

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO DUPL



3 1761 00273024 0

DS

109

.912

A64

T. HONYWOOD,

ROBESART.

RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY, 56, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

THE MONTHLY VOLUME,

EACH BOOK COMPLETE IN ITSELF, OCCASIONALLY ILLUSTRATED WITH ENGRAVINGS, AND CONTAINING ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-TWO PAGES, IN A GOOD, BOLD TYPE.

SIXPENCE, IN FANCY PAPER COVERS.

TENPENCE, IN CLOTH BOARDS, GILT EDGES.

"I never wanted articles on religious subjects half so much as articles on common subjects, written with a decidedly Christian tone."—DR. ARNOLD.

THE Committee of the RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY have resolved to publish a volume every month, adapted to the new development and growing intelligence of the times. This series, with the exception of a few reprints, will be ORIGINAL; from the pens of authors of ability in their respective departments in literature and science:—SCRIPTURAL; in the principles in which they are written:—POPULAR; in their style; so that instead of being limited to one class of the community, they may be generally acceptable:—PORTABLE; that they may serve as "hand-books" abroad and at home:—and ECONOMICAL; the twelve volumes of a year costing less than three half-pence per week. Thus while the MONTHLY SERIES will be fully adapted to the educated FAMILIES of our land, to

DAY and SUNDAY SCHOOLS, and to the LIBRARIES of mechanics and others, they will supply interesting and valuable reading to a large number of the people, who can only spare time enough for the perusal of a small volume, and whose means will not allow of a more costly purchase.

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

Each Volume complete in itself.

THE LIFE OF JULIUS CÆSAR.

GLIMPSES OF THE DARK AGES.

WILD FLOWERS OF THE YEAR.

JAMAICA, ENSLAVED AND FREE.

OUR SONG BIRDS.

THE SOLAR SYSTEM. PART I.

THE TASK, AND OTHER POEMS. BY WILLIAM
COWPER, ESQ.

SKETCHES OF THE WALDENSES.

THE SOLAR SYSTEM. PART II.

THE LIFE OF LUTHER.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

THE BLIGHTS OF WHEAT.

MODERN JERUSALEM.

ANCIENT JERUSALEM.

LIFE OF MOHAMMED.

PERSECUTIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

LIFE OF ALFRED.

DAWN OF MODERN CIVILIZATION.

ETC., ETC.

The Committee of the RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY therefore look with confidence to their friends, to aid them in widely distributing their MONTHLY VOLUME, in FAMILIES, SCHOOLS, and GENERAL LIBRARIES; while they entreat on this new effort the effectual blessing of Almighty God.

ANCIENT JERUSALEM.

Where now the pomp, which kings with envy view'd?
Where now thy might, which all those kings subdued?
No martial myriads muster in thy gate;
No suppliant nations in thy Temple wait:
No prophet bards, thy glittering courts among,
Wake the full lyre, and swell the tide of song.

LONDON:
THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY:
Instituted 1799.

DS
109
• 912
A 64.



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	Page
Origin and Early History	5

CHAPTER II.

The Site—Jerusalem in the time of David	30
---	----

CHAPTER III.

The Temple of Solomon	45
---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

Jerusalem in the time of Solomon	64
--	----

CHAPTER V.

Jerusalem to the Captivity	76
--------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI.

Jerusalem from the Captivity to the time of Christ	102
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

Jerusalem in the time of Christ	130
---	-----

HISTORY OF ANCIENT JERUSALEM.

CHAPTER I.

ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY.

FROM the want of authentic records ascending into remote antiquity, the origin of most very ancient cities is involved in obscurity. Such obscurity also shrouds the origin of JERUSALEM, which, in the purposes of God, was destined to become the most marvellous city of the earth—"marvellous from its beginning hitherto"—like the people with whom the most important part of its history is identified. And not only the most marvellous, but the greatest of earthly cities—if the degree of its greatness be measured, not by the extent of the empire of which it became the metropolis, or by the quantities of stone and mortar inclosed within its walls, but

by the extent, the fulness, and the depth of the living interests, human and spiritual, which were, in the course of ages, gathered round it, and of which it remains the centre, even unto this day. It is this which forms the great prerogative and distinction of Jerusalem beyond all other cities. Babylon, Nineveh, Thebes, Athens, Rome, have long since become things of the past ; and there is nothing of the present—nothing living—in the interest with which we regard the few remains of their glory that time has spared. But Jerusalem, which has scarcely a fragment left belonging to the times of its ancient renown—not so much thereof as the most extinct of those other cities—is to us more deeply interesting than they are of the past ; and yet not of the past only, but also of the present ; and not only of the present, but of the future—in virtue of its having been presented to us as the symbol of those hopes under which all true believers in our Lord Jesus Christ trust to become citizens of “ the new Jerusalem, that cometh down from heaven.”

It is not the want of early and authentic records which leaves in obscurity the origin of this famous city. The Scripture accounts reach back far beyond the age in which Jeru-

salem can be supposed to have been founded ; and it is to these inspired records that we owe all our knowledge concerning the foundation of cities still more ancient, and, indeed, the most ancient in the world,—such as Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calneh, Erech, and Babylon. Even with Palestine, the country in which Jerusalem is found, the Scriptures make us acquainted, and name many of its towns, at a time close upon the most remote of the dates which have been given to the foundation of that city. The question therefore arises, whether the town may not, in these ancient accounts, be mentioned by some other name than that which it in ensuing ages acquired ; or whether, if it then existed at all, it was not of too little importance, or too much out of the way of the patriarchs, to obtain particular notice.

Now, if we examine with attention the journeys of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we shall find them passing to and fro, north and south, over a district in the centre of which the site of Jerusalem stood, and by routes which must have led them through it, over it, or close by it. They go from Shechem, or from Bethel, in the country north of that site, to Bethlehem, Hebron, or Beersheba, on its south ; and then

they return again to the northern district. In the course of such journeys, the names of several places which we are still able to identify, do occur ; but not that of Jerusalem, or of any name which can be identified with it, unless, as is generally supposed, it be the same with the Salem where king Melchizedek came forth to meet Abraham, when he returned from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. Gen. xiv. 17—20 ; Heb. vii. 1. That it was the same is a general and very ancient opinion, which seems to derive support from Psalm lxxvi. 2, where the name Salem is certainly applied to Jerusalem. That passage is not, however, conclusive ; as it may there be no more than a poetical contraction of Jerusalem, such contractions not being unusual in the Hebrew. Against the identity of Jerusalem with Melchizedek's Salem, may also be urged not only the consideration which has been just advanced, tending to show that no town, or at least no town of so much importance as the Salem of Melchizedek, existed here in the time of the patriarchs ; but there is some circumstantial evidence going to show that the "mount," in "the land of Moriah," to which Abraham, at the Divine command, proceeded, with the intention of

offering up his son Isaac, and which all allow to have been the mount Moriah of Jerusalem, on which Solomon's temple was eventually built, was at that time a solitary place, which is not consistent with the notion that a town then stood there, or close by. On these and other grounds, many careful inquirers venture to think, that Jerusalem had not, under any name, an existence in the time of the patriarchs; and against the authority of tradition they produce another tradition, mentioned by Jerome and others, which fixes the site of Melchizedek's Salem far more to the north, near the Jordan, and in the neighbourhood of the place afterwards known as Bethshean, and, still later, as Scythopolis. We must, therefore, be content to remain in some doubt whether the famous city of Jerusalem did, or did not, exist under the name of Salem, or of any other name in the time of the patriarchs.

It would certainly be pleasant to think that Abraham beheld, in its comparatively infant state, that town which was destined, in the designs of God's providence, to become the high metropolis in which his descendants reigned. But if it remain doubtful whether we may with

unshaken confidence allow ourselves this satisfaction, there is another still better, in which we may freely indulge. If we could be certain that Jerusalem was the Salem of Melchizedek, and existed in the time of Abraham, it would be gratifying to know that the city, destined in future time to become the great centre of the true faith, was even then ruled by one distinguished as "a priest of the most high God:" but we should still want the means of connecting it directly with the history of Abraham, for it was not at Salem that the interview between Melchizedek and Abraham occurred; but the king of that place had joined other kings, who went forth to greet the patriarch when he returned triumphant from the pursuit and defeat of Chedorlaomer. The interview took place in "the King's Dale," the situation of which is not determinable by any scriptural authority; but which is supposed by some to have lain north of Jerusalem, while it is placed by others near the Jordan. Still the great event in the history of Abraham—the purposed offering up of his son upon mount Moriah—does, in any case, afford us the opportunity of connecting the history of the great father of the Hebrew people with the site in

which his descendants reigned, and where they worshipped God. And this connexion becomes the most interesting and impressive that could be conceived, when we reflect that it was, as it were, within sight of the spot where, in the fulness of time, the Son of God offered himself up a ransom for sin, became "obedient unto death," and Abraham entitled himself to be styled "the father of the faithful"—that is, of all who believe—by the willingness he manifested to offer up his son—his only son—the son that he loved, at the command of God. It was then, probably, that, in reward of his marvellous faith, he saw the day of Christ, and was glad. John viii. 56. And we may allow ourselves the satisfaction of believing, that he was then taught to interpret rightly the remarkable words which he had himself lately uttered, when, in answer to a natural question from his son, he said: "God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering;" and was made acquainted with the fact that "the Lamb of God"—"the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," was thereafter to yield his soul an offering for sin in that very place.

The history of the patriarchs evinces that Palestine was but thinly peopled when they

sojourned in the land. But when their descendants came back from Egypt the case was very different. While in the house of their bondage the Israelites had increased to a multitude of people; the population of the Canaanites in Palestine had manifestly increased greatly also, although not in the same, or in anything like the same, miraculous degree. When the Israelites appeared on the borders of Canaan, they had increased to 35,000 times the number which, 214 years before, had left that country for Egypt. If, in the same time, the Canaanites had increased to only ten or twelve times their number, this, as far as we can judge, would have sufficed to throng the country with people, and materially to alter its aspect, by necessitating the cultivation of soils which had been formerly suffered to lie waste, and by covering the land with inhabited sites, where none previously existed. That this had taken place, whatever may have been the precise rate of increase, is shown in the books of Numbers and Joshua, where it appears that the Amorites and others, who had been formerly west of the Jordan, had, in whole or in part, been driven out by the pressure of the population, and constrained to seek new settlements on the other

side the river ; where we find numerous kings and large masses of people confronting the invading Israelites at every turn ; and where the sacred pages are crowded with the names of towns, a large proportion of which appear to have been walled, and to have represented a further population in surrounding villages and hamlets, which are not named. We know also that many of these towns existed on sites which were not occupied in the time when Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob pastured their flocks, dugged their wells, planted their groves, and set up their altars in the land.

