

The Honorary Officers were re-elected.

5. A vote of thanks was passed to the President of the American Association for the gift of their photographs.

6. The Executive Committee received full powers to deal with the improvement or alteration of the *Quarterly Statement* as might be found expedient.

7. A vote of thanks was then passed to the Chairman, and the Committee adjourned.

THE SEPULCHRES OF DAVID AND OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH.

A HALO of intense interest surrounds the tomb of David. While its true position is a much disputed point in the topography of Jerusalem, its discovery would reveal the most ancient monument connected with the Holy City, and perhaps might throw some light upon the expression, "the city of David."

The recovery of such a precious relic of the past is a reward yet in store for some successful explorer; the definition of its exact or probable position it is now proposed once more to assay by argument.

We possess but scanty knowledge about early Jewish tombs, yet in three instances in the Old Testament (the sepulchre of Abraham, of the prophet at Bethel, and of Elisha) their situation seems to have been at least at some little distance from human habitations.

It is stated, however, in the Bible more than twenty times of some one or other of the kings of Judah, that he was *buried in the city of David*, frequently with the additional words, "with his fathers." No special honour was necessarily conferred by such burial "in the city of David," as is clear from the case of Jehoram, who was so buried (2 Kings viii. 24; 2 Chron. xxi. 20), whilst Josephus says (Ant. ix. 5. 3), "They neither buried him in the sepulchres of his fathers, nor vouchsafed him any honours, but buried him like a private man."

The surprise naturally arising at this intramural sepulture on the part of the Jews increases to amazement when one reads that all Israel "buried Samuel in his house at Ramah" (1 Sam. xxv. 1).

Perhaps, however, in our simplicity we have been making the Jews to do what they neither did nor thought of doing; so that it is necessary to examine the two expressions, "buried in his house," and "buried in the city of David," with the view of ascertaining the precise meaning of the three words "house," "city," and "in."

(A.) House. "They buried Samuel in his house."

The Hebrew word here used for house is "Beth." In the following passages the same term is applied to a tomb:—

Job xxx. 23. "The house appointed for all living."

Job xvii. 13. "If I wait, the grave is mine *house*."

Eccles. xii. 5. "Man goeth to his long *home*" (= house).

Isaiah xiv. 18, 19. "All the kings of the nations, even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own *house*. But thou art cast out of thy grave."

Unless it can be very clearly shown that the use of the word *Beth* in these passages in the sense of *tomb* is inadmissible in the historical books, it seems that without hesitation it ought to be admitted that *house* = *tomb* in these three passages, viz.—

1 Sam. xxv. 1 (as already quoted and elsewhere suggested).

1 Kings ii. 34. "Joab was buried in his own *house* in the wilderness."

2 Chron. xxxiii. 20. "They buried Manasseh in his own *house*." (Compare the parallel passage in 2 Kings xxi. 18, "Manasseh slept with his fathers and was buried in the garden of his own *house*, in the garden of Uzza.")

This seems to me sufficient to dissipate the common misapprehension that when Samuel is said to have been buried *in his house*, he was buried in his dwelling-house. "House" in such passages = (and should be translated) tomb or sepulchre.

(B.) *City*, as in the words "the city of David," and similar expressions.

From one passage it may be conclusively demonstrated that *city* (in the phrase *city of his refuge*) embraces the surrounding suburbs—*i.e.*, fields, and all the space within the Levitical boundary of 2,000 cubits. See Numb. xxxv. 25-28. Here it is said—

25. "The slayer shall abide in it" (*i.e.*, the city of his refuge).

26. "If the slayer shall at any time come without the border of the city of his refuge; (27) and the revenger of blood find him without the borders of the city of his refuge . . . and kill the slayer; he shall not be guilty of blood:

28. "Because he should have remained in the city of his refuge."

These verses show that the slayer was not required for safety's sake to remain within the walls of the city of refuge, but only within its Levitical boundary; and yet if he went beyond that boundary and was slain, the avenger was not guilty, for the other ought to have remained *in the city*—*i.e.*, within its prescribed boundaries.

Hence it is clear that the word *city* in such a case as Hebron or Kedesh includes a district outside the fortified walls. Why should it not have the same meaning in other cases, and even in the expression, "the city of David"?

