

which was a large and very well cut inscription. Prof. Zagarelli, of St. Petersburg, pointed out, in 1881, that it was of considerable importance to Georgian history, as it proves the long continuance of the Georgians with the Holy Land by the fact that at various times they built and supported cloisters. The Professor also drew attention to its importance palaeographically, as being a specimen of the ancient Georgian ecclesiastical characters.

The following is the translation :—

“ Christ. Holy Nicholas be thou intercessor with Christ for the Queen (= Princess) of Kachetien, Elizabeth, formerly Helena.”

This Helena here mentioned is doubtless the daughter of the king of Kachetien, David II (A.D. 1604),<sup>1</sup> and sister of Teimuraz I (1605–1665). She first journeyed (c. 1615) to Persia, and later (1625) to Jerusalem, where she founded the cloister of St. Nicholas, in which she became a nun, under the name of Elizabeth, or according to some inscriptions, Anastasia.<sup>2</sup>

## THE CITY AND TOMB OF DAVID ON OPHEL (SO CALLED).

By THE REV. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.

THE *Standard* of October 21, 1909, gave an interesting column on the fine attempt under Captain Parker to reach quietly the tombs of David and of the kings of Judah. The explorers wisely concluded that these rock-cut catacombs were on Ophel, the entrance (it may be but two feet square) being concealed by soil, stones, etc., and nobly refused to bore downwards to the ceiling of the cavities ; but consequently (it would seem) failed of success. Complete investigation without delay is much to be desired.

Meanwhile, as *The City of Jerusalem* (by the late Col. Conder) if not also *Ancient Jerusalem* (by Merrill) may perhaps lead some to think the wrong hill was searched, it may be well to point out that

<sup>1</sup> Lynch, in *Armenia, Travels and Studies*, Vol. I, p. 365, gives David II a much earlier date.

<sup>2</sup> Palestine Exploration Fund *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1883, pp. 112, 113.

the former writer errs as to the true general position of the above tombs.

On the plan of Jerusalem (p. 78) the tomb of David is marked near the position of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, quite half-a-mile (in a bee line) from the southern end of Ophel near Siloam. Again (p. 68) it is said: "Manasseh was not buried with his fathers, but in the palace garden near Siloam, where also, in the field of burial, the leper Uzziah had probably been buried, and perhaps Ahaz also. This cemetery is afterwards noticed as the 'sepulchres of David,' but we may now inquire where the seven kings who were buried 'in' or 'at' the city of David, with David himself and Solomon, were most probably entombed; for the site was *clearly not the same*, and was either within or close to the old city of David's time. The seven later kings buried 'with their fathers' were Rehoboam, Abijah, Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah." Conder suggested 30 years ago that the traditional graves of Joseph of Arimathaea and of Nicodemus had to do with this (above-named) tomb. (P. 70.) "This tomb of David was *distinct* from the cemetery in the garden of the palace near Siloam, which has not yet been found, but to which the term field of burial belonging to the kings seems to be first applied in speaking of Uzziah, *for they said, he is a leper.*"

Now, if Conder's statements be sound, it is clear that the latest explorers were doomed to failure in searching on Ophel (so called) for David's tomb, situated some half mile away.

I propose, however, to prove that his theory was built on sand, and his statements were unsound, and that the explorers searched the right hill.

His first axiom is "the tomb was distinct from the cemetery—the site of the two was not the same," *i.e.*, David was buried in one place, Uzziah in the other. Pull out this corner-stone and the wall will begin to fall.

Let it now be shown that, with the exception of Abijah, all the kings from David to Ahaz were buried in the same site.

I may refer to the conspectus (by H.B.S.W.) of the burial of the kings in *Q.S.* 1882, p. 269, which furnishes valuable aid. We see that the Bible does not state that Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, was buried *with his fathers*, but Josephus (often incorrect) does say he was buried in the sepulchres of his fathers. Asa, however, was

buried with his *fathers*, which word must at least include another besides Abijam, if we accept the words of Josephus. Thus we have in the Bible an unbroken link showing that (except Abijam) all the kings from Ahaz upward to Rehoboam inclusive were buried with their fathers. Therefore, all from David to Ahaz (except Abijam) were buried in one and the same cemetery, *i.e.*, David's tomb was not distinct from the cemetery, but the site of the two was the same.

In *Q.S.*, 1881, p. 94, on "The city and tomb of David," I dealt with this subject, and showed that when Josephus is at variance with the Bible the only satisfactory plan is to discard him altogether, and not to make a compromise between truth and error, from which have arisen almost all the difficulties about Jerusalem.

The Bible says David went to Jerusalem, took the stronghold of Zion, the same is the city of David; David dwelt in the stronghold and called it the city of David; or briefly, David took one place, dwelt in it, and called it the city of David, and was buried in (or at) it, and his successors as above.

Unfortunately, Josephus gave this paraphrase—David came to Jerusalem, took two places (probably due to the glossed *προ* in *προκατελάβετο*, implying two captures, in 1 Chron. xi, 5, LXX), called Jerusalem the city of David and was buried in Jerusalem and so were his successors—briefly he gives a miserable blundering abridgement, a Jew, not even naming Zion, and cruelly misleading his readers by writing that David called Jerusalem (not Zion) the city of David. "Those explorers knew better."

## CALVARY—"PLACE OF A SKULL."

By J. M. TENZ.

ABOUT 250 feet east of the traditional Calvary there were traces of a wall supposed to have been remains of the second north wall of ancient Jerusalem, but by careful investigations made by Mr. Archibald C. Dickie, it was found to have been a gateway, with a large door and a smaller one on each side, probably to an enclosure within which the Churches stood (see *Quarterly Statement*, 1907, p. 297, and 1908, p. 298). So far we have only historical