

# *Theology* on the *Web.org.uk*

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_peq\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_peq_01.php)

THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE CITY OF DAVID—  
ZION AND MILLO.

By SAMUEL BERGHEIM, Esq.

It is, I believe, generally accepted by all interested in this subject that :—

1. Jebus, the Jerusalem at the time of David, consisted of two parts :—
  - (a) The stronghold—which was not inhabited by the Israelites;
  - (b) The other division, where some Israelites (Benjamites) dwelt together with the original inhabitants—the Jebusites.
2. That the stronghold was taken by David, and became the City of David, and called Zion.
3. That Zion and the City of David are one and the same place.
4. That Millo was in and formed part of the City of David or Zion.

The main question then is :—

Where was this stronghold, and, therefore, where the City of David called Zion ?

So many arguments and views have been put forward, some supported by weighty reasons both scientific and historical, that it would seem almost presumptuous for me to start a fresh theory. But I would, as an old resident at Jerusalem—and basing my convictions on certain facts—venture to ask for a small space in the *Quarterly Statement* to explain my views.

Neither names of places nor customs have undergone much, if any, change. This is a well accepted fact, and I therefore need not occupy space to prove it.

We are distinctly told :—

1. That the City of David was the stronghold, and called Zion.
2. That this Zion was the highest of all the hills of or in Jerusalem.
3. That Zion was called the upper city.

I.—The *north-west* corner of Jerusalem contains the foundations of an ancient fort, castle, or tower, shown on the Ordnance Survey Map as Kala'at al Jalûd, and this name is rendered there “Goliath's Castle.”

The translation of “al Jalûd” as Goliath is absolutely erroneous. Jalûd does not mean Goliath, nor can the two names bear the same construction.

Jalûd means strong, mighty, impregnable, and should be so translated. Kala'at al Jalûd—the castle of the strong—the impregnable castle—or alone, al Jalûd—the stronghold.

The quarter or street round this Kala'at al Jalûd is called Harat al

Jawaldé—the street or quarter of the people or inhabitants of the stronghold, or, literally, the quarter or street of “the strongholders.”

The stronghold had a fosse (Heb. *tzinor*) on its west side. This fosse has been identified (see Plan of North-west Corner, *Quarterly Statement*, 1892, p. 18).

The City of David, Zion, occupied two hills—or rather two knolls on one hill—one on which the stronghold was situate being higher than the other on which the rest of the city was built. That part of the city which occupied the higher hill was called the upper city, the other, occupying the lower, was called the lower city. The upper part round the Harat al Jawaldeh is still called El Hara el Foka—the upper street or quarter, in contra-distinction to the lower part now occupied by the Church of the Sepulchre, the Muristan, the Coptic Convent, &c., and still called El Hara e' Tahta—the lower street or quarter.

The hill of Zion is described as the highest of the hills of Jerusalem. The upper knoll on which al Jalûd stands is 2,580 feet above the level of the Mediterranean Sea, and is actually the highest point in the city.

One side of the hill is described as scarped or precipitous. The south-western side of the hill below al Jalûd is still called “El Wa'riyeh” (see Ordnance Survey Map), which means the scarped, rocky, or precipitous, and the declivity is certainly very great even now, over 50 feet in a stretch of less than 500 feet, and the level of the ground at present is over 100 feet above the site of the original street.

Zion is described as occupying the north and also the north-west portion of the city. Al Jalûd answers to this description.

The lower knoll of Zion was levelled or reduced in height during the Hasmonean period. This lower knoll, at the foot of which is the present Church of the Sepulchre, is still called Khôt el Khankéh. Moslem tradition of recent times ascribes the name to a mother of one of the Sultans, a Vâlidé Khan, who is supposed to have endowed a college there, and it has since been called Khankéh.

This explanation is not of sufficient value to require attention, but it is remarkable that the word Khankéh means a knoll or prominence that has been cut down, lowered, or levelled. Khôt el Khankieh, i.e., “the site of the place or prominence that was levelled.”

David built a wall round Zion enclosing Millo, which formed the lower portion of Zion, and was afterwards called the lower city, but at the same time formed part of the city itself, that is of Zion the City of David.

This wall was frequently repaired and strengthened by successive kings of Judah. It had on its north-west end a gate called Gennath, leading to the upper market place, and to the descent to Silla.

This gate is placed by most writers on the topography of Jerusalem (amongst them such well-known authorities as Major Conder and Mr. Schick), and I think quite correctly, near the present Jaffa Gate. It led to the gardens and also to the stairs leading up to or down from the City of David to Silla, or *vice versa*.

