

and kneeling down to drink. No doubt he thought it was digging a grave.

The legend of Muhammad in the cave (of Mt. Hira) covered by the spider's web, is told of David in Talmudic literature, when he fled from Saul.

Ghouls do not seem to be familiar to the writer. There are several haunts of ghouls marked on the Western Survey, and east of Jordan all the dolmens were known to Arabs as "Ghoul's houses." Another ghoul lived in the Jordan valley in 1874, and I have been in a ghoul's cave near Jericho. The word, however, appears to be Turkish rather than Arabic. It is more commonly used among Arabs than among the Fellahin.

I believe the *Murid*, or candidate for admission into a Dervish order, usually appears naked at the ceremony of initiation.

The carrying about of boats is not a ceremony which I have seen in Palestine, but I have heard of it in seaside towns, such as Tripoli, and have witnessed it at Constantinople.

My impression is that it is very difficult to get natives to talk on such subjects at all, and that information can only be got from residents who have had the special experience of Mr. Baldensperger. Those who live in towns like Beirut do not, as a rule, know anything about the peasantry.

ZION (OR ACRA), GIHON, AND MILLO.

(All South of the Temple.)

By the Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

PATIENT investigation has clearly shown me that Zion, *i.e.*, the stronghold of Zion, captured by Joab and afterwards named the City of David, was situated on Ophel, due west of Gihon (Virgin's Fount). Any theory at variance with this conclusion will (I am satisfied) on careful examination prove to have been founded on some mistake.

We, the defenders of the Ophel site, are, as were the Jebusites, few in number, but like the conies we make our houses in the rock (but rocks, R.V.), and so are quite able to hold our own against all comers at all times. Our opponents have indeed the Press on their side. Canon Tristram, Sir C. Warren, Major Conder, Rev. A. Henderson, Mr. G. St. Clair, and, lastly, Sir Charles Wilson in the Dictionary of the Bible, are scattering their Pseudo-Zions far and wide. In vain I urged the Bible Society not to be afraid, but boldly to put the City of David where Nehemiah places it, *i.e.*, south of the Temple (*Quarterly Statement*, 1885, p. 61), the virtual reply in "New Bible Maps" was no plan of Jerusalem, and En-rogel misplaced at Gihon. Another Society that prints for the million was equally timid. Meanwhile, my publisher

taries at Jericho. Thus error catches thousands, while truth gets hardly a bite.

I do not undertake to convince my adversaries, but merely to confute their arguments or point out their inconsistencies. Yet if I break only one link in a chain, the latter is useless until it is mended. Would Samson have done more? Let me now deal with some of the errors adverse to our Ophel site.

1. Mr. St. Clair in these pages, and in his "Buried Cities," is partly in agreement with us in placing the City of David south of the Temple, but he does not extend it so far south as Gihon. As I first learnt from him the true position of the valley gate, I broke not merely one but (by way of special kindness) three links in his chain, by asking three questions in *Quarterly Statement*, 1891, p. 255, each one fatal to his line for Nehemiah's wall. These questions, first asked in *Quarterly Statement*, 1889, p. 207, remain still unanswered. As, however, a writer informs me that Mr. St. Clair has detected flaws in my theory, and discovered arguments fatal to my views, perhaps he will excavate them out of "Buried Cities" and state them distinctly in these pages; and also, just in passing, answer the three questions. Silence I shall take as equivalent to admitting that they are unanswerable.

2. Sir Charles Wilson, on the contrary, admits our Ophel site for both Acra and the City of David. He says (*Dict. of Bible, Jerusalem, 1634*): "Although the term Acra included that portion of the (eastern) hill upon which the Macedonian fortress and the Temple stood, it was more especially applied to the quarter of the city lying between the Temple cloisters and Siloam"; and (1651), "The question whether the stronghold of Zion was to the north or to the south of the Temple, cannot be solved with our present knowledge," and again (1652), on Nehemiah iii, 16, "This passage, when taken with the context, seems in itself quite sufficient to set at rest the question of the position (on Ophel) of the City of David, of the sepulchres of the kings, and, consequently, of Zion; all which could not be mentioned after Siloah, if placed where modern tradition has located them."

I pause to express the pleasure of having an opponent who candidly owns the correctness of our site. Perhaps in these twilight days most would be content with a compromise with error, but my intolerance precludes me from admitting that in the Old Testament, 1 Maccabees and Josephus the terms "the City of David" and "Acra" are in any case applied to any part of the eastern hill at Jerusalem, except to Ophel, so called. I say *eastern*, because Josephus writes so carelessly as to describe (in the opinion of Williams) Herod's towers in the Upper City ("Wars" VI, viii, 4) as Acra; and, if this be true, I am forced to admit that he may also mean the Upper City when he speaks of David taking the Acra in "Ant." VII, iii, 1 (*Quarterly Statement*, 1885, 208; 1890, 330).

