

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/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XII

NOVEMBER, 1846.

ARTICLE I.

TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

By E. Robinson, Professor in New York.

In a former Article, of which the present is a continuation, I endeavoured to bring out fully and clearly the testimony of Josephus respecting several points in the ancient topography of the Holy City. These, were, particularly, the position of the hills Akra and Bezetha, the valley of the Tyropoeon, the true place of the gate Gennath, and the course of the ancient second wall; all which have a special importance at the present time, from their connection with and bearing upon the question as to the intrinsic authority of ecclesiastical and monastic tradition. I now proceed in like manner to adduce the testimony of the Jewish historian, and such further evidence as may exist, relative to some other points in the antiquities of the Holy City; which, although they may not possess the same degree of temporary interest, are yet in themselves of high archaeological importance.

V.

The southern portion of the present Haram-area formed part and parcel of the ancient Temple-enclosure; and was not first built up at a later period.

So far as I am aware, no doubt as to the fact here affirmed has ever been suggested, except by the English writer so often re-

ferred to ; who chooses to assign this part of the area to the time of Justinian.¹ The German author nowhere alludes to the topic, nor in general to the southern part of the area in any way ; but the view he takes respecting the position of the fortress Antonia within the northern portion of the same enclosure,² necessarily implies that he adopts the affirmative of the present proposition. It may nevertheless not be inappropriate, here to bring together the facts and testimony which bear upon the question.

I. On viewing the exterior of the elevated Haram-area, courses of immense stones near the ground immediately arrest the attention of the beholder, which are obviously the remains of the substructions of the ancient temple-enclosure. "The lower courses of the masonry of ancient walls exist on the east, south and west sides of the great enclosure, for nearly its whole length and breadth."³ According to the English writer himself, these courses of "large stones at the exterior of the eastern wall of the enclosure above the valley of Jehoshaphat," not improbably "form part of one of those stupendous foundations [of the temple] mentioned with so much admiration by the Jewish historian."⁴ The immense blocks of the same character at and near the southeast corner, are to him "an angle of the first (and oldest) wall" of the city.⁵ The similar stones and wall at the point known as the Jews' Wailing-place, on the west side, he likewise regards as having belonged to the ancient temple.⁶

Now it is perfectly obvious on the slightest inspection, that the whole line of these immense ancient stones, whether on the eastern or western side, between the southern extremity and a point further north than the grand mosk, is of one and the same epoch, and formed part originally of one and the same wall, uninterrupted and unbroken. There is not, either upon the east side or the west, the slightest trace of any termination of a distinct *temple-wall*, nor of the junction of any city or other wall. If the huge stones on the east, opposite to the mosk, belonged to the temple, so did those at the south-east corner. If the wall at the Jews' Wailing-place was part of the ancient temple, so was that at the south-west corner, including the fragment of the immense arch existing at that point.⁷ Indeed, the conclusion is inevitable, that

¹ Holy City, p. 329 sq.

² Schultz, p. 54.

³ Catherwood in Bartlett's Walks, etc. p. 160. Ed. 2.

⁴ Holy City, p. 15.

⁵ Ibid. p. 330, 331.

⁶ Ibid. p. 347, 348.

⁷ See Bibl. Researches, I. p. 424 sq. The matter is well put by Mr. Bartlett, Walks, etc. Ed. 2. App. p. 249 : "It is clear that we are in this dilemma ;

if the southern part of the present enclosure be the work of a later age, then is the whole a work of the same late age; and no traces of the ancient temple-walls remain.

According to the English chaplain, "the conclusion is unavoidable," that the "ancient fragment" of immense stones forming the south-east corner of the present area, "is an angle of the first (or old) wall" of the city.¹ Here again it is entirely obvious, that if this south-east "angle" formed of huge stones be ancient, then too the line of the same masonry running from it northwards is in like manner ancient; as is indeed admitted. And further, the line of similar immense stones extending from it westwards,—that is to say, *the whole southern side of the present area*,—must in like manner be regarded as ancient. The character of the huge blocks and of the masonry is everywhere one and the same. But if the courses of this southern side be ancient, then this could only have been the southern limit of the ancient temple-area; for to refer this also to a city wall is not attempted, and would be absurd.²

II. Josephus, in speaking of the lofty portico along the southern wall of the temple-area,³ describes it as "continued from the eastern valley to the western; for it could not possibly be extended further;" and he also affirms, that "if from its roof one attempted to look down into the gulf below, his eyes became dark and dizzy before they could penetrate to the immense depth." Two circumstances are here specified, viz. that the portico (and of course the southern wall) could not have been prolonged further towards the east; and, that from the roof of the *southern* portico one looked down into the valley beneath. In both these circumstances the southern wall of the present area tallies precisely with the description; while they

—if the fragment of the wall at the Place of Wailing is of Jewish origin, so is the remaining portion, as far as the S. W. corner, including the bridge; but if this latter be a Byzantine arch, then must the wall it mitres into be also Byzantine, and as a matter of course the Wailing Place too. Whichever alternative is adopted, is fatal to the theory."

¹ Holy City, p. 330, 331.

² H. City, ib. "Had it been the *temple*-wall which made its angle here, it is evident that the *first or old wall* must have joined the *south* portico of the temple, not the *east*, as Josephus expressly affirms." But the eastern portico was doubtless extended to the south-east corner, where it was connected with the southern portico. At any rate, it may not be easy to see how the difficulty (if any exists) would be removed, by supposing the junction to be made under exactly the same circumstances at a point 500 feet farther north, as there proposed.

³ Jos. Ant. XV. 11. 5.

would not be true of a parallel wall at a point much further north. The present south-east corner is on the very brink of the steep declivity, hardly admitting even a footpath between; while more to the north a strip of level ground intervenes sufficiently broad to be occupied as a cemetery. Just at this corner, too, the valley of Jehoshaphat bends round for a moment to the south-west; so that the eastern part of the southern wall impends over it; which likewise could not be the case with any wall at a more northern point.

III. Josephus further relates,¹ that the southern front of the temple-precincts "had also gates about the middle (*τὸ μέτωπον τὸ πρὸς μισημβροίαν εἶχε μὲν καὶ αὐτὸ πύλας κατὰ μέσον*)."² The easy and natural explanation of this language is, that here was a *double* gateway in the southern wall, in the manner of the Golden gateway on the eastern side of the area. Accordingly, the grand subterranean gateway, still existing beneath the mosk el-Aksa, first explored by Mr. Catherwood and since visited and described by Messrs. Wolcott and Tipping, is a double gateway, with two arches and a middle row of columns extending up through the whole passage.³ The coincidence with the notice of Josephus is here too exact and striking, to be the result of accidental circumstances after an interval of more than five centuries.³

IV. The existence of spacious vaults beneath the southern portion of the present Haram-area, is now well known.⁴ It is urged, that an "objection to the Jewish origin of these substructures is found in the silence of the Jewish historian."⁵ If, however, I read aright, the Jewish historian is not altogether thus silent; but does make direct allusion to these spacious crypts. After the investment of the city by Titus, a tumult arose in the temple during the festival of unleavened bread. The party of the tyrant John got possession by

¹ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 5.

² Catherwood in the *Bibl. Researches*, I. p. 450. Wolcott in *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, No. I. p. 19, 20.

³ H. City, p. 335: "If Josephus is to be our guide, then this would not be the gate which he mentions; because this is so far from being 'in the middle of the southern side,' as that was, that it is almost one third nearer to its western than to its eastern extremity." As if the *κατὰ μέσον* of Josephus was intended to specify the exact middle point, and no other! The same author refers the gateway of course to Justinian; and speaks of Procopius, as describing it; p. 336. This, though not improbable in itself, is yet very doubtful. Procopius did not write as an eye-witness; and his account bears marks of the confusion and exaggeration of popular report, "bordering somewhat on the fabulous." See the original of Procopius as quoted, H. City, App. p. 496; and compare Mr. Williams' professed paraphrase of it, p. 332 sq.

⁴ See *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 246 seq.

⁵ H. City, p. 339.

stratagem of the fane (ὁ ναός) or holy house itself; and, in the confusion which ensued, many "leaping down from the battlements took refuge in the subterranean vaults of the temple-area (εἰς τοὺς ὑπονόμους τοῦ ἱεροῦ κατέφυγον)."¹ In like manner, after the capture of the city, the tyrant Simon, who with others endeavoured to make his escape by subterranean passages from Zion, being foiled in the attempt, suddenly appeared from the ground arrayed in white, on the place where the temple had stood, in the vain hope of terrifying the guards.² This account implies, at least, that there were here vaults and passages under ground. Indeed, their existence must have been well and widely known; for there is nothing else to which can be referred the "*cavati sub terra montes*" of the Roman historian.³

V. Josephus expressly informs us, that after Titus had got full possession of the temple and its precincts, desiring to hold a parley with the Jews on Zion, he "placed himself on the west side of the outer temple or temple-area (κατὰ τὸ πρὸς δύσι μέρος τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἱεροῦ); for here were gates over to the Xystus, and a bridge joining the upper city to the temple (καὶ γέφυρα συνάπτουσα τῇ ἱερῇ τῆν ἄνω πόλιν)."⁴ Now in exact accordance with this specification, we find at the present day in the western wall of the Haram-area, near the south-west corner, the remains of an immense arch springing out of the wall, and once evidently spanning the valley towards the opposite and precipitous rock of Zion on the west. The fragment begins thirty-nine feet distant from the said corner, and extends fifty-one feet along the wall. The three courses which remain are each about five feet thick; and are composed of huge blocks, measuring some of them twenty and twenty-four feet in length.⁵ Comparing now these massive remains with the above narrative of Josephus, we may adopt the appropriate language of Mr. Bartlett, and say with him:⁶ "Nothing can square more exactly with this [narrative] than the position of the arch; which is precisely in that place, and in no oth-

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 3. 1. It may be noted, that these crypts are here said to belong, not to the ναός or holy house, but to the ἱερόν or sacred enclosure.

² Ib. VII. c. 2.

³ Tacitus, Hist. V. 12: "Templum in modum arcis,—fons perennis aque, cavati sub terra montes, et piscinæ cisternæque servandis imbribus."

⁴ Jos. B. J. VI. 6. 2. The same bridge is also mentioned by Josephus in four other passages, viz. B. J. I. 7. 2. 11. 16. 3. VI. 8. 1. Antt. XIV. 4. 2.

⁵ See a more particular description of these remains, Bibl. Res. I. p. 424—428.

⁶ Walks, etc. Ed. 2. p. 139, 140. n.

er, where we should have looked for it, viz. on the west side of the temple-area, at the *nearest point to the steep cliffs of Zion*. Had no account of it existed in Josephus, we should still have inferred its obvious purport from the nature of the ground. What, in fact, could it have been, if not a viaduct? and if not *here*, where *could* have been that described by Josephus?" In view of these considerations, the same writer might well say: "It seems surprising, that any dispute should arise as to the import of this fragment." In like manner Mr. Catherwood, though unacquainted at the time with the testimony of Josephus, writes to the same effect:¹ "I had no doubt, from the moment I saw it [the arch], that it had formed part of a viaduct and aqueduct; but I was totally ignorant of its historical importance."

The existence of these remains of the ancient bridge at once settles the question as to the antiquity not only of this part of the western wall of the present Haram-area, but also of the southern portion of the area itself. The proof is indeed so overwhelming, that it can neither be resisted nor evaded, except by denying the connection of these remains with the bridge mentioned by Josephus. This the English writer has ventured to do. Without bringing forward a single tenable ground why this massive fragment should not have belonged to the bridge,² or affording the

¹ See in *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1844, No. IV. p. 797.

² H. City, pp. 337, 338. The main and indeed only objection here urged by this writer against the connection of this arch with the bridge, "amounting in his mind to an absolute impossibility," is thus stated: "This ruin is nearly, if not quite, level with the present bed of the Tyropoeon, on the east side of the valley; on the west side of which rises 'the precipitous natural rock of Zion, from twenty to thirty feet high,' the present base of which stands on a steep ridge of at least an equal height above the bed of the valley." Again, p. 338, note: "I feel confident, that the top of the perpendicular rock of Zion, on the west, can be little short of eighty feet higher than the spring-course of the arch on the east." Now so far is the fragment in question from being on a level with the bed of the valley, that the height of the concave surface of the upper course above the ground is about twelve feet by measure (*Bibl. Res.* I. p. 425); and the wall of the Haram rises still above this from forty-five to fifty feet; the whole altitude being here the same with that of the southern wall, or about sixty feet; *ibid.* p. 421. The elevation of the bridge was naturally not much less. On the west, this writer first makes the height of Zion to be at most from forty to sixty feet, or at any rate not greater than that of the Haram-wall; and then in the next breath he says, it can be little short of eighty feet above the spring-course of the arch! Yet in the same moment he appeals to Mr. Bartlett's sketch (*Walks*, Ed. 2. p. 136), as "giving a very good idea of their relative height;" and this sketch represents the Haram-wall and Zion as of

slightest explanation of so remarkable a phenomenon in such a position,¹ he yet everywhere refers the language of Josephus respecting the bridge, to the *mound of earth* further north, on which both the aqueduct from Solomon's Pools and the street from the Yâfa gate are now carried from the base of Zion across the low ground to the Haram.²

To this latter hypothesis the following considerations seem to present insuperable objections.

1. The Greek word *γέφυρα*, although in the Homeric and early poetic usage it is sometimes employed in speaking of a *causeway*, signifies nevertheless in the Attic and later prose-usage always and only a *bridge*.³

2. The causeway in question, at the foot of the street leading down from the Yâfa gate, runs to the gate of the Haram merely from the *base* of Zion as it there exists, and never had a connection with the brow or summit of that hill. The length of the causeway between these two points, is nearly or quite double the distance between the fragment of the arch and the opposite

equal altitude. It probably never occurred to any one else, to reduce the level of the whole bridge to that of the present fragment.

