

these difficult times. We want to learn the lesson which St. Paul taught the Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 2), "That ye be not soon shaken in mind or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." We want not merely to know the truth, but to know that we know it. We want to be kept in calm repose on the rock, in the full persuasion that the truth is clear, and the evidence for that truth impregnable. We do not want to be driven hither and thither by every wind that bloweth; or to be hurried into wild extravagance by every new fancy that arises. But we do want to be firmly assured that what is written in the Scriptures, that is sufficient, and that what God has revealed, that is infallible; that so we may be able to use the clear language with which this Epistle concludes (v. 18, 19, 20):—

We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not.

We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.

We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.

EDWARD HOARE.



ART. V.—THE LATER HISTORY OF JERUSALEM.

1. *Coins of the Jews.* By FREDERIC W. MADDEN, M.R.A.S., Member of the Numismatic Society of London, &c. With 279 Woodcuts and a Plate of Alphabets. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.
2. *Le Temple de Jérusalem, Monographie du Haram-es-Chérif, suivie d'un Essai sur la Topographie de la Ville-Sainte.* Par le Cte. MELCHIOR DE VOGUÉ. Paris: Noblet et Baudry. 1864.
3. *Stirring Times; or Records from Jerusalem.* Consular Chronicles from 1853 to 1856. By the late JAMES FINN, M.R.A.S., Her Majesty's Consul for Jerusalem and Palestine from 1849 to 1863. Two vols. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

THE Biblical interest of Jerusalem is of such paramount importance, it is so sacred, so manifold too and various, comprehending, as it does, both the Old Testament and the New, that very often it is viewed as exhausting the subject. Moreover the destruction of the Holy City by the Romans—in fulfil-

ment of prophecy and in punishment of Hebrew sin—isolates the city's later history from the past, and separates off that past from all succeeding generations. And, once more, Christianity is not a local religion; and we have no reason now for looking upon Jerusalem with the thoughts and feelings which on every pious Israelite were anciently imperative.

Thus it is sometimes forgotten that Jerusalem, since the time of its living association with the Bible, has been by no means a dead city, but has held, and still holds, a very great, and even central, place in the history of the world. Again and again, and in divers ways, it has been the focus of warm and affectionate enthusiasm, and the fulcrum of great military and diplomatic movements. Hence a slight and rapid sketch of its later annals may not be without its use; and such a sketch may indeed be the more useful by reason of its being slight and rapid, because thus the whole of this series of centuries, so full of diversified interest, will be seen at a glance.

It will be true to the facts of the case, if we connect the successive periods of this long range of time with the names of eminent men; while in this method there will be the further advantage, that a biographical aspect of the enumeration of events will prevent it from being dull. These names, too, are all really great names; and if each had a distinct personal connection with Jerusalem, as was certainly the case, this is enough to show that Jerusalem is a pivot for history from the declining days of the Roman Empire to the rise of what is termed "The Eastern Question" in the Levant. The names are those of Hadrian, Constantine, Jerome, Justinian, Chosroes II., the Khalif Omar, Godfrey of Bouillon, Saladin, Solyman the Magnificent, Mehemet Ali, and the Emperor Nicholas. They will be here taken separately and in succession; but in looking over the list as a whole, one general thought, full of deep sadness, oppresses the mind; for we see here the first arrival, and then the settling, of the dark Mahomedan cloud, upon the sacred city of the Hebrew Church.

(i.) Beginning with HADRIAN we make a sudden plunge; and this is really an advantage for us in beginning to take a survey of a period of history which is sharply separated from the past. Since the close of the Jewish War under Titus, there had been an absolute cessation of the existence of Jerusalem, as a home for a community of living men, during more than fifty years. Such a silence, so to speak, in the history of Jerusalem, is a very solemn fact. Hadrian was a great traveller, and a great builder. The incidents of his stay in Egypt are chronicled on the Barberini Obelisk, now to be seen in Rome. The gateway, which bears his name in Athens, is so placed as still to give us a very definite notion of the suburb which he built and

adorned there ; while the name of Hadrianople, memorable in connection with recent struggles of the Russians and Turks, is a record of his presence and influence in another part of the Levant. On no place did he impress himself more definitely than on Jerusalem. One feeling of his day was an extreme hatred of the Jews, who had manifested a determined tendency to rebellion ; and this feeling was expressed by Hadrian in the building of a thoroughly Roman city on the site of Jerusalem, with Temples dedicated to Jupiter and Venus on the most sacred spots, in making the place a "colonia," like Philippi, and in calling it "Ælia Capitolina," after his own family name and the name of the Capitol in Rome. This attempt to link Jerusalem with the secular history of the great world-power had no lasting effect. The Holy City refused this combination, and like the Holy Land has held itself aloof, with extraordinary tenacity, from being merged in the general fortunes of mankind. The place had indeed lost its continuous association with the Biblical past ; but in a new and unexpected way it connected itself immediately with Revealed Religion. Certainly no great love of Christianity was mingled in Hadrian's mind with his hatred of Judaism ; but Bishops of Ælia immediately appear, as taking their place in ecclesiastical councils and in the administration of the Church.

