

617TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, MARCH 15TH, 1920,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE CHAIR WAS TAKEN BY PROFESSOR BERESFORD PITE, M.A.,
F.R.I.B.A.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed

The HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections: Amand Routh, Esq., M.D., as a Member; and Mrs. Herbert H. Harington, the Rev. H. L. Jennins, L.Th., and Miss A. C. Dick, as Associates.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Lecturer, Dr. Ernest W. G. Masterman.

The CHAIRMAN, Prof. Beresford Pite, in introducing Dr. Masterman, the Lecturer, said: When I went to Palestine I had the pleasure—a pleasure which you will measure better after Dr. Masterman's lecture than before—of having his company for a very long week's ride from Damascus through the Holy Land, back to Jerusalem.

I expect few travellers in Palestine—I notice many here to-day—have had the opportunity of making the tour with two such well-instructed companions as Dr. Wheeler and Dr. Masterman, and had the pleasure of seeing them welcomed at every spot by all sorts of men. From that period onward Dr. Masterman has been at work in Jerusalem until the period of the War, a long period of more than twenty years, so that I am sure the information he has to place before us this afternoon will be equally well appreciated by you all. I may just remark that Dr. Masterman is one of the medical men attached to the English Hospital in Jerusalem who inherits a long train of deep interest in the antiquities of Palestine and their Biblical importance and connection. He succeeded Dr. Wheeler in Jerusalem (who is now back again), and he, in turn, succeeded Dr. Chaplin, who for more than twenty-five years (1860–1885) occupied the same post.

I think we may claim that the work of medical men in Jerusalem has provided a great source of scientific observation for the benefit of the Christian Church for a period extending over fifty years. I have now much pleasure in asking Dr. Masterman to give you his lecture.

THE WALLS OF JERUSALEM AT VARIOUS PERIODS.

By Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

THE site of Jerusalem is shut in by a triangle of higher hills. On the north lies the great backbone of the Judæan range, the city itself lying to the east of the water-parting. The range of hills which culminates in the well-known Mount of Olives, shuts in the city towards the east, and another range—like the last, a southern projection of the central range—encloses the city to the west and south-west. The one distant outlook is a narrow break between these two lateral branches, through which we have a glimpse of the wilderness of Judæa and of the Moab range.

The actual site of the city is demarcated from these higher ranges by two famous valleys. The eastern valley commences at some distance to the north of the city, and after sweeping south-east under the name of the Wady el Joz ("Valley of the Walnuts"), turns south and then south-west under the modern name of Wady Sitti Miriam ("the Valley of the Lady Mary"), called in Bible times the Nahl Kidron. Where this valley passes the eastern walls of the city it is a deep gorge; near its deepest part rises the one true spring of the city, Ain umm ed Deraj, known in the Bible as Gihon. South of the city this valley joins the western valley to form the Wady en Nar ("the Valley of Fire"), which runs a winding course, with sides of increasing precipitousness, to empty its winter torrents into the Dead Sea. In one of the wildest spots upon its course is situated the famous Greek monastery of Mar Saba. The western valley commences to the west of the city, near the pool called the Birket Mamilla, and after running east to near the Jaffa Gate it turns south; on this part of its course it is called the Wady el Mes, and contains the great reservoir the Birket es Sultan. Below this it sweeps gradually south-east under the name of the Wady er Rababi. This is undoubtedly the Gai Hinnom—"the Valley of Hinnom," Josh. xv, 8, etc.—also called the "Valley of the Sons of Hinnom" (2 Kings xxiii, 10). The name Gai Hinnom is the origin of the name Gehenna—the type of hell—a name of evil portent derived partly from the perpetual fires which once burnt here to consume the city's rubbish, and even more because the site was associated with the dark and idolatrous rites of those who offered here their children in sacrifice to the evil Moloch

(2 Kings xxiii, 10). Almost everyone is familiar with these valleys—the Kidron and Hinnom—but many Bible readers know little of the very important valley which bisects the city's site. This is known to-day as el Wad ("the Valley") and is named by Josephus the Tyropœan Valley, a name which he interprets as the "Cheesemonger's Valley," but which more probably means the "Dung" or "Sewage Valley," as down this for long ages has passed the main drainage of the city. Arising just east of the Jaffa Gate and running due east to join this main valley is a branch which is of extreme importance in the topography of the city. It is marked to-day by the steep street known to travellers as "David Street," but in ancient days, when it was much deeper than at present, it formed a northern defensive line for the first wall of the city, which hung along its southern edge. Before leaving these physical features we must briefly refer to yet another valley which, beginning a little east of the site now known to English travellers as "Gordon's Calvary," ran south-east across the north-east corner of the modern city. Across the breadth of this valley lies the Birket Israël, a deep reservoir, now largely choked with rubbish, which used half a century ago to be pointed out as the "Pool of Bethesda." Some have, for want of a better name, called this "St. Anne's Valley," after the church which lies there. It is only by getting the positions of these valleys clearly fixed that anyone can intelligently understand the position of the city's walls.

