

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

ARTICLE IX.

TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.¹

BY JOSEPH F. THOMPSON, D. D., NEW YORK.

WHEN Josephus wrote the fifth book of his Jewish War, he intended to give so accurate a description of the site and the structure of Jerusalem, that one familiar with the city should be able to reconstruct it in imagination; and, that the stranger should also be able to construct it upon a map, and to trace the siege of Titus, from wall to wall and tower to tower, as a spectator might have done from the summit of the mount of Olives. But in sketching the battle-ground of the Roman general, the Jewish historian only projected a battle-ground for future topographers; and squadrons of Rabbinitists, traditionists, archæologists, geographers, explorers, engineers, and draughtsmen, sciolists and scholars, English, German, American, have deployed about the city, from Hippicus to Antonia, assaulting chiefly the second wall of their antagonists, and waging the fiercest conflict over the Tyropœon valley. Within the last twenty years, especially, the topography of Jerusalem has become a subject not only of renewed investigation, but of elaborate and even acrimonious controversy. Travellers, by no means versed in archæology, and with no previous thought of historical investigations, are incited by the view of unquestionable remains of the Jewish and the Roman periods of the city, to put forth descriptions and theories of its ancient structure with all the assurance and profundity of antiquarian research; and thus the public mind is perplexed and divided according to the seeming competence and authority of the witnesses. Others have visited the city with partisan theo-

¹ The City of the Great King; or Jerusalem as it was, as it is, and as it is to be. By J. T. Barclay, M. D., Missionary to Jerusalem. Philadelphia: James Challen and Sons, and J. B. Lippincott and Co.

ries as to its principal points of historic interest, only to confirm themselves in preconceived opinions. Geographers have attempted, in the quiet of the study, to reconstruct upon paper the city as described by Josephus, and to harmonize with his detailed account the briefer allusions of other ancient writers, and the conflicting representations of travellers; but in so doing they have only provided new materials for controversy. Indeed, as Isaac Taylor has said — in making what at first view appears to be so simple a thing as a Plan of Ancient Jerusalem, one must “take position upon a battle-field; and he must prepare himself to defend, by all available means, every inch of that position; he must, in fact, make himself a party in an eager controversy, which has enlisted, and which continues to enlist, feelings and prepossessions of no ordinary depth and intensity.”¹

This diversity and controversy are owing, in part, to occasional obscurities and discrepancies in Josephus himself; to the impossibility of locating the gates and towers of Josephus in entire conformity with the outline of the city walls and gates as given by Nehemiah; to the modifications of the natural surface of the city, caused by the accumulation of debris and by military engineering; but more than all to certain ecclesiastical questions, which traditionists exalt above all the evidences of natural topography, of archæology, and of Jewish and Roman history. An illustration of this ecclesiastical spirit occurs in the Article on Jerusalem in Smith’s Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, from the pen of Rev. George Williams, B. D., of Cambridge University. The writer states without qualification, as if it were a point established in the topography of the Holy City, that “the valley of the Tyropæon meets the valley of Hinnom at the pool of Siloam, very near its junction with the valley of Jehoshaphat” [thus far all topographers *do* agree], “and can be distinctly traced through the city *along the west side of the temple enclosure to the Damascus gate*, where it opens into a small plain.” The statement in italics assumes

¹ Traill’s Josephus, Note cxxi.

one of the most disputed points in the topography of Jerusalem ; but it favors the traditional site of the holy sepulchre.¹

Dr. Barclay's remark as to the definite course of the wall of circumvallation built by Titus, applies with equal force to the second wall and the true course of the Tyropæon : " To mark out on paper a line of intrenchment thirty-nine stadia in length, is indeed such a very easy matter that it may be effected in the study, to the entire satisfaction of the designer and the general reader ; but to adapt it to the actual state of the localities and all the requirements and conditions of the case, is quite a different thing, and can only be accomplished by oft-repeated personal examination of the ground."² It is mainly as the most recent and thorough *explorer* of Jerusalem, that Dr. Barclay himself is entitled to be heard above the conflicting assertions of travellers and the controversies of scholars who have read more than they have seen of the Holy City. In the month of February, 1851, Dr. Barclay took up his residence at Jerusalem, as a missionary to the Jews of Palestine. He went in the two-fold capacity of a missionary-physician and a superintendent of such moral and educational appliances as should seem adapted to "ameliorate the condition of the Jews." Though representing a denomination of Christians who are sometimes thought to lay more stress upon the mode of baptism than upon certain cardinal doctrines of grace,³ Dr. B. ex-

¹ Mr. Williams advocates this in "The Holy City."

² Page 142.

³ The Campbellite Baptists. The points upon which this sect differ from other Christians are chiefly these : They admit the proper *personality* of the Holy Spirit, but hold that in conversion the Spirit operates *through the truth only*. They make *regeneration* in a sense identical with *immersion*, "born of water." But they hold that this is the last of a series of acts and properly includes or implies all that precede it. First in order is conversion by the Spirit through the truth ; this consists in, and is revealed by, a belief in Christ ; after this faith the subject is immersed and so regenerated. He is then "begotten of the Spirit," i. e. he believes the truth of Christ, and is "born of water," i. e. immersed. A declarative faith in Christ is made of more account than any inward "experience" as evidence of conversion.

The Campbellites are often called Arians ; but their departure from the received Orthodox view of the Trinity is more in the line of *Sabellius* than of

presses his own belief in the main points of the evangelical system, and his regard for faith above ordinances. He distinctly recognizes "the great expiatory sacrifice of the Son of God," — the "adorable Redeemer;" he speaks of Luke as a "Heaven-guided historiographer;" he declares that his object as a missionary is "not merely to establish a congregation of immersed professors of the Protestant religion;" and, while he is at variance with the whole scheme of the Anglo-Prussian bishopric at Jerusalem, he seems to be much in earnest to win souls to a "saving knowledge and reception of the truth as it is in Jesus."

Dr. Barclay remained at his post, almost without interruption, for three and a half years. In that time, besides gaining a familiar knowledge of people and languages, he acquired much personal influence even in high quarters, by his skilful treatment of disease, and his kind offices to the poor and the sick. This gave him facilities for examining the topography of ancient Jerusalem, which no occasional visitor could ever enjoy. The *Haram esh-Sherif*, the substructions of *El-Aksa*, *Ain Hammam es-Shefa*, the subterranean quarries, and other points hitherto guarded with Mohammedan superstition or jealousy, or visited stealthily by adventurous explorers, were opened to his repeated and careful inspection, either by the connivance of high officials, or through his own energy, perseverance, and skill. Though deficient in the niceties of archæology, and in those *minutiæ* of scholarship which accredit the labors of Tobler, Krafft, and Robinson, Dr. Barclay was an enthusiastic explorer, and

Arius. Strictly speaking, it is the old *Monarchian* view; that the Logos was divine and uncreated but became the "Son of God" only by entering into the flesh.

A statement of the Campbellite theory by *M. E. Land*, approved by Alexander Campbell, gives the following points:

1. "Christ in the state in which He existed as the Word, was as uncreated as the God with whom he existed."

2. "In his uncreated nature he is as perfectly *divine*, in the most essential sense of the term, as the Father who sent him."

3. "But he had no existence as the *Son of God* until born of *Mary*."

The Campbellites believe that the death of Christ made an expiation for sin.

an acute, and in the main accurate, observer. Dr. Robinson alludes to his researches in terms of respect.

The position of the Mission House, on the very brink of the steep eastern brow of Zion, is in itself favorable to the study of the antiquities of the city. The roof of the building commands a view of the Haram upon the opposite side of the Tyropæon, and directly beneath is the fragment of the ancient bridge over the valley, identified by Dr. Robinson. The causeway across the valley is also in view from the same point. The advantage of such a position for taking the bearings of objects, and the facilities which the possession of such a site affords for the inspection of surrounding localities, can be appreciated only by those who have enjoyed the view from the house-top or from the lofty windows of the dispensary. Recalling the beauties of the prospect and the tender associations of the worship of Him who is King in Zion, upon his holy hill, we can readily concede to Dr. Barclay much that he claims for the mission premises in this glowing description.