The science of numismatics furnishes us, in two ways, with most lively illustrations of that resumption of the history of Jerusalem with which we are now occupied. A word must be said here on each side of this illustration. Mr. Madden has recently published, under the title of "Coins of the Jews," what is virtually a new edition of his former work, entitled "History of the Jewish Coinage and Money in the Old and New Testaments." Neither work is limited to the period of the Biblical annals only ; and there are no more interesting parts of his work than the chapters on the money struck during the revolt of Barchochab, and on the Imperial Colonial coins minted at Jerusalem during the reign of Hadrian and afterwards. As regards the latter, which continues down to the time of Valerian in the middle of the third century, and specimens of which down to Elagabalus are in the British Museum, it is a curious study to mark the strictly Roman types on these coins—as for instance the architecture with the round arch, indicating the above-mentioned heathen temples, and the old mythological figures of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus—especially when we remember that this attempt to merge the history of Jerusalem with the history of Rome was quite nugatory.

The other series of contemporary numismatic illustration has perhaps even a greater interest for us. The revolt of Barchochab,

the son of a star,¹ in the reign of Hadrian, had a decisive effect upon the subsequent fortunes of Jerusalem. In this revolt was a gallant two years' resistance. "The exasperation of the Romans knew no bounds; and their fury was especially directed against the scholars and their disciples, so that many of them died under cruel torments." Among them was Akiba, who, while torn to pieces by red-hot pincers, continued to cry, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God: the Lord is God alone." Mr. Madden gives engravings of the series of coins, which were minted under Barchochab, and which remain to this day an eloquent memorial of this brave, but unsuccessful struggle of Hebrew nationality. The types on these coins are such as the following:—the palm branch—the Beautiful Gateway of the Temple, with a star above—the three-stringed lyre—the bunch of grapes—the two trumpets—with "the deliverance of Jerusalem," and the second year of the deliverance of Israel," as the mottoes. The vine was always viewed as characteristic of Judæa: a vine of metal was above the great entrance of Herod's Temple: wine is named as part of the supply to the Tyrian workmen at the building of Solomon's Temple; and the same is implied at the rebuilding under Ezra. The two trumpets were a warlike emblem with allusion reference to the instruction given in the Book of Numbers.² Among these coins one of the most interesting is in the British Museum, where emblems of this kind have been over-struck upon a silver coin of Trajan, minted at Antioch.

(ii.) With the reign of CONSTANTINE we come suddenly to two vital changes in the annals of Jerusalem. At this point the history of it as a Christian city begins: and this new period of history begins with the idea of localization in religion. Jerusalem now resumes its position as the sacred city of revealed truth; but under an aspect distinctively Christian, and not in the least degree Jewish. Again the old local feeling reappears on this sacred spot; but under conditions totally new. This is an absolute revolution in the manifold illustrious career of this city.

To enter here into the details of the famous story of the Invention of the Cross would be quite out of the question. It is enough to say—while it is very essential to say—that this story coloured a large part of the literature of the earlier Christian centuries, and helped to give character to a large part of the feeling of the Middle Ages.³ Nor will any attempt be

¹ This title was given to him in allusion to Numb. xxiv. 17. Afterwards the Jews called this false Messiah "Bar-Chozba," the son of a lie—just as Bethel, in olden times, was named Bethaven.

² Numb. x. 2.

³ All that can be said on this subject, and all that need be said, will

made here to solve those architectural questions, which have their beginning in Jerusalem at this point of time.¹ This only may be said with confidence that the great church built by Constantine's mother, over the supposed place of our Lord's burial, like the great church built by her at Bethlehem over the supposed place of His nativity, was of the Basilican type. The age of the Byzantine architecture, with the cupola which became characteristic of the East, was not yet come. The edifices which we see in Rome, at Ravenna, and indeed at Bethlehem itself, enable us to picture to ourselves the general character of the first Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The point of supreme importance for the history of Jerusalem in this period is that the great question of the "Holy Places," which has been so prolific since of pilgrimages, crusades, and modern wars, then and there took its beginning.