The actual site of the city consists, then, of a tongue of land sloping to the south-east, bounded east and west by the Kidron and Hinnom Valleys respectively, and divided longitudinally by the Tyropœan into a western higher and broader hill, and an eastern hill described by Josephus, not inaptly, as "half-moon shaped." The western hill is divided by the lateral branch of the Tyropœan, just described, into a massive and lofty southern hill, known since Christian times as Zion, but called by Josephus the Upper Market Place or the Fortress of David, and a northern part which has no definite name, except that Josephus, in describing the second wall, which must have enclosed part of this hill, refers to it as encompassing the "Northern Suburbs." To-day the southern hill is largely the Armenian quarter, and outside the walls contains the traditional "Tomb of David" and several cemeteries; while the northern hill is the "Christian quarter," which clusters round the world-famous "Church of the Holy Sepulchre."

The curved eastern hill is divided into three parts. The southernmost part, which is divided off from the temple hill by a shallow valley—rather inferred than actually demonstrated—is historically the most important spot in all Jerusalem, though to-day it has hardly any buildings upon it. It was called the Ophel Hill (which *was* the ancient name of part of it) by some of the earlier explorers, and I shall refer to it again under that name. Almost all modern Biblical scholars have come to recognize this as the site of the earliest Zion, the fortress-city of the Jebusites, which King David captured and called the City of David. At this time the whole city, which occupied the summit of this hill, was enclosed in one wall—with probably a single gate to the north. This may seem strange and inexplicable to those whose ideas of “cities” is confined to modern or even mediæval times, but the proofs, which are too elaborate to go into now, are, to my mind, quite convincing. The names Ophel, Akra and (in Josephus) “the lower city,” are all associated with parts of this hill. North of this, forming the centre of the half-moon shaped hill, lay the famous summit on which was built the temple, while north of the St. Anne’s Valley was the suburb called by Josephus, Bezetha.

Before tracing out the course of the walls in ancient times it will be well to briefly describe the existing walls, which were built by the greatest of the Turkish Sultans, Suleiman the Magnificent. These walls are some 35 feet high with thirty-five towers and eight gates and a circuit of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles. On the west is but one gate, but this, which has existed for many centuries, has always been very important. To-day it is known to travellers as the Jaffa Gate, but to the natives as Bab el Khalîl, the “Hebron Gate” (Khalîl meaning “friend,” being the name of Abraham, the “friend of God,” who is buried at Hebron, which city is consequently named after him). Near this gate are situated some of the most striking remains of mediæval and even Roman Jerusalem, and its position is an important point in historical topography, because Josephus describes the ancient walls from this point. The so-called Tower of David includes in its foundations parts of the substructures of Herod’s famous towers, Hippicus and Pharsael, and possibly also Mariamne. Passing north from here we find near the north-west angle of the city, just inside the north-west corner, some rough ruins known as Goliath’s Castle, which is considered to be part of the foundations of another famous building of King Herod—the tower Psephinus.

Along the northern walls there are three gates. One a little east of the before-mentioned corner is known as "the New Gate," or more correctly as the Bab Abdul Hamîd, so called because it was opened during the reign of that infamous Sultan. In the middle of the long stretch of the northern wall lies the Damascus Gate, so called because from here runs the northern road to that city. We know that the gate and the adjoining wall are upon the foundations of earlier constructions. The gate is known to the natives as Bab el Amûd, "the Gate of the Column," a name which may possibly be explained by the great column which is figured in the famous Byzantine mosaic map of Palestine discovered some years ago at Medaba. From this column the distances to places in other parts of the land were calculated. To mediæval Christians it was known as St. Stephen's Gate (not to be confounded with the gate in the eastern wall, so named in modern guide-books) because it is supposed that St. Stephen was led out here to be stoned.

