

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. XI

AUGUST, 1846.

ARTICLE I.

TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

By E. Robinson, Professor at New York.

IN the Preface to the Bibliotheca Sacra for the year 1843, I made allusion to intimations which had reached me from various quarters, that some of the positions taken in the Biblical Researches in respect to the topography of Jerusalem, were "likely to be assailed, in carrying on a *crusade* in favor of the reputed site of the Holy Sepulchre."

These anticipations have since been realized. During the last year (1845), two works appeared,—one in London, a thick octavo; the other in Berlin, a brief memoir,¹—giving the results of new speculations upon the topography of the Holy City; and devoted mainly to the support of a new theory as to the course of the ancient walls, by which the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre might be brought without the ancient city. These volumes, from the reputed scholarship of their authors and the advantages enjoyed by them during a long residence upon the spot in official stations, might seem justly to claim a higher degree of authority, than almost any former work upon these topics.

¹ THE HOLY CITY; or Historical and Topographical Notices of Jerusalem; by REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, M. A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; and late chaplain to Bishop Alexander at Jerusalem. Lond. 1845. 8vo. pp. 512. Published in April, 1845.

JERUSALEM; eine Vorlesung, von DR. ERNST GUSTAV SCHULTZ, königlich Preussischem Consul in Jerusalem. Mit einem Plane, gezeichnet von H. KIMPERT. Berlin, 1845. 8vo. pp. 120. Dated in June, 1845.

Indeed, I know of no work which can compete with them in all these (and perhaps some other) respects, except the folios of Quaresmius, who was for many years Superior of the Latin convent in Jerusalem.

Of the first of these works, that of the English chaplain, it is the express and avowed object, to controvert and (if possible) to overthrow the positions of the *Biblical Researches*, in respect to the alleged site of the Holy Sepulchre and the authority of the tradition on which it professedly rests.¹ The infallibility of the church, or rather of the hierarchy, in this particular, is to be maintained at all hazards; and to this end the "believing spirit" of both writer and reader is put in full requisition,—even a faith which shall be able to 'remove mountains,' and thus impart a new aspect to the whole topography of the Holy City. So earnestly is this author devoted to his one main object, that the topographical portion of his volume approaches nearly to the nature of a controversial commentary upon the *Biblical Researches*; so much so, indeed, that it can hardly itself be intelligible to the reader, without constant reference to the latter work. Of this I cannot well complain. The spirit of the book is truly that of a *crusade* in behalf of the Holy Sepulchre.² It may also be a circumstance worth notice, that this author, during a residence of fourteen months in Jerusalem, does not appear to have made a single new measurement, nor to have brought to light a single new topographical fact or remnant of antiquity; unless it be the few doubtful remains along the street of the Bazars, by the aid of

¹ Holy City, Pref. p. vi: "I do not hesitate to declare that one object of the present volume is to expose the fallacy of many conclusions, argued out very often on insufficient premises, or in contravention of historical or topographical phenomena, by the author of the *Biblical Researches* in Palestine; in the hope that the consideration of facts, which he has either overlooked or neglected, may prove, what some might imagine required no demonstration, that the evidence of a partial witness of the nineteenth century is insufficient against the voice of catholic antiquity. My motive I need not be ashamed to avow."—*Ibid.* p. 252: "If any apology be required for attempting a defence of the tradition relating to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, it is offered in the consideration that the credit of the whole church for fifteen hundred years, is in some measure involved in the question."

² This author in two instances, charges me with perverting or misrepresenting the statements of Eusebius and of Lightfoot; *H. City*, p. 129. n. p. 371. n. If the reader takes interest enough to examine the original language of these two writers, (not Mr. W's paraphrase of Eusebius, nor another man's Index to Lightfoot,) he will find that the charge of misrepresentation falls only on the head of him who made it.

which he endeavours to sustain his theory respecting the course of the ancient second wall.¹

The work of the Prussian consul has in general the same main object, though less openly and definitely presented. According to this writer, the topography of Jerusalem includes two distinct and independent investigations,—the history of the Jewish temple, and the history of the church of the Holy Sepulchre. He confines himself entirely to the latter topic; and admits that this alone gives occasion for his going back in the history of Jerusalem beyond the time of its destruction by Titus and its restoration by Adrian.² Following the English writer, to whom he ascribes the idea, he adopts the like course for the ancient second wall; and agrees further with him in transferring the position of the hill Akra to the north of the temple. In all other important points the German writer differs from the other; and accords mainly with the Biblical Researches. The memoir is written in a kind and friendly spirit; in this respect contrasting strongly with the work of the Cambridge Fellow.—The accompanying Plan by Kiepert is beautifully got up. On comparison, however, I am unable to discover, that either the topographical outlines or details differ in any obvious particular from those of the Plan in the Biblical Researches. The author has, indeed, liberally inserted the current legendary sites; and has marked hypothetically the places of various ancient edifices and of some historic events and monuments. The style of engraving, too, and of colouring, contributes to give the whole a new and pleasing aspect.

In respect to these works, then, it would appear, that the points of agreement which they exhibit, relating mainly to the defence of the reputed Sepulchre, are the result, not of the independent investigations of different observers, made at different times and without the knowledge of each other; but, rather, of continued personal intercourse and influence in behalf of a definite and favourite object. Yet the claims to authority which these volumes seem to present; the credit with which they are received by some in England and Germany; and the circumstance that travellers, in their brief visits to the Holy City, have, in some instances, already yielded, and probably will hereafter yield, their assent to the same views;³ have led me to investigate anew the

¹ Holy City, p. 286 sq. These remains are more fully considered at the close of the present Article.

² Schultz, p. 50.

³ LORD NUGENT, *Lands Classical and Sacred*, Vol. II. Lond. 1845.—C. Tisch.

evidence on which my former conclusions were founded. My sole purpose is and ever has been, I trust, to ascertain the truth. I have no prepossessions for tradition as such, nor against it. I have none for the Holy Sepulchre, so called, nor against it. If I could find satisfactory evidence in its favour, (and all my original impressions were on that side,) I certainly should be among the foremost to acknowledge it, and to feel the influences connected with such a spot. But I cannot give up a conviction of truth, resting on the plain and simple evidence of the senses and of common sense, and corroborated fully by the facts of history, either because I may wish to believe differently, or because mere tradition teaches otherwise.

It will be the subject of the following pages, to bring out the results of these renewed investigations. My plan will be, not so much to examine in detail the positions taken by the writers above named, but rather simply to adduce the evidence from Josephus and other sources, upon which the various points in the topography of the Holy City must be severally determined. This evidence, as it seems to me, goes very far to establish conclusively the opposite of nearly every one of the positions assumed by the English writer.

Before proceeding further, it is proper to call attention to the fact, that however many the exceptions which the writers above named take against the positions of the Biblical Researches, they nevertheless do both of them accord fully with that work in respect to the following important particulars :

1. That Zion was the south-western hill of the city ; and still terminates towards the north, as of old, in a steep declivity adjacent to the street leading down from the Yâfa gate.¹
2. That Moriah, the site of the Jewish temple, was the place

ENDORF, *Reise in den Orient*, Vol. II. Leipz. 1846. This last work I know as yet only from notices in the German papers. The journey was undertaken in order to examine manuscripts for a critical edition of the Greek Testament. He refers to both the works above named. Lord Nugent refers to Schultz personally.

¹ H. City, p. 268 : " There is a street which runs down from the Jaffa gate. — Its course is at first immediately under the steep brow of Mount Zion, which rises on the right side, once precipitous, now slanted off by ruins ; but on the other side, i. e. on the left hand, there is not the slightest appearance of a rise ; — the whole ground north of Zion declining equally towards the east." See also p. 261, 235, 236. Schultz, speaking of the Anglican church, describes it as " situated on the north side of the Armenian quarter, over against the citadel, on the northernmost border of Mount Zion ;" p. 29. See too p. 28.

now occupied by the grand Mosk or Haram, on the east and north-east of Zion.¹

3. That the ancient tower just south of the Yâfa gate, is the Hippicus of Josephus; from which the first ancient wall ran eastward along the northern brow of Zion to the temple-enclosure.²

4. That the ancient remains connected with the present Damascus gate, are those of an ancient gate upon that spot, belonging to the second wall of Josephus.³

The importance of these admitted points will be seen as we advance. I proceed now to state, in the form of propositions, what I hold to be the truth respecting various other points, adding the proper evidence under each. It will be my endeavour to do this dispassionately and with fairness.—The reader will do well to have some one of the recent Plans of Jerusalem constantly at hand.

I.

The ΤΥΡΟΠΟΕΟΝ was a depression or ravine (φάραγξ) running down eastward from near the Yâfa gate. The hill ΑΚΡΑ, on which was the LOWER CITY, was the ridge immediately north of Zion and west of Moriah.

As the points involved in this proposition are fundamental in this whole discussion, I shall be pardoned for bringing forward the evidence in detail. This is found mainly in the description given by Josephus of the site and extent of the city; which is as follows:⁴

“The city was fortified by three walls, wherever it was not encircled by impassable vallies; for in that quarter there was but one wall. It was built, one part facing another (*ἀντιπρόσωπος*), upon two hills (*λόφοι*) separated by an intervening valley (*μέσσηφάραγι*); at which, crowded one upon another (*ἐπάλληλοι*), the houses terminated. Of these hills, the one having the Upper City, was much the higher, and was straighter in its extent. . . . The other hill, called Akra, and sustaining the Lower City, was gibbous (*ἀμφικυρτος*).⁵ Over against this was a third hill, naturally

¹ H. City, p. 315 sq. 348.—Schultz, p. 29.

² H. City, p. 261, 288, comp. 286.—Schultz, p. 57.

³ H. City, p. 285, 391.—Schultz, p. 60.

⁴ Joseph. Bell. Jud. V. 4. 1.

⁵ The adjective *ἀμφικυρτος*, lit. *curved on both sides*, is an epithet of the gibbous moon, as she appears in her second and third quarters, between the half and full moon. Thus Martianus Capella, lib. VI: *Primo [Luna] est cornicu-*

lower than Akra, and formerly separated by another broad valley (*καὶ πλατεία φάραγγι διατεγόμενος ἄλλη πρότερον*). But later, in the times when the Maccabees ruled, they threw earth into this valley (*εἰς τὴν φάραγγα ἔχουσαν*),¹ desiring to connect (*συνάψαι*) the city with the temple; and working down the height of Akra, they made it lower, so that the temple rose conspicuously above it. The valley called the Tyropoeon, which we have said divided the upper city and the lower hill, extends down (*καθήμεν*) quite to Sion. . . . But without, the two hills of the city were enclosed by deep vallies; and because of the steep declivities on both sides, there was nowhere any approach."

This passage of the Jewish historian furnishes several definite and important topographical inferences.

I. Akra lay between two vallies. One of these separated it from the Upper City, the Zion of Scripture; while the other, which was broader, divided it from Moriah. Now, immediately on the north of Zion and west of Moriah, there is a hill, which I have described as "the continuation, or rather the termination, of the broad ridge or swell of land," which exists on the northwest of the city and extends down into it, forming its northwestern part.² This language the English writer adopts; and goes on to say truly, that "the principal part of this high rocky ridge is without the city" on the northwest; and that the part within the city is, "the termination or declivity of a swell of land."³ This portion of a "high rocky ridge," which terminates steeply and abruptly over against the place of the temple, where it is separated from Moriah by a broad and now shallow valley running

lata, quam μνησιδὴ Græci vocant. Medilunia, quam dicunt διάτομον. Delina dimidiato major, quæ dicitur ἀμφίκυρτος. Mox plena, quæ dicitur πανσέληνος. So Suidas s. voc. τετρακτύς. Reland Palest. p. 852. The word does not signify the moon itself, but only marks a particular form; and when applied to a hill, it denotes simply the same shape, viz. *curved on both sides, gibbous*. No little confusion has arisen in respect to this passage, from not observing this distinction. Josephus is often represented as comparing Akra with the moon; of which, however, there is no trace in his language. Rosenm. Bibl. Geogr. II. ii. p. 210.

¹ This expression does not imply, that they so filled up the valley, as to obliterate all traces of it; such is not the meaning of the word *χώννυμι*. It may here signify one of two things, viz. either that the Maccabees by filling in earth raised the general level of the valley; or, that they built a mound or causeway across it. We shall see further on, that the former is here the probable meaning.

² Bibl. Res. I. p. 391.

³ H. City, p. 264, 265.

south from the Damascus gate, I held, and still hold, to be the Akra of Josephus. The other valley, the Tyropoeon, separating it from Zion, I found, and still find, in the depression commencing near the Yâfa gate, and running down eastward between this said portion of "a high rocky ridge" or "termination of a swell of land" on the north, and "the steep brow of Mount Zion" on the south.

This latter valley, the Tyropoeon, judging from the nature and appearance of the ground, was probably at first a narrow ravine (*πέρας*) immediately under the northern brow of Zion; serving as a drain for the waters falling on the adjacent part of Zion, and also for those on the southern declivity of the ridge above described as Akra. In process of time, this ravine itself has become gradually and wholly filled up with the ruins and rubbish of eighteen centuries.⁹ Yet its place and its former existence are still distinctly to be recognized along the street leading down from the Yâfa gate; which street now occupies the lowest line of depression between the the church of the Holy Sepulchre and Mount Zion. To the same effect is the testimony of Brocardus in the thirteenth century. He describes the same depression as commencing near the tower of David so called, and running down along the northern side of Zion; and he adds: "The ravine itself is now wholly filled up; yet there remain vestiges of its former concavity."²

In like manner, the valley running southward from the Damascus gate, as it was broader than the former, so it was doubtless originally a much deeper ravine than at present. This is shown

¹ H. City, p. 268.

