

ZION, THE CITY OF DAVID.

ON urging a Society that sends its maps over the world not to be afraid, but boldly to put the City of David where Nehemiah places it, *i.e.*, south of the Temple, I was told in reply, "You have convinced nobody." This is an objection that has often, on other occasions, been urged against the truth.

I have not claimed to have convinced any one, but still some have been convinced. Professor Robertson Smith says that the Ophel site alone "does justice to the language of the Old Testament." Professor Sayce says, "Mr. Birch seems to me indubitably right in holding that the City of David stood on the so-called hill of Ophel" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1884, p. 80). Sir Charles Warren has for thirteen years candidly owned that the Book of Nehemiah places the City of David on Ophel. Captain Conder, after five years' unyielding opposition, at length admits that "when Ophel came to be inhabited, the name (City of David) may be supposed to have included Ophel" (*id.* 242).

My theory, then, ought not to be rejected off-hand on the plea that no one believes it. Yet what I undertook to do was not to convince my opponents, but to confute their arguments. Two widely divergent objections are urged against me in the July and October numbers. Captain Conder credits me (p. 242) with "confining ancient Jerusalem to the insignificant space south of the Temple," while Professor Sayce thinks I endanger my views by supposing that the City of David stretched across a deep valley;—in other words, the former thinks that I make Jerusalem small, and the latter that I make the City of David large. Strange to say, the *fact* is, I make Jerusalem larger and the City of David smaller than does either of these writers. Want of due circumspection has caused the one to strike on Scylla, and the other to fall into Charybdis. Neither can point to a single passage of mine in these pages in support of the theories they thus attribute to me.

Further, (1) in reply to Captain Conder I must remind him that I have *already* pointed out (1884, p. 81) that "the City of David was only part of Jerusalem," and that I place the former on Ophel, while I make my Jerusalem *larger* than his (*id.* 81). Thus, "confining Jerusalem to Ophel" is just what I have *not* done.

Again, why (2) does Professor Sayce speak of my "supposing the City of David stretched across a deep valley?" Where have I supposed it? So far from doing so, I have consistently for six years repudiated any theory that does not place Zion, the City of David, solely on Ophel (so-called).

My Jerusalem theory is as follows:—

1. The Tyropœon Valley was part of the valley of Hinnom which ran from near the Jaffa Gate through the present city to the Kedron.

2. Zion, the City of David, was entirely on the southern part of the eastern hill, *i.e.*, on Ophel (so-called).

3. The sepulchres of David were in this same part.

4. The "gutter" (2 Sam. v, 8) by which Joab gained access to Zion, was the secret passage (connected with the Virgin's Fount) discovered by Sir C. Warren.

5. Araunah betrayed Zion to David either by divulging the secret of the "gutter," or by assisting Joab in ascending it.

I have defied any one to upset No. 2, but I am willing to extend the challenge to the other points. Accordingly, when Professor Sayce comes boldly to the attack, I cannot run from my guns, but must ruthlessly mow down his objections to my (not Canon Birch's) theory by confuting them. I am glad, however, to say that Professor Sayce agrees with me, partially on No. 1, and all but entirely on Nos. 2 and 3, but he wholly rejects No. 4, and consequently No. 5, though, since he is "quite ready to believe whatever Josephus may say provided it is not contradicted by external or internal evidence" (p. 172), I anticipate in the end his hearty acceptance of my last point.

Professor Sayce's objections to No. 4 are practically three.

(1) He urges that 2 Samuel v, 6-8, has to do with the capture of *two* places, and that therefore it was not Zion, the City of David, to which Joab gained access.

(2) That Joab could not have got up the shaft found by Sir C. Warren, since in Professor Sayce's opinion it did not then exist, being of later date than the Siloam Tunnel.

(3) That the Hebrew word for "gutter" means a waterfall, and therefore could not be a rock-cut shaft or passage.

To make the matter in dispute more intelligible, I give in full the passages in question:—

2 Samuel v, 6. "And the king and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land, which spake unto David, saying, Except thou take away the blind and the lame, thou shalt not come in hither: thinking, David cannot come in hither.

7. "Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Zion: the same *is* the City of David.