Further east we have the Bab el Sahirah, the Gate of the Plain, called by travellers Herod's Gate.

On the eastern side there are two gates, one of which has long been walled up. The used gate is known to native Christians as the Bab Sitti Miriam ("the Gate of the Lady Mary," after whom the adjoining valley, the Kidron, is also named), to the Moslems as Bab el Asbat, "the Gate of the Tribes," and in the modern guide-books as St. Stephen's Gate. From this gate every Easter issues the weird and fantastic procession of Nebi Mûsa.

Between this gate and the south-eastern corner of the city is the famous Golden Gate, known in Arabic as the Bab ed Dahariyeh, "the Gate of the Conqueror," a fine piece of Byzantine work built either by Justinian or Heraclius. It is often a subject of surmise why this gate is kept shut, but the reason is evident: the gate leads directly into the sacred Haram or temple area into which none but Moslems have free access. To leave it open would necessitate perpetual guards to keep out the "infidels." Along the southern wall are two gates. One lying right across the now half-obliterated Tyropœan Valley known as the "Dung Gate," or more correctly Bab el Mughāribeh, the "Gate of the Moors" (because it leads into their dwellings), while on the higher ground further west is the so-called "Zion Gate," or the Bab Nebi Daoud, "the Gate of the Prophet David," so called because it leads out to the mosque enclosing the traditional tomb of

David. Before leaving the southern wall one must mention that that part of it which forms the southern boundary of the Haram shows still the single, the double and the triple gates which once led from the crowded lower city (upon the hill to the south, the *ancient of Zion*) into the temple itself.

The lines of the existing western, northern and eastern walls are all more or less upon those of more ancient city walls, as is shown by buried foundations and by the patched conditions of many parts of the wall, but to the south the direction of the walls has greatly varied through the ages, and the position of the present wall is so peculiar and so unsuited to the requirements of ancient warfare that it requires some explanation. This I shall hope to give at the conclusion of the lecture.

I must now very briefly refer to the results of the very considerable archæological excavations which have been made to ascertain the lie of the ancient walls.

During 1867-1870 Captain (now Lieut.-General Sir Charles) Warren, R.E., made some extraordinarily difficult and important excavations. Near the south-eastern corner of the temple area (the south-east corner of the present city walls) he sunk a shaft to a depth of 80 feet from which he ran tunnels to the foundations of the existing wall. This work is familiar to all the readers of the *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund, as it is depicted upon the cover. These galleries—run, I may mention, under great difficulty and no little hazard—excited great interest because upon the great stones thus uncovered were found certain Phœnician marks which were supposed at the time to establish these foundations to be the work of King Solomon. It is now generally accepted that these were simply masons' marks, and this great wall can now, I think, be proved to be the work of Herod the Great, who enlarged the temple enclosure in order to make his temple far more grand and magnificent than the two previous temples. If any remains of Solomon's original work exist they are now buried beneath the present Haram or temple enclosure. At a spot further to the north, where the St. Anne's Valley runs out to the Kidron Valley, Warren found that the foundations were actually 120 feet below the present surface. Near the south-western angle of the temple enclosure Warren made investigations near the spring of the arch known as "Robinson's Arch." He demonstrated the existence of the pier upon which the other side of the arch—which had a span of 50 feet—had rested, and between

this and the wall he found a paved street upon which actually lay the remains of the broken arch itself. Under the unbroken pavement was found the voussoir of a still earlier arch, lying partly in a rock-cut aqueduct 11 feet deep. The earlier arch, we know, had been broken down by the Jews in 63 B.C. in anticipation of an attack by Pompey, and the later arch, which had been reconstructed by Herod, was destroyed by Titus in A.D. 70. The archway supported a roadway from the western hill across the Tyropœan Valley—which is here 70 feet below the present surface—into the temple area. As regards the great rock-cut drain, it belonged to a very ancient water system which conducted water into the "lower city" (as it was called in the time of Josephus)—the original "City of David." More important to our present subject was the discovery by Warren of a massive wall $14\frac{1}{2}$ feet thick, which joined on by a straight joint to the present south-east corner of the city, and which he traced, running in a south-easterly direction, along the edge of the so-called Ophel Hill for 700 feet. Along its course were found four small towers with a projection of 6 feet and a great tower of large stones projecting $41\frac{1}{2}$ feet with a face of 80 feet and standing under the present surface to a height of 66 feet. Warren considered that this may be the "tower that standeth out" of Neh. iii, 25. Another discovery he made was the great rock-cut tunnel generally known as Warren's Shaft, which commenced to the west of the "Virgin's Spring" (Gihon) in a rock-cut pit 28 feet deep and descended by steps to a depth of $94\frac{1}{2}$ feet below the level of the rock surface. This sloping passage was 23 feet high and 13 feet broad, and belongs to the same kind of work as the great water tunnel at Gezer. Like it, it was made to reach the city's spring from within the ancient city walls, and it may probably be dated some 2000 years B.C.

