THE COMPARATIVE HOLINESS OF MOUNTS ZION AND MORIAH.

BY LIEUTENANT WARREN, R.E.

THE chief information extant on the subject of Jerusalem and Zion is to be found in the historical and poetical books of the Old Testament, the books of the Maccabees, and the works of Josephus.

Of these four sources, the first two are portions of the Inspired Writings, and therefore to them must we look for our most trustworthy information; we must, however, take into consideration the licence permitted in poetical works, and on this account it is proposed to examine the subject entirely from the Historical Books first; and for this purpose all the information which could be found bearing on the subject has been extracted.

From these extracts it will appear that Jerusalem, Zion, and Moriah were not interchangeable terms, but were fixed places,—the former being the Holy City, the two latter portions of Jerusalem, whose positions can nearly be determined, as we know one of them (Moriah) at the present day. Passing to the Poetical Books, we shall find that a parallelism exists with regard to the holiness of Mounts Zion and Moriah, which explains the apparent discrepancies hitherto creating so many difficulties in fixing these sites. Thence passing to the Maccabees, we shall find that this parallelism accounts for the change in the position of the name Sion; and following up the clue, we find the accounts of Josephus connected with those of the Old Testament, and through him bringing down the position of Mount Zion until we can fix it with considerable precision at the present day.

Now although these results differ considerably from those of the works on Jerusalem I have yet seen, yet I must acknowledge having arrived at them by continually conning over the arguments of the several writers, and finding in each case that there was something wanting to make it perfect; this something I believe I have found in the parallel holiness of Mounts Zion and Moriah.

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT.

Joshua x. 37. Adoni-zedec, King of Jerusalem (slain by Joshua).

Judges i. 1-8. And they brought him to Jerusalem, and there he died.—8. Now the children of Judah had fought against Jerusalem, and had taken it, and smitten it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire.

Joshua xv. 63. As for the Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day.

Joshua xviii. 21. Now the cities of the tribes of the children of Benjamin according to their families were . . . . Jerusalem . . . .

Judges i. 21. And the children of Benjamin did not drive out the

Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day.

Judges xix. 1. A certain Levite came over against Jebus, which is Jerusalem; and the servant said, Come, I pray thee, and let us turn into the city of the Jebusites, and lodge in it. And his master said unto him, We will not turn aside hither into the city of a stranger, that is not of the children of Israel.

1 Sam. xvii. 54; 2 Sam. v. 3.

1 Chron. xi. 4. And 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. And he built the city round about, even from Milo round about: and Joab repaired the rest of the city.

2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Chron. xiv. 3; 1 Chron. xv. 1.

2 Sam. vi. 12. So David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom into the city of David with gladness . . . .—16. And as the ark of the Lord came into the city of David, Michal, Saul's daughter, looked through a window, and saw King David leaping and dancing before the Lord . . . .—17. And they brought in the ark of the Lord, and set it in its place, in the midst of the tabernacle that David had pitched for it: and David offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings before the Lord.

1 Chron. xvi. 37. So he left there before the ark of the covenant of the Lord Asaph and his brethren, to minister before the ark continually, as every day's work required.—38. And Obed-edom with their brethren, threescore and eight; . . . .—39. And Zadok the priest, and his brethren the priests, before the tabernacle of the Lord in the high place that was at Gibeon.

2 Sam. vi. 20; 1 Chron. xvii. 1; 2 Sam. viii. 1.

2 Sam. xi. 1. David tarried at Jerusalem.

2 Sam. xv. 24. And lo Zadok also, and all the Levites were with him, bearing the ark of the covenant of God.—25. And the king said unto Zadok, Carry back the ark of God into the city.—29. Zadok therefore and Abiathar carried the ark of God again to Jerusalem.