Indeed, in the story of Shimei (1 Kings ii. 36, 37) Jerusalem evidently means more than the city within the walls, for Solomon first says to Shim, "Build thee a house in Jerusalem, and dwell there, and go not

forth thence any whither;” and then adds, “For it shall be, that on the day thou goest out and *passest over the brook* Kidron, . . . thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die.” Thus the limit imposed was not strictly the circuit of the walls of Jerusalem, but its suburbs, at least in one direction, so far as the Kedron.

(C.) The Hebrew prefix translated in A. V. “*in*,” is given by Gesenius as also signifying “*at*”—“*near*.”

The following passages in which this prefix is in A. V. rendered *in*, seem obviously to require it to be translated “*near*”:—

1. Gen. xiii. 18. “Abraham dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is *in* Hebron.”

Surely not within the city itself, but only near it.

2. Gen. xxxvii. 12, 13 (twice). “Feed their flock *in* Shechem.”
This must be equivalent to “*at*” or “*near*.”

3. Josh. xxiv. 32. “The bones of Joseph buried they *in* Shechem, in the parcel of ground which Jacob bought.”

Surely the Shechemites would never have sold any of the land in the city to a stranger; and the story in Genesis shows they did not.

4. Josh. v. 13. “When Joshua was *by* Jericho.”

This passage happily removes the last shadow of doubt. Here it was impossible for the translators (taking Jericho as = the city within the walls, as in chap. vi. 1, “Jericho was straitly shut up”) to render the Hebrew prefix any longer by the word *in*, so that they substituted “*by*,” since “*in Jericho*” was just where Joshua was not.

These examples are enough to show that in certain cases the prefix translated “*in*” cannot mean within, but only *at* or *near*; and therefore the oft-repeated phrase rendered in A. V. “*in* the city of David,” does not of necessity mean *within* the walls of the city, but may equally well mean *near* the city of David.

The prevalent opinion, then, that the sepulchre of David was *within* the city of David, having been founded on the above repeated expression, is thus shown to be based on a misapprehension. The narrow meaning of “*in*” (*i.e.*, within) being given to an equivalent having equally the wider signification of “*at*” or “*near*,” has given rise to an “*ignis fatuus*.”

Therefore the position of the sepulchre of David, whether *within* or *without* the walls of the city of David, must be decided on other considerations than this most misleading translation “*in the city of David*.”

Further, there is strong, if not conclusive, evidence in the Bible that one king said to have been buried *in* the city of David was really buried *outside* the walls. Azariah (or Uzziah) having been smitten with leprosy for his profane attempt to offer incense, was “a leper unto the day of

his death, and dwelt in a several house. . . . And they buried him with his fathers in the city of David (2 Kings xv. 5-7). In 2 Chron. xxvi. 23 this is explained, and it is more fully stated, that "they buried him with his fathers in the field of the burial which *belonged* to the kings; for they said he is a leper." The fact of his being a leper was the reason of his being buried in a *separate* rock-cut chamber of his own in the same field (LXX. *ἑβλω*) indeed, but not in the sepulchres of the kings.

Josephus says (Antiq. ix. 10. 4): "So he abode out of the city for some time, and lived a private life; . . . after which he died with grief . . . and was buried by himself in his own gardens."

If the defilement of leprosy shut out Uzziah for the rest of his life from the city, and when he was dead excluded him from sepulture in the sepulchres of David, we can hardly suppose it would have admitted of his burial within the city walls.