² "The Tyropoeon has of course been much filled up. In laying the foundations of the Anglican church on the northern part of Mount Zion, while I was there, the workmen dug through nearly *forty feet* of rubbish; and the accumulation in the valley would naturally be greater." Letter of Rev. J. Wolcott.—The author of the Holy City has an occasional fling at the idea of so much rubbish in Jerusalem; p. 284. n. 3. Yet he sometimes finds it convenient to appeal to it himself. Thus "the steep [northern] brow of Zion, once precipitous, [is] now slanted off by ruins," p. 268; and an old gateway near the top of the same brow is "so much choked up with rubbish, that the key-stone is nearly on a level with the street," p. 286. Now all this being so, and that too adjacent to the very spot in question,—to say nothing of other more striking instances,—it surely can require no great effort to admit, that the ravine in question, peculiarly exposed (as it was) to receive ruins and rubbish from above, may thus have been filled up, as represented in the text.

³ Brocardus, cap. VIII: *Verum nunc vorago ipsa tota repleta est, relictis tamen vestigiis prioris concavitatis.*

by the nature of the ground on each side; the valley being still skirted, on one side or the other, by ledges of precipitous rock quite down to Siloam. This ravine, originally so deep, separated at first the temple from Zion and also from Akra; and thus isolated it from the rest of the city. It was in order to connect the temple with the lower city, that the Maccabees heaped up earth in the valley; thus either raising its bed or forming a mound across it; while at the same time they lowered the point of Akra, which before had commanded the temple.¹

We thus find an Akra north of Zion and west of Moriah, separated from these hills by two vallies, one on each side of it; and corresponding thus far very definitely to the description of Josephus.

If now, on the other hand, we follow the theory of the writers in question, then the valley running south from the Damascus gate becomes the Tyropoeon; and the hill on the east of this valley and north of the Haram, was Akra. But where the other valley is or was, which in that case separated this hill from Moriah, they have nowhere definitely told us. The English author does not anywhere even allude to a valley, either as existing or as having existed, between his Akra and Moriah; except once very slightly, where he speaks of a "sloping ridge" on the north of the present Haram-area, and "presumes" that here the broad valley was filled up by the Maccabees.² The German writer is somewhat more definite. According to him, "the valley which formerly divided Akra from Moriah must have passed through the middle of the parallelogram which constitutes the present enclosure of the Haram."³ Indeed, he finds on the east of the Haram, directly opposite the grand Mosk, the ground outside to be of such a nature, "that traces of an artificial filling up may *perhaps* still be recognized."⁴ Not to press here the obvious remark, that such a 'perhaps' is quite too uncertain a basis on which to found so important a conclusion; it is nevertheless very apparent, that a disagreement like this between two such writers, is fitted in itself to awaken strong doubts as to the soundness of the whole hypothesis.

But we may go further, and may perhaps find it not difficult to

¹ Jos. Antt. XIII. 6. 6. See p. 418. n. 1.

² H. City, p. 280.

³ Schultz, p. 55.

⁴ Ibid. "dass sich vielleicht noch jetzt die Spuren der künstlichen Ausfüllung erkennen lassen."

show, both by the authority of these writers themselves and from the nature of the ground, that there never was a valley or depression on the north side of the present Haram-area; nor any valley, properly so called, on the north of Moriah, between it and the adjacent hill.

Both writers assume, that the fortress Baris or Antonia of Josephus was equivalent to the Akra or earlier fortress erected by Antiochus Epiphaneus, overhanging and commanding the temple.¹ This latter doubtless gave its name to the hill on which it stood; and this name remained to the hill and also to the quarter of the city long after the fortress itself was demolished, and the point of the hill lowered. The assumption is, that the earlier Akra of Antiochus stood upon the site of the later Baris or Antonia, on the north of the temple. The English writer also insists, that the northern limit of the ancient temple-area was identical with that of the present Haram-area.² Now, if the fortress Akra stood on the north of the temple, the broad valley by which it was divided from the latter, must, according to this view, have lain between this northern limit of the Haram, and the now precipitous rock of the adjacent hill; which rock once obviously extended further south, and has been cut away. The interval is here less than one hundred feet,³ and is occupied by the *Via dolorosa* and the Governor's house so called. But this writer himself affirms, and brings good evidence to show, that "this building, probably occupying in part the site of the ancient fortress Antonia, rests upon a precipice of rock which formerly swept down abruptly, and has obviously been cut away to form the level below [within the wall of the Haram], which also bears marks of having been scarped. This rocky precipice rises to a height of upwards of twenty feet."⁴ Here then we have the site of Antonia, and of course of the earlier Akra, identified with that of the Governor's house, in immediate contact with the temple-area as assumed; and we have further the rock of the northern hill described as originally extending south through the Governor's house, and also for some distance within the same area. Now,

¹ H. City, p. 351. Schultz, p. 54, 55.—Jos. Antt. XII. 5. 4. XIII. 6. 6.] Macc. 1, 33. We shall have occasion to see hereafter, that this hypothesis is without solid foundation.

² Holy City, p. 328, 329, 341.

³ Catherwood in Bartlett's Walks about Jerusalem, p. 162. Ed. 2.

⁴ H. City, p. 322; see also p. 319, 353. The author here quotes in part from Bartlett's Walks, etc. p. 143. Ed. 2.

each of these representations is conclusive against the possibility of any valley between that area and the adjacent northern hill.

The German author differs from the other, in supposing (with the Biblical Researches) that the fortress Antonia occupied the northern portion of the present Haram-area.¹ According to him, therefore, the earlier Akra must have been within the same enclosure; and as it was upon a hill, and separated from the temple by a valley, its site is thus necessarily determined to the north-western part of the present enclosure. Josephus testifies, that the hill was dug away, and thrown into the valley.² But he also testifies, that in later times the acropolis of Antonia was upon the same north-western part of the enclosure, and was situated on a rock fifty cubits high,³—on the very spot where, according to the theory, the hill sustaining the fortress Akra had been levelled. It follows, therefore, that the Akra must have occupied some other position, not within the present enclosure; and then the hypothesis of a valley running from west to east through the middle of the enclosure, falls away of itself.—But aside from these considerations, the idea, that from the valley running south from the Damascus gate and joining the valley of Jehoshaphat below Siloam, a lateral valley should branch off opposite the middle of the Haram, and there break through the ridge into the valley of Jehoshaphat, is, to say the least, contrary to geological analogy, and amounts to a physical improbability. If, further, the testimony of Mr. Bartlett is correct, that “the natural foundation of rock,” which is seen in the north-western part of the Haram-area, “extends beyond the great mosk in the centre,”⁴ then the idea of such a valley involves also a physical impossibility.

These results, as we have seen, are thus far clear inferences from the positions and statements of the two works in question. According to my own view, the long narrow tract lying between the valley running down from the Damascus gate on the one side, and the valley of Jehoshaphat on the other, is to be regarded as one ridge, having on it, as separate summits, the northern hill and Moriah; and corresponding further down with the ancient quarter Ophel.⁵ This ridge descends very steeply towards the south; so that Moriah was naturally much lower than the northern hill. The space between them, therefore, originally presented perhaps

¹ Schultz, p. 54.

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

³ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 4. B. J. V. 5. 8.

⁴ Walks, etc. p. 143. Ed. 2.

⁵ Bibl. Res. I. p. 333, 393.

no depression at all; or, at most, it was in the nature of an indentation or saddle between two summits on the same ridge, one much lower than the other. Such an indentation has no feature of a valley, and is never so called.¹ Much less could it have been the broad valley (*φάραγξ*) by which, according to Josephus, Akra was separated from Moriah.

It follows then, thus far, that the language of Josephus respecting Akra and the vallies which skirted it, is exactly applicable to the hill or ridge on the north of Zion and west of Moriah; but is wholly inapplicable to the hill on the north of Moriah.

II. A second inference from the passage of Josephus above quoted, is, that the two parts of Jerusalem, called the upper and lower city, Zion and Akra, were so situated as to face each other (*ἀντιπρόσωπος*); and being separated by the valley (*μέσηφάραγξ*) of the Tyropoeon, and by that alone, they lay side by side or adjacent to each other. This description again is directly applicable to Akra, regarded as the hill or ridge on the north of Zion and west of Moriah.—If, on the other hand, the hill on the north of Moriah be assumed as Akra, and the valley from the Damascus gate as the Tyropoeon, then Akra was *not* adjacent to Zion, nor did it face it, nor was it separated from it only by a single valley; but between these two hills there lay *two* vallies with an intervening ridge; and the distance between the nearest points of Zion and Akra was more than a quarter of a mile. It follows, that if the northern brow of Zion remains undisturbed, then Akra is the ridge adjacent to it on the north; or, if the hill on the north of Moriah be Akra, and the adjacent valley the Tyropoeon, then Zion must be extended so as to include the ridge on the north of it quite to the verge of that valley. This cannot be done; and no one probably will ever attempt it. If therefore Zion is right, then the Akra of these writers is wrong; if their Akra be right, then Zion is wrong. Both cannot be right; and they are thus left upon the sharp horns of a dilemma.²

III. The same passage of Josephus informs us further, that "Zion was straighter in its extent" or length; while Akra was gibbous (*ἀμφοίκυρος*).³ Accordingly, we find Zion to be straight upon its whole western side; as also upon its southern and northern sides. Akra too, if it be the hill on the north of Zion, the

¹ The Mount of Olives, with its two indentations between the three summits, is an example in point on a larger scale.

² See also Bartlett's Walks, etc. Ed. 2. App. p. 248.

³ See the note on this word, above, p. 417. n. 5.

termination of a ridge or swell running down into the city, is gibbous; that is to say, it has the general form of one end of the gibbous moon; and thus answers to the description of Josephus. But if the hill north of Moriah be Akra, then this description does not apply to it at all; for in no possible shape or sense can that hill be said to be gibbous or ἀμφίκυρος. Upon that hypothesis, therefore, the language of Josephus is without any significance.

IV. In another parallel description of the temple, Josephus informs us,¹ that on the western side of the area there were four gates; one issuing by the bridge to Zion and the royal palace; "two leading into the suburb (εἰς τὸ προάσπιον); and the remaining one conducting to the other city by many steps down into the valley (βαθμῶσι πολλαῖς διελεγμένη), and thence up again upon the ascent (ἐπὶ τῆν πρόσβασιν); for the city lay over against the temple (ἀπεναντὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ), in the manner of a theatre, being encircled by a deep valley on all its southern quarter."

Of these gates, the two leading to the suburb are not described as having steps connected with them; and from the nature of the case, therefore, these must have been the two northernmost, issuing from the temple-area where the ground outside was less depressed than further south. They led probably by a street along or near the valley to the ancient gate now known as that of Damascus; and so conducted to the suburb beyond, or also to Bezetha on the right. The remaining or fourth gate, then, was south of these; and led by steps (as at the present day in this part) down into the same valley where it was already deeper, and so up the ascent to "the other city." This latter, as mentioned after the royal palace on Zion, can only mean the lower city or Akra. Here then is direct testimony by the Jewish historian, that Akra formed part of the general acclivity on the west of Moriah; and the whole city, lower and upper, Akra and Zion, rose like an amphitheatre over against the temple; and was terminated on the south by the deep valley of the sons of Hinnora. It is easy to see, that this description is in no way applicable to the hill on the north of the temple.

The English author, it is true, seeks to change the relative position of these western gates. He places that leading to the "other" or lower city, with its many steps into the valley, on the north of those conducting to the suburb; contrary to the nature of the ground, which here even now descends rapidly towards

¹ Jos. Antt. XV. 11. 5.

the south, where it is much lower. He then insists quite strenuously, that this suburb must therefore have been on the west of the temple, situated between Zion and his Akra, and of course within the second wall of Josephus.¹ From these premises it follows, that a suburb, which is usually regarded as being outside of the wall of a city, and which Josephus here expressly mentions as *before* the city (*τὸ προάστειον*), was situated in this case in the very heart of Jerusalem, intervening between Zion and Akra; which, however, according to Josephus, were separated only by a ravine. Again, in behalf of the fourth gate, which he regards as the northernmost, this author abandons his Akra on the north of the temple only, and makes a lower city across the valley on the west of the temple;² whereas Josephus says that the *hill* Akra sustained the lower city.³ And further, although the same writer insists, that the intermediate space between Zion and his Akra is "called by Josephus 'the suburb,' as belonging strictly to neither part of the city;"⁴ yet in this place and elsewhere he makes the lower city include the said suburb; notwithstanding the obvious fact, that Josephus in the passage here under consideration expressly distinguishes them.

OBJECTIONS. The preceding four heads of direct evidence drawn from the testimony of Josephus, would seem to furnish conclusive proof in favour of that position of Akra maintained in the Biblical Researches. It is proper here to examine the validity of the objections brought forward against that view. They are mainly founded on the same passage of Josephus, first above quoted; and, with one exception, are urged by the English writer alone.