2 Sam. xx. 3.

1 Chron. xxi. 15. And God sent an angel unto Jerusalem to destroy it. . . . And the angel of the Lord stood by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. And David lifted up his eyes, and saw the angel of the Lord stand between earth and heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched over Jerusalem.—18. Then the angel of the Lord commanded Gad to say to David, that David should go up, and set up an altar unto the Lord in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite.—19. And David went up at the saying of Gad. . . .—20. And Ornan turned back, and saw the angel; and his four sons with him hid themselves. Now Ornan was threshing wheat.—21. And as David came to Ornan,

Ornan looked and saw David, and went out of the threshing-floor, and bowed himself to David with his face to the ground.—22. Then David said to Ornan, Grant me the place of this threshing-floor, that I may build an altar therein unto the Lord.—26. And David built there an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and called upon the Lord; and he answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offerings. . . .—28. At that time when David saw that the Lord had answered him in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite, then he sacrificed there.—29. For the tabernacle of the Lord, which Moses made in the wilderness, and the altar of the burnt-offering, were at that season in the high place at Gibeon.

1 Chron. xxii. 1; 1 Kings i. 39.

1 Kings ii. 10. So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David.

1 Kings iii. 1. And Solomon took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had made an end of building his own house, and the house of the Lord, and the wall of Jerusalem round about.—4. And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there.

2 Chron. iii. 1. Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite.

1 Kings vii. 51.

1 Kings viii. 1. Then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes, the chief of the fathers of the children of Israel, unto King Solomon in Jerusalem, that they might bring up the ark of the covenant of the Lord out of the city of David, which is Zion.

1 Kings viii. 6; 2 Chron. vi. 1.

2 Chron. viii. 11. And Solomon brought up the daughter of Pharaoh out of the city of David unto the house that he had built for her; for he said, My wife shall not dwell in the house of David king of Israel, because the places are holy, whereunto the ark of the Lord hath come.

2 Chron. ix. 3. And when the Queen of Sheba had seen the wisdom of Solomon, and the house that he had built . . . . and his ascent by which he went up into the house of the Lord, there was no more spirit in her.

1 Kings xi. 27. . . Solomon built Millo, and repaired the breaches of the city of David his father.—43. And Solomon slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David his father.

2 Chron. xx. 28.

2 Chron. xxi. 20. . . . . Howbeit they buried him (Jehoram) in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings.

2 Kings xii. 20. . . . . and slew Joash in the house of Millo, which goeth down to Silla.

2 Kings xiv. 13. And Jehoash king of Israel . . . . brake down the wall of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim unto the corner gate, four hundred cubits.

2 Chron. xxiii. 27. And Ahaz slept with his fathers, and they buried

him in the city, even in Jerusalem: but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the Kings of Israel.

2 Chron. xxx. 1. . . . . house of the Lord at Jerusalem.

2 Chron. xxxii. 5. . . . . and repaired Millo in the city of David.

2 Kings xviii. 22; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 30; 2 Chron. xxiii. 4.

2 Chron. xxiii. 7. In this house, and in Jerusalem.

2 Kings xix. 21. The virgin the daughter of Zion hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee.—31. For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of Mount Zion.

2 Kings xxi. 4.

2 Chron. xxxiv. 29. Then the king sent and gathered together all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem . . . .—32. And he caused all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to it.

2 Chron. xxxvi. 14. . . . . and polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem.—19. And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof.

Ezra speaks of the house of the Lord in and at Jerusalem.

From the above passages we find that, in the time of Joshua, Jerusalem was a city with a king, Adoni-zedec. On the partition of Palestine among the tribes of Israel, we find Jerusalem allotted to Benjamin, the boundary line running south of Jebus; and the children of Benjamin could not drive the Jebusites out, but dwelt with them. And, again, though Jerusalem is not allotted to Judah, we find Judah taking and burning Jerusalem, and putting the inhabitants to the sword; and, further on, that Judah could not drive the Jebusites out, but dwelt with them. Now from this alone we must conclude that some part of Jerusalem lay in the tribe of Judah, although the boundary line passing south of Jerusalem places it in Benjamin. But still there would exist a confusion in the mind upon the subject were we not able, from the succeeding history, to conclude that there were two portions to Jerusalem in the earliest times—a citadel and a suburb: a portion so well fortified that the children of Benjamin could not take it, and a part badly fortified, which Benjamin and Judah did take and dwell in. It is, however, better to let this question wait until we arrive at a correct notion of the appearance of Jerusalem when taken by King David. We find, then, that David went to Jerusalem which is Jebus, and took the stronghold or castle of Zion, which, in consequence, received the name of the city of David:

"And he dwelt in Zion, which is the city of David, and he built the city round about, even from Millo round about, and Joab repaired the remainder of the city."