Among the towns which thus arose, during the long absence of the Hebrews in Egypt, seems to have been Jerusalem. From all that appears in the Bible itself, there is, as we have seen, no undoubted evidence that it existed, as an inhabited site, in the time of the patriarchs. But when their descendants returned from Egypt, Jerusalem at once appears before us as a place of importance, and one of the chief of the many little states into which that part of the country, and indeed the whole of Palestine, was then divided. This distinction it doubtless owed to the natural strength of its position, which, in addition to the ordinary

defences, must have rendered it all but impregnable to such means of attack upon strong places as were known in that age ; and, under the condition of society which then existed, the strongest town was sure to acquire the predominance over many others, less strong, in its neighbourhood.

The first place in which the sacred history presents us with the name of Jerusalem, is at the beginning of the tenth chapter of Joshua. " Now it came to pass, when Adoni-zedec king of Jerusalem had heard how Joshua had taken Ai, and had utterly destroyed it ; as he had done to Jericho and her king, so he had done to Ai and her king ; and how the inhabitants of Gibeon had made peace with Israel, and were among them ; that they feared greatly, because Gibeon was a great city, as one of the royal cities, [of which Jerusalem itself was one,] and all the men thereof were mighty. Wherefore Adoni-zedec king of Jerusalem sent unto Hoham king of Hebron, and unto Piram king of Jarmuth, and unto Japhia king of Lachish, and unto Debir king of Eglon, saying, Come up unto me, and help me, that we may smite Gibeon : for it hath made peace with Joshua and with the children of Israel," Josh. x. 1—4.

It is obvious, that Adoni-zedec dreaded the discouraging effect which the submission of the Gibeonites to the Hebrews was calculated to produce, and therefore wished to make an example of them, and show that none of the small states in this region would be allowed, with impunity, to desert the common cause, and consult their particular interests, by making separate treaties with the invaders. The alarm which was felt on this point needed not, however, have been entertained, as the Israelites were more than equally averse to such treaties; and that into which they had entered with the Gibeonites had been drawn from them by the subtilties of the latter.

It is possible, from the tone of the message to the other kings, that Adoni-zedec exercised some kind of superiority over them, but this is by no means certain. The states might have been bound together by some obligations of reciprocal assistance in time of danger : and without some such understanding they could not well have maintained their existence as separate states. In that case, it is quite enough to suppose that the king of Jerusalem claimed assistance from the other kings, not as having a right to their service, but as having a claim for their

assistance, from being the most in danger ; for his city of Jerusalem was but six miles from Gibeon, and lay between it and the Hebrew camp at Gilgal.

The four kings brought their forces into the field at the call of the king of Jerusalem, and having joined him, they marched together against Gibeon. On this formidable attack the Gibeonites sought aid from Joshua. This assistance the Israelites could not, by reason of their covenant, refuse ; and having obtained the assurance of the Divine aid, Joshua, with his chosen warriors, marched all night, and fell unexpectedly upon the camp of the besieging kings by the morning dawn. Being defeated with great slaughter, they fled in different directions, and were pursued by the conquerors in those directions for ten, twelve, and fourteen miles. This pursuit of the vanquished host was rendered memorable by the great hailstones which fell from heaven and destroyed vast numbers of the fugitives ; and still more so by the prolongation of the daylight at the command of Joshua, who, strong in faith, cried, “ Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon ; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon,” and Jehovah wrought a miracle in behalf of his people : for “ the sun

stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies," Josh. x. 12, 13.

Joshua was fully sensible of the great importance of this victory, which, from the remarkable circumstances attending it, was well calculated to depress the spirits of the Canaanites, and to inspire them with dread of the Israelites, and of the God whom they served. To strengthen this impression, Joshua resolved to treat the five kings, who were held captive in a cave at Makkedah wherein they had sought refuge, with a kind of solemn severity, in accordance with the war usages of that and much later times, but adverse to the more humane spirit which Christianity has in our own days introduced even into warfare—which is at the best a very horrid and painful thing. The kings were brought out, and after the chief men among the Israelites had set their feet upon their necks—a well-known sign of military triumph—they were put to death, and their bodies hanged upon trees until the evening. Josh. x. 21—27.

This signal victory over the confederacy headed by the king of Jerusalem, did not, however, put that city into the possession of

the Israelites. The chief towns of the defeated allies had to be taken separately, in subsequent operations, which are described in the sequel of Josh. x. ; and it is remarkable that the name of Jerusalem does not occur in the account of these proceedings. When the subjugation of several places of inferior note in that quarter of the land is so particularly mentioned, including the towns of the allies of Adoni-zedec, this silence respecting Jerusalem can imply no less than that it did not fall into the power of Joshua, and probably that not even any attempt to reduce it was made. What prevented it can only be matter of conjecture ; but it is not unlikely that the Hebrew soldiers had not sufficient faith to attempt the reduction of a place so strongly situated by nature, and, doubtless, well fortified by art. Indeed, it is not easy to say in what position the Israelites stood with respect to Jerusalem at even a later period, when southern Palestine had been for the most part brought under their sway. It is not even clear to which of the tribes it was allotted in the division of the land, which division included many places not brought under subjection at the time it was made. In one passage it is said, " As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of

Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah in Jerusalem unto this day," Josh. xv. 63. Precisely the same thing is said of the "children of Benjamin" in Judges i. 21. This may, at the first view, bear the appearance of a contradiction ; but the just and usual inference from it is, that Jerusalem, which certainly stood upon the border line between the two tribes, was either common to both of them, or lay partly in the one and partly in the other. The latter case is the more conceivable at a time when the natural hills which compose the site were more distinctly marked than in a later age, and were not so covered with buildings as to form one united town. As the possessions of Judah lay to the south, and those of Benjamin to the north of the site, the northern portion of it is that which must have belonged to the latter tribe. It could not therefore have been Mount Zion as is commonly supposed, for that was the southernmost portion of the site, and in any such division as is suggested could not but have belonged to Judah.

It must not be concealed that there are some difficulties arising out of this divided right of two tribes to the site of Jerusalem ; and it is

certainly possible, that it was purposely left open to both the tribes on whose borders it lay, or possibly it was allotted as the reward of the tribe by which it should be first subjugated. And this would have been just, and in accordance with the usual course of God's providence towards the chosen people. Among them, to conquer implied faith—faith to combat against any odds, in the confidence that the Lord of hosts would fight for them, and give them the victory. Therefore, that they were “not able” to drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem, was entirely owing to their own remissness and unbelief.

Now that we have come to this point—where we first distinctly recognise a city called JERUSALEM existing on this site, we will pause to make some inquiry respecting the remarkable name which it bore. It may, however, be doubted whether, in the portion of its history which has passed before us, the name of Jerusalem is not given to it by anticipation ; for it seems to have been called Jebus by the natives, who were Jebusites ; and it is on subsequent occasions called by this name. Josh. xv. 8 ; xviii. 28 ; Judg. xix. 10. It is, therefore, by no means clear that the name was not given to

the spot by the Israelites themselves, when they gained full possession of it in the time of David. But it is certainly possible that they may have given it this name before, while they dwelt in it jointly with the Jebusites: for the Israelites may be supposed to have had some just repugnance to describe themselves as the inhabitants of a town bearing the name of one of the unsubdued Canaanitish nations, and the different name by which they called the place would serve to distinguish them from the heathen inhabitants.

The word JERUSALEM would be more correctly written JERUSHALAIM, or more fully, as given in the original of some texts, JERUSHALAYIM. There is no question respecting the latter half of the word—as SHALEM, or SALEM, indubitably signifies “peace,” and nothing else; and it repeatedly occurs as a name, or in the composition of names in Scripture. But respecting the first half JERU, there is more difference of opinion. Some derive it from the Hebrew word JERUSH, which signifies “possession,” and thus make the whole name to signify “the possession of peace.” Others prefer to derive it from another Hebrew word JARAH, which signifies “founding” or “foundation,” that is, a house or

habitation, and thus find the compound name Jerusalem to denote "the mansion of peace," equivalent to "city of peace," which, in more modern times, has been one of the surnames of Baghdad. It has been ingeniously conjectured that this name may have been designed by the Hebrews as a slight alteration in form, but a great one in sense, of the name JEBUS-SHALEM, which would mean "treading down of peace;" a name sufficiently appropriate to the warlike and turbulent character of the Canaanitish inhabitants, but wholly unsuited to the city which God himself had chosen for his own. Professor Lee rather inclines to uphold this explanation. He says, "It is true we find no such compound as that here supposed; yet this new name (Jerusalem) looks so much like a compound of the two old ones,* that it seems very likely to have been chosen for the purpose of indicating the existence of them both, with the altered character which the city was ever after to sustain."

One more conjecture is, that which derives the first part of the name from the latter part of the name *Jehovah-jireh*, which Abraham gave to the place in which he designed to offer

* *Jebus* and *Salem*. He assumes that the tower was the Salem of Melchizedek; but this point, as will be seen, we cannot feel to be certainly established.

up Isaac, Gen. xxii. 8, 14. This is the Rabbinical opinion, and many Christian interpreters, of high authority, have given it their sanction. It is, however, partly built upon the notion that Jerusalem was both the Salem of Melchizedek, and the site of Abraham's sacrifice; and, as this notion does not appear to have been clearly established, we cannot with any confidence build upon the conclusion which has grown out of it. The Rabbins themselves, who believe Melchizedek to have been Shem, maintain that out of respect to him the name of Salem was retained; and that out of respect to Abraham, that of Jireh was prefixed thereto, forming together the name of JIREH-SALEM, softened into JERU-SALEM.

Among these different explanations, that appears to be etymologically the most sound which makes the name to signify the "habitation of peace;" but there does not seem any sufficient ground for stating how or where that name originated, or whether that name had, or had not, any reference, designed or undesigned, to its peculiar and sacred character. Seeing that all the Hebrew names are significant, and often beautifully and strikingly significant, without our being able, in more than a very

few cases, to determine in what way the signification was applicable to the places or the persons by whom the names were borne, there is nothing very remarkable in the fact, that Jerusalem had a significant name, nor can much satisfaction be expected in dealing with it as a peculiar case. Under whatever circumstances this name was originally imposed, it soon ceased to be appropriate ; for there have been few cities in the world which have been less the "habitation of peace" than Jerusalem. This will be seen from the history, to which we now return.

