

ITINERARY OF THE EXODE.

Marches.

1. To Succoth.
2. Etham, route reversed.
3. Unknown.
4. Unknown.
5. Unknown.
6. Letopolis.
7. "Before Pe-ha-hi-roth."
8. In Wádi-Mūsa, Egyptians behind.
9. Wádi Mousa.
10. Three days from Letopolis, Migdol on left, Baal-zephon on right.
11. Crossing Red Sea from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. of next day, April 28th, B.C. 1491.

R. F. HUTCHINSON, M.D.

THE "CITY OF DAVID" NOT THE SAME AS THE
"CITY (JERUSALEM) OF DAVID'S TIME."

It was only the hope that a much abler pen than mine would take up the subject, that led me to abstain from commenting immediately on the extraordinary statements of Captain Conder on pages 105 and 106.

If one disputant does not read what has been said on the other side (and in *Quarterly Statement*, 1885, p. 228, Captain Conder avows that he had not then had the opportunity of doing so), or having read, neither acknowledges his own mistakes nor takes the trouble to point out to others the flaws in their arguments, and the errors in their statements of fact, it cannot be wondered at that "fifteen years of controversy" may have no result, but that "the disputants retain their opinions" (p. 105).

If Captain Conder had since August, 1885, read the papers in the January number of that year's *Quarterly Statement*, pages 57, 58, 61-5, it seems almost insulting to suppose that he would have written as he now has.

He must certainly have forgotten to refer to his own printed statements, when he says (p. 105), "I never claimed that the 'City of David' was a term equivalent to Jerusalem generally, but only that it meant—as one would naturally suppose—the City of David's time." What then does Captain Conder mean by the *City of David's time*, unless it is "*Jerusalem*."

References in my former paper (*Quarterly Statement*, 1885, p. 57) show that it was implied that the "capital of Syria"—the "capital of David's kingdom"—a "capital like Jerusalem," was meant by the name "City of David."

Again, *Quarterly Statement*, 1885, p. 229, we have the words, "I hold Zion to be the poetical name of Jerusalem."

"If Zion then be = Jerusalem, Jerusalem is = the "City of David," for "The City of David—is Zion" (1 Kings, viii, 1). Taking the latest statement, however, that the "City of David" is not a term equivalent to Jerusalem generally, and yet was the "City of David's time," how can it be shown that there is any difference between the two?

I can see none, unless by "Jerusalem generally" Captain Conder means Jerusalem at its largest extent, at a subsequent *time*.

Of course the *Jerusalem* of Herod was not the same as the *Jerusalem* of Hezekiah, or of Solomon, but our contention is, and Scripture clearly proves it, that the "City of David" was *not* the same *in David's time* as the City of Jerusalem as ruled over by the *same* monarch.

Much less was the "City of David" of Hezekiah's time of the same extent as Hezekiah's City of Jerusalem.

The "City of David" was the "stronghold of Zion" which David captured from the Jebusites, and the passages which tell us this, tell us also that David "built round about it," and it can hardly be maintained that he could do this, without the resulting Jerusalem of his time (made up of the former Jebusite city and his own additions) being *larger* than the contained fort or stronghold, which was the "City of David."

As to making a "distinction between the various books of the Bible in treating this question" when there is no *reason* brought forward for supposing that the words "City of David" are not "always used with the same meaning," seems a curious proposition from one who is the defender of orthodox views against the school of Welhausen.

If, however, Captain Conder is willing to accept the Books of Kings as authoritative, he will find that in his last paragraph, on p. 105, he has actually given up the whole case.

For the "field of the burial of the kings," which is allowed to have been on Ophel, *was actually part of the City of David*, seeing that Azariah, who was laid to his rest in that "field," was, according to 2 Kings, xv, 7, buried in "the city of David." Joram (2 Kings, viii, 24), Joash (2 Kings xii, 20, 21), and Ahaz (2 Kings, xvi, 20), were all alike buried in the "City of David," though they were *not* (according to Chronicles) interred in the *Sepulchres of the Kings*. Can it be that Chronicles is wrong, and that they were after all buried in the same set of tombs as David and Solomon?

Whatever Captain Conder may think, I believe your readers generally will, after perusing page 26, &c., of *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, see clearly that Millo, which was Akra, was actually, *teste* Josephus, on the modern Ophel, south of the Temple.

I acknowledge I ought not to have said that Manasseh built a wall *round* the City of David, but inasmuch as his wall was *outside* the City of David, and *yet* was westwards of Gihon in the Nachal (the Virgin's Fountain in the Kedron), it seems inevitably to follow that the City of David was on the hill west of Gihon, that is on the modern Ophel.

Whose theory it may be that placed "David's capital" on Ophel I don't know, the Rev. W. F. Birch does not. That it should be any

difficulty to find room on Ophel for "Zion, Millo, Ophel, City of David, and Akra," is only the difficulty of children who do not recognise that in the nursery rhyme—

Elizabeth, Betsy, Bessy and Bess
Went over the river to take a bird's nest,

the four names apply to one person.

Similarly it has been shown over and over again that the names quoted above all apply to the "City of David."

It is amusing to see that I am credited with *admitting* that "David's capital" was not "only a little village on Ophel," when it has been my sole aim in this controversy to show that *the part*, which was on Ophel, viz., the "City of David," was not as great as the *whole* of Jerusalem, the "capital of David's time."

I will not now occupy space with the "ancient nomenclature" of the "rest of the site of Jerusalem," but will only ask your readers generally, and Captain Conder in particular, to read the Scriptural evidence adduced in the January and April *Quarterly Statements* of 1885, and point out the errors, if that evidence does not show that David's capital (Jerusalem) was of greater extent than his fortified palace the "City of David."

H. B. S. W.

September 6th, 1887.

REPORT—EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

THE following is the Report of the Executive Committee, read and adopted at the meeting of the General Committee, June 14th, 1887.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,—

Your Committee elected at the last General Meeting, on July 26th, 1886, have, on resigning their office into your hands, to render an account of their administration during the past year.

1. The Committee have held seventeen meetings during the year.
2. The work of exploration has been carried on during the last year by Herr Schick at Jerusalem and by Herr Schumacher in other parts of the country. The portion of country recently surveyed by Herr Schumacher in Ajlûn consists of 500 square miles, containing a vast number of ancient sites and monuments. The map and memoirs arrived in England in January last; the memoirs contain sketches, plans, and drawings of all the most important places.

Some time before this survey Herr Schumacher executed for the German Society, having the same object as ourselves, a map of a large portion of the Jaulan. This was originally published in the "Zeit-