Now it is evident that this "city," Zion, was not a mere tower, for we hear afterwards of David's house being built there; and the household for his families was there; and the *houses* for the ark of God, in which we may presume were offices for Asaph and his brethren, and

Obed-edom with their brethren, threescore and eight, and the priests; and the Royal Sepulchres were also there, and Millo, which latter, from the allusions to it, may be supposed to have been the *dernier-ressort*, the strongest point in Zion. It is thus evident that Zion fully deserved the name of the "city" of David, and that it was a stronghold of very considerable extent; but, on the other hand, it is no less certain that it formed part and was the citadel of Jerusalem. There are many passages to prove this in the historical books, and not one to show that Jerusalem was a part of Zion. David took more wives at Jerusalem, and children were born to him in Jerusalem. When Joab went against Ammon David tarried at Jerusalem; when David fled from Jerusalem, the priests carried the ark of God *again* to Jerusalem, and they tarried there; and David came to his house at Jerusalem. Now, if Zion were not a part of Jerusalem, it could not be said that the ark was brought *again* to Jerusalem, after it had been deposited in Zion; and the same with David's house. Now, it is equally clear that Zion was not synonymous or co-extensive with Jerusalem, for we find Zion is only mentioned when it is desirable to fix the particular position of some building, &c., while Jerusalem is used to denote the city generally. Thus, having once said that David's house was in Zion, it was not necessary to keep recurring to that fact; but the term Jerusalem is used generally, except in a few instances, where it is necessary to make a distinction between the several parts of Jerusalem; for example, David's burial, the bringing of Pharaoh's daughter to the city of David until another house should be built for her in Jerusalem, the taking of the ark out of Zion to the temple, &c. We have not a single instance in the historical books of the term Zion, or the city of David, being used for the whole city.

It appears, then, that Jerusalem was the name for the whole city, walled and unwalled, and that Zion, the city of David, was the name for a portion of it better fortified than the rest: this appears also when David built the city round about, and Joab repaired the remainder of the city, and when Solomon built the walls of Jerusalem, and repaired the breaches of the city of David his father. It is also apparent that Zion was on the northern side of the Holy City, for it appears to have been within the boundary of Benjamin.

We may now proceed to examine the question of Mount Moriah.

This hill appears in David's time to have been close to and without the city of Jerusalem. It would hardly seem necessary to point out that Mounts Zion and Moriah were distinct hills, were it not that of late years they have been pronounced by some writers to be identical. In the first place, for many years after King David captured Jerusalem, Zion was a royal city, while Moriah must have been beyond Jerusalem, and was the private property of a sheikh or chieftain of the Jebusites. Then, again, David had to go up to Mount Moriah, which he could not have done had the two been identical; then we have the grand ceremony of bringing the ark of God *out of the city of David, which is Zion*, up to Mount Moriah.

Two of the great acts of Solomon's life were, building the house of the Lord on Mount Moriah, and building the walls of Jerusalem, and thus joining Moriah to and making it part of the Holy City; and we have every reason to suppose that Moriah was distinct from Zion; for while Zion, the city of David, is frequently mentioned with reference to the royal sepulchres, &c., we have, after the building of the Temple, Jerusalem marked as the Holy place *par excellence*. For example, when David goes up at first to the threshing-floor, he says, "This is the house of the Lord God." Again, we have, "But I have chosen Jerusalem that my name may be there . . . . Jerusalem the city which I have chosen to put my name there . . . . And they came to Jerusalem . . . . unto the house of the Lord . . . . House of the Lord at Jerusalem . . . . In Jerusalem shall my name be for ever . . . . In Jerusalem will I put my name . . . . the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem:"—and in no single instance is this said of Zion after the building of the Temple. To make this the more remarkable, we have two instances where the historian, quoting from the poetical book of Isaiah, says, "The virgin the daughter of Zion hath despised thee; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee."—"For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of Mount Zion." Thus marking the difference in mentioning the Holy City in prose and poetry. We have, then, the Holy City of Jerusalem containing at least two distinct hills, which are Zion and Moriah, the remaining portion of the city probably resting on a third hill and the intermediate valleys. Now, if we place three round-shot close together, we have a rough model of Jerusalem in the time of Solomon, the shot to the north being Mount Zion, that to the south-east Moriah, and that to the south-west the remainder of Jerusalem.