The next incident in the history of Jerusalem is afforded by the fact, that the Judahites, after their signal victory over the barbarous tyrant of Bezek, and the just punishment they inflicted upon him, brought him to Jerusalem, where he died. This circumstance takes the reader rather by surprise ; and the sacred historian, aware of this, explains that "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," Judg. i. 8. It is, however, perfectly clear from the subsequent history that this success was confined to such parts of the lower city as were not covered by fortifications, and that the strong-

hold of Zion resisted all the assault of the conquerors. This retention of the stronghold rendered the Jebusites still the real masters of Jerusalem ; and the recorded victory of Judah does not seem to have given it any permanent possession of even the lower city : and although some persons of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin appear to have lived there, the number of Hebrew residents could not have been numerous ; for when the Levite, travelling from Bethlehem to Mount Ephraim, came "over against Jebus, which is Jerusalem," his servant suggested that they should put up there for the night ; but he refused, saying, "We will not turn aside hither into the city of a stranger, that is not of the children of Israel ; we will pass over to Gibeah," Judg. xix. 12.

After this follows a long interval of about 350 years, during which the name of Jerusalem does not occur in the sacred books.

While David was king over the tribe of Judah only, he held his court at Hebron, which was in many respects well suited to be the metropolis of such a dominion. But when he became, after the death of Ishbosheth, the undisputed sovereign of the whole country, he saw that Hebron lay too far towards the southern

extremity of the kingdom to be a fit metropolis for his enlarged dominion. Still there were considerations, especially as connected with the rivalry between the great tribes of Judah and Ephraim, which would dictate to a king belonging to the former tribe, the expediency of placing the metropolis within or close upon its territories, and among the people from whom his dynasty would naturally expect to find the most devoted supporters. Had this consideration been over-looked, situations better suited than that actually chosen to become the metropolis of the whole kingdom might perhaps have been found. Samaria, for example, which eventually became the capital of the separate kingdom of Israel, is alleged by most travellers to be naturally a more eligible site for a general metropolis than Jerusalem — besides that it is more central, and therefore more equally open to all the tribes, who were constrained by the law to journey three times in the year to the place of the sanctuary. David overlooked this advantage in the more important one, to him, of establishing the seat of his empire in the quarter where his power was the strongest. The considerations which influenced him may be compared to those which induced the present

royal dynasty of Persia to neglect the great central cities which had formerly been the seats of government, and fix their residence in a comparatively remote and inconvenient situation at Teheran, for no other reason than that, in case of disturbance or rebellion, the king may fall back upon the resources and the certain attachment of his own tribe, whose territory is near and accessible.

Within the tribe of Judah there was certainly no place so suitable as Jerusalem ; which also lay as far north, towards the other tribes, as the king could go without quitting the territories of his own tribe.

There is, however, another and very important point of view in which this choice may be regarded. It has simply been stated that David, as king of all Israel, might have possibly found a better place for his metropolis than that which he selected. But it is evident, from the circumstances which afterwards arose, that no better site for the civil and ecclesiastical metropolis could possibly have been chosen. As David could not of himself have foreknown these circumstances, or have acted with reference to them, it appears highly probable that his choice was directed by some Divine intima-

tion, and it may very probably have been even then made known to him that this was the place which the Lord God had "chosen, to put his Name there," Deut. xii. 21; xvi. 11.

It is certain that David, at the very commencement of his more extended reign, resolved to make Jerusalem the capital of his empire. But Jerusalem, or at least the upper city, or strong-hold, was still in the possession of the Jebusites: and he had, therefore, first of all, to secure the place by the difficult task of their expulsion. The lower city seems to have occupied that portion of the hilly site which Josephus calls Acra, lying behind, or west of Mount Moriah, and below, or north of Mount Zion. This last was the highest of all the four hills which formed the site of the later Jerusalem, and on it stood the strong fortress which the Jebusites had so long retained against all the power of Judah and Benjamin, and which David now purposed to wrest from them.

This was no common enterprise. The Jebusites were so confident from long security, that, in derision of David's attempt, they exposed the blind and the lame on the walls, as if to intimate that such defenders sufficed to repel the attacks of the assailants. Exasperated at this

insult, and fully alive to the difficulty of the enterprise, David offered the chief command of the whole army to the warrior who should first cross the natural fosse surrounding the hill, and smite the Jebusites. The king's nephew Joab, a daring and able, but unscrupulous, man, had held the command of the army of David's first kingdom of Judah, but it had not yet been determined who was to have the command of the armies of united Israel. Joab might expect it; but, as he had lately given deep offence by the murder of Abner, he was by no means secure of this appointment: and it is very possible that David hoped, that the success of some other person in this feat, would afford him an excuse for withholding this high office from one whom he had already found reason to dislike and fear. But the stake was too important, for Joab not to be the foremost in the attempt to win it. He was the first to cross the fosse, the first to surmount the defences of Zion, and by that act became the hero of the siege, and secured the office of "chief and captain," which, except with one slight interruption, he held to the end of David's reign, 2 Sam. v. 6—8; and 1 Chron. xi. 4—8.

CHAPTER II

THE SITE—JERUSALEM IN THE TIME OF DAVID.

WE have now come to a point at which it is important that the reader should clearly understand the physical characteristics of the site of which David had gained possession, and which, from this time forward, became of the utmost importance in the history of the chosen people of God.

The part of Palestine which lies to the south of the plain of Esdraelon, is traversed through its whole extent by a broad mountain ridge, which may be found laid down with tolerable accuracy in most recent maps. This mountainous tract, or ridge, is nowhere less than from twenty to twenty-five miles broad, and it reaches in length from the plain of Esdraelon to a line drawn from the south end of the Dead Sea to the south-east corner of the Mediterranean—this ridge forms high and precipitous cliffs on the east, towards the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea; but

on the west it sinks down by an offset into a range of lower hills which lie between it and the great plain along the coast of the Mediterranean. The upper part of this ridge forms, in fact, a high, uneven table-land, the surface of which is everywhere rocky and mountainous, and is, moreover, cut up by valleys which run east or west towards the Jordan or the Mediterranean. The mountainous country formed by this ridge gradually rises as the traveller proceeds southward, and forms the tract anciently known as the mountains of Ephraim and of Judah. It reaches its highest point at Hebron, which is not less than 3000 feet above the level of the sea. More to the north than this, on a line drawn westward from the north end of the Dead Sea, the ridge is not more than 2500 feet above that level; and it is here, upon its very summit, that the city of Jerusalem stands, in the geographical position of $31^{\circ} 46' 43''$ north latitude, and $35^{\circ} 13'$ east longitude.

The site is an elevated promontory, or tongue of land, connected with the general table-land on the north-west, but on all other sides surrounded and isolated by valleys of various depth and breadth, beyond which rise hills, some of them considerably above the level of the

isolated platform on which the city stands, and which inclose it as in a basin. This platform is nearly three quarters of a mile across, from the brink of the eastern to that of the western valley, and its extreme length, as a promontory, may be reckoned at nearly a mile and a half; but as the site is not physically circumscribed on the north-west, it is difficult to fix the exact length; and building might, in fact, be extended almost indefinitely in that direction. In proceeding to indicate the more prominent characteristics of this site, it will be necessary, for the sake of distinctness, to use the names by which different parts of it were eventually known, without being sure that many of these names were known, and being sure that some of them could not have been known, in the time of David.

The site itself is uneven, being marked by swells or hills, which were anciently more distinguishable than at present, when, on occasions which will be hereafter described, the summit of at least one of the hills has been considerably levelled, and the separating valleys have been partly reduced or filled up, either by the accumulated rubbish of the many destructions which Jerusalem has undergone,

or with the intention of reducing the inequalities of the surface.

Of these swells or hills, the southernmost and highest was Mount Zion, on which was the citadel, or fortress, taken by David from the Jebusites, and which from that circumstance, and from the great improvements made thereon by this king, acquired also the name of "the city of David." Josephus calls it the Upper City, to distinguish it from the Lower City, in which the mass of the ordinary population resided. This lower city covered a separate and lower hill, called by Josephus, Acra, which was separated from that of Zion by a valley called, in Scripture, Millo, but by Josephus the Tyropæon. East of Acra, and north-east of Zion, was the Mount Moriah on which the Temple was eventually built. This was, in the time of David and long after, separated from Acra by a wide valley; but this valley was filled up by the Maccabæan princes, so that afterwards the two mounts were reckoned as one. A ridge, or southward prolongation of Mount Moriah, known by the name of Ophel, stretches down by the east side of Zion, from which it is separated by the lower part of the Tyropæon valley. There is another hill lying

to the north of Moriah, which is higher than Moriah, and perhaps as high as Zion. This was, during the whole period covered by Scripture history, beyond the limits of the city, but was, after the time of Christ, included within it.

The surface of the elevated promontory which forms the site of Jerusalem, besides being broken by these swells, has a general and somewhat steep slope or declination towards the east, terminating on the brink of the valley of Jehoshaphat. One interesting effect of this is, that, in the view of Jerusalem, from the Mount of Olives, on the opposite side of that valley, the whole city, in all its parts, lies fully and distinctly exposed to view.

The promontory which has thus been described as the proper site of Jerusalem, lies in the fork of two valleys, one called the valley of Jehoshaphat, and the other the valley of Gihon, the continuation of which is called the valley of Hinnom. The valley of Jehoshaphat bounds the site on the north and east. It is two miles long, and about a quarter of a mile broad in the widest part ; while, in the narrowest, it is merely a deep gully, the narrow bed of a orrent. That torrent is the Brook Kidron, whose channel

traverses the valley through its whole extent, but whose stream is dry during the greater part of the year. The valley of Gihon bounds the site on the south-west, and then, bending eastward, takes the name of Hinnom, and forms the southern boundary of the site under the Mount Zion, opposite the south-east corner of which it unites with the valley of Jehoshaphat. Both valleys are shallow at their commencement, but in their progress south become deep, narrow, and precipitous.

All around these valleys, rise hills higher than the inclosed promontory which forms the site of Jerusalem. On the east is the Mount of Olives; on the south, the Hill of Evil Counsel, so called, rising directly from the vale of Hinnom. On the west the ground rises gently, so that a traveller approaching in that direction—say, upon the road from Jaffa (Joppa)—obtains, at the distance of two miles, a fine view of the walls and domes of Jerusalem, with the Mount of Olives beyond. On the north, a bend of the ridge connected with the Mount of Olives bounds the prospect at a distance of above a mile. Towards the south-west, the view is somewhat more open; for here lies the plain of Rephaim, which

commences just at the southern brink of the valley of Hinnom, and stretching off north-west towards the Mediterranean. Even to the north-west, the prospect is somewhat open ; for the eye penetrates up along the upper part of the valley of Jehoshaphat, and from many points can discern the existing mosque of the place called Neby Samwil, (prophet Samuel,) which stands on a lofty ridge at a distance of about five miles. From this it will be seen that the site is not so entirely shut up by surrounding hills, as more general statements have led most persons to conceive. Yet these inclosing hills do give a marked and even peculiar character to the site, which did not escape the notice of the sacred writers, and which supplies a beautiful and consoling simile to the psalmist :—"As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so is the Lord round about his people," Psalm cxxv. 2.

