

to the south from A C (the crossing wall), and cutting E G in H, so that the area to be searched is further reduced to C H G D.

From Isa. xxii. 16, "graveth a habitation (*i.e.*, tomb) for himself in a rock" (*i.e.*, *sela* = in a cliff), and from the general construction of Jewish tombs, the entrance (which Colonel Wilson thinks may possibly have been a perpendicular shaft) I firmly believe must have been cut in a vertical scarped face of rock. The spot may probably now be encumbered with the ruins of Herod's white (marble) monument (Jos. Ant., xvi. 7. 1), which apparently fell down in the time of Hadrian (Dio. Cass. lxi. 15).

It may be added that if the malaki does not crop up south of the Haram Area, this theory is *worthless*. If it does not reach as far as the tomb" (Ordnance Map), I shall be surprised. That it was within the city wall seems required by the "over against" (Neh. iii. 16), though "the gate between the two walls by the king's garden" (Jer. lii. 7), and vii. 32 and viii. 1, might seem to be in favour of a position outside the ancient wall.

Surely, with such promising *clues*, we ought to try to recover the sepulchre where David's dust "rests in hope"—the magnificent catacombs where Solomon "lies in his glory"—the *loculus* (bed) of Asa, "filled with divers kinds of spices;" in short, the one intact monument of the Kings of Judah.

Surely, with such *check lines* to guide us, we ought to be able on a correct plan to fix the entrance within wonderfully narrow limits.

Surely, an officer of the R.E., of the "W." calibre, could, without literally "turning every stone," nevertheless discover the entrance (if it be there) at a moderate expenditure of time, labour, and money.

Surely those who are *interested* in the full illustration of the Bible, especially such as have offered funds to reopen Jacob's Well and to explore Rachel's Sepulchre, would not be backward to provide the means for trying to bring to light the sepulchres of the Kings of Judah, if the Executive Committee considered that there were sound reasons for anticipating complete success.

W. F. BIRCH.

NEHEMIAH'S WALL AND DAVID'S TOMB.

IF the Bible is *the* handbook for Palestine, Nehemiah is *the* guide for Jerusalem. How far does he enable us to make a *correct* reconstruction of the ancient city?

As experience has shown that in topographical matters *general consent* is occasionally wrong, it is necessary to show reason for the following obvious premises.

The description in Nehemiah iii. mentions *in strictly consecutive order* certain points along a *single line* of outer defences, and beginning near the north-east, goes round by north to west and south and east, ending at the starting-point.

(1) That the *line* was *single* is obvious, since the one object was to fortify Jerusalem as quickly as possible.

(2) That the places occur in *consecutive order* is obvious from xii. 31-39, where, starting from an intermediate point, one party passes certain points in the same order as in iii., the other, going the opposite way, certain points in exactly the reverse order.

(3) That "the description begins near the north-east," &c., is *certain*. Robinson says this course is obvious. Mr. Fergusson abandons an earlier view in favour of it; at least, so far as the "fountain gate."

Above all, it is the only theory which can possibly fit in with the approximately known positions of "the tower of Hananeel, the valley gate, the fountain gate, the city of David," and "the horse gate."

As it is stated that "the *breaches* began to be stopped," it is also obvious that the wall was not thrown down along its whole length.

THE COURSE OF THE WALL. (Neh. iii.)

1. *The sheep gate* was evidently in the outer wall on the north side of the temple, close to "Moriah" in the annexed plan. The identity of name requires us to place in this part "the Pool of Bethesda by the sheep market (or gate)," so that it could not possibly have been the Virgin's Fountain, south of the temple, as suggested by Robinson, &c. Passing the tower of Meah, we come to

The tower of Hananeel, apparently on the ridge running south from "Bezetha," but projecting somewhat northward towards B, so as (1) to form the *most northern point* of the city, since in Zech. xiv. 10, "from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's winepresses" = from north to south, and (2) probably to protect immediately to the west

3. *The fish gate* (probably in the valley running south from the Damascus gate), a very weak point where the Chaldeans entered (Zeph. i. 10).

As the importation of fish (xiii. 16) through this gate might have given rise to the name, it has often been placed on the west side, towards the sea, through inattention to the fact that the old way to Joppa would be by the north road, and near Gibeon.

6. *The old gate*.—Here (I believe) the north wall turned south, making *the corner*; so that this is identical with *the corner gate*, not expressly named in Nehemiah.

It is desirable to place this gate well to the west, perhaps as far as "Acra," since Zech. xiv. 10, "from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the *first gate*, unto the *corner gate*" = from east to west. For the same reason the *Benjamin gate* must have faced east at the north-east corner, or been close to it, and so could not well be the *sheep gate*. If it is meant above that the *corner gate* was the *first gate*, then the *first* (in point of time) gate = the *old gate*.

Distant at least 400 cubits (2 Ki. xiv. 13) from this last gate was *the gate of Ephraim*, which could not be *the gate of Benjamin* (as often supposed), since that was "by the house of the Lord" (Jer. xx. 2); pro-

bably it was near (7) "the throne of the governor," since the place for administering justice was at the gate.

