
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

proper sense we mean by creation, the bringing of some material or mental *substance* into existence. Some of the most eminent artists have recoiled from the use of this term in application to their works, and have insisted on limiting the word *creator* to Him who causes the beginning of substances.

We need not add, that while we cannot adopt the theories of the will which are contained in the two works here noticed, we still must regard them, and other theories hereafter to be noticed, as suggestive of many important truths.

ARTICLE X

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM.

BY REV. SAMUEL WOLCOTT, D.D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

THE Dictionary of the Bible edited by Dr. William Smith, and published in England in three large octavo volumes, is about to be republished entire in this country, under the editorial supervision of Professor Hackett of Newton, whose special qualifications for this service will be recognized by all. It is but fair to add that the paper here offered has grown out of an Article prepared by the writer, at his request, for the Dictionary — it being his purpose to render the American edition even more complete than the English. More than sixty of the eminent scholars in Great Britian, and a few in our own country, have contributed to its pages, and it embraces the fruit of more learned research than any other work of the kind which has been issued. It is, consequently, a necessity to every thorough student of the Bible, and an invaluable auxiliary to all who seek a fuller acquaintance with the word of God.

In most of the Articles we are presented with the latest *results* of Biblical science — ascertained facts, and not mere speculations and theories. On controverted or unsettled questions we are, in most instances, furnished with the facts or reasonings on each side, from a fair statement of which the reader is left to draw his own conclusion.

A portion of the Article on "Jerusalem" is an exception to this rule. More than forty pages with double columns are given to the general topic, and its importance justifies this extended treatment. It is mainly divided between two writers, one of whom presents *The Annals of the City*, from its foundation to its destruction by Titus (with a brief sketch of its later history by another pen), and the other devotes seventeen pages to *The Topography of the City*, of this portion the whole warp and

woof is the development and defence of a new theory. The writer is James Fergusson, Esq., Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects. It is understood (indeed it is evident) that he has never visited Jerusalem; but he challenges the attention of Biblical critics to views which he has carefully elaborated, and which are based on the published researches of travellers and authors.

The Article is very discursive; and we are unable to select a few compact sentences or paragraphs which embody the substance of its reasonings. We shall state the writer's views fairly as we proceed in the discussion, and we offer the following extracts as exhibiting his leading positions as clearly, perhaps, as any passages which can be selected.

"So little has this been done hitherto, that there are at present before the public three distinct views of the topography of Jerusalem, so discrepant from one another in their most essential features, that a disinterested person might fairly feel himself justified in assuming that there existed no real data for the determination of the points at issue, and that the disputed questions must for ever remain in the same unsatisfactory state as at present.

"1. The first of these theories is the most obvious, and has, at all events, the great merit of simplicity. It consists in the belief that all the sacred localities were correctly ascertained in the early ages of Christianity; and, what is still more important, that none have been changed during the dark ages that followed, or in the numerous revolutions to which the city has been exposed. Consequently, inferring that all which the traditions of the Middle Ages have handed down to us may be implicitly relied upon. The advantages of this theory are so manifest, that it is little wonder that it should be so popular and find so many advocates.

"The first person who ventured publicly to express his dissent from this view was Korte, a German printer, who travelled in Palestine about the year 1728. On visiting Jerusalem he was struck with the apparent impossibility of reconciling the site of the present church of the Holy Sepulchre with the exigencies of the Bible narrative, and on his return home published a work denying the authenticity of the so-called sacred localities. His heresies excited very little attention at the time, or for long afterwards; but the spirit of inquiry which has sprung up during the present century has revived the controversy which has so long been dormant, and many pious and earnest men, both Protestant and Catholic, have expressed with more or less distinctness the difficulties they feel in reconciling the assumed localities with the indications in the Bible. The arguments in favor of the present localities being the correct ones are well summed up by the Rev. George Williams, in his work on the Holy City, and with the assistance of Professor Willis all has been said that can be urged in favor of their authenticity. Nothing can exceed the ingenuity of the various hypotheses that are brought forward to explain away the admitted diffi-

culties of the case; but we look in vain for any new facts to counterbalance the significance of those so often urged on the other side, while the continued appeals to faith and to personal arguments do not inspire confidence in the soundness of the data brought forward.

