

and when we sleep." As the prophet of Israel touched the eyes of his servant, and showed him the mountains round about him filled with angelic warriors and chariots of fire, so must he who speaks for God to this unbelieving world be able to draw aside at times the thin veil that hides the invisible, and show his astonished hearers the dread realities that lie so near to every one of us. As in the contest of Greek and Trojan story, over the embattled hosts upon the plain, the gods themselves were fighting for and against the mortal combatants below, so must the dull worshipper of mammon and of sense, as he comes to the house of God, be made to see that the very air above him and around him is full of armed warriors in fierce contest over a prostrate soul, — and that soul *his own!*

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

BY REV. SAMUEL WOLCOTT, D.D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

In a former Article (Vol. xxiii. pp. 684–695) we reviewed the theory of the Topography of Jerusalem propounded by James Fergusson, F.R.S., an eminent British architect, and published in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, and gave some reasons for dissenting from it. After the Article had been printed, we met for the first time with a pamphlet of seventy pages, published by Mr. Fergusson subsequent to his Article in the Dictionary, entitled, "Notes on the Site of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, in answer to the Edinburgh Review." In our previous Article, written with a desire to compress the argument, in reply to the points brought forward in the Dictionary, into a brief compass, with as little of a controversial aspect as possible, we find that we passed over some points which did not seem to us essential to a

correct judgment of the question, but on which Mr. Fergusson lays special stress, and which in the pamphlet before us he reiterates and presses into the foreground as conclusive and unanswerable. Without going over ground already traversed, believing that our former argument offers a sure foundation for the convictions of those who accept it, we feel constrained to resume the discussion, and take up every point not already disposed of, and not belonging to his profession as an architect, which Mr. Fergusson deems important. This service we attempt the more readily, because in the judgment of so respectable an authority as Mr. Grove of Sydenham — one of the few biblical scholars who seem to treat his speculations with favor, — “his arguments have never been answered, or even fairly discussed” (Smith’s Bib. Dic. Vol. ii. p. 696). There were two references in our previous Article which first demand a brief explanation.

After quoting the point taken by the Edinburgh Review, that Mr. Fergusson failed “to account for the building reared by Abd el-Melek,” we remarked, “It may be added that he equally fails to account for the present Church of the Sepulchre” (p. 694). To the issue raised by the reviewer, he replies that he finds the Khalif’s building in the Mosque el-Aksa; and had the fact been in our mind, we should have stated it or omitted the reference. The issue which we raised in the above sentence we shall present again.

Next to the Bible, our most important witness on the Zion question is Josephus. Our citations from this author in our former paper, relative to the successive sieges of Jerusalem, were given without explanation, our object being to show that the royal palace and original citadel were in the upper city and on the western hill, and this appears on the face of the narrative. The Asmonean dynasty, about 165 B.C., while retaining the royal residence in the upper city, erected a fortress or acropolis near the northwest corner of the present Haram area, which Herod subsequently rebuilt, and which from the days of Nehemiah appears to have been a fortified point for the protection of the temple. This fortress figures

in the narrative of the sieges by Pompey and Herod. The former had to subdue it after he had gained possession both of the upper city and palace and of the temple; and it was from this that Antigonus descended when he surrendered to the latter. This later citadel is not to be confounded with (and in our previous paper should have been expressly distinguished from) the ancient tower of David and its successor, the apparent site of which is that of one of the towers built by Herod in the northwest part of Zion. With this explanation we take leave of Josephus.

Mr. Fergusson has not renewed in his Notes the discussion of his theory respecting Mount Zion, and we have no more scripture testimony to examine; but we inadvertently overlooked a verse cited in the Dictionary (Neh. iii. 16), which he pronounces "important." It is as follows: "After him repaired Nehemiah the son of Azbuk, the ruler of the half part of Beth-zur, unto the place over against the sepulchres of David, and to the pool that was made, and unto the house of the mighty." These localities, with many others named in the chapter, can only be fixed conjecturally. On the face of the passage they accord well with the received theory respecting Mount Zion, with which locality Dr. Barclay, after carefully examining the matter on the ground, associates them, and represents the wall here described as running "along the precipitous brow of Zion" (Jerusalem, pp. 126, 155). From this chapter, as from the scripture quotations cited and examined in our previous paper, Mr. Fergusson's theory derives no support. This disposes of the Biblical testimony.

But we cannot take leave of the theory without adverting to the confusion which it has introduced into the Dictionary, — the weak point in this great work — through the necessary failure of the attempt to harmonize it with the facts of history and topography. It was the evident intention of the editor that the Article on Jerusalem should be coherent and consistent; and the writers of the historical portions (Messrs. Grove and Wright) have passed over to their fellow contribu-

tor (Mr. Fergusson) most of the topographical points. We now propose to exhibit the position in which they have left this question, and will begin with Mr. Grove's "rough sketch of the *terrain* of Jerusalem" (i. 985).

The city occupies the southern termination of a table-land, a promontory, with deep, precipitous, trench-like ravines on the west, south, and east, and an open plateau on the north (*ib.*). This promontory which forms the site of the city, is itself divided by a longitudinal ravine, running up from south to north, east of the centre, and gradually rising to the high level on the north, dividing the promontory into two unequal portions, making it, in fact, a double promontory (*ib.*)

This general outline is sufficient for our purpose. The western ridge was divided by a subordinate ravine running east and west, making two summits, of which we hold that the southern was Zion, and the northern Akra. The eastern ridge was also divided by a tributary ravine, running east and west, making two summits, of which we hold that the southern was Moriah, and the northern Bezetha. Mr. Fergusson holds that Akra was the northern point of Moriah, and the summit which we call Akra he leaves without a name (p. 1025). We waive this question, and we waive all discussion of secondary valleys and minor points; our sole object is to ascertain the true site of the ancient Zion, as exhibited in the Dictionary.

