

old buildings such as the city walls, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and minarets, &c., but also, and with equal richness of colour, on some modern ones known to have been built before 1860 for instance, on the south wall of Christ Church, and on the oldest part of Bishop Gobat's School.

These observations led me to make special enquiries on the subject and I was told by several old European residents that the yellow colour was caused by a remarkable shower of yellow mud which fell about thirty-five years ago.

I was also told that Professor Roth of Munich, who happened to be here at the time, examined this yellow mud and found it to consist of sand similar to that found in some parts of the Sinaitic peninsula and to contain many minute shells also found in that region.

Mr. Schick has, in answer to my written enquiry, kindly favoured me with the following note :—

“The rain of clay happened in the year 1857. I think it was in February. There were showers of rain before, then scirocco came for a few days. That evening the sun disappeared and then, in the night, there followed a shower of rain which brought down all the very fine dust in the air. All channels were stopped up with a sort of fine clay of yellow colour, and everything exposed was painted yellow, but the following rains washed off a good deal. ‘Gakooli’ stones, however, remained yellow, as they usually become by the process of exposure to sun and rain, whereas harder stones keep the natural colour. Such a rain mingled with clay has since then fallen on several occasions, but only slightly, and never in any quantity worthy of comparison with that above mentioned. Sometimes small shells fall with it or may be detected in the sediment.”

I have ventured to call attention to this fact because I do not remember having noticed any mention of it in works on Palestine, and I therefore hope it may not be uninteresting to readers of your valuable *Quarterly Statement*.

ANCIENT JERUSALEM.

Zion or Acra, South, not North, of the Temple.

By the Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

SIR CHARLES WILSON, in his lecture on Ancient Jerusalem, places Acra, and consequently the stronghold of Zion, north of the Temple. This position seemed to have been so riddled by the arguments given in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 44, and 1886, p. 26, that I thought it was clearly untenable. It was with much surprise, then, that I found so cautious and able an authority on Jerusalem supporting the northern site. In self-defence I feel called upon to examine his theory, as

antagonistic to mine, that the City of David (or Acra) was solely on Ophel (so-called), south of the Temple. Should his view prove to be true, it only remains for me to own my errors and to keep quiet for the future.

Now, Sir Charles Wilson (practically) admits that the Biblical evidence places the City of David south of the Temple. I understand him to allow that in Nehemiah, the House of David, the stairs of the City of David (iii, 15 ; xii, 37), and the sepulchres of David, are all placed on Ophel ; indeed, on a plan approved by him, the sepulchres of the kings (which were in the City of David) are marked as due east of Ain Silwân, close to the upper pool of Siloam.

"The outer wall to the City of David, on the west side of Gihon in the valley" (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14), he locates on the west side of the Virgin's Fount, *i.e.*, on Ophel, and considers that 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, would most suitably apply to the Siloam tunnel, if only Ain Silwân could be described as on the west side of the City of David. His objection, however, seems to be already answered by the above plan, which places Ain Silwân *due west* of the most remarkable spot in that city, *viz.*, the sepulchres of the kings.

This is all the Biblical evidence, and it is enough. Sir Charles Wilson agrees with me as to my southern site for the City of David (and also for Acra) ; but, in my opinion, he is mistaken in maintaining that these names originally belonged to the site of Antonia, north-west of the Temple, and afterwards were used to comprehend the whole eastern hill down to Siloam. Of course, for this he has no Biblical evidence ; he relies solely on Josephus. I maintain, however, that the Bible is clear, and Josephus confused. One may elucidate Josephus by the Bible, but not the Bible by Josephus, as he contradicts in turn the Bible, 1 Maccabees, and himself. Sir Charles Wilson brings to his task a deep acquaintance with the natural features of Jerusalem, and only goes astray because he confides too readily in Josephus and his interpreters.

It is interesting in the case before us to note how a cautious writer comes to (what I must consider) several wrong conclusions. He seems predisposed to solve difficulties by extending terms. Thus, the expressions "Upper City," "Acra," or the "Lower City," and the "City of David," are made to comprehend in later times more than the parts to which they were first applied. In the same way, Gihon is not taken to represent only one spot, but is thought to be applicable to two or three ; and whilst the Hebrew word *nachal*, in regard to Jerusalem, is noted as being the unvarying term for the *brook* Kidron ; the other two terms, *gai* (ravine) and *emek* (dale), are taken as interchangeable, and thus the topographical lamp approved of by Gesenius (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 180 ; 1889, p. 38) and others, is at once extinguished, with the result that Sir Charles Wilson thinks he has fixed the original Acra, or the stronghold of Zion, on the site of Antonia, north-west of the Temple ; while to me it seems perfectly clear that the Ophel site is the only one possible.