(iii.) In the course of a journey through the Holy Land there is no more interesting moment, short of the paramount interest attaching to directly Biblical subjects, than a visit to the place associated with the life and labours of ST. JEROME. In one sense, indeed, this association is strictly Biblical: for at Bethlehem he executed the Vulgate translation; and one of the pictures in his grotto there represents him as occupied in this great task. The point of importance, however, to which we are now coming, is that with him we reach the epoch of pilgrimages; and the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem is a distinct memorial of this. The central interest of this topic is, of course, at Jerusalem—though from this point of view, as indeed from any point of view, the place of our Saviour's birth may be viewed as a suburb of the Holy City. The significance of this era of pilgrimages, and its close connection with Jerome, are so well set forth by Dean Milman, in both sections of his great historic work, that it is quite worth while to quote a few sentences from each. In the "History of Christianity" he describes thus the change which had taken place:—

Jerome's example, though it did not originate, strengthened to an extraordinary degree the passion for pilgrimages to the Holy Land; a sentiment in later times productive of such vast and unexpected results. In the earlier period the repeated devastations of that devoted country, and still more its occupation by the Jews, had

probably be found in Mr. Sinkler's article in the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities."

¹ Of the change effected in Jerusalem generally Dean Milman says: "Constantine, by the advice of his mother Helena, adorned with great magnificence the city which had risen on the ruins of Jerusalem. It had become a place of such splendour, that Eusebius, in a transport of holy triumph, believed that it was the New Jerusalem foretold by the prophets."—*History of the Jews*, iii. p. 11.

overpowered the natural veneration of the Christians for the scene of the life and sufferings of the Redeemer. It was an accursed rather than a holy region, desecrated by the presence of the murderers of the Lord, rather than endeared by the reminiscences of His personal ministry and expiatory death. The total ruin of the Jews, and their expulsion from Jerusalem by Hadrian; their dispersion into other lands, with the simultaneous progress of Christianity in Palestine, and their settlement in *Ælia*, the Roman Jerusalem, notwithstanding the profanation of that city by idolatrous emblems, allowed those more gentle and sacred feelings to grow up in strength and silence. Already, before the time of Jerome, pilgrims had flowed from all quarters of the world; and during his life, whoever had attained to any proficiency in religion, in Gaul, or in the secluded island of Britain, was eager to obtain a personal knowledge of these hallowed places (vol. iii. pp. 191, 192).

Dean Milman adds that Jerome himself was the most influential pilgrim to the Holy Land, and that the general and increasing desire to visit that land may be traced to his writings, which had opened a free and constant communication between the East and the West. In his "History of Latin Christianity" the author returns to the same subject, and points out how "during the following centuries pilgrimages became the ruling passion of the more devout." Indirect consequences of a good kind followed from this. The drawing up of itineraries must have promoted the knowledge of geography. The establishment of hospitals along the pilgrim-roads was an opportunity for the exercise of charity.¹ But, on the other hand, the mischievous notion grew up that pilgrimage was an expiation for sin, and the traffic in relics became a fraudulent trade. The perils of this passion were in some degree perceived at the time.

It is remarkable to find among those who yielded in other respects to the more materializing influence of the dominant Christianity, some who attempted to maintain on this point a lofty spirituality. Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine remonstrated against the dangerous and unnecessary journey to such remote lands; dangerous to the virtue especially of the female sex; unnecessary to him who might worship God with equal fervour in every region. Others of the Fathers during the fourth century strongly offered the more sublime tenet of the divine omnipresence to the sanctity of peculiar places; the superiority of a quiet holy life in any part of the world, to the wandering over sea and land, east or west, to seek more assurance of the Divine presence (vol. iv. pp. 168, 169).

Even Jerome himself "dissuades his friend Paulinus from the voyage," declaring that "heaven is as accessible from Britain as

¹ Some reference was made to the early travellers in the Holy Land in a paper on "Central Palestine," in the March number of the *CHURCHMAN*.

from Palestine." The example, however, of Jerome, adds Dean Milman, "was more powerful than his precept."¹

(iv.) The reign of JUSTINIAN was a memorable and well-defined epoch of the later Empire; and some of its results have been far-reaching and permanent. We have here to do with it only so far as it can be shown that any really important movements of that time turned upon Jerusalem. This reign, great as it was in itself and in its extent, seems at first sight to have but little connection with Palestine, if we except an interference between Jews and Samaritans by some pedantic rules regarding the use of language. Yet in one sense this reign is of the most cardinal importance for a true picture of Jerusalem as it was in the Middle Ages and as it is now. We need not think here of the famous system of jurisprudence which is connected with the name of Justinian, or of the scandalous life of the Empress Theodora, or of the reconquest of lost provinces. The reference here is solely to Architecture. From this point of time begins that divergence of the Basilican and Byzantine modes of church-building, which has resulted in such contrasted impressions of the West and East. The lofty spacious cupola of St. Sophia at Constantinople introduced an architectural change almost as great as that which was brought into the world by the Roman arch. We need not believe the fable that an angel revealed the new form of structure to Justinian, though it is quite possible that it may have been suggested, more or less, in a dream. Nowhere is the result more palpable than in Jerusalem. As we "gaze from Olivet" on the scene beyond the Kedron—

Where Tower and Dome in one wide prospect rest—

the two structures on which the eye dwells most eagerly are the Dome of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Dome of the Rock, popularly called the Mosque of Omar.² They differ very much in form, but each of them may most correctly be called a memorial of the reign of Justinian.