"2. Professor Robinson, on the other hand, in his elaborate works on Palestine has brought together all the arguments which from the time of Korte have been accumulating against the authenticity of the mediaeval sites and traditions. He has done this with a power of logic which would probably have been conclusive had he been able to carry the argument to its legitimate conclusion. His want of knowledge of architecture and of the principles of architectural criticism, however, prevented him from perceiving that the present church of the Holy Sepulchre was wholly of an age subsequent to that of the Crusades, and without a trace of the style of Constantine. Nor was he, from the same causes, able to correct in a single instance the erroneous adscriptions given to many other buildings in Jerusalem, whose dates might have afforded a clue to the mystery. When, in consequence, he announced as the result of his researches the melancholy conclusion, that the site of the Holy Sepulchre was now, and must in all probability for ever remain a mystery, the effect was, that those who were opposed to his views clung all the more firmly to those they before entertained, preferring a site and a sepulchre which had been hallowed by the tradition of ages, rather than launch forth on the shoreless sea of speculation which Dr. Robinson's negative conclusion opened out before them.

"3. The third theory is that put forward by the author of this Article in his 'Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem.' It agrees generally with the views urged by all those from Korte to Robinson, who doubt the authenticity of the present site of the sepulchre; but instead of acquiescing in the desponding view taken by the latter, it goes on to assert, for reasons which will be given hereafter, that the building now known to Christians as the Mosque of Omar, but by Moslems called the Dome of the Rock, is the identical church which Constantine erected over the rock which contained the tomb of Christ." — p. 1018.

"*Zion.*—One of the great difficulties which has perplexed most authors in examining the ancient topography of Jerusalem, is the correct fixation of the locality of the sacred Mount of Zion. It cannot be disputed that from the time of Constantine downwards to the present day, this name has been applied to the western hill on which the city of Jerusalem now stands, and in fact always stood.

"Notwithstanding this it seems equally certain that up to the time of the destruction of the city by Titus, the name was applied exclusively to the eastern hill, or that on which the temple stood.

"Unfortunately the name Zion is not found in the works of Josephus, so that we have not his assistance, which would be invaluable in this case,

and there is no passage in the Bible which directly asserts the identity of the hills Moriah and Zion, though many which cannot well be understood without this assumption. The cumulative proof, however, is such as almost perfectly to supply this want.

"From the passages in 2 Sam. v. 7, and 1 Chron. xi. 5–8, it is quite clear that Zion and the city of David were identical, for it is there said, 'David took the castle of Zion, which is the city of David.' 'And David dwelt in the castle, therefore they called it the city of David. And he built the city round about, even from Millo round about, and Joab repaired the rest of the city.' This last expression would seem to separate the city of Jerusalem which was *repaired*, from that of David which was *built*, though it is scarcely distinct enough to be relied upon. Besides these, perhaps the most distinct passage is that in Psalm xlviii. 2, where it is said, 'Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the *sides of the north*, the city of the Great King,' which it seems almost impossible to apply to the modern Zion, the most southern extremity of the city. There are also a great many passages in the Bible where Zion is spoken of as a separate city from Jerusalem, as for instance, 'For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of Mount Zion' (2 Kings xix. 31); 'Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem' (Psalm li. 18); 'The Lord shall yet comfort Zion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem' (Zech. i. 17); 'For the people shall dwell in Zion at Jerusalem' (Isa. xxx. 19); 'The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem' (Joel iii. 16; Amos i. 2). There are also numberless passages in which Zion is spoken of as a holy place in such terms as are never applied to Jerusalem, and which can only be understood as applied to the holy Temple Mount. Such expressions, for instance, as 'I set my king on my holy hill of Zion' (Psalm ii. 6); 'The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob,' (Psalm lxxxvii. 2); 'The Lord has chosen Zion' (Psalm cxxxii. 13); 'The city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel' (Isa. lx. 14); 'Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion to the Lord' (Jer. xxxi. 6); 'Thus saith the Lord, I am returned to Zion' (Zech. viii. 3); 'I am the Lord thy God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain' (Joel iii. 17); 'For the Lord dwelleth in Zion' (Joel iii. 21), and many others, which will occur to every one at all familiar with the scriptures, seem to us to indicate plainly the hill of the Temple. Substitute the word Jerusalem for Zion in these passages, and we feel at once how it grates on the ear; for such epithets as these are never applied to that city; on the contrary, if there is a curse uttered, or term of disparagement, it is seldom applied to Zion, but always to her unfortunate sister, Jerusalem. It is never said, The Lord dwelleth in Jerusalem; or loveth Jerusalem; or any such expression, which surely would have occurred, had Jerusalem and Zion been one and the same place, as they now are, and generally supposed to have been.