1. It is said, that the language of Josephus "throughout plainly implies, that the city comprehended *the whole* of the two hills, Akra as well as Zion; that Akra was in fact a distinct hill," and not the mere "continuation, or rather the termination of a broad ridge or swell of land."⁵ But the language of Josephus neither expresses nor implies any such thing. The word *λόφος*, *hill*, is a term of general import, signifying any *elevation* or *rise* of land.⁶

2. "Josephus," it is further said, "asserts, that the *two hills* on

¹ H. City, p. 276—278.

² H. City, p. 277, 278. See also his Plan, opp. p. xiii.

³ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 1; see above, p. 417.

⁴ H. City, p. 273. See the Plan.

⁵ H. City, p. 264.

⁶ Heychius: *λόφος*· *ὕψηλός τόπος*, γῆς *ἐπανάστημα*, i. e. a high place, an elevation of ground. So Passow: *λόφος*, *Erderhöhung*, *Anhöhe*, *Hügel*.

which the city stood, 'were everywhere enclosed from without by deep valleys;' which is not true of the ridge north of Zion."¹ I have elsewhere referred to this expression of Josephus, in the following manner:² "If he (Josephus) here means the two particular hills of Zion and Akra, as the insertion of the Greek article (*οἱ τῆς πόλεως δύο λόφοι*) would seem to imply, the language is not literally exact; but if, as is more probable, this is a mere form of expression intended to embrace the whole site of the city, then it presents no difficulty." That this is the true view, and that 'the two hills' are here put by synecdoche for the whole city, I am the more persuaded; inasmuch as Josephus immediately adds, that "because of the steep declivities on both sides (*ἐκαστέρωθεν*) there was nowhere any approach." Now this last clause applies only to the city as a whole; and the preceding clause is therefore to be taken in a like acceptation. To the same effect, also, is another passage, where Josephus relates that "a broad and deep valley encompasses (*περιέχεται*) the city, comprehending within it the temple, which was strongly fortified with a wall of stone."³ Here again it is expressly the city as a whole, which is said to be thus encompassed; although in fact there is no valley on the whole northern and north-western quarter.—But whatever difficulty may be felt in respect to the passage in question as connected with the hill west of Moriah, the same exists in full force in relation to the proposed Akra on the north of the temple, as defined in the English work. The author himself testifies, "that the hill of [his] Akra does not slope down to the valley of the Kidron; the skirt of Bezetha, on which stands the church of St. Ann, being interposed."⁴ I do not vouch for the accuracy of this testimony; but it is good as against the witness himself. Of course, his Akra is no more "enclosed by a deep valley" than is that of the Biblical Researches; and the difficulty as to the "two hills," is in no degree lessened. Or, even if this Akra be regarded as extending quite to the valley of the Kidron; even then it is difficult to see, why the *two* hills, Zion and Akra, should be spoken of as enclosed by a valley, any more than the *three*, including Moriah. To account for this circumstance, we must still have recourse to a synecdoche.⁵

¹ H. City, p. 265.

² Bibl. Res. I. p. 414.

³ Jos. Antt. XIV. 4. 1.

⁴ H. City, p. 282.

⁵ The German writer endeavours to evade this last difficulty, by assuming that Akra and Moriah were reckoned as *one* hill! Schultz, p. 56, 57. The English author makes the same supposition more than once; H. City, p. 106, 265.

3. Again, it is said: "Josephus invariably speaks of Zion as higher than Akra;" while the Akra of the Biblical Researches is "considerably higher than Zion."¹ Josephus does indeed *invariably* so speak of Zion; because he mentions the fact once, and only once; and this in the passage first above quoted.² But the historian there expressly refers to Akra as sustaining the *lower* city; that is, to the portion of the ridge which was within the second wall, and which alone was covered by the lower city. Let it be, that the same ridge further in the north-west beyond the second wall, even where included within the third wall, was and is higher than Zion. With all this the language of Josephus has nothing to do. He was not speaking of the interval between those walls; for this was not the *lower* city, but belonged to the suburb (*προάστειον*), or, as it was also called, the *new* city.

4. Once more it is said: "The broad valley which had once parted Akra from Moriah was filled up by the Asmoneans, so that these two hills became one;"³ and the conclusion is thence drawn, that this valley could not have been the present one on the west of the temple. Now, in this very statement there lies a *petitio principii*, which runs through the whole English volume. It consists in quietly taking for granted, that the valley in question was so completely filled up as to obliterate all traces of it; so that Akra and Moriah, which before were two hills, were now so united as to be but one hill. But the language of Josephus, as we have seen,⁴ neither expresses nor implies anything of the kind. He merely narrates, that the Maccabees desiring to connect (*συνάψαι*) the city with the temple, threw earth into the valley, and also lowered the height of Akra so that the temple rose above it. There is not a word about a valley obliterated, or of two hills made one.—Nor, even if the objection were well founded, does it help the matter in behalf of an Akra on the north of the temple. On the English writer's own authority, we have seen, that the whole northern part of the Haram-area, as well as the foundation of the Governor's house, is one mass of solid rock connected with the northern hill; utterly precluding the hypothesis that a valley could ever have existed there, and much less have been filled up.⁵

5. Another objection, one least anticipated and certainly enti-

¹ H. City, p. 266.

² See above, p. [417.]

³ H. City, p. 266.

⁴ See above, p. 418. n. 1. Jos. B. J. V. 4. 1, quoted and translated above, p. 417.

⁵ See above, p. 421.

led to the claim of originality, is urged by both writers. It consists in denying the existence of any valley or depression running down eastward from the Yáfa gate, where I have placed the Tyropoeon. In the margin the reader will find the statements of both writers in full; and has thus before him the whole strength of the objection and the testimony on which it rests.¹

It is averred, that from the northern declivity of Zion, "once precipitous, now slanted off by ruins," there is towards the north only level ground, and "not the slightest appearance of a rise, as a valley would require." Yet the same writer elsewhere speaks of the ground on the north, which I hold to be Akra, as being part "of a high rocky ridge;" not indeed "a distinct hill, but the termination or declivity of a swell of land."² The German author likewise speaks repeatedly of the church of the Sepulchre as originally situated upon "a rocky projection (Vorsprung) coming from the west, which overhung the adjacent parts of the city on the east;" and the elevation of which on the south side is now concealed by the ruins of the hospital of the knights of St. John.³ Now, where there is on one side a declivity "once precipitous, now slanted off by ruins;" and on the other side any portion of a "high rocky ridge" or "the termination of a swell of land;" it would be natural that there should be lower ground be-

¹ H. City, p. 267, 268: "I never could find any traces of the valley which Dr. R. calls the Tyropoeon. . . . However 'easy to be traced' this valley may be, I must confess that I could never discover it, during fourteen months' residence in Jerusalem, although I must have crossed it almost every day. . . . Here [along the street leading down from the Yáfa gate], if anywhere, this valley must be looked for. Its course is at first immediately under the steep brow of Mount Zion, which rises on the right hand, once precipitous, now slanted off by ruins; but on the other side, i. e. the left hand, there is not the slightest appearance of a rise as a valley would require; the whole ground north of Zion declining equally towards the east; so that every street running from south to north is completely level. . . . There is positively *not the slightest appearance of a valley here.*"—Schultz, p. 28: "This street [from the Yáfa gate] does not pass down in a valley, as you would be led to suppose from former Plans; but along the northern declivity of Zion, which naturally seems to become higher the more the street descends." Ib. p. 54: "I refer to my former remark, that there is no valley at all beginning at the Yáfa gate. At the utmost one might say, that the valley that comes from the north, from the Damascus gate, forms a bay between the church of the Sepulchre and the north side of Zion; which is occupied by the remains of the former edifices of the knights of St John. Or better still, it might be called a great terrace midway on the slope (*à mi-côte*) of the western hill."

² H. City, p. 265.

³ Schultz, p. 96; see also p. 30, 53.

tween the two, and that in passing from this lower ground towards either side, there should be some rise. This however, it would seem, is not according to the experience of the Cambridge Fellow.

It is further alleged, "that every street running from south to north is completely level." Now, this strong averment must be taken with some grains of qualification. The street running from south to north along the depression next to the Haram, can hardly be 'completely' level; for the ground here descends very rapidly towards the south, as is shown by the parallel wall of the Haram. Again, the street that runs northward from the Yâfa gate to the Latin convent, with a branch leading off to the upper part of the Greek convent, has "a considerable ascent," as the same writer affirms, using my words with emphasis; and even asserting further, that the street "becomes steeper as you approach the Latin convent."¹ These two streets, therefore, the uppermost and lowermost of the city, I presume, are not to be taken into the account. We have then remaining three streets, viz. one on the west of the church of the Sepulchre; another next below leading from the bazars along on the east of the same church; and a third still lower down, which is shorter. The last two of these streets extend northwards quite to the Damascus gate; and in so doing both of them descend a steep declivity to or across the *Via dolorosa* and the low ground north of it. Indeed, so steep is here the descent, that the lane leading northwards from the hospital of Helena so called, is carried down to the *Via dolorosa* by steps cut in the rock. This northern portion of these streets, therefore, this writer probably did not intend to include in his broad averment; but only the part between Zion and the brow of this "ridge" or "swell of land." This brow or crown of the ridge, would be very nearly indicated by a line drawn from the north-west angle of the city-wall, so as to pass just on the north side of the church of the Sepulchre to the front of the said hospital of Helena.

¹ H. City, p. 266. n. 1. Yet two pages further on, the same writer uses the following language, p. 268. n. 2: "Dr. R. attempts to alter the ground here, and to make a declivity from the Latin convent towards the south-east, in order to form the bed of his Tyropoeon." This passage is in direct contradiction to that quoted in the text. It comes then to this; that where it is desirable to this author to show that the Akra of the Biblical Researches is higher than Zion, then my language does not make the street running up to the Latin convent steep enough; but when the object is to represent the same Akra as not a hill, and the streets leading across it as 'completely level,' then I am charged with attempting "to alter the ground here and make a declivity!"

This ridge, thus steep on its northern or northeastern side, slopes off much more gradually on the south towards Zion. There, at the base of Zion, it was originally bordered (as I hold) by the narrow ravine of the Tyropoeon, as above described;¹ into which the water from it flowed, and the place of which is now apparently occupied by the street leading down from the Yâfa gate. Of the three last mentioned streets, which run from south to north and cross the said ridge, I can speak from personal observation only of the two westernmost. The third or easternmost I do not remember ever to have visited in its southern part; nor do I know of any traveller or writer who mentions it.² In respect to the other two, running one above and the other below the church of the Sepulchre, and forming principal streets of the city, I have elsewhere remarked, that the ascent towards the north, which is so "considerable" in the street nearest the Yâfa gate, is in them "less perceptible".³ Now this may arise from various causes. The crown of the ridge itself descends very rapidly towards the south-east; and of course the slope of the southern declivity diminishes at every step. It may be, too, that the relative direction of these streets is such as to carry them horizontally along the face of the hill; so that if the direction were a little changed towards the west, they would ascend more; or if towards the east, they would even descend. Or still further, it must be borne in mind, that for nearly eighteen centuries this quarter has been the centre of the city; and subject in every age to overthrow and desolation. Between these very streets once stood the famed edifices of the knights of St. John; of which only fragments now remain to mark the outline. If then the northern brow of Zion "once precipitous" is "now slanted off by ruins;" if adjacent to the citadel many remains of walls and buildings were discovered in digging deeply for the foundations of new barracks;⁴ if in the Jewish quarter on Zion, in preparing for the building of a synagogue, whole rooms and dwellings were uncovered from the rubbish in which they had been buried;⁵ if in the excavations for the Anglican church in the same quarter bevelled stones and capitals of columns were thrown out from the depth of thirty or forty feet, and an ancient aqueduct was uncov-

¹ See above, p. 419.

² No distinct reference is made to this street in the English volume.

³ *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 391.

⁴ *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 459.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 361.

ered more than twenty feet below the surface;¹ if all this be so, it surely is not too much to presume, that in this still lower tract the accumulation of the rubbish of so many centuries may have greatly changed the character of the surface; filled up the narrow ravine of the Tyropoeon; and rendered the gradual southern declivity of Akra less distinct and perceptible.

In regard however to these two streets next above and below the church of the Sepulchre, there may be some question, whether even in this their southern portion they are so strictly and "completely" level. They are both quite narrow, and paved in the manner usual in Palestine, having a deep trench or channel in the middle, which serves as a drain, and in which animals pass along in single file. Now, although these two streets, for some distance north of Zion, may be apparently nearly level; yet, after rain, the water (I think) would be found flowing off through these channels quite rapidly towards the south; certainly never towards the north. Indeed, the German author informs us, that along the street of the bazar, there is a large sewer, covered with broad flat stones, which runs from north to south.² All this of course has reference only to the portions of those streets lying south of the church of the Sepulchre. But in respect to the parts opposite or adjacent to that church, as well as in respect to the ground between them and further east in the same quarter, I am able to give more definite information; which may at least have the effect to lead to further examination.

The uppermost of these two streets, as I remember, on approaching from the south the rear of the said church, has very distinctly an ascent; and continues to rise gradually (if I mistake not) until it ends in the continuation of the *Via dolorosa*, which here comes up very steeply from the east. My own testimony to this fact does not stand unsupported; but is confirmed by that of a friend, whose accuracy is well known.³ As to the church itself, we have the testimony of the German writer, that "it lies upon a rocky projection (*Vorsprung*) coming from the west, which quite probably had a steep declivity towards the north and east; and the elevation of which on the south side is now concealed by the ruins of the buildings once belonging to the knights of St. John; these being filled up to the first story with rubbish. and

¹ Rev. S. Wolcott in *Biblioth. Sac.* 1843, No. I. p. 34. See also above, p. 419. n. 2. Bartlett's *Walks*, p. 82 sq. Ed. 2.