(v.) The intrusion of the Persians under CHOSROES II. into the regions near the Mediterranean is only an episode in the annals of that sea. Still even this presents to us Jerusalem as a pivot-city in important historical movements of the world. This eminent man, therefore, and his temporary conquests, and

¹ There is a noble sentence in one of Augustine's sermons: "Noli longa itinera meditari: ubi credis, ibi venis: ad Eum enim qui ubique est amando venit non navigando."

² This designation of the famous building which rises in much grandeur on or near the site of the Ancient Temple, has obtained currency in almost all books of Eastern travel. This mosque, however, was not built by the Khalif Omar, but by one of his successors.

his final defeat by the Emperor Heraclius, must have a place in our enumeration.

His taking of Jerusalem is a fact which, regarded merely in itself, cannot be passed over. It was one of those violent occupations of the city, in which it has been doomed, age after age, to be the scene of struggle and suffering. When the Persian monarch invaded the Byzantine Empire, after taking Antioch, he himself moved towards Constantinople, while one of his generals marched on Jerusalem, then a Christian city. The Jews, believing that their hour of vengeance was come, rallied in large numbers round the Persian army and stirred up their brethren in Damascus and Cyprus. A vast number of Christians were slaughtered; and ruin came upon the sacred buildings erected by Constantine and Helena and all other churches in the city. To use Gibbon's phrase, "the devout offerings of three hundred years were rifled in one sacrilegious day." Such an event cannot be omitted in a summary of the prominent facts in the later history of Jerusalem. It is true that Heraclius threw off the invader and reconquered Jerusalem, and made it Christian again, and himself visited it as a pilgrim. But even this is one of those strange alternations, to which our careful attention must be directed.

And in another way the time of Chosroes and Heraclius comes before us as a period of critical change for Jerusalem. We are now, so to speak, within the *penumbra* of the great Mahomedan eclipse. The historian of the "Decline and Fall" says that the second Chosroes "prepared that revolution of the East which was speedily accomplished by the arms and religion of Mahomet."¹ And this is illustrated by a curious anecdote. When the Persian monarch was in the full career of his success, a letter came to him from the Arabian prophet, then "an obscure citizen of Mecca," inviting Chosroes to acknowledge him as the apostle of God. The invitation was rejected, and the letter torn, which caused Mahomet to exclaim, "It is thus that God will tear his kingdom." Gibbon concludes his forty-sixth chapter with the following words:—

While the emperor triumphed at Constantinople or Jerusalem, an obscure town on the confines of Syria was pillaged by the Saracens, and they cut to pieces some troops who advanced to its relief: an

¹ This is made more articulate by Mr. Freeman. "The great campaigns of Chosroes and Heraclius made no lasting difference in the map, except so far as, by weakening Rome and Persia alike, they paved the way for the greatest change of all." In connection with the extraordinary speed with which the Saracens pressed their conquests, he adds that, "with the Mahomedan religion they carried also the Arabic language, and what we may call Eastern civilization as opposed to Western."
—*Historical Geography of Europe*, vol. i. pp. 109, 110.

ordinary and trifling occurrence, had it not been the prelude of a mighty revolution. These robbers were the apostles of Mahomet; their fanatic valour had emerged from the desert; and in the last eight years of his reign, Heraclius lost to the Arabs the same provinces which he had rescued from the Persians (viii. p. 263).

Thus we are now in direct contact with that mysterious change, which coloured all Eastern Christendom and seriously endangered the Christendom of the West. And this change is of paramount moment in our present sketch of history; for, not to make mention of it under any other aspect, Jerusalem was the point of struggle between Saracen and Crusader.