Let the reader, then, imagine or sketch the promontory on which Jerusalem stood, with deep valleys on three sides, and an internal ravine dividing it into two ridges, eastern and western, nameless as yet, and let him, as we proceed, fix the leading localities. We will quote fairly, without comment, in the order in which we find them in the Article on Jerusalem — numbering them for convenient reference — the sentences which ought to enable him to do this intelligently. It may require a little patience, and we invoke it, for the question is one of some importance and interest, and it is time that it were settled.

(1.) "Of these two [portions of the city] that on the west — the 'upper city' of the Jews, the Mount Zion of modern tradition — is the higher and more massive; that on the east — Mount Moriah, the Akra or 'lower city' of Josephus, now occupied by the great Mohammedan sanctuary — is at once considerably lower and smaller." — p. 985.

(2.) "The tombs of the kings were in the city of David; that is, Mount Zion, which was an eminence on the northern part of Mount Moriah." — p. 987.

(3.) "As long as the upper city remained in the hands of the Jebusites, they practically had possession of the whole." — p. 989.

(4.) "As before, the lower city was immediately taken and, as before, the citadel held out. The undaunted Jebusites believed in the impregnability of their fortress. A crowd of warriors rushed forward, and the citadel, the fastness of Zion, was taken. It is the first time that that memorable name appears in the history. David at once proceeded to secure himself in his new acquisition. He enclosed the whole of the city with a wall, and connected it with the citadel. In the latter he took up his own quarters, and the Zion of the Jebusites became the city of David." — pp. 989, 990.

(5.) "An embassy arrived from Hiram the king of Phenicia, offering artificers and materials to erect a palace for David in his new abode. The palace was built and occupied." — p. 990.

(6.) "The arrival of the ark was an event of great importance. A new tent had been spread by David in the fortress for the reception of the ark, and here, 'in its place,' it was deposited with the most impressive ceremonies, and Zion became at once the great sanctuary of the nation. In this tent the ark remained until it was removed to its permanent resting-place in the temple. In the fortress of Zion, too, was the sepulchre of David, which became also that of most of his successors." — p. 990.

(7.) "Antigonus got into the city, and reached the upper market-place, the modern Zion, without resistance." — p. 1005.

(8.) "Then the outer court of the temple and the lower city, lying in the hollow between the temple and the modern Zion was taken, and the Jews were driven into the inner parts of the temple, and to the upper market-place, which connected therewith by a bridge." — p. 1005.

(9.) "Herod occupied the old palace of the Asmoneans, which crowned the eastern face of the upper city, and stood adjoining the Xystus, at the end of the bridge between the temple and the upper city." — p. 1006.

(10.) "Herod built a new and extensive palace immediately adjoining the old wall, at the northwest corner of the upper city." — p. 1007.

(11.) "Archelaus despatched the horse-soldiers by a detour round the level ground north of the city, to surprise the pilgrims on the eastern slopes of Moriah." — p. 1007.

(12.) "Agrippa added an apartment to the old Asmonean palace on the eastern brow of the upper city, which commanded a full view into the interior of the courts of the temple. This view the Jews intercepted by building a wall on the west side of the inner quadrangle."—p. 1010.

(13.) "The temple was at last gained; but it seemed as if half the work remained to be done. The upper city, higher than Moriah, enclosed by the original wall of David and Solomon, and on all sides precipitous, except at the north, where it was defended by the wall and towers of Herod, was still to be taken. Titus first tried a parley, he standing on the east end of the bridge, between the temple and the upper city, and John and Simon on the west end."—p. 1013.

(14.) "Upper market-place"—the western hill, or modern Zion.—Plate I. Topography of Josephus.

(15.) "The 'upper market-place' was called the 'citadel' by David" (p. 1024.) "The citadel was still the 'virgin daughter of Zion.'"—p. 994.

(16.) "Akra was situated on the northern side of the temple, on the same hill, and probably on the same spot occupied by David as the stronghold of Zion."—p. 1025.

(17.) "The citadel, or upper market-place of Josephus was the *modern* Zion, or the city enclosed within the old wall; Akra was the *ancient* Zion, or the hill on which the temple and the city of David stood."—p. 1025.

(18.) "It is quite clear that Zion and the city of David were identical, for it is said, 'David took the castle of Zion, which is the city of David; and David dwelt in the castle, therefore they called it the city of David.'"—p. 1026.

(19.) "There is no passage in the Bible which directly asserts the identity of the hills Zion and Moriah, though [there are] many which cannot well be understood without this assumption. The cumulative proof, however, is such as almost perfectly to supply this want."—p. 1026.

(20.) "City of the Jebusites," the western or modern Zion hill. "City of David," the eastern or temple hill.—Plate II. Topography of the Bible.

(21.) "Old Jerusalem," the western hill; "New Jerusalem," the eastern hill.—Diagram, Fergusson's Notes, p. 47.

These extracts are all from one Article; and who can reconcile them with any theory, or find in them an intelligible topography? We have just tried the experiment on an intelligent gentleman, who at our request took a sheet of paper and drew with his pencil a rough outline of the city, and then, as we read sentence by sentence, sought to fill out

the sketch ; and after a persistent effort, before we had finished, he laid the pencil upon the paper with a bewildered look, equivalent to saying : "The mountains skipped like rams, and the little hills like lambs." On a topic which to some minds is of more interest than any other in the Dictionary, the Biblical student turns to a work containing the latest and richest fruits of learned investigation only to be baffled and perplexed. Instead of a description of the city which he hopes to find so clear that a blind person might walk through it, he meets with a theory which entangles him at every step, and causes him to "stumble at noonday." Before quitting the theme, let us gather into one sentence from these conflicting statements such points as are consistent with each other and with known facts and probabilities.