Sir Charles Wilson (agreeing herein with Sir Charles Warren, *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 43) considers that the place at Jerusalem where the first settlers would establish themselves was close to the Virgin's Fountain (i.e., Gihon); yet, I regret to say, he identifies this with En-rogel because he thinks there was only one natural spring near Jerusalem. To me it seems incredible that Gihon and En-rogel were identical, and it is pointed out in *Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 46, that at the time when En-rogel is first named in Joshua, there was an actual spring (ain) near Bir Eyûb, used by the Jebusites, even if there had not been an occasional spring at the same place in prehistoric times.

But I come to the main point. What evidence does Sir C. Wilson give that Acra, and previously Zion, the castle of the Jebusites, were north-west of the Temple site? Since the proof tendered is based upon Josephus, let me premise, as observed by Williams, that "no reliance can be placed on Whiston's translation, which is very inaccurate."

The arguments are as follows:—

1. Josephus ("Wars," V, iv, 1) says that Jerusalem (Lecture, p. 2) "was built on two hills opposite to one another, but divided in the middle by a ravine." The western hill sustained the Upper City. This last Sir C. Wilson does not confine to the modern Sion hill, for he says "The term *Upper City* is upon one occasion (Lecture 6) applied by Josephus to the high ground between the Jaffa Gate and the north-west angle of the present wall." On reference to this passage ("Wars," II, xix, 4) it turns out that Whiston's *mistranslation* of *πρός* as *into*, forms the whole ground for carrying the Upper City north of the first wall of Josephus. Thus there is no evidence that the term Upper City is ever extended.

2. Sir C. Wilson points out that the eastern hill, reaching from Antonia to Siloam, had in its natural state "the form of the crescent moon," and that Josephus say that "the other hill, which was called Acra, was the shape of the crescent moon." The actual word used by Josephus is *ἀμφικυρτός*, which Whiston *mistranslated* by "the shape of the moon when she is horned." The word, however, does not mean crescent-shaped, but gibbons, or, with sloping sides, as pointed out in *Quarterly Statement*, 1886, p. 30; and 1890, p. 129. It is obvious, then, that the natural crescent form of the eastern hill receives no confirmation of this characteristic from an epithet not signifying crescent-shaped. In other words, this wrong interpretation is not any evidence that the term Lower City or Acra was extended beyond the part south of the Temple, while it is conceded that it was frequently applied to that southern part.

Thus in these two cases Josephus does not really support the view that the Upper City on the west, and the Acra or Lower City on the east, extended to the north of a line drawn along the northern brow of modern Zion to Wilson's Arch. Let me now show from Josephus that even the term Tyropæon is not applied by him to any part to the north of Wilson's Arch.

In "Wars," V, iv, 1, Josephus adds that at the ravine called the

Tyropæon, which separated the Upper City from the Lower, and reached to Siloam, "the corresponding rows of houses on both hills end" (Whiston).

It will readily be admitted that south of the south-west corner of the Temple (or Haram), the Upper City and Acra (may have) had houses as described above; but from this corner to the north-west corner of Antonia there was (practically) a long high wall or fortification, with the necessary approaches to some of the western Temple gates. Still, if, for argument's sake, it be admitted that there were houses in some places along this western part of the eastern hill, then I must point out that Sir C. Wilson's own application of Josephus (*see* below 3) shows that the valley to the west of the eastern hill was no longer regarded as the Tyropæon.

Josephus goes on to say that over against this (Acra), there was a third hill, naturally lower than Acra, and once separated from it by "another broad ravine" (Williams), which was afterwards filled up, with a view of joining the city to the Temple. Again, in "Ant.," XV, xi, 5, he says of the western gates of the Temple, "The remaining one led to the other city (or rest of the city), where the road descended down into the valley (or ravine) by many steps, and thence up again by the ascent, for the city lay over against the Temple in the manner of a theatre, and was encompassed with a deep ravine along the entire south quarter." In his lecture, p. 7, Sir C. Wilson says, "The lower slopes of the western hill (*i.e.*, north of the first or old wall) were known on the south as the *suburbs*, and on the north as the *third hill*, on which stood the *other city*." Further on, p. 9, he explains the expression to the "other city," as meaning, in other words, "to that quarter of the city which lay between the first and second walls" (called, by an oversight, the second and third; *see* p. 11). This quarter, I may add, Josephus describes as "the northern quarter," in "Wars," V, iv, 2; and I, xiii, 3; but as "the suburb," in "Ant.," XIV, xiii, 4 (where he narrates the same event), and XV, xi, 5 (*Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 108).