Sir Charles Wilson's inclination, or decision, to place the stronghold of Zion at Antonia, north of the Temple, does not seem to me to rest upon the mistake (see 3 below) of Canon Tristram, Major Conder, &c., that the

southern site was indefensible as being *dominated* or *commanded* by the higher ground north and west, but on misapprehensions as to the Acra of the Macedonians and Josephus, which Acra, it is obvious, was practically the site of the City of David, *i.e.*, the stronghold of Zion.

I arrived at the southern position for Zion without difficulty, as soon as ever I laid aside Josephus and took the Bible as my guide in this matter. This was a simple way it is true, but fifteen years have proved it to be a safe way.

Sir Charles still prefers to work backwards (*supra*, 165) through Josephus, *i.e.*, muddledom, but such a course compels us at each step to consider the veracity of Josephus. I am willing to take Josephus at Sir Charles Wilson's estimate. He says (Dict. B., 1632) Josephus is not yet convicted of "any material error in describing localities in *plan*," but he uses "exaggerated statements whenever he speaks of heights"; his "national vanity" is "checked, when he speaks of what still existed and could never be falsified." Lastly, on p. 165 (*supra*) he says: "If we could once reconstruct Jerusalem as Josephus *saw* it." (Italics are mine.)

Armed with this gauge, let me now accompany Sir Charles in his search for Acra, and test his conclusions by the standard thus approved by him.

(A) On p. 165 he says Acra was situated "on the eastern hill, upon a rocky height that was afterwards cut down and levelled." Now did Josephus ever see that height either existing or cut down? Neither. For the date assigned to the story was 200 years before he wrote. This case then is not one of *saw* but of *height*, *i.e.*, of *certain exaggeration*. I may repeat that I Macc. knows nothing whatever of "a rocky height" or of "cutting down and levelling."

(B) "The Acra was in close proximity to and *overlooked* the Temple." As on Sir C. Wilson's plan the distance between his Acra and his Temple is precisely the same as between my site for Acra and his Temple, it is unnecessary here to remark on the "close proximity"; but as to the *overlooking*, I must observe again that Josephus was not there to *see*, and the question is again one of *height*, and so of *certain exaggeration*. That the mount of the Temple which was by (*παρά*) the Acra (1 Macc. xiii, 52) means necessarily that one was within bowshot of the other, I cannot for a moment admit. Part of Sicily is said by Polybius to be *παρα*, *i.e.*, alongside of Italy.

(C) He urges that Acra was "within the limits of the *City of David*," and refers to 1 Macc. i, 33, "They builded the City of David with a great and strong wall (and) mighty towers, and it became (or was turned into, *ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄκραν*) an Acra for them." This so obviously means that the places were identical, that I have difficulty in seeing why this reference should have been given as showing or implying that the Acra was *within* the City of David: for if *εἰς* is to be made to imply *within*, it would be the City of David that here was *within* the Acra, which is diametrically opposed to what is urged above in support of Sir Charles Wilson's theory. Brecon, I admit, has been made into a

depôt, and the depôt, I presume, is *within* Brecon. This is possible and true, because we speak loosely. But if we built the castle there with a great wall and mighty towers, and it was turned into a (mediæval) fortress (or Acra), surely no one would urge that the fortress was within the castle. Yet this seems to me to be precisely what is done in the above statement as to Acra. If one thing is clear in 1 Macc. it is this, that the two terms "Acra" and "City of David" are identical. Indeed, Josephus recognises the identity when he paraphrases "The host that was at Jerusalem (in) the City of David" (1 Macc. ii, 31), by the words "The forces they then had in the Acra at Jerusalem" ("Ant." XII, vi, 2). If it be urged that in the Greek text (Macc.) there is something wrong, as Jerusalem was obviously not the City of David, then I must refer to 1 Macc. xiv, 36, "Those in the City of David those in Jerusalem who had made themselves an Acra." Here the persons referred to are obviously the garrison of the Acra named in Josephus. If it be urged that, though Josephus above and in XII, x, 4, uses "Acra," where 1 Macc. uses "the City of David," it does not follow that the Acra was not within that city, then I must exclaim, "Surely building the City of David means building the City of David, and not merely some part within that city (or castle)."

