ṢION: THE CITY OF DAVID.

In previous papers under this title [1] reasons were given for the opinion now prevailing with the majority of scholars that the Jebusite fortress of Jerusalem lay upon the eastern of the two hills which form the site of the City, and just above the spring called the Virgin's Well. These reasons were derived from the topography. The western ridge, though higher than its fellow, is not so suitable for the site of a hill fort,[2] and lies besides at an inconvenient distance from the only sources of water known to us to have existed in ancient times. It is true that the frequent disturbance of the district by earthquakes, as well as the manifold deposits of débris left by a score of sieges upon the original surface prevent us from excluding from the data of our argument the possibility of there having been formerly other vents for the underground waters which now issue in the Kidron Valley. But we have at least evidence which identifies the present Virgin's Well with the Old Testament Giḥon, and proves that Giḥon was already a sacred, and therefore an ancient, fountain before 1000 B.C.[3] The ridge immediately above this spring is more suitable for a small hill-fort than the western ridge. Narrow as it is and overlooked from the north, it has been accepted by military authorities of our own day [3] as a sufficient site for the Jebusite stronghold.

[1] Expositor, April and May, 1903. [2] מְצוּדָה 2 Sam. v. 7.
[3] See Expositor for March 1903.
[3] Sir Charles Wilson and Sir Charles Warren.

To these topographical reasons we are now prepared, being arrived at the time of David, to add others drawn from the history of Jerusalem under Israel. They start from the verse which records his capture of the stronghold, and run along the history of the two names which the verse assigns to it: 2 Sam. v. 7, *David took the stronghold of Ṣion, or Ṣiyyōn; the same is the City of David.*

1. The Meaning of the Name Ṣion or Ṣiyyon.

In the verse quoted the name is given (as throughout the Old Testament) without the definite article; that is, as already a proper name. This has not prevented the attempt to derive it from a Semitic root expressive of the character of the site to which it was originally attached. In early Christian literature it has been variously translated "watch-tower," "peak," "dry place," "impassable," and "fixed" or "ordained." [1] The meaning "dry" has been revived by Gesenius and Lagarde [2]; and that of "ordained" or "set up" by Delitzsch.[3] Another derivation is from the root which appears in the Arabic Ṣan "to guard" [4]; another compares the Mishnic Hebrew Ṣiyyūn "the act of making anything conspicuous by marking it." [5] I think that a much more probable derivation may be reached through the Arabic equivalent for Ṣiōn: Ṣahyun or Ṣihyun.[6]

[1] So Jerome (*Liber Interpr. Hebr. Nom.*, see Lagarde, *Onom. Sacr.* pp. 70–73, etc.): "Sion, specula vel speculator sive scopulus," "vel mandatum vel inuium." *Onomastica Vaticana*, see Lagarde, *id.* p. 204: Σιων σκοπευτήριον; p. 211: Σ. διψῶσα; p. 222: ἡ ἐντολὴ σκοπιᾶς.

[2] Ges. *Thes.* 1164; Lag. *Bildung Hebr. Nomin.* 84, as if צִיּוֹן were a contraction of צַהֲיוֹן from צָהָה; cf. Graetz's emendation of צִיּוֹן in Jer. 31. 17 to צְיוֹן.

[3] *Psalmen*, 3rd ed. 170, as if from צָוָה.

[4] Wetzstein, see Delitzsch, *Genesis*, 4th ed. p. 578.

[5] From this no doubt came the meaning "tomb" (cf. Cruden's *Concordance*), for tombs were marked white.

[6] The present name for the Mount Ṣion of Christian tradition, the S.W. hill. Bab Ṣihyūn is in Muḳaddasi, the present Bab en Nabi Dāūd, and

In Boha-ed-Din's *Life of Saladin* [1] a castle near Laodicea in northern Syria is described, under the name Ṣehyun, as "well-fortified on the edge of a hill." Now the Arabic Lexicons give Ṣahweh as the "highest part" or "ridge of a mountain or hump or shoulder," or even as "a citadel or bastion." That there was a second castle of the same name, also on a narrow ridge,[2] encourages the belief that in this Arabic form we may find the correct etymology of Ṣion or Ṣiyyōn; the termination -ōn being that which occurs in so many place-names. Ṣiōn would then mean "protuberance, shoulder or summit of a ridge,"[3] and so "fort or citadel." In itself such a meaning is most probable.