Though these cannot be taken as absolute proof, they certainly amount to strong presumptive evidence that Zion and the Temple Hill were one and the same place. There is one curious passage, however, which is scarcely intelligible on any other hypothesis than this; it is known that the sepulchres of David and his successors were on Mount Zion, or in the city of David, but the wicked king Ahaz for his crimes was buried in Jerusalem, 'in the city,' and 'not in the sepulchres of the kings' (2 Chron. xxviii. 27). Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 20) narrowly escaped the same punishment, and the distinction is so marked that it cannot be overlooked. The modern sepulchre of David (*Neby Daûd*) is, and always must have been in Jerusalem; not, as the Bible expressly tells us, in the city of David, as contra-distinguished from the city of the Jebusites.

"When from the Old Testament we turn to the Books of the Maccabees, we come to some passages written by persons who certainly were acquainted with the localities, which seem to fix the site of Zion with a considerable amount of certainty; as, for instance, 'They went up into Mount Zion, and saw the sanctuary desolate and the altar profaned, and the shrubs growing in the courts as a forest' (1 Macc. iv. 37, 60); 'After this went Nicanor up to Mount Zion, and there came out of the sanctuary certain persons' (1 Macc. vii. 33), and several others, which seem to leave no doubt that at that time Zion and the Temple Hill were considered one and the same place. It may also be added that the Rabbis with one accord place the Temple on Mount Zion, and though their authority in matters of doctrine may be valueless, still their traditions ought to have been sufficiently distinct to justify their being considered as authorities on a merely topographical point of this sort. There is also a passage in Nehemiah (iii. 16) which will be alluded to in the next section, and which, added to the above, seems to leave very little doubt that in ancient times the name of Zion was applied to the eastern and not to the western hill of Jerusalem." — p. 1026.

"The Praetorium where Christ was judged was most probably the Antonia, which at that time, as before and afterwards, was the citadel of Jerusalem and the residence of the governors, and the Xystus and Council-house were certainly, as shown above, in this neighborhood. Leaving these localities, the Saviour, bearing his cross, must certainly have gone towards the country, and might well meet Simon or any one coming towards the city; thus every detail of the description is satisfied, and none offended by the locality now assumed.

"The third class of evidence is, from its nature, by no means so clear, but there is nothing whatever in it to contradict, and a great deal that directly confirms, the above statements. The earliest of the travellers who visited Jerusalem after the discovery of the Sepulchre by Constantine is one known as the Bordeaux pilgrim; he seems to have visited the place about the year 333. In his Itinerary, after describing the palace of David,