The city or stronghold of the Jebusites was the southern portion of the western ridge, the highest, most inaccessible, and easily fortified ground in the city ; conquered by David, it became his fortified abode ; his castle or citadel was here, and remained here ; his palace was built here, and through successive reigns and dynasties, down to the Christian era, it continued to be the royal residence ; it was the ancient as it is the modern Zion, enclosed by the old wall, the original wall ; it was the upper city, the upper market-place ; it was here that the ark abode until its removal to the temple ; the royal sepulchres were here ; and Moriah was the southern portion of the eastern ridge, and on this the temple was built. This statement, embodying, we believe, the truth of history, agrees with, and is supported by, the above extracts numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, and 21, and portions of 1, 2, 17, and 20 ; and with these extracts, and with the statement which rests on them, the extracts numbered 16 and 19, and portions of 2, 17, and 20, are in irreconcilable conflict. With this we close the discussion of the site of Mount Zion.

We will now proceed to the discussion of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. "Who has ever doubted," exclaimed Dr. Robinson, in 1838, "the identity of the pres-

ent site with that selected by Constantine?" (Biblical Researches, ii. 71.) The architect who transfers Zion to the eastern hill, transfers the Church of the Sepulchre to the same summit. These are twin theories.

We said in the former Article that Mr. Fergusson's theory fails to explain the present church, a building of great intrinsic and historic interest. When, and by whom were its early foundations laid? Who built up its original walls? For how many centuries has it been palmed upon the public as the church of the sepulchre? Has the largest and most remarkable Christian sanctuary in the East, planted in the very centre and confluence of Christian devotion, come down to us without a chronicle or even an intimation of its origin? We repeat that the early history of such an edifice could not, since the Christian era, and in the most conspicuous spot in Christendom, have faded into utter oblivion, like that of some temple of the Old World, around which the sands of the desert had gathered for ages before Christ.

Mr. Fergusson's theory, while failing to account for the existence of the most imposing church in the East, fails also to account for the disappearance of every vestige of another church of imperial magnificence. This argument, like the preceding, is collateral, and we do not offer it as independent proof. Church edifices in Palestine, large and small, have been destroyed by violence, or have crumbled by decay. Some of them have been rebuilt or repaired, and perpetuated on their present sites, like that of the Nativity in Bethlehem, or that of the Sepulchre in Jerusalem; and others are clearly traceable, if not impressive, in their ruins, like that of the Baptist in Samaria, that of St. George in Lydda, that of St. Anne in Eleutheropolis, and the ancient cathedral church in Tyre. But what church of the largest class has had a history which corresponds with this theory? The emperor Justinian had a passion for church-building, and decorated his metropolis with a majestic temple, which is still its boast. He erected another in Jerusalem, which he designed to be worthy of "the City of the Great King," and of the Virgin mother,

in whose special honor it was built, "on which great expense and labor were bestowed to make it one of the most splendid in the world." It does not appear to have been disturbed by the subsequent convulsions of the country; writers who describe the injury done to the Church of the Sepulchre in the sack of the city by the Russians, and under the Fatimite Khalifs of Egypt, so far as we know, are silent respecting this edifice. The Mosque el-Aksa, which in accordance with prevalent tradition, is almost universally regarded as the original church of Justinian, Mr. Fergusson appropriates as the Mosque of Abd el-Melek. This leaves the church to be provided for, and in the plan of the Haram area, which he has introduced into the Dictionary and republished in his Notes, he places the church of Justinian, and sketches its walls, where not the slightest trace appears of a foundation ancient or modern. It is purely a conjectural site, demanded by the exigencies of his theory, according to which the solid walls, pillars, and arches of a church described by a contemporary historian, and sketched by Mr. Fergusson as four hundred feet in length and one hundred and more in breadth, have vanished as utterly as if they had been pulverized and scattered to the winds. It has disappeared, withal, from a quarter of the city which was never needed nor used for other purposes, where no dwellings could have encroached upon it, and where no rubbish has accumulated. Considering the character, the location, and the dimensions of this building, and the date of its erection, we hazard the assertion that no parallel to such complete annihilation can be found in the East.

The Mosque of Omar near it, Mr. Fergusson claims to have been converted by the Muslim conquerors into a mosque from a church; we advance the same claim for the Mosque el-Aksa; and there were similar transformations, as is well known, of the Church of St. John in Damascus, and of the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, built also by Justinian. Instead of converting to the same use the substantial and splendid church which the same emperor had erected

here, what could have prompted the Muslims to obliterate every memorial of it? Within the same enclosure, according to Mr. Fergusson, the "great Anastasis of Constantine," the present Mosque of Omar, built two centuries earlier, survives in all its essential features. "The walls of the octagon still remain untouched in their lower parts; the circle of columns and piers that divide the two aisles, with the entablatures, discharging arches, and cornices, still remain entirely unchanged and untouched; the pier arches of the dome, the triforium belt, the clere-story, are all parts of the unaltered construction of the age of Constantine" (Notes, p. 29). The Mosque of Abd el-Melek, the present el-Aksa, abides within the same enclosure in its original strength. "Its whole architecture is that of the end of the seventh century" (Dict. i. 1033). But the church of Justinian, standing by their side in rival glory, mysteriously passed away from that open area — wall and column and arch and architrave — from foundation to top-stone, smitten like the psalmist's bay tree:

"And lo, it vanished from the ground,  
Destroyed by hands unseen;  
Nor root, nor branch, nor leaf was found,  
Where all that pride had been."

Mr. Fergusson's theory leaves the later history of the church of Justinian enveloped in the same darkness as the earlier history of the Church of the Sepulchre.