² Schultz, p. 61.

³ Rev. Eli Smith, now in this country.

occupied by a garden, from which one looks down into the streets as into trenches."¹ The street along the bazar, below the church, does not indeed make an ascent on reaching the corresponding point; but it is carried through what seems to be the crown of the ridge by a hollow way covered over on a level with the surface of the ground on each side, and high enough for loaded and mounted camels to pass through. The details are given in the note below, by a friend who resided for several months adjacent to the spot.² It is supposed by some, that the ground here on both sides is artificial; and that at least the garden on the east side, connected with the house occupied by Mr. Lanneau, rests upon the arched substructions of former edifices. Such subterranean arches upon the west side would be less probable. The whole region needs further examination; and I therefore state the matter hypothetically. Should it turn out that even one side only (the western) is of solid earth or rock, that would explain why the street makes no ascent; and would be sufficient for my argument.—Leaving now this street and passing down that which leads east by the hospital of Helena, we come after a few rods to the former house of Mr. Lanneau on the left.³ Entering through the front by a covered passage, we ascend several steps to an open court; under which is a large cistern, understood to be hewn in the rock. Thence several more steps lead up to the level of the garden and main dwellings. The impression which

¹ Schultz, p. 30, 31; comp. p. 53, 96.

² Rev. S. Wolcott, who writes to me as follows: "The street that leads north from the bazars to the Damascus gate, is arched over for a few rods, between the street that runs east by the hospital of Helena and the parallel street called the *Via dolorosa*. The arch is so high that loaded and mounted camels pass through it easily. The street is lighted by openings in the top; though in one section of it a part of the arch is now broken away. What depth of soil rests on the arch, I do not know; but the surface of it is on a level with the ground on either side; so that, unless the ground is artificial, the present street is a trench cut through a ridge. It cannot, I think, be less than twelve or fifteen feet deep; and, being covered, appears like a tunnel. The house occupied by Mr. Lanneau when you were in Jerusalem, and where I took up my quarters, is on the north side of the street that runs east by Helena's hospital. You first enter from the street a covered passage; then ascend several steps to an open court or pavement; and thence a few more to the garden. Crossing the garden westwards, you pass through a gate and come upon the terrace over the street above described, and across it upon ground of equal elevation. This latter is accessible by a path that ascends gradually from the street itself, on the west, commencing some distance south of the arched covering."

³ See the preceding note.

I received while sojourning in the house, was, that this ascent from the street was occasioned by the same rocky ridge, coming from the west and continuing towards the east; where it has further down a very steep descent along the street, and is in some places cut into steps.¹ This impression may be erroneous; but I have as yet seen no evidence to call it in question.

The bearing of all these facts and circumstances upon the question here at issue, is obvious. I may add, that during my visit to Jerusalem in 1838, the views maintained here and in the *Biblical Researches* respecting the Tyropoeon and Akra, were at the time topics of daily consideration and discussion between myself and the nine or ten American and English missionaries then congregated there, several of whom had for years resided in the city; and that it never occurred to any one of them to question the existence of a ridge or hill on the north of Zion, nor of a depression or valley (once deeper) running down from the Yafa gate between the two. The same depression is indicated very distinctly in the beautiful and accurate views of Jerusalem in folio published by Mr. Bartlett; as also in the earlier and splendid Sketches of Mr. Roberts.² I subjoin also in the margin the later testimony of an accurate observer to the same effect; I mean the Rev. Dr. Durbin, who visited Jerusalem in 1843.³

I present further, in full, the well considered testimony of two other gentlemen, given since the publication of the English work, and with express reference to the assertions of that work. The first is that of Mr. Bartlett, who, after speaking of the "hollow" on the north of Zion, writes as follows:⁴ "According to Mr. Williams, there is really no valley here at all. But while we admit

¹ The description which the German writer gives of this whole tract, as a bay setting up from the east, implies of itself a ridge or higher ground on the north, as well as on the south. See above, p. 428. n. 1.

² BARTLETT'S *Comparative Views of ancient and modern Jerusalem*, fol. Also on a small scale in his "Walks about Jerusalem."—ROBERTS' *Sketches*, etc. No. 11.

³ *Observations in the East*, l. p. 223: "We see that the ground on which it [the city] lies, is very unequal, but yet that it is clearly divided into four distinct parts by two valleys; the first commencing in the plain about the Damascus gate (in the northern wall); the second opening from the citadel, first eastwardly and then turning to the south, called the valley of the Tyropoeon or Cheesemakers. Four hills are thus distinguished, forming as many distinct quarters of the city."

⁴ *Walks about Jerusalem*, Ed. 2, App. p. 247.

with him, that the streets running north and south *across Akra*, are nearly or quite level, still it is equally true, that taking the line from the church of the Sepulchre obliquely down to the Jews' Wailing Place, there is a palpable descent, though certainly not answering in abruptness to the opposite cliff of Zion." The other is from the Rev. Eli Smith, who was again in Jerusalem in the year 1844, and thus writes:¹ "Draw a line along the ridge of Akra from the northwest corner of the city-wall so as to pass just upon the north side of the church of the Sepulchre; and another along the northern brow of Mount Zion from the citadel; and there would be a decided depression between them, into which water would run from both. This is according to the best of my recollection."

The preceding facts and testimony will enable the reader to put a right estimate upon the assertions of the English writer.

6. A further and last objection to the position of the Tyropoeon and Akra as maintained in the *Biblical Researches*, is not indeed stated in so many words, but is nevertheless everywhere implied in the English volume, and amounts to this, viz. that such a view rests only on "the evidence of a partial witness of the nineteenth century." The impression everywhere and obviously intended to be left on the mind of the reader, is, that the view in question is a novel one, first broached by the author of the *Researches*, without authority, and unknown to the scholars of preceding centuries. Nor is there in the whole work anything to counteract this impression. Not an allusion is made throughout the whole to any former traveller or scholar, as having entertained the same opinions. The German writer is more just; and correctly regards the *Researches* as representing in these points, opinions long prevalent; and as only following out in respect to the Tyropoeon and Akra the conjectures of former writers.² This is the true state of the case; for so far is the view maintained by me in relation to these two points from being a novel one, that it is in fact the very earliest of which we have any record, and goes back at least to the centuries of the crusades. In these particular instances, all that the author of the *Biblical Researches* has ever supposed himself to have accomplished in the way of novelty, is, to have shown more carefully than before, the coincidence of the description of Josephus with the actual physical and historical features of the Holy City.

¹ Manuscript Letter. Dec. 1845.

² Schultz, p. 53, 54.

The first writer on Jerusalem, so far as I have been able to discover, who refers at all to Josephus and attempts to apply his details to the actual features of the place, is the monk Brocardus, about A. D. 1283; to whom we are indebted for the topography of the Holy Land and Holy City, according to the views current in the age of the crusades.¹ He states distinctly, that a valley descended from the tower of David [Hippicus] along the northern side of Zion quite to Moriah, and there turned south; it thus separated Moriah and also the whole lower city from Zion, and was extended quite down to the Kidron. The upper part of this valley was already filled up in his day, yet there remained vestiges of its former concavity.² He then goes on to speak of a supposed but fabulous valley, which, commencing at the same tower of David, was held to have run northwards and formed the western fosse of the city quite to the northern border. Adjacent to this valley, as was supposed, on the inner (eastern) side, rose the rock called by Josephus *Arra* (Akra); while outside of the same valley towards the west was the place where our Lord was crucified. It is not necessary to follow the description any further. My only object is to show that Brocardus, five and a half centuries ago, held the same views as to the general position of Akra and the Tyropoeon, which are maintained in the Biblical Researches.

It is easy to see, that this writer was already pressed with the difficulty of reconciling the definite description of Josephus with the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre. The latter was to be preserved at all events; and therefore the account of the historian, while professedly followed, was sadly wrested. Thus, it is

¹ BROCARDI *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*; appended to Sanson's *Geogr. Sacra*, ed. Le Clerc, Amst. 1711, fol.

² Brocardus, cap. VIII: "Proinde vallis quae a turri David descendebat contra latus Aquilonare montis Sion usque ad montem Moria, et reflectitur in Orientem [Australium], separabat montem Moria—a monte Sion, et totam inferiorem civitatem, extendebaturque usque ad torrentem Cedron, per locum ubi nunc est porta aquarum inter montem Sion et palatium Salomonis, quod aedificatum fuit in parte Australi montis Moria," etc. Here the reading: "flectitur in Orientem," is obviously a *lapsus*, probably of a transcriber, instead of: "flectitur in Austrum." The course of the valley along the north side of Zion is nearly due east; and it is therefore an absurdity to say that the valley afterwards "turns to the east." Besides, from the point where it turns, it is said to pass "along the place where is now the Water-gate, between Zion and the palace of Solomon on the southern part of Mount Moriah,"—necessarily implying a southern course. See above, p. 419. and n. 3.

the third or outer wall, built by Agrippa long after the crucifixion, that Brocardus here makes to run below or on the east of the Sepulchre; as is evident from his naming the tower *Nebloas* (*Psephinos*) at the north-west corner.¹ The same difficulty has been felt by all succeeding writers, who, holding the tradition of the Sepulchre, have yet attempted to follow Josephus. Hence, probably, it is, that this writer has been very generally overlooked or disregarded by monks and travellers down almost to the present day. And thus, too, for the most part, it has been only the distant scholar in his study, who has striven so to apply the language of the Jewish writer as not to trench upon the authority of the church; or else has ventured to set aside tradition when arrayed against the clear light of history.

The next writers who refer to Josephus, are Adrichomius and the Jesuit Villalpandus, at the close of the sixteenth century; both of whom fully adopt in respect to the Tyropoeon and Akra the view which I have supported.² From them, probably, the traveller Sandys, who was at Jerusalem in 1611, derived the same view.³ About the middle of this seventeenth century, Lightfoot, by a wrong interpretation of a passage in the Psalms, and by his reliance on the Rabbins, was led into the error of placing Zion on the north of the Holy City, and Akra on the south; in which he was followed by Cellarius.⁴ This hypothesis was rejected by O. Dapper as early as 1677; though it was left for Beland in the next (eighteenth) century to furnish a terse and conclusive refutation.⁵ Reland in the same connection gives his own views in full, on the authority of Josephus; assigning to Akra its place on the north of Zion and west of Moriah.⁶ Next came the geographer D'Anville, who, commenting upon Josephus, adopts very

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 5. Brocardus, or the translator whom he followed, would seem to have read *Ψεφινός, neblisus*, instead of *Ψήφινος, ex calculis factus*. The fabulous valley was perhaps introduced in order to make out the deep valleys around the two hills; see above, p. 426.

² C. ADRICHOMIUS, *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae*, Col. Agr. 1590, etc. fol. p. 151, 152; also the Plan of Jerus. p. 145. VILLALPANDUS, *Apparatus Urbis et Templi Hieros.* in PRADI ET VILLALP. in *Ezech. Explanaciones*, etc. Tom. III. fol. Rom. 1604. This writer says: "Mons igitur hic [Acra] ad Aquilonem situs Sioni, ad Occidentem Moriae, describitur a Josepho his verbis," etc. p. 22. B.

³ SANDYS' *Travails*, etc. p. 122.

⁴ LIGHTFOOT, *Cent. Chorogr. Matthaeo praem.* c. 22. 23. His error was founded on Ps. 48, 2.—CELLARIUS, *Notit. Orbis*, II. p. 457 sq.

⁵ O. DAPPER, *Palestyn*, p. 311.—RELAND, *Paltesium*, p. 847 sq.

⁶ *Palaest.* p. 850—853.

decisively the same conclusions as Reland; and gives upon his Plan, for the first time, some of the results of a partial survey of the city, with a slight shading, by which he indicates the Tyropoeon in nearly its true course from the Yáfa gate.¹ During all these centuries, the travellers who visited Jerusalem added little to the stock of knowledge respecting its physical topography. Even the best of them, as Maundrell and Niebuhr, make no reference to Josephus; and Pococke, although he finds the Tyropoeon in the right position, and describes it as now occupied in part by the bazars, yet makes Akra extend the whole breadth of the city from west to east, and assigns to it *two* summits, one on the west and the other on the north of Moriah.²

Nor has much more light been shed upon the physical features and topography of the Holy City by the earlier travellers of the nineteenth century. Dr. E. D. Clarke in 1801 started his fancy of converting the valley of Hinnom into the Tyropoeon; but this, though favourably received for a time, is now only matter of history. Sieber's Plan was constructed in 1818, and served as the basis of those of Berggren and Catherwood; but it marks no physical features within the walls, except the site of the hill Bezetha, correctly placed on the north of the Haram. The Plan of Westphal, published in 1826, distinguishes the hills of Zion on the south and Akra on the north; but has otherwise no great correctness.³ Prokesch in 1829 is apparently the first traveller of the century, who speaks definitely of the hills within the city. He describes them as four in number; two, Zion and Akra, in the south-east and north-west; and two others, Moriah and Bezetha, on the east.⁴ The same general position of Akra, viz. north of Zion and west of Moriah, is assigned by the more distinguished sacred geographers of the present century, as Rosenmueller, Raumer, Crome.⁵ The Plans of the two latter, con-

¹ D'ANVILLE, *Dissertat. sur l'étendus de l'ancienne Jerusalem*, Paris, 1747; reprinted in the Appendix to Chateaubriand's *Itineraire*. He says: "La seconde colline [Akra] s'élevoit au nord de Sion, faisant face par son côté oriental au mont Moria," etc. p. 331, ed. Chateaub. See the Plan of Jerusalem upon D'Anville's Map of Palestine.