the great synagogue, and other objects inside the city, he adds, 'Inde ut eas *foris murum* de Sione euntibus ad Portam Neopolitanam ad partem dextram deorsum in valle sunt parietes ubi domus fuit sive palatium Pontii Pilati. Ibi Dominus auditus est antequam pateretur. A sinistra autem parte est monticulus Golgotha, ubi Dominus crucifixus est. Inde quasi ad lapidem missum est cripta ubi corpus ejus positum fuit, et tertia die resurrexit. Ibidem modo jussu Constantini Imperatoris Basilica facta est, id est Dominicum mirae pulchritudinis.' From this it is evident that passing out of the modern Zion gate he turned round the outside of the walls to the left. Had he gone to the right, past the Jaffa gate, both the ancient and modern Golgotha would have been on his right hand; but passing round the Temple area he may have had the house of Pilate on his right in the valley, where some traditions placed it. He must have had Golgotha and the Sepulchre on his left, as he describes them. In so far, therefore, as his testimony goes, it is clear he was not speaking of the modern Golgotha, which is inside the city, while the very expression 'foris murum' seems to indicate what the context confirms, that it was a place on the verge of the city, and on the left hand of one passing round the walls, or in other words the place marked on the accompanying map."—p. 1031.

"It only remains, before concluding, to recapitulate here that the great difficulties which seem hitherto to have rendered the subject confused, and in fact inexplicable, were (1) the improper application of the name of Zion to the western hill, and (2) the assumption that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre was that built by Constantine.

"The moment we transfer the name Zion from the western to the eastern hill, and the scenes of the passion from the present site of the Holy Sepulchre to the area of the Haram, all the difficulties disappear; and it only requires a little patience, and perhaps in some instances a little further investigation on the spot, for the topography of Jerusalem to become as well or better established than that of any city of the ancient world."—pp. 1034, 1035.

It will be seen from the preceding that the two points in the topography of Jerusalem which Mr. Fergusson regarded as demanding special elucidation are, the site of Mount Zion, and the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. With reference to both, he has advanced theories which are original — theories which not only have not been broached before, and are unsupported by a single tradition, but which, so far as is known, contradict the previous impressions of the Christian world. Speculations so novel respecting localities so prominent in the history of the sacred city, naturally awaken the reader's surprise, and suspicion, and demand a candid scrutiny.

I. *Mount Zion.*—Mr. Fergusson's theory is, that the Mount Zion of the sacred writers is not "the western hill on which the city of Jerusalem

now stands, and in fact always stood," but "the eastern hill, or that on which the temple stood."

The sacred historian says, "As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Israel could not drive them out, but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day" (Josh. xv. 63). Four hundred years later, "David and all Israel went to Jerusalem, which is Jebus, where the Jebusites were, the inhabitants of the land. And the inhabitants of Jebus said to David, Thou shalt not come hither. Nevertheless, David took the castle of Zion, which is the city of David. And David dwelt in the castle; therefore they called it, The city of David" (1 Chron. xi. 4, 5, 7). Here was his citadel, and here his residence; and hence the frequent allusions in the Bible to the towers, bulwarks, and palaces of Zion. A few years later, "David made him houses in the city of David, and prepared a place for the ark of God, and pitched for it a tent." "So they brought the ark of God, and set it in the midst of the tent that David had pitched for it" (1 Chron. xv. 1). Thirty years after, "Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, in Mount Moriah" (2 Chron. iii. 1). Seven years later, "Solomon assembled the elders of Israel unto Jerusalem, to bring up the ark of the covenant of the Lord, out of the city of David, which is Zion" (2 Chron v. 2), and then follows the account of their removing the ark and depositing it in the temple.

From this it is clear that the Jebusite stronghold which David stormed, and where he dwelt, was Zion, or the city of David; that the ark of the covenant was brought to this spot, and from it was transferred to the temple on Mount Moriah; and that Mount Moriah, the site of the temple, could not have been identical with Zion, the city of David. This view appears on the face of the narrative, and there is not a passage of scripture which conflicts with it, or which it renders difficult or obscure.

