

THE CITY AND TOMB OF DAVID.

VALUABLE as is Lieutenant Conder's Survey work, he is, I believe, radically wrong on Jerusalem. Theories proposed by him, however, may not improbably be accepted by some, as well-established facts, so that it is necessary for me to point out how his fire (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 228) utterly fails to touch my position, viz., that the City of David was on Ophel (so called) *i.e.*, on the eastern hill south of the Temple. I will take his shots one by one.

1. I objected to his position for the Tomb of David, as being *beyond the limits of Zion*. He replies (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 228), "I am not aware of any direct statement in the Bible to the effect that the Kings were buried on Zion. The Kings were buried *in* the City of David." But the Bible twice states that the City of David was Zion. (1 Kings viii, 1; 2 Chron. v, 2. "The City of David which *is* Zion"). I have already stated (168) that "in the historical passages of the Bible the stronghold of Zion and Zion are identically the same place—both are said to be the City of David." But to prevent further mistakes on this point the passages shall be here given fully.

2 Sam. v, 7.	"The stronghold of Zion : the same is—	} THE CITY OF DAVID."
" " 9.	"David dwelt in the fort and called it—	
1 Chron. xi, 5.	"The castle of Zion, which is—	
" " 7.	"David dwelt in the castle ; therefore they called it—	

These four passages with the two given above, make it the A B C of Jerusalem topography, that, Zion, and the stronghold (of Zion) and the City of David are all one and the same place. If this does not tally with Josephus, then so much the worse for that arch-error-monger.

2. Lieutenant Conder thinks it "improbable that the City of David was on Ophel, for several reasons," viz : (1.) That this identification is *contrary to the account of Josephus* ; but as he does not give particulars, it is not clear to what he refers. (2.) That the wall on Ophel was not *one enclosing*, but one *outside* the City of David. (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14.) What is the point of this? Surely it was quite possible to build a second wall *outside* the enclosing wall of the City of David ; for it is quite unnecessary to suppose that the City of David occupied the whole of the Ophel spur.

(3.) That Millo was according to the LXX the same as Akra, and was *in* the City of David, so that I must either place Akra on Ophel or discard this identification of the LXX. That the Akra of the Maccabees and Josephus was *solely* and *entirely* on Ophel is just what I have all along been earnestly contending for (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 185 ; 1880, p. 168). The City of David being fortified was called the Akra (1 Macc. i, 33), and so Millo itself being a (considerable ?) part of the former might easily in the LXX be translated "Akra."

3. I may reply that when Josephus is at variance with the Bible, the *only satisfactory plan* is to discard him altogether, and not make a

compromise between truth and error, from which have arisen almost all the difficulties about Jerusalem.

4. Josiah was buried in *his own sepulchre* (2 Kings xxiii, 30), and yet in *the sepulchres of his fathers*. (2 Chron. xxxv, 24.) Therefore Asa and Ahaziah equally with Jehoshaphat and others may have been buried in the sepulchres of the Kings, although each was buried in *his own sepulchre*. N.B.—To speak more exactly: Asa was “buried in his own *sepulchres* (plural) which he had made for himself in the City of David” (2 Chron. xvi, 14). If Lieutenant Conder had carefully verified this reference of his, he would have altered the sight for the next shot, and so not gone so wide of the mark.

5. Of course the fact that the Royal tombs called (Neh. iii, 16) “the sepulchres of David” existed on Ophel is the very centre of my position. But the case of Asa just cited shows that it is only wasting powder and shot to argue that “as the word is used in the *plural* (לְבָרִי), and David himself can only have occupied one sepulchre, we are forced to understand this expression as elliptical, and as meaning “sepulchres of the House of David.” Clinging to an unsound theory, like blindly following Josephus, has evidently *forced* Lieutenant Conder into strange expedients, (1) to overlook “sepulchres” in his reference to Asa, (2) to find a difficulty in the Hebrew plural, so as (3) to make “the sepulchres of David” to be necessarily elliptical for “the sepulchres of the House of David,” even while Asa made sepulchres (plural) for himself.

The words of Nehemiah must be taken to mean the place where David was buried, unless some better argument than this can be alleged against the identification (see below, 9).

6. As the Royal sepulchres on Ophel are apparently those of David, since no elliptical expression is required, I take them to be identical with “the Royal cemetery (or rather catacombs) in the city of David,” since the *cemetery* itself is described as “the *field* of the burial which *belonged* to the Kings” (2 Chron. xxvi, 23). In this were (1) the system of catacombs, called “the sepulchres of David,” or “of the (good) Kings,” (2) the sepulchre of Uzziah, (3) the sepulchres of Jehoram, Joash, and Ahaz. I consider, however, that Lieutenant Conder is quite correct in maintaining that Uzziah was buried on Ophel, and when I add a reference which he has omitted, viz., 2 Kings, xv, 7, “they buried him (*i.e.* Azariah = Uzziah) with his fathers in the City of David,”—then from Lieutenant Conder’s premise, that “Uzziah was buried on Ophel,” followed by the Bible’s premise that “Uzziah was buried in the City of David,” we draw the inevitable logical conclusion—that “the City of David must have been on Ophel,” and my position is proved, and his own theory disproved by Lieutenant Conder himself. Leaving him to revise his premise we come to the next point.