The indirect testimony of Josephus is hardly conclusive either way. From his statements (Ant. vii. 15. 3; xiii. 8. 4; xvi. 7. 1: and Wars i. 2. 5) of the great treasures buried in the tomb of David, it has been urged that the tomb could not have been outside the walls, otherwise it would have been plundered when Jerusalem was besieged by foreign armies. To this there is the unanswerable reply, that if ever such treasures were deposited there it is incredible that they should have been left untouched in the dire extremities to which the kingdom was reduced, as for instance "when Hezekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord." The suggestion that Hyrcanus took the Corban and then invented the story about the treasures found in the tomb of David, or that Herod spread the tale about Hyrcanus to excuse his own entrance into the tomb, seems satisfactorily to explain the statements of Josephus. It is highly probable, however, that the tombs of some of the kings, if not the sepulchral chambers of David and Solomon, had been rifled long before; for in Baruch ii. 24, reference is made to the prophecy of Jeremiah (viii. 1) as already fulfilled. "At that time, saith the Lord, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah . . . out of their graves." Still the passage (Ant. xvi. 7. 1) may be worth something as bearing upon the position of the tomb. On the words, "Εἰσέρχεται πραγματευσάμενος ἥκιστα μὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει φανερώς εἶναι," Lewin observes, "He was anxious to elude the observation of those *in the city*, from which the inference arises that the tomb itself lay *without the city*; for if both the palace and tomb were within it, the words *in the city* would have been superfluous."

We now come to the exceedingly *valuable*, but (to most) very *perplexing* testimony of the book of Nehemiah—*valuable*, because it alone gives any indication of the position of David's sepulchre; *perplexing*, because the position indicated has by most authorities been considered as lying outside the walls of the Jerusalem of David's time; and therefore has seemed to clash with the oft-repeated statement "*in the city of David.*"

Two passages have to be compared in Nehemiah—

<p>iii. 15, 16, 26.</p> <p><i>The gate of the fountain</i> repaired Shallum . . . he built it . . . and the wall of the pool of Siloah by the king's garden, and unto the stairs that go down from the city of David.</p> <p>After him repaired Nehemiah . . . unto the place over against the sepulchres of David, and to the pool that was made, . . .</p> <p>(26) Moreover the Nethinims (<i>marg.</i>) which dwelt in Ophel, (re- paired) unto the place over against the water gate toward the east.</p>	<p>xii. 37.</p> <p><i>At the fountain gate,</i> which was over against them, they went up by</p> <p><i>the stairs of the city of David,</i> at the going up of the wall,</p> <p><i>above the house of David,</i></p> <p>even unto <i>the water gate eastward.</i></p>
--	---

This is not the time to enter upon the difficult question of the course of the wall and position of the gates of Jerusalem as restored by Nehemiah; but it is agreed (universally, I believe) that the description in chap. iii. begins at the north-east and goes round by the west and south, returning at last to the starting-point at the north-east; and that in the procession in chap. xii. the first company proceeds from west by south to east. The pool of Siloah is also admitted to be the pool of Siloam, so considered now, at the south end of the Ophel hill.

Beyond this the case is almost one of "*quot homines, tot sententiae.*" Still since the position of the sepulchre of David is affected by the position of other points named in these passages, reasons are given below (Note A) which seem to me to indicate that—

1. The *fountain gate* was near the pool of Siloam.
2. The *water gate* was a gate leading from Ophel to the virgin's fountain, and was near to it.
3. The *pool that was made* was one lower down the Tyropæon valley (the "*old pool*" on the ordnance map).
4. The *stairs of the city of David* led down the Ophel hill to near the pool of Siloam.

The remarkable coincidence (in the parallel verses above) will have been observed.

iii. 16.

xii. 37.

"The sepulchre of David" (corresponding to) "the house of David."

If now we take the word "*house*" (it is the former word "*Beth*") in the sense it has been shown to possess by paragraph A, the difficulty about the palace of David vanishes, having all along been based on a misapprehension, and the two passages in Nehemiah, mutually supporting one another, afford us their combined assistance towards fixing the position of the tomb of David.

The order given in Neh. iii. 15 seems to me to show that the stairs

of the city of David could not have descended westwards from Ophel into the Tyropœon valley to a point at all considerably north of the pool of Siloam; for (1st) the procession went up *at* (most probably = *close to*) the fountain gate, and (2nd) it most certainly went up by the stairs, *at the point where the wall went up, "at the going up of the wall."*

Again, as the pool *that was made* seems almost certainly to be the lower pool of Siloam, the first company cannot possibly have gone round by the south side of it, because such a course for the wall would not admit of the stairs of the city of David forming a point in the rebuilding of the wall between the *pool of Siloam* and the *pool that was made*.