Now, having the figure of Jerusalem in our minds, we may again recur to the question of the boundary line between the two tribes. merely to notice 2 Chron. xxxiv. 29, where it says—"the elders of Judah and Jerusalem—all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin"—which successively places Jerusalem within the boundary of each tribe. And as there can be little doubt that Zion the stronghold was in Benjamin, we have nearly the certainty that the remainder of the Holy City was to the south of Zion.

And now we come to mention what appears to be the key to the topography of the Holy City, the parallel holiness of Mounts Zion and Moriah.

During the latter years of King David's life Moriah was selected as the abode of God's name, but Mount Zion was the hill on which the ark of God was placed during the full tide of David's strength and successes, and on which it rested throughout his trying family troubles; and there can be little doubt that a large number of his psalms were penned during that period. No wonder then that he should continually sing the praises of Zion; the stronghold which he had captured after it had resisted the arms of Israel nigh four hundred years,—the house of

the Lord where he offered up burnt-offerings and peace-offerings,—the site of his palace,—where his children were born,—where he brought up Absalom,—the royal city in which he had built so much and where he probably had arranged for his burial; no wonder then that this city of David was made famous in his songs. And further, Zion was a holy hill not only during part of David's reign; even after he had said of Mount Moriah, "This is the house of the Lord God," Zion still remained a holy place, the seat of the ark of God; and in it Solomon, when anointed king, offered burnt and peace-offerings; and even after the ark of God had been taken out of the city of David and placed on Mount Moriah, Zion still appears to have remained holy; for did not King Solomon take his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, out of the city of David unto a house he had built for her? for he said, "My wife shall not dwell in the house of David, King of Israel, for the places are holy whereunto the ark of the Lord hath come." This, then, is apparently the key to the great question about Mounts Zion and Moriah.

Mount Moriah was added to Jerusalem, and therefore we have, in the historical books, the mention of the "Lord's name in Jerusalem;" but in the poetical books the first songs were penned before ever David knew of the existence of Mount Moriah beyond its being the threshing-floor of a Jebusite; and all his thoughts were concentrated in Zion, the seat of the ark of God. Therefore it is we have in those Psalms ascribed to David such expressions as "My holy hill of Zion;. . . . Lord which dwelleth in Zion." But it is important to remark, that in Psalm lxviii., ascribed to David at the dedication of the materials for the future Temple on Mount Moriah, he at once marks the difference, and for the first time says, "Because of thy temple at Jerusalem." In Psalm cxxxii. we also find Jerusalem alone spoken of as the house of God. We therefore come to the conclusion that until the dedication of the materials for the Temple on Mount Moriah, King David celebrated the praises of Zion alone, but that afterwards he indifferently used the names either of Jerusalem or Zion, or used them both in apposition, taking advantage of that beautiful parallelism for which Hebrew poetry is noted, and which, though it runs throughout the earlier Psalms, is not applied to Jerusalem itself until about the forty-seventh to the fifty-first Psalm, when Jerusalem possessed two holy places in one.

If we now examine the poetical books, we shall find Zion, or Mount Zion, used indifferently and vaguely, first, for the city of Jerusalem generally; secondly, for the city of David, Zion proper; thirdly, for the house of God in a figurative sense. We also find Jerusalem used in the first and third senses, if not in the second; but by far the greater number of passages mention Jerusalem or Zion in a figurative sense—meaning the children of Judah generally, or the abode of God's name,—and not in such a manner as to denote any particular piece of ground.

