum as a 'place' for the historical Jesus, (2) as the location where early Byzantines located the water-to-wine incident, and (3) as a site, like Capernaum, which reflects ongoing parallel Jewish and Christian communities.

---

seems the venerated room at the centre of the *insula sacra* may originally have been a courtyard: (1) the space is too big to be roofed; (2) the drawings show a 'ghost wall', of which there is no physical evidence, to solve this problem; (3) the area in question is closely similar to a courtyard in another nearby house. I am indebted to Lawrence Morey for raising such questions and prompting this scepticism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688502000206 Published online by Cambridge University Press