¹ He does indeed make one suggestion, of which he shall have the benefit. Speaking of the vaults under the southern part of the Haram-area as probably extending to the western wall, he adds: "I take liberty to join another arcade at the western extremity in order to bring in that arch;" H. City, p. 339. He is here insisting that the vaults in question were *cisterns*; he compares them with other cisterns at Constantinople (p. 340), and affirms that the said vaults and this external arch have "all one date and one general plan." It follows, that this external arch once went to form a *huge covered cistern* above ground!! *Credat Judæus*. But the writer forgets to tell us why it is, when all the interior vaults begin at the southern wall and run northwards indefinitely, that this external "arcade," which is far more massive, commences at thirty-nine feet from that wall, and extends northwards only fifty-one feet. Further, although there may be cisterns adjacent to the western wall, as reported, yet all the vaults yet known are towards the eastern side, and certainly were never cisterns. The arches and aisles seen and described by Mr. Wolcott (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, pp. 19, 20) were those of the great southern entrance under the mosk el-Aksa; which even Mr. Williams, had he reflected but a moment, would hardly have turned into cisterns. Those described by Mr. Catherwood (*Bibl. Res.* 1. pp. 448—450) lie still further east. The floor of them is earth, into which the olive-trees from above have shot down their roots; and the ground rises rapidly towards the north, being indeed apparently the acclivity of the hill. These circumstances are conclusive to show that *these* vaults (and these are the only ones yet explored) were never used nor intended to be used as cisterns.

² H. City pp. 343—346.

³ See the *Lexicons of Passow*, of Liddell and Scott, etc.

cliff of Zion. It is a low mound, apparently raised mainly for the purpose of introducing the aqueduct into the Haram, after it has been carried for some distance along or through the steep face of Zion towards the *north-west*, in order to maintain the proper level.¹ The street just mentioned likewise crosses the valley upon the mound.²

3. When Pompey had got possession of the lower city and of Zion, the insurgents "withdrew [from Zion] into the temple; and cutting off the bridge which joined it to the city (*καὶ τὴν συνάκτουσας ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τῆ πόλεως γέφυρας ἀποκόψαντες*), they prepared to hold out to the last."³ But to have thus cut off the present low mound, or any other like causeway, for such a purpose and with any such expectation, could only have been preposterous. In the same connection Josephus speaks further of the bridge as "being subverted or broken down (*τῆς γεφύρας ἀναστραμμένης*);" which expression is applicable only to an actual bridge, and not to a mound.⁴

¹ The aqueduct was traced by Mr. Wolcott; see *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 32.

² This "causeway" the English writer holds to be the same spoken of in 1 Chron. 26: 16, 18; and the latter again, he thinks "could be no other than that mentioned among the great works of Solomon, as the 'ascent by which he went up to the house of the Lord,' 1 K. 10: 5. 2 Chron. 9: 4;" see *Holy City* p. 274. The author quotes Lightfoot as authority for this "causeway;" in respect to which, however, that profound scholar seems to have been in error, as he was in regard to the position of Zion; *Descr. Templi Hieros.* c. V. in *Opp. ed. Leusd.* I. p. 559. The ascent which the queen of Sheba admired (1 K. 10: 5. 2 Chron. 9: 4) is expressed in the Hebrew by מַעְבָּד and מַעְבָּדָה, signifying strictly a *step, stair*, and collectively a *staircase*, as in Ezek. 40: 26; and the true rendering of the Hebrew would therefore be: "the stairs (or staircase) which went up to the house of the Lord." Again, the word rendered "causeway" in 1 Chron. 26: 16, 18, is מַעְבָּדָה, strictly a *raised way, highway*; but it is also put to denote a *staircase, stairs*. Thus it is related in 2 Chron. 9: 11, that Solomon made of the almug-trees brought from Ophir, certainly not 'causeways' nor 'terraces,' but "staircases (מַעְבָּדָה) to the house of the Lord and to the king's house, and harps and psalteries for singers." Here there is evidently a reference to the מַעְבָּד (staircase) already mentioned in v. 4 of the same chapter. In all the three passages therefore, the allusion is to the beauty and costliness of the stairs or staircases in and around the temple and palace. Hence the whole argument thus attempted to be founded on a supposed ancient "causeway" falls to the ground.

³ *Jos. B. J. I.* 7. 2. *Antt.* XIV. 4. 2.

⁴ *Jos. Antt.* XIV. 4. 2.—The attempt of the English writer to avoid the difficulty thus presented, is very lame; *H. City*, p. 346: "I consider it much more likely that there was no literal bridge at all, but that the communication was cut off or interrupted for the occasion by a detachment of Jewish engineers!"—The passage of Josephus most relied upon to show the existence of a causeway

4. At the east end of the bridge, the tyrant John, who held the temple, built a tower of defence against Simon, who had possession of Zion. In like manner, at the west end, Simon erected a tower against John.¹ Such a proceeding in reference to the present or any other like mound or causeway, would have been utterly absurd.

If now, in conclusion, we give to all the preceding considerations their due weight, and especially to the remains of the massive arch, they seem to be decisive as to the point they were brought forward to sustain,—the antiquity of the southern portion of the area,—and to sweep away the baseless fabric of mere opposite hypothesis. Still more will every one, who has himself looked upon those vast and wonderful remains, be convinced, that at least, all those which have here been drawn into consideration, belonged to one and the same structure,—to that temple where our Lord taught, and which Josephus has described.

A few words as to the antiquity of these immense remains, may not be out of place. I have elsewhere remarked,² that they are probably to be referred to a period long antecedent to the days of Herod; inasmuch as the magnitude of the stones, and the workmanship as compared with other remaining monuments of Herod, seem to point to an earlier origin. . . . There seems therefore little room for hesitation, in referring them back to the days of Solomon

instead of a bridge, is Antt. XV. 11. 5; which the same writer thus states, p. 345: "The passage from the southern part of the temple to the palace on Zion, was formed by the filling up of the valley between (*τῆς ἐν μέσῳ φάραγγος εἰς δίοδον ἀπειλημμένης*), or by the causeway, as it is called in Scripture. . . . Therefore the bridge and causeway are identical." Now it so happens, that Josephus's own expression makes no allusion whatever to a filling up of the valley; the participle *ἀπειλημμένης* (from *ἀπολαμβάνω*) signifying simply: *being taken off, separated, intercepted*; so that the true sense is: "the valley being intercepted for a passage," i. e. divided or interrupted by the bridge.—The author says further (p. 343), that Josephus "having in that passage explained what kind of a bridge it was, he used the best word he could find to describe it in other passages where he had occasion to speak of it" But it so happens again, that of the five passages where Josephus speaks directly of the bridge (*γέφυρα*), four are in the Jewish Wars, his earliest work, and only one in the Antiquities (XIV. 4. 2); so that the passage here under consideration (Antt. XV. 11. 5) is the latest allusion of all to the bridge. Hence the author's principle, whether correct in itself or not, works against himself; and we must explain, not the earlier passages by this later one, but this last by the earlier; or, what is better, not the clear passages by the more doubtful one, but the one doubtful phrase by the five clear and explicit ones.

¹ Jos. B. J. VI. 3. 2. ib. VI. 8. 1.

² Bibl. Res. I. p. 427.

or rather of his successors; who according to Josephus built up here immense walls "immoveable for all time (*ἀκινήτους τῶ παντί χρόνῳ*)."¹ The historian relates also, that "long ages were consumed in these works (*εἰς ὃ μακροὶ μὲν ἐξανηλώθησαν αἰῶνες αὐτοῖς*);"² and his language strongly implies, that the substructions of which he was there speaking,—those existing in his day and which he himself beheld with so much admiration,—were the same that had been built up during those long ages after Solomon. The area thus formed around the first temple, Josephus describes as a square of four stadia in circuit, or one stadium on each side.³ In narrating elsewhere the rebuilding of the temple by Herod, he states that Herod "walled in a space around it twice as great as the former one (*καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν ναὸν χώραν τῆς οὐσης διπλασίαν*);"⁴ that he rebuilt with great expense and splendour the fortress on the north, which he called Antonia;⁵ and that the whole circuit of the porticos of the temple, Antonia being also included (*περιλαμβομένης καὶ τῆς Ἀντωνίας*), was now six stadia.⁶ As this last specification of six stadia including Antonia, is just double the former one of four stadia for the earlier temple-area alone, (that is, two square stadia instead of one,) the enlargement of this area by Herod seems necessarily to refer to the wall by which he included Antonia in the precincts of the temple. There is no other intimation in the various accounts of Josephus, that this monarch had anything to do with the vast substructions laid in the "long ages" after Solomon. Indeed, the language of the historian, expressing his own admiration of those immense ancient works, implies the contrary.⁷

Still, if it be a fact, that the use of the *arch* cannot be referred back to so high an antiquity as the days of the successors of Solomon,—a position which, though often asserted, has not yet (I believe) been proved except as to Greek and Roman, and

¹ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 3. B. J. V. 5. 1. ² B. J. V. 5. 1.

³ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 3. So too the Talmud; see Lightfoot Opp. ed. Leusd. 1. p. 554.

⁴ Jos. B. J. 1. 21. 1. Antt. XV. 11. 2, 3.

⁵ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 4. B. J. 1. 21. 1. ⁶ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 2.

⁷ Josephus does indeed speak in one place (Antt. XV. 11. 3) of Herod as "removing the old foundations, and laying down new;" but here it is expressly said that these were the foundations of the *ναός* or fane itself. In another place (B. J. V. 5. 1) he speaks of those who followed Solomon, as having "broken through the northern wall" and taken in more space. But this again refers to the building up of the square court of the first temple, and has nothing to do with Herod's labours.

perhaps Egyptian architecture,—then it might certainly be conceded, that Herod may at least have rebuilt these vaults and substructions *upon more ancient foundations*. In this way, if necessary, all the present appearances might doubtless be satisfactorily accounted for. The opinion of Messrs. Bonomi and Catherwood, who visited the interior of the vaults, refers them to the time of Herod.¹ The bridge between the temple and Zion is first mentioned during the siege by Pompey, twenty years or more before Herod was made king.²

In respect to the huge *bevelled* stones, which are seen in the most antique parts of these temple-substructions, as also in the massive ancient chambers adjacent to the Damascus gate, I have elsewhere ventured to ascribe to them a Jewish origin, and to regard them as exhibiting a peculiar style of Jewish architecture.³ The same feature is very strikingly displayed in the walls of the great Haram at Hebron.⁴ Bevelled stones of the like character have since been discovered in the most ancient portions of the ruins of Ba'albek; in the earliest substructions of the great fortresses of Baniás, Hünin, and esh-Shukf; and also in the antique remains at Jebeil and on the island Ruad, the ancient Aradus.⁵ All these circumstances go to show, that this was a feature of architecture common in those ages throughout Palestine and Phenicia; but which (so far as appears) has never yet been found in any country west of Palestine, nor elsewhere in any connection with the early architecture of Egypt, Greece, or Rome.⁶ It may have been Phenician in its origin, and introduced among the Jews by Hiram or other architects from Tyre; but that it was a *peculiarity* in the architecture of the country, there would seem

¹ Bonomi as quoted in Bibl. Res. I. p. 447. Catherwood in Bartlett's Walks, etc. Ed. 2. p. 163, 165.

² Jos. B. J. I. 7. 2. Antt. XIV. 4. 2.

³ Bibl. Res. I. p. 424.

⁴ Bibl. Res. II. p. 434.

⁵ For Ba'albek and Jebeil, see Rev. S. Wolcott in Biblioth. Sacra, 1843, pp. 84, 85. For the other places, see Rev. W. M. Thomson in Biblioth. Sacra, 1846, pp. 193, 202, 207; comp. p. 213. In Tyre and Sidon no examination is known to have been made; nor do they probably contain many traces of ancient substructions of any kind. It would be a matter of some interest to ascertain, whether any traces of this style are extant among the remains of Carthage, the daughter of Tyre.

⁶ Something of a similar kind, indeed, but differing in character, is found in after centuries in the *rustic* architecture under the later Roman emperors. It is an exaggeration of the *bevelled* style; and may possibly have been borrowed from the east. See Hirt's *Baukunst nach den Grundsätzen der Alten*, Berlin 1809. fol. p. 152. Pl. XXXI.

little reason to doubt. It therefore may have its appropriate place, in estimating the age and character of ancient remains.

VI.

The fortress Antonia appears to have occupied the whole northern portion of the present Haram-area.

According to Josephus, Antonia was the fortress of the temple, as the temple was that of the city.¹ It stood upon the north side of the temple-area (*τῆ βορείῃ κλίματι τοῦ ἱεροῦ προσκείμενον*);² was of a quadrangular form, with towers at the four corners;³ and having been first erected by the Maccabees under the name Baris, was rebuilt by Herod with great strength and splendour.⁴ A more specific description places it, or rather its main citadel (*ἀκρόπολις ἐγγώνιος*),⁵ upon a rock at the northwest corner of the temple-area, fifty cubits high. Within, the fortress had all the extent and arrangements of a palace; being divided up into apartments of every kind, and courts surrounded with porticos (*περίστοα*), and baths, and also broad open places for encampments (*στρατοπέδων ἀνὰ πλατείᾳ*);⁶ so that, as having everything necessary within itself it seemed a city, while in its magnificence it was a palace. Where the fortress joined upon the northern and western porticos of the temple, it had flights of stairs descending to both. We have already seen,⁷ that Antonia was separated from Bezetha on the north by a deep artificial trench, lest it should be approachable from that hill; and the depth of the trench added greatly to the elevation of the towers.

Along with this description of Antonia, it is to be borne in mind, that the original area of Solomon's temple was a square of a stadium on each side or *four stadia* in circuit; which circuit was enlarged by Herod to *six stadia* including Antonia; thus enclosing double the former area.⁸ From this statement it would strictly follow, that Antonia was also a square of a stadium on each side; but as Josephus was writing at Rome, without actual measurements and after many years absence from Jerusalem, the statement can be regarded only as a general estimate expressed in a popular form. It may also be kept in mind, that the present

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8.