(D) Sir Charles Wilson further urges that no Greek engineer would have built an acropolis on lower ground than the building it was intended to command and overawe. But who says that the Acra was intended to command the Temple? If it be said Josephus, then I reply this again would be a question not of *sight* but *height*, i.e., *certain exaggeration*. In point of fact, however, there was nothing needing to be overawed. The faithful Jews fled from Jerusalem. The sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness, and its gates burned up. The story of Josephus about those in the Acra rushing out upon the Jews going up to the Temple, relates to a time years after the Acra was built, and is the Jewish historian's paraphrase of the statement in 1 Macc. vi, 18, that the garrison of the Acra besieged those in the sanctuary (or Mount Zion).

The reader will probably by this time perceive that "Acra (at Antonia) on a rocky height, within the limits of the City of David, and overlooking and overawing the Temple" is, after all, only an imposing castle of cards, the *section* being *exaggerated* by Josephus, and the *plan* misplaced by modern writers misled by the fanciful section. Acra such and so situated is only a chimera. The City of David in the Old Testament is always consistently placed south of the Temple, and there was no call for the Jews, after the time of Nehemiah, to devise another north of it. I pass by Aristæus with one remark. If Sir C. Wilson's site for the Temple be correct, the summit of Moriah being north of it suffices for his fortress; if wrong, the tower of Hananeel would do equally well.

I must briefly notice the replies given on p. 165 to my points on p. 74.

(a) I do not see how the statement that "Acra was in the Lower City" shows that either was north of the Temple.

(c) Josephus (in his fiction) says the very mountain itself was cut

down. Surely a scarped rock does not indicate both a limit of range and also economy of labour.

(d) It is not part of my theory but of my opponents', that Acra was higher than the Temple. I ought not, however, to have questioned their knowledge of geology, but I suspect that it is also geologically impossible for the site of Acra at Antonia to have been naturally higher than Sir C. Wilson's third hill. The level at the Holy Sepulchre seems to be 2,495 feet, and that of Antonia 2,462. Will the dip from east of the Damascus gate allow the rock near to Antonia to have exceeded 2,495 feet?

(e) I accept the explanation given as possible in the first case, which is one of *height*, and therefore of *certain exaggeration*; but what of the second, where Josephus arbitrarily turns *down* into *up*?

(f) It is objected that if the Temple be the third hill there must be a valley across Ophel which does not exist. Josephus says there used to be such a valley, which was filled up (200 years before he wrote). Is not this, therefore, a case not of *sight* but *height* (or depth, practically the same thing), and, therefore, for the last time of asking, of *certain exaggeration*? As, however, the City of David must have had some fortification (Millo) on its north side on Ophel, and probably also an artificial ditch, both of which were no doubt removed before his day, there was probably some small foundation for his levelling of Acra and filling up of the valley at some unknown date.

(g) My quotation (*supra*, 75) from Josephus is said to be incorrect and incomplete. I suppose the sting is always in the tail. I deal severely but, I hope, not shabbily with Josephus. On p. 73 I had given the quotation both in full and also correctly, so far as I can see, and shall be glad to have my error (if it exists) pointed out. It seemed needless then to quote again in full on p. 75. To say the meaning attached to it is wrong does not help to settle the question any more than saying a particular site for Acra is wrong without any evidence being produced. I maintain my meaning is right.

(h) As no instance is produced of a threshing-floor being inside a city, I imagine such cannot be found. To place Araunah's, therefore, within the city seems to be an anomaly.

But I must pass on. Sir C. Wilson says (D. B., 1622), Cestius "at last encamped in the Upper City opposite the palace," but outside the first wall. I believe it is admitted that in every passage except this ("Wars" II, xix, 4) the Upper City means the south-western hill within the first wall. To put it briefly, the words of Josephus (*ἔλθων πρὸς τὴν ἄνω πόλιν*) are pressed into meaning not "having come towards (or near to) the Upper City," but having come to (Whiston says into) it, so as necessarily to occupy a part of it. The preposition *πρὸς* is common in Josephus. Titus turned aside (*πρὸς*) towards the tower Psephimus, yet he did not enter it then, but remained outside for days. Simon came to the wall of Jerusalem ("Wars" IV, ix, 8) and was indignant at being kept outside it. Vespasian came to (*πρὸς*) Gamala, but did not occupy it without a siege. This is a question of *plan*, and it is not necessary in this case, even if it be possible, to force

a construction on the words of Josephus that does not well agree with what he says elsewhere about the Upper City. Ewald, it is true, or his translator J. F. S. uncritically says that "the Romans pushed into the New City and obtained a position *in* the Upper City opposite the Royal castle"; but Milman and Williams, with better judgment and more respect for Greek, state that "Cestius advanced *against* the Upper City." Thrupp, a good scholar, observes (Jerusalem, 191) that "Cestius encamped (evidently within Agrippa's Wall) *against* the Upper City opposite the palace," and again (199) "Cestius encamped on the north of the Upper City, opposite the Palace of Herod." If any one can produce a passage from Josephus in which *προς* must mean *into* and not merely *towards*, let him do so. Traill's translation (*supra*, 166), "proceeding *to* the Upper Town," being ambiguous, has easily been taken in a way prejudicial to Josephus, and misleading.