(vi.) The spirit of the Crusaders has remained very tenaciously among the French. They never willingly reconcile themselves to the thought of losing their hold on Palestine and the Levant; and some of the authors who write the most warmly and eagerly on questions connected with these regions are those who write in the French language. Among recent authors of this class a high place must be assigned to Count de Vogüé, who, besides a very elaborate and beautiful work on the ancient churches of Syria, has published the book named at the head of this article. From Arabian sources he gives an account of the KHALIF OMAR'S entry into Jerusalem, which, though it relates to a very serious event, is extremely entertaining. The Saracen conqueror, leaving his camp on the Mount of Olives, entered the city quietly and modestly, and was met by the crafty Christian Patriarch Sophronius. Omar asked to be taken to the Temple of David, concerning which he stated that he had seen a vision, which would easily enable him to identify the place. Sophronius took him first to the Church of the Resurrection. "This," said Omar, "is not the Temple of David." Then the patriarch conducted him to the Church on Mount Sion. "Neither is this," said the Khalif, "the building which I saw in my vision." Then, after some difficulty, an entrance was procured to the area, where the Great Mosque now stands. Here the recognition was immediate. "Here is the Temple of David, of which the prophet gave me a description." Sophronius said (in what language, or whether audibly or not, we are not informed), "This is indeed the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the Holy Place." Thenceforward Jerusalem became a sacred city of the Moslems, as it had been a sacred city of the Hebrews in one sense, and of the Christians in another. In fact, as Count de Vogüé remarks, this visit of Omar made the site of Solomon's Temple a Moslem sanctuary of the first rank. Biblical events have so great a place in the Koran, that it could not be otherwise.

It is to be observed that the Saracen occupation of Jerusalem,

notwithstanding the magnitude of the change which it involved, was by no means attended with the carnage that accompanied its capture by the Romans, the Persians, or the Crusaders. Large privileges were granted to the Christians. Toleration was accorded to the exercise of their religion. But it was the toleration of ignominy. For this time "the iron entered into the soul" of the Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine. They were thenceforward an abject and humiliated caste. As to their religion, no bells were to be rung, no cross was to be exhibited, no sacred processions seen in the streets. As regards their private and social life, the rules made for their costume, their names, their very gestures, reminded them perpetually of the dishonour into which they had sunk. It is probable, too, that their consciousness of the secret exultation of the Jews added another bitter ingredient to the bitterness of their cup. What was true of the Christians of the Holy Land was true likewise of all the Christians of the East, wherever the Mohamedan power had overshadowed and crushed them: and a keen sense of shame and sympathy penetrated Western Christendom.

(vi.) But, above all, the Holy Places were now in the hands of the Infidels. The greatness of the place of Jerusalem in mediæval history is seen in this one fact, that it gave occasion to the Crusades. This was the most conspicuous movement of that period, the fullest of enthusiasm and heroism, cruelty and folly; the fullest of far-reaching consequences for all future time. English tourists at Brussels, when they are enjoying their comfortable quarters at one of the two principal hotels near the statue of GODFREY OF BOUILLON, hardly consider how near their thoughts are, or ought to be, at such a time, to Jerusalem.

The very magnitude of the subject imposes brevity on this part of our historic summary. When we read Tasso, there are two passages of his "Jerusalem Delivered" on which we pause especially. These are the descriptions of the first view of the city obtained by the Crusaders from the east and of their taking of it from the north. In the early part of the poem the description of the position of Jerusalem and its geographical relations is remarkably accurate; and we see clearly how well the Western mind had been made acquainted with it through the reports of the pilgrims. As to the feeling of the Crusaders we need not attenuate its fervour and earnestness; and the description of their emotion after first coming in sight of Jerusalem is probably true:—

Al gran piacer che quella prima vista
Dolcemente spirò nell' altrui petto,
Alta contrizion successe, mista
Di timoroso e riverente affetto.

And regarding Godfrey himself, we certainly need not doubt the deep and honest devotion with which he spent time in prayer and gave orders for religious observances before the last assault :—

Del dì, cui dell' assalto il dì successe,
 Gran parte orando il pio Buglion dispensa ;
 E impon, che ogni altroi falli suoi confesse,
 E pasca il pan dell' alme alla gran mensa.

Yet the shock is very great, when we compare all this either with the savage and indiscriminate cruelty of the massacre, when Jerusalem was taken, or with the quarrels and low ambitions of the Crusading princes themselves during the Latin occupation of the East.

The numismatic illustrations of the Frankish kingdom of Jerusalem are of extreme interest, though the surviving coins of its kings are, as might be expected, scanty in number. We must especially note the representations of three buildings which appear on these coins. On those of Baldwin the Second, Third, and Fourth, we have what is called the Tower of David, and which seems to represent that very tower which still remains in the highest part of Jerusalem, and is very familiar to all Eastern travellers. Coins of Guy Lusignan (1186-1192) exhibit the cupola of the "Temple," which is in fact the "Dome of the Rock," mentioned above as built by one of the early Khalifs, while those of Amurath I. show the "Church of the Holy Sepulchre" with a round conical roof and arches below, and apparently in the form which it presented before the fire of 1808. No coins of Godfrey himself are known to exist, and probably none will ever be found. It is not likely that he who refused to wear a crown of gold where Christ had worn a crown of thorns, would put his effigy, or use any titles in honour of himself, on the money of his kingdom. Of this numismatic series none brings the struggle of Saracen and Crusader more forcibly before us than one struck, from metal taken from the churches, during the very siege by Saladin.