The rejecters of his theory recognize this ancient house of worship in the building adjacent to the southern wall of the Haram, two hundred and eighty feet long by one hundred and ninety broad, and which, with later appendages, both Christian and Saracenic, answers to the description of Justinian's Mary Church, and whose vaulted passages below, from which Christian visitors have long been excluded, are among the impressive objects which it was our fortune to examine in Jerusalem.

What has been said of Justinian's church may be repeated on his theory respecting the church which he affirms that

Constantine built within the same enclosure, whose walls he conjecturally traces in the same way, with no more signs of a foundation or site, and which has vanished in like manner, except a festal entrance which he identifies with the present Golden Gateway in the eastern wall of the Haram area.

We will now examine the contents of Mr. Fergusson's last pamphlet. The subject is treated methodically under the four heads: "The Personal Argument; The Architectural Evidence of the Buildings; Eusebius; The Medieval Historians." — p. 16.

Under the first head, he argues that his personal acquaintance with the localities is not a disqualification for writing about them, and reaches the comfortable conclusion, "that my [his] not having visited the place is a positive advantage for the elucidation of the truth." — p. 20.

The argument under the second head is beyond our province; but he introduces an extraneous paragraph which we can appreciate:

"Before concluding this part of the subject I must mention that one of the reviewer's happiest hits is taunting me that I cannot produce a record of the transference of the Sepulchra. I shall return to this presently. For our present purpose it is sufficient to know that the Sepulchre once stood on Mount Moriah, and now stands in the middle of the town. I did suggest a mode in which the transference might have taken place, but am quite willing to adopt any better that may be suggested. But can he be serious in asking for a *record*? Does he not know that the very essence of a fraud is concealment? If a record is made, it ceases *ipso facto* to be a fraud, and becomes a fact. Surely he hardly expects that those men who substituted the new sepulchre for the old, would proclaim to all the world what they were doing! I presume the reviewer does not believe in all the legends and miracles recounted in the 'Legenda Aurea,' and other books of the Middle Ages; yet I defy him to produce a single record of the mode in which any one of the thousand and one pious frauds of that age were produced. The record is not made till the fraud is detected; and that we are now engaged in doing." — p. 42.

The full difficulty of such a transaction, accomplished without detection or suspicion, has not been stated. Not the Christian world alone, on this hypothesis, but the Muslim world likewise, has been imposed upon in this matter, and

by parties who could not have concocted the fraud together. And all this has been done subsequent to the seventh century. So late as the close of that century, if this theory is true, all Christians and all Muslims, who knew anything about Jerusalem, knew that the present Mosque of Omar was not then a mosque, and never had been; and that the present Church of the Sepulchre, or one on its site, was not *the* Church of the Sepulchre. On both sides they have since that date been misled by designing men. In his Notes Mr. Fergusson is even tempted, on the authority of a Greek writer, to bring down the date of the imposition to the seventeenth century, or later; but seeing the contradiction and confusion in which this would involve him, at the period (A.D. 1697), when Henry Maundrell was minutely describing the Church of the Sepulchre on its present site, and the ceremonies of Easter Sunday as still performed, and two centuries after Kadi Mejir ed-Din (A.D. 1495) had minutely described the present Mosque of Omar as a mosque, he dismisses his witness with the remark: "Of course he was wrong, if he is to be understood as speaking of things as they existed in his time"; thus stultifying the testimony, and defeating the object for which he professed to cite it, which is stated in these words: "Even the last assertion, that the [current] tradition has been constant for fifteen hundred years, will not bear examination, as may be seen from the following extract from Dositheus, an author who wrote in the seventeenth century, and died 1709." (p. 59); and after thus quoting and discarding his witness, he adds, "the argument does not stand in need of any such assistance" (p. 60). Whatever may be the date of the fraud, the double fact remains on Mr. Fergusson's theory, that all Christians, residents in Jerusalem, and visitors, so far as is known, have from the first ascribed the site of the present church to the emperor, and all Muslims, residents in Jerusalem and visitors, so far as is known, have from the first ascribed the present mosque to the Khalif, and yet in all these centuries they have alike been the dupes and victims of a double delusion and impo-

sition, commencing we know not when. Can this fact be matched, either in historic annals, or in the fabulous legends of the Dark Ages ?

An incident in the Mohammedan conquest of the city, narrated by both Christian and Arabian writers, may properly be cited in this connection. We quote from the historic portion of the Article on Jerusalem in the Dictionary, furnished by Mr. Wright, of Cambridge University : " The Khalif, after ratifying the terms of capitulation, which secured to the Christians liberty of worship in the churches which they had, but prohibited the erection of more, entered the city and was met at the gates by the patriarch. Omar then, in company with the patriarch, visited the church of the Resurrection, and at the Muslim time of prayer knelt down on the eastern steps of the Basilica, refusing to pray within the buildings, in order that the possession of them might be secured to the Christians. Tradition relates that he requested a site whereon to erect a mosque for the Mohammedan worship, and that the patriarch offered him the spot occupied by the reputed stone of Jacob's vision," etc. (i. 1016). Passing by the tradition, we have the historic fact that the Khalif declined entering the church, for the reason above given, stated in almost the same words by another writer : " In order that his followers might have no pretext to claim possession of the church after his departure, under the pretense that he had worshipped in it " (Biblical Researches, ii. 37). Yet if we may believe Mr. Fergusson, this plighted faith, understood alike by both parties, and on the testimony of both scrupulously respected at the outset, was afterwards violated without any known protest or remonstrance or condemnation on the part of Christians, we know not when, history and tradition being both as silent respecting this transaction as in regard to the " pious fraud " by which the homage of Christendom was subsequently transferred to another locality.