The second important link in our understanding the position of the ancient southern wall was the discovery in 1875 by Mr. Henry Maudslay of the massive rock-cut tower, 45 feet square and 20 feet high, now incorporated in the C.M.S. boys' school. This great mass of rock-scarping undoubtedly belonged to the foundations of a tower which stood at the south-western corner of the ancient city, and scarped rock running north from this to the present south-west corner of the city clearly demonstrated the line of the southern part of the western wall of the city. From this tower another scarp ran east, skirting the northern side of the present boys' playground and the Anglo-German cemetery.

When in 1894-1897 Messrs. Bliss and Dickie commenced their important excavations they discovered that this scarp ended in another tower. From this tower they found that the wall, at different periods, ran in two directions, one north-east towards a mass of masonry near the present southern wall of the city, known as Burj el Kebrît, the other more important line of wall ran south-east along the edge of the Valley of Hinnom in the direction of the Pool of Siloam. This latter line showed wall foundations belonging to four or more periods, enclosing a great area of ground now given over almost entirely to cultivation. Upon the earliest of these walls we found towers similar to those found by Warren on "Ophel."

In what is now part of the Anglo-German cemetery was found the remains of a gate some 8 feet wide, which showed evidence of reconstruction at least four times. It is generally accepted that this is the "Gate of the Gai" (or Valley) of Neh. iii, 13. A second great city gate was found some 200 feet south of the Birket el Hamra (the so-called "Lower Pool of Siloam") at what must have been the southernmost part of the city wall. This, too, showed reconstruction at at least three periods. The gate gave access to the great main street running down the Tyropœan, beneath which ran a great drain, which probably traversed the whole of the great central valley. Here we probably have the "Dung Gate" of Neh. iii, 13. A little to the north a great dam was discovered rising some 50 feet from the bottom of the valley where it enters the Kidron. This massive wall now dams the mouth of the valley and produces the Birket el Hamra. The road across the valley mouth now runs along this dam, but it is clear that originally it was constructed to carry the city wall across the valley. There is evidence, however, that at some periods the wall encircled the Pool of Siloam, leaving the pool itself outside the walls, though in close proximity to them on the west, north and east. Bliss was able to trace the wall by various rock scarps and a few scattered stones *in situ* up on to the hill "Ophel" in the direction of, but not quite as far as, the southern termination of Warren's wall.

This is the merest sketch of the important work here done time will not permit of more.

I must now briefly give you the summary of the results and the conclusions we have come to as to the general position of the walls at various periods.

I have already referred to the opinion that the city of the

Jebusites, which King David captured, occupied the then very strong and well-fortified south-east hill we have here called the "Ophel Hill." Let me anticipate criticism by saying that, small as the site seems to us, the really ancient sites we have explored in Palestine are all similar in this respect. Gezer, which was certainly a more important site in pre-Hebrew times, has been fully explored and its ancient walls measured. A wall traced round the circumference of the summit of this south-eastern hill would not be very much less than that which existed at the same age in Gezer. The arguments that this was the site are briefly these. Here, at the foot of this hill, is the great spring Gihon (now the Virgin's Fount), the only considerable spring in the district. It was, without doubt, the existence of this copious source which attracted the first settlers to this neighbourhood, and their primitive cave-dwellings near the spring have been unearthed. In connection with this spring are some extraordinary rock cuttings. The most ancient of these is the so-called "Warren's Shaft," and not only is the very existence of this great work proof that the original inhabitants of the walled town on this hill had to make this great work to supply themselves with water in times of siege, but it is probable that we have a reference to this very work in the account of David's capture of the city. The Jebusites were so secure within their fortifications that they could mock David's little army. The passage is obscure, but we read that they said "Thou shalt not come hither: the blind and the lame shall turn you away." But David knew of this secret passage (2 Sam. v, 8) and it was up this "water course" (Hebrew צִנּוֹר *tsinnôr*) that Joab and his men (1 Chron. xi, 6) made their way and, arriving in the heart of the city unexpectedly, made a ready capture of it. To do this they must have waded through the water in the cave at the source and ascended the perpendicular shaft. The feat looks hazardous, but some British officers in 1910, without any assistance from ladders, did the same, and what they could do in European clothes and boots, David's hardy mountaineers would certainly find possible.