² POCOCKE, *Descr. of the East*, II. p. 7, 10, 12.—Pococke's statements are followed by Hamelsveld; see his Plan.

³ Hertha, Bd. I. 1825. Found also in Ackermann's Bible Atlas.

⁴ *Reise ins h. Land*, p. 61; comp. p. 43. Prokesch, following Lightfoot's view, takes the northwestern hill as Zion, and the southwestern as Akra.

⁵ ROSENMUELLER *Bibl. Geogr.* II. ii. p. 210.—VON RAUMER, *Palæstina*, Leips. 1838, p. 346—348.—CROME, art. *Jerusalem*, in Ersch und Gruber's *Encyclopædie*.

structed from the best materials then extant, exhibit the Tyropoeon in its proper place, separating Akra on the north from Zion on the south.

All this testimony is that of witnesses earlier than the year 1838, when my own visit to Jerusalem was made; the results of which were published in the *Biblical Researches* in the year 1841. The testimony of some later travellers has been already adduced.¹

Such then is the evidence derived from witnesses scattered over no less than seven centuries. I have adduced it here for two reasons; *first*, to demonstrate that the view maintained in the *Biblical Researches* as to the place of Akra and the Tyropoeon, is not a novel one resting only on "the evidence of a partial witness of the nineteenth century;" and, *secondly*, to show that although the Cambridge Fellow "never could find any traces of a valley" or depression where this view places the Tyropoeon, yet others, not less *impartial* than himself, both before and after him, have been less unsuccessful.

The discussion respecting the place of Akra and the Tyropoeon may here be brought to a close. It has been thus drawn out into minuteness of detail, because these points are fundamental in the topography of the Holy City. If the true position of Akra has now been made clear, the remaining topics will require only a briefer consideration.

II.

The hill BEZETHA was the hill immediately adjacent to the present area of the Haram, on its north-northwest quarter.

The main evidence respecting this hill is contained in two passages of Josephus; in both of which it is represented as in immediate contiguity with the fortress Antonia on the north of the temple.

The first passage is as follows:² "This [third wall] Agrippa placed around the city where it had been further built out (τῆ προσκτισθείσῃ πόλει); the whole of which part was naked. For the city, overflowing with the multitude of inhabitants, had by little and little crept beyond the walls; and the population having thus united to the city the parts on the north of the temple adjacent to the hill (καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὰ προσάρκτια πρὸς τῆ λόφος συμπολίζοντες), had advanced not a little; so that a fourth hill was now

¹ See above, p. 433 sq.

² Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2.

inhabited, which is called Bezetha, lying over against Antonia and separated from it by a deep excavation (*ὄρυγμα*). For a trench had been here dug through on purpose; lest the foundations of Antonia, being joined to this hill, should be easily accessible and less lofty. In this way the depth of the trench added very greatly to the elevation of the towers. In the language of the country this newly built part (*τὸ νεόκτιστον μέρος*) is called *Bezetha*; which, being interpreted in the Greek tongue, signifies the *New City*."

The second passage includes a reference to the first:¹ "The hill Bezetha was divided (*διήρθετο*), as I have said, from Antonia; and being the highest of all, it was built up contiguous to a part of the new city, and alone overshadowed the temple on the north (*καὶ μόνος τῷ ἱερῷ κατ' ἄρκτον ἐπασκότει*)."

The reader who has satisfied himself that Akra was on the west of the temple, will feel no hesitation in regarding the above language of the historian as having a clear and decisive application to the hill immediately on the northern, or rather north-north-western quarter of the present Haram. There are, further, in the language of Josephus certain specifications, which show that Bezetha could have been no other hill.

I. Bezetha was separated from the fortress Antonia by a deep artificial trench. Let now the exact position of Antonia have been what it may, so long as it was situated in or close upon the north-west quarter of the temple-area, the hill Bezetha thus divided from it by an artificial trench, could only have been the hill immediately contiguous. Indeed, there exists here only this one hill.

II. The hill Bezetha alone overshadowed the temple on the north. This applies directly and fully to the hill immediately on the north-northwest of the Haram-area; and by no possibility can it be referred to anything else.

III. In view of these facts, it would seem as if the English writer must have "overlooked or neglected" the testimony of Josephus, when he transfers the main hill of Bezetha to the north-east quarter of the city, outside of the present city wall.² Even

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 5. 8.

² H. City, p. 282: "There is a hill distinct from Akra [meaning here the hill north of the Haram], not mentioned by Dr. R., lying between it and the valley of the Kedron.—The highest point of this hill is nearly northeast of the summit of Akra; now without the city walls, and planted with olives; while the south, or lower part, is within the walls, and reaches down to the trench now

if such a hill existed in that region, it would be more than a quarter of a mile distant from the northern limit of the Haram-area; and very nearly as far also from the position of Antonia, even as assumed by that writer himself.¹ How then it, and it alone, could overshadow the temple on the north, or how it could be divided from Antonia only by an artificial trench, we are nowhere informed. There is also room for more than doubt, whether in fact, any such hill exists in that quarter. The surface of the ground is undulating, with occasional swells and hollows; but exhibits nothing that could in any circumstances be properly regarded as one of the four hills of the city mentioned by Josephus. The large Plans of Sieber and Catherwood indicate no hill in that vicinity; although they both give the eminence over the grotto of Jeremiah, so called, and although the former depicts even the mounds of ashes on the north of the city,² and also marks olive-trees on the very place of the alleged hill. The testimony of Schultz, upon his new Plan, is to the same effect; for, while he too inserts the grotto of Jeremiah and the mounds of ashes, he yet indicates no trace of any hill upon the north-east quarter of the present city.³

REMARKS. Before leaving this topic, two or three remarks connected with the above passages of Josephus, may not be out of place.

known as the 'Pool of Bethesda.' The hill of Akra does not slope down to the Valley of the Kedron, the skirt of Bezetha, on which stands the church of St. Ann, being interposed. In approaching the city from the north by the Damascus road, the two hills [this alleged Akra and Bezetha] are so distinctly marked that it is impossible to mistake them." This "skirt" of a supposed Bezetha is an undulation upon the eastern slope of the hill north of the Haram, formed by a slight depression, which according to Schultz (p. 32) extends south from the gate of Herod, so called. Such a "skirt" or "summit" of another Bezetha, is unknown to Schultz. Besides, how can such a "skirt" overshadow the temple? And where too was the deep trench which divided Antonia from it? There is at least reason in the remark of the English writer: "With regard to the fosse, I fear that cannot be found;" H. City, p. 355.

¹ H. City, Plan of Antonia, etc. p. 324.

² Bibl. Res. II. p. 95.

³ The theory of Schultz himself is, that Bezetha was the hill on the north-west of the Haram, as maintained in the text; and the hill Akra (on which stood the fortress Akra and, as he thinks, afterwards Antonia) was a prolongation of the hill Bezetha towards the south; while on his Plan the hill Bezetha is marked with the word *Akra* in the sense of the lower city; p. 56 bis. But, according to Josephus, the hill Akra sustained the lower city; and Bezetha was a fourth hill distinct from Akra and the lower city; see the citations in the text, also Jos. B. J. V. 4. 1

1. The historian in the first passage calls this northern hill *Bezetha*, and explains the word as meaning the *New City*; while in the last passage he distinguishes between the two, and speaks of the *hill* Bezetha as joined to the new city. The two are likewise distinguished in other places.¹ Probably the hill was the first place built upon, outside of the former wall, and thus received this name; which then continued to be its specific appellation after the other or *lower* new city had extended itself upon the plain. Hence, in the writings of Josephus, the term *Bezetha* seems always to designate the hill alone; while the new city, as such, has its own distinct name.²

2. Josephus says that the hill Bezetha was "the highest of all" (*πάντων ὑψηλότερος*). But the word "all" obviously does not here refer to all the hills of the city. The historian had just been speaking of the temple as the fortress of the city (exclusive of Zion), and of Antonia as the fortress of the temple; and he goes on to say, that the hill Bezetha, the highest of all *these*, (*viz.* the lower city, Moriah, and perhaps the rock of Antonia,) was on one side connected by its buildings with the new city, and on the other overshadowed the temple.³

3. The language of Josephus being thus decisive to show that the hill on the north-northwest of the Haram was Bezetha, it is therefore equally decisive to demonstrate *per se*, that this same hill could not have been Akra.

III.

The gate GENNATH, at which the second wall of Josephus began, was in the first or old wall NEAR TO the tower HIPPIOUS.

The evidence in support of this position is derived, partly from the nature of the ground, and partly from the notices and statements of Josephus.

The gate in question is mentioned by its name Gennath, only once in the writings of Josephus; and this, where he is describing the commencement and course of the three walls which protected Jerusalem on the north.⁴ The first or innermost of these

¹ Jos. B. J. II. 19. 4. Perhaps too ib. V. 12. 2.

² Thus the new city, as such, is called by Josephus: *ἡ καινὴ πόλις*, B. J. V. 5. 8. V. 8. 1; or *Καινόπολις*, ib. II. 19. 4; or also *ἡ κατωτέρω Καινόπολις*, ib. V. 12. 2. This last appellation, the *lower New City*, was probably used to distinguish it from the hill or higher ground on the south and west.

³ See the remarks of Villalpandus on both these points; Præd. et Villalp. • Explanat. in Ezech. Tom. III. p. 97.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2.

walls began at the tower Hippius, and ran (eastwards along the northern brow of Zion) to the Kystus, and so to the western part of the temple. "The second wall had its beginning at the gate called Gennath in the first wall; and encircling (*κυκλοῦμενος*) only the tract on the north, extended quite to Antonia." The third wall began also at the tower Hippius; and being carried north to the tower Psephinos, thence swept around over against the tomb of Helena, and so to the Kedron.

I. The gate Gennath then was in the first wall; and led out of Zion either into the lower city or into the open country on the north or north-west. The name Gennath (*Γεννάθ*, Heb. גַּנָּת, גַּנָּת, Aram. גַּנָּת) signifies *a garden*; and implies here a gate leading out to or near by a garden; equivalent to *Garden Gate*. Now, such a garden cannot well have been within the walls either of Zion or of the lower city. The population was too crowded; and the analogy of the king's gardens below Siloam is likewise against such a supposition. We must therefore look for it outside of the wall, on the north or northwest of Zion. The gate of Gennath, then, led out of Zion to the country, and not into the lower city.¹ But, for such a gate, the natural place is and was near to Hippius, not far south or southeast from the present Yafa gate; where the descent from Zion towards the north is, and must always have been, comparatively small and gradual. More towards the east, the steepness and apparent elevation of this northern declivity of Zion increase at every step;² and there, too, in ancient times stood the towers of Phasaelis and Mariamne, built in the first wall and connected with the royal palace. Josephus describes the elevation of Zion in this part as great (*λόφος ὑψηλός*); and speaks of the old or first wall along its brow, to say nothing of the towers and palace, as rising still thirty cubits above the hill.³ To assume therefore a gateway, leading out of Zion into the country, at any point not near to Hippius, would be against all probability.⁴

¹ So too the author of the "Holy City," p. 261. So likewise Schultz, p. 62.

² Schultz, p. 28: The street leads down "along the northern declivity of Zion, which naturally seems to become higher, the lower the street descends."

³ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 4.

⁴ The English author expresses himself still more strongly on this point; p. 262: The absurdity of supposing an exit for a city gate through such a royal palace, and down a precipice of thirty feet, is obvious, and need not be insisted on." "The same general idea I intended to convey by a remark in the *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 462: "It [the gate] could not have been far distant [from Hippius];

On the other hand, both the writers in question assign the place of the gate Gennath as having been on the northern brow of Zion, just above the street leading up south from the west side of the bazars.¹ This spot is about eight hundred feet distant from Hippicus. At this point, according to the English writer, there is "a sudden rise to Zion;" or, as he likewise calls it, "a steep declivity;" and, according to the German author, this northern declivity of Zion "seems to become higher, the lower the street [running east] descends."² Between this point, too, and Hippicus, stood the towers of Phasaelis and Mariamne, as also the royal palace, "along the northern brow of Zion, which was here a rocky eminence thirty cubits high."³ Taking into account, then, the nature of the ground, as described by both authors, it may be difficult to see, why we are not brought back by them, after all, to the "obvious absurdity of supposing an exit for a city gate . . . down a precipice of thirty feet."⁴ Nor does the fact of "a tradition of a gate" in this vicinity, "leading into Zion and still revered by pilgrims," when rightly understood, at all lessen the difficulty.⁵

because that part of Zion was then high and steep." This remark the same writer pronounces to be "perfectly unintelligible;"—"for," he says, "how a city gate could have an exit where a wall was carried along a perpendicular cliff thirty cubits high, I cannot understand;" p. 261. n. 3.—It may be remarked in passing, that this "thirty cubits" (not thirty feet) is not assigned by Josephus as the elevation of the hill, but as the height of the wall above the hill; B. J. V. 4. 4.