The city wall may have run round the north side of the pool of Siloam, *i.e.*, of the upper pool, or (less probably) on the south side of it.

If the stairs were close to the wall (which seems probable) then since the company went *above* (= *over*, as in xii. 37, "(from) *above* the gate of Ephraim," &c.) the sepulchre of David, it is rather difficult to understand how the entrance to the tomb could have been otherwise than outside the wall of the city. But if the stairs diverged from the wall, then they might have been said to have gone *over* the house (= tomb) of David, even while the entrance was within the walls. Again, Nehemiah (iii. 16) might probably have been said to have repaired *over against* (= in sight of, or opposite to) the sepulchres of David, whether the entrance was within or without the city, for it is difficult to limit the use of the words "*over against*" exclusively to objects either inside or outside the line of the walls. (See Note B.)

It may be added that, since it seems to have been an especial mark of honour to possess a sepulchre in an elevated situation—as was the case with Shebna's tomb (Isa. xxii. 16), "He that heweth him out a sepulchre on high" (LXX. ἐν ὑψηλῷ), and perhaps with Hezekiah's (2 Chron. xxxii. 33), "They buried him in the *chiefest* (margin, "highest;" LXX. ἐν ἀριστέῃ) of the sepulchres of the sons of David"—it seems probable that the entrance to the tomb of David was either cut in the face of a high wall of rock or situated near to the top of the steep point (forty or fifty feet high, Robinson's "Researches") with which the ridge of Ophel ends, just over Siloam. The field of the burial of the kings, 2 Chron. xxvi. 23 (in which Uzziah was buried in his own gardens, probably the same as the garden of Uzzah, 2 Kings xxi. 18, 26), may have been just below in the Tyropœon valley, at the south end of Ophel, the position apparently (Zech. xiv. 10) of the king's winepresses and near the king's garden.

The actual discovery of the tomb of David is more properly the work of the pick than of the pen, but if the argument here attempted be sound, the position of the tomb is brought within very circumscribed limits.

If, therefore, the Ophel wall could be found near the pool of Siloam and traced east or north-east till opposite the lower end of the *pool that was made* (the old pool, O. S.), we must come somewhere to

"*the going up of the wall,*" and then we ought to find cut in the rock on its western side the stairs of the city of David. Ascending these we pass over the tomb of David, while its entrance would seem to be below us, somewhere on the right hand. Captain Warren ("Recovery of Jerusalem," p. 280) speaks of steps existing at Siloam, and states that they lead up towards the Ophel hill.

NOTE A.

Fountain Gate.—It will be allowed by the supporters of all theories that—

1st. *The fountain gate stood somewhere on a line drawn from the south-east brow of the upper city to the pool of Siloam, perhaps passing through a point up the Tyropœon valley and ending close to the pool of Siloam.*

2nd. *The wall of the city, after the rebuilding by Nehemiah, at least approached near to the same pool.*

A wall must certainly have done so in the time of Hezekiah to protect the pool; but that another wall ran across the Ophel hill farther north, to a point opposite to the Virgin's fountain, seems to me to be a pure supposition; while the crossing of Ophel along such a line would have formed so remarkable a feature in the night journey that its omission in the narrative would be inexplicable. A necessary consequence of this second point seems (to me) to be that we must allow that—

3rd. *The wall of the pool of Siloam means (as seems natural) the city wall towards the south end of Ophel, close to the pool, and not (as has been suggested as probable) the wall on the distant heights round the lower part of the Tyropœon.*

4th. *There was a gate or some kind of outlet from the city close to this spot.*—For (1) if the pool were outside the walls and no access to it existed at this point, whither did the stairs lead? but (2) if the pool were inside the city wall, the weakest point in this part is taken thereby into the line of defences, and with its admission the objection to drawing the city wall from the south-east corner of the upper city to Siloam at once vanishes. Then the fountain gate ceases to be one leading down from the city wall above, having found its natural position close to the fountain of Siloam, and it becomes instead an outlet from the city at the south of Ophel. In placing the fountain gate elsewhere than close to the pool of Siloam, we should have to account for the extraordinary omission of any mention of, or allusion to, a gate near Siloam, even while we are told of the wall being repaired at this point as far as *the stairs that go down from the city of David*. Besides, we should have also to alter our translation of Neh. iii. 37, which is (I think) fairly rendered—"At the fountain gate, which was over against them, they went up by the stairs."