But if the slopes within the second wall were (as interpreted by Sir C. Wilson) separated from the eastern hill by another broad ravine, called *another* by Josephus *in opposition* to the Tyropæon, it is clear that the two thus distinguished were neither regarded as one and the same, nor called by the same name.

Here once more Whiston (according to Williams) mistranslates Josephus in rendering *another* by *from the other*. But not to insist on *another*, it must here be pointed out that, if "the other city" in "Ant.," XV, xi, 5, be identified with Sir C. Wilson's third hill, then, as the city had a deep ravine along its whole southern quarter, it follows that in this part the Upper City and Acra (here Antonia and part of the Temple according to Sir C. Wilson) was separated from each other not by one ravine, but at least by two; for the (practically) right angle formed by eastern hill and north wall of the Upper City contains both the broad ravine on the east of the third hill or other city, and the deep ravine on

its south side. The Tyropæon in no case can do duty for two ravines, in whatever way ἀλλῆ be translated.

Thus the extinction of the "crescent" and limitation of the Tyropæon to the part where houses on the two hills faced one another, exclude all sound reason at present from carrying Acra further north than the southern limit of the Haram or of the Temple.

3. Sir C. Wilson, however, under the impression that Acra was a term covering Antonia and the Temple, would identify the northern quarter within the second wall ("Ant." V, iv, 1; *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 108) with the third hill over against Acra, and with the other city to which the last-named gate led.

Josephus happily adds that the broad ravine was filled up with the view of joining the city (on the third hill, as I understand Sir C. Wilson) to the Temple. This line to the Temple can only have been a short distance north of Wilson's Arch, and must have coincided with the line of passage from the gate just named, which had many steps leading into the valley and up again to the (means of access or) ascent. For as it is most improbable that there should have been a mound across the valley, and many steps down into it and up from it, side by side, offering alternative routes to the same part, one seems driven to make the two ways *coincide*, so that if this interpretation of Josephus be accepted, the way from the last gate led down many steps into a valley, which was really no valley at all at that time, having been already filled up.

The improbability of such an arrangement satisfies me that this interpretation of Josephus is wrong; and yet (so far as I can judge) such a result has to serve Sir C. Wilson, as all the evidence available for identifying the northern quarter with the third hill and with the other city; and for conferring the term Acra on the Temple and Antonia.

As, therefore, there is nothing to show that the term Acra ever got to the Antonia site, it is needless to consider how it could have got away from it to the Temple site, or to the part south of the Temple to which alone it is really applied by Josephus. Acra was on the site of the fort or City of David in which David dwelt, but what is true of Acra is true also of David and his city. There is no evidence taking either of them first to the Antonia site and afterwards down from it to Ophel (so called).

In *Quarterly Statement*, 1888, p. 44, I pointed out the unsoundness of the arguments alleged in favour of the northern site for Acra by Fergusson, Thrupp and Lewin. Let me now give other points against the northern, and in favour of my southern site on Ophel.

(a.) Josephus nowhere gives the title of Acra or Lower City to Antonia or the Temple; but he repeatedly gives it to Ophel (so called).

(b.) The Bible (as already noticed) in several places applies the term City of David (or Zion) to Ophel (so called).

(c.) Josephus says that the Acra, after it was cut down, was lower than the Temple site. The Antonia site, on the contrary, is higher, even at the present day. (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 186.)

(d.) The southern site, however, is so much below that of the Temple, that its very lowness has been urged as proving that it could not have been the City of David, the stronghold of Zion, or Acra; and this has been urged most strongly by those who believe that the Acra had been lowered, but curiously failed to see that, if it had been lowered, it might formerly (for all that they could tell) have been high enough even to have commanded and overlooked the Temple hill.

(e.) Josephus no doubt firmly believed that Acra used to be higher than the Temple, and actually *alters history* to make it square with his notions, for whereas 1 Maccab. vii, 32, 33, says that Nicanor went *up* from the Acra to Mount Zion, Josephus on the contrary ("Ant." XII, x, 5) says he went *down* from the Acra to the Temple.

A similar instance is given in *Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 168.