(vii.) From Godfrey of Bouillon the progress of history brings us very rapidly to SALADIN. The inevitable course of events is well put before us by Count de Vogüé :—

The kingdom of Jerusalem could not possibly last. Notwithstanding prodigies of valour and perseverance, it was doomed to yield to the attacks of the Arabs and to the elements of dissolution which it carried in its own bosom. The struggle which it maintained was not an equal one. The West had not then that superiority over the East, which has now been assured to it by the development of Christianity and the progress of civilization. The moral and material conditions were at this epoch nearly the same in the two camps. The military valour, the religious ardour, the political constitution, the armament,

were the same on one side and on the other. Thus, other things being equal, victory was sure to remain with that one of the two adversaries which fought on its own soil. The advantage of ground was against the Crusaders, forced as they were to supply their commissariat from the sea by the help of an imperfect fleet, at an enormous distance from their base of operation, while the centre of Asia furnished an inexhaustible source to the fleet of their enemies, which renewed itself continually. We know the brilliant part which the Templars played during this struggle of a century. They postponed, without preventing the final catastrophe. The day came when they were obliged to quit Jerusalem and the famous fortification, the name of which, made young by their sword, was thenceforth ever to be associated with the memory of the highest military virtues (p. 78).

The biography of Saladin is of surpassing interest, and ought to be better known. Like Abraham, he came from Mesopotamia; and, like Abraham, "he went down into Egypt;" the footsteps alike of the great Patriarch and the great Saracen were in early life by the Euphrates and the Nile—though in no other respects would it be easy to find a resemblance between the careers of the two men. Saladin won his spurs in Egypt in conflict with the Franks of Palestine (1166–1168). He defended Alexandria against them. This is one of the last appearances of that city as an important place, before it was overshadowed for long centuries by the greatness of Cairo. He became virtually sovereign of Egypt, owning a nominal allegiance to the Khalif—herein presenting a curious anticipation of the present condition of that country. He finally quitted Cairo in 1182; and thenceforward he is identified with Syria, Palestine, and Jerusalem. His sway extended from Tripoli in Africa to Damascus, with the interruption only of the small Latin kingdom the capital of which was still the Holy City. The battle of Hattin in July, 1187, decided the fate of the Christians in Palestine. Jerusalem was taken in October of the same year, after having been eighty-eight years in subjection to the Franks.

The third and fifth crusades must not be forgotten—the former on account of the memory of our King Richard Cœur de Lion, the latter because of the temporary resumption of Frankish rule in Jerusalem under the Emperor Frederic II. The siege of Acre is not likely to be forgotten, at least by Englishmen who have travelled from Carmel to the Lebanon. Saladin died at Damascus when King Richard was in his Austrian prison.¹ The expedition of the young German Emperor under the order of his guardian, Pope Innocent III., takes us back to Jerusalem

¹ One of the most remarkable sights in Damascus is the tomb recently erected in the great mosque to the memory of Saladin. It is an indication of that Mahomedan enthusiasm, which is one of the most serious factors of the Eastern Question.

once more. But the new Latin kingdom here was ephemeral. The privileges obtained for the Christians were before long extinguished; the sacred buildings of Jerusalem lost their Christian characteristics, and became Mahomedan once more; and the title of its Christian kings faded into a mere shadow of the past on the coins of Cyprus and Savoy.

(viii.) Travellers who describe Jerusalem (and they have been very numerous, perhaps too numerous) seldom refer to the extraordinary interest of the walls of the city. Let her walls, then, in this slight account of her later history, receive their true position of honour.

In the first place, the instances are very rare in modern times, when one can walk all round the wall of a fortified city without being interrupted by outlying suburbs. This can be done now at Jerusalem—and done far more easily than when Nehemiah took his famous ride by night, “going out by the gate of the valley,” examining the whole circuit of the walls, and entering by the same gate again.¹ And it ought to be done with very great care and attention; for we have in the circuit of these walls, whatever may have been the changes in their actual masonry, a memorial both of the late Roman and of the Crusading times. But besides this, the existing walls (and in the walls the gates must be included) are of extreme dignity and beauty. Their stone-work is excellent; its colour has a very peculiar charm; and the combination of the masonry with rock, whether this natural stone forms part of its basis, or is exposed to view with a small interval between, is very striking. This last characteristic attracts attention particularly on the north side, in the neighbourhood of the Damascus gate. But, above all, it is to be remembered that the present aspect and condition of the walls of Jerusalem are to be connected with a great historic name.