² Jos. B. J. I. 5. 4. 1. 21. 1. Antt. XV. 11. 4.

³ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8.

⁴ Jos. B. J. I. 21. 1. Antt. XV. 11. 4.

⁵ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8; comp. Antt. XV. 11. 4. See Bibl. Res. I. pp. 431, 432.

⁶ If any one here prefers to render *στρατοπέδων* by *hosts*, *armies*, or even by *troops*, I do not object.

⁷ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2. V. 5. 8. Translated above, pp. 438, 439.

⁸ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 3. B. J. V. 5. 2. See above, p. 614.

Haram-area is 1525 feet in length from south to north, by about 925 feet in breadth; thus leaving on the north an extension of about *six hundred feet* more than a square. The problem is, to find for Antonia a place on the north of the mosk of Omar, where the preceding description of Josephus shall accord with the actual physical features.

I. The fortress obviously could not have been situated on the north, or outside of the present northern wall, of the Haram-area. To suppose this, we must first (and without adequate reason) reject the testimony of Josephus and the Talmud as to the square form of the temple-area proper; and must also disregard the statement of the former as to the extent of Antonia. If Antonia was north of the present wall, and the temple-area was a square; then, instead of the former being joined to the latter, a space of some 600 feet lay between them.¹ Again; if with Mr. Catherwood we assume Antonia as situated between the present northern wall and the *Via dolorosa*, and as extending from the northwest corner to near the reservoir further east,—an area of about 550 feet in length by an average of 130 feet in breadth,—we are still left to inquire, how this can well accord with the “apartments of every kind, and courts surrounded with porticos, and baths, and broad open places for encampments,” and the *city-like* character of the whole fortress; and still more, how this area could ever be reckoned to that of the temple, so as to be said to form one with it and to increase the latter by a space equal or half equal to itself.²—Or, further, if with Raumer³ we place Antonia on the northwest of the present area, having its eastern side on a line with the western wall of the same, then the like difficulties, and especially, the want of room, bears upon us in a still greater degree. Even according to this view, each side of Antonia measured not less than half a stadium or about

¹ This particular difficulty of course does not exist to those, who regard the temple-area as having at all events extended to the present northern wall; whether for this they reject the testimony of Josephus like Mr. Catherwood, or cut off the southern portion of the present area like Mr. Williams.

² In assuming this position for Antonia, Mr. Catherwood expressly rejects the testimony of Josephus as to the square form of the temple-area; and also overlooks his statements respecting the extent of the fortress; see in Bartlett's *Walks*, Ed. 2. p. 165.

³ Raumer's *Palästina*, Plan.—So too on the Plan in Olshausen's *Topographie des alten Jerusalem*. But this writer no longer holds the same view; see his article on the Biblical Researches in the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1842, Bd. 98. S. 139.

300 feet; and this extent would carry it westward quite beyond the street and valley running parallel to the Haram. So that in this case the fortress of the temple, having its acropolis on a rock fifty cubits high, was in fact situated in a valley lower than the temple. Nor does it help the matter, in any degree, to throw out an imaginary Antonia still further towards the west, north, and east, as is done by Mr. Williams.¹ In this way one part of the fortress must still extend across the whole valley; while another part occupies the hill Bezetha, instead of being separated from it by a trench. This trench too was cut through the rock; and if one so deep as that described by Josephus had ever existed on the north of the *Via dolorosa*, some traces of it must have remained visible to this day.²

II. The fortress Antonia was in such a way connected with the temple, and was so included in its precincts, that it came to be regarded as an integral part of the same, and was often comprehended under the general term τὸ ἱερόν, the temple. This is implied in its being called "The fortress of the temple, as the temple was that of the city;"³ and still more from the circumstance, that the circuit of the porticos *including Antonia* is given at six stadia. It is further implied, and that yet more strongly, in the historian's accounts of the several sieges of the temple by Pompey, Herod, and Cestius.

Pompey advancing upon the Holy City found it strongly fortified on all sides except the north;⁴ for "a deep and broad valley encompasses the city, comprehending within it the temple, which was strongly fortified with a wall of stone (τὸ ἱερόν, λίθινον περιβόλην περιτειχισμένον)." The Romans having got possession of the city, the insurgents retired from Zion into the temple; and having cut off the bridge, they prepared to hold out till the last. Pompey now encamped on the north of the temple, where it was assailable (ἐπίμαχον). Here were great towers; and a trench (τάφρος) had been dug; and it (the temple) was encompassed by a deep valley (θάλασς); for the part towards the city was likewise precipitous (ἀπερρώγει), the bridge being broken down. The Romans cut down all the trees round about,

¹ Holy City, p. 324, Plan.

² H. City, p. 355: "With regard to the fosse, I fear that cannot be discovered." Certainly not on the north of the *Via dolorosa*, where most obviously none ever existed.

³ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8. See above, p. 616.

⁴ Jos. Antt. XIV. 4. 1, 2, 3. Comp. B. J. I. 7. 2, 3, 4.

to fill the trench; but this was accomplished with great difficulty because of its infinite depth (*μόλις πλησθείσης τῆς τάφρου διὰ βάρους ἀπειρον*).¹ The engines were at length brought up, and the temple carried by storm. Now all this took place nearly eighty years after the fortress Baris had been built by the Maccabees on the north of the temple.² To this fortress belonged doubtless the great towers on this side; for there is no mention nor trace of any towers in connection with the wall of the temple proper. The fortress then was in existence; and must have been on the south side of the deep trench described. It follows, that the Baris was already regarded as an integral part of the temple-precincts; for in this way only can the silence of the historian respecting it in this connection, be satisfactorily accounted for.

In like manner, when Herod some twenty years later took the city and stormed the temple,³ no mention is made of any separate fortress; though then too the Baris was standing; and was afterwards rebuilt, strengthened, and transformed by Herod himself into Antonia. Still further, when about A. D. 65 Cestius laid siege to the temple, not a word is said of Antonia;⁴ although it had now been for three quarters of a century the fortress of the sacred precincts. It was reckoned as part and parcel of the same; and therefore in common parlance no distinct mention of it was required.⁵

Not less strongly is the same *oneness* of the fortress and temple implied in the historian's application of the celebrated oracle; that "the city and temple would be captured when the temple should become four-square."⁶ He asserts that "the Jews, after

¹ Jos. Antt. XIV. 4. 2.—In the parallel passage, B. J. I. 7. 3, the *φάραγξ valley*, stands in immediate connection with the *τάφρος trench*, as follows: *τὴν τε τάφρον ἔχον καὶ τὴν φάραγγα πᾶσαν*, he filled in also the trench and the whole valley. In the Antiquities, written later, the two are separated, as in the text; thus showing that the "valley filled in" was probably that on the west of the temple, where Pompey may have made some of his approaches.

² Simon destroyed the fortress Akra on the hill Akra about B. C. 140, and appears to have erected the Baris not long after; see NOTE in the text further on. The date of Pompey's siege of the temple is about B. C. 63.

³ Jos. B. J. I. 18. 2. Antt. XIV. 15. 14. XIV. 16. 1.

⁴ Jos. B. J. II. 19. 4, 5.

⁵ Antonia, as the fortress of the temple, is distinguished by Josephus from the temple, where he narrates the projected assault of Florus (B. J. II. 15. 5, 6), and also usually in his account of the siege by Titus. The reason may be, that these generals directed their assaults more particularly upon Antonia, in order to get possession of the temple through the fortress.

⁶ Jos. B. J. VI. 5. 4. See more further on, under IV.

[by] the destruction of Antonia, made the temple four-square;" and thus the oracle received its accomplishment. Previously, then, the temple (*ιερόν*) was *not* a square; because it comprised Antonia as a part of itself.

III. The Antonia on the rock at the northwest corner of the temple-area, was apparently a main acropolis or citadel, within a larger walled fortress bearing the same general name. Indeed, it is expressly called an *acropolis* (*ἀκρόπολις ἑγγώνιος*), situated at this very point.¹ At this point, too, it is once mentioned as a *tower* (*πύργος*).² On the other hand, Antonia as a whole is never called a tower; but is spoken of only as a *fortress* or *castle* (*φρούριον*), presenting, as is once said, a 'tower-like' appearance (*πυργοειδής*).³ The rock on which the acropolis stood, is described as fifty cubits high; a statement which can be regarded only as a loose estimate of the historian, after years of absence; and which, judging from the high ground now on the north, must be taken with considerable allowance.⁴ This rock could not have had a very great lateral extent; for it was covered over from the base to the top with hewn stones, both for ornament and to render the ascent more difficult to assailants. Upon this rock above was situated the acropolis, which would thus itself be "tower-like," but could hardly be expected to have other towers at the four corners still fifty and seventy cubits high, nor to comprise within itself "broad open places for encampments."⁵ Again, Titus, in his siege of Antonia, by the power of his engines made a breach in the wall; but the ardour of his troops was dampened by the sight of another wall which the Jews built up within.⁶ Not one of all these circumstances is applicable to the acropolis on the rock. And further, when the Roman army, after seven days of labour, had razed the very foundations of the acropolis, and so formed a broad approach against the temple, Titus is still repre-

¹ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 4. B. J. V. 5. 8.

² Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8 *πρὸ τῆς τοῦ πύργου δομίσσεως*.

³ Jos. B. J. I. 5. 4. I. 21. 1. Antt. XVIII. 4. 3, etc.—B. J. V. 5. 8.

⁴ Josephus was naturally tempted to exaggerate in all that related to his own countrymen; and also in respect to the strength of fortifications which Roman valour had overcome. How very easily even an impartial witness may be misled in a case of this kind, appears from the example of the cautious Niebuhr; who estimates from recollection the general depth of the valley of Jehoshaphat, opposite the city, at not over 40 or 50 feet, while it is in fact from 100 to 150 feet deep in that part. Niebuhr Reisebeschr. III. p. 54. Bibl. Res. I. p. 400. n.

⁵ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8.

⁶ Jos. B. J. VI. 1. 3, 4.

sented as taking his station in Antonia, in order to overlook the assaults and direct the further efforts of his troops.¹

All these considerations necessarily imply a distinction between the whole fortress Antonia and its main acropolis. The latter was at the northwest corner; and there would appear to have been a considerable interval between it and the northern wall or northern portico of the temple-area proper. The Romans, as we have seen, razed the foundations of the acropolis, in order to obtain more space on which to erect their mounds against the temple; whereas, had this rock of the fortress been immediately contiguous to the temple-wall, it would itself have been the best possible mound. Further, when the Romans had surprised the acropolis by night, many of the Jews, in fleeing away to the temple, fell into a mine that had been dug by the tyrant John. The Romans likewise rushed forward, and strove to enter the temple-area; but were repulsed after many hours of hard fighting. This combat Titus looked down upon from the acropolis.²

The manner in which this acropolis Antonia was connected with the northern and western portions of the temple, is not very clearly described. In speaking of the abortive attempt of Florus to get possession of the temple through Antonia, Josephus relates,³ that the Jews "went up and themselves cut off the porticos which connected the temple with Antonia (*τὰς συνεχεῖς στοὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ πρὸς τὴν Ἀ. δεικνύσαν*);" and Florus learning that the porticos were thus broken off (*ὡς ἀπερρώγισαν αἱ στοαί*), gave up his attempt. Now it is difficult to see, how the mere destruction of a portico belonging to and within the proper temple-area, could render this latter less approachable from Antonia; and it seems therefore necessarily to follow, that the porticos thus cut off must have been on the north of the proper temple-enclosure or wall, and have in some way connected this with the acropolis. Antonia had its own courts with porticos (*περίστοα*), as we know;⁴ and some of these were not improbably connected with the porticos of the temple. That this is here the true view, is also manifest from the subsequent allusion made by Agrippa to this very disruption, when censuring the insurgents:⁵ "Ye paid no tribute to Caesar, and ye cut off the porticos of Antonia (*καὶ τὰς στοὰς ἀπεκόψατε τῆς Ἀρτωνίας*)."—It is likewise difficult to see, further,

¹ Jos. B. J. VI. 2. 1, 7.—Ibid. VI. 4. 4, 5.

² Jos. B. J. VI. 1. 7, 8.

³ B. J. II. 15. 5, 6.

⁴ See above, p. 616.

⁵ Jos. B. J. II. 16. 5.

how even the interruption of *such* a portico could render the temple less assailable from Antonia, unless we suppose it to have been in the nature of a gallery, leading from the acropolis on the rock to the upper part of the temple-wall, and thence by stairs down into the portico of the temple proper. The breaking down of such a gallery, would of course be an obvious means of defence against an enemy in the acropolis.

With some such view as this, seem also to tally several circumstances connected with the siege by Titus.¹ The Romans having possession of Antonia, and having been repulsed in an attempt to force their way into the temple-area, the Jews themselves now "set fire to the connection of the northern and western porticos with Antonia (*τῆς βορείου καὶ κατὰ δύσιν στοᾶς τὸ συνεχὲς πρὸς τὴν Ἀ. ἐμπήσαυτες*), and then broke off about twenty cubits; thus commencing with their own hands to burn the sacred precincts." Two days afterwards the Romans set fire to the adjacent portico; and the fire having advanced fifteen cubits, the Jews in like manner "cut off the roof, thus destroying whatever connected them with Antonia (*καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν Ἀ. συναφὲς αὐτῶν διαρροῦντες*)."—That the portions thus destroyed were not within the temple-area proper, and that they were probably also in the nature of a gallery, is apparent from the further fact,² that afterwards the Jews having filled the northern end of the western portico of the temple-area with combustibles, and then feigning flight, the Romans from Antonia followed hard after them and *ascended into that portico by ladders*; where the combustibles being now kindled, they were surrounded by the flames, and those who escaped, leaped down some into the city, some into the temple-area among the Jews, and some into the area of Antonia among their own comrades.³

IV. From all these various considerations, it is at least not a hasty conclusion to infer, as was done conjecturally in the *Biblical Researches*,⁴ that the fortress Antonia probably occupied the

¹ Jos. B. J. VI. 2. 9.