2. History of the Name Ṣion in the Old Testament.

When Israel, in possession of the Jebusite citadel, changed its ancient name to that of their own king, its conqueror, they may have expected that the former, a foreign and obscure designation, would disappear behind a title so illustrious and, as it proved, so enduring as "the City of David." Instead of this the name Ṣiōn, as if emancipated from the rock to which it had been confined, began to extend to the neighbourhood, and, advancing with the growth of Jerusalem, became more identified with her final extent and fame than that of David himself. The name of David appears to have remained on the limited

Kenisah Ṣihyun the name in Mas'ûdi for the Christian Church on the traditional Mount Sion; see Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 203, 212–215. In the *P. E. F. Quart. Statement*, 1877, p. 21, Col. Conder points out that the name still exists in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, Wady Ṣahyūn, about 1¾ miles S.W. from the Jaffa Gate, and quotes Isaac Chelo as describing Ṣion not *at* but *near* Jerusalem.

[1] Ch. 43, opening sentence.

[2] Yaḳut, *Geogr. Lex.*, tells us that the Syrian castle was sometimes confused with the Jerusalem Ṣion.

[3] Cf. the expression in Joshua, *the shoulder of the Jebusite.*

area on which his people had placed it: Ṣion not only spread over the Temple Mount, the whole city and her population, but even followed the latter during their exile to Babylon. It is a remarkable story which we are now to trace. An epithet, originally so limited in application and apparently so concrete in meaning, gradually becomes synonymous with Jerusalem as a whole, is adopted as one of Israel's fondest names for the shrine of their religion, and is finally idealised as an expression of the most sacred aspects of their character as the people of God. Yet even across so wide a career there lie scattered proofs that the spot from which the name started was that narrow summit of Ophel above Giḥon.

In the history of Solomon's reign Ṣion, still equivalent to the City of David, is described as distinct from the site of the Temple and as lying below it. According to 1 Kings viii. 1 ff. Solomon gathered the heads of the people to *bring up* the Ark out of the City of David *which is Ṣion* to the Temple. The other verb used in verse 6 of the conveyance of the Ark, after it had reached the Temple level, to the Holy Place, viz., *brought in*, proves that the verb *brought up* in verses 1 and 4 is to be taken in its obvious sense and not (as some argue, who place the original Ṣion on the South-Western Hill)[1] as if it merely meant *started out with* or *brought on its way*. To the writer of this passage Ṣion evidently lay *below* Solomon's Temple: that is, on the site on which topographical reasons have led us to place it, on the eastern ridge above Giḥon.[2]

The next appearances of the name are in the writings of the Eighth Century Prophets, some two hundred and fifty

[1] For example, Rückert, *Die Lage des Berges Sion*, p. 32.

[2] To the above passages may be added 2 Sam. xxiv. 18 ff., 1 Chron. xxi. 18 ff.; according to which David *went up* from his residence in the city of David to the threshing-floor of Araunah, subsequently the site of the Temple.

years after David. Amos says: *Yahweh roars from Ṣion and utters his voice from Jerusalem,* and speaks of *those who are at ease in Ṣion and secure in the mount of Samaria.*[1] The former passage certainly includes in Ṣion the Temple as the residence and oracle of the God of Israel. Isaiah records a word of Yahweh: *I lay in Ṣion a foundation stone*: that is, the intimate spiritual relation between Himself and His people, on which He calls their faith to rest.[2] Micah mentions Ṣion as equivalent to the whole town of Jerusalem, and adds, as if it were distinct from this, *the Mount of the House* or Temple.[3] Both Micah and (probably) Isaiah speak of the City and her population as the *Daughter of Ṣion.*[4] Another form, *Mount Ṣion,* occurs in a number of oracles attributed to Isaiah, but assigned by many scholars to exilic or post-exilic times. I do not feel, however, that the reasons which the latter give against the authenticity of some of these passages are conclusive. Ch. viii. 18 appears to be genuine, in spite of Volz's and Cheyne's arguments to the contrary, and if so, affords evidence that the Temple Hill was called Mount Ṣion in Isaiah's time.[5]