¹ H. City, p. 286. Schultz, p. 61, 62. See especially their Plans.

² H. City, p. 286. Schultz, p. 28; see note 2 on p. 442.

³ H. City, p. 261. See note 4 on p. 442.

⁴ H. City, p. 262. See above, p. 442. n. 4.—The English writer speaks of "a dip in the hill" in this part of Zion, "so marked that in passing from south to north . . . from near the Zion gate, you have little or no descent at all to the bazars;" p. 285. This language is, at least, exaggerated. This "dip," if any where, is according to this writer on the street leading up to Zion from the eastern side of the bazars; and is therefore some distance further east than the alleged place of the gate Gennath. What then it can have to do with the position of that gate, it may not be easy to see; and the mention of it in this connection can only serve to throw dust in the eyes of the reader. The "dip," if any really exists, may have been the effect of attrition, or perhaps partially of labour, in diminishing the steepness of a main thoroughfare, adjacent to what has been for many centuries the chief place of trade in the city.

⁵ H. City, 286. Schultz, p. 61, 62. This traditional gate, of which even Mr. W. says he "would not attach much importance to it taken alone," is the *Porta ferrea*, so called, of the monks; which their tradition regards as a gate "leading into Zion," through which Peter passed on his way from the prison to the house of the mother of Mark; Acts 12: 10, 12. H. City, *ibid.* Quares-

II. Josephus affirms that "the city was fortified by three walls, wherever it was not encircled by impassable vallies;"¹ that is to say, upon its whole northern quarter. But if the gate Gennath, at which the second wall began, was not adjacent to Hippicus; and especially, if it was so far distant as to be opposite the bazars; then all that tract of the upper city from Hippicus to the said gate, was fortified only by a single wall before the time of Agrippa; and by only *two* walls (instead of three) at the time of which Josephus wrote. The tract thus unprotected extended, as we have seen, about eight hundred feet; amounting to more than one half of the entire northern side of Zion, and to nearly one half of the whole length of the first wall.

III. That all this, however, was not so; but that the whole of Zion was actually protected on the north by these walls, appears further from the fact, that in every siege or capture of Jerusalem, (the approaches being always and necessarily made on the north or northwest,) no attack or approach is ever described as made against the *upper* city (Zion), until after the besiegers had already broken through the second wall and got possession of the *lower* city. But if the second wall began near the bazars, then (as we have seen) more than one half of the northern brow of Zion was not protected by it at all; and the possession of the lower city was not necessary in order to make approaches against the upper, and that too at the most accessible point,—the very point indeed, near to Hippicus, where the ground was most feasible, and where Titus actually made his assault *after* he had taken the second wall.² Josephus narrates three such instances of the capture of Jerusalem, viz. by Herod, Cestius, and Titus.³

mios II. p. 95. Unfortunately for tradition, this "iron gate," according to the Scripture, was the strong outer gate of the prison itself; which prison the same tradition places in the lower city, north of the pool of Hezekiah and not far south of the Church of the Sepulchre; Quaresmius, II. p. 89.—Both writers describe another "old gateway" in this part, "so much choked up with rubbish, that the key-stone is nearly on a level with the street;" H. City, p. 286. Schultz, p. 61, 62. But this gateway, even if ancient, (of which no evidence is adduced,) could not have belonged to the first wall, as the English writer admits; since it opens towards the west. Yet Lord Nugent thinks this may "not improbably have been the gate Gennath;" and as such he gives a drawing of it; II. p. 54, 55. To this view Schultz likewise seems to assent; p. 61, 62.

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 4. 1. See p. 417, above.

² Jos. B. J. V. 8. 1. V. 11. 4. VI. 8. 1.

³ Pompey laid siege only to the temple, the rest of the city having been opened to him; B. J. I. 7. 2. Antt. XIV. 4. 2.

Herod reduced the city about the year 33 B. C. some seventy years before the building of the third or Agrippa's wall.¹ The outer (afterwards the middle) wall was taken by him with great difficulty after forty days; the next, or external wall of the temple-area, after fifteen days more. In the words of Josephus: "The exterior temple and the lower city being thus captured, the Jews took refuge in the interior temple and the upper city."² These were afterwards taken by assault.

Cestius marched against Jerusalem about A. D. 66; some years after the completion of Agrippa's wall.³ The northern gates of the city were thrown open to him. He set fire to the hill Bezetha, to the Caenopolis or new city so called, and also to the timber-market (*δοκῶν ἀγορά*); and then "coming to the upper city, he encamped over against the royal palace. And had he been willing in that very hour to have forced his way within the walls, he might have taken the [upper] city upon the spot," and have put an end to the war. Instead of this he turned aside to assault the northern part of the temple; where the Roman soldiers came near to set fire to one of the temple-gates. That Cestius was already in full possession of the lower city, is apparent from this assault upon the temple; as we shall have occasion to see more fully hereafter.⁴

Titus first took the outer wall; then broke through the second wall into the lower city; was driven back, but speedily regained possession; and then, and not till then, he "laid his plans to assault the third wall" (*τῷ τρίτῳ προσβάλλειν ἑπευόμας*); that is to say, the third in the order of attack, being the inner or old wall on Zion.⁵ Having now full possession of the lower city, he divided his forces against Antonia on the one hand, and the northwestern part of Zion on the other, over against the royal palace (*κατὰ τὸ πρὸς δύναι κλίμα τῆς πόλεως ἀντικρὺς τῆς βασιλικῆς αὐλῆς*). This was obviously the most feasible point of attack in respect to the ground, notwithstanding the impregnable strength of the three towers Hippius, Phasaelis, and Mariamne, by which it was defended; and here it was that the Romans, in conse-

¹ Jos. Antt. XIV. 16. 2; comp. B. J. 1. 18. 2.

² Joseph. *ibid.* φημέμενον δὲ τοῦ ἐξωθεν ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς κάτω πόλεως, εἰς τὸ ἐσωθεν ἱερὸν καὶ τὴν ἄνω πόλιν Ἰουδαῖοι συνέφυγον.

³ Jos. B. J. II. 19. 4 sq.

⁴ See more in another Article, in the next Number of this work, *Objection*.

⁵ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 2. V. 8. 1, 2.

quence of a panic among the Jewish leaders, finally made their way by a breach into the upper city.¹

I have dwelt the more fully upon these historical circumstances; because they furnish of themselves strong and almost conclusive evidence, that the second wall protected the whole northern side of Zion; and therefore the gate Gennath, at which it began, must have been near to Hippicus.

IV. Still more conclusively is this fact brought out by comparing the notices of the monument of the high priest John, which is several times mentioned by the Jewish historian, in his account of the assaults made by Titus upon the three walls successively.

The Roman general, on his arrival, after reconnoitring the city, determined to make his attack upon the outer wall at the monument of the high-priest John;² "because in this part the first [outer] fortification was lower, and the second made no junction (*καὶ τὸ δεύτερον οὐ συνήπτειν*); they having been negligent in walling up those parts where the new city was not very thickly inhabited; but rather there was an easy approach to the third [inner] wall, through which he thought to take (*αἰρήσειν ἐπενόει*) the upper city, as also the temple through Antonia." Here the want of junction spoken of in the second wall, seems necessarily to refer to its junction with the first or old wall on Zion.³ Josephus probably intended to express the idea, that this second wall, which strictly began at the gate Gennath in the first wall, had been suffered to fall into decay after the building of Agrippa's outer wall; so that it was now no longer actually joined to the first wall at that point. Hence, there was in this quarter an "easy approach" to the lower city and to the inner wall on Zion. This view also finds support from another consideration.

After Titus had taken the outer wall, and thus got possession of the new city, Simon and his party, who held Zion and Akra,⁴ "took for their share the point of attack (*τὴν ἐμβολὴν διαλαβόντες*)

¹ Josh. B. J. VI. 8. 1, 4.

² Jos. B. J. V. 6. 2.

³ The phrase in question: *καὶ τὸ δεύτερον οὐ συνήπτειν*, cannot of course refer to any junction of the second with the outer wall; for none could ever be supposed, since the outer wall began at Hippicus and the second at the gate Gennath on the east of that tower. Nor can the phrase be understood as affirming merely, that the second wall was here not adjacent to the first or third wall; for the verb *συνάπτειν* never has reference to mere proximity, but always to actual contact.

⁴ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 2, 3.—In respect to Simon and the position of his followers, see *ibid.* V. 6. 1.

at the monument of John, and fortified it (*ἑρμάξαστο*) quite to the gate by which water was brought into the tower Hippicus." This passage shows very clearly, that the portion of the second line of fortification lying between the monument of John and the tower Hippicus, was in a state of neglect or dilapidation; and it thus confirms the interpretation of the former passage given in the preceding paragraph. Some further inferences will be drawn from it below.

Titus took the second wall, and was driven back from it. Again he got possession of it; destroyed the northern portion; stationed guards in the towers of the part towards the south; and afterwards planned his attack upon the third or inner wall.¹ For this end he raised embankments at the monument of John, "intending here to get possession of the upper city" (*ταύτη μὲν τῆν ἄνω πόλιν αἰρήσων ἱεροῶν.*)² In speaking elsewhere of these embankments, Josephus describes one of them as at the pool Amygdalon; and another as being thirty cubits distant at the monument of the high-priest.³ And again he testifies, that these works were on the western quarter of the upper city, over against the royal palace, where stood the three towers Hippicus, Phasaelis, and Mariamne, impregnable against all the energies and efforts of the enemy.⁴

These various passages of Josephus, taken together, throw light upon the position of this monument of John the high-priest; and furnish also some important inferences in relation to the place of the gate Gennath.

First. The third or outer wall began at Hippicus; and ran, as we know from ancient vestiges, for some distance northwesterly, perhaps a little within the line of the present wall, along the brow of the upper part of the valley of Hinnom. The attack of the Romans, therefore, could not have been made just in this part; though it would naturally take place at a point as near to Hippicus as the nature of the ground would permit; perhaps two or three hundred feet south of the present northwest corner of the city-wall. Here the Romans broke through the outer wall, at the monument of the high-priest John; and then urged their attack upon the second

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 8. 1, 2.

² B. J. V. 9. 2. Comp. ib. V. 11. 4. VI. 2. 10.

³ B. J. V. 11. 4.

⁴ B. J. VI. 8. 1, 4. These towers were connected with the royal palace; ib. V. 4. 4.

wall at the same monument. The inference is, that this monument was situated between these two outer walls, in the new city, so called, and had been erected there, outside of the lower city, before Agrippa's wall was built. Further, it needs but a glance at the plan of the city, to show that the pool Amygdalon, at which one of the embankments was thrown up, can have been no other than the pool of Hezekiah, so called, a work of unquestionable antiquity.¹ The southern end of this reservoir is less than two hundred and fifty feet distant from the course of the first or old wall on Zion. It follows, that the monument of John and the embankments near it, which were raised against the wall on Zion, and one of which was at the pool, could not have been more distant from Zion, than was the pool itself. And further, that the said monument and the embankments were on the west of the pool, is apparent from three considerations, viz. the proximity of the monument to the outer wall, so as to mark the point of attack on the same; then, the statement of Josephus that these embankments were on the western quarter of Zion; and lastly, the fact that the Romans broke through both the outer and second walls before raising their embankment at the pool. In view of all these circumstances, there will probably be no great error, if we assign the position of the monument in question, as having been between the second and outer walls, on the west of the pool, not more than some two hundred or two hundred and fifty feet distant from the latter.²

¹ Bibl. Res. I. p. 487 sq. The identity is also admitted by the author of the 'Holy City,' p. 271. The name *Amygdalon* does not of course affect the question, whether this pool was the work of Hezekiah.—In the same passage of the *Biblical Researches*, I have spoken of this reservoir as being "usually called the Pool of Hezekiah." For this I am taken to task by the English writer; who asserts, that so far from its being "usually" so called, "it may be questioned whether there are fifty persons in Jerusalem who would know it by that name;" p. 269. Yet on the very next page (p. 270), he admits that Quaresmius has the name; and that "this tradition was handed down by the Latin monks, and received from them by English travellers, until at last it found its way into a modern plan of the city;" meaning Catherwood's. He might have added, that every plan of the city, (even that of Schultz,) which marks the pool itself, gives it the name of Hezekiah. By this writer's own statement, therefore, this is its usual name among monks and travellers; and so I employed it, expressly mentioning the distinct native name, *Birket el-Hammâm*. The case is precisely the same as with the Pool of Bethesda, so called by monks and travellers; although its native appellation is *Birket Isrâ'îl*.

² The distance of 'thirty cubits' between the embankments does not fix the distance of the monument from the pool; since the direction of the latter from

Secondly. From the second of the passages above cited,¹ it appears, that whatever may have been the position of the said monument, the second wall, which Simon and his party fortified, ran from it "quite to the gate by which water was brought into the tower Hippicus." Such a gate, of course, must have been quite near to Hippicus. It follows then from this language decisively and conclusively, that *there was a gate in the first wall adjacent to Hippicus*; and that the second wall had its junction with the first or old wall on Zion at that gate. Hence also we have the direct corollary, that this gate by which water was brought into Hippicus was *the gate GENNATH*.

These simple conclusions from the language of Josephus, would seem to be incontrovertible; and can hardly fail to carry conviction to every candid mind.

IV.

The SECOND WALL of Josephus, ran on the west of the CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE, and included that site within the Lower City.