² Jos. B. J. VI. 3. 1.

³ Whether the hypothesis of a gallery from the acropolis of Antonia to the upper part of the temple-wall be correct or not, there was no doubt a communication through the wall below between the temple-area and that of Antonia. At the capture of Antonia by Titus, the Jews in fleeing away to the temple, fell into a mine; and the whole account of the conflict at that time, including the exploits and death of Julian the centurion, obviously implies such a communication; see Jos. B. J. VI. 1. 7, 8.—The Apostle Paul was carried into Antonia, not directly from the temple, but apparently from the city; having been first dragged out of the temple-area and the gates shut; Acts 21: 30—35. 40.

⁴ Bibl. Res. i. p. 432 sq.

whole northern part of the present Haram-area, that is to say, the tract on the north of the proper temple-square, being about 600 feet from south to north, and about 925 feet from west to east; and that the acropolis was in the north-west part upon a projection of rock extending from Bezetha into the said area, and separated from the said hill by a deep trench; which rock has since been cut away. Such a site accords well with the description and various notices of Josephus; and enables us to understand and apply all his specifications in a natural manner and without any violence. It affords ample space for all the "apartments of every kind, and courts surrounded with porticos, and baths, and broad open places for encampments;" and also for the city-like character of the whole fortress.¹ It leaves room for the square form of the temple-area proper, as specified by Josephus and the Talmud;² and although we do not now find the whole area, inclusive of Antonia, to be full six stadia in circuit, yet the actual difference is not greater than might be anticipated in the case of a merely popular estimate. And further, this view enables us to account for the very remarkable excavation on the north of the present area, still more than *seventy-five* feet in depth; which tallies so strikingly with the fosse mentioned by Josephus on the north of the temple and Antonia, and described by him as of "infinite depth (*βάθος ἀπειρον*)."³ This is probably, even now, the deepest excavation of the kind known. If it be said, that this very depth militates against the idea of its having been intended for defence, and that therefore it was probably at first a mere reservoir for water; then the reply is, that on this latter supposition the great depth is still more anomalous and inexplicable. As a military fosse, we have the direct testimony of Josephus that its depth was "infinite;" and he says expressly, too, that between Antonia and Bezetha there was "a deep trench (*ὄρυγμα βαθύ*), which added very greatly to the elevation of the towers."⁴ It is not indeed necessary to suppose, that the trench was carried through the rock of Bezetha at the same depth or of the same width, as is now found in the still remaining portion. This eastern part may not improbably have been thus widened and enlarged, and possibly deepened, for the very purpose of converting it into a vast reservoir for water; for which it has evidently been used in former times.⁵

¹ See above, p. 616.

² Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 3. Lightfoot Opp. ed. Leusd. l. p. 554.

³ Jos. B. J. I. 7. 3. Antt. XIV. 4. 2.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2.

⁵ See Bibl. Res. I. pp. 434, 489 sq.

The same general position of Antonia in relation to the temple, is implied by several other circumstances.

One of these is the fact, that Josephus, in describing the gates leading from the temple to the city and suburb, speaks only of the four upon the west and one in the southern side; affording the strong implication, that there were none upon the north.¹ Or, at least, if there were gates upon the north, issuing directly upon the hill and quarter Bezetha,² it is difficult to conceive a reason why the historian did not enumerate them with the rest; while on the other hand, if Antonia lay along upon the whole of this northern side, we have at once a sufficient explanation of his silence.

Another circumstance is the easy explanation thus afforded of the Rabbinic statement, that the holy house itself stood in the north-western part of the temple-area or outer court. According to the Talmud: "The greatest space was on the south; the next on the east; the next on the north; and the least on the west."³ That is to say, the building was in the north-western part; but the length of it being from west to east, the space left next the western wall or portico was less than that on the north. The like position seems to be implied in the account given by Josephus, that Titus cast up one of his mounds and brought forward his engines "over against the northwest corner of the *inner* temple,"⁴ it being obvious that the Romans made their assaults upon the wall of the temple-area, whether from Antonia or from the city, at or near the north-western corner. If therefore the rock now beneath the mosk of Omar, which the Jews in the fourth century were accustomed to wail over as marking the site of their former temple, does thus mark some point in the true site; which I am not disposed to call in question;⁵ then the position thus indicated accords well with that above described, provided the temple-area was in popular language a square, and the space further north was occupied by Antonia.

In the same way, Josephus obviously regards and applies the famous oracle already alluded to, as having received its fulfilment.⁶ The temple and Antonia together formed a parallelo-

¹ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 5.—There were none upon the east also; for, as we shall see, the Golden gate probably belonged to Antonia.

² The author of the "Holy City" assumes such gates; p. 402. n.

³ See Lightfoot, Descript. Templi Hieros. c. III. p. 556. ed. Leusd.

⁴ B. J. VI. 2. 7. VI. 4. 1.

⁵ See Bibl. Res. I. p. 444.

⁶ See above, p. 619.

gram; which, by the destruction of the latter, was reduced to a square.¹

More weighty perhaps than all these is the circumstance, that the present eastern wall of the Haram-area exhibits in its northern portion, as compared with all the southern part, traces of a difference of architecture, and probably of era. Adjacent to the north-eastern corner, the ancient massive stones in the eastern wall, for the length of about eighty-four feet, project several feet beyond the usual line of the Haram-wall. The stones too on the north side adjacent to the same corner, are of the like age and size.² Such a projection indicates, that this part of the wall is not of the same original erection as the ancient portion in the south; and that here was probably a corner tower of the fortress Antonia, not unlike Hippius.³ The appearance of this projection is so striking, that (as I am informed) it was to the mind of an intelligent English artist, a decisive corroboration of the theory, that the fortress was coextensive in width with the temple-area.

Further than this, there now lies before me another measurement of the whole eastern wall of the Haram-area, taken with care by the Rev. Eli Smith early in A. D. 1844. From this it appears, that beginning at the extreme south-east corner and proceeding northwards, there is at the distance of 963½ feet *another projection*, less prominent than the one above described, which continues for an extent of about 174 feet, and there terminates. From this last point, the usual line of the Haram-wall continues for 303½ feet, where it meets the former projection, 83½ feet distant from the north-east corner. Here then we have a second, though less imposing projection, affording further striking coincidences with the description and notices of Josephus. The 963½ feet of wall towards the south, constituted of course the

¹ See also Bartlett's Walks, Ed. 2. App. p. 250.—The author of the "Holy City" naively alludes to this account of the oracle by Josephus; which, he says, "is to me wholly unintelligible on every hypothesis, but which, I dare say, has some satisfactory meaning;" p. 355. I have referred to it in the text, simply as a part of Josephus' testimony in regard to the form of the temple-area and Antonia. In this light it is decisive. What he meant in saying this oracle was *ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς λογίοις*, is more doubtful. B. J. VI. 5. 4.

² Rev. S. Wolcott, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 29.

³ One side of Hippius measures 70½ feet. *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 456.—If I may trust to my own impressions after so long an interval, I think it will be found, that the stones in this part, though large, are yet less smoothly hewn within the bevel than those in the southern portions of both the eastern and western walls; resembling in this respect also the antique courses in Hippius. See *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 456.

length of the ancient temple-area on this side, the breadth of which may be taken at an average of 925 feet;¹ thus not forming indeed a mathematical square, but yet having the sides so nearly equal, that in popular language it would always be so called. The northern line thus indicated would fall some distance north of the present mosk. This second projection itself, then, was at the south-east corner of Antonia; where, as we know from Josephus, there was a tower seventy cubits high, the most elevated of all those connected with that fortress.² It is not necessary to suppose, that this tower extended over the whole projection. Again, nearly in the middle of this same projection, we find the famous Golden Gate, so called, fifty five feet in breadth, and itself projecting six feet beyond the adjacent wall.³ All the above circumstances go to show, that this gate led out from Antonia into the country at this sheltered spot, where no enemy could assail it. The projection in which it is found, probably had some relation originally to the position and construction of the gate itself; which is usually referred by architects to the time of Herod.⁴

At what time or in what way the ancient precincts of the temple assumed the form and extent of the present Haram-area, is unknown. Titus left the whole a mass of scorched and smoking ruins. Half a century later Adrian rebuilt the city; and apparently gave to its walls their present course and circuit. At the same time he erected a temple to Jupiter on the site of the former Jewish temple; and decorated the area with statues of himself, one of them equestrian; which last was standing in the days of Jerome, late in the fourth century.⁵ Since that time, there is no reason

¹ There are at least four different measurements of the south wall of the Haram, or (what is the same thing) of the Haram-area. The first lays claim to no minute accuracy. They are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. My own in 1838; see <i>Bibl. Res.</i> I. p. 431, | 955 feet. |
| 2. Mr. Catherwood's in 1833, from his notes, | 932 " |
| 3. That of Wolcott and Tipping in 1842; see <i>Biblioth. Sac.</i>
1843, p. 23, | 915 " |
| 4. Rev. E. Smith's in 1844, | 906½ " |

In the text I have assumed 925 feet as an average near enough for all practical purposes.

² *Jos. B. J.* V. 6. 8.

³ The more exact position and measurement of the Golden Gate, is as follows: From the south side of the projection to the Golden Gate, 51 feet. Breadth of the Golden Gate, 55 feet. Thence to the north side of the projection, 68½ feet. In all 174½ feet.

⁴ Catherwood in *Bartlett's Walks*, Ed. 2. pp. 158, 159, 161.

⁵ See *Bibl. Res.* I. pp. 437, 438.

to suppose that any important change has taken place in the extent or limits of the area; and its present form therefore may be referred back in all probability to Adrian. The rock on which the acropolis stood, was apparently cut away, at least in part, by the Romans, when they "razed the foundations of Antonia."¹ Adrian may have completed the work; and the rocky surface in the northwestern corner of the area still testifies, that this portion has been artificially levelled.² In this process the western part of the adjacent trench would naturally be filled up; and the Roman arches extending westward from the present reservoir may not improbably be reckoned among the labours of Adrian. All these great works would readily connect themselves with the rebuilding of the city and the erection of splendid temples.

OBJECTION. To the preceding view of the position and extent of Antonia, exception has been taken, so far as I know, only in a single instance. The English author, so often mentioned, asserts, that there is "one insuperable objection at least to this theory, . . . it being obvious from numerous passages, that the whole of the north wall of the temple was not covered by the fortress in question."³ These "numerous passages" as given by the author, consist in a reference to the three sieges of the temple by Pompey, Cestius and Titus. The account of Pompey's siege, in which the Romans made their approaches from the north, we have already considered;⁴ and have seen, that at that time the fortress Baris occupied the ground on the north of the temple proper, and was so included in the sacred precincts as to be reckoned to the temple. It was therefore, in fact, this fortress Baris, that Pompey thus assailed from the north. At a later period, Herod likewise made preparation to attack the temple (Baris) in the same quarter; but gave up the attempt, and afterwards made his assault from the lower city.⁵

Many years later, it is urged, Cestius also made an attack upon the temple on its northern part (*κατὰ τὸ προσάρκτηιον κλίμα*); but being repulsed from the portico (*στοά*), the Romans undermined the wall, and prepared to set fire to the gate of the temple.⁶ From this language there follows, it is said, not only the above inference, that the whole of the north wall of the temple was not

¹ See above, p. 620.

² Bartlett's Walks, Ed. 2. p. 143. Catherwood *ibid.* p. 162

³ H. City, p. 327.

⁴ See above p. 618.

⁵ Jos. Antt. XIV. 15. 14. XIV. 16. 1, 2. B. J. I. 18. 2.

⁶ Jos. B. J. II. 19. 5.

covered by Antonia, but also further that there was here a gate on the north, leading out from the temple to Bezetha.¹ But, in the first place, the Jews are said to have driven back the Romans from the portico (*ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς εἰργον*); and next, the Romans continued their attacks and undermined the wall. Now both these circumstances are inconsistent with the idea of an assault from the north; where, as we know, there was a very deep trench. A gate on that side could have been approached only by a narrow bridge or passage over the fosse; affording no opportunity either for scaling the portico or of undermining the adjacent wall. We are therefore driven to the conclusion, that the spot where Cestius made his attack, was on the northern part of the western wall of the temple; where, as we know, there was no trench, and where too there were gates. In the very same way the soldiers of Titus are said to have "undermined the northern gate;"² this being, as the whole context shows, the northernmost of the gates on the west side, where the assault was made.³

One other passage in Josephus is referred to in support of the same objection. When Titus laid siege to the city, the Jews were divided into two factions; one of which, under Simon, had possession of the upper and lower city; while the other, under John, held "the temple and the tract around it to a great extent," including of course Bezetha.⁴ After taking the outer wall, Titus pitched his camp within it in the northwest part of the new city, and pressed the attack on the second wall. The Jews, being still separated into two factions, bravely repelled the Romans from this wall; "those with John fighting from Antonia and the northern portico of the temple, and also before the monument of king Alexander."⁵ Here now all depends on what is implied in the statement, that John's party "fought from the northern portico of the temple." If it be meant, that they directly assailed the enemy from that portico, as the latter approached from the north; then it might seem to follow, that the whole of this portico was not covered by Antonia. This is the conclusion insisted on by the objector. But if nothing more be intended, than that the

¹ H. City, p. 402; comp. p. 328.

² Jos. B. J. IV. 4. 1.

³ Similar to this is the language of Josephus, on another occasion; where, having spoken of the mounds raised by Titus against the northern wall of Zion, at the pool Amygdalon and the monument of John (B. J. V. 11. 4), he afterwards describes these same works as being "on the western quarter of the city (*κατὰ τὸ πρὸς δύσιν κλίμα τῆς πόλεως*), over against the royal palace;" B. J. VI. 8. 1. See above p. 447.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 6. 1.