Thus it appears that the name Ṣion, which till Solomon's time at least had been confined to the Jebusite fort, had spread during the next two hundred and fifty years across the whole of Jerusalem. The reasons for this extension

[1] Amos. i 2, vi. 1. The genuineness of both passages has been contested but on insufficient grounds.

[2] Isaiah xxviii. 16: accepted as genuine by all critics. Other oracles mentioning Ṣion might be added to this one, for there is not much reason to doubt that they are Isaiah's own. But as they are not accepted as such by all critics, I refrain from using them here.

[3] Micah iii. 10, 12.

[4] Micah i. 13; Isaiah i. 8.

[5] In Isaiah xxix. 8 and xxxi. 4, which are also probably genuine, *Mount Ṣion* may be even interpreted as covering the whole of the City. Other occurrences of the name in prophecies which still quite recently were generally regarded as Isaiah's own, are iv. 5, x. 12, xviii. 7. In x. 32 and xvi. 1 is found *Mount of the Daughter of Ṣion.*

are obvious, even if we cannot define the successive stages of the process. Either the name followed the expansion of the population, and (as Micah iii. 12 seems to show) only subsequently to this included the site of the Temple; or more probably it first accompanied the Ark to the latter (as we might infer from Amos i. 2) and thence spread over the rest of the City. But we must not forget the possibility of a third alternative: that the name Ṣion had covered the whole of the Eastern Hill from the earliest times. In any case it would be more natural for it to spread first across this, and only then over the rest of Jerusalem.

In the Seventh Century Jeremiah uses *Ṣion* as equivalent to Jerusalem, City and Temple[1]; and the *Daughter of Ṣion* as the personified City and her population.[2] He does not give the name *Mount Ṣion*. Coming to writers of the Exile, we find that Ezekiel nowhere mentions Jerusalem or the Temple Mount by the name of Ṣion; a remarkable omission, as if this rigid theologian had purposely excluded from the holy precincts a title of Gentile origin. But in Lamentations, on the contrary, *Ṣion* and *the Daughter of Ṣion* are frequent designations not only of the City, ruined and desolate, and, as personified, *spreading forth her hands*,[3] but also of the community carried away captive.[4] Once there is mention of *Mount Ṣion*, the deserted site trodden by foxes.[5] As in Jeremiah so in the great prophet of the Exile, Isaiah xl.–lv., *Mount Ṣion* does not appear; but *Ṣion* is used both of the City,[6] as parallel to Jerusalem,[7] and of her exiled people,[8] who are also addressed as *the daughter of Ṣion*.[9]

All these instances of the name in its various forms increase throughout the later literature (except in certain

[1] Jer. iv. 6, viii. 19, xiv. 19, xxvi. 18; and probably also xxxi. 6.
[2] iv. 31, vi. 2, 23. [3] Lam. i. 4, 17, v. 11. [4] iv. 22.
[5] v. 18. [6] e.g. li. 11., lii. 7 f. [7] xl. 9, xli. 27, lii. 1.
[8] li. 16; cf. Zech. ii. 7. [9] lii. 2.

books presently to be noted). *Ṣion* is become the full equivalent of Jerusalem,[1] and the name is as closely attached to the Lord as to His people. Ṣion is Ṣion of the Holy One of Israel,[2] His Holy Mount,[3] and dwelling place[4]: the mother of the nation,[5] the nation herself[6]; the pure and holy nucleus of the nation.[7] To Ṣion the Gentiles look, and from her goes forth the true religion.[8] The fuller name *Mount Ṣion* is sometimes employed as covering all Jerusalem[9]; and sometimes apparently in the narrower sense of the Temple Mount where Yahweh reigns.[10] Instances of such applications of the name in the Psalms are too numerous for citation.