To extend the Upper City north of the first wall, of course, might seem to give some little support to Sir C. Wilson's theory that the Tyropæon ravine reached north of Wilson's arch towards (or up to) Antonia, but the help is very small indeed. Josephus says the Tyropæon ravine separated Acra from the Upper City; yet this extension of the Upper City would be separated from Antonia, not merely by his Tyropæon but also by the third hill placed as he proposes.

Little need be said by me about ἀμφίκυρος, as no doubt the eastern hill is naturally *humped* (*Quarterly Statement*, 1886, p. 31) north of the Temple, as well as south of it. When Josephus says the western hill was *higher and straighter*, I see he speaks correctly of *section*, and so too of the eastern hill as *low and humped*. Sir C. Wilson takes him to speak both of *section* and *plan*. I have never seen it pointed out how the western hill is specially *straighter* on plan, and a single curve for ἀμφίκυρος seems to me very unsatisfactory.

Sir C. Wilson would place En-rogel at the Virgin's Fount, already admitted to be Gihon in one passage. I cannot accept two or three Gihons, especially as he states there is only one known spring at Jerusalem. I said (*Quarterly Statement*, 1889, 45): "Joab's well seems undoubtedly to answer to the required position of En-rogel, but not to be actually En-rogel." Is any one prepared to say that if Joab's Well and Sir C. Warren's aqueduct were stopped, there would not be a stream of water next season bursting from the ground near Joab's Well, not to say anything of my Jebusite speculations? Josephus ("Wars" V, xii, 2) mentions a valley of the Fountain (πηγή), which I take to have been En-rogel, near Joab's Well. Curiously, this last spot (Bir Eyub) is in D.B., 944, said to be "in full view of the city, which the other spot (Virgin's Fount) is not." This latter rather seems to me to be under the very windows of the City of David, and therefore the last place near which to secrete spies (2 Sam. xvii, 17).

I regret wrongly taking Sir C. Wilson to apply *gai* and *emek* to the same part of Wady er Rababeh. Still, if the western part of this Wady be the dale of the dead bodies (Jeremiah xxxi, 40) and the lower part the

valley (*guz*) of Hinnom, why is not that defiled but famous valley named in the description given on the way to the brook Kidron? I must reserve 3 for another time.

PAVING STONES OF THE TEMPLE.

By J. M. TENZ.

IN company with the Rev. J. E. Hanauer and the Rev. C. Biggs, Chaplain to the Bishop of Jerusalem, I visited the convent of "The Sisters of Zion," and saw a portion of the ancient street, lately discovered—it is about 5 or 6 feet below the level of the present street—also the two Stones of Proclamation and that portion of the Ecce Homo arch which once formed the smaller side entrance—probably of a Roman triumphal arch of later date—a part of which is now taken within the building of the convent. The rockscarp on the north side was also kindly pointed out to us by one of the Sisters of Zion, which is about 150 feet from the rock where once the "Tower of Antonia" stood, and formed a broad ditch to separate the tower from Bezetha, or new city. This ditch, also serving for a road, was paved with white stones, with slight cuttings or grooves across them, about 2 inches apart, for animals of burden to have a firm footing; but at some later date, when repaired, yellowish polished stones were put in many places to replace the missing ones, as now may be seen in the cellar of the convent, where they were discovered by digging for the foundation. These repairs were no doubt made after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Romans, and the fine polished stones of the Temple court were used to adorn Adrian's city. Josephus and the Talmud state that the Temple courts were paved with stones of that description, also that in the taking of the Temple by the Romans a soldier fell down in the Temple court because the stones were so very smooth. It would be interesting to know if these fine polished stone slabs were from the pavement of the Temple courts. The broad ditch, beside serving for a roadway, may also have been used as a market place where sheep and oxen were sold for sacrifices, until at last it was extended to the outer court of the Temple, from which Jesus drove them.

The Stones of Proclamation were said to have served as a stand from which announcements were made of anything which had been lost or of something to be sold. These stones, when first found, were on the same level on the pavement, and may also have served the same purpose as the two stones on Mars Hill at Athens, where, when cases had to be tried, the accuser was placed on one stone and the accused on the other to state their grievances.
