

north of Wady Kanah, the conclusion is in favour of that line, where it is found with the rest of the points identified. With regard to the Ephraimite city of Shechem, being found within the tribal limits of Manasseh, it may be remarked, that the parcel of land which Jacob bought at Shechem was bequeathed to Joseph, and although Manasseh was his eldest son, the patriarch Jacob's blessing fell upon Ephraim, taking effect in the elevation of Joshua, who appears to have recovered possession of Jacob's land at Shechem without a struggle; and having made the place his capital, and the gathering place of all the tribes, it probably became a seat of his own immediate family and followers. Perhaps the extension of Manasseh south of the Kanah was a compensation to Manasseh for the Ephraimite possession of Shechem, and it may have been for the more complete satisfaction of Manasseh, that Shechem was surrendered by Ephraim, first as a city of refuge and afterwards to the Kohathite Levites. Nothing in subsequent events serves to throw any light on the Kanah as a boundary.

TRELAWNEY SAUNDERS.

NOTES ON DISPUTED POINTS.

MR. BIRCH'S papers must be regarded as of great interest to the subscribers of the Palestine Exploration Fund. I would, however, venture to defend myself against some of the objections which he has raised in the previous *Quarterly Statement*.

Tombs of the Kings (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 167). Mr. Birch objects that the site I have proposed is beyond the limits of Zion. I am, however, 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, which Mr. Birch places on Ophel. This identification appears to me improbable for several reasons. 1st. It is contrary to the account of Josephus (whose authority Mr. Birch however denies). 2nd. The wall on Ophel was not one enclosing, but one outside the City of David (2 Chronicles xxxiii, 14). 3rd. Millo was according to the LXX, the same as Akra, and was in the City of David. Mr. Birch must, it would seem, either remove Akra to the Ophel ridge, or must discard this ancient identification of Millo.

This question is one which of course presents difficulties or it would not have been a matter of dispute for the last half century. Theories however, which discard the evidence of Josephus and other ancient authorities may perhaps be thought to be less satisfactory than those which aim at reconciling every ancient account.

The reason why I have supposed Asa and Ahaziah not to have been buried in the tomb of David is that each is recorded to have been buried in his own sepulchre (2 Chronicles xvi, 14; 2 Kings ix, 28). It is

possible, however, that Mr. Birch's view is more correct, and it is also not improbable that the tomb which I have supposed to be that of the Kings contained 11 or 12 *Kokim*, as will be seen by consulting the plan published in the *Quarterly Statement* (April, 1877, p. 78).

The strength of Mr. Birch's argument lies in his appeal to the fact that Royal tombs existed on Ophel (*Nehemiah* iii, 16), called "the sepulchres of David." This fact cannot be denied, but as the word is used in the *plural* (לְבָרִי), and as 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." I have endeavoured (though perhaps too briefly) to explain in the "Handbook to the Bible" (p. 341), that these Royal sepulchres on Ophel are identical with the "field of burial of the Kings" (2 *Chronicles* xxvi, 23), where Uzziah was buried—a place distinct from the Royal cemetery in the City of David, and probably the same as the "garden of Uzzah" (2 *Kings* xxi, 18), where also Manasseh and Amon (verse 26) were buried.

This Royal Cemetery in a garden belonging to the King's house may naturally be placed on Ophel, where was the Royal garden (*Nehemiah* iii, 15), and the King's high house. Josephus makes the same distinction in speaking of Manasseh as having been buried in his own garden (Ant. X 3, 2), and states that, as a leper, Uzziah was excluded from the city (Ant. IX, 10-4).

That Solomon's palace stood on Ophel, is I believe, generally understood, and is rendered very clear by several passages in the Bible. To this palace the Royal garden naturally belonged, but it is equally clear from other passages that this palace was not in the City of David (1 *Kings* ix, 24; 2 *Chronicles* viii, 11). The tombs in the City of David cannot therefore, it would seem, have existed on the Ophel spur. The Royal palace seems still to have existed in the time of Nehemiah (*Nehemiah* iii, 25), but the usual explanation of the expression "House of David" (*Nehemiah* xii, 37) is, as Mr. Birch admits, that it refers to the tombs on Ophel already noticed in the same place. David probably never built any palace, but lived in the Fort of Zion, in the City of David, which according to Josephus, was the Upper City or Market.

As regards the translation "westwards to the City of David" we have the authority of Keil, and of Dr. Davidson, that this is the natural and correct rendering. I do not think that its occurrence in another passage (2 *Chronicles* xxii, 14), creates any serious difficulty, although in both passages, the direction is, if we speak with the precision of modern times, "south-westwards" rather than westwards.

As to the difficulty which Mr. Birch finds with regard to the procession passing from the Fountain Gate (*Nehemiah* xii, 37), there is little to be said. The passage is not very clear because it is so concisely worded. The general course is sufficiently certain from Siloam towards the south-east angle of the Haram, but whether the course was above the house (or tomb) of David, or whether the "going up" of the wall only were above the same, I must leave to better scholars to determine.

The questions here raised have been disputed ever since the time of Thrupp and Williams, and are of peculiar difficulty. The argument which I wish to bring forward as clearly as I am able is this:—

1. Solomon's palace was on Ophel. It was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel; or again
2. Manasseh built a wall on Ophel. This wall was not in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was not on Ophel; or again
3. Millo was in the City of David. Millo, according to the Jews was Akra. Therefore Millo was not Ophel.

Ingenious as is Mr. Birch's theory, it is hard to believe that the names Sion, Moriah, Akra, Ophel and Millo, all applied to the one narrow ridge, and that the larger hills of the city are not mentioned in the Bible by any distinctive name.

C. R. C.

NEW IDENTIFICATIONS.

Chephar Haammonai (Joshua xviii, 24). I have hesitated to identify this site with the ruin of *Kefr'Ana*, north of Bethel, but when the boundary of Benjamin is laid down on the map it appears that the situation of the ruin in question agrees well with the description of the border descending southwards to Bethel (verse 13), and we thus obtain another point on a part of the line which was before not well indicated.

Jezreel (of Judah). The situation of the ancient ruin called *Sirreh* would agree well with the probable position of this town. (Joshua xv, 56.) The name is not very close, though the loss of the final L, and the change of *Zain* to *Sad* are of occasional occurrence. The ruin lies west of Juttah, (*Yuttah*), the name preceding Jezreel on the list. We may also compare the form *Izar* which Josephus gives for Jezreel (Ant. VIII, 13-8) in speaking of the capital of Ahab.

The Negeb. Many of the towns of Simeon may be identified with cities north of Beersheba and west of the Debir hills. The following occur close together in this district, being newly identified from the Survey Sheets with exception of the first:—

1. En Rimmon	<i>Umm er Rumdmîn.</i>
2. Ashan	<i>'Aseileh.</i>
3. Hormah	<i>Horân.</i>
4. Beth Birei	<i>Bireh.</i>
5. Baalah	<i>Umm Baghleh.</i>
6. Etam	<i>'Aitûn.</i>
7. Madmannah	<i>Umm Deimneh.</i>
8. Sharuhem	<i>Tell Sherî'a'h.</i>
9. Bethul	<i>Beit Leyî.</i>

Some of these I have already proposed in former numbers of the