The country around Jerusalem is all of limestone formation, and not particularly fertile. The rocks everywhere come out above the surface, which, in many parts, is also thickly strewn with loose stone ; and the general aspect of the whole region is barren and dreary. Yet the olive thrives in it abundantly, and fields of

grain are seen in the valleys and level places, although they are considerably less productive than in the neighbourhood of Hebron and Shechem. Neither vineyards nor fig-trees flourish on the high ground about the city, although the latter are found in the gardens below Siloam, and are very common a few miles south in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem.

The climate of the elevated tract in which Jerusalem is situated, differs from that of the temperate parts of Europe, more in the alternation of wet and dry seasons, than in the degree of temperature. The variations of rain and sunshine, which in the west exist throughout the whole year, are here, as in the rest of Palestine, confined chiefly to the latter part of autumn and the winter. The rains come mostly from the west or south-west, (that is, from the Mediterranean Sea,) whence our Lord, when at Jerusalem, said, "When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh rain ; and so it is," Luke xii. 54. Snow often falls at Jerusalem in January and February, to the depth of a foot, or more, but it seldom lies long upon the ground. The ground never freezes, but the standing pools in the valley of Hinnom are sometimes covered with a thin film of ice.

Returning now to the history, we find that David was no sooner in possession of Jerusalem, than he proceeded to make great improvements in it, to adapt it to its new destination as the capital of an important kingdom. Gratified with his new conquest of the fortress on Mount Zion, and after the practice of which there is an example in 2 Sam. xii. 28, he called it after his own name, "the city of David," 2 Sam. v. 7, 9. This denomination, however, though sometimes used in Scripture, and which seems to be applied by Josephus to the whole of Jerusalem, (*Antiq.* vii. 3, 2,) did not supersede the former and more proper designation, as, in fact, such complimentary appellations never do in the east. They exist for a time among great persons and official people; but the old name is retained among the great body of the people, and in the course of ages is the only one that remains permanently connected with the place.

David, however, had more ground for imposing his name upon the place than the right of conquest gave. His improvements were so important and extensive, that Josephus considers it as amounting to a "rebuilding" of Jerusalem; and if we accept his reasonable interpretation of 1 Chron. xi. 7, 8, it would appear that he

not only rebuilt the citadel upon Mount Zion, and erected thereon, by the assistance of Hiram king of Tyre, a palace for his own residence ; but, by enlarging the lower city, and inclosing the whole within one continuous wall, he made the whole one united city, instead of two cities, as they seem to have been hitherto considered. In 1 Chron. xi. 8, it is added, according to our version, "And Joab repaired the rest of the city." It is not very clear in what capacity this duty could have devolved upon, or have been undertaken by Joab, whereas there is a perfect propriety in his having been made "governor of the city," which his valour had been so highly instrumental in bringing under the power of David ; and this is the interpretation which is given to the clause by Josephus and the Targum, and which Kennicott and others believe to be the correct rendering of the text.

In making himself master of Jerusalem, David demonstrated that the city was not impregnable—the belief of which had no doubt much contributed to its previous safety : and as he had taken it from the Jebusites, his more powerful enemies did not see why they need despair of taking it from him. The Philistines—those

valiant and inveterate enemies of the Israelites—were those who resolved to make the attempt, and they therefore appeared in great force in the plain of Rephaim, to the south of the city. It was not the inclination of David to await their attack; and finding his own wish sanctioned by the Divine approval, he left the city on the opposite quarter, and, by making a circuit, fell upon the camp of the Philistines by surprise, and defeated them with great slaughter, 2 Sam. v. 17—25. It was to his attention to such intimations of the Divine will, and to his implicit reliance upon the strength of the Almighty arm, that David owed all his successes and all his greatness; and in all Israel there was no man so deeply sensible of this fact as himself. It was this that in his official capacity, as king of the chosen people, made him more entirely “the man after God’s own heart,” than any monarch that ever reigned over them.

David being now thoroughly settled in his new capital, conceived the intention of removing the ark of the covenant, which, since its restoration by the Philistines, had remained fifty years on the premises of Abinadab, at Kirjath-jearim. This has been construed into an intention to constitute Jerusalem the ecclesiastical as

well as the civil metropolis of the kingdom ; but the ecclesiastical establishment under the law of Moses centred around the altar at which sacrifices were offered, not around the ark ; and the altar and tabernacle were still at Gibeon, where the priests performed their sacred ministrations. If, therefore, this had been his intention, he would have rather chosen to remove the tabernacle and altar to Jerusalem, and then have brought the ark and set it in the tabernacle. This he did not ; probably because he did not as yet know that Jerusalem was the spot that the Lord "would choose to set his name there." Still the ark was a sacred and venerable object, the symbol of the holiest mysteries of the Jewish religion, and David probably felt that it was becoming and proper that it should be placed with all honour in his new capital instead of resting in obscurity in the house of a private person. That he did not rather restore it to its proper place in the old tabernacle at Gibeon, before which the altar stood, may seem to indicate that he did not consider that to be the destined resting-place of those holy things, though he may not as yet have known that Jerusalem was that destined place. Great were the preparations made

for the removal of the ark with all due solemnity to Jerusalem, where David had prepared a new and probably magnificent tent or tabernacle for its reception. Messengers were despatched throughout the land, to summon the priests and Levites, and to invite as many of the people as were disposed, to attend this great ceremony. On the appointed day, David and his court, with a large body of priests and Levites, and a great multitude of people, assembled to escort the ark, with rejoicing music, and triumphant songs, to Jerusalem. But the grievous judgment upon Uzzah, for putting forth his hand to stay the ark when it was shaken by the oxen, brought all this gladness to a sudden close, and caused the king to abandon his object, and return dispirited to Jerusalem, 2 Sam. vi. 1—10.

Three weeks after, however, David having heard that the blessing of the Lord had fallen abundantly upon the house of Obed-edom, in whose charge the ark had meanwhile been left, was encouraged to complete his former design. The judgment upon Uzzah had directed attention to the proper course of proceeding; and now the ark, instead of being, as before, conveyed on a cart drawn by oxen, was borne on

the shoulders of the Levites, as the law required, (Exod. xxv. 14,) and the whole proceedings were placed under the direction of Chenaniah, the chief of the Levites, who was found to be best acquainted with the proper observances, 1 Sam. vi. 11—23 ; 1 Chron. xv. Under these more careful arrangements, the ark was brought safely to Jerusalem, with such rejoicings as Israel had seldom seen, and was deposited in the tent which David had provided for it. Here an orderly and regular attendance upon it was instituted by the king ; but the usual services of religion were still performed at Gibeon, where the old tabernacle and the altar remained, and which was still, therefore, the place of concourse to the nation at the great festivals.

It was five years after this, when God had given David rest from all his enemies, and when he had finished and taken up his abode in his own "house of cedar," that the thought occurred to him, how unbecoming it was, that, while he was thus splendidly accommodated, and had a settled and magnificent home, the ark of God still remained within the curtains of a movable tent, and the whole establishment retained the characteristics of the migratory

circumstances in which it had originated. He mentioned this thought to his friend the prophet Nathan, who, consulting only the impulse of his natural judgment, highly approved the design of building a temple in honour of Jehovah, which the king's expressions indicated. But he was afterwards instructed to inform David, that this undertaking was less appropriate for him, who had been a warrior from his youth, and had shed much blood, than for his son, who should enjoy in prosperity and peace the rewards of his father's victories. The design itself was, however, highly approved, as a token of proper feelings towards the Divine King, 2 Sam. viii. 1—12; 1 Chron. xvii. 1—14; xxviii.

From that time forward, it was the care of David to collect materials, and to make all suitable arrangements for the great work his son was to execute; and so great and various, so extensive and yet so minute, were these preparations—including even the plan of the building, and a new arrangement for the becoming performance of the sacred services in it when completed, that to David must be allowed a large, if not the principal share of the honour due for the erection of that glorious temple which bears the name of Solomon.

CHAPTER III.

THE TEMPLE OF SOLOMON.

It does not appear that David knew, until the last year of his life, the precise site which this temple was to occupy. In that unhappy year, when his sin in numbering the people brought down the Divine judgments upon them, he was directed to build an altar, and offer sacrifices in the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, which then occupied the summit of Mount Moriah. The king accordingly bought the threshing-floor from Araunah (who would willingly have given it free of cost) for fifty shekels of silver. He then hastened to set up an altar, and to offer burnt-offerings and peace-offerings thereon, and called upon the name of the Lord. No sooner was this done, than the destroying angel sheathed his sword, and the plague was stayed. As this was the first command to build an altar for sacrifice which had been given since the delivery of the law, which

made the altar at the tabernacle the sole altar for sacrifices in Israel, and as the site was indicated with so much precision, and the offerings so signally accepted, the spot seemed so highly honoured and sanctified, as to point it out for the site of the future temple. Thus, when the temple came to be built by Solomon, the site is described as the place "at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord had appeared unto David his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing-floor of Ornan (or Araunah) the Jebusite," 2 Chron. iii. 1. In the countries of the south and east, the site of the threshing-floors is selected on the same principles which might guide us in the selection of the site of windmills. We find them usually on the tops of hills, on all sides exposed to the winds, which are required to separate the chaff from the grain. But the summit of Moriah, though large enough for the purpose of a threshing-floor, had no level sufficient for the plans of Solomon. According to the very probable statements of Josephus, (Bell. Jud. v. 5,) the foundations of the temple were laid on a steep eminence, the summit of which did not at first afford a sufficient level for the temple and its

courts. As it was surrounded by precipices, it was found necessary to build up strong walls and buttresses, in order that the required surface might be gained by filling up the interval with earth. The hill was also fortified by a three-fold wall, the lowest tier of which was in some places more than 300 cubits high. The dimensions of the stones of which these walls—or more probably the lower part of them—consisted, were, as the occasion required, very great. The “great stones” needed for this purpose are mentioned in 1 Kings v. 17; and Josephus says that some of them were as much as forty cubits long. This is probably an exaggeration, although stones not less than sixty-four feet in length occur among those which form the terrace of the great temple of the sun at Baalbec; and it should be added, that parts of the walls or fortifications, which Josephus had in view, and on which he seems to have founded his statement, may have been, and probably were, added at a period considerably after the erection of Solomon’s temple. At all events, there still exist sufficient traces of these inclosing walls to corroborate the statement which has been given. The nature of the soil rendered it necessary that the foundations of the building

should in parts be laid at a very great depth. Unless we take into account the vast expense and labour thus employed in preparing the site and the substructions, we shall form but an inadequate notion of the greatness of the undertaking.