7. Solomon’s palace no doubt stood on Ophel (so called). It is not however clear to me whether or not it embraced the “House of David” (2 Chron. viii, 11) within the City of David, which house I am inclined to think was called *Millo*.”

The two passages quoted by Lieutenant Conder certainly do not show that it was not in the City of David, for they both refer, not to Solomon's palace, but to *the house which he built for Pharaoh's daughter*. (1 Kings vii, 8.) "His house . . . Solomon made also an house for Pharaoh's daughter."

8. Be it however that Solomon's palace was altogether outside the City of David, yet how is the conclusion to be drawn that "the tombs in the City of David cannot therefore, it would seem, have existed on the Ophel Spur"? This can only be on the groundless assumption that Solomon's palace occupied so much of Ophel as to leave no room for the City of David, while we know next to nothing of the size of either place.

9. "The House of David" (Neh. xii, 37) I believe to be the place where he lived, but on the admission that it means his *tomb*, Lieutenant Conder must again beg the point that it is an elliptical expression for the sepulchres of the house (?=sons) of David, if we are to understand that, though it was the tomb of David, he was not buried in it.

10. If by "in the Fort of Zion, in the City of David," Lieutenant Conder means *which was in the city of David*, this is an error, as the two are identical as shown by 1, in spite of Josephus.

11. Lieutenant Conder ("Handbook," 335) takes Gihon in the valley (Nachal) to be En-rogel, how then does he propose to draw a wall "westwards to " it instead of on its western side (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14) ?

12. I found it difficult (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 167) in regard to the House of David, to imagine how Lieutenant Conder could avoid placing it on Ophel; for I never anticipated the dash which would make it to be a place with which David had nothing to do either alive or dead. The next two shots seem enough to burst the gun. Let me show the fallacies.

13. "Solomon's palace was on Ophel. It was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel." Answer. There was room on Ophel both for Solomon's palace and for the City of David, just as there is room in Westminster for the Abbey and for the Houses of Parliament.

14. "Manasseh built a wall on Ophel. This wall was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel." Answer. The walls of the City of David were not so low down the Ophel hill as to leave no room for building another wall outside them.

15. "Millo was in the City of David. Millo, according to the Jews (who? Josephus or LXX?) was Akra. Therefore Millo was not Ophel." (*on Ophel*). I have admitted that Millo might fairly be called Akra by the LXX, but as I challenge any one to show that either 1 Macc. or Josephus places Akra anywhere else than on Ophel, I cannot for a moment admit the conclusion, "Therefore Millo was not (*on*) Ophel." The true position of the City of David is discussed in another paper.

My theory, whether *ingenious* or not, I believe to be true, and only for the sake of *truth* have I thus mercilessly pursued a friend through all the

errors which an excessive veneration of Josephus has chiefly produced, Strange as it may seem, Sion, Moriah, Akra, Ophel and Millo—are all names applied to one ridge. Be it observed, however, that the Hebrew Zion of the historical books is identical with the Greek Akra ; Millo is part of Sion *i.e.*, of Akra ; Ophel really was not the name of a *hill*, but of a certain part of it, a locality apparently near the south-east corner of the Haram ; while lastly Mount Moriah, the part of the eastern hill on which the Temple stood—is only mentioned *once* in the Bible, for the term commonly used by the Jews was “the Mountain of the House,” which is equivalent to the Mount Zion of the first book of the Maccabees. The only other decided hill which I believe could fairly be reckoned into the Jerusalem of Nehemiah was the south-west hill, that of the upper city, and this is called in the Bible “the hill (Gibeah) of Jerusalem” (Isaiah, x, 32 ; see also xxxi, 4 ; lit. “against the hill”).

W. F. BIRCH.

IT IS REQUIRED TO FIND THE ENTRANCE TO THE TOMB OF DAVID.

(1.) It is here assumed (as I think it may be demonstrated) that the City of David was on the eastern hill, south of the Temple. The following points are also assumed (though all are not at present capable of proof, while all (to me) seem highly probable) viz, that :—

(2.) The Tomb was *within* the City of David, facing from west to south.

(3.) The pool of Siloah (Neh. iii, 15) was in the Tyropæon between the south wall of the Haram and the present (so called) pool of Siloam.

(4.) The stairs of the City of David (Neh. iii, 15) were near the pool and ascended some part of the west side of Ophel (so called).

(5.) The entrance to the Tomb was in a vertical face of rock, as is common in Jewish tombs.

(6.) The entrance was not covered over when Herod built the S. W. corner of the Haram Area.

(7.) It was in the great malaki bed, 40 feet thick, mentioned by Colonel Wilson.

To economise labour and expense it is desirable to ascertain how the malaki bed lies south of the Haram. Excavation must *decide* this ; but excavation may be guided by the following considerations.

Colonel Wilson (Ordnance Notes) says (31) the upper beds of missæ dip 10° to east, and 15° to south.

(34 p.) The rock has a dip of 12° in a direction 85° east of north.

(3 p.) Strata near Jerusalem dip to E.S.E. at about 10°.