The only description given by Josephus of the beginning and course of this second wall, has been already quoted, as follows:² "The second wall had its beginning at the gate called Gennath, in the first wall; and, encircling only the tract on the north, extended quite to Antonia (*κυκλούμενον δὲ τὸ προσάρακτιον κλίμα μόνον ἀπὸς μαχρὸν τῆς Ἀκτωνίας*)." This gate Gennath in the first wall, as we have just seen, was adjacent to the tower Hippicus. The position here taken is, that the said second wall, commencing at that gate and extending to Antonia, ran by a *circuitous course* between those two points, on the west of the present church of the Holy Sepulchre. This appears from the following considerations.

I. The use of the word *κυκλούμενον*, *encircling*, by Josephus necessarily implies such a course of the said wall. Otherwise his language is without meaning, or at least cannot be true. A wall carried from near Hippicus to Antonia below the church in

the embankment next to it is not known.—Schultz places the monument of John near the church of the Holy Sepulchre, p. 68; contrary to the clear induction from the language of Josephus.

¹ Jos. B. J. V. 7. 3.

² Jos. B. J. V. 4. 2. See p. 442, above.

question, would occupy almost a straight line; and could in no possible sense be said to *encircle* the tract on the north.¹

II. If the wall thus ran below the church of the Sepulchre, then the whole space included in the lower city was a small triangle of about *six hundred yards* on the south side, and some *four hundred yards* on the east side; the distance of the church itself from the wall of the Haram being about four hundred yards, or less than a quarter of a mile. This is a restriction of limits utterly incompatible with all accounts of the ancient populousness of the city, as well as against every probability.²—The difficulty is only increased, if the position of the gate Gennath be assigned as opposite the western bazar, or indeed at any point not near to Hippicus; since every step by which the said gate is removed eastward from that tower, serves only to contract still more these narrow dimensions of the lower city. Especially is this the case, if the wall be supposed to have run from such a point “in a northerly direction parallel to the westernmost of the three arcades which compose the bazar, and to the street which is continued down to the Damascus gate.”³ Such a course would reduce the lower city in this part into a narrow strip or parallelogram of less than *three hundred and fifty yards* in width; being only a few yards broader than the court of the present Haram or the ancient temple,—a space far too confined to accord either with probability or with any of the historical representations of the ancient Jerusalem.

III. Whatever may have been the position of the gate Gennath, if the second wall ran below the church in question it must have passed, obliquely or directly, across the very termination or point of the ridge Akra, where the declivity is rocky and quite steep. In this way, instead of being a defence to the lower city, the wall would have been itself overlooked and commanded by the higher ground on the west and northwest.⁴ Further, on occasion of the

¹ Lord Nugent here cuts the knot; though he writes *εν κύκλω* instead of *κυκλούμενον*. “This phrase,” he says, “Dr. R. seems too hastily to interpret as meaning a *convex* curve. Now if these words . . . were intended to describe any peculiarity in this part, surely they are more likely to signify a *concave* turn, which would have been a peculiarity worthy of mention!” *Lands Class. and Sac. II.* p. 37.

² See also *Bibl. Res.* I. p. 462. II. p. 68, 69.

³ *H. City*, p. 285.—Schultz, p. 61, 62.

⁴ This the English writer admits: “It [the wall] will be carried along a sloping ground, which is a disadvantage. . . . The disadvantage would be obviated in some measure by artificial contrivance;” *H. City*, p. 285. That is to

siege of the city by Antiochus Pius (Sidetes), about 130 B. C. a hundred and seventy years before Agrippa's wall was built, the tract "on the northern part of the wall" is described as being a "plain" (*ἐπίπεδος*);¹ and here Antiochus erected a hundred towers against the city. All this is irreconcilable with any proposed course of the wall below the church.

IV. Upon the preceding suppositions, and especially that which makes the second wall to have run along the west side of the street of the bazar, the form which results for the lower city is singular and unaccountable. No necessity existed for it; no military or other purpose was answered by it; but every conceivable motive was against it. The special reason, which now induces some to assume the course of the second wall below the church in question, viz. to save tradition and the alleged Holy Sepulchre, did not exist until centuries after that wall was built.

V. We turn to something more positive. We have seen above, that the monument of the high priest John was on the west of the pool Amygdalon, now known as Hezekiah's, and was also outside of the second wall. The pool itself was within the second wall; for the Romans broke through two walls before raising an embankment at the pool;² nor is it probable that such a reservoir, receiving its water from another pool higher up, would be formed close to the wall of the city on the *outside*, where it would benefit only besiegers and not the besieged. Now, as we have seen, after the taking of the outer wall, Simon and his party fortified the second wall from the point of attack at the monument of John quite to the gate by Hippicus;³ and Titus having afterwards destroyed the northern portion of the same wall, stationed guards in the towers of the part towards the south.⁴ The second wall then *ran northwards from the gate by Hippicus, quite near to the monument of John and on the west of the pool*; and so doing, there is almost an absolute necessity for supposing it to have continued on in the same general direction on the west of the church. This must be conceded; unless indeed the hypothesis be set up, that the wall in question here made a sharp bend for no reason and

say, a wall built for the defence of the lower city, is placed without any reason at such disadvantage as to be useless, unless "the disadvantage be obviated by artificial contrivance!" Wise master builders; skilful engineers!

¹ Jos. Antt. XIII. 8. 2.

² See above, p. 448.

³ Joseph. Bell. Jud. V. 7. 3. See above, p. 446, 447.

⁴ Joseph. Bell. Jud. V. 8. 2. See above, p. 447.

against all reason, except in order to leave the place of the future sepulchre outside.

These positive considerations, confirmed by the other circumstances above presented, and by the nature of the ground, compel me still to believe, as I have elsewhere suggested,¹ "that the second wall ran first from near Hippicus northwards across the higher and more level part of Akra," perhaps to some point in the present city wall not far below the Latin convent; and from thence swept round to the ancient gate in the valley, now that of Damascus. In confirmation of this general course, may be adduced the testimony of Messrs. Wolcott and Tipping, who found in the angle of the city wall just north of the same convent, "the remains of a wall built of large hewn and bevelled stones; and near by are blocks so large as to be taken at first for the natural rock; but which on close examination appear to have been bevelled, though now dislocated." They remark further, that "an unusual proportion of the stones in the present wall between the north-west corner of the city and the Damascus gate, and also of those in the adjacent buildings, are ancient and bevelled; and we could hardly resist the impression, that this had been nearly the course of some ancient wall."²

VI. In favour of the conjectural course of the second wall along the west side of the street of the Bazar, it is urged by both the writers in question, that there still exist traces of ancient remains along this street, which (as they think) may have belonged to an external city wall; and this then could have been only the second wall of Josephus.

One of these supposed traces is, of course, the *tradition* of a former gateway—for it is not pretended that any *actual* traces of it now exist—at the intersection of the *Via dolorosa* with the street of the Bazar, the *Porta judiciaria* so called, through which Jesus is said to have been led out to execution. This tradition is first mentioned by Brocardus in the thirteenth century;³ is most obviously connected with, and dependent on, that of the *Via dolorosa*; and like the latter is apparently not older than the times of the crusades.⁴ It can therefore itself prove nothing;

¹ Bibl. Res. I. p. 462.

² Biblioth. Sacra, 1843, No. I. p. 29.

³ H. City, p. 287. Schultz, p. 60.—See Brocardus, cap. VIII. p. 183. ed. Cleric.

⁴ Bibl. Res. I. p. 344, 372. We shall have occasion to recur again to the *Via dolorosa* in a second Article.

nor indeed can it have the slightest weight in the case now before us.

In addition to this legendary gate, the English writer adduces only "the pier of a gateway, with the spring-course of the arch still entire," on the southern part of the ruins of the hospital of the knights of St. John, and adjacent to the street of the Bazar.¹ This is described by the German author as "the smaller half of a fine portal of a kind of architecture which might well enough (*könnte füglich*) belong to the Roman period before the destruction of the city by Titus."² This latter writer brings forward, further, the remains of what he thinks may *probably* have been a large portal just south of the street leading down to the hospital of Helena; and likewise the remains of four or five columns between this last conjectural gateway³ and the *Via dolorosa*. Lord Nugent, who examined the spot in company with the Prussian consul, and speaks as on his authority, is here more explicit. According to him, the "pier of a gateway" above mentioned is sixty-eight yards north of the corner at the street leading down from the Yâfa gate; and the several columns further north are of granite and ten feet apart.⁴ His lordship adds likewise the following particulars, to which no allusion is made by the other writers: *First*, "ranges of large hewn stones, bevelled at the edges, precisely like those of the more ancient part of the tower of David [Hippicus];" these are found at the corner of the street in question and that from the Yâfa gate; and of them the writer says: they "appear to have been the lower part of a corner tower, which from its similarity of construction to that of Hippicus, Dr. Schultz and I judged not unlikely to have been that of Mariamne!"⁵ *Then*, "a ridge of ground," in two places, marking a line as of an outer wall. *Lastly*, three of the said "massive

¹ H. City, p. 286: "I discovered a solid and compact mass of masonry of a totally different character from any I had before seen in Jerusalem. The workmanship was much better, and the stones much whiter and harder than those used in the hospital or in any modern building. On a closer examination I found it to be the pier of a gateway with the spring-course of the arch still entire." P. 287: "A frequent inspection of this singular and venerable pier left little doubt on my mind, that it belonged to a gateway of the second wall."

² Schultz, p. 61.

³ Schultz, p. 60, 61.—"Ein muthmassliches Portal;" *ibid*.

⁴ The existence of this "row of granite columns," or rather of their remains, is mentioned also by the Rev. S. Woleott in an unpublished letter.

⁵ Lands Class. and Sacred, II. p. 50.—The tower of Mariamne, it may be remembered, was in the first or old wall on the high northern brow of Zion.

granite pillars built into what was evidently an old wall."¹ This last specification seems to refer to what the German writer regards as a "conjectural gateway."

As these remains are thus brought forward with a show of confidence; and are in truth, after the facts and considerations already presented, the only basis on which the hypothesis in question can yet depend for a shadow of support; it may be proper to give them some further attention.

1. The reader cannot fail to be struck with the difference of testimony in three writers, who held intercourse with each other in Jerusalem itself, and whose volumes were afterwards published almost simultaneously. In March 1844, Lord Nugent and the Prussian consul found at the corner opposite the bazars, "ranges of large hewn and bevelled stones," which they held to have belonged to an ancient corner tower of the first or inner wall; and also a "ridge" extending northwards along the street. Now these two particulars, if well founded, are of great importance in the question before us; yet the consul, in June 1845, makes no allusion to them in his own account. It is therefore a fair presumption, that either there was in respect to these an overstatement of the facts, or else he became convinced that in these two instances the high antiquity before claimed for them cannot properly be urged. The same course of reasoning may also be applied to other particulars brought forward. The German author, besides the more southern "pier of a gateway," adduces a second "conjectural portal" further north, with the adjacent granite columns. Now it cannot well be, but that the English writer, in his search for just such testimony, should have seen and considered these very phenomena. Yet he nowhere makes the slightest allusion to them; and we are therefore left to infer, that in respect to them also the claim and appearance of antiquity were too slight to satisfy even his not incredulous spirit.

2. It may also be noted, that no evidence is specified, by which the reader can judge for himself, whether these remains are in fact to be regarded as ancient. Lord Nugent, indeed, in speaking of the supposed "corner-tower," says expressly that the stones were "bevelled" precisely like those of the more ancient part of Hippicus; from which statement the conclusion is so far certain, that whatever may have been the edifice to which the present ranges belonged, the materials at least were derived from ancient

¹ Lands Class. and Sec. II. p. 51.

structures. But as to the remaining instances, neither Lord Nugent nor the other writers inform us, whether the stones are bevelled, or whether the work resembles that of other structures acknowledged to be ancient. In respect to the "pier of a gateway" only, the English writer expressly remarks, that the "masonry is of a totally different character from any he had before seen in Jerusalem;"¹ and of course it differs from that of acknowledged ancient monuments. In a case where so much depends upon characteristics like those here referred to, the omission to speak of them at all must be regarded as intentional; and shows that these characteristics probably do not exist. If now the stones are *not* bevelled, this fact is conclusive against the assumed antiquity of the remains. Or if, on the other hand, they are bevelled, then all depends on the circumstance, whether they are still in their original place, or have been used over once and again in the erection of later buildings. A large portion of the present walls both of the city and of the Haram is obviously built up with the bevelled stones of earlier structures; and such too is probably the case in the supposed corner-tower of Lord Nugent and the Prussian consul.² I may add here, what neither writer has mentioned, that in the southern part of the street of the Bazar, the street itself is laid with *large bevelled stones*, which of course are not here in their original place; but, like the other bevelled stones in this quarter, are probably part and parcel of the materials of the ancient wall and towers on the adjacent brow of Zion. To all this there comes the testimony of one whose accuracy in such matters is well known, who in 1844 examined the alleged remains in reference to the very question here at issue; but was unable to recognize in them any traces of the high antiquity claimed for them.³

3. But whatever may be said of the other remains specified, it is quite obvious that the granite columns described can never have formed part, either of an ancient city-wall, or of a gateway in such a wall. The latter supposition is contradicted by their

¹ H. City, p. 286.