It would seem, therefore, that it is not practicable to avoid placing the fountain gate close to the pool of Siloam, whether we adopt the *curve* round the Tyropœon, or the *line straight* across to Siloam, as the course of the city wall on the south.

The water gate towards the east.—It seems to me that *this water gate* was the gate by which women used to go down from Ophel to draw water from the Virgin's fountain. Captain Warren's interesting discovery of the way in which it was rendered practicable to obtain water from this spring without going out of the city, tends to show that there was a need for using this supply; and that therefore it was previously the custom to go outside the city to draw water from this source.

We ought, then, naturally to look for a gate near the Virgin's fountain, and we seem to have such a gate (agreeing both in *name* and *position* with what we want) in that mentioned as *the water gate towards the east*. (The same descriptive expression is used in connection with the *horse gate* farther north in Jer. xxxi. 40, "Unto the corner of the horse gate toward the east.") Obviously there must have been a gate in this position, so that if it was not *the water gate* mentioned in iii. 26, we have one gate (and even two, if we suppose the fountain gate not to be near the pool of Siloam) passed over without any mention or allusion in chap. iii.; for in ver. 7, "the throne of the governor on this side the river" answers, I believe, to *the gate of Ephraim*, the place for administering justice being, of course, at the gate.

No argument against *the water gate* having been a gate in the outer wall seems (to me) to lie in the fact that no mention is made of its having been repaired, since the same silence is observed both in regard to *the horse gate* and *the gate Miphkad* (not to mention the Ephraim gate); and if it be urged that no one of these three was in the outer wall, then we have to explain the astounding circumstance, that there is neither any mention of, nor allusion to, any outer gate in the whole course of the eastern wall—a thing perfectly incredible, while so many particulars are given of the repairing of that wall.

The pool that was made.—In case of the water gate being an outer gate near the Virgin's fountain, as seems to me to be proved above, then in default of any evidence of a pool situated farther south in the valley of the Kedron, it follows that *the pool that was made* must be a pool in the Tyropæon ravine, somewhere lower down than the pool of Siloam—that is, it must be *the lower pool of Siloam*, marked *Old Pool* (O. Survey), and now indicated by the remains of an embankment across the mouth of the valley.

It seems probable, however, that we must arrive at the same result from other considerations.

In three places (2 Kings xxv. 4, Jer. xxxix. 4, lii. 7) we are told that Zedekiah escaped by the gate *between the two walls near the king's garden*. Had mention been made only of the *king's garden*, then it might have been that he escaped by a gate near the Virgin's fountain, since the royal gardens were near this spot (see *Quarterly Statement*, No. V., 1870, p. 253, and Jos. Ant. vii. 14. 4). Or had mention been made only of *the two walls*, then he might have escaped on the west side of the city near the valley gate, since certainly in the time of Manasseh there were two walls in this part (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14), though the difficulty of eluding

the Chaldæans would have been vastly increased by quitting the city on its western side. The combined mention, however, of the *king's garden* and *the two walls*, forces upon us the conclusion that Zedekiah escaped down the Tyropœon valley, or at all events through the part of it near the pool of Siloam,

This seems to be the way indicated by Josephus when he says he fled out of the city through the fortified ditch (*καρτερῶς φάραγος*, Ant. x. 8. 2).

The LXX. have a remarkable gloss on Jer. lii. 7, for they render between the two walls by *ἀναμέσον τοῦ τεύχους καὶ τοῦ προτείχιματος*.

When this is compared with their translation of 2 Chron. xxxii. 5, “(Hezekiah) built up all the *wall* that was broken and raised it up to the towers and (*ἐξω προτείχιμα ἄλλο*) another *wall* without,” one is inclined to think that the translators possessed considerable topographical knowledge in this case, and that *προτείχιμα* in both cases represents the same wall. It seems to me reasonable to conclude that the *wall* “without” of *Hezekiah* and that of *Manasseh* (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14) were not identical, but that while the latter was on the west side of the city near the valley gate, the former was either (1) built by Hezekiah from near the pool of Siloam (or the south part of the Ophel wall) taking in the pools of Siloam, and reaching to the south-east part of the upper city wall, or (2) was an outer wall built round one or both of the two pools of Siloam of the present day; at any rate round the lower pool, since the upper might previously have been within the walls.