8. "And David said on that day, Whosoever getteth up to the gutter, and smiteth the Jebusites, and the lame and the blind, *that are* hated of David's soul, *he shall be chief and captain.* Wherefore they said, The blind and the lame shall not come into the house."

1 Chronicles xi, 6, states: "And David said, Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites first shall be chief and captain. So Joab the son of Zeruiah went first up and was chief."

To prove his first point, Professor Sayce tries to make a short cut, by impressing into his service Hebrew grammar. He protests against my describing his interpretation of two places being taken as a "popular error" (perhaps my *popular* was ill-chosen), and asserts that "the Hebrew tenses admit of no other (interpretation); we have *waw consecutivum* in each clause. The narrative sets before us a sequence of events. . . . David captured the outpost of Zion, and *after this*—but on the same day—he promised rewards to 'whosoever getteth up to the gutter,' &c."

My contention (p. 72) was that in verse 8 the sense would be made clearer by translating "And David said" by "For David said," &c., since this verse explains *how* David succeeded in taking Zion, the capture of which was mentioned in the previous verse.

The question is, *Must* the words translated "And David said" mean "And *after this* (the previously mentioned event) David said," or may they not mean "For David said," and, if so, does not this rendering agree better with the rest of the passage?

A disputed point of grammar must be dealt with by a competent Hebrew scholar. I extract the following from a full explanation of the question, kindly furnished to me by Professor Theodores:—

"The verbal form called 'future' (Hebrew. עתיד by the older grammarians), is variously named in the modern grammars as imperfect, aorist, fiens, &c. . . . The letter ך prefixed to the 'future,' generally provided with the vowel Pathach (-) and followed by a dot called 'strong Dagesh' in the initial letter of the verb, has the property of changing the verb from the future to the past, whence the Hebrew grammarians named it 'the *vav* conversive.' Modern grammarians have invented for it different names, *consecutive*, voluntative, relative, &c. The interpretation of the prefix ך varies between *and*, *now*, *for*, *but*, *still*, *nevertheless*, *then*, *inasmuch as*, *namely*, *consequently*, and probably still more particles, either temporal or logical.

"It is not true that ך before a verb in the future *must* be interpreted to mean 'afterwards' (Sayce, p. 174). Examples are numerous. . . . Thus in Genesis xxxvii, 5, we read (A.V.), 'And Joseph dreamed a dream, and he *told it* his brethren, and they hated him yet the more.'

Here follows verse 6: "And he said [future with ך] unto them, Hear, I pray you, this dream which I have dreamed." Would it not be absurd to render the beginning of verse 6, viz., וַיֹּאמֶר (wayyōmer), "Afterwards he said unto them?" Joseph did not tell his dream in consequence of his brothers' hatred; but his brethren hated Joseph in consequence of his communication about dreaming. In point of time, verse 6, commencing with "And he said," is anterior to the words "and they hated him yet the more" in verse 5. Again, in Exodus xl, 17, we are informed that on the first day of the first month in the second year the tabernacle was reared up.

The next verse, the 18th, reads, "And Moses reared up [future with ך] the tabernacle, &c." Can ך here mean "afterwards?" What! *after* the rearing up of the tabernacle, Moses reared up the tabernacle!

Professor Theodores adds this translation:—(6) "Then marched the king and his men towards Jerusalem against the Jebusite inhabiting the land, and he said to David thus, Thou wilt not enter here, except thou set aside the blind and the lame, meaning: David shall not enter here! (7) Nevertheless, David conquered the fortification 'Zion,' which is 'the City of David. (8) For David proclaimed on that day, He that smites the

Jebusite, reaching so far as the aqueduct, along with the lame and along with the blind, those hated by the soul of David . . . [The Scripture is here elliptical, not stating what should be done to him, but the want is supplied in 1 Chronicles xi, 6], because the lame and the blind, even they say he shall not enter within. (9) Thus David settled in the fort and called it the City of David. And David built round about from Millo and inward." Professor Theodores further adds:—"In the Hebrew commentary, called Biur, on the translation called Mendelssohn's, the following opinions are stated:—Verse 7. 'And David conquered.' This 'And' is adversative and means *but, nevertheless*. Verse 8. 'And David said.' In the preceding verse (7) the text states in a *general* way that David overpowered the stronghold, but now in (8) the *particulars* are stated how the conquest was effected."