The Jews' Quarter.— Perched upon a bold, rocky promontory of Mount Zion, at an elevation of ninety-one feet above the present level of the Tyropæon, is a cluster of rudely constructed houses, now occupied as the premises of the American Christian Mission. This spot is undoubtedly one of the most notable localities about the Holy City, though heretofore it has failed to attract the attention not only of tourists and pilgrims, but of professed antiquarians and topographers. It is the north-eastern-most projection of "the Holy Hill Zion," and is distant only one hundred and eighteen yards from the western wall of the Haram-es-Sheriff, which being identical in position with that of the western cloister of the Temple, defines the width of the Tyropæon Valley at that spot, between Mount Moriah and Mount Zion — the Mugrabin Quarter of the city. * * * * *

This commanding situation must ever have been a very important one, whether in the possession of heathen, Jew, or Christian; and accordingly we learn from Josephus that it was, successively, the site of the royal palaces of the Davidian, Asmonean, and Herodian dynasties of Israel. Herod the Great, however, required a larger area for the display of his magnificent designs; and hence he erected another, and perhaps still more sumptuous, palace near the Tower of Hippicus (which he seems mainly to have occupied), on the site of the present splendid Anglican Church and Consulate, quite on the opposite side of the city. But not only did Herod Agrippa (called king) have his magnificent palace on this identical spot,

but also built by its side another for his beautiful but meretricious sister Berenice. Here also was the famous hall "for feasting and compotations," to which the great Jewish historian and priest thus alludes: "King Agrippa built himself a very large dining-room in the royal palace in Jerusalem, near to the portico. Now this palace had been erected of old by the children of Asmoneus, and was situated upon an elevation and afforded a delightful prospect to those that had a mind to take a view of the city, which prospect was desired by the king, and there he could lie down and sit, and thence observe what was done in the temple, etc." (Ant. book 20, chap. ix. sec. 10.) And truly it was a most delightful prospect. The beautiful, purplish, chatoyant mountains of Moab and Ammon, bounding a part of the horizon, at the distance of twenty-five or thirty miles; the hallowed ridge of Olivet forming the remainder at the distance of a mile. Then, only one hundred and fifty yards distant was the gorgeous Temple, "exceeding magnifical, and of fame and glory throughout all conuntries," crowning Mount Moriah. The deep gorge of the Tyropœon, at that time perhaps about two hundred feet below the palace, adorned by the magnificent Xystus Porticos which lay below — the towering Castle of Antonia loomed aloft on the north, and on the right were Ophel, Kedron, Siloam, En-rogel, etc. Immediately adjacent on the north was unquestionably situated the "Armory of Solomon," or "the House of the Forest of Lebanon," and just in its rear, in the direction of the Tower of Hippicus, was the "House of the High Priest." The east end of the palace was connected with the Temple by that cyclopean bridge so often mentioned by Josephus, spanning the Tyropœon, and forming a noble highway between Moriah, the colossal remains of which are still to be seen at its abutment against the Temple wall — the highway or "ascent" of Solomon, so much admired by the queen of Sheba.

This spot was subsequently occupied by the Crusaders, who (if we may form a judgment from present indications) crowned it with a magnificent church, in one sense at least resembling a city set on a hill that cannot be hid. The tent, pitched on the top of one of the houses, now jumbled on its ruins, covers one of the circular skylights of the ancient church; and the little court beneath this tented skylight is the humble tabernacular chapel of the Mission.

Immediately at the base of this perpendicular cliff, more than a hundred feet below the ancient palace, was situated the Xystus, so often mentioned by Josephus. By this term, we are not only to understand the long gallery beneath the palace, running parallel to the western cloister of the Temple, at a distance of about three hundred feet to the west, but also the intervening Tyropœon, or Cheese-monger's Valley of Josephus, called here, both by Josephus and the sacred writers, the suburbs (and the situation is literally *sub urbe*) — Mount Zion overhanging it on one side, to the height of one or two hundred feet, and Mount Moriah nearly as much on the other. It seems originally to have been mainly appropriated to gymnastic purposes, but in process of time evidently became the theatre of the grand

Jewish convocations, for the discussion of great national concerns. Hence it was probably the place where Herod the Great convened the Jews to consider his proposition for the reëdification of the Temple. And here it certainly was that king Agrippa assembled the hosts of Israel, to address them on the occasion of their rebellion against their oppressive Roman masters, the circumstances of which Josephus details, as well as the king's speech, in the 16th chapter of the Second Book of the Wars of the Jews.

It was across this portion of the Tyropœon occupied by the Xystus that Titus caused Josephus to remonstrate with the infatuated Jews, after he had dispossessed them of the Temple; and across it also that Marc Antony held his celebrated parley with that stubborn people after he had captured Mount Zion—the bridge, in each instance, having been broken down. Many other circumstances concur to invest this place with peculiar interest in the eyes of the Jews."

Dr. Barclay also resided at one time in the Mohammedan quarter on Bezetha, and he has had a summer health-retreat on the mount of Olives, whence the city as a whole is distinctly in view. He has therefore gained that knowledge of localities which a neighborhood residence affords to one whose powers of observation are always upon the alert.

The intelligent family of Dr. Barclay, who sympathized with him in his spirit of antiquarian research, as well as in his missionary zeal, brought to him additional facilities for exploration, and largely assisted in his measurements and observations. Some of the most interesting passages in his work, as well as many of its most beautiful illustrations, were furnished by these invaluable assistants. Besides being a good draughtsman, Dr. Barclay is skilled in the art of photography, and hence his sketches of buildings and remains are more authentic and reliable than many hitherto given to the public. These have been reproduced by the engravers in the best style, and they are worked into the letter press with care. The mechanical execution of the volume deserves the highest praise. In the quality of the paper, the clearness of the text, and the neatness and beauty of the illustrations, it is one of the finest specimens of the typographic art ever issued in the United States.

The work is divided into three principal parts, which treat severally of "Jerusalem as it was," "Jerusalem as it is," and "Jerusalem as it is to be." The first of these divisions

occupies more than one half of the volume. The topics discussed under this division are the local features of the city and its environs, its various quarters as mentioned in the Bible and by Josephus, its walls, towers, gates, castles, citadels, fortresses, palaces, tombs and sepulchral monuments, the temple, the fountains, aqueducts and reservoirs, and the changeful fortunes of the city under Pagan, Moslem, and Christian domination. Dr. Barclay is, we believe, the only writer who has attempted to identify every locality of ancient Jerusalem upon the surface of the present city and its surrounding ruins. In his catalogue of names and his array of arguments and measurements, he exhibits an enthusiasm worthy of all praise; but his anxiety to make this identification complete, sometimes leads him to hasty assumptions and untenable positions, which impair the confidence of the reader in his conclusions.

This plan, moreover, compels the author to enter largely into minutiae that can interest only the scholar, while yet his work does not present the scholarly attractions of profound learning and cultivated style. Uncouth phrases, cumbersome sentences, an occasional grandiloquence of fancy or unseemly witticism, detract from the literary merit of a book, faultless in mechanical execution. But the preface of the author would disarm mere verbal criticism, if the greatness of his theme and the service he has rendered it, did not forbid this. Dr. Barclay's compendium of ancient writers upon Jerusalem will be found of value to the general reader; and his minute description of the city as it now is, will interest readers of every class. But we are chiefly concerned with those investigations and discoveries which relate to the topography of Jerusalem and the line of its defences in the time of our Saviour.

Before analyzing the contributions of Dr. Barclay towards a solution of this vexed question, it will be well to inquire what points in the topography of Jerusalem may be regarded as settled. As the ground-plan of our inquiry, we take the well known description of Josephus.¹

¹ B. J. 5. 4. 1.

"The city was fortified by three walls, except where it was encircled by impassable ravines; for in that part there was but one wall. It was built upon two hills, one part facing the other, (*ἀντιπρόσωπος*, *face to face*,) separated by an intervening valley, at which, one upon another, (i. e. crowded together) the houses ended. Of these hills, that on which the upper city stood was much the higher, and straighter in its length. Accordingly, on account of its strength, it was called the fortress by King David, the father of Solomon, by whom the temple was originally built; but by us it is called the upper market place. The other hill, called Akra, which sustains the lower city, is curved on each side (*ἀμφίκυρτος*, *gibbous*). Over against this was a third hill, naturally lower than Akra, and formerly separated from it by another broad ravine. Afterwards, however, when the Asmoneans were in power, desiring to connect the city with the temple, they filled in this ravine, and cutting down the summit of Akra, they reduced its elevation, so that the temple might appear above it. The valley called *Τυροπῶρον* [the valley of the cheese-makers], which we have said separated the hill of the upper city from that of the lower, extends as far as Siloam; for so we call a fountain whose waters are both sweet and abundant. From without [i. e. exterior to the city] the two hills of the city were encompassed by deep ravines, and because of the precipices on both sides there was nowhere any approach."

