

church built upon the earth, and another decorated chamber above the church. In the old choir, the high altar still stands, but it is a ruin."

In A.D. 1517 Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Turks, and in A.D. 1547 the Mohamedans took possession of the Christian buildings on Mount Sion, and since that time access to them has been difficult. It would be interesting to make a thorough examination of the place in order to see what remains of the great church still exist, and it would also be desirable to excavate the ground to the east and search for the ancient foundations. I do not know, however, if this would be possible, as the buildings are surrounded by cemeteries.

To sum up, the conclusions at which I have arrived are as follow :—

- (1) It seems improbable that the Basilica of St. Mary, built by Justinian, was in the vicinity of the Temple, or that there was any Christian church in the Haram area prior to the occupation of Jerusalem by the Crusaders in A.D. 1099.
- (2) It is probable that the basilica of Justinian was constructed on Mount Sion on or near the site of the existing buildings, usually known as the Ccenaculum and Tomb of David.

THE LEVELLING OF THE AKRA.

By Rev. W. F. BIRCH.

SIMON'S expulsion of the enemy from the Akra (1 Macc. xiii, 50) developed in the fertile brain of Josephus into the herculean labour of a three years' demolition of fort, hill, and all.

Jahn long ago observed that the expressions in Maccabees are entirely at variance with the story of Josephus, adding that it probably originated in a mistake.

This "cock and bull" has brought a cycle of mischief upon Jerusalem research, but it is only fair, by putting a finger on the initial error, to show that the mistake of the Jewish historian was more his misfortune than fault.

Josephus in his day (*Quarterly Statement*, 1886, p. 26) certainly found that the term Akra was assigned to the sloping ridge (now called ed-Dhahr, *i.e.*, back) south of the temple, with no visible

ditch or valley between the two; and becoming devoted to precipices, he was doubtless amazed that the city of David ever stood on such a paltry hill. Yet 1 Macc. i, 33, left no room for doubt, as it stated distinctly that the city of David became the Akra.

Later, he faithfully (according to Whiston) performed the difficult and painful task of abridging 1 Macc. down to xiii, 50. Here the copy used abruptly ended, leaving him to make the best he could of the situation. This verse says that Simon "cast them (the garrison) thence (*i.e.*, from the Akra) and purified (*εκαθαρισεν*) the Akra from its pollutions" (*μιασματων*). Josephus, however, tells quite a different tale: first, in Wars I, ii, 2, briefly stating that Simon overcame the garrison and rased to the ground (*κατεσκαψε*) the Akra; and afterwards, in Ant. XIII, vi, 7, more copiously adding that he took the Akra, and levelled to the ground both it and the hill on which it stood, with other details. In this account he thrice uses the same verb for levelling (*καθειλε*, *καθειλειν*, *καθηρουν*), but omits all mention of pollutions or purification.

Now, if the imperfect manuscript preserved of *εκαθαρισεν* merely the four letters *καθ . . . ρ* and ended with Akra (*ακραν*), what would follow? The hero of precipices, with no (*μιασματα*) miasmas to guide him, could not be expected out of *καθ . . . ρ* to scent *εκαθαρισεν* or *εκαθαίρε* (purified), in preference to *καθηρει* (levelled). He had to restore the text as best he could. Here he would divine the solution of his difficulty. Did Simon level the Akra? If so, there is a reason for no peak now. Then he would picture to himself the table-rock of Akra, as once crowned by a peak, and so justly entitled to its name. He would be as glad as I was, when its true site became clear to me. Could he, in Ant., use *levelled* less than thrice? As a lover of strong positions, Josephus seems, in Wars V, iv, 1, to intend to locate the Jebusite stronghold of Zion on the lofty (S.W.) hill, when he writes: "David called that hill the *φρουριον*" (= Heb. Metsudah?); but subsequently, in the account of David's capturing it, he used the LXX, and accepted the Akra (the hill south of the future temple) as the site of that stronghold. Soon he was face to face with the following appalling difficulty: First, he found that the Bible stated more than 20 times that king after king (from David to Ahaz) was buried in the city of David; next he knew from 1 Macc. i, 33, that the city of David became the Akra; thirdly, from personal observation he was sure that Herod's white monument, erected at (or over) the entrance to David's tomb, was

at the siege situate towards the southern end of ed-Dhahr, near Siloam (Neh. iii, 16); while, finally, he had long assimilated the fiction that the Akra fort and hill had been wholly removed.

It was obvious that the royal sepulchres could not be in existence in a hill that had long before ceased to exist. Therefore all of these four articles of belief could not then be true. Accordingly, although the Bible said that David "called it (the fort) the city of David" (2 Sam. v, 9), Josephus twice in one passage (Ant. VII, iii, 2) wrote: "David named Jerusalem the city of David." By this perversion or prevarication he sacrificed the valuable precision of the sacred record, and brought vexation on posterity to save his own credit.

THE TRADITIONAL "HARBOUR OF SOLOMON" AT JAFFA.

By the Rev. J. E. HANAUER, Jerusalem.

To supplement my remarks on the traditional harbour of Solomon at Jaffa (*see Quarterly Statement*, July, 1903, pp. 258-264), I may observe that I inadvertently omitted to give chapter and verse for my quotation on p. 263 describing the fortified island existing at Jaffa in 1253. The reference is to Bohn's edition of Joinville's memoirs in *Chronicles of the Crusaders*, pp. 486, 495 sq.

When I submitted my notes I emphatically remarked that I did so "pending the time when more expert investigators and the results of excavation throw more certain light on the matter." As a matter of fact, during the spring such excavations and investigations were carried on under the auspices of the American School of Archæology, and in return for references and information furnished by myself, I have just received from Dr. Barton, late Director of the School, a kind note, written from the British Museum, and dated July 18th, containing the interesting information that at a depth of half a mètre below the present level of soil, and at a height of $4\frac{1}{2}$ mètres (nearly 15 feet) above sea-level, the excavators had re-discovered the wall to which I referred on p. 260.

We must, of course, await the publication of Professor Barton's report for fuller information of details, but I am happy to be able to send the following extract from his letter:—"I am convinced