13. *The valley gate.* As it had its name from the Valley of Hinnom (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 180), which here lies on the north side of the "upper city," this gate must be placed either (1) in the valley (marked "Tyropœon") facing west, or (2) on the brow of the "upper city" facing north; in any case a little east of E. Its resemblance to the Gennath Gate (*id.* 180) of Josephus is in favour of (2). The order of places in 2 Chron. xxvi. 9 inclines to (1): "Uzziah built towers in Jerusalem at the *corner gate*, and at the *valley gate*, and at the *turning of the wall*." The last expression means apparently a *re-entering angle*, which I can only suitably place at the junction of the wall from the corner gate, with the wall on the north brow already named.

The wall next ran due south at least for 1,000 cubits to

14. *The dung gate*, near south-west corner of the "Upper City." Here apparently was "the place called Bethso" (= dung-place), Jos. W., v. 4. 2.

15. Hence to *the fountain gate* the wall did not need repairing; obviously for the reason that, as no one would ever think of attacking Jerusalem on this south side, it would have been labour lost to overthrow its fortifications. So Nehemiah (ii. 13, 14) observed the walls broken down as far as "*the dung gate*."

Thus with little trouble ("facilis descensus Averni") we have got down to the fountain gate in the valley of the son of Hinnom, but to return from Tophet (Jer. xix. 6, 14) by the stairs that go down from the city of David, until we know the *precise* position of the *fountain gate*, is quite a different thing.—"Hoc opus, hic labor est."

Two years ago, on the assumption that the present Pool of Siloam really represented (as is usually supposed) the Pool of Siloah (iii. 15), I gave reasons (which seemed to me conclusive) for fixing the sepulchre of David close to it, at the south extremity of the Ophel ridge (so called).

That the *assumption* was *unsound* and the *conclusion* *worthless*, appeared *probable* when it was pointed out (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 179) that the Tyropœon was the Valley of Hinnom, and the ridge named the true site of the city of David (as all along required by Neh. iii. 15; xii. 37). Instead of *probable* it now seems to me *perfectly certain* for reasons given in *Quarterly Statement*, *id.*, 188, that neither of the two Pools of Siloam represents the *Pool of Siloah*, and that while the upper one (*Quarterly Statement*, 1877, 204; 1878, 188) represents "the pool that was made" (iii. 16), "*the Pool of Siloah*" (iii. 15) was *higher up* the Valley of Hinnom, with "the fountain gate" and "stairs of the city of David" of course close to it (*Quarterly Statement*, 1877, 200, 203). See "Note on the Two Pools."

Omitting these three points for the present, it is clear from Neh. xii. 37 that the wall having crossed the valley of Hinnom *ascended* the Ophel ridge near "the stairs." Then (obviously bending to the

south) it passed "over against the sepulchres of David," and went on to "the pool that was made," i.e., the present Pool of Siloam. This sweep to the south seems improbable, until we consider (1) that the object was to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem (ii. 17), and not simply to make a fortification; and (2) that the wall here, like that from the dung gate, probably needed but few repairs. After turning north, the wall was continued apparently on the line of Manasseh's *outer wall* "without the city of David on the west side of 'Gihon' in the valley" (nachal) 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14 (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 182).

That this later wall was the one repaired by Nehemiah seems to be the true explanation of the strange fact that the wall now rebuilt, instead of embracing as part of itself such points as "the armoury" (iii. 19); "the turning of the wall and the tower," &c. (25); "the water gate and tower" (26); "the great tower" (27) only passes "over against," i.e., "opposite to" them. This expression "over against" is used ten times in Nehemiah iii.; eight or nine times it obviously and necessarily refers to objects *within* the wall. One seems forced therefore to admit that in the remaining cases or case (iii. 15) it has the same reference, and therefore "over against the sepulchres of David" means that they were *within* the wall (see below).

26. As the "gutter" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, 184) may have been made when the stronghold of Zion was constructed, the water gate need not have been near the Virgin's Fountain, as stated in *Quarterly Statement*, 1877, 202.

27. Here we seem to join the wall of Ophel (? = the swelling) near K, which word seems to denote that part of the hill where the narrow ridge (of Zion) swells out to the east as we approach the Haram Area.

28. The horse gate probably was near the south-east corner of the latter (Jer. xxxi. 40, corner).

29-31. The wall may have gone north *exactly* on the present line. The massive wall, however, mentioned in Jerus. Rec., pp. 156-7, offers a suitable course, bending west to the sheep gate, to complete the circuit.

31. The place of the Nethinims (Νηθιναιιμ) is perhaps referred to in 1 Macc. xii. 37. "The wall toward the brook on the east side was fallen down, and they repaired that which was called Capphenatha" (? corrupted from Cephar Annathinim = village of the Nethinims). The gate Miphkad (i.e., of the appointed place) was evidently on the east of the temple, and near it "the bullock of the sin-offering was burnt in the appointed place (Miphkad) of the house, without the sanctuary" (Ez. xliii. 21).

W. F. BIRCH.

NOTE ON THE TWO POOLS.

A. The Virgin's Fountain is certainly Solomon's Pool (Jos. W., v. 4. 2), and so may well be the King's pool (Neh. ii. 14). As the valley here is narrow, it is not strange that Nehemiah could not go up on his beast