In the succeeding chapter of the same book, Josephus thus describes the hill upon which the temple was built:

"The temple, as I have said, was seated on a strong hill. Originally, the level space on its summit scarcely sufficed for the sanctuary and the altar, the ground about being abrupt and steep. But king Solomon, who built the sanctuary, having completely walled up the eastern side, a colonnade was built upon the embankment. On the other sides the sanctuary remained exposed. In process of time, however, as the people were constantly adding to the embankment, the hill became level and broader. They also threw down the northern wall, and enclosed as much ground as the circuit of the temple at large subsequently occupied. After having surrounded the hill from the base with a triple wall, and accomplished a work which surpassed all expectation — a work on which long ages were consumed, and all their sacred treasures exhausted, though replenished by the tributes offered to God from every region of the world, they built the upper boundary walls and the lower court of the temple.

"The lowest part of the latter they built up from a depth of three hundred cubits, and in some places more. The entire depth of the foundations, however, was not discernible; for with a view to level the streets of the town, they filled up the ravines to a considerable extent. There were stones used in the building which measured forty cubits; for so ample was the supply of money and such the zeal of the people, that incredible success

attended the undertaking; and that of which hope itself could not anticipate the accomplishment, was by time and perseverance completed."

From the foregoing description it would seem that if we can identify any two of the hills named, we have the third. Thus, if we can identify Zion and the temple-hill, then the hill which directly faces Zion upon the north, and is divided from it by a ravine, and which also stands "over against" the temple-hill, but with traces of another intervening ravine, must of course be Acra, and no hill which does not at once face Zion and the temple-hill, as a natural prominence distinct from either, can properly claim that name. The geographical characteristics so clearly marked by Josephus, must be first sought for as the basis of all identification. If we except the theory of Schwartz and of some resident savans of Jerusalem, to be noticed presently, there is little diversity among writers on the topography of Jerusalem, as to the identity and the general boundaries of Zion. Williams makes Zion identical with the Armenian and Jewish quarters of the present city, together with the parts of the hill lying without the walls, to the south and east. He also regards the northwestern tower of the modern citadel at the Jaffa gate, as occupying the site of the tower of Hippicus, which stood "at the northwest angle of the wall of Zion."¹

There is a like agreement as to the site of the temple. Indeed Mr. Williams observes that "this site has the singular good fortune to be the only one of all the sacred localities in Jerusalem whose identity has not been disputed in modern times. It is universally agreed that the hill now occupied by the mosque of Omar and its surrounding courts, is the mountain of the Lord's house."²

But Mr. Williams makes what Dr. Robinson and nearly all recent authorities regard as Bezetha, the Acra of Josephus, and the valley running down from the Damascus gate to the pool of Siloam, the Tyropæon.³ He does not however, with Schwartz, extend the area of Zion so as to include any part of the hill which Robinson regards as Acra,

¹ Holy City, p. 261.

VOL. XV. NO. 58.

² Ibid. p. 15.

39

³ Ibid. p. 273.

but makes this only the termination of the rocky ridge sometimes called mount Gihon. The precise difference between Williams and Robinson — whom we select as the strongest representatives of two opposing theories — may be comprehended at a glance upon any map of modern Jerusalem. Both agree that *Zion*, so far as it is enclosed within the present wall, is the area of the *Armenian* and *Jewish* quarters. Both also agree that the *Temple-hill*, sometimes called *Moriah*, is represented by the present enclosure of the *Haram es-Sherif*, or mosque of Omar. But Robinson identifies *Acra* mainly with the modern *Christian* quarter, while Williams makes *Acra* identical with the *Mohammedan* quarter — the *Bezetha* of Robinson, and leaves the *Christian* quarter entirely without the plot of the city as it stood in the time of Christ. But Williams's theory of *Acra* is disproved by the course given to the second wall, upon his own map, as compared with the testimony of the Jewish historian. Josephus states that "the city was built upon two hills, face to face (*ἀντιπρόσωπος*), separated by an intervening valley, at which, one upon another, the houses ended." This accords with the terse and graphic picture of Tacitus. "Duos colles, immensum editos, claudebant muri per artem obliqui, aut introrsus sinuati, ut latera oppugnantium ad ictus patescerent."¹

The valley which separated the hill of the upper city (*Zion*) from that of the lower (*Acra*), Josephus calls the *Tyropæon*. But Mr. Williams, while he rejects Robinson's theory of *Acra*, yet runs his second wall across the slope of that same hill, and across what he calls the *Tyropæon*, so that his *Tyropæon* nowhere separates *Zion* from *Acra*, the "upper city" from the "lower," but divides the Lower. Neither do *Zion* and his *Acra* come, anywhere, face to face on opposite sides of his *Tyropæon* valley; only the north-eastern corner of the upper city stands diagonally opposite to the south-western corner of the lower city, at a considerable distance from it. This cannot meet the bold outline sketched by Josephus. Mr. Williams denies that the ridge

¹ Hist. V. 11.

directly north of Zion, lying between the Jaffa and Damascus gates was Acra. He maintains that the Tyropæon ran from the Damascus gate along the eastern side of that hill and the eastern side of Zion, down to the pool of Siloam. He avers that "during fourteen months' residence in Jerusalem, he could never find any traces of the valley which Dr. Robinson calls the Tyropæon," viz. a valley running eastward from the Jaffa gate between Zion and the present Christian quarter. And yet Williams draws his own line of the second wall midway across this very hill which he declares is not Acra, and carries it along on the *western* side of what he calls the Tyropæon, and thus throws that valley entirely within the Lower city, except where it separates *Zion* from *Moriah*. But Josephus describes this valley as between the Upper city and the Lower, which confronted each other across its chasm.

There are other points in which Mr. Williams is inconsistent with Josephus and with himself. When he wishes to locate the Tyropæon according to his theory, he asserts that there are "no traces of a valley" from the Jaffa gate eastward; but when his object is to locate the gate Gennath, according to his theory of the second wall, far to the east of Hippicus, he makes much of the statement of Josephus that "the northern brow of Zion was a rocky eminence *thirty cubits high*;"¹ which of course implies a depression beneath the brow of the hill. For another purpose he alludes to the fact that in making excavations for the foundation of the English church near the Jaffa gate, rubbish was removed to the depth of forty feet. This surely is one trace of a valley in that quarter. The old chapel of St. John, exhumed from a depth of thirty feet below the Jaffa-gate street, proves the same thing.

The conjecture which Mr. Williams makes as to the course of the second wall, is also at variance with Josephus. He says: "Let us suppose the gate Gennath in the northern wall of Zion somewhere near the entrance to the bazaars from the west, and the second wall commencing here

¹ Holy City, p. 261.

to run in a northerly direction it will be carried along a sloping ground, which is a disadvantage ; but the Tyropæon must be crossed ; and since Acra is north of Zion, the wall must run in that direction along the declivity to the upper and more shallow part of the valley, near the Damascus gate ; it here reached *the hill of Acra*, round which it was carried until it met the wall of the fortress of Antonia.”¹

Compare with this the statement of Josephus. “The city was built *ἀντιπρόσωπος*, *one part facing the other*, upon two hills, separated by a valley *between* ; *at which*, compactly built together, the houses ended.” But Mr. Williams, instead of placing Acra face to face with Zion upon the opposite side of the Tyropæon, carries the second wall northward from the northern wall of Zion to the Damascus gate, before it strikes the Tyropæon or the hill of Acra ; he locates that hill upon the *east* of the Tyropæon, so that this valley divides Acra from “the rocky ridge of Gihon,” but *at no point* separates it from Zion. Moreover Josephus informs us expressly that the Lower city was commensurate with Acra ; and that its buildings terminated on the edge of the Tyropæon opposite to the houses of Zion or the Upper city. But Mr. Williams, on his map and by the course of his second wall, includes the upper part of the Tyropæon within the Lower city, which he extends over “the rocky ridge of Gihon,” as well as over the opposite promontory, which he designates “the hill of Acra.” He thus interposes, between Acra and Zion, (1) the depression eastward from the Jaffa gate, which Dr. Robinson proves to have existed between Zion and the hill directly to the north, (2) the hill which Mr. Williams calls the termination of the broad swell of Gihon, and (3) the valley running southward from the Damascus gate, which he calls the Tyropæon ; these three marked features, instead of the *one* valley of Josephus, the Tyropæon, on the opposite sides of which the two divisions of the city, the Upper on Zion and the Lower on Acra, stood “fronting each other.” Mr. Williams’s theory of Acra must

¹ Holy City, p. 285.

be dismissed as entirely without foundation. It is to be regretted that this is presented in Smith's Dictionary of Ancient Geography as if it were the established or conceded view of the position of the second hill.

