

lines, beginning with Colonel Warren's "Parallel" on his invisible Zion ("The Temple or the Tomb," p. 22).

If, however, my opponents, especially the R.E's, will accept the inevitable and join me, so much the better, as their professional skill would be most valuable in searching for the entrance to the Tomb of David on Ophel (so called).

Is it not to such work that the Committee are beckoned in the oracular couplet of an anonymous pilgrim ?

"Est operæ pretium tumuli lustrare cavernas ;
Regia monstrabit putre sepulcra lutum."

Zion Sought and Found, vol. i, p. 7.

This has been freely rendered—

'Tis worth your while 'mid Ophel's caves to pry ;
'Here David sleeps,' his mouldering clay will cry.

NOTE ON JOSEPHUS AND THE LXX.

JOSEPHUS may have derived from the LXX his mistaken notion that Zion and the City of David, which are used as equivalent terms in the historical passages of the Bible, only meant just the same thing as Jerusalem.

This seems probable from the following :—

- (1) In 1 Kings viii, 1, the LXX substitute *Zion* for *Jerusalem*.
- (2) In 2 Chron. xxviii, 27, "In the city in Jerusalem" (Hebrew), which means "the City of David at Jerusalem," becomes in the LXX *ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ*.
- (3) 2 Chron. xxv, 28, "In the city in Judah" (Hebrew) becomes in the LXX *ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ*. Possibly this was the true reading.
- (4) In 1 Kings ix, 15, a confused reading may possibly give *τὸν φραγμὸν τῆς πόλεως Δαυίδ* as equivalent to the wall of Jerusalem.

Thus in saying that David called Jerusalem the City of David Josephus is totally wrong ; but in saying that king after king was buried in Jerusalem, he is merely sacrificing the precision of the original Hebrew, which names the exact part of Jerusalem in which the royal sepulchres were situated, *i.e.*, in the City of David, or Zion (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 154).

W. F. B.