As additional support to this view of the site of Zion, one may refer to the frequent references of the carrying *up* of the ark of God from the "City of David" to the temple hill, an expression quite understandable if the ark went from here, but inapplicable if it was carried from the lofty south-west hill. Even more convincing are the references to Hezekiah's aqueduct

(the Siloam aqueduct) which brought the waters of Gihon "down on the *west* side of the city of David" (2 Chron. xxxii, 30) and the statement that Manasseh built "an outer wall to the city of David on the *west side of Gihon* in the Nahal," *i.e.*, the Kidron Valley (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14). One may add that while excavators have found here greater quantities of the most ancient pottery than on the whole Jerusalem site, this has not been found at all on the south-west hill. We picture, then, this strong and compact fortress-city with probably a single gate to the north (2 Sam. xv, 2). During David's reign the neighbouring hillsides became dotted over with unwalled settlements. It fell to the lot of Solomon to build what Josephus describes as the "first" wall to link up the City of David, the temple and palace precincts and, without much doubt, the summit of the left south-west hill. Josephus describes the first wall as running from what is now the Jaffa Gate along the southern edge of the lateral branch of the Tyropean eastwards to the temple. Then from the same spot (*i.e.*, Jaffa Gate) he traces it to the "tower of the furnaces" (Neh. iii, 11).

From here we know from Bliss's excavations as well as Josephus' description that the wall ran downwards along the edge of the Valley of Hinnom to the Pool of Siloam. It is, however, quite possible that the shorter line running along the edge of the south-west hill to the Burj el Kebrit (see above) was the original course of Solomon's wall. If so, it crossed the Tyropean somewhere near the position of the present southern wall and then bent down southwards to link into the old wall of the City of David. Solomon must also have carried the wall on the edge of the Kidron Valley to connect up with the temple and palace enclosure. Whether this is so or not, it is certain that the later kings followed the whole southern course as excavated by Bliss. This, too, was the line of wall which is described, in its ruined condition, in the Book of Nehemiah. The relevant passages are, Neh. ii, 13-15, the account of the night ride; iii, 1-32, the description of the rebuilding; and xii, 31-39, the routes of the two processions at the dedication of the walls. Nehemiah went out by the Valley Gate, the gate found by Bliss in the Anglo-German cemetery; he passed from it to the Dung Gate (also found by Bliss, see above) and from here he viewed the walls of the city. He then proceeded to the Fountain Gate, which would seem to have been completely destroyed, but was probably near where the overflow from the Pool of

Siloam now runs out. Near this was the "King's Pool," perhaps represented to-day by the Birket el Hamra. Here Nehemiah apparently proposed to turn into the city, "but there was no place for the beast that was under me to pass" (Neh. ii, 14), so he went up the Nahal (Kidron), viewed the walls from there, and retraced his steps to the Valley Gate. From the other accounts we can follow the circuit of the city. The wall was carried "over against the sepulchres of David," which must have stood in the original City of David above Gihon, past "the pool that was made" (probably at the entrance to the cave in which Gihon rose) and to the "tower that standeth out," *i.e.*, Warren's tower. Near here we have mention of a Water Gate just where we might expect it, as water would be carried this way from Gihon to this temple. Proceeding north, we come to the "Horse Gate," which we know was close to the entry of the King's house (2 Kings xi, 16; 2 Chron. xxiii, 15; Jer. xxxi, 40).

The expression "above" the Horse Gate may imply that the gate itself was a rock-cut tunnel such as occurs, for example, at Kerak. It must have been near the present south-eastern angle of the city. Thence "repaired the priests, every one over against his own house," the houses being to the east of the temple. Then comes the Gate of Hammephad, somewhere near where the so-called Golden Gate now stands, and finally the Sheep Gate, which the references in Neh. iii, 1, 31; xii, 39, show was at the eastern extremity of the north wall.

