

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

Hicks, Oppert, Menant, and others to our knowledge of ancient history, and of the bearings of all these investigations on scripture. These important topics we can only indicate. It is sufficient now to say that these grammars and this dictionary, with all their guesses and inevitable mistakes, have put the next generation of Assyriologists under deep obligations.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### THE TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

BY REV. JOHN FORDES, LL.D., EDINBURGH.

The reperusal, in the third Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, of the views of Lieut. Warren on the site of Mount Zion, which I had only cursorily glanced over in the Athenaeum, when on the continent this autumn, and away from my books, has set me to re-examine the Topography of Jerusalem. This subject cannot but be interesting to the countrymen of Professor Robinson, whose "Researches in Palestine," gave the impulse to all the investigations of recent times; and I beg a little space in the Bibliotheca Sacra to assist in dispelling an error now become almost inveterate, and which, by placing Mount Zion on the southwest, instead of the northwest mountain, as advocated by Lieut. Warren, has introduced inextricable confusion into all our inquiries. The correctness of his view seems demonstrated by the happy reconciliation which it effects of all the statements in the Bible, the First Book of Maccabees, and Josephus.

Josephus's general description of Jerusalem is as follows (Wars, v. 4. 1): "The city was built, one part facing another, upon two hills, separated by an intervening valley, at which, over against each other, the houses ended. Of these hills the one bearing the upper city was much the higher, and in length more straight. The other hill, called Akra [the Citadel], and sustaining the lower city, was crescent-shaped. Over against this was a third hill [Mount Moriah], by nature lower than Akra, and formerly separated by another broad valley. But afterwards in the times when the Maccabees ruled, they filled up the valley with earth, with the view of connecting the city with the Temple; and working down the height of Akra, they made it lower, so that the Temple might appear above it."

I would humbly submit the following inferences as strictly deducible from this description, and from our other sources of information; numbering them for the sake of distinction and ease of reference, should any of them be called in question:

1. There can be no dispute which is the higher and which the lower city; that on the southwest hill being still about eighty feet higher than the one north of it, according to the Ordnance Survey Plan.

2. There ought never to have been a question whether the Tyropœon valley after coming opposite the Temple hill turns to the west. To separate the two hills, there must have been an intervening valley. Wherever therefore its place may eventually be found, whether, as Robinson thinks, in the direction of the Jaffa gate, or farther to the north, the Tyropœon, which skirts the pseudo-Zion on the east, must have turned westward, and joined the valley on the west side of Jerusalem.

3. Thus alone can the "crescent shape" be given to the hill on which the lower city stands.

4. Our next question is: Which of these cities was the City of David, and contained the stronghold of Zion connected with it? From Josephus (Ant. vii. 3. 1, 2 — quoted below, see No. 5), notwithstanding he never mentions Zion, and even gives the name of the City of David to the whole of Jerusalem, the legitimate conclusion, I believe, is that which Lieut. Warren has drawn — that Zion, "the citadel out of which David cast the Jebusites," was in the lower city. Still the conclusion may be evaded, as has so generally been done, by maintaining that by the citadel is meant the higher city, and that it was that which David "joined to the lower city, and made it one body." The conclusion, however, at which Lieut. Warren aims, comes out with unanswerable clearness from a comparison of 1 Macc. i. 30-34 with Joseph. Ant. xii. 5. 4.

The account in Maccabees of the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes and his army is as follows: "He fell suddenly upon the city, and smote it very sore. And when he had taken the spoils of the city, he set it on fire, and pulled down the houses and walls thereof on every side. Then builded they the *City of David* with a great and strong wall and with mighty towers, and it became a stronghold (an Akra, εἰς ἄκραν) for them. And they put therein wicked men, and it became a place to lie in wait against the sanctuary." Compare also chap. ii. 31, where the City of David is expressly distinguished from Jerusalem: "The host that was at Jerusalem, in the City of David"; and again chap. xiv. 36.

This, in the corresponding passage of Josephus (Ant. xii. 5. 4.), is: "When he [Antiochus] had pillaged the whole city, he burned down the finest buildings; and when he had overthrown the city walls, he built the stronghold [τὴν ἄκραν] in the *lower city*; for the place was higher, and overlooked the Temple; on which account he fortified it with high walls and towers, and put into it a garrison of Macedonians; and the impious and wicked part of the [Jewish] multitude dwelt in it."

The author of the Maccabees places the Akra of the Macedonians, in the *City of David*; Josephus, in the *lower city*. The inference is unavoidable, that the City of David and the lower city are synonymous;

and, since Zion formed part of the City of David, that Zion is to be sought for, as Lieut. Warren has placed it, in Akra, or the lower city.