The site having been properly prepared, and all the preliminary arrangements completed, the foundation of the temple was laid in the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, in the month Siv, being the third month of the year 1012 before Christ, 480 years after the departure from Egypt ; and it took seven years and a half in building, being completed in the month Bul, the eighth month of the eleventh year of Solomon's reign.

The Israelites had hitherto no opportunity or occasion to become proficient in architecture, or in the arts connected with it ; and we do not, till the reign of David, read of any public buildings or monuments being erected in their territories. For this there are many reasons ; but it may suffice to indicate the chief of them, which are—their previously unsettled political condition, the absence of a great central metropolis, such as was now obtained in Jerusalem ; the possession of the buildings erected by the

inhabitants of the land, which, for many generations, sufficed for the new possessors ; the simple, unostentatious habits of even the great men in Israel ; and, more than all, the want of all those objects for which imposing structures are usually called into existence : temples they could not erect, because there was but one place of public worship and sacrifice allowed by the law ; and palaces they did not need, because they had no king or central government. It is, therefore, no matter of surprise that both David and Solomon were under the necessity of seeking the aid of Phœnician artificers in building their palaces ; and that the latter king was obliged to draw from Tyre nearly all the skilled labour which the works of the temple required. There was at this time, and long after, a very good understanding, cemented by the mutual advantages of the connexion, between the monarchs of Israel and Tyre. It had been begun by David, whose munificent character and warlike prowess seem to have quite won the heart of Hiram, king of Tyre. That the feeling between them amounted to something more than the usually formal amity of kings, is testified by the phrase that Hiram had been “ ever a lover of David ;” and in answer to Solomon’s application

for assistance, willingly undertook to render to the son the same friendship and aid which he had before, in lesser undertakings, afforded to the father. The groundwork of this alliance rested on the circumstance that the Phœnicians, being confined to a narrow strip of territory, and being exclusively addicted to commerce and manufactures, found it exceedingly convenient to draw such products of the soil as they needed for use or exportation, from the Hebrew territories : while the Israelites found it nearly an equal advantage to obtain, in exchange, timber, stone, manufactured goods, and the various products of foreign lands, of which the Phœnicians had become the factors, and of which Tyre was the emporium. In accordance with this explanation, we find that Solomon undertook to pay in corn, wine, and oil, the staple products of his kingdom, for the essential assistance in workmen and materials which king Hiram agreed to furnish, 1 Kings v. It is, however, worthy of note, that, after this, the Israelites never needed the assistance of Phœnician workmen in their public buildings, even when they did obtain from them materials, chiefly timber, from Lebanon : and this seems to show that they profited well by the instruction in the architectural arts

which they received from the Phœnicians during the reigns of David and Solomon.

The temple and its utensils are fully described in 1 Kings vi. and vii. and 2 Chron. iii. and iv. ; and it is desirable that the reader who wishes to understand the matter thoroughly, should peruse these chapters with attention. These descriptions enable us to realise a tolerably clear idea of many important details of this glorious structure ; but they do not suffice to afford us a distinct notion of the architectural elevation of the principal buildings. If any proof of this fact were wanting, it would be found in the circumstance that almost every scholar or architect who has attempted to make a design of the fabric, from the descriptions which exist in the Scripture and in Josephus, has furnished something very different from what has been produced by others making the same attempt.

It is necessary, in the first place, to realise the leading use and idea of the building, which made this and other ancient temples entirely different from European churches and cathedrals. These are intended for the reception of the worshippers, and are, therefore, necessarily spacious ; but the temple at Jerusalem was never

intended to be entered by the worshippers. They stood in the open air, in the courts before the temple, which itself consisted of two chambers, the centre of which (called the Holy Place) was entered by the officiating ministers alone, only twice a day, to attend to the lamps and to offer incense, while the inner chamber (called the Holy of Holies, that is, the Most Holy,) was entered only once in the year by the high-priest, upon the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of sacrifice upon the ark of the covenant, a type of the offering of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ once for all. The temple, therefore, was simply the house, or palace, in which the Most High dwelt, as it were, among his people ; his presence among them, in that house, being represented by that visible resplendence called "the glory of the Lord," or the Shekinah, which rested in the Holy of Holies, above the wings of the golden cherubim which hovered over the ark. This being its destination, and its sole destination, it was not necessary or desirable that its dimensions should be vast and imposing ; but the feeling which found no proper vent in this manifestation, was shown in lavishing vast wealth, the most costly materials, and the

highest resources of the arts, upon a structure of comparatively small dimensions. Bearing these two facts in mind, the special use of the building, and its limited extent, how striking appears the exclamation of Solomon himself with reference to it, in the noble prayer which he uttered at its dedication !—"But will God indeed dwell on the earth ? Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee ; how much less this house that I have builded !" 1 Kings viii. 27.

Our idea of the temple must be, however, by no means limited to this small building, but must embrace the whole site, as the word "temple" usually does in Scripture, with the immense outer walls, the noble gates, the courts, and the shady colonnades, store-chambers, and vestries, by which these courts were surrounded. These, taken altogether, gave the reality as well as the appearance of vastness ; and the house of God itself appeared beautifully in the midst, not seemingly diminutive, but as the cynosure, the crowning glory, of the whole ; like a costly gem in a broad setting of gold.

This sanctuary was sixty cubits long, twenty wide, and thirty high, which are dimensions

comparable only to those of our smallest churches and chapels. It is, however, impossible to overlook the statement of Josephus, who gives the same breadth and length as the Scripture, but makes the height sixty cubits; and not only so, but adds, that "over this was another stage of equal dimensions," so that the height of the whole structure was 120 cubits. It is impossible to receive this in the literal sense which the words seem to convey, and that because it does not agree in that sense with Scripture, and because a building of such proportions would be an architectural monstrosity. It may, therefore, be conceived that he means to say that there was a part as elevated above the top of the building as that was above the foundations; and this could only be true of the porch rising up into a kind of a tower or steeple—an interpretation which is corroborated by 2 Chron. iii. 4, which assigns this same height of 120 cubits to the porch. This has the sanction of a received interpretation; for it is well known to ecclesiastical antiquaries, that the general arrangements of churches have been framed, as far as difference of use allowed, with express reference to, and in imitation of, the distribution of parts in Solomon's temple; and the

towers and steeples, and other such like elevations, mostly over the porch, are understood to be involved in this imitation. It is a more important question, how Josephus gets at the general height of sixty cubits, when in 1 Kings vi. 2, it is expressly stated as thirty cubits. The statement respecting the porch, corroborated as it is in Chronicles, makes it more probable and proper that the height should be sixty than thirty cubits; and the statements may be reconciled by supposing that Josephus indicates the whole external height, including the basement and the roof, whereas the writer in Kings, speaks of the internal height from the floor to the ceiling. Some have thought that the difference may have arisen from the existence of an upper story, which may have consisted of rooms for the accommodation of the priests, such as vestries and treasuries. But those who give this explanation do not consider that it was needless to encumber the holy house with such adjuncts, for which there was abundant room in places more suitable and convenient, and that it would be revolting to all oriental and to all Jewish ideas, that any persons—even priests—should tread over-head of a place devoted to most holy services.

The interior of the sacred edifice was, as already intimated, divided into two apartments. The inside dimensions of the outer chamber, called the Holy, was forty cubits long, twenty cubits wide, and thirty cubits high. This chamber was separated from the inner, called the Holy of Holies, by a partition, a large opening in which was, after the manner of the east, closed by a suspended curtain. This Holy of Holies was at the western extremity of the building, and its internal dimensions formed a cube of twenty cubits. At the east end of the building was the porch, at the entrance of which stood the two pillars called Jachin and Boaz, which were twenty-three cubits in height. The sacred building was surrounded by three stories of chambers, each of which was five cubits high, making together fifteen cubits; so that what appeared above, of the walls of the main building, afforded ample space for its windows.

The lowest story of the chambers was five cubits, the middle six cubits, and the highest seven cubits wide. This difference of width arose from the circumstance that the walls of the holy house were so thick, that they were made to recede one cubit, so that the successive

shelvings in the wall of the temple afforded a firm support to the beams of the several stories, without the necessity of inserting their ends into the very substance of the wall, which might not have been considered reverent. These observations will be found to render more intelligible the particulars given in 1 Kings vi. 5, 6; and it will be seen from this that, assuming the elevation of the porch as already described, this, with the stories of chambers on each side, rising to half the height of the main building, must have given the structure a general resemblance, in the external view, to a church with a nave and two side aisles, and with a tower or steeple rising in front. This analogy was indeed intended in the original construction of churches. But it will be observed that the parts (stories of chambers) which answered to the aisles of a church, had in the temple no connexion whatever with the interior of the building.

The windows in the wall of the main building, above the uppermost stories of the side chambers, were doubtless of the curious lattice work, still used in the east, even where glass is known, as more favourable than glass to the coolness and ventilation which a warm climate

demands. It is probable that the windows of the temple were, for these purposes, rather than for light; for the outer chamber of the temple was lighted by the lamps of the golden candlestick, and it is generally understood that the inner temple was strictly an *adytum*, having no windows. It was to this circumstance that Solomon alludes: "The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness," 1 Kings viii. 12.

The substantial fabric of the temple "was built of stone, made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building," 1 Kings vi. 7. The object of this was doubtless to lessen the expense and labour of transporting the stone from the quarries; but the effect was remarkable:—

"No workman steel, no pond'rous axes rung;
Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung."

The structure was, however, wainscoted with cedar wood, which was covered with thin plates of solid gold. The boards within the temple were ornamented with beautiful carvings, representing cherubim, palm-trees, and flowers; and being covered with the precious metal, must have had a truly rich effect. The ceiling of

the temple was supported by beams of cedar, and was wholly covered with gold. The partition which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies, consisted probably not of stone, but of beams and boards of cedar; and it would further appear that the panels consisted of a kind of reticulated work; so that the incense which was daily offered in the outer chamber, might diffuse itself freely into the inner sanctuary, see 1 Kings vi. 21.