Josephus does not use the word *Zion;* but his paraphrase of the scriptural narrative accords entirely with the above: "David took the lower city by force, but the citadel held out still" (Antiq. xiv. 4, 2), with the other particulars as already given. He also says, "The city was built upon two hills, and that which contains the upper city is much higher, and accordingly it was called *the citadel* by King David" (Antiq. xiv. 15, 2). In the siege by Pompey, one party within counselling resistance and the other submission, the former "seized upon the temple and cut off the bridge which reached from it to the city, and prepared themselves to abide a siege, but the others admitted Pompey's army in, and delivered up both the city and the king's palace to him" (Antiq. xiv. 4, 2), and, having secured these, he laid siege to the temple, and captured its occupants. In the siege by Herod, "When the outer court of the temple and the lower city were taken, the Jews fled into the inner court of the temple and into the upper city"; and when the latter was carried by assault, "Antig-

onus came down from the citadel" (Antiq. xiv. 16, 2). In the siege by Titus, after the lower city had been taken, and it became necessary to raise an embankment against the upper city, "the works were erected on the west side of the city, over against the royal palace" (Bel. Jud. vi. 8, 1). Describing the temple, Josephus says, "In the western parts of the enclosure of the temple were four gates, one leading over to the royal palace; the valley between being interrupted to form a passage" (Antiq. xv. 11, 5).

Nothing can be plainer than that the upper city of Josephus is identical with the Zion, or city of David, of the sacred scriptures; that the citadel and the royal palace were on this western hill; that the temple was on the lower eastern hill, separated from the western by a deep valley, which was spanned by a bridge; and that the site of the temple is identical with the Mount Moriah of the Bible, and distinct from Mount Zion. This view which is in harmony with the scriptural view already given, accords also with every other allusion in Josephus to these localities. And the substructions of the bridge above referred to are the most striking feature in the remains of the modern city.

We come now to the Christian Itineraries, etc., and the testimony is uniform and unbroken. Except one or two wild speculations, no other Mount Zion has been known, from the days of Eusebius down, than the high western hill of Jerusalem which now bears the name. So late as 1852, Professor Robinson referred to this as one of the few points "yet unassailed" (Bib. Res. 206).

The term *Zion* came, naturally, to be employed both by sacred and profane writers, as the representation of the whole city, of which it formed so prominent a part. It was thus used by the later prophets, quoted above, as also in the Book of the Maccabees, where it evidently *includes* the temple and adjacent mount.

Mr. Fergusson says: "There are numberless passages in which Zion is spoken of as a holy place in such terms as are never applied to Jerusalem, and which can only be applied to the holy Temple Mount." Surely, no strains could be too elevated to be applied to the mount on which the tabernacle was pitched, and where the ark of the covenant abode; the seat of the theocracy; the throne alike of David and of David's Lord; the centre of dominion and of worship. Indeed, the verse quoted, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," could *only* be affirmed of that western hill which was the royal residence. The same may be said of the verse quoted as specially difficult, on the received theory, in its allusion to *the sides of the north*, the reference here being to the lofty site of the city; and to one who approaches it from the south, the precipitous brow of Zion invests the description with a force and beauty which would be lost by a transfer to the other eminence.

It is, moreover, a mistaken impression that greater sanctity is ascribed

to Zion than to Jerusalem, or that the two names are, in this respect, carefully distinguished. What passage in the Bible recognizes greater sacredness in a locality than the plaintive apostrophe: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy"? The Song of songs sets forth the divine beauty of the bride, or loved one, by the similie, "comely as Jerusalem": and the call of the evangelical prophets is, "Awake, put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city." The localities are thus constantly identified, "To declare the name of the Lord in Zion and his praise in Jerusalem." The names are, and may be, used interchangeably, without "grating on the ear"; and the extraordinary assertion, "It is never said, The Lord dwelleth in Jerusalem, or loveth Jerusalem, or any such expression," we meet with the inspired declarations from the Chronicles, the Psalms, and the Prophets, "I have chosen Jerusalem that my name might be there"; "The God of Israel, whose habitation is in Jerusalem"; "Blessed be the Lord out of Zion, who dwelleth at Jerusalem"; "Thus saith the Lord, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem." Our Saviour expressly forbade the profanation of the name; and through the force of the same sacred associations, the beloved disciple could find no more fitting type of heaven itself, as he beheld it in vision — the New Jerusalem of the saints in glory.