The two towers Hananeel and Hammeah (Neh. iii, 1; xii, 39) appear to have been the most northerly points of the city (Zec. xiv, 10) and may well have been where later the fortress Baris and still later the Roman fortress of Antonia (and to-day the Turkish barracks) successively stood.

The Fish Gate (Neh. xxxiii, 12, 39; Zeph. i, 10), where the men of Tyre sold their fish (Neh. xiii, 16), is generally considered to have stood somewhere on the same kind of position across the Tyropœan Valley, though farther south, than the Damascus Gate now occupies. It may well be identical with the "middle gate" of Jer. xxxix, 3.

The next gate to the west, after apparently a considerable interval, is translated the "Old Gate," but more correctly the Gate of the Old . . . —either old *city* or old *wall*. This gate has also been identified as the Corner Gate of 2 Kings xiv, 13; 2 Chron. xxv, 23; Jer. xxxi, 38; Zec. xiv, 10, and with the First Gate of Zec. xiv, 10. There is strong reason for believing that

this gate stood somewhere near the Jaffa Gate. The next gate, which was 600 feet farther on, is the Gate of Ephraim, which, if the former identification is correct, must have stood somewhere in the line of the present western wall, but the site is quite lost. After this comes the Broad Wall, which led on to the Tower of the Furnaces, which we have already suggested is identical with the great rock scarp at the C.M.S. boys' school. This circuit of the walls fairly satisfied all conditions, though if time permitted it might be necessary to discuss some difficulties.

It may be added that the Gate of Benjamin (Jer. xx, 2; xxxvii, 13; and xxxviii, 7) is very probably identical with the Sheep Gate, as the natural exit from the city towards Anathoth. This is strengthened by the reference in Zec. xiv, 10, where the breadth of the city is described as "from Benjamin's Gate unto the Corner Gate." Quite probably, too, at an earlier period this was referred to as the "Upper Gate of the Temple" (2 Kings xv, 35; 2 Chron. xxvii, 3).

We must now turn to the famous description of the walls of Jerusalem given by Josephus. I need not again dwell upon his account of the first wall, but he describes two other walls which protected the weakest part of the city's defences, that towards the north. The second wall was in existence in the time of our Lord, but when it was built is a matter of doubt. Professor Sir George Adam Smith believes it may have been during the time of the later kings; others, and I have adopted that view, during the Maccabæan period.

This wall is described as beginning at the Gate Ganneth. At one time the explorers of the Palestine Exploration Fund thought they had identified the Gate Ganneth with a half-buried gateway on the general line of the old wall to the south-east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Unfortunately excavations showed that this was impossible. So the starting-place of this wall is uncertain and speculative reconstructions have usually been biased by a desire to include or to exclude the traditional Holy Sepulchre from within its circuit. Although we have as yet no archæological proof, I can see no reason why a wall built, as this probably was, to protect the buildings which had grown up outside the Fish Gate, along the great north road—buildings chiefly in the low-lying Tyropæan Valley—should have made so wide a circuit to the west as to include the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Unfortunately the subject is seldom looked at in a dispassionate way. This second wall completed its circuit at the tower of

the Antonia. The third wall was commenced after the Crucifixion by Herod Agrippa I upon an elaborate plan, but, for fear of Claudius Cæsar, was not so finished, and at the time of the approach of the Roman army under Titus, was hastily completed. It had a breadth of 18 feet, rose to a height of 40 feet and had 90 massive towers. It began at the tower Hippicus (near the present Jaffa Gate), reached round the north quarter of the city to the tower Psephinus—possibly where Kulat el Jalud (Goliath's Castle) is now—and then turned eastwards. The more I have looked into this subject on the ground itself the more I am convinced that the general line of this wall is that of the existing north wall, though there can be no doubt but that near the present Herod's Gate it struck south-east along the edge of the "St. Anne's Valley," excluding the north-east corner of the existing city.