5. The connection, however, between the stronghold of Zion and the City of David must be more clearly defined.

The southwest hill being undoubtedly the higher of the two hills, and, if we compare it as a *whole* with the other, the stronger and more inaccessible from the deep valleys that surround it on all but the north side, it has been hastily concluded that the stronghold of Zion must have stood there. Now, however, that we find from a comparison of Maccabees and Josephus that its site was in the lower city, we are forced to the conclusion, since it was the most impregnable part of Jerusalem, that within the lower district of the city rose a towering eminence somewhat similar to the Castle Rock in Edinburgh, which by its precipitous sides had bidden defiance, till the days of David, to every effort of the Israelites to dislodge the Jebusites from its stronghold, and even for some time to David himself after he had taken the lower city, just as the Castle of Edinburgh continued to hold out against Prince Charles Edward after he was in possession of the city. The expression, "Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Zion; the same is the city of David" (2 Sam. v. 7), must not mislead us to suppose that the stronghold formed the whole of the City of David. It might very naturally by metonymy give its name to the whole of the lower city, just as the Abbey of Westminster has given its name to the district of London in which it stands. Even in scripture we have plain intimations of the mount and stronghold of Zion being distinct from the City of David. David, we read, at first "dwelt in the fort" itself (2 Sam. v. 9), but afterwards built a separate house for himself (v. 11), which was still in the City of David (2 Chron. viii. 11). The distinction between Zion and the City of David is further intimated by the notice in 2 Sam. v. 9; and 1 Chron. xi. 8, that David "built the city round about, even from Millo and inward," in order to make the fortifications of the city somewhat more worthy of the all but impregnable fortress which he had taken. The version, however, of these words by Josephus, (Ant. vii. 3. 1, 2, now that it has been shown that his Jebusite citadel was not in the higher city) removes all ambiguity: "so David took the lower city by force, but the citadel (*ἀκρά*) held out still. . . . When David had cast out the Jebusites out of the citadel, he made buildings round about the *lower city*; he also joined the citadel (*Akra*) to it, and made it one body."

The citadel in the lower city, which Josephus calls the *Akra*, must not be confounded, as several authors have done, with that in the higher city, which Josephus (Wars, v. 4. 1) calls the watch-tower (*φρούριον*), evidently from the superior height of the mountain giving a more commanding view of an approaching enemy.

6. The name of *Akra*, here applied by Josephus to the stronghold of Zion, is the word uniformly applied by him (with the exception quoted

below), and by the author of the Maccabees, to designate the stronghold of the Macedonians, erected to overawe the temple. Is it not, then, the natural inference, that the original hill-fort of Mount Zion, occupied from the earliest times to dominate the lower city, is the same rock as that which, dismantled probably during the Babylonish captivity, Antiochus refortified for his Macedonian garrison? He would certainly select the strongest position which he could find; and it will scarcely be maintained that there were two such strongholds in the lower city. Nay, so pre-eminent was this fortress that Josephus on one occasion (*Ant.* xii. 6. 2) calls it "the *Acropolis* of Jerusalem" too, i.e. of the whole city; and such was its height and magnitude, that when the Maccabees gained possession of it, it took the people of Jerusalem three years' hard labor, working day and night, to level it, and join it on to the Temple mount, by filling up part of the intervening valley.

There would thus be no confusion in Josephus's employment of the term *Akra*, as asserted by some writers. The *Akra* of the Jebusites taken by David was still the same *Akra* which was occupied by the Macedonians; and which by a very natural metonymy gave its name to the district of the city in which it was situated, as Zion had done previously.

7. We have now a simple solution of two main difficulties which have hitherto perplexed all inquirers.

The first of these is: How came Mount Zion and the Temple mount to be so identified as to be used synonymously in scripture, if Mount Zion was, as the prevalent theory holds, on the west side of Jerusalem, while the Temple mount is on the east, and separated from it by a deep ravine? Lieut. Warren seems scarcely aware of the value of his conclusion as a reply to this difficulty. He dwells on what he places as the title to his paper, "The comparative *holiness* of Mount Zion and Moriah," and considers that the earlier holiness ascribed to Mount Zion from the presence of the ark would still continue to attach to it even after the transference of the ark to Mount Moriah, and satisfactorily accounts for the blending of the two names in the *poetry* of later times, while in *prose* they were kept distinct.

But how account for the *prose* use of Zion in 1 Macc. v. 54; vi. 62; vii. 33, etc., to denote the Temple mount alone, exclusive of any other part of the city, even of the Macedonian *Akra* itself? Had Zion been where the fancy of the monks and pilgrims of the Middle Ages has placed it, it seems altogether impossible to account for the real Zion, had such it been, losing suddenly its proper name and transferring it to another mount on the opposite side of Jerusalem, and separated from it by a deep intervening valley. But assume that Mount Zion was so close to the north-west corner of Mount Moriah, as according to Josephus's description of the Macedonian *Akra* to "adjoin to, and overlook the Temple" (*Ant.* xii. 9. 3; compare also 1 Macc. xiii. 52), and all difficulty disappears. To the

eye they would seem almost to form one continuous line; and when Mount Zion, once so holy, had now been desecrated by the long occupation of Macedonian idolaters, and was at length razed to the ground and obliterated; and the very site on which it had stood joined on to Mount Moriah, the name with it would most naturally be transferred to the sacred Temple mount, and by a patriotic writer like the author of Maccabees, be refused in his narrative to the desecrated citadel, to which up to that time it had properly belonged.

