

His drawing of a demon head I have verified from the cast and find very correct. Speaking of the emblem accompanying the oft-repeated *altar*, he confuses, I think, two distinct Hittite signs, viz., C, which is usually a suffix, and IC, which is always a prefix. It is the first which is found so often attached to the altar, and which compound I read *Bar-d*, but the altar occurs without this suffix C = *d* (or *ak*), and when alone probably reads *Bar*.

C. R. CONDER

REPLY TO CAPTAIN CONDER'S NOTES ON ZION.

IF silence gives consent, the opponents of Ophel being the site of the City of David are convinced of their error, and it only remains for me briefly to notice Captain Conder's objections in *Quarterly Statement*, 1887, p. 105.

1. He asks, "Is it certain that the words City of David are always used with the same meaning" in the Bible. I answer, without hesitation, Yes, as no evidence placing it elsewhere than on Ophel has yet withstood investigation.

2. He takes "the field of burial of the Kings," "the Garden of Uzzah, near Solomon's Palace on Ophel," to be a different place from "the Tombs of the Kings of Israel," *i.e.*, of David and other kings. Here are several mistakes.

a. The "field" and the "garden" were distinct places. For Manasseh was buried "in his house," or "in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzzah." This house or palace was that built by Solomon near the Temple (within the "enclosure of Herod's Temple," "Handbook," 340), but "the Sepulchres of David," which Captain Conder (106) takes to be equivalent to this "field of burial," were not only, as he admits, on Ophel, but also between the Pool of Siloam and the pool that was made (Neh. iii, 15, 16), and so certainly not north of the Virgin's Pool. In other words, Manasseh's tomb was at the north end of Ophel, so called, and Uzziah's towards the southern side, so that the two localities were quite distinct.

b. Captain Conder admits that the field of burial where Uzziah was buried was on Ophel, but 2 Kings xv, 7, states that he was buried with his fathers in the City of David. Therefore the City of David was on Ophel, and my position is proved by Captain Conder himself. This mistake of his, which I pointed out six years ago (1881, 95), seems to show that "disputants retain their opinions," probably because they do not carefully examine the evidence bearing on the question under discussion, even to comparing Chronicles with Kings.

But further, Uzziah was buried with "his fathers." As all the kings after David and Solomon downwards to Uzziah, with only one exception,

are all said (see H. B. S. W.'s table, 1882, 266) to have been buried "with their fathers," we have a distinct Biblical assertion that they were all buried together in the same locality, though not all in the same sepulchres.

Therefore, *volens volens*, Captain Conder is forced to admit (if argument influences him) : 1, that David was as much buried on Ophel as was Uzziah, and (2) that the Sepulchres of David (Neh. iii, 16), need not mean anything else than the place where David was actually buried. The fact is the southern part of Ophel was the cemetery for good and bad kings alike down to the time of Manasseh.

3. When Captain Conder says that there is no doubt that Akra was west of the Temple, he makes a statement directly contrary to the whole testimony of Josephus, as I showed (*Quarterly Statement*, 1886, 26). Here, again, I must suppose that he has not read my remarks on his theory.

4. Captain Conder's energy seems to waste itself in opposing a theory which places David's capital on the little spur of Ophel. Let me say once for all, that (in these pages) no one has ever advocated such a theory. It is a chimera of Captain Conder's own invention. He has indeed attributed it to me and also to Professor Sayce, but both of us have distinctly repudiated it. My theory is, that even in the time of Joshua, Jerusalem occupied ground on both sides of the Valley of Hinnom (*i.e.*, the Tyropœon), being both in Judah and Benjamin, and therefore was not confined to Ophel, while Professor Sayce includes the temple hill in his Jerusalem of David's time, though wrongly, I admit. If, ceasing to fight with his own shadow, Captain Conder will turn his attention to the arguments of H. B. S. W., and to mine, perhaps we shall soon have the aid of his pen against other errors.

5. Captain Conder thinks that no engineer would be able to agree that a fortress could have stood on Ophel. I can forgive one of my cloth (Canon Tristram, 1885, 107 ; 1886, 34) falling into error on this point ; but, O ye heroes of Rorke's Drift, what think ye of a R.E. rejecting Ophel as indefensible, when with time and stone without stint, a position that with a wall of 50 feet high would not on any side be overtopped within 400 feet, is condemned off-hand as untenable ?

What, I ask, at a distance of 400 feet, had a stone fortress in David's time to fear from bows, slings, and javelins, and even all Jonathan's artillery ? The answer must be, Nothing.

6. Access to the Gihon spring, Captain Conder takes to have nothing to do with the position of the castle (of) Zion, as other fortresses were often far away from the nearest spring. Exactly so, and all the other fortresses in the mountains were accordingly captured, while Zion for four centuries remained secure, and was only at last taken by treachery. Even Antiochus the Great could not take Rabbath Ammon, until its water supply was cut off. In opposition to Captain Conder I may quote the words of Sir Charles Warren in 1879 : "The strongest point to my mind in favour of Ophel having been the ancient site of the Jebusite city is the fact of the one spring of water being found there. I have carefully noted the manner in which the Kafirs have located themselves close to water

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