

“THE HOLY PLACES OF JERUSALEM.”

PROFESSOR HAYTER LEWIS has lately published a book, entitled the “Holy Places of Jerusalem,” which may be looked upon as a very distinct evidence of the value of the labours of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Twenty years ago such a work could not have been produced. It has taken many years of exploration to accumulate the data on which this book is based. When the Palestine Exploration Fund began its operations there was great uncertainty about the topography of the Holy City. The writers on the subject before that time had propounded theories, and as these theories were opposed in many cases to each other, it took time to find out which were reliable; and which were not. Progress was made slowly, bit by bit points have been cleared up, and although much yet remains to be done, some of the principal questions have been cleared up, and have ceased to be subjects of controversy. The very names of buildings and places were found to be wrong—such as the “Mosque of Omar,” which we now know was built by Abd-el-Malik. To this another example may be added, which has only lately been cleared up. The large hollow at the north end of the Haram has long passed for the “Pool of Bethesda,”—it is so named even in the Ordnance Survey Map. The real Pool of Bethesda has at last been discovered, and a gain to our knowledge has been made. One merit of the book just produced is, that the author has had reliable material to work with. He has also visited Jerusalem more than once to see with his own eyes the places that had been discovered. Add to all this that he has been able to devote many years to the study of the questions connected with the archæology and architecture of the locality, and being both an architect as well as an archæologist, the result is a volume which has many merits, and it will be read with the greatest interest by all, and more particularly by those who have devoted study to the subject.

The largest portion of the work is devoted to the Dome of the Rock, and the other buildings of the Haram area. In this the author gives the latest historical material which has been derived from the publication of the Palestine Pilgrims Texts, such as Mukaddasi, who belonged to an architectural family, this connection giving his details about the structures of Jerusalem a peculiar value; he wrote about the year 985 A.D. This author mentions the existence at that date of both the Dome of the Rock and the Holy Sepulchre—this conjunction being one of the facts which has gone far to disprove Mr. Fergusson’s theory. As that theory is now untenable, it may be well to quote the final conclusion that Professor Hayter Lewis has arrived at. He says: “I am satisfied, after the most careful study which, as an architect, I have been able to give to the subject—First, that the Dome of the Rock was not built by Constantine, nor for several centuries after him, inasmuch as it is built up of fragments of too debased a character to have been used in buildings erected

<sup>1</sup> “The Holy Places of Jerusalem.” By T. Hayter Lewis, F.S.A., Emeritus Professor of Architecture, University College. John Murray, October, 1888.

and destroyed before his time. Secondly, that there is nothing to show definitely, in plan, construction, or details, that it is Byzantine, and that there is no reason to suppose that any such building would have been erected on a site which was considered by the Christians to be accursed, or which, if erected before the time of Chosroes, would have survived the destruction wrought by the Jews. As regards the suggestion that it was erected by Eudisia (c. 460), the above observations will apply equally well, except that Sir C. Wilson considers that it does not occupy the site of the Jewish Temple.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, that there is nothing, either in plan, details, or construction, to disprove the distinct statement made in the famous Cufic inscription, that the Dome of the Rock was built by Abd-el-Melik in 691 A.D. Finally, I must express my full belief that the Dome of the Rock was the work of Arabs, designed for them by a Byzantine or Persian architect, and with Persian or Byzantine workmen, before the Arabs had developed any definite style of their own, and that it was built with the capitals, bases, and columns ready to hand, being derived from the remains of churches and other buildings destroyed by Chosroes and other invaders," pp. 71, 72.

The suggestion that the capitals and other fragments which had been utilized by the builders of the Dome of the Rock are too debased to have been produced before the time of Constantine, is, if I mistake not, a new one, and it is, at the same time, of great force.

Professor Hayter Lewis also deals with the Holy Sepulchre; Jeremiah's Grotto, and the late speculations regarding it as the Site of Calvary; and also with Siloam, and the tunnel which brings water to the Pool from the Umm ed Deraj, or Fountain of the Virgin. The book is very full of beautiful plates, maps, and plans, making every point treated upon clear and distinct.

WILLIAM SIMPSON.

### NOTES ON THE PLAN OF JERUSALEM.

The parts shown in red are the more important of the recent discoveries, the descriptions of which will be found in the *Quarterly Statement* as noted below.

A. Scarped rock, &c., showing line of ancient wall to the south of the city. *Quarterly Statement*, 1875, pp. 7, 34, 81, 86.

B. Portion of the (supposed) second wall. *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, p. 21; 1887, pp. 23, 218.

C. Ancient wall near house of Latin Patriarch. *Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 65.

D D. Old remains outside the north wall of the city. *Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 63.

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Wilson suggests that possibly the Dome of the Rock was originally the church of St. Sophia, which was erected by Eudisia in the fifth century. Three documents in the sixth century mention this church, and no document before, or after, alludes to it. Sir Charles thinks that Abd-el-Melik either rebuilt this church or repaired it, making additions at the same time.