As the *two walls* in the three passages named have undoubtedly to do with some part of the Tyropœon valley, south of the present city wall, it seems only reasonable to consider that they are also referred to in Isa. xxii. 11. “Ye made a ditch (= pool) *between the two walls*.” As this took place in the time of Hezekiah, there seems every reason for concluding that the very same pool is referred to in 2 Kings xx. 20, where among the acts of Hezekiah it is stated that he “*made a pool*.”

As we are not told of any other pool being specially made, it seems that nothing short of a very strong reason can release us from concluding that *the pool* thus already (apparently twice) mentioned as *being made*, is the identical pool described in Neh. iii. 16 as *the pool that was made*. Thus we arrive at the former result in another way. From this it would seem that the king's pool (Neh. ii. 14) must be the Virgin's fountain, and so identical with Solomon's pool (Jos. Wars, v. 4. 2); while the contracting of the Kedron ravine at this point may have caused the ruins to have completely blocked the way.

Stairs of the city of David.—As these are mentioned *after* the fountain gate and the wall of the pool of Siloam, and *before* the pool that was made, it is obvious that they were both near the pool of Siloam, and on the hill of Ophel; while if “*at the fountain gate*” is a correct translation, meaning “close to it,” it follows that the foot of the stairs must have been very near not only to the gate but also to the pool of Siloam; because the order in Neh. iii. 15 is the *gate*, the *pool*, and then the *stairs*.

NOTE B.

Even on the admission (Note A) that the *pool that was made* was in the Tyropœon valley, it might still be urged that the *lower* pool of Siloam was the pool of Siloah, and the *upper* pool of Siloam was the pool made by Hezekiah.

Such a view may possibly be consistent with the LXX. rendering of Neh. xii. 37, Isa. xxii. 11, though the objections to it on other grounds seem to me very strong. If it could be maintained, then the line of the wall and stairs would have to be drawn from the north end of the embankment up the Ophel hill, and the position of the tomb of David altered accordingly.

W. F. BIRCH.

St. Saviour's Rectory, Manchester.

NOTE ON NOB.

(a) Bearing on page 56, lines 15, 14 from the end, and page 58, last paragraph, is the important passage in Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 18, "In his time Sennacherib came up and sent Rabsaces, and *lifted up his hand against Sion* and boasted proudly" (LXX., *καὶ ἀνῆρε (ἐκ Λαχεῖς) καὶ ἐπῆρε χεῖρα*).

The words in italics seem only a reproduction of Isaiah x. 32, "As yet shall he remain at Nob that day: *he shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion.*"

Here it has been commonly assumed that the shaking of the hand was to be effected both at Nob^a and also *in sight of Jerusalem*. The writer of Ecclesiasticus, however, the earliest commentator on the passage, evidently takes Isaiah's words to refer to the haughty message of Sennacherib delivered by Rabshakeh (2^d Kings xviii. 17—xix. 4).

Therefore the shaking of the hand took place not at Nob, but in fact within earshot of Jerusalem—"by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field," and the condition that "Zion should be visible from Nob" is not required by Isa. x. 32.

(b) I cannot but think that Lieutenant Condet must have fallen into some mistake in saying in his note on page 60 that—

(1) "Ai (et Tell) is not visible from Jeb'a." My observations give et Tell as visible from a point of lower elevation than Jeb'a, about half a mile east of it, and as being a hill to attract attention all the way to Ramah.

Robinson (Researches, vol. ii. p. 113) from Jeb'a saw Deir Diwân; so that the loftier et Tell immediately west of it can hardly be out of sight.

(2) "Jeb'a is hidden by the Hizmeh ridge" (*i.e.*, I suppose from Anathoth). But (*id.*, p. 110), "From this point Anâta there was an extensive view. Jeb'a was before us, bearing N. 10 degrees E."

These discrepancies show how sometimes even careful observers may