Mr. Fergusson remarks "that the sepulchres of David and his successors were on Mount Zion, or in the city of David, but the wicked king Ahaz for his crimes was buried in Jerusalem, 'in the city,' and 'not in the sepulchres of the kings.' Jehoram narrowly escaped the same punishment, and the distinction is so marked, that it cannot be overlooked." The burial of King Ahaz is thus recorded: "And they buried him in the city, in Jerusalem, but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chron. xxviii. 27). That of King Jehoram is as follows: "He departed without being desired, howbeit they buried him in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chron. xxi. 20). That of King Joash (which Mr. Fergusson overlooks) is as follows: "They buried him in the city of David, but they buried him not in the sepulchres of the kings" (2 Chron. xxiv. 25). Mr. Fergusson assumes that there is a "marked distinction" between the first and the last two records. We assume that the three accounts are, in substance, identical; and we submit the point to the judgment of the reader, merely adding, that of the three monarchs, Jehoram was apparently the most execrated, and Josephus, who is silent about the burial of Ahaz, describes that of Jehoram as ignominious.

Mr. Fergusson says: "There are a great many passages in which Zion is spoken of as a separate city from Jerusalem," and adduces instances in which the Hebrew scholar will recognize simply the *parallelism* of Hebrew poetry; no more proving that Zion was a separate city from Jerusalem,

than the exclamation, "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel," proves that Jacob was a separate people from Israel.

Much more might be written respecting this theory, but its claims have been fairly met; and the reader will judge whether the argument which accepts and supports the modern Zion as the ancient site is not as firm as the mountain itself, "which cannot be removed, but abideth forever."

II. *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre.* — Mr. Fergusson's theory is, "that the building now known to Christians as the Mosque of Omar, but by Moslems called the Dome of the Rock, is the identical church which Constantine erected over the rock which contained the tomb of Christ."

He concedes the conclusiveness of the argument by which Dr. Robinson has shown that the present church does not cover "the place where the Lord lay." *This* has been the battle-ground of recent writers on the topography of the city, and the concession renders it unnecessary to adduce here the proofs which the Professor has brought together, and which may be found in his Biblical Researches (in 1838, II. 64–80; in 1852, 254–263, 631–633). The "power of logic" with which they are presented is not affected by any theory which may be held respecting the identity of any other spot. The argument reaches "its legitimate conclusion," alike whether the reader accepts some other site, or whether he regards the true site as beyond the reach of modern discovery. The theory here offered, like the one which we have examined, is novel and startling, and like that, is put forth with much confidence by a writer who has never examined the localities. We submit our reasons for rejecting it; and as we agree with Mr. Fergusson that the site of the church is not the place of our Lord's burial, our interest in the question is purely historical.

Eusebius, who was contemporary with Constantine, and his biographer, represents the church which he built over the supposed sepulchre, as having an open court on the east, towards the entrances, with cloisters on each side and gates in front, "after which, in the very midst of the street of the market (or in the middle of the broad market-place) the beautiful propylea (vestibule) of the whole structure presented to those passing by on the outside the wonderful view of the things seen within" (Vit. Const. iii. 39). Along the street of the bazaars, east of the present church, which would make their site identical with "the market-place" of Eusebius, and correspond with the position of the propylea, are three granite columns, the apparent remains of an ancient portico, and which can be referred to no other structure than the church of Constantine. Mr. Fergusson admits that the propylea of the church "had a broad market-place in front of it," but fails to show how this would be possible on his theory which identifies it with the "golden gateway" of the temple-area. The market-place might have been, naturally, in the city, where the bazaars now are, but this hypothesis would locate it on the western slope of the

Valley of the Kidron, outside of the city, "where a market-place," to use the words of Professor Willis, "is ludicrously impossible" (Edin. Rev. 1860, p. 225). The *critique* of Prof. Willis here quoted, we have not seen.