The floor of the temple was throughout of cedar, but boarded over with fir. 1 Kings vi. 15. The doors of the Holy of Holies were of olive wood; but the door of the outer chamber had posts of olive wood and valves of fir. Both these doors had folding leaves, which, however, seem to have been usually kept open, the apertures being closed by a suspended curtain. This contrivance is still observed, not only in the mosques and Christian churches of the east, but in the churches of southern Europe, where the doors usually stand open, but the doorways can only be passed by moving aside a heavy curtain. A similar contrivance may be noticed at the law courts in Westminster Hall. The opening for the door of the most holy place appears to have been equal to one-fifth of the

whole area of the partition; and that of the whole temple to one-fourth of the breadth of wall in which it was placed. We may thus understand 1 Kings vi. 31—35, from which we also learn that the door was covered with carved work, overlaid with gold.

In the most holy place, stood the ark only : but in the centre were ten golden candlesticks, the altar of incense, and the table of shew-bread.

The temple area was divided into two courts. The inner court, called also the court of the priest, and by Jeremiah the upper court, was that in which stood the temple, and in which the priests officiated. The inclosure of this appears to have been formed of cedar beams, resting on a foundation of stone, 1 Kings vi. 36 ; and is described by Josephus as being three cubits high. The outer court was called also the great court, 2 Chron. iv. 9, and “the court of the Lord’s house,” Jer. xix. 14, xxvi. 2. Both these courts were surrounded by spacious buildings and offices, some of which, however, appear to have been added at a period later than that of Solomon. Notices of some additions occur in 2 Kings xv. 35 ; Jer. xxvi. 10 ; xxxvi. 10 ; and compare Josephus’s “Wars of

the Jews," v. 5. 1. The outer court was that in which the congregation assembled, and the inner court that in which the priests and Levites officiated. They were separated not by any wall or partition, but by some steps, probably not more than three; so that all the ritual service performed in the court of the priest was open to the view of those who stood in the great outer court. It seems that the sacred building did not occupy the centre of the inner court, but stood near up towards its western end; and the area in front of it, (that is, of the inner court,) contained the great altar of burnt offerings, the brazen sea, supported upon twelve oxen, and the ten brazen lavers.

The temple being finished, was opened for Divine service by a solemn act of dedication, in which Solomon himself took the leading part. The priests removed the ark from its temporary abode to its place in the new temple; and at that instant "the glory of the Lord" filled the place. This drew from the king, who sat high above the rest upon a brazen platform, three cubits high, in the interior court, the words:—
"The Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness. I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to

abide in for ever." He then turned towards the people, and briefly recapitulated the circumstances in which the building had originated, and under which it had been brought to a completion. Then, after a solemn pause, he knelt down, and spreading forth his hands towards heaven, uttered the noble prayer which is contained in 1 Kings viii. 23—61, and 2 Chron. vi. 13—42. The king had no sooner concluded his prayer, than fire descended from heaven, and consumed the sacrifices which were laid out upon the altar, and "the glory of the Lord filled the house." At this signal of the Divine acceptance, and that the Lord had, as it were, taken possession of the house and the altar consecrated to him, all the people "bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord, saying, For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever," 2 Chron. vii. 1—3.

This was a great day in Jerusalem. The feast of the dedication was kept up for an entire week; and was followed by the feast of tabernacles, which lasted another week, so that high festivity was maintained for a fortnight together, during which the people were in part,

if not wholly, feasted upon the flesh of the sacrifices which were provided by the king, to the enormous extent of twenty-two thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep. At the end of this time, Solomon formally "sent the people away into their tents, glad and merry in heart for the goodness that the Lord had showed unto David, and to Solomon, and to Israel his people."

CHAPTER IV.

JERUSALEM IN THE TIME OF SOLOMON.

HAVING brought his work to a successful close, Solomon, who seems to have had a great taste for building, proceeded with other undertakings suited to his ample resources, and to the magnificence of his character. The principal of these was the palace, which afterwards became the royal residence of the kings of Judah, and which, on that account, has a sort of historical interest connected with it, which renders one naturally desirous to form as distinct an idea of it as it is now possible to realise. In matters of this kind—matters of description—we cannot dispense with the assistance of Josephus; for although his original materials were no other than such as we still possess in the sacred Scripture, he had means of understanding the details of the inspired accounts which we do not in the same degree possess; and his descriptions of buildings and such matters, may

therefore be taken to convey a tolerably faithful paraphrase or explanation of the inspired accounts. With respect to this palace, however, his description is still so indistinct, that it requires some knowledge of the arrangements of eastern buildings to apprehend his full meaning. He very properly directs attention to the fact, that although Solomon was able to get the temple finished in seven years, it took him thirteen years to complete his own palace, although a far inferior work, and involving far less cost. This he ascribes to his wanting, in this case, the zeal which had urged him to bring all the resources of his kingdom to bear upon the more holy undertaking, as well as to the want of that vast preparation of funds and materials by his father, which had enabled the works of the temple so rapidly to advance.

This palace was a large and remarkable building, supported by many pillars of cedar; whence it seems to have obtained the name of "the house of the forest of Lebanon," either because the multitudinous pillars suggested the idea of a forest, or because the produce of a forest in Lebanon had, as it were, been required to furnish the timber it contained. Some think that "the house of the forest of

Lebanon," and Solomon's royal palace, were different buildings ; but we are unable to discover any satisfactory grounds for this opinion. It was designed not merely for a residence, but as a place where public business might be commodiously transacted, and, in particular, the administration of justice, which engaged no small portion of the time and attention of the Hebrew kings. The main building was, therefore, sufficiently spacious to contain the great numbers of people who came together to hear their causes determined. It was a hundred cubits long, fifty broad, and thirty high, supported by quadrangular pillars of cedar. The walls were of polished stones; and the fabric rose in three stories, each with rows of windows symmetrically arranged. It seems that the palace built for the principal wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, was not a separate building, as some readers of the scriptural account apprehend, but, as a knowledge of the arrangements in eastern palaces would lead one to expect, an interior pile of building, complete in itself, but adjoining to and connected with the king's palace. In fact, these descriptions can never be understood, unless we realise the true idea of an oriental

palace, which is that of a number of open courts one within another, each surrounded on two or more sides with buildings, and all inclosed within an outer wall, and together forming the royal court. The outermost quadrangle contains the public apartments, in which alone the king is seen by his subjects, and where he holds his courts, gives audiences, and administers justice. The interior courts beyond this contain the actual residence of the king and of his wives and concubines—forming what is now called the harem. It is difficult to point out any analogy to this arrangement in our own country ; Hampton Court, and other old palaces, supply some indications of a similar arrangement. But the difference is still very great, the several courts being more spacious, and the buildings they contain more independent of each other than is usually seen in such palaces.

In these oriental palaces, the public buildings—including the hall of audience and of justice—are always in the outer court. There is, indeed, a feeling that, to insure easiness of access for suitors to the royal presence, the court of justice should be held at, or as near as possible to, the gate. In common cases, and

in the provinces, justice was administered at the gates of towns; but in the metropolis—at least in those matters that came before the king—causes were heard by him at or near the gate of the palace. Hence we read of Solomon's "porch of judgment," which was not, as some have supposed, a separate building, but the front part of the palace. It reminds one of "the gate of judgment" in the Moorish palace, the Alhambra, at Granada in Spain. This palace, indeed, taken on the whole, supplies more materials in illustration of, and for comparison with, Solomon's buildings than any other edifice in Europe—and quite as much so as any in Asia. Besides these buildings, Solomon extended the town wall, so as to include the hill now occupied by the temple, within the circuit of the city, which he further strengthened and adorned; and because the hill of Zion, on which the palace stood, was separated from "the mountain of the house" by a valley of considerable depth, he facilitated the approach to the latter by a causeway, the traces of which remain to this day. This causeway was a work of so much magnificence, or of such excellent art, that it is mentioned among the works of Solomon which attracted the particular admira-

tion of the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings x. 5. It is also said that this king "built Millo," 1 Kings ix. 15. What this Millo was, has perplexed inquiry. It owed not its foundation to Solomon, but was rebuilt or restored by him; for we read of it before, immediately after the taking of the fortress by David, who is said to have "built round about from Millo and inward." 2 Sam. v. 9; 1 Chron. xi. 8. The word signifies "fulness;" and is most generally supposed to denote a mound or rampart, so called as being filled in with stones and earth; although others make it, on the contrary, a trench filled with water. Being an important and distinguished feature of a fortress, it came in popular language to signify the fortress itself, as in Judges ix. 6; where "the house of Millo" plainly denotes the *acra*, or citadel, of Shechem. In Jerusalem, it probably denoted, in the most limited sense, that particular part of the citadel called the ramparts, or mound inside the wall. Those who have lived in fortified towns will know how usual it is, even now, and in this country, to use the term "ramparts" as equivalent with "citadel"—a part for the whole, in such phrases—"I am going to the ramparts," "I have been upon the ramparts," etc. Those writers who

attempt to combine a number of the different interpretations by reference to a number of circumstances which existed together at Jerusalem, forget that the name Millo was used also in Shechem, where the same combination of circumstances did not exist.

Jerusalem was at the height of its glory and greatness during the reign of Solomon. In the time of his father, it had been the metropolis of the whole nation, but not also the religious metropolis—the seat of the Divine King—and, as such, the place to which the whole people resorted three times in every year. In the time of Solomon, it was both. After him it was neither. In his time, it not only enjoyed these distinctions, but was the seat of a really powerful and wealthy kingdom ; and into it flowed the wealth which arose from the commercial and other enterprises of the king, whose wisdom and magnificence attracted the attention of foreign potentates, who in their own persons, or by their ambassadors, journeyed from far to pay their respects to so renowned a king, as well as to hear the outpourings of his wisdom, and to behold his curious and magnificent works. These left behind them costly gifts, and the products of distant lands ; and the

succession of such visits of great monarchs with their suites, filled the streets of Jerusalem with foreigners, in their various and fantastic garbs ; and gave unusual life and animation to the secluded city. These visits of foreigners, were to the Israelites a mark of aggrandizement and importance of which they were profoundly sensible ; for in the subsequent writings of their poets and prophets, such resorts of foreigners to the holy city is indicated with emphasis, as marking the consequence which it once possessed, and which it might yet recover. These strangers, on their return to their homes, spread far and wide the renown of Jerusalem.

