

comes to her barefoot and bareheaded. And when the news is spread Za'hlan falls down dead, whilst Risk takes Khadra home again with Barakat and all they possess. So Barakat having increased the Arabs is henceforth called Abu-Zaid, "father of increase," for having increased the tribe of Beni-Helal.¹

ANCIENT JERUSALEM.—ZION, AND ACRA, SOUTH OF THE TEMPLE.

By the Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

AUSPICIOUSLY it has been my lot to try to restore peace to Jerusalem by doing no small business in fighting against my friends. Yet with Sertorius I desire to live in quiet in the Fortunate Islands free from never-ending wars.

Mr. St. Clair's objection (p. 150) that I *assume* that "Zion is the same as the stronghold of Zion" and "Zion to be coincident with Akra," shows very plainly why there are such diverse opinions about ancient Jerusalem. Writers have hastily had recourse to imagination instead of patiently examining evidence. I dealt with the question of the identity of Zion and the stronghold of Zion years ago in *Quarterly Statements*, 1878, 182; 1880, 168; and 1881, 94. This identity lies at the root of a correct restoration of the Holy City. Josephus blundered over it, and so proves a blind guide to blinded followers. With difficulty I myself broke away from this *Cicerone*, and have by me to this day notes collected in my days of darkness to show that the City of David difficulty was solved by the view of Josephus that the stronghold of Zion was only a part of Zion and not identical with it. I have told (1882, 56) how, groping in the dark, I was accidentally brought into the light.

As others besides Mr. St. Clair are still misled by Josephus, let me give once more the simple Biblical evidence that proves the identity of Zion and the stronghold of Zion.

(1.) The Bible, R.V., twice says "the City of David, which is Zion" (1 Kings viii, 1; 2 Chron. v, 2).

(2.) It also twice says, "the stronghold of Zion; the same is the City of David" (2 Sam. v, 7; 1 Chron. xi, 5).

Here one would naturally take "the same" to refer to "Zion," and so (2) would corroborate (1).

Happily there are two other passages in the historical books that supply what is needed.

(3.) The Bible says (2 Sam. v, 9), "David dwelt in the stronghold, and called it the City of David," and again (1 Chron. xi, 7), "David dwelt in the stronghold; therefore they called it the City of David."

¹ The Arabic of the above paper has been kindly corrected by A. G. Ellis, Esq., of the British Museum.

Thus twice in each case we have Zion, the stronghold of Zion, and the stronghold, distinctly stated to be or to be called the City of David; and as things that are equal to the same are equal to one another, it follows mathematically (and is not *assumed*) that Zion is equal to, or the same as, the stronghold or (fully) the stronghold of Zion. The convertibility of the three terms in the historical books of the Bible is, as I have already stated (1881, 94), the A B C of Jerusalem topography. When, as on this point, Josephus is at variance with the Bible, the *only satisfactory plan* is to discard him altogether, or throw him overboard (to use Mr. St. Clair's words), and not to make a compromise between truth and error, whereby have arisen almost all the difficulties about Jerusalem.

On passing from the Bible to 1 Maccabees, the second point, that Zion (already proved to be the City of David) was coincident with Akra, is clear beyond doubt, because 1 Macc. i, 33, states, "They builded the City of David . . . and it became an *Akra* for them." The identity seems to me complete. Ignoring this passage does not diminish its force. I dealt with this point in 1893, 326.

The Macedonian Akra in the "Antiq." of Josephus is obviously identical with that of 1 Macc., and is, I maintain, coincident with Zion. The Akra of his "Wars," however, is first the hill on which the lower city stood (V, iv, 1); next it is the lower city itself (V, vi, 1), while in "Ant." XII, v, 4, Akra is placed in the lower city. I do not maintain that a fixed quantity, the City of David (or Zion), was coincident with an Akra of two or three dimensions; but still this Akra of different sizes was, like Zion, wholly south of the Temple. Mr. St. Clair admits "there are passages in Josephus which require Akra to be on Ophel"; let me add that there are none that require an Akra (connected with the lower city) to be situated anywhere else. I have walked about Zion and gone round about her too long and too often during the last sixteen years, and marked her bulwarks too carefully to believe that the City of David on Ophel has anything to fear from the keenest criticism; and even if I turned traitor like Araunah, my Plymouth brother H.B.S.W. has the will and power to break all weapons forged against her. Still, if any hero remains eager to outdo Joab, let him assail our Zion. It might be well for him beforehand not to pry too closely into the evidence, or possibly she may attract another knight-errant and dismiss me *donatum rude*.

If any should object that our City of David on Ophel was only a tiny citadel on a low hill, and therefore could not have been an impregnable fortress, I cheerfully admit the description; but I must reply that in old times citadels were called cities; that Nora, the chosen stronghold of Eumenes, the great strategist, was less than $2\frac{3}{4}$ acres in extent, the very area assigned to my Zion by Major Conder (1886, 152); and that the citadel at Rabbath Ammon, "the rock of the plain" (Jer. xxi, 13) in spite of its naturally strong position, was thrice reduced by thirst. On the other hand, Gihon gave to Zion strength as well as sweetness. The

founder of Jebus was, beyond all question, a keen Tartan in preferring even a little water to high rocks.

Jerusalem has been besieged at least twenty-seven times, and only in one instance is any mention made of even a temporary scarcity of water. Vegetius well observed, "Difficile sitis vicit, qui quamvis exiguâ aquâ ad potum tamen tantum in obsidione sunt usi."

THE ANCIENT HÆMATITE WEIGHT FROM SAMARIA.

In the *Quarterly Statement* for last July the correspondence which appeared in the *Academy* on Dr. Chaplin's weight is printed without the replies of Mr. Tyler and myself to Professor Robertson Smith. Had they been given it would have been seen (1) that I have never said that *netseg* was "derived" from *yâtsag*; (2) that the explanation of *netseg* is due to Dr. Neubauer and not to myself; and (3) that Dr. Neubauer's reference of it to *yâtsag* is not "a grammatical blunder."

As, however, I have been compelled to write again on the subject, I take the opportunity of commenting on Professor Robertson Smith's letter, which my absence in Nubia prevented me from doing last winter. Firstly, as to the word on the "bead" found at Jerusalem. The Professor wished to make it נצג instead of נצב, though he confessed that with this reading he could not explain the word. My experience of Phœnician *graffiti* leads me still to maintain that the last letter is "certainly" not נ but ג, and that the word accordingly must be *netseg*.

Secondly, as to the weight itself. I gather from the Professor's communication that although he began his examination of the inscription with a prejudice against my reading של, he was eventually forced to come round to it; but, in order to get rid of the obnoxious *shel* "of" he took refuge in the desperate conjecture that של stood for שלם! The idea that the inscriptions on the two sides of the weight are of different age and authorship, seems to me, I confess, to be preposterous. I have handled a good many Oriental seals and cylinders, and have never seen a clearer case of identity as regards both the form and the weathering of the letters. The only difference between the inscriptions is that one of them has been worn more than the other, probably owing to the weight having been usually laid on the side on which it occurs. And as Professor Robertson Smith himself acknowledged, unless my reading is adopted the inscription makes no sense. But ancient writers were not in the habit of engraving nonsense, whether on weights or on anything else.

A. H. SAYCE.

23, CHEPSTOW VILLAS,
August 3rd, 1894.

[The letters referred to by Professor Sayce as having been omitted in the correspondence reprinted by us are the following.—ED.]