Dr. Tobler finds Acra in a subdivision of what is commonly called Zion. According to him the depression between the Armenian and the Jewish quarters answers to the Tyropæon, and within the modern walls the Upper city is to be sought mainly in the present Armenian quarter, and the Lower city in the Jewish quarter. The western half of Zion was the Upper city; the eastern half, nearest the temple, was the Lower.¹ The profound learning of Dr. Tobler, and his patient research upon the ground, command our high respect. But his theory is impracticable upon any fair interpretation of Josephus. The depression between the Armenian and the Jewish quarters, could never have formed so marked a feature as to give the appearance of a two-hilled city to this bi-fronted hill of Zion;² and the supposition that Acra intervened between Zion and the temple-mount, contradicts the express testimony of Josephus that a bridge joined "the Upper city to the temple: *καὶ γέφυρα συνάπτουσα τῷ ἱερῷ τὴν ἄνω πόλιν.*" B. J. 6. 6. 2. Moreover, the theory of Tobler greatly contracts the area of the city.

If the location of Acra by Dr. Robinson be incorrect, there seems to be no alternative but that resorted to by Thrupp, viz. to locate Acra upon the east of the Tyropæon, opposite the eastern front of Zion, now the Jews' quarter; thus making it identical with the temple-hill. This writer, in common with Robinson and Williams, identifies Zion with the Armenian and Jewish quarters of the present city and the southern brow of the hill upon which these are built,

¹ Topographie von Jerusalem, I. 34, Berlin, 1853.

² Dr. Tobler in his Plan represents this division as *marked*: "Die Oberstadt oder der Obermarkt entspricht der heutigen Westhälfte Zions, die sich ebenfalls mehr gerade in die Länge zieht oder von Süd nach Nord eine längliche Form hat. Ich verweise deshalb auf meinen Plan von Jerusalem. Wie die Form des Hügels mit der Oberstadt bezeichnet ist, so auch diejenige des die Unterstadt tragenden Hügels; eine rundliche, fast vollmondige Form, im Gegensatz zur länglichen . . . Die Westhälfte Zions die obere, die Osthälfte die untere," etc.

now lying without the walls ; Acra is the ridge of the Haram, beginning near the present Stephen's gate and extending southward to the terminus of the ridge below the village of Silwân on the east and the fountain of Siloam on the west ; the third hill is the *hill*-part of the Mohammedan quarter of the modern city, lying to the north of the Haram-esh-Sherif (the Bezetha of Robinson, Ritter, and others), and Bezetha is to be found in "the ridge of the modern Hâret Bâb el-Hitta," the greater part of which is excluded by the modern wall. This theory excludes from the city, in the time of Christ, the whole of the present Christian quarter, and that section of the Mohammedan quarter which lies westward of the street running down from the Damascus gate.¹ By this plan of the city, Mr. Thrupp brings Acra and Zion face to face upon opposite sides of the Tyropœon, which he identifies with the Moors' quarter of the modern city ; and by making Acra the temple-hill, he can connect the temple with the Upper city by a bridge over the valley, according to Josephus. But his plan contradicts the Jewish historian at one explicit point of his description, and can only be defended by a new and forced construction of his account of the third hill. Having described Acra as the hill of the *Lower* city, Josephus immediately adds :

"Over against this was a third hill, naturally lower than Acra, and formerly separated from it by another broad ravine. Afterwards, however, when the Asmoneans were in power, desiring to connect the city with the temple, they filled in this ravine, and, cutting down the summit of Acra, they reduced its elevation, so that the temple might appear above it."

Mr. Thrupp contends that the temple stood upon the *second* hill, viz. Acra ; that the "third hill" lay to the north of the line of the *Via Dolorosa*, and that the northward portion of the *temple*-hill itself—the second hill or Acra—was levelled, in order that the temple, standing upon Acra, and already visible from Zion opposite, might also be made visible from the third hill on the north, and thus "be made

¹ Ancient Jerusalem by Joseph Francis Thrupp, M. A. Cambridge, 1855. pp. 35—40.

conspicuous to the whole city.”¹ This ingenious rendering meets the topographical description of Josephus better than the grammatical structure of his text. Josephus describes the city proper as built upon two distinct hills. If the temple, the most conspicuous building of Jerusalem, the dearest object to the Jew, the pride and glory of his city and his faith, and the most obstinately-contested point in the very siege which Josephus describes, had stood upon either of these hills, it is incredible that he should have omitted to speak of it. The immediate mention of a third hill over against Acra, and the statement that the Asmoneans filled the ravine between these two hills in order “to connect *the city* with the temple,” proves that the temple could not have already stood within the Lower city. Mr. Thrupp’s theory places the temple in the Lower city, and then unites it with an insignificant section, to the north, in order “to connect it with *the city!*” Clearly Josephus means, that, as the temple-hill was connected with Zion by a bridge, so it was connected with Acra by a causeway. Besides, the surface of the temple-hill, as described by Josephus, would not admit of a surrounding city. He expressly states that “originally the level space on its summit scarcely sufficed for the sanctuary and the altar, the ground about being abrupt and steep.” His whole description warrants the inference that the temple-hill was the “third” hill, and distinct from Acra. Ritter, while he leaves the position and boundaries of Acra somewhat unsettled (*zweifelhafte*), has no hesitation in locating the temple-hill opposite to Acra, upon the east.² Tobler, though he locates Acra differently, makes the site of the mosque Moriah on the temple-hill.

Rejecting Thrupp’s theory as untenable, we must fall back upon Dr. Robinson’s view, *unless we carry the boundaries of Zion much further to the north*. This is the view of Rabbi Schwartz, who transfers Hippicus from the Jaffa gate to a point near Jeremiah’s grotto. The resident antiquarians and savans of Jerusalem are generally agreed in extending the area of Zi-

¹ Ancient Jerusalem, p. 37, Note.

² Erdkunde, Von Asien, B. VIII. 8. 4. § 9.

on so as to include Dr. Robinson's Acra, making the valley running southward from the Damascus gate the Tyropæon, and Acra the ridge sweeping round from that point to the Haram. This view is far more consistent with Josephus than that of Williams; inasmuch as it brings Zion and Acra face to face on opposite sides of a once steep ravine, while it also presents Acra as originally divided from the temple-hill by a broad valley, traceable from about the line of Stephen's gate. It has the further advantage of extending the area of the city so that it comports better with the measurements of the walls, given by Josephus, and with his statement of the population. This theory is fatal to the traditionists with respect to the site of the holy sepulchre, which could not have been within the wall of Zion. We are disposed to wait the result of further investigations in this direction. But at present we do not see how the advocates of this enlargement of Zion can dispose of the mass of evidence in favor of the common Zion of topographers, and of the identity of the Jaffa-gate castle with the Hippicus of Josephus.¹

Von Raumer, in his third revised edition of his *Palestina*, after a candid and thorough review of all the evidence on these points, declares his entire agreement with Dr. Robinson in the location of Zion, Acra, the Tyropæon, and their mutual relations.² So far at least as the theories of traditionists concerning the holy sepulchre are concerned, may we not assume that the position of Acra is determined upon topographical grounds which no ecclesiastical tradition can disturb? True, the location here assigned to Acra does not of necessity overthrow the site which tradition has assigned to the place of the Saviour's crucifixion and burial; for the course of the second wall, over the ridge of Acra, remains to be determined. But the more violent traditionists seem tacitly to admit that to identify Acra with the summit due north from Zion is fatal to their theory. To build a wall

¹ For the evidence on this latter point, see Ritter, Von Raumer, Tobler, Robinson, Williams, Traill's Josephus, and Barclay.