It is a fact worth noting that the street leading straight down from this point is still called *Sueket 'Allon*—the street of the ascent, and that it is remarkably steep. The word *'Allon* is not an Arabic one, but is a transformation or corruption of the Hebrew, *Ma'aloth*, or *'aloth*, ascent—stairs.

This street of *'Allon*, starting at Gate Gennath at a level of 2,528 feet, goes down in a straight line to the edge of the hill above the Tyropeon Valley to a level of 2,450 feet, and then across the valley (formerly, no doubt, over a causeway or viaduct—Wilson's Arch) to Bab el Silsileh.

The name of this gate of the Temple or Haram enclosure has been wrongly translated. Silsileh does mean a chain, but only so because a chain resembles running water in its continuity. The right translation should be—fountain—running water—a water conduit.

This water conduit does exist, even to the present day, under this gate, as shown in the Ordnance map, and the word *Silla* is evidently from the more ancient one, *sehl*—flow, flowing. *M'Silla* seems to be *Ma Silla*, the water of the flowing—the water conduit.

Joash was slain at *Millo*, in or near the stairway *'Aloth* or *'Alon*—leading to *Silla M'silla*—the water conduit.

II.—*Millo*. To strengthen *Millo* a second wall was built *inside* the City of David.

Between the two walls Hezekiah made a pool called by Josephus *Amygdalon*, “of the stronghold.” This inner pool was fed or supplied by a pool which he made outside the City of David by a conduit, which entered the city at the *west side*.<sup>1</sup>

The present pool, called the Upper of *Gihon* and *Ma Milla* in Arabic, is connected by a conduit with the pool between the two walls, and, in fact, is its source of supply.

This water conduit is shown on the Ordnance Survey Map. *Ma Milla* is supposed by some to derive its name from an early Christian saint of the name of *Mamilla*, who built a church near the place. The words are, however, so thoroughly local that this is not worth a second thought. The saint probably built a church near the pool, and took her name from the locality. *Ma Milla* should, I think, be correctly translated as the “Water of or for *Milla*,” or *Millo*, the transposition of “a” into “o” being a common one.

<sup>1</sup> That the stronghold (“house of the mighty”), the sepulchres of David and some of his successors, and the pool that was made (Hezekiah's), were contiguous, is clearly shown in Nehemiah ch. iii, v. 16.

The walls of Jerusalem were rebuilt in Nehemiah's time in sections or apportioned parts, one following the other (“after him builded,” “from,” “to”), and the part that Nehemiah, the son of *Azruk*, undertook to build, and did build, enclosed the stronghold (house of the mighty men), the pool that was made, and the sepulchres of David.

This outer pool, then, was made to supply the one made by Hezekiah inside the walls. The latter being situate in Millo, the appellation given to the former would be quite natural. *Birket Ma Milla*, i.e., the pool of the water for Millo. There should, therefore, be no difficulty in recognising the present *Birket Hamam al Batrak* as occupying part of Millo.

It was near this conduit connecting the two pools, that the Assyrian Rabshakeh stood and talked to the men on the wall, near the Fuller's Field.

Taking these facts into consideration, there seems to me little room left for doubt that the City of David, viz., Zion, including Millo, occupied the north-west portion of the City of Jerusalem.

The first wall, I believe, started at al Jalûd, then on to the end of the scarped side opposite the so-called Tower of David, or Hippicus, near the present Jaffa Gate, and then in a straight line down the 'Alon to the south-east corner of the Muristan, and then onwards in a straight line to the present Damascus Gate, and then round, along, or just outside the present north wall to al Jalûd.

Recent excavations show the remains of such a wall, near al Jalûd, marked C on plan illustrating recent discoveries, near the top of 'Alon, marked B on plan, in the Khan el Zeit below the Church of the Sepulchre and the Coptic Convent, marked F, and outside the present north wall above the Damascus Gate, marked D.

The second wall to strengthen Millo was inside the first wall, see Conder's Map of Ancient Jerusalem; also Schick's (*Quarterly Statement*, July, 1893, p. 191).

The tombs of David and Solomon, as well as of the Kings of Judah buried with them, would necessarily be within the first wall enclosing the City of David. The ancient Jewish tombs now enclosed within the present Church of the Sepulchre (and within the first wall as indicated) offer in every way the required features; and little, if any, room can be left for doubt that they are the very sepulchres of David, and some of his successors. This view is, I am gratified to find, held by Major Conder.

The theory, then, as to the tomb of Christ being within the present Church of the Sepulchre, becomes untenable.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Plan of Jerusalem to illustrate recent discoveries, published by the Palestine Exploration Fund.