⁵ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 3.

Jews of John's party, after being driven in from the third wall, now made Antonia and this northern portico *their head-quarters* from which to conduct their defence of the second wall; then no such inference can be drawn. That such an interpretation is both possible and admissible, none will deny; that it is here the probable and necessary one, follows from all the facts and arguments above adduced, which militate so strongly against the other interpretation and the inference drawn from it. Indeed, it is this other mode of interpretation alone, that affords any plausible ground of objection to the view above presented as to the extent and position of Antonia.¹

NOTE.—It may not be out of place to subjoin here a few remarks upon the supposed identity or connection of the fortress Baris with the *Akra* or castle of Antiochus Epiphanes, which gave name to the hill sustaining the lower city. Such a connection is assumed on the alleged ground, that the *Akra* of Antiochus is said in the first book of Maccabees to have stood "on the hill of the temple."² But the language of that book asserts no such thing; as we shall see presently. We shall also see, I think, that there exists good ground for supposing, that the two fortresses were not situated upon one and the same hill, nor in the same quarter of the city.

It is related in the first book of Maccabees, that the Syrians under Antiochus Epiphanes "builted the *city of David* with a great and strong wall, with mighty towers, and made it a strong hold (*εις ἀκρὰν*) for them. . . . For it was a place to lie in wait (*εις ἔσθρον*) against the sanctuary."³ When Judas Maccabeus was employed in restoring the temple, he "appointed certain men to fight against those that were in the fortress, until he had cleansed the sanctuary."⁴ After several vain attempts on the part of the Jews to subdue this strong hold, the garrison straitened by hunger at length surrendered to Simon; who removed the foreign troops, "cleansed the fortress from pollutions," and "ordained that that day should be kept every year with gladness.

¹ Schultz suggests two solutions of the language of Josephus, p. 69; either as referring to the defence of the temple from one post to another, in which case the northern portico would be the last station; or else as signifying, "the portico which ran northwards," i. e. the eastern portico, from which the defence would naturally be conducted against the troops on the Mount of Olives. Neither of these suggestions strikes me as satisfactory.

² H. City, p. 351, 352. See 1 Macc. 13: 52.

³ 1 Macc. 1: 33—36.

⁴ 1 Macc. 4: 41.

Moreover, the hill of the temple that was by the fortress (*παρὰ τῆς ἀκρᾶς*), he made stronger than before (*προσπαύρωσε*); and dwelt there himself and those with him."¹ It is further said in the commemorative tablet publicly consecrated to Simon,² that in his time "the heathen were taken out of the country, and they also that were in the *city of David*, in Jerusalem [were taken away], who had made themselves a strong hold (*ἀκρᾶ*), out of which they issued and polluted all about the sanctuary, and did much hurt in the holy place; but he placed Jews therein, and fortified it for the safety of the country and the city."

Josephus, a much later writer, narrates, that Antiochus erected in the lower city an *Akra* (*ἀκρᾶ*) or fortress, which was lofty and overlooked the temple (*ὑπερχειμένη τὸ ἱερόν*);³ so that Judas, when he restored and cleansed the temple and built a wall around it, had to set chosen men to repel the attacks of the garrison.⁴ This fortress was at length taken and destroyed by Simon; who also lowered the hill on which it stood, and cast the earth into the valley between it and the temple.⁵ The same historian further informs us, that the fortress Baris on the north of the temple, occupying as its acropolis doubtless the rock so often mentioned, was built by the Maccabees; but he specifies no particular individual as its founder.⁶ It may have been the work of several successive leaders.

The preceding are two parallel narratives, by different historians, relating to the origin and later history of this *Akra* of the Syrians, from which the Jews and their temple suffered for so long a time. Intermediate notices are given by both writers; which, however, it is not necessary to cite here, inasmuch as they have no special bearing upon the question at issue.⁷

A comparison of the two accounts presents several points of coincidence and mutual elucidation, which serve to bring out and establish the non-identity of this *Akra* with the Baris on the north of the temple.

1. Both accounts agree in representing the fortress (*ἀκρᾶ*) in

¹ 1 Macc. 13: 49—52.

² 1 Macc. 14: 27, 43; see vv. 36, 37.

³ Jos. Antt. XII. 5. 4. XII. 9. 3.

⁴ Jos. Antt. XII. 7. 6. B. J. I. 1. 4.

⁵ Jos. Antt. XIII. 6. 6. B. J. I. 2. 2. V. 4. 1.

⁶ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 4.

⁷ Compare 1 Macc. 2: 31, with Jos. Antt. XII. 6. 2.—1 Macc. 6: 18, with Antt. XII. 9. 3.—1 Macc. 7: 32, with Antt. XII. 10. 4.—1 Macc. 9: 53. 10: 9, with Antt. XIII. 1. 3.—1 Macc. 10: 32, with Antt. XIII. 2. 3.—1 Macc. 11: 20 sq. with Antt. XIII. 4. 9.—1 Macc. 11: 41, with Antt. XIII. 5. 2.—1 Macc. 12: 36, with Antt. XIII. 5. 11.—1 Macc. 13: 21, with Antt. XIII. 6. 5.—See generally Raumer's *Palæstina*, Ed. 2, p. 446.

question, as near to the temple and commanding it. The one says it was a place to waylay the sanctuary (*εἰς ἔνεδρον τῷ ἁγιάσματι*); the other that it overlooked the temple (*ὑπερχειμένη τὸ ἱερόν*). Both relate that Judas Maccabaeus stationed soldiers to protect the workmen on the temple-precincts from the attacks of the garrison. Indeed the fortress was so near the temple, that according to Josephus the troops in it could, and sometimes did, sally out upon those going up to worship in the sanctuary and slay them;¹ and with all this accords the statement of the other writer as above cited, that "they polluted all about the sanctuary, and did much hurt in the holy place."

2. From both accounts it appears, that the fortress in question was not upon Mount Zion. Josephus asserts expressly, that it was in the lower city;² and the position ascribed to it relatively to the temple by the other writer, is wholly inconsistent with a site upon any part of Zion.

3. The fortress in question was not situated on any part of the temple-mount; nor was it connected with the temple-precincts. According to the historian of the Maccabees, as above quoted, Simon having captured this *Akra*, "strengthened still more the hill of the temple that was near by the fortress (*παρὰ τῆς ἀκρας*);" of course the two were distinct.³ Josephus likewise is very explicit, that the hill of the *Akra* or fortress was distinct from that of the temple; they having been separated by a ravine (*φάραγξ*), which was afterwards partly filled up.⁴

4. It follows that the *Akra* of Antiochus had no identity nor connection with the later *Baris* or *Antonia*. The latter fortress was not, like that *Akra*, separated from the temple by a valley. The *Akra* too was said to overlook or overhang the temple, as above; which is never affirmed of *Baris* or *Antonia*. Besides, when the *Akra* was demolished, the hill on which it stood was dug away, and the earth cast into the adjacent valley; but in the later *Antonia* we find the acropolis still occupying a rock fifty cubits high; an elevation certainly not less than that of the northern hill.⁵ It follows further, that the *Baris* which Josephus says the Maccabean chiefs erected, was probably identical with the "temple-hill" which Simon fortified more strongly and dwelt

¹ Jos. Antt. XII. 9. 3.

² Jos. Antt. XII. 5. 4. B. J. I. 1. 4.

³ 1 Macc. 13: 52.—Yet the author of the "Holy City" writes: "This tower [fortress] is expressly said to have stood upon the *hill of the temple!*" p. 352.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 1. See the translation and discussion above, p. 417 sq.

⁵ See above, p. 620.

therein. The form of expression (*προσωχύρασις*) implies that there was already a fortification on the spot. This may well have been, as is suggested by Gesenius, the fortified *palace* (*בית*) mentioned by Nehemiah as "appertaining to the house," meaning the house of God or the temple;¹ and in this Hebrew word (*בית*) we have probably the origin of the Greek name *Baris* (*Βάρις*). Not improbably it may have been rebuilt or repaired first by Judas Maccabaeus, when he restored and cleansed the temple, and built a wall around it.²

Thus far in both these writers all is coincident and plain. The result is, that the Akra of Antiochus stood upon the high rocky point of the hill or ridge over against the temple on the west; which rock was afterwards cut away, while the hill itself continued to bear the name of Akra. It is the same position, which we have found at the outset to belong to the hill Akra of Josephus.³

But notwithstanding this general and striking coincidence in the accounts of the two writers, there are nevertheless two points of apparent discrepancy between them, which deserve a moment's consideration.

First. The writer of the first book of Maccabees relates in one place, that Simon having subdued the fortress of Antiochus, cleansed it from pollutions, and then "strengthened still more the hill of the temple that was near by the fortress, and dwelt therein."⁴ In another passage the same writer affirms, that Simon having captured the Akra, "fortified it for the safety of the country and city."⁵ Josephus, on the other hand, asserts repeatedly, that Simon razed the fortress and dug away the hill on which it stood.⁶ Here it is obvious, that between Josephus and the first allegation of the other writer, there is not necessarily any discrepancy. Indeed the fact stated by the historian of the Maccabees, that Simon built another fortress and dwelt in it, would rather imply that the Akra had been afterwards abandoned; and so far this statement goes to confirm that of Josephus. But the second allegation of the same writer, that Simon fortified the Akra, is certainly *prima facie* at direct variance with Josephus; and perhaps partially so with himself. Yet we cannot well call the fact itself in question; since it is professedly copied from a commem-

¹ Neh. 2: 8. See Gesenius Heb. Lex. art. בית. Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 4.

² Jos. B. J. I. 1. 4. Compare Jos. Antt. XII. 7. 6, 7. 1 Macc. 4: 60; in which latter passage Mount Zion is put for the whole city.

³ See above p. 417 sq.

⁴ 1 Macc. 13: 50, 52.

⁵ 1 Macc. 14: 36, 37.

⁶ Jos. B. J. I. 2. 2. V. 4. 1. Antt. XIII. 6. 6.

orative tablet publicly consecrated to Simon by his grateful countrymen in the third year of his high-priesthood.¹ Neither is there any valid ground on which to discredit the testimony of Josephus, repeated as it is on various occasions. Perhaps the following considerations may serve to remove the apparent difficulty. Simon succeeded his brother Jonathan, and held the station of high-priest about eight years.² The Akra was subdued apparently in his second year; and the public tablet was consecrated in his third year.³ Now it is very possible, that Simon at first was led to retain and strengthen the Akra as a defence for the temple and city; and this fact was so inscribed on the public tablet of the next year; but that afterwards, finding the fortress better adapted to command and overawe the temple than to protect it, he determined to raze both it and the rock on which it stood, and rebuild another on the north of the temple. For all this there was ample time during the five years of his life *after* the date of the tablet. In this way the second allegation of the writer of the first book of Maccabees may be laid out of view, as referring only to an earlier date; and then the statement of Josephus is left to stand along with the first allegation of that writer; in which case, as we have seen, there is no necessary discrepancy between them.⁴

Secondly. Josephus places the Akra of Antiochus in the lower city; while the historian of the Maccabees describes it as situated in the city of David, by which is usually understood the upper city or Zion.⁵

This difficulty and its solution depend upon the extent of signification given to the term "city of David." That this name originally and in the earlier books of Scripture was specifically applied to the particular hill Zion, there can be no doubt.⁶ But afterwards the name Zion itself came by synecdoche to be very commonly employed for the whole city, including the temple, so as to be used as synonymous with Jerusalem.⁷ The question

¹ 1 Macc. 14: 27, 48.

² 1 Macc. 13: 8, 41; 16: 14.

³ 1 Macc. 13: 51; 14: 27.

⁴ I have dwelt the longer on this point; because I have formerly expressed doubt as to the correctness of Josephus' statement; see *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 410, n. 2. I was there misled by relying upon the authority of others; but having given the subject further consideration, I see no valid ground for doubt in respect to either writer.

⁵ See above, p. 629, 630.

⁶ 2 Sam. 5: 7, 9. 1 Chron. 11: 5, 7.—1 K. 8: 1. 2 Chron. 5: 2.

⁷ Ps. 48: 12. Is. 8: 18. 59: 20. Jer. 3: 14. Zech. 9: 4. Rev. 14: 1; and often. So too in 1 Macc. 4: 37, 60. 5: 54. 6: 48, 62. 7: 33.—In respect to these passages

therefore naturally arises, whether the term "city of David" may not in process of time have been similarly extended? If so, the apparent discrepancy now under consideration disappears.

Some traces of such a usage are found apparently in the prophet Isaiah; who, writing in the time of Hezekiah, says:¹ "Ye have seen the breaches of the city of David, that they are many: . . . and ye have numbered the houses of Jerusalem." Here the city of David and Jerusalem are in parallelism and apparently synonymous; just as the same prophet in another place exclaims:² "Wo to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt;" meaning Jerusalem. Still stronger are passages in the first book of Maccabees; where the writer uses the two names in apposition, and of course as identical.³ Lastly, and perhaps mainly, Josephus relates, that "David having driven the Jebusites out of the citadel, himself rebuilt Jerusalem and called it *the city of David* (καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνοικοδομήσας τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα πόλιν αὐτῆν Δαβίδου προσήγορενσε);"⁴ and this remark the historian repeats a second time. It would seem to follow, that in Josephus's day the specific application of the term "city of David" to Zion alone, was no longer in vogue; and that he understood by it the whole city.

We are therefore authorized to assume, that in other passages also of the first book of Maccabees, the name "city of David" is to be taken as synonymous with Jerusalem;⁵ and thus the alleged difficulty is removed.

VII

The fountain GIBON was on the west of the present city, probably in the upper part of the valley of Hinnom.

All we know of this fountain is from the Old Testament; since Josephus merely names it and that but once.⁶ The place or region where it lay was outside of the city; for Solomon was brought thither from the city to be anointed.⁷ Of Hezekiah it is

in the first book of Maccabees, the author of the "Holy City" remarks, p. 352: "It is manifest that the temple-mount is perpetually called Mount Zion." Now if there be here an "error," it belongs to this author; for not one of these passages relates to the temple-mount, as such; but all of them to the whole city, as usually called Mount Zion.