The builder was SOLYMAN THE MAGNIFICENT, the second Khalif and Sultan who reigned at Constantinople. How great this monarch was, how worthy of his title, will be seen by help of a very brief enumeration of facts. And it is the more incumbent on us to take note of him because we are now living in the period of the decay of the Turkish Empire. It is to be remembered that in reaching this Sultan we have passed from the Saracens to the Turks, from a period of Mahomedan history, which, as we view it now, is brightly coloured by romance, to a dismal reality with which we are too sadly familiar. Solyman II., however, stands out very nobly in the annals of his time. He was a really great monarch in an age of great monarchs. As to his date and his relation to other rulers, it is useful to recollect

¹ Nehem. ii, 11-15.

that he came to his throne almost exactly at the time when Charles V. was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, and that his alliance with Francis I. was the first instance of such a combination between Turkey and any Christian power. In this way Turkey was in fact brought into the modern States-system of Europe, as an incongruous element indeed, but a very important one. It was precisely at this time that the Ottoman Empire of Constantinople reached, not indeed its widest extent, but its highest eminence of military power. The Turks were then a terror to Europe; the pirate Barbarossa was sweeping the commerce of the Mediterranean; and one of our Collects for Good Friday stands as a memorial of English feeling on this subject in its Christian form. To return to Solyman the Magnificent, his conquests extended from Belgrade to Bagdad; he drove the knights of St. John from Rhodes; he besieged Vienna in person. But it is more to our purpose to say a word of his character. He was so great a legislator, that his Mahomedan title is drawn from this circumstance. One of his noble sayings was (as if in sarcastic anticipation of the Turks of the present day) that he wished those who administered justice under him to be "like those rivers which make fruitful the lands through which they flow, not like those streams which tear away all the ground in the neighbourhood of their courses." He was a poet and a mathematician. A famous mosque at Constantinople attests the splendour of his views of architecture. He diligently made roads and bridges. The point to which all these remarks in the present instance are leading up, is this, that to Solyman the Magnificent are due the strength and the aspect of those walls of Jerusalem, with which every modern tourist is familiar.

(x.) From his name to that of MEHEMET ALI is a deep descent; but we must come by this sudden fall to the next personage in our catalogue. The whole range of modern history—three hundred years in duration—lies in this interval, though indeed the fifty years which have passed since the day of Mehemet Ali have, in one sense, generated more history than all the preceding time, especially as regards scientific discovery and invention. Jerusalem has lain meanwhile immovable under the heaviest part of the Mahomedan cloud; and yet, when we think of it, we are conscious that it lies in the very heart of the great Eastern Question, which was stirred so vehemently in the days of Mehemet Ali. We feel, in looking back on those days, the beginning of the storm which broke out so seriously in the Crimean War, and the beginning too of what is happening at this moment. It was a time of great movements throughout the world. It was immediately after the passing of the Reform Bill in England, and after the emancipation of Greece by the Battle of Navarino,

that Mehemet Ali endeavoured to secure the independence of Egypt; and this would have been done but for the interference of the European Powers, the arresting of Ibrahim Pasha on his march to Constantinople, and the bombardment of Acre by our own ships. The mention of this last event seems to bring that time with a very fresh remembrance into the mind, while the presence of von Moltke in the battle of Nizib is a most curious link between those days and ours. The point before us is the condition of Jerusalem and of Palestine in regard to the world at large. The Holy City and the Holy Land cannot be viewed, in discussions such as these, separately from one another. Now this may be said with truth, that, notwithstanding the excitement of the period, they seemed to lie mysteriously in a kind of sacred isolation, waiting for the future. And this has occurred again and again through the long lapse of history. Palestine was like a bridge for the Egyptians and Turks, as it had been in the times succeeding Alexander the Great for the armies of the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ. Mehemet Ali felt, as Napoleon felt, some five-and-thirty years later, that Jerusalem did not lie on the line of his operations.¹ It is most remarkable that, so to speak, the Holy City and the Holy Land refuse to be secularized, and still stand apart for a destiny of their own.

As we pass on to our conclusion, it must be added that there is one very unexpected aspect, under which Jerusalem appears as the influential centre of what may truly be called a great movement. Cardinal Newman has told us, in his "Apologia," that the establishment of the Anglo-German Bishopric in Jerusalem was one of the events which most decisively broke his link with the Church of England. This indeed may appear a very small matter to some students of contemporary history. But, perhaps, when the whole significance of the annals of this country is fully known, no movements will be seen to be really more important than those which have been connected with such names as those of Chevalier Bunsen and Dr. Pusey.