Under the third head he refers to the passage which we cited in our former paper as disproving his theory, namely,

the existence of "a broad market-place" in front of the Basilica of Constantine's church, and to Professor Willis's criticism that this would be "ludicrously impossible" where he locates the building, he replies: "There is now an extensive cemetery on the spot in front of this gateway; and where men can bury they can buy; where there is room for tombs, there is room for stalls" (p. 50). With reference to this locality, we quote the following from Mr. Grove: "The main cemetery of the city seems from an early date to have been where it is still, on the steep slopes of the valley of the Kidron. Here it was that the fragments of the idol abominations, destroyed by Josiah, were cast out on the 'graves of the children of the people' (2 Kings xxiii. 6), and the valley was always the receptacle for impurities of all kinds" (Dict. i. 987). Connect with this the fact that the spot was then, as it is now, outside the city, and on its least populous side, and we leave the reader to judge what element of absurdity is lacking in Mr. Fergusson's supposition.

The passage on which he places his main reliance, under this head, is contained in the following extracts. The *italics*, in all his quotations, are his, and not the author's:

"The 33d chapter is the most important of the whole, as containing the only topographical indication. 'Accordingly on the very spot which witnessed the Saviour's sufferings a new Jerusalem was constructed, *over against* the one so celebrated of old, which, since the foul stain of guilt brought upon it by the murder of the Lord, had experienced the extremity of desolation. It was *opposite* the city that the emperor began to rear a monument to the Saviour's victory over death, with rich and lavish magnificence.'

"To this we may add the passage from Socrates referred to by the reviewer, in which he says, 'The mother of the emperor built a magnificent house of prayer on the place of the sepulchre, founding a new Jerusalem opposite to the old and deserted city.'

"To my mind this is in itself sufficient to settle the whole question; but as every one is not familiar with the plan of Jerusalem, the annexed diagram will make it clearer.

"There can be no doubt whatever that at the time of the destruction of the city the whole part shaded was covered with houses, and must in Constantine's time have been covered with ruins; while, from the incidents

of the siege — such as the people on the walls of the Temple watching the review of Titus's army on Bezetha, and the mention of their being no obstacles on the north of the Temple — we may feel certain that that part, on the other hand, was clear of houses. It appears as clear as the sun at noonday that Eusebius and Socrates meant to describe the sepulchre as opposite to, and not in, the old city. The Dome of the Rock is opposite ; the present church is in the city. There is no doubt or difficulty about the translation of the passage, but till it is got over the argument halts. Since I pointed it out writers have carefully avoided it. The reviewer is the first who boldly quotes it — and, with a daring worthy of a better cause, quotes it against me. Did he never see a plan of Jerusalem ? or did he merely trust to others taking his assertion for granted ? — pp. 46, 47.

We shall examine this testimony presently.

Under the fourth head we give his main argument in full ; not suppressing the reference to American literature and to Dr. Robinson, as our nerves can bear it, and it is a fair specimen of his style.

“The first in order of time is the Bordeaux Pilgrim, A.D. 333. His testimony to the locality is, that, passing *outwards* from the Sion Gate, a person going to the Neapolitan Gate, *outside the wall*, ‘foris murum,’ has the house of Pilate ‘down in the valley on the right, and the sepulchre and Golgotha on the left,’ — thus confirming my views to the fullest extent. Dr. Robinson gets over this difficulty by leaving out the words ‘foris murum,’ and making him pass inside the town ! and this, with the addition of definite articles to the text of Eusebius, he thinks a sufficient answer to so elaborate an argument and to all the architectural evidence adduced above.

To any one not acquainted with American literature this might appear a most inexplicable phenomenon. The fact however is, America has no architectural style of her own ; her children see nothing but that jumble of styles which is found in all modern countries, and when, in after life, they come in contact with true styles few of them appreciate the fact of their importance, and no American writer I know of has taken the trouble to study the rudiments of the art, much less to master its significance. The consequence is, as far as the learned Doctor is concerned, unless he finds it written in his text-books, he never can tell whether a building was erected by the Saracens or the Crusaders. A Jewish or a Roman building is all the same to him, and whether Constantine or the Crusaders built the Holy Sepulchre, can in his opinion, only be decided by the *littera scripta*.

“That such a man should look on my book as he would at an arrow-headed inscription is not to be wondered at. Anything is good enough

for one who has knowledge which is, to the Doctor, 'foolishness,' and two most slovenly mistranslations were, in his opinion, sufficient to upset an argument based on reasoning which was utterly unintelligible to his mind. When his error was pointed out to him in the 'Athenaeum' of 1856, he wisely took no notice. If he does not answer now, the world will probably consider that he cannot, and most men will think he has acquired but little honor in the contest.

"Next in order of time to the Bordeaux Pilgrim is Antoninus Martyrus, who visited Jerusalem between the time of Justinian and the Mahometan conquest. Among other things we find the following unconscious testimony to the truth of what has been stated above. After describing Golgotha and the altars of Abraham and Melchisedec, he goes on to say, 'Near the altar is a crypt, where, if you place your ear, you will hear the flowing of water; and if you throw in an apple, or anything that will swim, and go to Siloam, you will find it there.' It need not be added that such an expression is absolutely inexplicable if applied to the present church, where there is no well and no connection with Siloam, and no tradition of any having ever existed. In the crypt under the Dome of the Rock there is a well called the Btr Arroah, and, immediately south of it, Dr. Barclay recently explored a great excavated sea, having connection with that well and all the watercourses of the Haram area, and of which the overflow is to Siloam. It is therefore a fact at this hour, that, if you throw into this well under the Sakrah anything that will swim, it will be washed down to Siloam, as in the time of Antoninus.

