

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

be mistaken. Accordingly I still hope that some part of the hill of Ramah may prove to be in sight from some part of Jeb'a, perhaps from the old tower, possibly also Almit, as well as the western ridge overlooking L'Isawiyeh, since Laish might easily have stood higher than the present village.

(c) One reason for identifying Tell el Fûl with Gibeah of Benjamin is that the Levite (Judges xix.) going north from Bethlehem proposed to lodge at Gibeah or Ramah. Josephus (Ant. v. 2. 8) says, that from near Jerusalem he went on twenty stadia and came to Gibeah. Lieut. Conder says the distance to Tell el Fûl is little over twenty-two. The agreement is sufficiently close.

Again, Tell el Fûl may be identified with Gibeah of Saul, for Titus, marching from Gophna (Wars, v. 2. 1), pitched his camp at the valley of thorns, near a village called Gabaoth Saul—*i.e.*, the hill of Saul, being distant from Jerusalem about thirty stadia. The "distant" refers to the *valley*, not to the village or hill, and even then Josephus, who often speaks in round numbers, only ventures to say *about* thirty stadia. Geba lies quite away from the direct road.

That there should have been two Gibeahs close together, and that both names should have perished, seems more improbable than the identity of Gibeah of Benjamin and Gibeah of Saul.

It is allowed that Gibeah may = Geba in 1 Sam. xiv., but that Geba was ever called Geba (or Gibeah) of Benjamin (xiv. 16) is not so clear.

Errata.—For visible from, etc. (p. 51), *read* visible not far from Diospolis or Lydda, in justice to Jerome, whose words are, "*Haud procul ab eâ (i.e., Lyddâ) vidit Nobe.*"

After but (p. 58, line 8) *read* ?

After S.E. of Geba (*id.*, line 26) *read* called Goba.

W. F. BIRCH.

NOTE ON KAL'AT JALUD.

IN 1872, I sent home a sketch of the southern chamber of this castle and some notes published in the *Quarterly Statement* for October of that year (see p. 172).

The drafted masonry is of no great size, and the bosses are rustic. On the west wall of the south chamber is a pointed arch, with masonry dressed with a draft, the boss carefully worked; there are five voussoirs to the arch. The piers, which are older than the small modern masonry, have also rustic bosses to the stones. I saw nothing in the two chambers which I visited which could be ascribed to an earlier period than the Crusading Tancred's Tower. The descriptions given in the memoir of the Crusading castles of 'Athlît, Kaukab, and Kalansâwîeh, built in places where no old ruins of importance are known to have existed before the twelfth century, will, I hope, show clearly that large masonry, three to five or six feet in the length of the stones, was hewn by the