(xi.) We end with the Crimean War, the strong personality associated with that passage of modern history being the EMPEROR NICHOLAS. Those were indeed "stirring times," to use the title of the book written by the late Mr. Finn, our highly esteemed consul at Jerusalem. Nothing in the history of the world is more strange than that the question of the possession of a silver star and of a key at the place of the Nativity of our Lord should have convulsed Christendom, cost multitudes of precious lives, and changed the boundaries of States—and this too in our own scientific, industrial, unromantic day. But that

¹ See a paper on "Southern Palestine," in *THE CHURCHMAN* for September, 1881.

star was adorned with the arms of France, the patron of Latin Christianity in the East; and that key locked or opened one of the Holy Places to the Greek Christians who looked to the Russian Emperor as the chief source of their strength, as he looked to them to further the extension of his influence in Turkey. Other events too conspired to bring on the acute phase of the Eastern Question. Especially it was at this time that the President of the French Republic became Emperor.

Mr. Finn's book, published by his widow and introduced to us by a preface from Lady Strangford, is of great value, because it presents to us the state of feeling in Jerusalem and Palestine, with all sorts of miscellaneous information, at the critical time of the Crimean war. In consequence of the variety of its topics, it is a somewhat difficult book to read; but all those topics are worthy of our careful attention. The very gossip of Jerusalem at that time is instructive.

Mohamedans are for ever expecting wars between Christendom and Islam; and to them Christendom is Eastern Christendom. . . . But they expect the day of final triumph after a contest more sanguinary and desperate than any which have preceded it—a real Holy War, in which all the forces of both sides will at last be arrayed against each other. . . . It was amusing to hear the bazaar-talk in Jerusalem at the beginning of the Russian War, and afterwards when an alliance between Turkey and some of the European nations was first mooted, . . . it was gravely said that the Sultan, being attacked by the Christians (Russians), was about to call upon his vassals for aid in money and by arms. Was not the Sultan the Khalif Allah? Did he not give permission to the French kings and queens to put on their crowns and swords after they had first made submission to them on their accession? Did not each king and queen take oath to come and fight for the Sultan when called upon? And now he was going to call upon the Queen of England, as his friend (and vassal), and upon the Latin kings, or at any rate upon their leader, the French Emperor, because the enemy was leader of the Greek Church, and the Latin Church must from duty and from policy come at the call of their suzerain and fight till the offenders had been chastised. If they, the vassals, came when summoned and did their duty—well; if not, why, they must be supposed to have made common cause with the enemy. And then? why, then the Green Flag must be unfurled, the Holy War proclaimed against all Christians—in Circassia and Asiatic Russia, in Algeria against the French, in India against the English. All true believers would rise as one man; and it would not be long before the last great triumph, the coming of Mohammed, and victory for ever to Islam (vol. i. pp. 344-346).

This was the popular Mahomedan talk at Jerusalem at the opening of the Crimean War. If to this we add the popular Christian talk, with a remembrance of the various nationalities and churches represented there, we obtain some important views

of the complication of the Eastern Question. The book opens with an animated account of the departure of the Turkish soldiers from Jerusalem on Sept. 19, 1853. The close of the war was signalized by a peculiarly fierce conflict of Greeks and Latins in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre ; for then, as during the present year, the Greek and Latin Easter came together. Nothing could be more humiliating than such conflicts. Still these facts remain before us, that Jerusalem was the pivot upon which the Crimean War turned, and that the Eastern Question, centralized there, awaits its solution.

In thus reviewing the vicissitudes through which Jerusalem has again and again been "made a heap of stones," and again and again become a centre of power and influence in the earth, no wonder in the mind is greater than the speculation as to how it is possible that on this site—and the site has always been the same—the city can have been at various periods so large and so splendid. No reference is here made to the magnificence of Solomon and Herod. Their periods were anterior to the survey we have been taking. But since the taking and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, it has been a large and splendid city as *Ælia* or Roman Jerusalem under Hadrian, and its successors, as Christian Jerusalem with the grand churches of Helena and Constantine, as the place of the noble Mahomedan mosques of the Khalifs, as the metropolis of the Eastern kingdom of the Crusaders, with a glory still attested by remains of fine Gothic architecture. The site, bounded by the ravines of Hinnom and of the Kedron, seems too small for the architecture and the population required by such facts. We wonder, as we roam through the poor narrow squalid streets (if streets they can be called) of modern Jerusalem. This is only part of the general surprise created by the smallness of Palestine ; and the experience of the traveller is precisely the same in Greece. Great events have often been enacted, and great principles illustrated, within scanty limits of space and time. "A thousand years are with God as one day, and one day as a thousand years ;" and we wait for the full understanding of all that He means when He says : "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem ; he gathereth together the outcasts of Israel."

J. S. HOWSON.