¹ Isa. 22: 9, 10.

² Isa. 29: 1.

³ 1 Macc. 2: 31 ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ πόλει Δαβίδ. 14: 36 τοῦς ἐν τῇ πόλει Δαβίδ τοῦς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

⁴ Jos. Antt. VII. 3. 2 init. Repeated in the middle of the same paragraph.

⁵ 1 Macc. 1: 33. 7: 32. Compare ib. 13: 49. 14: 36.

⁶ Jos. Antt. VII. 14. 5.

⁷ 1 K. 1: 33, 38.

said, that "he stopped the upper water-course of Gihon," or, literally, the upper out-flow (מַצְיָוָה) of the waters of Gihon, "and brought it down to the west side of the city of David."¹ It is further said of the same king, that "he took counsel with his princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains which were without the city;—and there was gathered much people together, who stopped all the fountains and the brook that ran through the midst of the land, saying, why should the kings of Assyria come, and find much water?"² In the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus also we are told, that "Hezekiah strengthened his city, and brought in water into the midst of it; he dug with iron into the rock, and built fountains for the waters."³

From all these passages it is certainly the obvious conclusion, that there existed anciently a fountain Gihon on the west of the city; which was "stopped," or covered over, by Hezekiah, and its waters brought down by subterranean channels into the city. Before that time they would naturally have flowed off through the valley of Hinnom; and may thus have formed the "brook," which was stopped at the same time.⁴

The probability of this view is evinced by the analogy of the Pools of Solomon, so called, beyond Bethlehem. Those three immense reservoirs lie one below another in a small valley; and are partially fed from a fountain about forty rods distant from the upper one. This fountain springs up in subterranean chambers, to which the only access is by a narrow well twelve feet deep; and from thence the water is carried by a channel under ground to the reservoirs.⁵ In some such way, Hezekiah may easily have concealed the fountain Gihon on the west of the city. Further down in the same basin and valley of Hinnom, the great reservoirs of the Upper and Lower Pool may in time of peace have been fed from it; while in time of war its waters would be withdrawn from the enemy and distributed in the city by subterranean channels to various reservoirs and fountains. The pool of Hezekiah, now so called, the Amygdalon of Josephus, was probably one; and the fountain under or near the

¹ 2 Chron. 32: 30. See also 2 Chron. 33: 14.

² 2 Chron. 32: 3, 4.

³ Eccles. 48: 17 [19], Cod. Alexandr.

⁴ If we may suppose that the fountain Gihon, lying in the basin which forms the head of the valley of Hinnom, gave its name to that basin generally, then we can see why Solomon is said to have been brought down from Zion to Gihon.

⁵ See Bibl. Res. II. p. 104—107.

Haram may have been another.¹ Josephus likewise speaks of the gate by which water was brought in (*σισηκτο led in*) for the tower Hippicus; and of an aqueduct (*εισπηρος*) connected with Herod's palace on Zion.² At any rate, no running water could have been introduced upon Zion, except from a fountain or reservoir on the west side of the city; and this fountain was Gihon.

Such is the view respecting Gihon, which I have elsewhere taken,³ and the general correctness of it has since been singularly attested by the actual discovery of an "immense conduit" beneath the surface of the ground on Zion, brought to light in digging for the foundations of the Anglican church. This edifice is situated near the northern brow of Zion, a short distance east of Hippicus; and it therefore occupies in part the site of the palace of Herod, with which, as we have seen, an aqueduct was connected. On sinking a shaft, the workmen at the depth of more than twenty feet came upon the roof of a vaulted chamber of fine masonry and in perfect repair, resting upon the rock. Within were steps leading down to a solid mass of stone-work, covering a channel the bottom of which was lower than the floor of the chamber; and this proved to be "an immense conduit, partly hewn out of the solid rock, and when this was not the case it was solidly built in even courses, and cemented on the face with a hard coating of cement, about one inch thick, and was covered over with large stones. . . . The direction of this aqueduct was east and west." Mr. Johns, the architect of the church, to whom we are indebted for this account, traced it eastward for more than two hundred feet. He says further: "The question naturally arises, what could this chamber and aqueduct have been for? There is no doubt on my own mind, that they have been used for the purpose of supplying the inhabitants with pure water; and this is proved by there being several apertures opening from the streets at distant intervals. The aqueduct was nearly level, the fall being so slight as to allow the water to remain level; so that by means of a line and bucket water could at any time be procured. The chamber was evidently a reservoir, to which, at some period, access was had by a flight of steps. . . . The aqueduct bears incontestible proof of far greater antiquity than the vaulted chamber."⁴

¹ *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 487 sq. See above, p. 448.—*Bibl. Res.* I. p. 506 sq. *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 24 sq.

² *Jos. B. J.* V. 7. 3. See above, pp. 447, 449.—*Jos. B. J.* II. 17. 9.

³ *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 512 sq.

⁴ Mr. Johns in *Bartlett's Walks*, Ed. 2. pp. 82—84. See also "The Angli-

That this subterranean channel was indeed an aqueduct, as the architect supposes, is obvious from the preceding description. The cutting into the rock, the cement upon the other portions, the occasional apertures above, as well as the vaulted chamber with steps, all show it to have been constructed for the transmission of living water.¹ As an aqueduct, it could have been supplied only from a source on the west of the city. Assuming, then, that such was the position of Gihon, we find the language of the Old Testament respecting Hezekiah's works as above quoted, and likewise the notice of Josephus, exactly borne out by the ancient remains still extant. Hezekiah, it is said, "made a pool, and a conduit, and brought water into the city;" and also "he stopped the upper water-course of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David." Josephus mentions too the existence of an aqueduct on Zion, precisely where one is now found; and his pool Amygdalon is that usually and with good reason regarded as Hezekiah's.²

In opposition to this series of clear and connected testimony, it is now proposed to transfer the fountain of Gihon and the upper pool to "the north side of the city, not far from the tombs of the Kings."³ Of all the points of evidence advanced in support of this view, only one is tenable; and even that has no bearing on the question. I refer to the "common report among the natives, that there is a spot near the Damascus gate, without the city, where, in a still time, by putting the ear near to the ground, the trickling or murmur of a subterranean water-course can be heard; but only at night."⁴ Let it now be true, that such a water-course does actually exist; this does not show it to be Gihon nor to come from Gihon. The other points brought forward are mere

can Cathedral Church on Mount Zion, by J. W. Johns, Architect." pp. 9, 10.

¹ Yet the author of the "Holy City" speaks of it alightingly as "a sewer, which traverses the whole of Zion;" p. 276. As an aqueduct, it is greatly in the way of his speculations.

² In the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, No. I. p. 200, I remarked, that the bringing of water by an aqueduct from the west upon Mount Zion "involves a physical impossibility, unless by a lofty aqueduct or arches." This had reference, of course, to a channel along the surface of the ground. But a subterranean channel, like that since discovered, lying about twenty-five feet below the present level of the ground on Zion, certainly involves no such impossibility. At that time no one suspected the existence of such a channel.

³ *Holy City*, p. 400. The Memoir of Schultz places Gihon in the basin west of the city; p. 79.

⁴ *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 28. *H. City*, p. 390.

assumptions in respect to the position of the Fuller's field and the camp of the Assyrians; the former of which is without a shadow of proof, and the latter contrary to the testimony of Josephus.¹ The character of the ground too is at variance with any such theory; and one statement of the writer of the Chronicles is absolutely fatal to it, namely, that Hezekiah brought the water of Gihon "down to the *west* side of the city of David." From the vicinity of the tombs of the Kings so called, water could be brought (if at all) only to the *north* side of the Holy City; not even according to the distorted Plan of the author in question.²

VIII

The earliest GATE OF ST. STEPHEN was the present DAMASCUS GATE; which was so called from the tradition as to the place of Stephen's martyrdom on the north of the city.

The gate of St. Stephen is mentioned as on the north of the city, and in a position corresponding to the present Damascus gate, by all writers down to the middle of the fourteenth century. The earliest is Adamnanus, who records the information received by him from Arculfus, about A. D. 697; he enumerates in all six gates, beginning with that of David or the Yafa gate, and naming St. Stephen's as the *third*.³ Then follow the notices of the

¹ H. City, pp. 392, 393.—Jos. B. J. V. 12. 2.—See more further on.

² On his Plan Mr. Williams represents the *second* wall of Josephus as making on the north of the Damascus gate a narrow *horn-like* circuit or projection, in order to take in the hill of the grotto of Jeremiah, so called. It is apparently on the strength of this, that he seems to reckon the Damascus gate as on the *west* side of the ancient city! H. City, Plan; comp. p. 400.

³ Adamn. l. 1, "Portas bis ternas, quarum per circuitum civitatis ordo sic ponitur: 1. Porta David ad occidentalem partem montis Sion. 2. Porta villae Fullonis. 3. Porta S. Stephani. 4. Porta Benjamin. 5. Portula, hoc est parvula porta; ab hac per gradus ad vallem Josaphat descenditur. 6. Porta Tecuitis." Here the "porta David" is unquestionably the present Yafa gate; and the next, "Porta villae Fullonis," was obviously so called from the "fuller's field" of Is. 7: 3, which was rightly held to lie on the west of the city; Brocardus c. VIII. fin. This gate therefore was on the northwest part of the present city; where Brocardus also says there was a gate in his day called "Porta judiciaria," over against the interior traditional gateway of that name, and leading to Shiloh (Neby Samwil) and Gibeon. Then follows the gate of St. Stephen, identical with the present Damascus gate. After this we have the "Porta Benjamin," now Herod's gate; and then the "Portula," or little gate, from which steps descended into the valley of Jehoshaphat. This again is from this circumstance a fixed point; and can only be the gate on the east, the modern St. Stephen's, which alone leads down into the valley. Reckoning therefore either way, the identity of the St. Stephen's gate of Arculfus with

historians of the crusades; including the definite specification of Brocardus about A. D. 1283, who likewise sets the gate David first, and that of St. Stephen *third* in the series; and so too the accounts of later travellers.¹ In all these the name of this gate stands in connection with the traditional place of Stephen's martyrdom; which was early shown on the north of the city at the distance of a furlong from the present gate;² where too stood a church dedicated to the martyr, with which also a monastery was connected.³ In the time of Rudolf of Suchem (1336—50) these edifices had already disappeared⁴

On the other hand, after the middle of the *fifteenth* century, all travellers with one accord speak of the name of St. Stephen as applied to the gate on the *east* side of the city, and to that only; as is the case at the present day.⁵ During the intervening century the tradition had undergone a change; but in what way, or on what grounds, history is silent. It is a signal instance of such mutation; and in so far serves, as we shall see, to awaken or confirm doubt as to the authority of other like examples.

The account of Stephen's death in the book of Acts affords no hint of the place of his martyrdom, except where it is said that they "cast him out of the city and stoned him."⁶ The spot form-

the Damascus gate, is evident.—The German writer denies this identity, apparently overlooking the testimony of Brocardus to a gate on the northwest, and also the steps leading down into the valley on the east; and misled further by a fanciful etymology, by which he would regard the modern Arabic name of Herod's gate (*ez-Zahary, the flowery*) as a translation of the Greek name Stephen (*Στέφανος, a garland, crown*). In this way he admits *two* changes of the tradition. Schultz, pp. 51, 52, 118.

¹ Will. Tyr. VIII. 5, "porta quae hodie dicitur *Sancti Stephani*, quae ad Aquilonem respicit." VIII. 6. IX. 19. Gesta Dei, etc. 572. Brocardus c. VIII. fin. Marin. Sanut. III. 14. 8. Descr. of Jerusalem in 13th cent. in Schultz, pp. 111, 112, 113, 118.

² Will. Tyr. VIII. 2. "a Septentrione ubi usque hodie locus in quo protomartyr Stephanus a Judaeis lapidatus." Gesta Dei, etc. p. 572. Brocardus c. VIII. fin. "porta S. Stephani, qui extra eam lapidatus fuit." Rudolf of Suchem in Reissb. des h. Landes, p. 846.—Tillemont Mémoires pour servir, etc. II. p. 24.

³ Gesta Dei, etc. p. 572. Jac. de Vitriac. 63. p. 1081.—Tillemont l. c. p. 24. See also for the monastery two documents of A. D. 1157 and 1162, cited by Schultz, App. p. 118.

⁴ Rudolf of Suchem l. c. p. 846.

⁵ So in the Journals of Steph. v. Gumpenberg, A. D. 1449; Tucher, A. D. 1479; Breydenbach and F. Fabri, A. D. 1483, etc. See Reissb. des h. Landes, p. 444, 665, 111, 252.—Sir John Maundeville about A. D. 1325, speaks already of a church of St. Stephen upon the east of the city, by the valley of Jehoshaphat; p. 80. The tradition had begun to waver.

⁶ Acts 7: 58.

erly pointed out, and decorated with a church and monastery, was beyond all doubt within the circuit of the third wall at the time of Stephen's death, and therefore within the city as described by Josephus. Of course, it was not the true spot, according to the testimony of Scripture. Yet there existed in behalf of it a traditional authority so strong, that it may not be inappropriate to dwell upon it for a moment, as illustrative of the nature and character of such tradition in general.