8. The second difficulty which has occasioned so much perplexity to commentators: How could Mount Zion be said in Psalm xlvi. 2, to be "on the sides of the north," in like manner disappears.

9. Finally, let me advert to a point to which attention has scarcely been drawn: To which of the two hills or cities of Josephus does Ophel belong? To one or the other of the two it must be annexed, unless we would add a fourth to the three hills of Josephus. To the pseudo-Zion it cannot be annexed without breaking the continuity of the Tyropoeon, which he states formed the separation between the two hills. To Akra, or the lower city, it must be united, if the crescent shape attributed to Akra is to be completed. After the addition of Mount Moriah to the lower city, these, with Ophel, would appear to the eye to form but one mountain or ridge, and consequently would all be reckoned, as by Josephus, the lower city. It is doubtful, however, whether a branch of the Tyropoeon ever ran so far northward (as is represented in the small plan on the collecting cards of the Palestine Exploration Fund) so as to join the depression that comes down from the Damascus gate, and whether there was not rather from the first a narrow ridge connecting Ophel to the lower city, and which passed to the west of the Temple area, skirted by the Tyropoeon on the one side, and by a valley between it and Mount Moriah on the other.

By making Ophel part of the City of David, we have an explanation of two passages in Nehemiah which seem not to admit of any other conclusion. In giving the detail in chap. iii. of those who repaired the walls, Nehemiah names in order, passing from west to east, verses 13-15, the valley [of Hinnom] gate, and "one thousand cubits on the wall from this the Dung gate," and then "the gate of the Fountain." This, he says, "Shallun repaired, and the wall of the Pool of Siloah by the king's garden, and unto the stairs that go down from the *City of David*," ver. 15. We are now, therefore, while still in the vicinity of the Pool of Siloam, quite close to the City of David, "at the stairs that go down from it." This is confirmed by the words immediately following: "Nehemiah repaired unto the place over against the *sepulchres of David*." And that we are now entering upon the wall that surrounded *Ophel*, which adjoined to the Temple, and was the residence of the priests and other servants of the Temple, is evident from the succeeding list of those who repaired the walls: "the Levites," ver. 17, one of whom had to repair "unto the door of the

house of the high priest," ver. 20; "the priests of the plain [of Jordan]," ver. 22; "the Nethinims," ver. 26; and the rest of "the priests repaired every one over against his house," ver. 28. Of these it is expressly said, ver. 26, that "the Nethinim dwelt in Ophel," and ver. 27, that "the Tekoites repaired even unto the wall of Ophel." It seems impossible to evade the conclusion that Ophel formed part of the City of David.

But should any doubt remain, it will be removed by comparing the account of the dedication of the wall in Neh. xii. Two companies started from about the middle of the western wall and met from the opposite sides in the Temple. Of the company which went "on the right hand toward the Dung gate," ver. 31, it is said, that "at the Fountain gate they went up by the stairs of the City of David, at the going up of the wall above the house of David, even unto the Water gate eastward," ver. 37. From this it is evident that immediately on passing the Fountain gate, they were in the city of David, for they ascend "the stairs of the City of David," and pass "the house of David," and proceed onwards till they reach the Water gate of the Temple.

It may be remarked, by the way, that this very passage is a sufficient proof that the higher city on the west hill is not the true Zion; for had "the stairs of the City of David" led up to it, the wall and the company that followed its course must first have turned back westward to ascend it, then have descended again down the steep ravine of the Tyropocon, and after crossing it have ascended again Ophel before they could reach the Temple.

The same conclusion, that Ophel formed part of Akra, seems to follow from two passages in Josephus's Jewish Wars. In vi. 6. 3, we read: "The Romans set fire to Akra, and to the place called *Ophlas*; at which time the fire proceeded as far as the palace of Queen Helena, which was in the middle of Akra." And again, in vi. 7. 2: "On the next day the Romans drove the robbers out of the lower city, and set all on fire as far as Siloam." The obvious inference is, Siloam being at the south extremity of Ophel, that Ophel must have formed part of Akra, or the lower city.

It would be an interesting subject of investigation for Lieut. Warren to ascertain whether any traces are still to be found near to Siloam of "the steps that led up to the City of David." "The sepulchre of David," too, must be sought for in the same vicinity — not, it seems reasonable to suppose, literally in the city, so as to defile it, but cut into the solid rock beneath it, and entering in from the valley.