

in their various strongholds, and I think, that, unless there were very urgent reasons, the Jebusites would have located themselves near what is now called the Virgin's Fount."

It seems hardly fair that Captain Conder should bear the whole burden of fighting against the truth. Will none of those who hold somewhat the same opinions, as Canon Tristram and Sir C. Warren, or who spread his Jerusalem errors, as Mr. Henderson in his "Palestine," do justice to their views by trying to defend them in these pages? A little investigation would, I hope, reveal to them how greatly one is misled by taking Jerusalem sites on trust.

W. F. BIRCH.

---

## THE CITY OF DAVID.

### III. ZION, SOUTH, NOT NORTH OF THE TEMPLE.

FERGUSSON, followed by Thrupp (and Lewin partly), placed Zion rightly on the eastern hill, but wrongly north of the Temple.

Let me briefly point out the unsoundness of the arguments alleged in favour of this northern site.

1. He quotes Psalm *xlvi*, 2, "Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great king." These words seem to me too ambiguous for any argument to be built upon them. Thrupp (Jerusalem, 19) refers to the Prayer Book version: "Upon the north side lieth the city of the great king," which, he adds, "may be taken as identical with the City of David." If Hebrew scholars will agree that the original words *must* mean that the city lieth on the north side of Mount Zion, and cannot mean that Mount Zion is on the north side of the city (as I interpret them), the supporters of the northern site are welcome to have this passage in their favour.

2. On this verse Fergusson quotes the Rabbis from Lightfoot as in his favour, but he errs with Lightfoot (as they are really against him), overlooking the distinction between *Zion*, the City of David, of the historical books of the Bible, and Mount Zion which always, in 1 Macc., means the Temple hill (*xiv*, 27, compared with 48), if not in the Bible.

Lightfoot, with Psalm *xlvi*, 2, compares Isaiah *xiv*, 13: "I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation (*i.e.*, Mount Zion) in the sides of the north," and Ez. *xl*, 2, "He set me upon a very high mountain, by which was as the frame of a city on the south." He then quotes the Rabbis thus: "Aben Ezra, Mount Zion is on the north side of Jerusalem; Lyranus, Mount Zion is in the north part of Jerusalem; Kimchi, the Temple, was to be built on a mountain as before, and the City of Jerusalem is near it on the south;" and Lyranus again, "the Temple was in the north part, but the city in the south part." Lightfoot, however, not observing the above distinction, adds, "Behold! reader, Zion (he ought

to have said Mount Zion) on the north, in the Psalmist, and the city on the south part, in the Prophet." Elsewhere, Lightfoot makes the same mistake: "The mountain of the Temple will be found lying northward of Jerusalem," and he adds, "and Zion northward of the mountain of the Temple." See also prospect of the Temple: "Mount Moriah, this mountain seated in midst of Jerusalem . . . . on the south Jerusalem; on the north side lay Mount Zion."

Thus, while the Rabbis say that Mount Zion (*i.e.*, the Temple) was north of Jerusalem, and the city south of the Temple (*i.e.*, Mount Zion), and only refer to *two* places; Lightfoot goes wrong making *three* places out of the *two*, through not discerning that Mount Zion was identical with the Temple, as in 1 Macc.

Thus the appeal to the Rabbis is *against*, and not in favour of, the northern site for the City of David.

3. Thrupp says, "That the Acra of Antiochus (*i.e.*, the City of David, 1 Macc. i, 33) stood to the north of the Temple, can hardly admit of question. Josephus, who is a competent authority on this point, tells us that it overlooked, or rather, overlay the Temple." Unfortunately, however, for this argument Josephus shows that he is *incompetent*, for he contradicts 1 Macc. (his authority for these times), and makes Nicanor go *down* from the Acra to the Temple, although 1 Macc. says distinctly that he went *up*. This northern theory is simply baseless. I have shown that the Rabbis are not its friends but its foes; that when it rests on Josephus, he contradicts 1 Macc. vii, 33. For it to agree with the Bible, Neh. iii must be chopped into pieces and pieced afresh, and, according to Thrupp, "David" altered into "Solomon," in Neh. xii, 37.

But here, against Fergusson (Temple of the Jews, 53), I maintain that Neh. iii is an *orderly* (1879, 176) description of the wall. The order of the verses is as important as the order of figures in a sum. Against Thrupp (Jerusalem, 172) I maintain that the "the House of David" cannot mean the Palace of Solomon, which stood not on the south-western, but on the eastern hill, and with which David had nothing whatever to do.

Indeed, in his last book (Temples of the Jews), Fergusson is willing to accept Ophel as an alternative site for the Sepulchres of David which were in "the City of David," while Thrupp and Lewin are inclined to admit that this term afterwards extended to the part south of the Temple. For 2 Chron. xxxiii, 14, which Thrupp claims, I must refer the reader to *Quarterly Statement*, 1885, 104.

I have already proved directly that the City of David was south of the Temple (1885, 100, 208; 1886, 26). I must also now claim to have proved this by the exhaustive process, for as it has been shown that there is no proof that it was *west*, or *south-west*, or *north* of the Temple, it only remains for it to have been *south*, the only other possible site, and this has again and again been demonstrated to be the true site. Therefore Zion, the City of David, was on Ophel.

## IV.—ZION, NOT JERUSALEM IN GENERAL, IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

This broad view, which allows every site to be right, except the correct one, needs but little notice. It meant to make things pleasant all round, by telling each combatant his site was true, and could be proved by sound argument.

(1) As I have shown that there is no evidence for the western or south-south-western or northern position for the City of David, while there is abundant evidence for the Ophel site, it is to be hoped we have heard the last of this greatest of imposters.

(2) It may be urged that the LXX in one passage substitutes Zion for Jerusalem (1884, 198), and that Josephus always substitutes Jerusalem for the City of David in speaking of the burial of the kings.

To this I would reply that Zion in the prophetic books often seems to be equivalent to Jerusalem, so that it might easily be interchanged for Jerusalem in the LXX, though possibly the translator in 1 Kings, viii, 1, may have made the change accidentally, or to show off his topographical knowledge.

Josephus, on the other hand, merely sacrificed precision by the alteration he made, and being perhaps perplexed thought this the best way out of his difficulty.

(3) It is urged that Josephus (*Ant.* VII, iii, 2) says that David called Jerusalem "the City of David." I ask—Whence did Josephus obtain this information? And if it is said he obtained it from 2 Sam. v, 9, then (in *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, 29) I showed how very far his paraphrase is from being true to his text.

I now claim to have proved beyond fear of refutation, that Zion, the City of David, was solely and entirely on Ophel.

Contradiction, without either argument or any attempt to meet the evidence I have brought forward, I take to reflect not on my theory, but on the intelligence of the opponent, as condemning a theory which he cannot upset.

To the map-makers I make my humble request that they will not for the future perpetuate a glaring and flagrant falsehood by ever writing the name, "the City of David," at Jerusalem, anywhere except on the hill south of the Temple.

W. F. BIRCH.

## NEHEMIAH'S NIGHT-RIDE.

THE topography of ancient Jerusalem is a very perplexing question, and in studying it, while nothing is more helpful than to compare the third chapter of Nehemiah with the twelfth, nothing is more vexing than to find that even the two accounts taken together are insufficient. They may, however, be supplemented, to some small extent, by Neh. ii. 13-15: "I went out by night by the valley gate, even toward the dragon's well,