A few examples are here given:—

1. *Zion, meaning the whole City of Jerusalem.*—Psalm cxlix. 2; lxxxvii. 2. Isaiah xxxiii. 14. Joel ii. 1.

2. *Zion, meaning Zion proper, the City of David.*—Psalm xlviii. 12; lxxiv. 2. Isaiah xxx. 19. Micah iv. 8.

3. *Zion, meaning the House of God.*—Psalm ix. 11; xcix. 2; cxxxii. 13; cxlvi. 10. Isaiah viii. 18. Jeremiah viii. 19. Micah iv. 7.

With regard to Jerusalem, we find the term used, of course, frequently in its proper sense:—

Psalm lxxiv. 1; cxxv. 2. Ezekiel iv. 1.

4. *Jerusalem, meaning the House of God.*—Psalm lxviii. 29; cxxii. 1, 9; cxxxvii. 5. Isaiah xxvii. 13; xliv. 20; lxii. 7. Jeremiah iii. 17. Ezekiel xxxvi. 30. Zechariah ii. 12; viii. 3.

We thus find that after the latter days of King David, Jerusalem or Zion, when mentioned separately in the poetical books, are used as interchangeable terms, meaning either the Holy City or the house of God. We also find this to be the case in the parallel passages; so much so, that Judah or Israel also stand in places for the sanctuary.

Psalm lxxvi. 2; cii. 21; cxiv. 2; cxxxv. 21; cxlvii. 12. Isaiah ii. 3; xxiv. 23. Joel ii. 32; iii. 16. Micah i. 5. Zechariah iii. 2; viii. 3.

Again, if we proceed further, we find that Jerusalem and Zion are denounced both singly and in the parallel passages:—

Isaiah iii. 16; iv. 4; xxxiii. 14. Jeremiah xiv. 19; xxx. 17. Lamentations iv. 2. Micah iii. 10.

It thus appears from the preceding examples that from the poetical books alone no idea of the relative meanings of Jerusalem and Zion can be obtained; it yet, however, remains to be shown that from the parallel passages, when taken individually, it can be proved that Jerusalem and Zion *are the same*, and that they *are different* places. For this purpose we will quote some extracts from the Psalms:—

Psalm xcviii. 8; civ. 18; cxiv. 2; cxxxii. 4; cxxii. 7; vi. 5; cxlvii. 12.

Now we have in these extracts several instances of constructive parallelism, in which there is equality between the different propositions, though differing considerably in degree in each extract. Thus, take Psalm xcviii. 8, and compare it with cxxxii. 4, or vi. 5. Now, if we take a number of them like Psalm xcviii. 8, we may prove Jerusalem to be different from Zion in Psalm cxxvii. 12; and if we take several, like Psalm cxxxvii. 4, or vi. 5, we may prove Jerusalem to be Zion in that same verse of Psalm cxlvii. It is thus evident that the parallel passages also, except in special cases, are worthless so far as settling the topography of Jerusalem is concerned; and that the topography of the poetical books can only be read by the light of the historical books. It is a very important point to establish that the poetical books are unable of themselves to settle the disputed points, because hitherto much stress has been placed on the prominence given to Zion in them. It is to be observed that the passages bearing directly on the subject which were extracted from the poetical books, and of which twenty-six refer to Jerusalem, fifty-eight to Zion, and sixty-two to Jerusalem, Zion, Judah, &c., are all in parallelism.

It now remains to point out Psalm xlviii. as being perhaps an excep-

tion to the general rule, for in this Zion appears from its palaces, &c., to mean the stronghold of David, and if so we have direct proof that it stood on the northern side of the city. Another has a curious appearance. Isaiah xxxi. 4: "To fight for Mount Zion and the hill thereof."

We thus appear to have shown how up to the dedication of the materials for the Temple the praises of Zion alone were sung, and that after that time advantage was taken of the Hebrew style to parallel the present holiness of Moriah with the past glories of Zion: thus giving to the poems a strength and beauty which they lacked before.

