

could not be mentioned after Siloah, if placed where modern tradition has located them."

With such splendid certificates in black and white, why should we Ophelites hide our heads, as if we were detected imposters? We know that we speak sober truth, and do not wish opponents to be silent, as the more they say (*e.g.*, Mr. Bergheim's fresh theory) the worse their case is seen to be. Therefore I say, Give! Excavate! and the *Bellum Topographicum* will end.

"Hæc certamina tanta
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescent."

THE CITY OF DAVID.

ZION NOT AT "GOLIATH'S CASTLE."

By Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

As I invited (*Quarterly Statement*, 1883, p. 151) any one to upset "Zion on Ophel," let me point out how Mr. Samuel Bergheim's "fresh theory" utterly fails.

It ought to be premised that in the controversy about Old-Testament Jerusalem, the quality of the evidence is of more value than the quantity. One verse of the Bible is better than a page of Josephus or a tome of Jerome.

Mr. Bergheim accepts on p. 120 (above) the A, B, C, of Jerusalem topography by admitting that the three terms Zion, the City of David, and the stronghold, are equivalent. That they are such is clear from the Bible (1894, p. 282), and ought to be cheerfully admitted, but is often ignored.

The locality to which the most reliable evidence assigns even but one of these three terms ought to be the right site.

I have pointed out repeatedly (1) that in the Bible Ophel (so called) is referred to as the site of the City of David, of the House of David, of the Sepulchres of David, which were in the City of David; and (2) that the Akra of Josephus, which was the Akra of the Maccabees, which was the City of David of the Bible, is consistently placed on Ophel.

Mr. Bergheim makes no attempt to meet these practical demonstrations. He could not wisely do so. I know well that the Ophel position is impregnable, and that the attempt would be useless.

Error, however, has as many lives as a cat, and must be met as often as it reappears.

I have therefore to show that what Mr. Bergheim alleges in support of his fresh theory that Zion was at the north-west portion of Jerusalem, and more precisely at Goliath's Castle, carries no weight at all, or at least not enough to prove his case.

(1) If existing names are to settle the question, then as the south-west hill has been called Zion for the last 15 centuries, there is no place whatever for discussion. Names, however, do not settle the question.

(2) Mr. Bergheim says : " We are distinctly told :—

"(2) That this Zion was the highest of all the hills of or in Jerusalem.

"(3) That Zion was called the Upper City."

He adds that his site is actually the highest point in the city. The conclusion, then, would seem to be that his site *must* be Zion.

It is not, however, stated *who distinctly* asserts (2) and (3). I venture to say that here is some misapprehension ; and that neither the Bible, nor Josephus, nor anyone whose testimony is worth anything, makes any such distinct statement.

I presume Josephus has been misunderstood. He says that the Upper City (the south-west hill) was higher than the Lower City, but Mr. Bergheim is pleading for the north-west hill, a different place altogether, so that this statement of Josephus does not help Goliath's Castle to be Zion.

Again, if Josephus, who never uses the term Zion, means (as I understand him) that the *φρούριον*, so called by David, on the south-west hill, was the "stronghold," and if the statement were true (which it is not), it would then be the south-west hill that was Zion and not the north-west hill at all. Thus neither (2) nor (3) affords any support for the "Goliath's Castle" site, which has nothing to do with the south-west hill referred to by Josephus in both cases.

Further, it is stated (p. 121) that Zion is described as occupying the north and also north-west portion of the city. The authority is not named by Mr. Bergheim, and is unknown to me. I suspect that here also is some mistake. The north side in Psalm *xlvi*, 2, hardly bears out this interpretation (*Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 44).

It has already been shown (1886, p. 26) that the Maccabæan Akra was on Ophel, and not near the Church of the Sepulchre, so that to place the Sepulchres of David at that church is simply a freak of fancy and not according to any sound evidence.

A footnote on p. 122 rightly observes that the account of Nehemiah's Wall is orderly, and that the House of the Mighty, the Sepulchres of David, and the pool that was made were comparatively contiguous. It is utterly impossible, however, to fit them in near the north-west portion of Jerusalem, and Mr. Bergheim makes no attempt to do so. They were all towards the south-east.

I welcome the deep interest thus manifested by Mr. Bergheim in the position of the City of David. It is no fault of his if an incorrect site cannot bear investigation, and if a north-west site shares the fate that has befallen other wrong sites and must befall every site except the true one on Ophel (so called).