² *Palestina*, Leipzig, 1850, p. 312.

northward from the wall of Zion, *κυκλούμενον*, as Josephus describes it, to the tower of Antonia, and yet to exclude from its "encircling" sweep the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, would require such crooks and angles, such a contraction of the city area, and withal such exposure of the Lower city to an enemy commanding the slope of the hill above the wall, as must forbid the admiration which both Josephus and Tacitus bestow upon the fortifications. Dr. Barclay justly remarks that "the physical features of the everlasting hills are more permanent and reliable than the oracles of Protean tradition; and it must needs be confessed by the most devoted traditionist, that that which is topographically impossible, cannot be traditionally true."¹

This citation brings us back from our long dissertation, to the analysis of Dr. Barclay's contributions to the topography of the Holy City. In the main points thus far considered — the course of the Tyropæon and the relative positions of Zion, Acra, and the temple-hill — Dr. Barclay agrees with Dr. Robinson. His theory of the valley and the pools of Gihon, is in some points novel, and is hardly favored by the few indistinct allusions of the Old Testament. Dr. Barclay maintains that the valley of Gihon began a little north-west of the Damascus gate and extended southward to a line with the Jaffa gate, where it joined the Tyropæon, i. e. his *Gihon* is the *Tyropæon* of Williams.

"Few localities have been so much the sport of topographical speculation and tradition as this place, which has been located almost everywhere about Jerusalem, except the right place. The present locality assigned it, is the valley south-west of Jerusalem, called in the Scriptures Ben Hinnom. But the utter incompatibility of that site with the declaration (2 Chr. 33: 14) that 'Manasseh built a wall without the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entering in at the Fish gate,' is evidence enough of its mislocation; for, a wall built in this valley on its west side, would everywhere be located to great disadvantage, and in many places be no defence whatever, owing to the cliffs of Hinnom overtopping it. But besides this negative proof of its mislocation, the well-ascertained position of the Fish gate clearly shows that the valley of Gihon could be no other than that heading north-west of Damascus gate and gently descend-

¹ Page 230.

ing southward, uniting with the Tyropæon at the north-east corner of Mount Zion, where the latter turns at right angles and runs towards Siloam. The wall, thus built by Manasseh on the west side of the valley of Gibon, would extend from the vicinity of the north-east corner of the wall of Zion in a northerly direction, until it crossed over the valley to form a junction with the outer wall at the trench of Antonia — precisely in the quarter where the Temple would be most easily assailed.

“Although this location of Gibon may be rather startling to those who are wedded to the school of oral tradition, yet it is unquestionably the only view of the matter by which Manasseh’s construction of the wall can be reconciled with the “stubborn facts” of the case; most evident is it that it is perfectly consistent with everything mentioned in connection with it, either in the Scriptures or Josephus. The correctness of this location is also confirmed by the etymological import of the term. For it is certainly a most graceful and well favored valley.”¹

Dr. Barclay gives the following comment on 2 Chr. 32: 2-4.

“We here learn that ‘when Hezekiah saw that Sennacherib was come (to Lachish), and that he was purposed to fight against Jerusalem, he took counsel with his princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains which were without the city; and they did help him. So there were gathered much people together, who stopped all the fountains, and the brook that ran through the midst of the land, saying, “Why should the king of Assyria come, and find much water?” Where these various fountains were, we have now no positive means of ascertaining; though Enrogel and the spring now called the Virgin’s Fount may well be numbered amongst them. Josephus mentions the existence of various fountains without the city, but does not locate or even name any of them in this connection but Siloam. (W. v. ix: 4.) ‘The brook,’ however, is located with sufficient precision to enable us to trace it very definitely. We are told that it ‘ran through the midst of the land.’ Now a stream running through either the Kedron or Hinnom valley could in no proper sense be said to run through *the midst of the land*; but one flowing through the true Gibon valley, and separating Akra and Zion from Bezetha, Moriah, and Ophel, as a stream once doubtless did, could with peculiar propriety be said to “run through the midst of the (holy) land” on which the (holy) city was built.” And that this is the correct meaning of the phrase is not only apparent from the force of circumstances, but is positively so declared in the Septuagint, where, moreover, it is also called a river; which at least implies a much larger stream than the Kedron, and comports well with the marginal reading, where it is said to ‘overflow through the midst of the land.’ Previous to the interference of man, there was, no doubt, a very

¹ Page 94.

copious stream that gushed forth somewhere in the upper portion of that shallow, basin-like concavity north of Damascus gate — which is unquestionably the upper extremity of the Gihon valley — and pursuing its meandering course through this valley, entered the Tyropœon at its great southern curve, down which it flowed into the valley of Kedron.

“If we are to understand that the flow of these fountains was entirely arrested, they were doubtless reopened on the retreat of the invading army. But we learn from the 30th verse that one of these fountains never visibly flowed again on the exterior of the city, having been permanently conducted into the city through a secret subterranean channel; for, ‘This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper watercourse of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the city of David.’

“Now, had the so-called ‘Upper pool of Gihon’ been the ‘upper watercourse or out-flow of Gihon’ (of Scripture), as is generally alleged (though there is not the slightest intimation of such a thing, either in the Bible, the Works of Josephus, or any other reliable authority), there would be no propriety in mentioning that its waters were brought down ‘to the west side of the city of David;’ for they were already on that side. But if the fountain thus sealed was situated on the north side, then it would have been a fact sufficiently notable to deserve a special notice. But that the waters stored up in that pool were designed for quite another purpose, is most obvious; for to this day they are conducted — not through a deep rock-cut channel, as Hezekiah’s no doubt was — but most of the way by a trifling foot-wide ditch on the surface of the ground, to a reservoir on Akra near the Jaffa gate, traditionally called Hezekiah’s pool, but which most certainly is the Amygdalon pool of Josephus. If by ‘the city of David’ is here meant the whole city of Jerusalem, and the water was conducted literally to the west side of Jerusalem, the enterprise was very difficult of execution, and by no means as useful as it would have been if located more centrally. It is observable, too, that in this immediate connection this term is restricted to the lower portion of Zion.”¹

Ritter, after citing the various references to the pool of Gihon in the Old Testament, remarks that these make it highly probable that the fountain Gihon and the “old pool” lay on the north side of the city (in the neighborhood of the present Damascus gate), and not on the western side, although later traditions locate it in the upper valley of Hinnom, westward of the *Kasr Dschalâd*.² Thrupp identifies the so-called Pool of Bethesda, near St. Stephen’s gate, “the fosse of the fortress Antonia, according to Robinson,³ as the upper pool of Gihon, which he thinks was fed by a subterranean water-

¹ Pages 307, 308.

² Erdkunde, VIII. p. 370.

³ Bib. Res. I. 331.

course.¹ In his first edition of the *Researches*, Dr. Robinson expressed himself cautiously in favor of the identity of the present *Birket el Mamilla* with the upper pool of Gihon; but in his *Later Researches* he reargues the question, and greatly strengthens his original position. No trace is found of any other pools that could answer the description of those immense reservoirs of the ancient city. The *Birket el Mamilla* and the *Birket es Sultan* stand related to each other as the Upper and Lower pool in the basin and valley of Hinnom. An ancient aqueduct has been traced from the site of "the royal palace" near the Jaffa gate westward toward the upper pool; but "no sources of living water have been discovered at or near the Damascus gate," and the rain-cisterns in that vicinity could never have fed a reservoir for the city.² Dr. Barclay, who is the highest authority upon the present water resources of Jerusalem, says expressly that the two large tanks at Damascus gate are not to be regarded as sources of living waters. "They are entirely dry the latter part of summer, and evidently supplied by rain-water conducted into them by drains on the side of the road."³ The *Birket el Mamilla*, commonly called the Upper pool of Gihon, westward of the Jaffa gate, Dr. Barclay regards as the "serpents' pool" of Josephus; while he suggests that "the true fountain of Gihon was situated in the present basin across the intervening Hill of Gareb, just opposite the traditionary pool." But this is pure conjecture. If, according to Dr. B., the fountain of Gihon already poured a stream through the city by the valley leading southward from the Damascus gate, why should Hezekiah divert it around the western side of the city to a pool without the walls, and thence conduct its overflow into the city? There would seem to be neither wisdom nor economy in such a course. The pool within the walls, which Robinson regards as that built by Hezekiah, Barclay makes the Amygdalon of Josephus. On the pool of Hezekiah, he offers the following conjecture.