It is to be observed that in general a preference is given to Zion, the elder city in holiness, except in the Book of the Prophet Zechariah, where Jerusalem appears to be preferred; and it is natural to suppose that Zion should in song have the preference, since not only do the prophets copy their style each from the other, thus originally deriving it from David, but Zion had of itself a more unmixed, even if an inferior, holiness to Jerusalem, for it had contained only the ark of God and the royal palaces, &c., while Jerusalem, besides containing the holy places (Zion and Moriah), was the abode of the Jebusites and other original Gentile inhabitants of the land. It is evident, then, how Zion would gradually acquire in the minds of the people a meaning synonymous with the Temple, except to those who were well acquainted with the historical books.

Having now obtained the leading features of the topography of Jerusalem from the historical books, and having seen that the poetical books can only be read by the aid of the former, we pass on to the Books of the Maccabees. We have already anticipated that the constant use of the Psalms of David would connect the name of Zion with the house of the Lord. This we find to be the case in the Books of the Maccabees, written more than 300 years after the time of the prophet Nehemiah, during which interval Jerusalem was repeatedly besieged and desolated. At this time, then, we find the city of David occupied by a foreign garrison, and still the stronghold of the city, from whence the foreign soldiers descended to molest the Jews going up to the Temple, the sanctuary now called Sion. Here we see the effects of poetry. The historical books may be out of mind, the prophets may be forgotten—but the songs of David descend from father to sons by word of mouth, and still reign in the hearts of all. Hence they call the sanctuary (though changed in position) Mount Zion.

Extracts from the Books of the Maccabees.—1 Macc. i. 33. Then builded they the city of David with a great and strong wall, &c.

iv. 37. . . . . And went up in into Mount Sion. And when they saw the sanctuary desolate and the altar profaned. . . . .

v. 54. So they went up to Mount Sion with joy and gladness, where they offered burnt-offerings. . . .

Now, crossing over to Josephus, we find the same tale of the Maccabees told in different language; but mention is not made of the

Zion of David or the Sion of the Maccabees. How could he mention them by name? As an historian he must have been aware of the identity between the city of David and Sion (his Acra), but he could not call it Zion; to do so would have caused a confusion in his story to anybody who had also access to the Books of the Maccabees: he therefore wisely left the name out altogether. Now, as Josephus describes the topography of Jerusalem in the time of Herod, and gives the position of Zion, city of David of the Maccabees, his Macedonian Acra, we have a connecting link throughout.

The point marked on the Ordnance Survey plan as Acra, the palace of Helena, appears in all probability to be the site where Zion once was, and is not; for the Hasmoneans, working night and day for three years, cut away the old stronghhold of David, and by that act destroyed the parallelism between the holy places, leaving Moriah alone to represent the abode of God's name.

When Jerusalem came under the Roman and Christian rule, and the songs of David held diminished sway, and history began to be examined, it is likely that the term Zion should again denominate the city of David; but this had disappeared, and therefore it is probable that the next hill, other than the Temple, should be called Zion; and this we find to be the case.

We have found, then, in the historical books of the Old Testament, Jerusalem, containing the city of David or Zion, Mount Moriah or the Temple, and the remainder of the city. Again, in 1 Maccabees, we find Jerusalem containing the same city of David, or the tower or fortress (ἡ ἄκρα), the same Temple, and the remainder of the city. And in Josephus we find Jerusalem containing the same Temple, and an upper and a lower city (ἡ ἄκρα); but the names Zion, Sion, and Moriah are not mentioned: the city of David is mentioned, and it will be shown that it was used to designate the lower city of King David's time, to which was joined the Akra, the citadel, and that after this circumstance the whole of the lower city, including the citadel, was called Akra. Now of the two cities, the upper and the lower, it is evident, without any doubt, that the latter, the lower city, the Akra of Josephus, corresponds to, and is identical with, the city of David, or fortress or Akra of the Maccabees, and therefore with the city of David or Zion of the historical books; but we appear to know where the upper city was, for an upper city exists at the present day, viz., the hill lying south of the road leading from the Jaffa Gate to the Bab es-Silsile, and including the Armenian and Jewish quarters, and probably also part of the hill to the south, outside the walls. We have nearly positive proof of this being the upper city of Josephus, from his statement that the palace of Agrippa overlooked the Temple, that it was in the upper city, and connected with the Xystus, and from thence by a bridge with the Temple; and in Jerusalem no other site can be found for this palace but on the high ground overlooking the southern end of the Haram area. Now, having fixed the site of the upper city, the