When, therefore, Josephus speaks of the Acra overlooking or overhanging the Temple, we know what such an unsupported statement is worth. When, again, he speaks of the Acra being lowered, of which exploit 1 Maccabees knows nothing, or of there having been a valley, and of its being filled up, between Acra and the third hill, it is necessary to bear in mind that Josephus is talking of what he had not seen and about which he is probably only making a guess.

(f.) Josephus says there was a third hill over against Acra, but naturally lower than Acra, and once separated from it by another broad ravine, which was filled up with a view to joining the city to the Temple.

This third hill here must have been the Temple hill, since there is no evidence that the Acra was itself the Temple hill, and the city must have been the Lower City or Acra.

(g.) The road by the last gate led by Robinson's arch "into the ravine and thence up again to the other (or rest of the) city, which had a deep ravine along its whole southern quarter." This deep ravine was Wady Rababeh, commonly but wrongly named the valley of Hinnom. The Tyropæon is never (so far as I know) called either a broad or deep ravine, though deeper than the ravine north of the first wall.

(h.) If the fort of Zion had been at the Antonia site and another part of Jerusalem on Ophel (so called), it would be interesting to know what is to be done with Araunah's threshing floor. Prof. Sayce (*Quarterly Statement*, 1884, p. 174), hazarded the statement that it was inside the city, being private property, but he adduces no evidence of threshing floors being so situated. But if the threshing floor were outside the city (as I believe it was), the difficulty would still be great of connecting or not connecting the Acropolis with the lower city near Gihon.

Lastly, with the castle of Zion at Antonia, how are we to account for the successful resistance of the Jebusites for 400 years, when the area was so limited that David had to build his cedar house far away on Ophel? It was in the plains that the Canaanites held their own, having iron chariots. What was there then in the unproved northern Zion to make it impregnable? Nothing whatever. As soon, however, as the

stronghold of Zion is placed in the position marked out in the Bible; the truth begins to leak out, and the mystery that has hung over Zion for centuries vanishes away in the solution given by Kennicott a hundred years ago.

The secret of Zion's long invincibility did not lie either in the height of its scarps and walls, or in the valour of its defenders, but in its happy possession of an unfailling supply of water from Gihon by means of the secret passage called in 2 Sam. v, 8, "the gutter." Its fall at last was due neither to overpowering numbers, nor (as would at first sight appear) to the extraordinary audacity of Joab, who led the scaling party through the horizontal aqueduct, up the vertical shaft, and then along the oblique winding gallery on Ophel, so capturing Zion, and gaining the object of his ambition. "Joab the son of Zeruiah went up first and was made chief."

The ascent of the gutter proved far too tedious and difficult a task to Captain Warren on 24th October, 1867, in time of peace, for it ever to have been effected in B.C. 1047, in time of war without help from within. Some Jebusite, mindful it may be of Jericho, Gibeon, and Bethel, obviously made peace with Israel, by selling the fortress into the hands of David. Circumstantial evidence, and the repeated and consistent indications of Josephus, leave no doubt on my mind that this traitor was Araunah. Contempt for the deed will, no doubt, give place to commendation of the doer, when it is borne in mind that he thereby saved his life, and eventually netted 600 shekels of gold, thus doing well unto himself.

While many are freely giving a good sum to buy a doubtful tomb at Jerusalem, will no one provide a small fraction of that amount to secure possession of "the gutter," and by re-opening Sir C. Warren's passage to the surface of Ophel, enable visitors at Jerusalem to explore the ancient scene of Joab's famous exploit. There need be no fear about *this* position maintaining its claim to be considered the *most* interesting of genuine sites at Jerusalem, until the auspicious day dawns, on which access will be gained to the true but long-concealed sepulchres of David on the southern part of Ophel.

So far from finding it necessary to abandon my "gutter" and Araunah, I feel now more convinced than ever that I have got hold of the truth, and have the utmost confidence in a theory which, after standing the test of fourteen years' criticism, has just passed unscathed through Sir Charles Wilson's severe examination. Neither can I myself find the flaw in my theory, nor can I find anyone to detect it for me. If among the readers of these pages any Solomon or Daniel wishes to outdo the prowess of Joab, he can (I think) hardly do better than assail with argument "the gutter," up which that crafty hero climbed. I shall be obliged by anyone discovering arguments that I have hunted for in vain. The strength of the position (I need hardly say) lies in its being really not mine, but that of Nehemiah and the Bible.