"In reproving the Jews for confiding more in human means than Divine

¹ Ancient Jerusalem, p. 87.

² *Researches*, III. 243—245.

³ Page 513.

aid, Isaiah comments upon the defensive measures adopted by Hezekiah and his princes, when threatened by Sennacherib, in the following terms : 'Ye have seen also the breaches of the city of David, that they are many; and ye gathered together the waters of the lower pool. And ye have numbered the houses of Jerusalem; and the houses ye have broken down to fortify the wall. Ye made also a ditch between the two walls for the water of the old pool, but ye have not looked,' etc. (Isa. xxii. 9-11.) The 'ditch' and the 'lower pool' here alluded to are, therefore, evidently trenches for military defence; and, of course, the pool commonly ascribed to Hezekiah — being obviously designed for no such purpose — cannot be either of them. In exploring the Temple area and its immediate vicinity, I discovered a large pool beneath the Mechemeh and Temple street, extending eighty-four feet along side the Temple wall, which is here constructed of large Jewish rocks like those at the Wailing-place, is ten feet deep, and still partially coated with cement. But its entire extent from east to west could not be ascertained — a wall having been built across it at a distance of forty-two feet from the Temple wall for the purpose of supporting the buildings above. Can this be the "ditch between the two walls for the water of the old pool" — or the trench built by Hezekiah between "the First" and "Second walls" of Josephus, as a defence to the *First* wall passing from Zion to the Temple, and which was supplied with water by a branch of Hezekiah's aqueduct? Or are we to recognize the empty pool below Siloam as "the ditch?"¹

As we have been led into a somewhat particular discussion of the water resources of Jerusalem, we will here add the valuable testimony of Dr. Barclay concerning the subterranean waters of the city. One of the first conditions of the growth of a city is an abundant supply of wholesome water. The annotations upon Dr. Trail's translation of Josephus, picture the artificial advantages of Jerusalem in this respect in glowing contrast with the natural barrenness of the surrounding region.

"Perhaps upon no city of the ancient world had greater cost been bestowed, or more skill shown, in securing for it an unfailing supply of water; and such was the repute of Jerusalem in this particular, that its strength as a fortification is frequently alluded to by profane writers, as including this grand and indispensable means of sustaining a lengthened siege. Thus Strabo, having mentioned the fact generally that Jerusalem, situated in the midst of a district destitute of water, was itself abundantly supplied therewith, presently afterwards; and, while referring to the capture of the city by Pompey, states that he took it, notwithstanding its sub-

¹ Page 310.

stantial munitions, and its being abundant in water, while all around was dry: — *ἐντὸς μὲν εὐθρόν, ἐκτὸς δὲ παντελῶς διψηρόν* xvi. (p. 762), 1106. To the same purport is the often-cited passage in Tacitus (Hist. v. 12), who describes the temple with its porticos as a fortress; and such, in fact, it was, well fitted to sustain the frequent sieges to which it was liable. ‘Fons perennis aquæ, cavati sub terra montes: et piscinæ cisternæque servandis imbribus.’

In truth, the provision made — and it appears to have been from the earliest times of the monarchy — for securing a supply of water to the city generally, and to the temple especially, was of the most elaborate kind; and so well contrived were these works, that they continued to be effective for their purposes through the course of many centuries; and indeed are so, in great measure, to the present time. Almost every house of the better class, in the modern Jerusalem, has its capacious tank, occupying the basement, and which, collecting the water of the rainy season from its courts and roofs, furnishes an ample supply during the months of drought.”

“There are frequent allusions in Josephus and other writers to deep-seated aqueducts within and without the city.

“In the many sieges which the Holy city has sustained during the lapse of ages, the same course of events nearly is presented — the sufferings of the besieged from hunger, and of the besiegers from thirst. A scarcity of water does not seem ever to have aggravated the miseries that were endured within the walls; while the want of it without has, in each instance, tormented the assailants.

“Wealth, intelligence, and constructive skill, to an extent which has not been well understood by modern writers, were undoubtedly at the command of the early Jewish monarchs; and while the storms of war, ravaging their land from age to age, have swept from the surface almost every monument of its early greatness, so much of the national resources as were providently expended beneath the surface, in works of primary importance, has been — in its wrecks at least — conserved, these to the present time, to claim, what they so well deserve, the enlightened attention of Biblical archæologists. The temple of Solomon and of Herod has been razed, yet its substructures still, and not obscurely, shadow forth its greatness. The cedar roofs of a hundred palaces, blazing with gold, are no more; but the ample and well-contrived reservoirs which those palaces bestrode, still exist, and still subserve their purpose. The terraced gardens, the ‘paradises’ of the kings and nobles of Jerusalem, have long been desolated; but even now, around the slopes of the hills may be traced, mile after mile, the aqueducts whence those gardens drew perpetual verdure, and which then poured their superfluous streams into the deep bosom of Moriah!” (lviii—lxi.)

In addition to these artificial water sources, the tradition has long been credited of a natural spring of water under the

Haram, the site of the temple. To the investigation of this point, Dr. Barclay addressed himself with sagacity and perseverance. The following is the result of his observations, in his own words.

“WATERS OF THE HARAM. — *Great Reservoir of the Temple — ‘Royal Cistern’ — Subterranean ‘sea’ of the temple.* — During our exploration of the Haram enclosure, we observed on removing a half-buried marble capital on one occasion, a rude subterranean passage, leading to a long flight of steps. The Effendi immediately despatched some of the workmen for flambeaux, and prepared for a thorough exploration. Descending a broad flight of forty-four wide steps, cut in the native rock — but so worn in some places as to have required partial re-cutting, only a few centuries ago, to all appearance — we reached a beautiful sheet of water. The Effendi mounted the shoulders of a Fellaḥ and seemed to navigate the waters very pleasantly; while my sons and self spent our time certainly as pleasantly in wading through its rude but venerable halls; and making an accurate ground-plan of it — finding the water nowhere much more than knee-deep. We afterwards spent a good portion of another day in its dark nether regions, completing and verifying the plat, taking other measurements, and making an accurate sketch — that here figured — a few minutes’ inspection of which will convey a better idea of this long-lost place than many pages of written explanation.

“This sheet of water is, without doubt, the ‘sea’ of which the Son of Sirach and the Commissioner of King Ptolemy speak in such rapturous terms. It is now, however, quite a rude piece of work — the massive metal-covered pillars having given place to ill-shaped piers, apparently of unhewn rocks, badly plastered; the rapacity of some of the various spoilers of the devoted city — Syrian, Roman, Persian, Saracenic, Turkish, or Frank — having left it minus the lead or brass with which it was formerly encased. It is seven hundred and thirty-six feet in circuit, and forty-two in depth; and, according to the best estimate I could make, its capacity falls but little short of two millions of gallons! The rain from el-Aksa is conducted into it by a small trench, and much also finds its way through small superficial channels leading from various parts of the temple area into the same opening near el-Aksa porch. We discovered no fountain in connection with it, nor did we find the entrance of the aqueduct from Solomon’s Pools, which, we were told by one of the old keepers who had formerly visited this subterranean lake, enters it on the west, yet we cannot positively affirm that there is none; nor did we discover any exit from it into the neighboring pool under el-Aksa; yet, as that pool, which is said to be very capacious, has no visible source of supply, there is probably a communication between them. It formerly had eight apertures above, through which the water was drawn up; but only one remains open at this time.

“I am not able to say how many wells there are in the Haram enclosure

—the larger ones having several mouths each; but there are no less than thirty-two well-mouths; though some of these reservoirs are now disused and nearly filled with rubbish. The dimensions of only the few marked on the map could be ascertained. That under el-Aksa is forty-seven feet deep, that at Mugaribeh gate twenty-seven and a half, and that on the right hand of the Cotton bazaar, near Hammam es-Shefa, is only thirty-three feet in depth—a conclusive proof that it can receive no water by lateral connection with the latter, as some have contended—being less than half its depth. According to Mejr ed-Din, there were thirty-four of these wells or reservoirs in the Haram yard about three and a half centuries ago.”¹

The famous *Hammam es-Shefa*, described by Mr. Wolcott and also by Mr. Williams, was more thoroughly explored by Dr. Barclay. The substance of his report is as follows.