lower city, Akra, falls into its place to the north, about et-Takiyeh, or the palace of Helena (where is the word Akra on the Ordnance Survey plan?); for Akra could not have been south of the upper city as here fixed, and if further to the north than et-Takiyeh it would have been on the other side of the valley, and in such a position that the Macedonian garrison, quartered in it, could not have disturbed the Jews who went up to the Temple, as described in 1 Maccabees.

Now, though Josephus does not actually mention Zion, we ought, if he be an accurate writer, to be able to infer from his language where he supposes Zion to have been. In trying this and looking into the matter we find a striking peculiarity in his topography, viz., his vagueness in speaking of the topography of the past, his precision in detailing the walls and buildings which existed about his own time; this is greatly in contrast with the precision throughout the historical books and 1 Maccabees, and causes the topographical account of Josephus up to the time of the death of Simon Maccabeus to be of secondary consideration. Thus we find Josephus frequently adding to and amplifying the Biblical stories; but it does not appear in any case that he gives any help in the topography; on the contrary, he always mentions Jerusalem in such general terms as to lead one to suppose that he was himself uncertain of the identity of its various portions, as he knew it, with those which are mentioned in the Biblical account. It is, however, clear that he is in accord with the historical books and 1 Maccabees in making Zion, the city of David, coincide with Akra, the lower city:—

Antiquities, vii. 3:—"So he took the lower city by force, but the the citadel (ακρα) held out still. When David had cast the Jebusites out of the citadel (ακρα) he also rebuilt Jerusalem, and named it the city of David. Now when he had chosen Jerusalem to be his royal city . . . a royal palace at Jerusalem. Now David made buildings round about the lower city: he also *joined the citadel* (ακρα) *to it and made it one body;* and when he had encompassed all with walls he appointed Joab to take care of them."

We have, then, David taking the lower city and afterwards Akra (or in the Biblical account Zion), and then joining all in one, so that the whole lower city with its citadel took the name of Akra; but we hear nothing of the upper city. Josephus gives, however (*B. J.*, v. 4, § 1) another account, which says that David called the upper city the fortress (φρουριον); and some writers have identified the upper city, which David called the fortress, with the Akra which he captured; and in order to do this they have to conclude that Josephus gave the same denomination, Akra, to both the upper and lower cities; but if so, why does he not say that David *called* the upper city Akra?

The apparent explanation of Josephus is this: King David took the lower city with its citadel, Akra (Zion), and joined them together in one, so that together they formed the hill of Akra: afterwards, when the upper city was walled in, David called it the fortress (φρουριον).

There are many other reasons against the upper city being the citadel, the Akra, which Josephus described David as having captured. For example, he speaks of Jerusalem and the city of David as one, and of the citadel as if it were merely a citadel; but the upper city appears to be at least four times as large as the lower city, and it is absurd to suppose a city occupying one-fourth the space of its own citadel; and again, Josephus makes David join the citadel on to the lower city; but if the lower city were only one-fourth of the citadel, surely he would have said that David joined the lower city on to the citadel. Then, again, Josephus appears to call the lower city Jerusalem, the city of David, and he says David built his palace there, and made buildings round about it. It thus appears that Josephus, though speaking more vaguely, is strictly in accord with the historical books and the 1st Maccabees. The only question that appears to remain is a question of degree: whether the citadel, Akra, which David captured, is not Millo of the city of David, and the lower city of Josephus Zion. As Akra was taken in and formed one with the lower city, so Millo may have been taken in and formed one with Zion.