To this frequent reference to Ṣion in post-exilic literature, there is one remarkable line of exceptions. Just as Ezekiel does not use the name, so it is absent from Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. Except as the Jebusite designation of the citadel which David took, the Chronicler does not mention Ṣion.[11] To him the mountain of the Temple is Mount Moriah.[12] Even in passages describing the gathering of the people to sacrifice or to the cleansing or repair of the Temple, in which we might have expected the use of the name Mount Ṣion,[13] it is constantly avoided; and the worshippers are described as *coming to Jerusalem* or *going up to the house of the* LORD.[14] In Ezra the formula frequently used is *the house of God* or *of Yahweh which is in Jerusalem*[15]; and Nehemiah speaks of *Jerusalem* and the *courts of God's house*.[16] That the Chronicler, who knew of Ṣion as the

[1] Zech. i. 14, 17, viii. 3. Zephaniah iii. 16 (a late passage).
[2] Isa. lx. 14. [3] Joel ii. 1, cf. 15.
[4] Joel iii. 17. [5] Isa. lxvi. 8; Joel ii. 23.
[6] Zeph. iii. 14, daughter of Ṣion=Israel. [7] Isa. lix. 20.
[8] Isa. ii. 3 (if indeed this be a post-exilic oracle, and not one, as is probable, from an earlier date), Micah iv. 11.
[9] 2 Kings xix. 31; Obad. 17, 21; Joel ii. 32.
[10] Isa. xxiv. 23; cf. xxvii. 13, the holy mount; Micah iv. 7.
[11] 1 Chr. xi. 5; 2 Chr. v. 2. [12] 2 Chr. iii. 1.
[13] e.g. 2 Chr. xx., xxiii. ff., xxxiv.
[14] e.g. xxix. 20. [15] i. 3, 5, iv. 24, etc. [16] xiii. 7.

name of the Jebusite fort, and who introduces the City of David, Ophel and Moriah; that Ezra and Nehemiah, who also give so many of the topographical names of Jerusalem, neglected by accident to call the Temple Mount Ṣion, appears incredible. Doubtless, like Ezekiel, they had some religious reason for refusing the name to so holy a place. Were it not for the frequent use of Ṣion in the Psalms, we would be tempted to say that Ṣion was exclusively a prophetic designation; which the priestly school of writers avoided.

One other witness to the use of the name in the Old Testament period, is the author of First Maccabees (about 100 B.C.). In this Book Mount Sion is always the Temple Mount[1] distinct both from the City of David and from the rest of Jerusalem. So Sion in other parts of the Apocrypha.[2]

Neither in the Old Testament nor in the Apocrypha is there any passage which can be interpreted as applying the name Ṣion specially to the Western Hill. The attempt to do so has indeed been made. Verses of the Psalms, which, according to the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, place within the same couplet *Ṣion* and *Yahweh's Holy Hill*, have been interpreted as if they thereby designated *two different localities*; viz., the Western Hill and the Temple Hill. But this would imply that within ancient Jerusalem there were actually two sites of equal sacredness: an impossible conclusion. The only natural inference from the parallelism just quoted is that Ṣion and the Temple Hill were identical.

3. The Name, City of David.

While the ancient Canaanite name, *Ṣion*, thus left the citadel and grew across the City, the Israelite title *City of David* appears to have remained confined to that fort and

[1] iv. 37, 60, v. 54, vi. 48, 62, vii. 33, x. 11, xiv. 27.

[2] 1 Esdras viii. 81 (2 Esdras v. 25); Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 10, and (apparently) Judith, ix. 13.

its complex of buildings. We are, therefore, able to discover in the use of this title in Old Testament times even more evidence that the citadel lay on the Eastern Hill.