A question which has long puzzled students of the subject is how the present line of the southern wall ever came to be selected. The old wall was along a line of great natural strength, but the mediæval course, now followed, is quite otherwise. Sir Charles Wilson put forward a theory which I am convinced is the true explanation. After Jerusalem had been completely destroyed, the Emperor Hadrian erected a Roman camp on part of the site. It is expressly mentioned that Herod's great towers, near the present Jaffa Gate, were not completely destroyed, and that a Roman camp was established there. Now Sir Charles Wilson has shown that if this camp followed the usual size and construction of such camps it would be four-walled and cover an area of about 50 acres. He found that if Hadrian utilized the remains of the first wall for the northern side and that of the western wall—running south from the towers—as the western side of the camp, then the southern wall must necessarily have run along the course of the present south wall from the south-west corner. This being so, when later the emperor erected the city of *Ælia Capitolina* out of the ruins, he took the south wall of his camp as the southern boundary of the western half of the city and the massive southern wall of the temple area (which, it is quite clear, survived the sieges) as the south wall of the eastern half of the city and joined these two by a wall crossing the Tyropœan along the general line of the present wall. This became the line during almost all the succeeding centuries.

For a time—for at least over a century—the old southern line was restored (with beautifully cut stone, as Bliss's excavations

showed) by the Empress Eudoxia, widow of Theodosius II (A.D. 450), but this apparently did not last long—the city probably was too small to need such a circuit and Hadrian's line was too strong a defence to make the restored line necessary. Again in the fifth and again in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, we know from contemporary plans, the top of the southern end of the western hill, with the traditional Cœnaculum and the tomb of David, was enclosed. The remains of these walls were also recovered by Bliss. When Suleiman made this last and complete wall he fell back upon the old Roman lines, which have survived to this day.

I feel I have strained your patience to the utmost, but the subject is a very wide one and contains so many items of interest that, even in a paper of this length, only a bare outline has been possible.

DISCUSSION

The CHAIRMAN: There is so much interest and importance connected with the subject of Dr. Masterman's lecture that one scarcely knows where to commence any discussion. As regards the location of the original city of Zion, Dr. Masterman has a perfect knowledge of the progress of modern research in the matter. Of course, Sir George Adam Smith's recent book sums it up very fully and conclusively, and the book of Prof. Sanday of Oxford led us to the same conclusions

There is one difficulty to my mind about it, and I should be glad if Dr. Masterman could relieve it. It is in regard to the Mount Moriah dominating Mount Zion. I think we make a mistake in concentrating on Palestinian archæology without a sufficient acquaintance or recollection of Old Testament Scripture in regard to other Eastern cities. The temple of Solomon was half outside and half inside the city. Would you have a city with an enclosure lying between it and the rocky background? The enclosure would be on a higher level approached by steps and ramps, and on this platform a series of magnificent column porticoes

am considering a city on a hill, and have to accept the shape of the hill, but I get my hill, my platform, my porticoes, and I get my temple platform beyond. The ideas seem to be common to Babylonia and to this arrangement of the site in Jerusalem.

Another point seems interesting and important in the construction of the planning of the city. Alexander brought out of Greece into Asia the fine fruit of Grecian art and Grecian architecture, but was bound hand and foot by tradition which quite unconsciously re-created temples without variation. He comes to the East, sees the plans of Egypt, the plans of Babylon, and Persia, and his Grecian ideals become enlarged with the Egyptian sense of scale and the Eastern sense of dignity, and the consequence is that the ensuing age sees the great cities of Asia rebuilt on grand and new lines, resulting from the combination of Greek taste and refinement with Egyptian skill and symmetry. So you see Ephesus, so you see Antioch, so you see Alexandria, and why should I exclude Jerusalem? Why in that area—the Herodian area—should you exclude the effect of this Grecian thought infused with Eastern imagination upon the great cities of Asia? You see it in the plan of Damascus in a most emphatic way, and I think I see it here. I do not know how far Dr. Masterman will see this too. Here I see Herod's great palace and hippodrome laid out and concentrating upon the Acropolis, so I think it is important that you should examine the plans of those great cities. For instance, I should therefore plan the street opposite the temple across the centre of the market place, the remains of the Hellenist architecture. That is a much later principle in town-planning and you do not find it until later in the Roman period, but I am inclined to look upon this as an indication of the same system of town-planning which marks the great cities of the Græco-Asiatic empire. I must not detain you upon these points, which are rather beside Dr. Masterman's subject. You come to Jerusalem expecting to see Roman architecture and you see it Gothic, but you must remember that the Jerusalem you are looking at is the Christian Jerusalem, occupied by the Saracens and fortified as against the Christian world, and the fortifications belonged to about 1547. King Henry VIII died in 1549, and I think I could put my finger upon what was being done at St. Peter's in Rome in 1547, and that is the period of these walls which Dr. Masterman has been taking us round this afternoon.