"In order not to be too lengthy, I will only allude to one more circumstance. The French Bishop Arculfus, who visited Jerusalem in the last years of the seventh century (Willis says 'circa 697,' and he is probably correct), not only describes minutely all the Christian buildings in Jerusalem, and gives plans of four of them, but he mentions also 'that on the site of the Temple, the Saracens had then (nunc) erected a *square* house of prayer, capable of containing about three thousand persons;'<sup>1</sup> and adds other particulars, describing most minutely the Aksah, which had been erected nine or ten years previously; but the important point is, that neither directly nor indirectly does he allude to the Dome of the Rock, which then was, and now is, by far the most conspicuous and important building in Jerusalem, if the theory is correct that the present church then existed.

<sup>1</sup> Ceterum in illo famoso loco ubi quondam Templum magnifice constructum fuerat in vicinia muri ab oriente locatum, nunc Saraceni quadrangulum orationis domum quam subrectis tabulis et magnis trabibus super quasdam ruinarum reliquias vili fabricati sunt opere ipsi frequentant; quae utique domus tria hominum millia simul ut fertur capere potest. — Lib. de Loc. Sanct., Mabillon, p. 504.

"It has been attempted to assert that the little cell of Omar is the square building he referred to. That, however, is a small vaulted apartment, which could not contain thirty, certainly not three hundred persons, and does not answer the description in any respect. The only possible solution, so far as I can see, is that he had described the Dome of the Rock as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and that there was not then, as there are now, two great domical buildings in Jerusalem.

"In so far as the argument is concerned I would be prepared, if necessary, to waive the architectural evidence altogether, and to rest the proof of what is advanced above on any one of the following four points:

"1. The assertion of Eusebius that the new Jerusalem, meaning thereby the buildings of Constantine, was opposite to, and over against, the old city.

"2. The position assigned to the Holy Places by the Bordeaux Pilgrim.

"3. The connection pointed out by Antoninus between the Bir Arroah and Siloam.

"4. The assumed omission by Arculfus of all mention of the Dome of the Rock, and, I may add, the building of a Mary Church by Justinian within the precincts of the Haram area.

"No solution beyond the merest assertion has been proposed to any one of these difficulties, but they must all be answered before the title of the present church can be considered as good. And even these are not one-half of the case. But till they are answered, which I have no fear of their being, they alone suffice." — pp. 52-55.

We welcome the closing summary which covers both the third and fourth heads, and presents us with tangible ground. We will take up in their order and fairly examine the "four points" here named, with which Mr. Fergusson agrees to stand or to fall.

"1. The assertion of Eusebius that the new Jerusalem, meaning thereby the buildings of Constantine, was opposite to, and over against, the old city."

The statement referred to is quoted above. "The old city," in respect to its dwellings, was divided into two parts, "the upper" and "the lower." The former was on Mount Zion and the latter on Mount Akra (anciently separated from each other by a valley of which no trace appears in the Fergusson "diagram"), and in the adjacent valleys. The site of the Mosque of Omar is directly opposite to the latter, or to the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which "stands

directly on the ridge of Akra" (Biblical Researches, i. 391). The site of the Temple and that of the church lie "over against" each other. These are the points which Eusebius is comparing. He does not refer directly to the ruined dwellings of either the upper or the lower city; he refers especially to the deserted ruins of the Temple. By "the new Jerusalem," says Mr. Fergusson, he means "the buildings of Constantine." Exactly—he means these and nothing else. And by "the old Jerusalem" he means the buildings of the Temple, neither more nor less. Or rather, while the primary meaning is on each side thus restricted, he intends to designate by the latter the ancient city, of which the Temple was the crown, and by the former, the modern city, of which the church was to be the future glory. The antithesis is complete. The other interpretation makes the comparison incongruous—the old city meaning a collection of dwellings, and the new city meaning simply a church. Dr. Stanley has justly observed: "Whatever differences of opinion have arisen about the other hills of Jerusalem, there is no question that the mount on which the Mosque of Omar stands, overhanging the valley of the Kidron, has from the time of Solomon, if not of David, been regarded as the most sacred ground in Jerusalem" (Palestine, p. 177): This is the fact which the Christian Fathers recognize, using each locality as, in a religious sense, the representative of the city, when they say that the emperor Constantine, "founded a new Jerusalem, opposite to the old and deserted city," a phrase, withal, more applicable to the eastern hill, which was burned over, swept "clear of houses," and was still forsaken, than to the western hill which had never been thus completely desolated, and was still inhabited. Opposite the deserted site of the Hebrew Temple Constantine reared the Christian sanctuary. This is our interpretation of Eusebius and Socrates; and we shall not accept as an answer to it the question with which Mr. Fergusson retaliated on his reviewer: "Did he never see a plan of Jerusalem?" This disposes of the first point.

"2. The position assigned to the Holy Places by the Bordeaux Pilgrim."

His testimony is quoted in full, in our former Article, commencing, "Inde ut eas foris murum de Sione euntibus ad Portem Neapolitanam," which is, says Mr. Fergusson, "that passing *outwards* from the Sion Gate to the Neapolitan Gate, *outside the wall*," etc. Shall we incur the risk of being set down as "slovenly" translators, in company with our countryman, Professor Robinson, if we suggest to this bland scholar, that *one* "outwards" or "outside" is an adequate rendering of "foris," and that there is not an allusion here to the Zion Gate?