“AIN HAMMAM ES-SHEFA (*Well of Healing*).—The entrance to this mysterious well is situated ten feet south of the Cotton bazaar, one hundred and twenty-five and a half feet from the Haram wall, and one hundred and seventy-six from the Valley street. Its apparent depth is nearly eighty-five feet; but, subtracting eighteen and a half of this for the height of the house, upon the top of which its mouth opens, its real depth beneath the surface of the ground is only sixty-six and a half feet. Its mouth being ten feet higher than the general level of the Haram area, its bottom is, therefore, seventy-five feet below the level of the Haram.

“That its source is entirely independent of and totally disconnected with any of the waters alluded to, or indeed any others whatever, is obvious from the fact (at least when considered in connection with their small supply), that no such source is discoverable, and that water trickles into it from nearly every portion of the interior; and though only *gullatim*, yet, considering the large surface from which it exudes, is fully adequate to the daily demand, which is only about three or four hundred skinsful—except on Friday. Upon this sabbatical day of the Moslem, about eight hundred skins are demanded for expurgatorial ablution. My own impression is, that a well (probably from former indications of moisture in the neighborhood) was originally sunk to the depth of the room, now ten feet above the bottom; which, being plastered and shaped as cisterns generally are, was probably the original cistern, and long used as the receptacle. But the supply proving inadequate to the demands of later times, after the cessation of the latter rains, it was deepened and enlarged; in process of which—following no doubt the leaky veins of porous chalky formation—a cave of crumbling material was reached, which required to be walled in and supported by masonry.

“Even had I not proved by previous analysis the fallacy of the assertion that this water is identical with that of the Virgin’s Fount, Fla-

¹ Pages 526—528.

gellation Well, Cotton Grotto, reservoir, etc., this examination would have induced a contrary conviction; for, instead of coming from the north, as such an opinion necessarily implies, the source of this fountain is directly from the south, and therefore cannot be derived from either of the above-mentioned places. And having witnessed an unusually copious outflow of the Virgin's Fount of thirty-seven minutes' continuance on the preceding Friday, about mid-day, after seven or eight hundred skins (four or five thousand gallons) had been drawn up for the bath and its supply well nigh exhausted, I was convinced that the outflow could not be owing, as is generally supposed, to the discharge of this alleged over-filled reservoir, by a rude kind of natural syphon. That it is not derived from a large fountain within the precincts of the Haram es-Sherif, as others contend, is also fairly inferable from the fact that the channel along which it flows, instead of coming from the east, in the direction of the Haram, approaches the well from the south as far as is ascertained either by report or actual examination; so that, when protracted, it falls considerably short of even touching the most westerly corner of the Haram enclosure.

Most evident is it, from what has been already stated, that this well does not communicate with any source of living water of the Haram, and more especially with one immediately under the threshold of the holy oracle. Nor can it be in connection with any of the Haram reservoirs; for it is thirty-three feet lower than the large reservoir between Kubbet es-Sakhrâh and el-Aksa, forty-two lower than that between the well and the supposed site of the temple, and twenty-eight below that in el-Aksa—the most southern and the deepest reservoir in the Haram enclosure.”¹

We cannot dwell longer upon Dr. Barclay's discussion of the water resources of Jerusalem and its vicinity, than to mention his conjecture that the *Ænon* of John's baptism was the Wady Farah, about six miles north-east of the city. There is nothing, however, in the allusion to *Ænon* in John 3: 23, to indicate the locality of these “many fountains.”

The most interesting and exciting portion of Dr. Barclay's book is that in which he introduces us to “Nether Jerusalem.” That the modern city of Jerusalem, like Paris and Rome, stands upon a rock that has been honey-combed by ancient excavations, has been often conjectured by archaeologists from the allusions of Josephus to subterranean passages, and the partial exploration of ancient conduits and drains; but the fear of some military stratagem for the surprise of the city, and the suspicion of treasure-hunting by

¹ Pages 533—536.

some magic of the Franks, make the Moslem residents of Jerusalem extremely jealous of an attempt to explore the city beneath its surface. The narrative of Dr. Barclay's discovery of the great quarry under Bezetha, is so graphic and instructive that we give it entire, as prepared by one of his sons.

"Having received some intimation of the existence of an entrance to a very extensive cave near the Damascus gate (entirely unknown to Franks), we resolved upon its exploration, on the strength of the Nazir's permission. Accordingly, a few days afterwards, father, brother, and myself repaired thither; and after several hours of vain labor, finding it utterly impossible to effect an entrance unperceived in the open light of day, we concluded to return in the shades of the evening — resolving to pass the night *under Jerusalem* in making a thorough exploration.

"Having provided ourselves with all the requisites for such a furtive adventure (matches, candles, compass, tape-line, paper, and pencils) a little previous to the time of closing the gates of the city, we sallied out at different points, the better to avoid exciting suspicion, and rendezvoused at Jeremiah's Pool, near to which we secreted ourselves within a white enclosure surrounding the tomb of a departed Arab Sheik, until the shades of darkness enabled us to approach unperceived — when we issued from our hiding-place, amid the screeching of owls, screaming of hawks, howling of jackals, and the chirping of nocturnal insects. The mouth of the cavern being immediately below the city wall and the houses on Bezetha, we proceeded cautiously in the work of removing the dirt, mortar, and stones; and, after undermining and picking awhile, a hole (commenced a day or two previous by our dog) was made, though scarcely large enough for us to worm our way serpentinely through the ten-foot wall.

"On scrambling through and descending the inner side of the wall, we found our way apparently obstructed by an immense mound of soft dirt, which had been thrown in the more effectually to close up the entrance; but, after examining awhile, discovered that it had settled down in some places sufficiently to allow us to crawl over it on hand and knee; which having accomplished, we found ourselves enveloped in thick darkness, that might be felt, but not penetrated by all our lights, so vast is the hall.

"For some time we were almost overcome with feelings of awe and admiration (and I must say apprehension, too, from the immense impending vaulted roof), and felt quite at a loss to decide in which direction to wend our way. There is a constant and in many places very rapid descent from the entrance to the termination, the distance between which two points, in a nearly direct line, is seven hundred and fifty feet; and the cave is upwards of three thousand feet in circumference, supported by great numbers of rude natural pillars. At the southern extremity there is a very deep and precipitous pit, in which we received a very salutary warning of

caution from the dead — a human skeleton ! supposed to be that of a person who, not being sufficiently supplied with lights, was precipitated headlong and broke his neck, or rather his skull, I should judge, from the fracture I noticed on picking it up ! There is also near this pit a basin excavated in the solid rock, about five feet in diameter and two and a half feet deep, into which the percolating water trickles ; but it was in vain we tried to quench our thirst with water of such bitter, disagreeable taste. A little, however, was bottled for analysis. Water was everywhere dropping from the lofty ceiling, which had formed numerous stalactites and stalagmites — some of them very resplendent and beautiful, but too fragile to be collected and preserved.

“ We noticed bats clinging to the ceiling in several places, in patches varying from fifty to a hundred and fifty, hanging together, which flew away at our too near approach, and for some time continued to flit and scream round and about our heads in rather disagreeable propinquity. Numerous crosses marked on the wall indicated that, though unknown to Christendom of the present day, the devout pilgrim or crusader had been there ; and a few Arabic and Hebrew inscriptions (though too much effaced to be deciphered) proved that the place was not unknown to the Jew and Arab. Indeed, the manner in which the beautiful white solid limestone rock was everywhere carved by the mason’s rough chisel into regular pillars, proved that this extensive cavern, though in part natural, was formerly used as the grand quarry of Jerusalem.

“ Also, from the close correspondence in the strata of rock in this cave and the opposite hill, we came to the conclusion that this cavern and the Grotto of Jeremiah, two or three hundred yards distant (the intermediate hill having been carried away for the construction of the city wall, temple, etc.), constituted one immense cave. There are many intricate meandering passages leading to immense halls, as white as the driven snow, and supported by colossal pillars of irregular shape — some of them placed there by the hand of nature, to support the roof of the various grottos ; others evidently left by the stone quarrier in quarrying the rock to prevent the tumbling of the city. Such reverberations I never heard before !