It is matter of more than mere tradition, that after three centuries of oblivion the burial-place of Stephen was held to be revealed, and his body recovered, at a village called Caphar-Gamala twenty miles from Jerusalem, in A. D. 415. On Friday the 2d day of December in that year, at evening, Lucian the priest of that place saw in a dream or vision an old man coming to him, who made himself known as the Gamaliel of the book of Acts, and informed him, that after Stephen had been stoned before the north gate of Jerusalem, and his body left for a day and night as a prey for beasts and birds, (though none touched it,) he himself, being at heart a Christian, had caused the corpse to be deposited in his own tomb at Caphar-Gamala, where the body now lay; as also the bodies of Nicodemus and of himself and son. All this Lucian was to make known to John, bishop of Jerusalem. On awaking, Lucian had doubts as to the vision; and betook himself to prayer and fasting. The result was, that on the two following Fridays the same vision was repeated. His doubts being now removed, Lucian repaired to the bishop; and received his orders to make the necessary search. This was done with the help of a further vision to another monk; and the bodies were found in the manner and form prescribed. On opening the sarcophagus containing the body of St. Stephen, there was an earthquake; an odour of extreme fragrance was diffused; and several sick persons were healed. A week later the bones of the martyr were transferred with great solemnity to Jerusalem, and deposited for the time being in the church on Zion. In the same hour there fell great rain, which put an end to the extreme drought. The bones of the saint were afterwards removed to a magnificent church on the north of the city, erected on the place of his martyrdom by the empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius the younger; which was many years in building and was dedicated in A. D. 460. A monastery appears to have been connected with it. The empress resided long, and at length died, in Palae-

tine; and her body was deposited in a splendid tomb in the same church.¹

The relation of the discovery and removal of the body of St. Stephen, from which the above account is extracted, was written by Lucian himself; and the authority of it is attested by St. Augustine, the great theologian of that and later ages, and also by Gennadius of Marseilles, a well known writer in the latter part of the same century, whose work was continued by Jerome.² Augustine likewise testifies largely to the many miracles wrought by relics of the saint, which were possessed by his own church at Hippo in Africa, and by the neighbouring churches at Calarne and Uzal.³ Indeed, this recovery of the body of the protomartyr, with the miracles that followed, was the great event of the fifth century. Sozomen, the cotemporary historian, speaks of it as most extraordinary and wholly divine.⁴

I have dwelt the longer upon the circumstances of this narrative, because they present many points of analogy, both in the alleged facts and in the testimony, with the accounts we have of the similar discovery of the Holy Cross and Holy Sepulchre in A. D. 325, less than a century earlier.⁵ The finding of the body of Stephen claims to have been a matter of revelation. The transfer of his bones to Jerusalem was the occasion of seeking out and consecrating the place of his martyrdom, as the fitting site of his subsequent sepulture. Whether there existed previously a traditional knowledge of the spot on the north of the city, we are not informed; but the evidence and the probability on this point are at least as great as in the parallel case of the

¹ On the church built by the empress Eudocia, and the accompanying circumstances, see Tillemont *Mémoires pour servir*, etc. Tom. II. p. 24. Also his *Histoire des Empereurs*, Tom. VI. p. 86.

² The tract of Lucian is found in *Angustini Opera* ed. Benedict. Tom. VII. Appendix. Prefixed to it are some of the testimonies of Augustine and that of Gennadius, as well as references to later writers. Augustine in one place, speaking of Stephen, says: "Hujus corpus ex illo usque ad ista tempora latuit; nuper autem apparuit, sicut solent apparere sanctorum corpora martyrum, revelatione Dei, quando placuit Creatori.—Verum autem revelatum fuit ei, qui res ipsas inventas monstravit." *Sermo* 318. no. 1. The words of Gennadius are as follows: "Lucianus presbyter, vir sanctus, cui revelavit Deus, temporibus Honorii et Theodosii Augustorum, locum sepulcri et reliquiarum corporis S. Stephani martyris primi, scripsit ipsam revelationem ad omnium ecclesiarum personas, Graeco sermone;" *de illustrib. Viris*. Only the Latin version is now extant in various recensions.

³ Augustin. de *Civitate Dei*, lib. XXII. 10—22.

⁴ Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* IV. 16.

⁵ See in *Bibl. Res.* II. pp. 12—16.

Holy Sepulchre. It is not to be supposed, that the scene of an event so important to the whole church as the death of the first martyr, connected as it was so signally with the history of the illustrious Apostle of the Gentiles, should in so short a time have been forgotten among the Christians of Jerusalem and those of the whole world who flocked thither as pilgrims. At any rate, the empress Eudocia, who lived for years in the Holy City, would not have lavished her treasures to erect a church upon a site, which she and her spiritual advisers did not know to be the true one. The people and the clergy residing on the spot must have known the place; at least they were much more likely to know it than those of the fifteenth century, or than any "partial witness of the nineteenth century."¹ For ten centuries, too, this was, and continued to be, the unanimous and unquestioned belief of laity and clergy, of bishops and councils and popes; yea, of the church universal. And yet, as we have seen, according to the testimony of Scripture, this venerated spot could not have been the true site of Stephen's martyrdom; and in the fifteenth century the whole church had abandoned the former belief, and transferred the place of martyrdom to the east side of the Holy City.

The question naturally arises, what element of testimony is wanting in this case, as compared with that of the Holy Sepulchre? What element is here less weighty and convincing? If in the one case there probably existed an earlier tradition as to the spot; just so likewise in the other. If the miracles wrought by the cross were of any avail; just so Lucian's thrice repeated vision and the miracles of healing, which are far more strongly attested than those of the cross. If a splendid church erected by an empress demonstrates the true site of the Sepulchre; so too here in like manner it marks the true place of martyrdom. If further the general consent and belief of the whole church avail anything in behalf of the one; still more must they avail in respect to the other; for in regard to the site of the Sepulchre doubts existed in every age,² while as to the spot of Stephen's sufferings no doubt was ever expressed. Yet after ten centuries the one tradition comes to an end; while the other still exists for five centuries more; and this fact of its continuance is now

¹ All these are main arguments in behalf of the alleged site of the Holy Sepulchre. They apply here with at least equal force.

² *Bibl. Rea.* II, p. 65. So too pope Gregory the Great (ob. 604) makes Jerusalem *transmigrate* in order to save the present site; *Homil. in Evang.* 39. *init.*

urged as its highest claim to be received with an undoubting faith. It might be hard to assign a reason, why a thousand years of universal undoubting faith should not afford an equal claim; or how five additional centuries can add strength to the evidence. Is the latter now better attested? is it more clear, more consistent, more convincing, than it was five hundred years ago?

A further question arises here, in respect to these two traditions of high and almost equal antiquity, attested in like manner by the acknowledgment of sovereigns and councils and the erection of churches, and both running on together with equal credit and like undoubting faith for more than a thousand years. Why should it be, that at the end of this period "the one should be taken and the other left?" Why should the one be discarded, and the other increase in strength and high pretension? I fear no satisfactory answer can be given to this inquiry; unless it is to be found in the different fortunes of the churches and convents connected with each spot. The church and convent of St. Stephen, which still existed in the time of the crusades, were on the north of the present city; were consequently exposed to the havoc and desolation of besieging Muhammedan armies; and had wholly disappeared early in the fourteenth century. The church and convents of the Holy Sepulchre have ever been in the midst of the city, and therefore less exposed to the same occasions of desolation; and although the church has been several times wantonly destroyed, yet there has ever existed for it so deep an interest throughout Christendom, as to render the immediate rebuilding of it a matter of no difficult accomplishment. Thus it has remained the central point, not only of intense affection on the part of those who put faith in its claims, but also of a mass of traditions, of legends, of rites, of ceremonies, of Greek fire, and the like. The same interest was not felt throughout Christendom to rebuild the edifices on the place of Stephen's martyrdom; and therefore, when those edifices had disappeared; when the splendour and the ceremonies and the monks were no more; *then* the tradition was forgotten. Had all these continued unto the present day, affording still to the tradition "a local habitation," there is little reason to doubt but that the gate of St. Stephen would even now be found, as of yore, upon the north of Jerusalem.¹

¹ Churches in honour of St. Stephen were frequent; there were not less than *nine* in Constantinople alone. An earlier church of St. Stephen is said to have existed in Jerusalem; Tillemont Mémoires, etc. II. p. 24. Others would

Here then we have two local and similar traditions, both resting upon like testimony and like authority, both received by the whole church with equal faith for a thousand years; when the one is silently dropped by the whole church, and the other continues still to be held fast by multitudes. When the former was laid aside, was not "the credit of the whole church for a thousand years in some measure involved in the question?"¹ Has any one therefore ever undertaken to overturn the topography of the Holy City, to remove mountains, to efface vallies, to run curves and sharp angles and zigzags in the ancient outer wall, in order to bring the spot of Stephen's martyrdom outside of the former city, and thus save the credit of the church? Has any one ever charged the monks and pilgrims of that day with being "partial witnesses of the fourteenth century?"² Have they ever been held up as "the unbelieving array,"³ because they abandoned a tradition which the whole church had received? No such thing. Nowadays it is only "an unhappy circumstance that the site of the protomartyr's sufferings was found for many years without the Damascus gate; . . . and what is more provoking is, that the empress Eudocia erected a large church to the memory of this saint, at the supposed place of his martyrdom without the Damascus gate, as early as the fifth century!"⁴

Such is the consistency of Protestant writers at the present day, who gird themselves to do battle in behalf of the tradition of the Holy Sepulchre; while the existence of a like tradition as to the place of Stephen's martyrdom, equally received by the church for a thousand years and then dropped, is to them at most *unhappy* and *provoking*! Are they not aware, that in thus admitting the facts of the latter case, they destroy at once the whole foundation and fabric of their argument in the former?

Here then we find another striking example, illustrating the general principle which I have elsewhere laid down upon this subject, viz. "That all ecclesiastical tradition respecting the ancient places in and around Jerusalem and throughout Palestine,

naturally be built afterwards; and Sir John Maundeville in the beginning of the fourteenth century speaks of one such "anent" the valley of Jehoshaphat on the east of the city; Travels, p. 80. This church was probably the occasion of attracting thither the tradition as to the *place* of martyrdom, after the church on the north of the city was destroyed.

¹ H. City, p. 254.

² Ibid. Pref. p. vii.

³ Ibid. Pref. p. ix.

⁴ H. City, p. 364. The writer pronounces it *unhappy*, "because, but for this fact, there would be little difficulty in fixing it [the place of martyrdom] to the neighbourhood of this [gate], which now bears his name!"

is of no value, except so far as it is supported by circumstances known to us from the Scriptures or from other contemporary testimony."¹

IX.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The following remarks have reference to some other miscellaneous points of topography in and around the Holy City, as to which I may differ from the views expressed by one or the other of the two writers so often alluded to in the preceding pages. The reader will, of course, not understand me as assenting to various other positions taken in those volumes, merely because I do not deem it important to discuss them.

I. TOMB OF HELENA. I have elsewhere brought forward evidence to show, that the remarkable sepulchral excavation near Jerusalem, usually known as the Tombs of the Kings, is most probably the identical monument spoken of by ancient writers as the Tomb of Helena, queen of Adiabene.² The main points of evidence are, that Josephus in one passage describes the tomb of Helena as constructed with three pyramids at the distance of three stadia from the city, and in another place speaks of it as overagainst the northern gate of the city where Titus approached to reconnoitre;³ and that Eusebius also mentions the pyramids or cippi (*στῆλαι*), while Jerome relates of Paula that as she approached the city from the north the mausoleum of Helena lay upon the left or east.⁴ Now as Paula came from Gibeah of Saul, the modern Tuleil el-Fül, she could only have reached the city by the great northern road, which must always have occupied very nearly the same line as at present. These accounts then are exceedingly definite. The tomb of Helena was three stadia north of the third or outer wall of the city, on the east side of the road leading to Gibeah. Now this is precisely the position of the Tombs of the Kings so called, on the east of the great northern road, somewhat more than half an English mile or nearly five Roman stadia from the Damascus gate, anciently a gate of the second wall. The third wall ran, as we know, further towards the north; but of its exact course we are not informed. If then

¹ *Bibl. Res.* 1. p. 374.

² *Bibl. Res.* 1. p. 536 sq.

³ *Jos. Antt.* XX. 4. 3. *B. J. V.* 2. 2. Josephus mentions the same tomb in two other places; *B. J. V.* 3. 3. *V.* 4. 2.

⁴ *Euseb. Hist. Ecc.* 11. 12.—“*Ad lævam mausoleo Helenæ derelicto,—ingressa est Jerusalem urbam;*” *Hieron. Epit. Paulæ, Opp. T. IV. ii. p. 673. ed. Martianay.*

this sepulchre is not that of Helena, still the latter must have been somewhere in the immediate vicinity. But the Greek writer Pausanias describes the mausoleum of Helena as one of the most remarkable in the world, especially on account of the mechanism of its doors.¹ All this again is applicable to nothing around Jerusalem, except the sepulchral monument in question and its former sculptured doors, now broken down. This circumstance likewise goes to establish the identity of this mausoleum with that of Helena.

This result is not acceded to by the German writer, who supposes himself to have discovered the sepulchre of Helena on the northwest of the present city, at some distance beyond the site of the ancient tower Psephinos.² "Here are two large sepulchres hewn in the rock; and three heaps of ruins, which may possibly (*möglicher Weise*) come from the three pyramids which marked the sepulchre." He does not further describe the tombs. But it seems obvious, that they do not in any degree correspond to the account of Pausanias; while such a position is wholly at variance with the express testimony of Jerome, that the tomb of Helena was on the *east* of the great northern road.

The three pyramids or *stelae* were probably *cippi* of a slender pyramidal form, erected on the level ground over the portal, not unlike to those surmounting one of the rock-hewn tombs at Petra.³

II. THE FULLER'S FIELD. This spot is mentioned in the Old Testament on two occasions; once where Isaiah is directed to go forth to meet Ahaz "at the end of the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field;"⁴ and again when Rabshakeh and his companions "stood by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field."⁵ Until recently this field has always and justly been held to lie upon the west side of the city, where there still exists an "upper pool" of high antiquity, from which water is even now brought into the city by a conduit; and where too, as we know, there was "an upper water-course of Gihon," which Hezekiah brought "straight down to the west side of the city of David."⁶ Near this pool or conduit the fullers (strictly *washers* or *cleansers* of woollen garments)⁷ apparently

¹ Pausan. Graeciae Descr. VIII. 16. See Bibl. Res. I. pp. 537, 569.