All this glory was not without its dangers. It was the destiny of the Israelites to be a people separate among the nations, and there was no evil which their great legislator had more anxiously endeavoured to prevent than their intercourse with strangers, and the establishment of common interests with them. But there was hardly one of the inspired directions which Moses had enforced—especially as regards the conduct of the king, which Solomon had not neglected. How this happened—how he allowed himself to act contrarily to what he must have known to be the will of God declared

through Moses, we have no means of knowing ; but it seems to us likely that it arose from the pride of superior intellect, which led him to fancy that the restraints which the law imposed were framed for common minds, but not for such as he—who, with his high wisdom and singular gifts, might venture to suppose himself fortified against the dangers which had been thought likely to arise from the practices forbidden. But even the wisest of men, when he leaned upon his own understanding, leaned upon a broken reed. That superstructure of high and illustrious character, which he rested upon the sandy foundations of self-confidence, fell—and the fall thereof was great. His free intercourse with strangers brought to his knowledge many men of high intellect and congenial attainments ; and respect for their understanding bred a sort of easy tolerance of the religious errors which such minds could entertain.

There must be something, after all—he seems to have thought—not so awfully bad, not so utterly unreasonable in practices and opinions to which such men had submitted their understandings, and which they, with their keen intellects, believed to be right. Then again,

Solomon had, contrary to the law, "multiplied wives unto himself," and among these wives were many foreigners, some of them princesses, whom he felt disposed to treat with consideration and respect. Intercourse with them confirmed these impressions, and produced all the dangers which the prophet had foreseen. He became increasingly familiar with and tolerant of errors, which seem to have been insensibly fused down in the alembic of his own subtle mind, into something "not so very bad," not so very intolerable, when rightly understood. So from one thing to another, he was led to aim a blow against the first principle of the Hebrew polity and religion, by tolerating the open practice of idolatry at Jerusalem, and even went so far as to build temples for the gods worshipped by his wives, upon the hills facing Jerusalem in the east, for he did not venture to set up these unlawful establishments within the holy city itself. The southernmost of the three summits of the Mount of Olives bears to this day the name of the Mount of Offence, from being supposed the site of this idolatrous worship.

For these things, the wrath of God fell upon the house of David. The latter days of Solomon were troubled; and at his death the

dominion over ten of the tribes was rent from his misguided son Rehoboam; and Jerusalem at once sank from being the capital of the whole nation, to the metropolis of the petty kingdom of Judah, comprising only the territory of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. Still it had the temple, and might still have retained the dignity of the ecclesiastical metropolis, in which the descendants of Abraham were bound to render service to their Divine King. But Jeroboam, the new king of the ten tribes, henceforth distinguished as the kingdom of Israel, apprehended great danger to the continuance of his power if his subjects were permitted to repair three times in the year, with their dues and offerings, to the metropolis of the rival kingdom; and therefore, with due worldly policy, he took such measures as he judged best calculated to prevent the healing of the breach which had been made, and to prevent the return of the ten tribes to their allegiance to the house of David. To this end, and under the ostensible pretext that Jerusalem was too distant for the resort of the distant tribes, he set up a new establishment in his own dominions, the seats of which were at Dan, in the north, and at Bethel in the south, whither the people

were required to repair, and bring tneir offering. At these places the worship was intended to be in honour of Jehovah, but was celebrated in a manner so corrupt, as to be a gross profanation and matter of offence. In the first place, the Lord was represented and worshipped under the ancient and familiar, but interdicted symbol of the golden calf ; and on finding that the priests and Levites generally refused to support his design or to assist in this worship, he appointed priests indiscriminately from the general body of the people, and assumed to himself the office of the high priesthood, the union of which with royalty, was common in other countries, of which he had witnessed an example in Egypt, where he had spent some years in exile during the latter years of Solomon's reign.

CHAPTER V.

JERUSALEM TO THE CAPTIVITY.

THE effect of Jeroboam's measures, so far as regarded Jerusalem, was, that the city lost the consequence which it had derived from being the actual centre of religion to all the tribes : but, on the other hand, the Levites, whose cities had lain in the territories of the ten tribes, repaired in large numbers to the southern kingdom, so that Judah and Jerusalem now possessed, as permanent residents, large numbers of those sacred persons, whose abode had previously been dispersed over the whole of Palestine. This was doubtless a great advantage, and must be counted among the circumstances which contributed to keep Judah more faithful to the Lord than the sister kingdom, and which preserved it longer from the terrible overthrow that eventually came upon them both.

Moreover, Jerusalem was still the greatest

city in the land, and the only one, so far as we can discover, which possessed any important public buildings. Vast wealth was also accumulated in it, not only in the shape of the precious metal lavished as a material of ornament in the temple, and in the palaces and armories of Solomon, but stored up in the treasuries of the palace and of the holy house, the possession of which gave an important advantage to the kings of Judah, and tended in no small degree to render their condition more equal to that of the kings of Israel than the difference in extent of territory might, at the first view, seem to intimate. The treasures of David and Solomon were indeed soon dissipated by, or taken from the hands of the kings of Judah; but other compensating circumstances arose in the course of time which contributed to maintain the balance of external power between the two kingdoms, and sometimes rendering the kingdom of the two tribes not only equal, but superior, to the kingdom of the ten.

It is important to notice, that after the time of Solomon, the kingdom of Judah was almost alternately ruled by good kings, "who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord," and by such as were idolatrous and evil disposed;

and the reign of the same king often varied in its character, and was by turns good or evil. The condition of the kingdom, and of Jerusalem in particular, was very much affected by these mutations. Under good kings, the city flourished ; and under bad kings, it suffered greatly. All the history of Jerusalem, after the separation of the kingdoms, is but an illustration of this great truth.

A very rich city in a weak state is an object of great temptation to neighbouring princes. There is thus little reason to doubt that the reputation of the enormous treasures stored up in Jerusalem, joined to the persuasion that the state must be too much weakened by the separation of the ten tribes to be any longer able to protect the capital, led to the invasion of the land and the capture of the city by Shishak, king of Egypt, in B.C. 973. It is true that this may have involved a design of succouring Jeroboam, with whom Shishak was on friendly terms, by weakening the house of David ; and it is possible that Jeroboam himself may have incited him to this measure ; but if so, the costly bribe which the treasures of Jerusalem offered, formed, no doubt, the particular inducement exhibited before the mind of the

Egyptian king. Having once secured this, he was satiated with spoil, and retired without attempting to retain the kingdom under tribute or to reduce its strongholds. This spoil consisted of what he found in the treasuries of the temple and the palace, together with the shields of beaten gold which had been used by the royal guards on state occasions, and which, when not in need, formed the ornament and glory of the armoury in "the house of the forest of Lebanon." In the place of these, Rehoboam afterwards provided brazen shields; and the substitution of brass for gold formed no inapt emblem of the deterioration which the kingdom had undergone. 1 Kings xiv. 25—28; 2 Chron. xii. 2—10; comp. 1 Kings x. 17.

In the ensuing reign of Abijah nothing of peculiar moment to Jerusalem appears to have occurred; but we cannot forbear to direct attention to the just complacency with which the king, in his address to the Israelites before joining battle, dwells upon the decent and orderly service of Jehovah which was still kept up in his temple at Jerusalem, as contrasted with the disorderly practice of the ten tribes: "*We keep the charge of the Lord our God; but ye have forsaken him.*" 2 Chron. xiii. 8—11.

This king did not, however, take heed to correct the idolatrous practices, even in Jerusalem itself, which Rehoboam, after the example of his father, had tolerated ; and when, therefore, a more single-minded prince, Asa, son of Abijah, and grandson of Rehoboam, mounted the throne in 955 B.C., he found Jerusalem crowded with abominations, which he laboured diligently to expel and overthrow. This task he performed with a zeal which allowed no compromise with expediency or even with natural affection. His own mother, (or, as some suppose, his grandmother,) Maachah, who had encouraged idolatry by her example, was deposed from her high place, and her idol was destroyed and publicly burned by the brook Kidron. 1 Kings xv. 12, 13. A reign thus faithful in its commencement, was in its progress victorious and happy ; and in its tenth year, a glorious scene was witnessed at Jerusalem, when the pious king returned triumphant, and followed by vast spoil from his great victory over one of the mightiest hosts, led by Zerah the Ethiopian, by which the chosen land had ever been invaded. The prophet Oded went forth to meet the returning victor, and excited anew his zeal and gratitude by in-

structing him to ascribe this signal success to God alone; and by promises of further manifestations of the Divine favour, encouraged him in the course he had pursued. This led Asa to exert himself in rooting out the remnants of idolatry which still existed; and even to enter with his people into a solemn and public covenant "to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and with all their soul." Since the dedication of the temple, no greater day had been seen in Jerusalem than that on which the assembled people "swore unto the Lord with a loud voice, and with shouting, and with trumpets, and with cornets." Nor was this a reluctant covenant on the part of the people; for "all Judah rejoiced at the oath; for they had sworn with all their heart." 2 Chron. xiv. 9—15; xv. 1—15.

The subjects of the neighbouring kingdom were not unobservant of the prosperity of Judah, and of the signal favours which the Lord had shown towards its king; and many of the best disposed among them hastened to place themselves under the happier influences by which such blessed results had been produced. As these valuable immigrants were necessarily without the means of acquiring lands in the territory

of Judah, they must, without doubt, have settled in the towns, and Judah probably received a large proportion of them. These new comers joyfully took part with the Judahites in their covenant to serve Jehovah ; and their presence must have added much to the solemnity of that great occasion. This defection of his own subjects gave much alarm to Baasha, king of Israel ; and he invaded the north of Judah, and having taken Ramah, proceeded to fortify it as a frontier garrison to check the intercourse between the two kingdoms. Unhappily for Asa, he, instead of relying upon that high aid which had so wonderfully helped him against the Ethiopians, looked for help to the heathen king of Syria, whom he induced by a rich subsidy to make a diversion in his favour, by invading the north of Israel. The object so far succeeded, that Baasha was obliged to withdraw to defend his own dominions. But this relief was dearly purchased, for not only were the treasures of the temple and of the palace squandered to secure the assistance of the Syrians, and public feeling outraged, by that people being thus taught, for the first time, to desire and to invade the inheritance of Abraham's children ; but the Divine displeasure was

incurred, and was made known to Asa by the prophet Hanani. The consciousness of this great error, coupled with bodily disease, soured the temper of Asa, and begat the reckless and irritable course of conduct which, in the latter days of his reign, frequently made Jerusalem the scene of many cruel deeds and fierce excesses. Yet Asa, at his death, in consideration of his great services in upholding the Mosaical institutions and the true worship of God, was honoured with a distinguished funeral, and his remains were deposited in a sepulchre which he had prepared for himself upon Mount Zion. 1 Kings xv. 16—24 ; 2 Chron. xvi.