David brought the Ark into the *City of David* and was buried there.[1] Solomon lodged there the daughter of Pharaoh, till he should have built *his palace and temple and the wall of Jerusalem round about.*[2] When the Temple was finished he *brought up* to it (as we have seen) the Ark from the City of David,[3] and was buried in the City of David,[4] as were also in the next centuries many of the kings of Judah.[5] Except in an oracle of Isaiah,[6] which however does not define its position save in holding it distinct from Jerusalem as a whole,[7] the City of David is not mentioned in the prophets of the eighth century. We find it, however, in the Chronicler's account of that period, as distinct from the City at large,[8] but also as lying upon the Eastern Hill above Gihon. The Chronicler tells us that Hezekiah, in stopping the fountains outside the City so as to deprive the besiegers of water,[9] closed *the vent* or *issue* of the waters of the upper Gihon, and *brought them straight down* or *underneath, to the west of the City of David.*[10] This can refer only to the tunnel hewn under the Eastern Hill from Gihon to the Pool of Siloam, and it places the City of David above the tunnel and between its two ends. The Chronicler

[1] 2 Sam. vi.; 1 Kings ii. 10. [2] 1 Kings iii. 1.

[3] 1 Kings viii. 1. [4] xi. 43.

[5] 1 Kings xiv. 31, etc. Thenius (*Bücher der Könige*, ed. 2, p. 15), quotes Theodoret (4th cent.) as placing these graves near Siloam.

[6] xxii. 9. [7] v. 10.

[8] 2 Chron. xxviii. 27, which states that Ahaz was buried in Jerusalem, but not in the sepulchres of the kings, which, we have just seen, lay in the City of David.

[9] 2 Chron. xxxii. 3; cf. 2 Kings xx. 20; Ecclus. xlviii. 17.

[10] 2 Chron. xxxii. 30: the English versions do not give the exact meaning of the original. In the *P.E.F. Quart. Statement* for 1877, 178 f., Colonel Conder admits that according to this verse the City of David was on Ophel: but he regards the name as transferable.

adds that Manasseh built a wall on the west side of Gihon in the valley of the Kidron: that is on the most natural site for such a wall, immediately above the fountain; and *compassed about Ophel.*[1] After the exile Nehemiah also places the City of David here, for he mentions the *stairs which go down from it* in close connexion with Siloam [2] and describes a procession as entering by the gate at Siloam and thence ascending these stairs. Sir Charles Wilson does not write too strongly when he says [3]: "The statements of Nehemiah, which place the stairs of the City of David, the palace of David and his tomb between the pool of Shelah (Siloam) and the Temple, absolutely exclude the western spur as a possible site for the City of David."

In the First Book of Maccabees the City of David stands still distinct from the Temple Mount, and both of them from the rest of Jerusalem. While the Temple Mount was at first desolated by Antiochus Epiphanes, the Syrian forces garrisoned the City of David, described as the Akra or Citadel, all through the war of independence till the reign of Simon.[4] There is no definition in First Maccabees of the site of the City of David, except that it was close to the Temple, but the fact is clear that it was still a quarter distinct both from the Temple Hill and the rest of Jerusalem. It seems, therefore, most natural to assume that the name remained where it lay from David's time to Nehemiah's. But this is a question which we must treat in greater detail when we come to the Maccabean period.[5]

[1] *Id.* xxxiii. 14. [2] iii. 15, 16.

[3] Article "Zion" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary.*

[4] 1 Macc. i. 33, ii. 31 (in this verse Jerusalem is either a gloss or the words *City of David* have been added as a more exact description of the site of the Akra); iv. 37, 41, vi. 18 ff., 26, ix. 52 ff., x. 9 ff., xi. 20 f., xii. 36 f.; xiii. 21, 49 f., 52 (*the hill of the Temple which was by the Akra he made stronger than before, and there he and his men dwelt*).

[5] In one passage Josephus *B.J.* v. vi. 1 appears to place the Akra near Siloah on the Eastern Hill.