The testimony of another contemporary writer, the Pilgrim of Bordeaux, describing some objects which might be seen on the right and left in passing from Zion to the present Damascus gate, is quoted by Mr. Fergusson, with the remark, "From this it is evident that passing out of the modern Zion gate, he turned round the outside of the walls to the left." Now no visitor would have passed out of that gate to go to the opposite side of the city, either to the right or the left, and especially not to the left. Not only would such a circuit have been difficult, in the absence of any thoroughfare or path, but a glance at a plan of the city will show (what one can understand more fully on the spot) how unnatural and improbable such an excursion would have been.

The suggestion is encumbered with the further difficulty, that "the modern Zion gate" did not then exist (Adam. ex Arculf. I. 1). It involves, further, the absurd supposition that the governor's house, where the Saviour was arraigned, was in a valley, unprotected, outside of the city, "where some traditions placed it" (?) when in the preceding paragraph the writer has asserted that the residence of the governor and the probable scene of the trial was the castle of Antonia.

The natural course of one who passed out of the city northward, going from Zion to the Neapolis gate, would have been formerly, as now, between the temple-area and the site of the church of the Sepulchre, near to the latter, and the objects seen would have been in just the relative position in which this traveller describes them. The contemporary testimony, therefore, so far as is known, is concurrent and conclusive against this theory.

A considerable share of Mr. Fergusson's reasoning is professional and technical. As an architect he gives his decision on points which many of his readers are incompetent to judge of, with an authority which, for that reason, few are inclined to dispute. This professional judgment is entitled to respect, but it cannot set aside historical evidence. It is challenged, moreover, by members of his own profession; and an able critic in the Edinburgh Review (Oct. 1860), who, if not an architect, is familiar with archaeological researches and architectural canons, rejects this theory on the identical grounds on which its author asserts it — deducing from the same data opposite conclusions. He also notices other points which we have passed over, one of which is, that in thus appropriating this celebrated mosque, the writer omits "to account for the magnificent building which, indubitably, was reared by the Caliph Abu el-Melek, but which, according to his theory, must in some strange way have disappeared." It may be added that he equally fails to account for the present church of the Sepulchre, an edifice which cannot wholly have parted

with its history. Were we convinced by the reasoning before us, we should be tempted to suggest the theory of a double transfer. Having proved that the original church is the present mosque, would Mr. Fergusson's genius be unequal to the proof that the original mosque is the present church?

There remains an objection to this theory, as decisive as any, which can be best appreciated by those who have been on the ground. The site of the so-called Mosque of Omar could not have been, in our Saviour's day, outside of the walls. The theory would break up the solid masonry of the ancient substructions of the temple-area, still existing, making one portion modern and the other ancient, leaving one without the city, and retaining the other within it, in a way which is simply incredible. Whatever may have been the bearings and dimensions of the temple, with its courts and porticoes, in the enclosure above, the massive foundations of the area are one work, and that a work of high antiquity. The immense beveled stones in the southeast corner were laid at the same time with the stones in the southwest corner. They are of the same magnitude, and it does not need the eye of an architect to assure us that they are of the same age and style of workmanship. They were the two extremities of the ancient southern wall, as they are of the modern, stretching, as Josephus informs us, from valley to valley, and laid with stones "immovable for all time;" and to-day they confirm his testimony, and contradict this theory. "We are led irresistibly to the conclusion," said Dr. Robinson, on his first visit, "that the area of the Jewish temple was identical on its western, eastern, and southern sides, with the present enclosure of the Haram." "Ages upon ages have rolled away, yet these foundations endure, and are immovable as at the beginning" (Bib. Res. I. 427). The investigations of his second visit confirmed the conclusion of his first, — from which we see not how any visitor who has inspected this masonry can withhold his assent, — that in the southwest corner, in the southern part of the western wall, in the southeast corner on both sides, and along the southern wall, we have before us "the massive substructions of the ancient Jewish temple. Such has been the impression received by travellers for centuries, and such it will probably continue to be so long as these remains endure" (Bib. Res. 220).

We have now presented our main reasons for dissenting from the theory of Mr. Fergusson's Article on the Topography of Jerusalem, in its two principal points; and if these points are untenable, almost the entire reasoning of the Article falls with them.