Mr. Fergusson assumes that the phrase "foris murum" requires us to believe that the visitor's course, here described, from Zion to the Neapolis Gate (called Neapolis then, for the same reason that it is now called Damascus), lay outside of the wall. If so, the reference is to the inner wall along the brow of Zion, the first of the "three walls" which surrounded this part of the city. This may be the meaning of the barbarous Latin of the old Pilgrim, which Professor Robinson unfortunately slurred, but far more probably, we think, he means simply what we suggested in the previous Article. There never was a road from Zion southward, and no suggestion could be more improbable than that of plunging from Zion into the lower Tyropoeon, outside the city, ascending the opposite slope, and making the long detour by the northwest corner of the city to reach the gate named. The point of destination was northward from Zion, and the Pilgrim says that one who would go beyond the wall, or outside of the city, passing from Zion to the Neapolis Gate, would see the objects described, on the right and left. The peculiar construction of the sentence favors this rendering of "foris murum," and we have an authority for it, exactly in point. "*Foris*; in late Latin, with the accusative—*beyond*. 'Constitutus si sit fluvius, qui foris agrum non vagatur'" (Andrew's Lexicon, *in loc.*). Either of these interpretations we claim to be more natural and probable than Mr. Fergusson's, for the reasons already given. This disposes of the second point.

“3. The connection pointed out by Antoninus between the Bir Arroah and Siloam.”

This testimony will be found above. Quoting the same in the Dictionary, Mr. Fergusson says: “In so far as we know,” the connection exists; meaning merely, We do not know that it does not exist. In the Notes before us, he says: “It is, therefore, a fact at this hour,” that the connection exists. Without any new light upon the subject, in the interval between the publications, the absence of knowledge to the contrary has, by a law of its own, developed into an ascertained present “fact.” The positive assertion is a random and rash assertion. The connection has not been established, and the subterranean watercourses of Jerusalem are still involved in much uncertainty. The witness cited in support of the alleged fact pronounces directly against its probability, and in favor of the opposite theory. Dr. Barclay, who has been a most thorough explorer, gives his reasons for believing that the subterranean conduit of Hezekiah was brought down on the west side of the valley running south from the Damascus Gate, and says that on this hypothesis “it would pass just by the rock Golgotha,” the traditionary site of the sepulchre, as described by Antoninus (Jerusalem, 94, 300). Furthermore, in examining the fountain of Siloam, he found a subterranean channel which supplied it, and which he traversed for nearly a thousand feet; and on locating its course, he was “perfectly satisfied that this subterraneous canal derived its former supply of water, not from Moriah, but from Zion” (*ib.* 523). He also says: “If this channel was not constructed for the purpose of conveying to Siloam the surplus waters of Hezekiah’s aqueduct, then I am unable to suggest any purpose to which it could have been applied” (*ib.* 309). So little countenance, so palpable a contradiction, rather, is given to the “fact” by the witness cited to corroborate it. This disposes of the third point.

“4. The assumed omission by Arculfus of all mention of the Dome of the Rock, and, I may add, the building of a Mary Church by Justinian within the precincts of the Haram area.”

We do not see the bearing of the last-named particular. Churches in honor of the Virgin were erected in many localities, and it is not necessary to account for the selection of this site, though it were easy to conjecture a reason. It proves nothing.

The remaining specification, like the other, is an argument drawn from silence and conjecture, and rates no higher as proof. It runs thus: If this building were then in existence, this visitor must have described it; the building was in existence, and the opposite theory assumes that he did not allude to it; therefore, the current theory is false. We cannot but be struck with the difference between this position and the principle with which Mr. Fergusson professedly started, of "admitting nothing which cannot be proved, either by direct testimony or by local indications" (Dict. i. 1018). There is no pretense that this argument rests on either of these; it rests on nothing but an unaccountable "omission." And this silence is offered as not merely corroborative evidence, but as vital proof. Mr. Fergusson adduces this as one of four points, "any one" of which establishes his theory beyond question. As if the existence of St. Paul's in London, or of St. Peter's in Rome, at any period, would be absolutely disproved by the silence of a visitor respecting either, in a professed description of the objects of interest in the city. At the best, it could only be a natural inference; it could never be proof positive. And here we might rest; for if we proceed no further, Mr. Fergusson's last point is disposed of, and his claim is prostrate.

But we join issue with him, and affirm that what Arculfus describes as the Church of the Sepulchre, was the building standing on the site of the present church, and not the Mosque of Omar, or any part of it. Neither could "the square house of prayer erected on the site of the Temple," have been, as he alleges, the Mosque el-Aksa. The phrase "vili fabricati sunt opere," could never have been applied to this structure. The immense quadrangle, rudely built with beams and planks over the remains of ruins, as described by

the bishop, would seem to be a natural account of the building erected by the Khalif Omar over the rock *es-Sâkhrâh*, as Dr. Barclay suggests, "which in the course of half a century gave place to the present elegant octagonal edifice, erected by Abd el-Melek" (Jerusalem, p. 336). If the assigned date of the completion of the latter edifice is correct, this would serve to fix more definitely the date of Arculfus's visit which is only known to have been "in the latter part of the seventh century" (Wright's Introduction, p. xii, Bohn's ed.).

We pass now to the bishop's description of "the Church of the Holy Sepulchre," and whatever other changes may have taken place, we have a crucial test of the identity of the building described with the church or the mosque, in the account of the cave which was the reputed tomb of the Saviour. Arculfus says: "In the middle space of the inner circle is a round grotto, cut in the solid rock, the interior of which is large enough to allow nine men to pray, standing, and the roof of which is about a foot and a half higher than a man of ordinary stature. The entrance is from the east side, and the whole of the exterior is covered with choice marble, to the very top of the roof, which is adorned with gold, and supports a large golden cross. Within, on the north side, is the tomb of our Lord hewn out of the same rock, seven feet in length, and rising three palms above the floor." These measurements were taken by Arculfus with his own hand. "This tomb is broad enough to hold one man lying on his back, and has a raised division in the stones, to separate his legs. The entrance is on the south side, and there are twelve lamps burning day and night, according to the number of the twelve apostles. Internally, the stone of the rock remains in its original state, and still exhibits the marks of the workman's tools" (p. 2, Bohn's ed.).

With this account of Arculfus, the reader will now compare that of Willibald, a few years later — A.D. 721-727.