4. Conclusion from the Preceding Evidence.

We find, then, that the Biblical data and the testimony of the Apocryphal writings agree with the topographical evidence. The Jebusite stronghold of Ṣion, the City or Citadel of David, lay on the Eastern Hill above Giḥon, the present Well of our Lady Mary. There is no trace, let me repeat, of the application of the name Ṣion to the South-Western Hill in distinction from the rest of Jerusalem. There is no trace of that hill ever having been regarded in Old Testament times as sacred.[1]

5. Josephus and the Western Hill.

With Josephus, however, there was started another tradition, which placed Ṣion and the City of David upon the South-Western Hill; and this tradition, adopted by the Christian Church, was till a few years ago universally received and is still held by some experts in the topography of Jerusalem.

Like so many of the Old Testament writers, Josephus nowhere uses the name Ṣion, but he places David's citade on the Western Hill.[2]

Such a contradiction of the Biblical tradition was doubtless due to the fact that Jerusalem had been so often destroyed and restored between the date of the Maccabees and the time of Josephus, and that Herod, in particular, had so strongly fortified the Western Hill, that it was natural to suppose that it had always been the main citadel.[3]

[1] It is not necessary to use Baron von Alten's argument (*Z.D.P.V.* ii. 29) in support of this. He quotes Ezekiel's description of the removal of the offended God of Israel from the Temple Hill to the Mount of Olives (xi. 23 and xliii. 1 ff.) as if that proves that the S.W. hill had no special sacredness before Ezekiel's time; for he thinks that if it had been sacred Ezekiel would have named it as the Deity's resting place instead of th Mount of Olives.

[2] V. *Bell. Jud.* iv., where he identifies it with his upper city, though he elsewhere appears to locate the Akra on Ophel; see above, p. 10, n. 5.

[3] See *Encycl. Biblica*, column 2420. Cf. Baron von Alten, *Z.D.P.V.* ii. 20 f.

The Christian Fathers did not all follow Josephus in this transference of the military centre of Jerusalem from the Eastern to the Western ridge. Origen[1] takes the Temple Hill and Ṣion as identical, and so apparently Jerome, in his comment on Isaiah xxii. 1 f. But in the *Onomasticon* both Eusebius and Jerome place Ṣion on the Western Hill[2] and this came to be the accepted opinion among Christians. As Sir Charles Wilson has pointed out,[3] its acceptance was probably facilitated by the building of the Church of the Resurrection, on the Western Hill, in addition to the statements of Josephus. Christians and Mohammedans alike continued to identify the South-Western Hill as Mount Ṣion, and the identification was accepted by the first scientific geographers of the nineteenth century: Robinson, Ritter, De Vogué and others. It was at first also taken for granted by the excavators of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and it is still defended by Colonel Conder, Consul Merrill, Dr. Archibald Henderson, Dr. Mommert,[4] Georg Gatt,[5] and Dr. Rückert.[6]

6. The Return to the Eastern Hill.

The credit of being the first to attack this tradition, which cannot be traced beyond Josephus, belongs, I believe, to Thomas Lewin,[7] to Dr. Ch. Ed. Caspari, who in 1864 identified the Old Testament Ṣion with Moriah, and placed the Syrian Akra on Temple Hill[8]; to Fürrer[9]; to the Rev. W. F. Birch, who in 1878 began to argue

[1] *Ad Joan.* iv. 19 f.

[2] So also the Bordeaux Pilgrim, 333 A.D.

[3] Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, 2nd ed., art. "Jerusalem," p. 1651.

[4] *Topographie des Alten Jerusalem*, 1 *Theil*, *Zion und Akra*, Leipzig: preface dated Dec. 1900.

[5] *Die Hügel von Jerusalem*, Freiburg, i. B., 1897.

[6] *Die Lage des Berges Sion*, Freiburg, i. B., 1898.

[7] *Jerusalem*, 1861.

[8] *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, 309 ff.