“ Though disappointed in our fond expectations of working our way to the Sanctum Sanctorum, Hippicus, or Antonia, as we had vaguely conjectured we might be enabled to do, we were nevertheless highly delighted with our little jaunt in nether Jerusalem.

“ From the former entrance of the cave down to the temple area is a gently inclined plane — a fact that suggests a satisfactory solution of what has heretofore been regarded as a very puzzling question — the difficulty of placing such immense masses of rock *in situ*, as those found at the south-east and south-west corners of the temple wall.

“ We entered the cave at 7 P. M., with the intention of passing the night in its dark recesses ; but after making a plan, were so fatigued that we concluded, that were we to yield ourselves to the influence of Somnus, the rising sun would probably reveal to the jealous Mussulmans the

opened entrance to the scene of our nocturnal adventure. Therefore, at 2 A. M., we repaired to an old vacated oil-mill adjacent, and having kindled a brush and grass fire, passed the remainder of the night in a state of no little discomfiture—longing for the light of morning.

“The numerous burrows, into which we so often sank knee-deep, served to confirm the construction we had put upon the report made to us by our faithful dog in this arduous reconnoissance—and proved that here ‘the foxes had holes,’ as well as ‘the birds of the air their nests’—for the bones that lay strewn about proved that the voracious jackal was now the ‘lord of this manor,’ whose interminable halls had for centuries resounded to the busy din of the hammer and chisel. What untold toil was represented by the vast piles of blocks and chippings, over which we had to clamber in making our exploration! A melancholy grandeur, at once exciting and depressing, pervaded these vast saloons. This, without doubt, is the very magazine from which much of the temple rock was hewn.”¹

Lest this should be regarded as the exaggeration of a youthful explorer, in the first enthusiasm of discovery, we subjoin a brief description of the quarry, from Rev. Stephen H. Tyng, D. D., of New York.

“Dr. Barclay’s discovery of the great quarry under the north-eastern part of the city, was a very remarkable addition to the topographical knowledge of Jerusalem. In this vast subterranean cavern we wandered for hours in wondering observation. It runs south and east from under the northern wall, probably quite beneath the area of the temple. When we saw the immense white stones in the western foundation of the temple wall, where the Jews weekly meet for their wailing over the desolations of Jerusalem, the size and aspect of these ancient stones struck us with amazement. But our visit to this vast quarry interpreted the whole scene. Here, perhaps for more than a third of a mile in extent, we walked over heaps of chips and sprawls, such as fill every stone-cutter’s yard, and saw where courses of immense blocks of the purest white stone had been quarried and worked. Many of these stones are still remaining just as the ancient workmen left them. Some stand in rows still united to the rock, cut down in separate channels, scooped out at the bottom, as if worked with an adze. Some have the mortices for the wedges by which they were to be thrown off, worked on the back edge of the outside. Some are cracked and partially separated, as if the work had been arrested in the very use of the wedges; and some are lying across each other on the floor, just as they fell. Here is the whole secret revealed of the noiseless construction of the temple—of the ‘stones squared by the stone-squarers,’ before they were brought thith-

¹ Pages 459—462.

er — and of the ‘great stones,’ ‘hewed stones,’ ‘costly stones,’ ‘glistening stones,’ which were used in the construction of the wonderful edifice. The whole investigation is startling in its character, and compensating in a high degree.”¹

This discovery of the probable temple-quarry, serves not only to illustrate the manner of building, but, by exhibiting the stone *in situ*, confirms the testimony of Josephus as to its dazzling whiteness. The friable nature of the stone may also account for the complete disintegration of the temple walls after their overthrow by Titus. The name of Dr. Barclay will always be associated with this wonderful discovery.

We would willingly follow our author through all his supposed discoveries and identifications ; but the reader would be impatient of further detail. Dr. Barclay displaces many of the localities fixed by previous topographers, and determines others with a facility which fails to inspire confidence in his results. The most obvious fault of his work is that of hasty inference, prompted by the desire to settle every disputed point. The reputed tomb of Helena he regards as a sepulchre of the Herodian period. Golgotha he locates upon the eastern brow of the Kidron, far up the valley. He attempts also to identify nearly every gate and quarter of ancient Jerusalem with some locality of the modern city. It was our privilege and our pleasure, in 1853, to ride in company with Dr. Barclay, over the principal suburbs of Jerusalem, and especially to make the circuit of the mount of Olives as far as Bethany. His location of Bethphage upon a spur of Olivet about a mile from the city, appeared more plausible upon the spot than it is possible to make it by a verbal description. It rests, however, mainly upon conjecture. The same must be said of the rocky eminence overhanging the site of Bethany, which Dr. Barclay would make the scene of the Ascension. This is very well as a *conjecture* ; but it enhances the sublime spirituality of the New Testament economy that, in the very land of sacred places and symbols, every trace of the Saviour’s footsteps which

¹ Protestant Churchman.

might be used for scenic effect, or perverted to the ends of superstition, is utterly and forever obliterated.

But the merits of Dr. Barclay's book are too great to suffer us to criticize severely its defects. It gives a valuable compendium of ancient and modern authorities concerning Jerusalem; a minute array of the points of its topography drawn from the Scriptures and Josephus; careful observations upon its climate and its vital and economical statistics; valuable measurements of ancient remains; the most elaborate and reliable account of modern Jerusalem yet given in the English language; while in its minute descriptions of the water-resources of the city, of the discovery of the great quarry, of the interior of the mosque of Omar and the substructions of el-Aksa, and also of the arch of the Tyropæon bridge, first identified by Robinson,¹ it adds not a little of substantial value to our knowledge. It is understood that the author will soon return to Jerusalem to prosecute his labors and researches under the most favorable circumstances. It is important to the interests of archæology to have such an acute and indefatigable observer continually upon the ground.

The concluding chapter of Dr. Barclay's book treats of "Jerusalem as it is to be." Dr. B. is a literalist of the extremest school. Accordingly he maps out upon the present territory of Palestine the features of Ezekiel's vision — the "Prince's possession" of fifty-one and a quarter miles square, including the city "Yehovah-shammah," nine miles square. This looks like running prophecy into the ground. Still, at this very hour, the Christian nations of Europe are girdling the land of Palestine with great commercial lines, uniting the East and the West; and nothing is wanting but a wise and efficient government, giving protection to capital and encouragement to industry, to render Palestine the very centre of commercial intercourse for both hemispheres. The memoir of the American Geographical Society on "Syrian

¹ Dr. Barclay discovered an arch with a key-stone under Solomon's Pool at el-Burak.

Exploration," develops many interesting facts upon this subject. In the cycle of ages, the law may once more "go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

"Palestine is so remarkably situated, that it forms the bridge between two continents, and a gateway to a third. Were the population and wealth of Europe, Asia, and Africa condensed into single points, Palestine would be the centre of their common gravity. And with the amazing facilities of modern intercourse and the prodigious extent of modern traffic, it is not easy to estimate the commercial grandeur to which a kingdom may attain, planted as it were on the very apex of the old world, with its three continents spreading out beneath its feet, and with the Red sea on one side to bring it all the golden treasures and spicy harvests of the East; and the Mediterranean floating in, on the other side, all the skill, and enterprise, and knowledge of the West. For the sake of higher ends, it seems the purpose of God to make the Holy Land a mart of nations."¹ But whether that land shall be occupied by Israel recalled and regenerated, and Jerusalem shall once more become a joy in the earth, are questions we would reverently and patiently leave to the unfolding of that prophecy which, "sounding through the long galleries of centuries," proclaims that all nations shall be blessed in Abraham and his seed.

NOTE. Since the foregoing Article was in type, Dr. Horatius Bonar's "Land of Promise" has come to hand. It gives a clear statement of the theory which enlarges Mount Zion upon the North, and transfers Akra to the eastern side of the valley from the Damascus gate, which Dr. B. regards as the Tyropæon. (pp. 496—501.) His view of Gihon, however, is untenable and self-contradictory.

¹ Cited in "The Last Times," a volume of discourses by Rev. J. A. Seiss, Lutheran Pastor in Baltimore; an eloquent advocate of the pre-millennial advent.