² So too in the tower at Carmel beyond Hebron, which on hasty examination I supposed to be ancient, notwithstanding the pointed arches inside; but on some of the stones of which Messrs. Wolcott and Tipping discovered inverted Greek crosses, showing that the whole structure was erected out of the ruins of another. *Bibl. Res.* II. p. 198. *Biblioth. Sac.* 1844. No. I. p. 60.

³ Rev. Eli Smith; to whom also I am indebted for the information respecting the large stones with which the street is laid.

number and the space which they occupy. As to the former hypothesis, the position is that they formed an internal decoration of an outer wall or rampart of the city. But such a decoration would be entirely out of character in connection with a defensive work; nor, apparently, does anything of the kind exist among any known remains of the fortifications of ancient cities.

4. Inasmuch as the supposed wall is held to have run from the bazar to the Damascus gate, it may further be remarked, that it is not in the southern part, where so many revolutions are known to have taken place, that we should naturally look for remains of high antiquity. The traces of an ancient wall upon this course, were any still in existence, would far more likely be found in the northern part, towards the gate of Damascus; where, so far as we are informed, no like revolutions have been felt, or at least the work of desolation and renovation has been carried on with far less activity. Yet just here, where we might most expect them, no traces whatever of an ancient wall are found. The inference is certainly unfavourable to the antiquity of the remains existing in the southern part.

5. If, lastly, we look more carefully at the facts of history, we may possibly find evidence, if not fully to show the actual date and character of the remains in question, yet sufficient to confirm the belief, that they cannot belong to so high an antiquity as the age of Josephus.

The original edifices of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, as erected by Constantine and dedicated in A. D. 335, had little resemblance to the structure of the present day.¹ Over the cave or sepulchre itself stood a chapel or oratory, decorated with splendid columns and ornaments of every kind. Adjacent on the east was a large court open to the sky, paved with polished marbles, and having porticos or colonnades on three sides. The fourth or eastern side was occupied by the magnificent *Basilica*, erected over the spot where the cross was found, if not also over the rock held to be Golgotha.² Beyond this *Basilica*, of course

¹ See, for the following description, Euseb. Vita Const. III. 34—39. Compare Touttée "Descr. et Hist. Basilicæ S. Resurrect." in Cyrill. Hieros. Opp. p. 418. § 4—9.

² The fact of a large court between the sepulchre and this *Basilica*, and also that later a chapel was erected over Golgotha between the two, seems to favour the idea, that at this time the rock or *monticule* of Golgotha was left uncovered in the midst of this splendid area. Eucharisius seems also to testify to the same effect; see Touttée l. c. § 6.

still towards the east, was another court, with porticos or colonnades on the sides, and gates leading to the city (*αἱ αὐλοὶ πύλαι*); "beyond which, in the very midst of the street of the market (*ἐν ἀντῆς μεσῆς πλατείας ἀγορᾶς*), the splendid *Propylæa*, or vestibule of the whole structure, presented to those passing by on the outside the wonderful view of the things seen within."¹

These edifices of Constantine were destroyed by the Persians under Chosroes in A. D. 614; but were not long afterwards rebuilt by Modestus, apparently with some modifications.² According to Arculfus, as reported by Adamnanus, at the close of the same century (A. D. 697),³ there now stood over the place of the sepulchre a large circular church with three concentric walls; the Basilica occupied the same position as before; while between the two was now the church of Golgotha, enclosing the rock so called. Adjacent to these, on the south, was a church of St. Mary.—Two centuries later (A. D. 870), the monk Bernhard⁴ speaks likewise here of four churches, the walls of which were connected together; but he names only three, viz. the Basilica of Constantine, the church over the Sepulchre, and that of St. Mary. The fourth he designates as "on the south;" meaning probably the church of Golgotha mentioned by Adamnanus. Between these churches was an open court or garden (*paradisus sine tecto*), with ornamented walls and paved with precious marbles. The church of St. Mary had enjoyed the bounty of the emperor Charlemagne; it possessed through his munificence a noble library, and had farms and vineyards, and also a garden in the valley of Jehoshaphat.⁵ Adjacent to this church, and of course towards the south, was likewise the hospital of Charlemagne, in which were received all pilgrims who spoke the Roman tongue. In front of the hospital was the market-place;

¹ Euseb. Vit. Const. III. 39.—In the Bibl. Res. II. p. 18, I have spoken of these *Propylæa* as composed of twelve columns in a semicircle; but these belong properly to Eusebius' description of the altar.

² See Bibl. Res. II. p. 34.

³ Adamnanus *de Locis Sanct.* I. 2—7.

⁴ Bernhard *Itin. in Loca Sanct.* 10. Found in Mabillon Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sec. III. P. II. p. 472. Also in Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires publié par la Soc. de Geogr. Tom. IV. p. 789, 790.

⁵ "Ecclesia in honore Sancte Marie, nobilissimam habens bibliothecam studio predicti imperatoris [Karoli], cum XII mansionibus, agris, vineis, et orto in valle Josaphat;" Bernhard l. c. — By an oversight, Wilken transfers the church itself, and also the hospital, to the valley of Jehoshaphat; Gesch. der Kreuzzüge II. p. 538.

where each tradesman paid yearly two pieces of gold for his privilege.¹

These buildings, or at least those on the south of the sepulchre, appear to have been again destroyed at a later period; probably during the incursions of the Egyptian Khalif Mu'ez about A. D. 969, when the church of the Sepulchre was also set on fire.² In the latter part of this century, the merchants of Amalfi in Italy, who were particularly favoured by the Khalifs, obtained permission to erect in the Holy City a domicile, which they might call their own.³ They accordingly founded a monastery with a church in honour of the Virgin, at the distance of a stone's throw from the Holy Sepulchre, in which all the services were performed in Latin; and which for this reason was called *St. Mary de Latina*.⁴ Adjacent to this a nunnery was erected not long after, in honour of Mary Magdalene; in which the nuns devoted themselves to the care of poor female pilgrims. In the course of the following century, as the numbers and the need of the pilgrims increased, a Xenodochium or hospital was built within the allotted precincts, in which the pilgrims found shelter, and were fed from the fragments of the monastic tables. The hospital was dedicated to St. John Eleemon, the former patriarch of Alexandria, and bore his name. The site of this church and hospital can have been no other than that occupied by the former church of St. Mary and the hospital of Charlemagne.

Until the capture of the Holy City by the crusaders in A. D. 1099, the hospital of St. John continued to be dependent upon the adjacent monastery, and was sustained partly by the same, and partly by the alms of pious Christians and pilgrims. At that time, Gerard of Provence was at the head of the hospital; and found such favour with Godfrey of Bouillon and afterwards with king Baldwin I, as to induce these leaders to grant to the hospital independent privileges, accompanied with rich donations. In this way arose the celebrated order of the Hospitalers, or knights of St. John of Jerusalem. Under their second Grand Master, Raymond Dupuy, their privileges and possessions were greatly enlarged; and the former hospital for needy pilgrims now gave

¹ "Ante ipsum hospitale est forum, pro quo unusquisque ibi negotians in anno solvit duos aureos illi qui illud providet;" Bernhard l. c. The pronoun *illud* probably refers to the hospital.

² Cedrenus ll. p. 661. ed. Par. Le Quien Oriens Christ. III. p. 466.

³ See Bibl. Res. II. p. 44 sq. Will. Tyr. XVIII. 4, 5. Jacob de Vit. 64.

⁴ "Monasterium de Latina," Will. Tyr. XVIII. 5.

place to "a magnificent church in honour of St. John the Baptist, and, near by, various apartments and vast buildings,"¹ testifying to the wealth and power of an aspiring order of lordly knights. The site of all these "vast buildings," including the church of St. Mary de Latina and other edifices with their courts and precincts, was the tract on the south of the Holy Sepulchre, and west of the street of the Bazar.

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, while the Christians had possession of the Holy City and afterwards, the streets of Jerusalem appear to have been the same as at the present day. The chief market-place of the city was on the site and the streets now occupied by the modern bazar; and the street running from it north to the Damascus gate, was likewise in part covered and appropriated to tradesmen.²

A comparison of the preceding historical facts affords the following results and inferences:

1. That as early as the fourth century, and ever since, the market-place (*ἀγορά, forum*) of the Holy City occupied the site of the present bazar and the street leading north to the Damascus gate.
2. That the eastern or outer court of the original Basilica of Constantine, and probably likewise that of the Basilica of the seventh and ninth centuries, extended eastward to the said street, or to an open place upon it; and had there gates, and also splendid *Propylæa*.
3. That therefore the remains of granite columns now seen along said street, and any portions of apparently old wall connected with them, (all of which are directly opposite the site of the said Basilica,) cannot possibly be of an earlier date than the fourth century; much less can they have belonged to an ancient city-wall of the time of Josephus. Had they perhaps, in some way, a connection with the *Propylæa* of Constantine or of Modestus?
4. That, considering the "vast buildings" and the "magnificent" churches and chapels, and monasteries with their courts, which occupied the tract on the south of the sepulchre, it is against all

¹ Vertot, Hist. of the Knights of Malta, etc. I. p. 20. Lond. 1728. fol.—St. John Eleemon, the patron saint of the order, became early confounded with John the Baptist.

² See the very interesting extracts from a description of Jerusalem in the thirteenth century, first published in *Bevauor Assises de Jerusalem*, Paris 1843. fol. Tom. II. p. 531 sq. Cited also at length in Schultz, App. p. 107 sq. See likewise extracts from documents of the twelfth century, Schultz, p. 117.

probability that any remains of a wall, and much less of a city gateway, from the time of Josephus, should yet be found there; and therefore the "pier of a gateway" described in this region as ancient, may, with far more probability, be regarded as having formed an entrance to some one of the courts or halls connected with these splendid edifices.¹

One other point requires perhaps a few words. The German author adduces further the reputed ancient tomb of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, within the church of the Sepulchre, as evidence to show that this spot, and of course the site of the church, must have been outside of the ancient second wall; inasmuch as there could have been no sepulchre *within* the lower city.² This tomb is a small low vault or chamber in the very wall, of the western part of the rotunda; and is entered by a narrow passage leading south from the alcove or recess behind the altar of the Syrians. The eastern side of the chamber, as described by this writer, is formed by the masonry of the wall itself; while the western and southern sides, according to him, are of solid rock. In the southern side, two niches, as for dead bodies, have been cut in longitudinally; while another receptacle for a body is sunk in the rock which forms the floor of the chamber. This latter the writer in question regards as not older than the times of the crusades;³ but the other niches he holds to be of high antiquity. Now it is obvious from the plans of the church given by Quaresmius and others,⁴ that this chamber in the wall stands in architectural connection with the western alcove of the rotunda; and cannot therefore, at the utmost, be of an earlier date than the eleventh century, when the Khalif Hakem caused the former church to be razed to the very foundations.⁵ Nor do we find a tomb of Joseph or Nicodemus ever mentioned, until near the close of the sixteenth century by Zuallart, and then by

¹ So late as the fourteenth century, travellers speak of this hospital as still a palace, ornamented with many columns, and able to accommodate a thousand pilgrims; so Sir John Maundeville, *Travels*, p. 81; Rudolf of Suchem, in *Reissh. des h. Landes*, p. 845.—The author of the 'Holy City' alludes further to another gateway, on the precincts north of the hospital, "whose fragments [still] exhibit a variety of rich and exquisite ornament;" *H. City*, p. 229.

² Schultz, p. 96, 97. Lord Nugent brings forward the same statements and argument, referring also to the personal authority of the Prussian consul; *Lands Class. and Sac.* II. p. 47.

³ So too Lord Nugent; *ibid.*

⁴ Quaresm. II. p. 576. See too the Plan of the church, *H. City*, p. 250.

⁵ *Bibl. Res.* II. p. 46.

Sandys and Quaresmins.¹ Eye-witnesses moreover differ in their testimony. In the year 1844, a friend, whose name has already been frequently mentioned, examined the tomb in reference to this very theory; and the impression left upon his mind was, that the whole chamber, niches and all, is built up with masonry within the wall; and that if any part is earlier than the times of the crusades, it is the receptacle sunk in the floor. The entire silence of the English author in respect to this reputed tomb, is likewise under the circumstances a strong testimony against any claims of high antiquity.

We may here close the discussion respecting the course of the ancient second wall. The foregoing historical considerations relieve the subject from the dust which has been cast upon it; and leave the explicit language of Josephus, and the other circumstances above adduced, to bear their testimony in its full strength, without danger of contradiction or need of modification.

In a second article, I propose to consider the evidence relating to the following points, viz. the southern part of the temple-area and the ancient bridge which led from it to Zion; the position and extent of the fortress Antonia; the situation of the fountain Gihon; the earlier gate of St. Stephen, and the tradition connected with it; as also some miscellaneous topics of minor importance.

ARTICLE II.

SCHOTT'S TREATISE ON THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF SERMONS.

By Edwards A. Park, Professor at Andover.

[A BRIEF notice of the writings of Henry Augustus Schott was given in the Bib. Sac. Vol. 2. pp. 12, 13. The notice was introductory to an abstract of the first volume of Schott's *Theorie der Beredsamkeit*. The second volume of that work is condensed into the following Article. The title of the second volume is, *The Theory of Rhetorical Invention*, with especial reference to

¹ Zuallart, Anvers 1626, p. 150. Sandys' Trav. p. 127. Quaresm. II. p. 568. All these writers speak of it only as the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea; so that Nicodemus has come in for a share only at a still later period.