[9] Schenkel's *Bibellexikon*, 1871; article "Jerusalem."

independently on the Biblical data for the location of the Jebusite citadel on the Eastern Hill: and to Baron von Alten, who in 1879[1] gave at great length reasons, good and bad, for identifying this hill with Sion. They were followed in 1881 by Stade,[2] and by Robertson Smith, and in 1833 by Professor Sayce.[3] Since then the opinion has come to prevail with the large majority both of the excavators of Jerusalem and of Old and New Testament scholars. Sir Charles Wilson, and later Sir Charles Warren, who long contended for the other view, have adopted it.[4] Professor Guthe adhered to it as early as 1883[5]: and supported it by maintaining that his excavations had proved the existence of a valley or trench between the site of David's citadel and the northern Temple Wall, the existence of which, however, is denied by Colonel Conder and others, and requires further investigation. In addition to these may be mentioned the names of the following authorities on the Old Testament, or the topography: Klaiber, Socin, Benzinger, Ryle, Driver, Cheyne, Buhl, Schürer, V. Ryssel and (practically also) A. B. Davidson.[6] But the most notable of recent adherents to the support of the Eastern Hill is the Dominican scholar M. Jos. Lagrange, in a very able and lucid article in the *Revue Biblique* for 1892. Till the appearance of this article, Roman Catholic opinion had almost unanimously[7] adhered to the ecclesiastical tradition in favour of the

[1] *Z.D.P.V.*, vol. ii.

[2] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 267 f.

[3] *P.E.F. Quarterly Statement.*

[4] Sir Charles Wilson, *City and Land*, 1892, 19 f. and *op. cit.*; and Sir Charles Warren: Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 3866.

[5] *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*

[6] For references to the passages in which these authors express their views, see the article by the present writer in the *Encycl. Biblica*, column 2418. Klaiber's two lucid articles appeared in 1880, 1881, in the *Z.D.P.V.*, vols. iii. and iv.

[7] Klaiber refers to an earlier Roman Catholic work: Ries, *Biblische Geographie*, 1872.

Western Hill. There is no one more familiar with the site of Jerusalem than M. Lagrange: his estimate of the Biblical evidence and the evidence of Josephus is temperate and judicious; and his explanation of how Josephus adopted opinions so much in contradiction to the data of the Old Testament is natural. He points out how frequently the sacred names of Palestine have passed from one site to another. When the early Church, following Josephus, transferred the name Ṣion from the Eastern to the Western Hill, there "was no falsification of tradition, but the adaptation of an ancient term to a new situation." To suppose that the name Ṣion first crossed from the Western Hill to the Eastern, became attached to the latter and then passed back again, is unnatural. There is no Biblical authority for its ever having been specially applied to the Western Hill. That such a scholar should have been compelled by a careful review of the evidence to abandon the Church tradition is as significant as that explorers like Sir Charles Warren, who also for so long accepted it, have made the same change.

On the contrary side no more careful review of the evidence could have been made than that which Dr. Mommert has presented to us in the work cited above. He has issued a learned and a judicious treatise. But after a careful examination of his arguments against the opinions of scholars in favour of the Eastern Hill, I cannot say that I have been convinced by them. There are still many difficulties to be cleared up; and several both of Colonel Conder's and Dr. Mommert's arguments are not without cogency.[1] But alike on the present topographical and Biblical evidence, I, who also once accepted the tradition started by Josephus, feel that I must give my vote for the Eastern Hill. Had we only the topographical data,

[1] Dr. Rückert's arguments are too much tied to tradition.

it might be well to postpone a decision till the questions of the walls of the ancient city, and of the possibility of the existence of other ancient fountains than Giḥon were cleared up, as they can only be, by further excavations. But the evidence of the Bible itself in favour of the Eastern Hill appears to me to be too clear for indecision.

I hope to return to the subject in further studies on Jerusalem in the Maccabean and Roman periods. The next study will be on the size and appearance of Jerusalem under David and Solomon.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.