"And near at hand is the garden, in which was the sepulchre of our Saviour, which was cut in the rock. That rock is now above ground, square at the bottom, but tapering above, with a cross on the summit, and

over it there is now built a wonderful edifice. And on the east side of the rock of the sepulchre there is a door, by which men enter the sepulchre to pray. And there is a bed within, on which our Lord's body lay, and on the bed stand fifteen golden cups with oil, burning day and night. The bed on which our Lord's body rested, stands within the rock of the sepulchre on the north side, to the right of a man entering the sepulchre to pray. And before the door of the sepulchre lies a great square stone, in the likeness of the former stone which the angel rolled away." — *Travels*, p. 18, Bohn's ed.

We will next quote the testimony of another visitor — *Saewulf*, A.D. 1102 :

"In the middle of this church is our Lord's Sepulchre, surrounded by a very strong wall and roof, lest the rain should fall upon the Holy Sepulchre; for the church above is open to the sky. This church is situated, like the city, on the declivity of Mount Zion." "We descend from our Lord's Sepulchre about the distance of two arbalist-shots, to the Temple of the Lord, which is to the east of the Holy Sepulchre, the court of which is of great length and breadth, having many gates; but the principal gate, which is in front of the Temple, is called the Beautiful," etc. "In the middle of which Temple is seen a high and large rock, hollow beneath, in which was the holy of holies." — *Travels*, pp. 37, 39, 40, Bohn's ed.

From this it appears that the surreptitious transfer of site, for which Mr. Fergusson contends, made after the close of the seventh century, was unsuspected at the commencement of the twelfth.

The sepulchral cave of the church, above described by Arculfus and Willibald, Mr. Fergusson claims to have been the cave in the rock es-Sâkhrâh, beneath the dome of the present Mosque of Omar. This rock has been the most stationary landmark in Jerusalem, and has probably changed as little as any other object. We will quote such accounts as have reached us of the cave within it. The first is from a Muslim, written about A.D. 1150 :

"Beneath is the rock tomb; this rock is of quadrangular form, like a buckler; one of its extremities is elevated above the ground to the height of nearly half a fathom; the other adheres to the soil; it is nearly cubical, and its width nearly equals its length; that is to say, nearly ten cubits. Beneath is a cavern or a dark retreat, of ten cubits in length and five in width, and whose height is more than a fathom. One cannot penetrate its darkness but by the light of torches." — *El-Edrisi*, p. 12, Rosen. ed.

The next is from the fullest Arabic description which we have of Jerusalem, written by Kadi Mejr. ed-Dîn, A.D. 1495.

“Beneath the rock is a cave on the south, to which is a descent by stone steps. The steps are intercepted in the middle by a small bench excavated in the rock on the east side, where the pilgrims rest. Here is a marble, the base of which stands on this bench, joined on the south to the side of the cave; the capital supports the side of the Sakhrah, as if to prevent it from leaning towards the south side, or in any other way.” — Quoted by another from Williams's Holy City, to which we have not access.

The last is from a recent Christian visitor who has seen it, and who was permitted to examine it at his leisure :

“The shape of the Sakhrah is irregular; it is about sixty feet in length from north to south, and fifty-five in breadth. In the southeast portion of this rock is a small room, irregularly square and roughly finished, about eight feet in height and fifteen on each side — ‘the Noble Cave.’ Its ceiling is about four or five feet below the upper surface of the rock, from four to six feet thick, and pierced with an oval-shaped hole about three feet in diameter. A hollow sound being emitted on striking the northern side, shows undoubtedly, that vacant space is beyond. On stamping upon a circular stellar-constructed piece of variegated marble about the centre of the floor, sonorous reverberations are emitted, clearly evincing the existence of a large excavation below this stellated alab, which they say, closes the door to Hades. This is the Bir Arraoh, or ‘Well of Souls,’ which was formerly kept open for the convenience of holding intercourse with departed spirits. Is this the ‘*Lapis pertusus*’ of the pilgrim fathers, that the Jews so much venerated? Access is had to this room by a pair of steps cut in the native rock, just above which, on entering the door of the room, is a tongue very highly revered by good Musalima.” — Barclay's Jerusalem, pp. 497, 498.

The question here asked is one which Dr. Robinson raised in 1838, and was disposed to answer affirmatively in 1852. (Biblical Researches, p. 236). The Bordeaux Pilgrim in the fourth century describes a “perforated rock,” on or near the site of the Temple, to which the Jews came annually with lamentations. If its identity with this rock is established, it proves that Constantine's church was not erected upon it. Waiving this point, we ask the reader to compare the description of Arculfus with the last two descriptions. It is not credible that they all refer to the same excavation. His account can be adjusted to the present Church of the Sepulchre

and its reputed tombs, making due allowance for the changes wrought by the destruction of the building. But by no practicable change, by no possibility, can the narrative of Arculfus be adjusted to the rock es-Sakhrah and the cave beneath it. And this disposes of the fourth point.

We have now completed our examination of Mr. Ferguson's "four points"—his "Quadrilateral." He offered to "rest the proof" of his theory "on any one" of them; and we have shown that on a fair investigation not one of them sustains his theory in a single particular, and for the most part they pointedly refute it. His plea that "no solution, beyond the merest assertion, has been proposed to any one of these difficulties," must now be withdrawn in respect to each of them; and if he abides by his offer, his case is lost. That he does not intend to abide by it is plainly indicated, we think, by his closing remark: "And even these are not one-half the case; but till they are answered, which I have no fear of their being, they alone suffice." These words, if we understand them, are prophetic of a retreat into his architectural castle, whither few, comparatively, can follow him. He may ensconce himself within that; and we take leave of him on its threshold, with the friendly suggestion that he cannot prudently venture a foot beyond it in any direction.