² Schultz, p. 65.

³ Bibl. Res. II. p. 515; comp. p. 510.

⁴ Is. 7: 3.

⁵ 2 Kings 18: 17. Is. 36: 2.

⁶ 2 Chr. 32: 30. See above, p. 637.

⁷ See Mark 8: 3. Winer Realw. art. *Walker*.

plied their trade, and spread out the garments thus cleansed to dry upon the ground, near by the great road leading from the western gate to Joppa. Something of the same kind may be said to exist at the present day.¹

The next notice of the spot is by Eusebius and Jerome, who merely say that it was seen in their day in the suburbs of the city.² In Adamnanus, A. D. 697, we find mention of the *Porta Villae Fullonis* in the west wall of the city, so named obviously in reference to this field; which Brocardus in the thirteenth century expressly places on the west, outside of the gate leading to Hebron and Joppa.³ Now since it appears from the Scriptural passages quoted, that this field was on the west of the city; and Adamnanus at the close of the seventh century, and Brocardus in the thirteenth, both recognize it as in the same quarter; we may infer with tolerable certainty, that such was also the position in which Eusebius and Jerome knew it in the fourth century. We thus obtain a series of testimony, coincident with that of Scripture, down through many later centuries.

The only possible ground for attempting to transfer the site of this field to the north of the city, as has been done of late, is the suggestion of a connection between it and the Fuller's monument, which stood at the extreme north-east corner of the new city, where the third or outer wall came down to the valley of the Kidron.⁴ We are told that "it seems natural to connect the Fuller's monument with the Fuller's field."⁵ It may "seem natural;" but it is just as natural not thus to connect them, nor is it in the slightest degree necessary; especially when this must have the further effect of transferring from the west to the north, not only the Fuller's field, but likewise the fountain Gihon and the upper pool with its conduit; contrary to the facts of history, to the remains of antiquity, and to the nature of the ground.⁶

III. CAMP OF THE ASSYRIANS. This is twice mentioned by Josephus, and only by him, as the place where Titus pitched his

¹ In 1838 we saw persons washing garments at the upper pool, and the ground for some distance around was covered with the clothes spread out. The same was the case, once at least, at the fountain of Siloam; and also at the well near the Tombs of the Kings.

² Onomast. art. *Ager Fullonis*.

³ See above, p. 638. n. 3. Brocardus, c. VIII. fin.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 2.

⁵ H. City, p. 392. So too Hitzig, in his Comm. on Is. 7: 3.—Schultz connects the *Porta Villae Fullonis* with the Fuller's monument; but places the Fuller's field rightly on the west; pp. 51, 84.

⁶ See above, p. 637, 638.

own camp within the new city, after having broken through the third or outer wall, and before making his assault on the second wall.¹ The spot is sometimes assumed as identical with that where Rabshakeh and the Assyrian host sent by Sennacherib are supposed to have "stood," while he communed with the messengers of Hezekiah, viz. "by the conduit of the upper pool in the highway of the fuller's field."² In accordance with this view, the German writer fixes the camp of the Assyrians at the north-west corner of the present city, in the vicinity of the Latin convent.³ This assumed identity, however, is merely conjectural. Against it we have, on the one hand, the fact, that the city was more than once invested by an Assyrian host; and there is therefore no reason why this should be taken as the camp of Sennacherib's army, rather than of another.⁴ On the other hand, even if the camp be assumed as that of Sennacherib's host, still the Scriptural account goes only to show, that the *colloquy* between the Assyrian general and Hezekiah's messengers took place at the spot described; and not that the troops were encamped there. In seeking therefore for the true site of the camp in question, we must be governed solely by the language of Josephus.

Titus, on approaching with his legions from the north, encamped first on Scopus;⁵ and from thence levelled the ground before the walls of the city, cutting down the fruit-trees and groves, demolishing the walls and hedges, filling up the hollows and chasms, and cutting away the ledges of rock.⁶ He then removed, and with one division of his troops encamped before the corner, two stadia from the wall, over against the tower Psephinos, "where the circuit of the northern wall bent round upon the west side."⁷ The other division extended itself over against Hippicus, in like manner two stadia distant from the city; probably on the level ground south of the upper part or basin of the valley of Hinnom.

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 3. V. 12. 2. ² 2 K. 18: 17. Is. 36: 2. See above, p. 646.

³ Schultz, p. 85; comp. p. 68. The author of the "Holy City" places the camp of the Assyrians on the north-east corner of the new city, at the Fuller's monument, near the Kidron; p. 393.

⁴ Thus, where Manasseh is taken prisoner by the Assyrians, and carried away to Babylon; 2 Chron. 33: 11. It may be that "Assyrians" is here a more general word for the "Chaldeans" of Babylon; since this use of the name is not infrequent in the later books; see 2 K. 23: 29. Jer. 2: 18. So too Nebuchadnezzar is called king of the Assyrians, Judith 1: 7, 11. 2: 1. 4: 1. 5: 1, etc. Hence, the camp of the Assyrians at Jerusalem might with equal propriety be regarded as the camp of Nebuchadnezzar's or any other Assyrian or Chaldean army.

⁵ Jos. B. J. V. 2. 3.

⁶ Jos. B. J. V. 3. 2.

⁷ Jos. B. J. V. 3. 5.

After breaking through the outer wall into the new city, Titus transferred his head-quarters to the camp of the Assyrians within the same, "having first taken possession of the whole intervening tract (*ἐπισχῶν πᾶν τὸ μεταξύ*) quite to the Kidron, and being still out of the reach of weapons from the second wall."¹ This language would seem to imply, that the spot in question must have been in the western part of the new city. To the same effect is another passage, where it is said of Titus, that having begun his own wall "from the camp of the Assyrians, where his own troops now lay, he carried it down upon the lower new city (*ἐπὶ τὴν κατωτέρω Καινόπολιν ἤγε*), and thence through the Kidron to the mount of Olives."² From all these notices it seems clear, that the camp of the Assyrians, so called, must have been upon the eastern declivity below the tower Psephinos; and far enough towards the north to be out of the reach of weapons from the second wall; which, as we have seen, probably did not vary much from the line of the present northern wall.³ Here, in the north-western quarter, the new city was apparently not fully built up; and thus Titus found space along the declivity for the encampment of his troops within the city.

IV. COURSES OF VARIOUS WALLS. The specifications of the German writer in regard to the courses of some of the walls, seem to admit of further investigation.

1. *Third or outer Wall.* The general course of this wall is rightly given upon the new Plan of Kiepert, so far as the ancient traces of it extend on the east of the corner tower Psephinos. Beyond this point the Plan represents it as carried northwards quite to the valley of Jehoshaphat, where the latter runs east; and then as following the brow of this valley down to the city; thus taking in the Tombs of the Kings so called, and the other similar sepulchres in that quarter.⁴ This course is laid down by the German writer mainly on the presumption, that he has discovered the sepulchre of Helena in another spot, on the north-west of the city.⁵ But—to say nothing of the improbability that the Tombs of the Kings and the adjacent sepulchres should all have been within the city—so long as the strong proof above adduced exists to show that the main sepulchre in question is identical with the mausoleum of Helena, it is certain that the third wall could not have made so great a circuit towards the north.

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 3.

² Jos. B. J. V. 12. 2.

³ See above p. 452.

⁴ See Bibl. Res. I. p. 534.

⁵ Schultz, p. 62 sq. See above, p. 645, 646.

Josephus describes its course from Psephinos as follows: ¹ "Thence it was carried along (*καθῆκον*) over against the tomb of Helena; and being prolonged through the royal caves, it turned by the corner tower at the Fuller's monument so called, and, joining the old enclosure, terminated at the valley of the Kidron." This language necessarily implies, that the third wall left the tomb of Helena at some distance on the outside.

2. *Second Wall.* From the ancient gate now that of Damascus to Antonia, the second wall, according to the German writer, followed the course of the present wall; that is, it ran along the northern brow of the hill Bezetha, as understood both by this writer and myself.² But, according to Josephus, Bezetha lay outside of the second wall and lower city; and was first taken in when the third wall was built.³

3. *Wall of Titus.* After Titus had taken the second wall, and made several unsuccessful assaults upon Antonia and the upper city, he went to work more cautiously, and built a new wall around the whole city so far as it was not yet subdued, in order to prevent all egress and hope of escape to the Jews.⁴ "Beginning at the camp of the Assyrians within the third wall, where Titus himself was now encamped, he carried the wall down upon the lower new city; thence through the Kidron to the mount of Olives; there turning it took in the mount as far as to the rock called *Peristereon* (*Περιστερεών*) and the next hill, which lies over the valley at Siloam; thence turning west it went down into the valley of the fountain; beyond which ascending by the tomb of the high-priest Ananus, and taking through (*διαλαβών*) the hill where Pompey encamped, it turned northwards, and going on as far as to a certain village called Chickpea-house (*Ἐρεβίθων οἶκος*) and beyond this including the monument of Herod, it joined again towards the east upon his own camp, where it had begun." The length of the whole wall was thirty-nine stadia; and it was completed by the whole army in three days.

The camp of the Assyrians, as we have seen,⁵ was probably on the declivity below the tower of Psephinos, some distance further north than the place assigned to it upon Kiepert's Plan. This position at once saves what appears upon the Plan as a very awkward angle in a wall of this description. My purpose here, however, is mainly to call the reader's attention for a moment to

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2.

² Schultz, p. 62; comp. p. 56.

³ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2. See above, p. 438.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 12. 1, 2.

⁵ See above, p. 647, 648.

one or two other points in connection with the wall. We may, I think, take it for granted, that the Romans would not make the wall *longer*, or give it a larger circuit, than was necessary for their purpose; they did not introduce into it curves or angles where a straighter line would answer as well. On the east and south the wall would naturally be carried along the side of the mount of Olives and of the southern hill, on a line not higher up than was absolutely necessary to render the wall defensible and secure against the efforts of the Jews. This then is all that can well be meant, when it is said of the wall, that it "took in the mount of Olives." The meaning cannot be, that it took in the *whole* mount, either as far as to Bethany or even to the summit; for why should the Romans subject themselves to all the trouble and toil of dragging their materials up hill, and of lengthening the wall by at least half a mile, without the slightest necessity? I cannot but think, therefore, that the "rock called Peristereon and the next hill lying over the valley at Siloam," were points on the western declivity not much above the valley, and are mentioned here simply to mark out more exactly the course of the wall.

The German author, however, carries the wall nearly to the summit of the mount of Olives, in order to take in the Tombs of the Prophets so called; which, led away by a fanciful analogy, he holds to be the Peristereon of Josephus.¹ In like manner he makes the wall run high up towards the summit of the southern hill, where he assumes that Pompey first encamped on his arrival from Jericho.² This seems to me to be without good reason, and against all probability. A far more probable position both for Pompey's camp and for the course of the wall, would be the

¹ Schultz, p. 72. The manner in which this author connects the two together, is an instance of the haste with which he sometimes jumps at a conclusion. He says: "Peristereon (*περιστερεών*) means *Columbarium*, which signifies not only *dove-cote*, but also 'a sepulchre with many niches.' Therefore it is here a name for the tombs of the Prophets, in which are many niches." Now both the Greek and this Latin word were certainly figuratively applied to things having resemblance to a dove-cote; the former being used as the name of a kind of weed, and the latter as the name of the hole for an oar and other like apertures in walls, etc. But no classic author ever employed either word to denote "a sepulchre with many niches." Honest Sandys, indeed, by way of *comparison*, once speaks of the large room in the tombs of the Judges as being "cut full of holes in manner of a dove-house;" Trav. p. 136.—For a full account of the tombs of the Prophets, by Rev. S. Wolcott, see *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1843, p. 36, 37.

² Josephus says not a word of Pompey's encampment on his arrival from Jericho; but only speaks of his encamping afterwards on the north of the temple; *Antt.* XIV. 3. 4, comp. 4. 2. B. J. I. 6. 6, comp. 7. 3.

less elevated ground on the west of the valley of Hinnom over against Zion. To this quarter indeed the language of Josephus seems rather to point; and here one portion of the troops of Titus afterwards encamped, as did likewise in later ages a division of the army of the crusaders.¹

V. VIA DOLOROSA. I have formerly made the remark, that "the *Via dolorosa* seems to have been first got up during or after the times of the crusades;" and that "the earliest allusion I had been able to find to it, is in Marinus Sanutus in the fourteenth century."² The opinion thus advanced, I am happy to find, is most fully confirmed by the description of Jerusalem in the thirteenth century, to which allusion has already been made.³ From that work it appears conclusively, (what indeed might be inferred from the silence of Brocardus,) that in the thirteenth century no such name of a street existed in Jerusalem. The one now so called then bore two names in different parts. West of the street leading south from the Damascus gate, it was called the street of the Sepulchre (*la rue du Sepulcre*); while east of the same, quite to the gate at the valley of Jehoshaphat, it was known as the street of Jehoshaphat (*la rue de Josaphat*).⁴

At the same time, we may perhaps discover the immediate occasion of the subsequent name *Via dolorosa*, as applied to this street. In the highest part of the said street of Jehoshaphat was a gateway (*porte*) over against the temple, which was called *Portes doulereuses*.⁵ This was doubtless the present arch or gallery *Ecce Homo*; but no reason is assigned why it was then so called.

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 3. 5; see above p. 648. Will. Tyr. VIII. 5.

² Bibl. Res. I. pp. 344, 372. Marin. Sanut. III. 14. 10.

³ See above, p. 459, n. 2. First published by БУЗГОТ, *Assises de Jerusalem*, Paris 1843, fol. Tom. II. p. 531 sq. Extracts in Schultz, App. p. 107 sq.

⁴ Descript. of Jerus. in Schultz App. pp. 112, 113, 114; comp. pp. 119, 120.

⁵ Ibid. Schultz, p. 114.