Thus it is amply shown that the grammar does not prove that two places were taken in 2 Samuel v; 1 Chronicles xi. If I may add a word of my own, I would say there would be an unaccountable *lacuna* in the sacred narrative if two places had been taken, since no mention whatever is made of the second capture. The passages give a complete story of one place being taken, stating the fact of its capture, that a reward had been offered for its capture, and the name of the successful hero.

The A.V. is right in the heading of 1 Chronicles xi: "He winneth the castle of Zion from the Jebusites by Joab's valour," and so far I was wrong in describing Professor Sayce's interpretation as a *popular* error. Thus I conclude that it *was* the fort (of) Zion to which Joab gained access.

But, secondly, Professor Sayce says (175): "The careful workmanship of these passages, the niches for lamps—a Græco-Roman invention—the iron ring, and the fact that the lower conduit (discovered by Sir C. Warren) led into the winding Siloam Tunnel, all go to show that this lower conduit was later in age than the Siloam one."

a. Niches for lamps.—In his account of the Siloam Tunnel (1881, p. 142) Professor Sayce mentions a niche opposite the inscription, and admits the reasonable suggestion that it was for the lamp of the workman that cut the letters. Was the inscription therefore (and the tunnel as well) a Græco-Roman invention? I will not, however, press the point. If Professor Sayce will refer to Colonel Warren's account of the passage, he will, I think, find no mention whatever of "niches for lamps," but only of piles of loose stones (Letters, p. 39; Memoirs, Jerusalem, p. 367), an invention dating as far back as Jegar—sahadutha.

b. "The iron ring."—My initials and H.B. are smoked beyond the broad arrow in a low passage in the cave of Adullam, but the antiquity of the cave is not consequently reduced. The ring *must* have been added after the passage was made, but how long after no one knows, and therefore the *iron* age proves nothing.

c. The lower conduit, &c.—It would, however, be quite as correct (more correct I believe) to say "the Siloam Tunnel led into the conduit." Colonel Warren's professional opinion (Letters, p. 40) on discovering the passage, was

as follows:—"The fact of the newly found aqueduct being nearly in a line with the first 50 feet of the old one, gives the idea that this may originally have been the means of providing Ophel with water, and that the remainder of the duct to the present Pool of Siloam may have been an afterthought."

He also holds to the same opinion in "Underground Jerusalem" (p. 333). Thus Professor Sayce's second objection fails.

His third objection I propose, if time permit, to answer fully when I have exposed in detail the fallacies of the arguments urged for placing the City of David in any other position than on Ophel (so-called). It will suffice now to say that the evidence proving that the gutter was an aqueduct, and that Araunah betrayed Zion, is given in *Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 184; 1879, p. 104.

W. F. BIRCH.

THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

I.

PERMIT me to reply to the views of Mr. Baker Greene, as given in the October number of the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and which have been made the subject of a leading article in the *Morning Post* of the 22nd October, regarding the identity of Mount Hor with Mount Sinai. I regret not having seen Mr. Greene's book, but as his views are very fully set forth in the *Quarterly Statement* I will deal with a few points on which he lays stress in that publication; and I hope to be able to show, by the aid of a few crucial tests, that his views are altogether untenable.

I may be allowed to point out that this is pre-eminently a question which requires some personal knowledge of the countries referred to; and it does not appear from Mr. Baker Greene's statement that, like the venerable Dr. Beke, he has made a pilgrimage to the East in order to verify his views by personal observation. On the other hand, I may remind the reader that the identification of Mount Sinai (Jebel Mûsa) in the peninsula of Arabia Petræa with the "Mount of the Law" has been maintained by eminent men who have personally examined the district, such as Dr. Robinson, Burkhardt, the late Professor Palmer, and Col. Sir Charles W. Wilson, formerly of the Ordnance Survey of Sinai. After this consensus of opinion it might have been supposed that nothing more was to be said.

Mr. Baker Greene asserts that after the passage of the Red Sea the Israelites followed the old caravan road across the Th tableland to Akabah, which he identifies with Elim, where there were "twelve wells and threescore and ten palm-trees" (Exod. xv, 27). As Elim merely means "a grove of palms," the name might doubtless have