I think it is my duty to invite you to discuss the paper, and I must remind you to be very brief.

Mr. M. L. ROUSE said : The story of the capture of the chief Jebusite city by Joab for David recalls the capture of Naples from the Ostrogoths for Justinian by his general, Belisarius : the Byzantine troops then clambered through the tunnel of the great drain of the city and took its defenders by surprise.

I should like to call attention to a striking coincidence and contrast in Bible history. When, as we this evening have heard explained, the Jebusites, in mockery of David, set the blind and lame to protect the city, they challenged him if he could to remove them ; and he replied by offering the highest military honour for valour in these words : " Whoever first getteth up to the watercourse and smiteth the Jebusites and the blind and the lame that are hated of David's soul " (or " that hate David's soul " as another reading has it) " shall be chief and captain " ; and Joab won the honour.

Centuries rolled by, and the Lord Jesus, the eternal King of Jerusalem, entered amid triumphant, though fickle, honours into the city ; and after He had for a second time purged His temple of the avaricious, we read that the blind and the lame came to Him " there, and He healed them."

Mr. Rouse writes the following additional comment, which he had intended to make upon the lecture : If the Canaanites occupied with their city only the south-eastern crescent hill, then we can understand what has always been hard to comprehend, how Abraham could have ascended a hill-top in Mount Moriah and in complete privacy prepared for the solemn faith-testing sacrifice of Isaac ; in privacy he meant it to be, for he had told his servants to wait below while he " and the lad " went " yonder to worship."

Dr. SCHOFIELD : Is there any evidence that in ancient times Ophel was considerably higher than the insignificant proportions attributed to it, and that between it and Mount Moriah there was a deep valley, and that to talk of the citadel of Zion would be more relevant, because there was a large city outside the city of Zion which was taken by Joshua, although no one could find the citadel ? This citadel was no doubt the site of the original city. Jericho is smaller than the whole of Ophel, the first city which was taken, and, therefore, may it not have been built round it ? Would Dr. Masterman allow a distinction between the city of Zion and the hill of Zion ?

A MEMBER: May I ask the relation of the Saviour's tomb to the city walls?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we cannot have such a large question raised at this hour.

Mr. MOON: Could we be told the distance of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre outside the walls of Jerusalem? How many feet would the eastern wall of the holy sepulchre be from the second wall to which Dr. Masterman referred?

Dr. MASTERMAN: I know I must be very brief, and I am afraid there are some subjects which it would be no use to try and dismiss in a few words. About the higher hill dominating Zion, I think the chief reasons for the identification of the south-east hill as Zion is that the result of the excavations shows this to be a site in keeping with all the ancient fortified sites we know in Palestine, and it is no objection to such a view that there is a higher hill some distance away. The essential thing is these ancient sites was a tongue of land isolated on three sides by deep valleys and on the other side isolated by the higher ground from which it springs, either by a natural depression or an artificial fosse. I do not agree with Dr. Schofield's remark that there was a city on "Mount Zion" in the time of the Jebusites. With regard to the western site there was no city in the whole country in pre-Hebrew times which covered the area which such an identification suggests. Of course, the name Zion has been applied to many parts. It was an alternative name for Jerusalem in the Psalms, and the name Mount Zion has been applied during the Christian era to the western hill. The original Zion was the hill which David took and which he renamed "the City of David."

As regards the site of our Lord's tomb, there is still much controversy. If you have read Sir Charles Wilson's book *Golgotha*, you will find the subject discussed in a thoroughly scientific spirit. His conclusion is to this effect: He considers, while there is nothing archæological to support the view that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the present site, we have found nothing in the position of the walls to make it impossible that it could have been the site. I cannot go farther than that, because I can only say that is my attitude. I do not believe we shall ever get nearer a conclusion than that

I have been asked about the distance of the second wall from the Holy Sepulchre. I can only say that Sir Charles was a military man and a great student, and he said the walls could be sketched in just far enough to make the site possible.

The CHAIRMAN asked Col. Roberts to move a vote of thanks to Dr. Masterman

Col. ROBERTS: I have much pleasure in doing that, and I hope Dr. Masterman will come again. I think, if I may say so, to-day's paper is more interesting than on the last occasion, at least it is to me, because it is more concentrated, and I think concentration on a particular subject makes it more interesting. I ask you to pass by acclamation a vote of thanks to Dr. Masterman for his very interesting paper.

(Vote of thanks.)