Let us now pass on a step, and test Josephus as to the topography of his own time or a couple of centuries before it, viz., from the death of Simon Maccabeus; for it appears that it is only after that time that he can be looked up to as chief and almost the only authority. We now find at once a change; he is no longer vague and general in his remarks, he is master of the field, and must write with precision, not only because he is almost the only historian of his time, but also because he is speaking of a city the topography of which was known to himself and to many who were likely to be his readers. We may, then, suppose that Josephus's account becomes valuable just when it is most wanted, viz., after the death of Simon Maccabeus.

Looking at Jerusalem as it is, we find Robinson's Arch to have been a portion of a bridge leading from the Temple to the foot of the upper city. How exactly this coincides with the account of Josephus, when he tells us of the bridge leading over to Agrippa's (or the Hasmonean) palace through the Xystus. It appears probable, then, that Robinson's Arch was used in the time of Herod and destroyed after the taking of Jerusalem by Titus; and if so, when was the bridge broken down in Pompey's time? It is to be recollected that it was not till Herod's time that the Temple area was expanded to double its previous extent; and in looking for an area 600 feet square, no site can well meet all the requirements but that nearly coinciding with the platform of the Dome of the Rock, though even this site does not seem quite to suit the historical account. There appears, however, to be the fewest objections against this site. If this is near the site of the old Temple, then the bridge of Pompey would have been near Wilson's Arch in the lower city.

Now it has been stated that Robinson's Arch appears to have fallen before the first of Wilson's Arches was built; therefore it appears that

this latter arch was built *after* the destruction of the Temple by Titus. We may look, then, farther north for the bridge of Pompey, perhaps near the Bab el-Kattanin. It has also been surmised that the Haram Wall from the Huldah gate round to Barclay's gate is more recent than that about the south-east angle.

We now appear to have got hold of some pieces of the puzzle, viz.: that the first Temple may have been situate at the south-east angle of the Haram area, or more probably nearly on the Dome of the Rock platform; that a portion of the present wall was probably not built till Herod's time; that Wilson's Arch was not built till after the destruction by Titus; that the bridge destroyed in Pompey's time may have been near Bab el-Kattanin; and, to finish up for the present, we have the suspicion that the valley running down from the Damascus Gate may as well run across the northern portion of the Haram area as down under Wilson's Arch. It is not at all certain that it does do so, but there is nothing that we know of against it; and, whether it does or not, the valley up by Bab el-Hadid appears to be what the Bedawin call a *thoghret*,—that is, a point where a water-course, after having passed down a valley, is undecided which of two fresh valleys it shall follow. It is not an uncommon feature in Palestine; and it appears that cases are on record in other countries where running water, on coming to a *throghret*, bifurcates and passes on in a double stream.

The question of the course of this valley has a most important bearing upon the position of the Antonia. Josephus tells us that the Antonia, or Baris, was at the north-west angle of the Temple. We also learn from the 1st of Maccabees that there was a fort attached to the Temple. There is no reason to suppose it was a mere tower, and possibly it was the fortified palace spoken of in the Book of Nehemiah. The question is, whether it was joined to the Temple directly, or by cloisters, which could be cut off without injuring the Temple or the Antonia. The latter appears probably to have been the case; but it is a question which requires much looking into.

Now, Josephus tells us that the Antonia was on Bezetha, and separated from Bezetha by an artificial ditch. If it were joined directly to the Temple, it would have been near Bab el-Hadid; the valley in front being the artificial ditch. There are many reasons, however, against this, and in favour of its having been at the north-west angle of the Haram area, where the Serai is now, and joined to the Temple by cloisters running across the valley which separates Bezetha from Moriah, which valley was pointed out in my letter to Mr. Grove of Nov. 12, 1867. This appears to be the great question at present. A few innocent-looking little shafts in the grass-grown, unfrequented portion of the northern Haram area would probably settle the matter; but, alas! it appears that we are to be debarred the satisfaction of obtaining a plan of ancient Jerusalem for our Biblical history, merely because a confusion has been made between the Haram area at Jerusalem, and the more jealously-guarded Haram at Hebron.

CHARLES WARREN, Lieut. R.E.