The reign of Jehoshaphat, although one of the most interesting in the annals of the kingdom of Judah, offers few facts bearing a special application to Jerusalem. We know, however, that the city must have prospered under his wise and beneficent rule ; and as he paid much attention to building in other parts of his kingdom, we may conclude that Jerusalem was also improved and strengthened. This king paid much attention to the administration of justice in his dominions, and completed his measures by establishing a supreme college of justice at Jerusalem. A remarkable scene also took place

in the city, when Jehoshaphat, being alarmed at the unexpected invasion of his territories by the Arabian and other tribes, from the south-east, publicly, in the presence of the people, assembled "with their little ones, their wives, and their children," in the temple courts, cast himself upon the Divine protection, saying—"We have no might against this great company that cometh against us; neither know we what to do." A few days after, a very different scene was witnessed, when Jerusalem opened wide her gates to receive the same king and people returning triumphant, "with psalteries, harps, and trumpets," and enriched with the spoils of that same terrible host, from which the Lord, in whom they trusted, had delivered them, and whose utter destruction they had been sent forth to witness. The rejoicing crowd, headed by the king, marched straight up to the temple, and there offered up their solemn thanks to the Lord for his great mercy. 2 Chron. xix. 8; xx. 1—29.

The great error of this good king lay in the alliance which he contracted with the house of Ahab, king of Israel, the history of whose reign forms so dark a page of the Hebrew annals. This error, which nearly cost him his life at the

battle of Ramoth-Gilead, entailed the most serious calamities upon his kingdom and his house after his decease. Jehoram his son had married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and she inherited, in abundant measure, all the stern and unwomanly qualities of her mother, combined with all her dislike of the Hebrew religion, without any trace of the imbecility of her father's character. Under her influence, the idolatries which the two former kings had taken so much pains to suppress, reappeared at Jerusalem, in the reign of her husband—or, rather, a more flagrant idolatry crept in, which her mother had introduced from Tyre into the neighbouring kingdom. This was the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth. Hitherto, the idolatries of the Israelites had, more or less, a seeming or alleged reference to Jehovah ; but this was a foreign idolatry—not even pretended to involve any reverence for that great name ; and the worship, therefore, amounted, on the part of the Israelites, to an open and avowed apostasy from the God of their fathers. Into this apostasy the great body of the ten tribes had fallen, so that, in the time of Elijah, there were but seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, or kissed

the hand to his image. 1 Kings xix. 18. And this was the idolatry which now reared its head high in Jerusalem under the auspices of Athaliah, as it had long since done in Israel under the patronage of Jezebel. The odious measures permitted, or adopted, by Jehoram, under the influence of his wife, were punished in due season by such disgraces as had befallen no king before him. The country was ravaged by nations who had humbly brought tribute to his illustrious father; and the Philistines, assisted by Arabian hordes, made their way into Jerusalem, and spoiled its pleasant things. The palace was plundered, the sanctity of the royal harem invaded, and all the women were carried away captive, except Athaliah; and all the royal princes, except Ahaziah, the youngest of all. The tortures of an incurable disease heightened the miseries of the unhappy king; and when at length he died, in 896 B.C., after a reign of eight years, none regretted him, and the voice of the people denied his corpse the honours of a royal burial, and a place in the sepulchre of the kings, 2 Kings viii. 16—22; 2 Chron. xxi.

Athaliah had matters all in her own way during the ensuing short reign of Ahaziah.

But no sooner did she learn that he had been slain by Jehu, while on a visit to his uncle Jehoram, king of Israel, than she resolved to reign still more absolutely by seating herself upon the throne of David; and she scrupled not at the dreadful crime through which alone this could be brought about; for she caused all the young princes of the royal house, children of her dead son, to be put to death. One only escaped—an infant, who was hid and secretly brought up in the temple, with the privacy of the high-priest Jehoiada, by his wife Jehoshaba, who was a daughter of king Jehoram, and, therefore, stood in the relation of aunt to the infant prince, whose name was Joash. Till he had reached the seventh year of his age, Joash was brought up carefully in the secret chambers of the temple; and then the general discontent and disgust which the atrocities of Athaliah had produced in the minds of the people, disposed the high-priest to think that the time was come when he might venture to produce the hidden child to the people as their king—the true and sole heir of the throne of David. He whispered the secret to many persons of influence, and with them arranged the plan of operations: and, on the appointed day,

the temple and its approaches were strongly guarded, and the nobles and Levites dispersed themselves as usual at an inauguration ceremony, while great numbers of the people filled the court. The high-priest then appeared, leading by the hand the last scion of the house of David. He placed him by the pillars where the kings were usually stationed, and having anointed him with the sacred oil, he set the crown upon his head, invested him with royal robes, and gave into his hands the book of the law. He was then conducted to the throne prepared for the occasion ; and on taking his seat thereon, the air was rent with shouts of "Long live the king !" That was a great day in Jerusalem. And it was rendered not the less remarkable for the scene of blood with which it closed. Athaliah was drawn by the unwonted noise to the temple ; and after one desperate effort to produce a re-action in her favour, submitted to her doom, and was led forth beyond the hallowed precincts to her death. The people consummated their triumph over this atrocious usurpation, by destroying the temple of Baal, which, it seems, had been erected in Jerusalem. 2 Kings xi. 1—18 ; 2 Chron. xxiii.

The young king was carefully brought up by Jehoiada, who, in fact, ruled the kingdom during his long minority: and much good was accomplished under his influence, both during his regency, and after the king had formally taken into his own hands the reins of power. During the former period, the services of the temple, which had fallen into some confusion, were carefully restored, after the regulations established by David and Solomon; and during the latter, commencing in the twenty-third year of the king's reign, the thorough repair of the temple was undertaken. The sacred structure had been built nearly 160 years, during which it had sustained much dilapidation, particularly of the ornamental parts—less from time than from successive spoliations—especially during the last reign, in which “the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman, had broken up the house of God; and also all the dedicated things of the house of the Lord did they bestow upon Baal,” 2 Chron. xxiv. 7. The king himself suggested and urged forward this undertaking, which seems to have been at first regarded with culpable indifference by the priests and Levites. The crown was too impoverished to undertake this work at its own

expense; and hence the required funds were raised by a collection throughout the country. The money was profusely and willingly furnished by the people; so that there was not only enough thoroughly to restore the fabric of the temple, but a surplus remained which was made up into utensils of gold and silver, to be used in the sacred ministrations. 2 Chron. xxiv. 4—14. Jehoiada died soon after this work had been completed, at the great age of 130 years; and for his eminent services to the crown and nation, he was buried in “the city of David, among the kings.” After his death, however, it only fully appeared how great his services had been; for Joash took to evil courses as soon as the restraint of his influence was withdrawn; and at length he consummated his guilt and ingratitude, by causing the high-priest Zechariah—his own cousin, and the son of those to whom he owed his life and his crown—to be slain in the very temple, “between the porch and the altar,” on account of his honest protest against the abominations which the king encouraged. This was such an atrocity as Jerusalem had never yet witnessed. It filled the people with horror; and when at length Joash was murdered in his bed by

his own servants, it is said to have been "for the blood of the sons of Jehoiada the priest." The public sentiment was also expressed by the denial of a place for his remains in the sepulchre of the kings. 2 Chron. xxiv. 15—25.

Under his son Amaziah, a great disaster and deep disgrace befel Jerusalem. His wanton and unprovoked challenge of Jehoash the king of Israel, was rebuked not only by the stern and becoming answer of that monarch, but by defeat in the battle of Beth-shemesh. He was himself taken by the enemy, and the justly exasperated conqueror brought him as a prisoner to Jerusalem, which he sacked and pillaged, not even sparing the sacred vessels of the temple. As a memorial of his triumph, he even broke down 400 cubits of the city wall;* and then returned to Samaria, leaving his humbled rival to repair his shattered fortunes as best he could, and soon after to become the victim of the well-earned disaffection of his subjects. 2 Chron. xxv. He was succeeded by

* The breaking down of a portion of an old wall as a sign of triumph, was as effectual for a memorial as the erection of a monument; for, when repaired, it would necessarily exhibit a different appearance from the other portion of the wall, and for many generations this would be known as the portion of the wall which king Jehoash overthrew.

his son Uzziah, who, upon the whole, reigned well and prosperously. He was a great builder and improver; and Jerusalem seems to have largely benefited by his measures. It is certain that he built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall; and he even brought new inventions to bear upon the defences of the city: for we are told that "he made in Jerusalem engines, invented by cunning men, to be on the towers and upon the bulwarks, to shoot arrows and great stones withal." Uzziah's fame spread abroad—"he was marvellously helped till he was strong:" but, alas! "when he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction;" and a most presumptuous attempt to invade the priestly office by offering incense in the holy place, was punished by sudden leprosy, which afflicted and constrained him to live in seclusion and separation to the day of his death. 2 Chron. xxvi.

His son Jotham inherited the tastes of his father, and paid much attention to the improvement and strengthening of his kingdom. In Jerusalem "he built the high gate of the house of the Lord, and on the wall of Ophel he built much," 2 Chron. xxvii. 3. This "high

gate," or "higher gate" as it is called in 2 Kings xv. 35, is supposed to be that which lay between the temple and the king's palace, and which led thereto. This was first built by Solomon, and must, therefore, have been merely repaired or rebuilt by Jotham. It is called "the new gate" in Jer. xxvi. 10, and xxxvi. 10. It occupied the same place with that which was afterwards called the gate of Nicanor and the east gate, as say the Jewish writers.

Ahaz, the son of Jotham, proved the most corrupt monarch which the house of David had hitherto produced. He began by reviving the worship of Baal, and set up images of that idol, whose horrid rites and inhuman sacrifices defiled the valley of Hinnom. Then when the Lord in judgment suffered him to be smitten and brought low by the Syrians, he argued in this insane fashion:—"Because the gods of the kings of the Syrians help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me." The sacred writer adds, "But they were the ruin of him and of all Israel." Ahaz stripped the temple of all the precious metal, which had been introduced by his father and grandfather to repair the ravages of Jehoash king of Israel, to send as a subsidy or gift to Tiglath-pileser, king

of Assyria. Next, and probably to repair his exhausted means, he took away even all the brass which was not indispensable to the sacred services; and, among the rest the bases of the lavers were taken away; and even the brazen sea was taken off from the backs of the twelve brazen oxen, and set upon a pavement of stone. All this he probably sold for his own profit, or possibly, he caused the metal to be employed in casting his "molten images," and in forming the great brazen altar, fashioned after one he had seen at Damascus, which he set up in the court of the temple, in the place of that which had been occupied by the altar of Solomon. Eventually he caused the temple to be shut up altogether, while he multiplied altars to his Syrian idols in every part of Jerusalem. 2 Kings xvi.; 2 Chron. xxviii.

The repair of these ravages occupied for many years the care and solicitude of his son, the excellent Hezekiah, who ascended the throne in 725 B.C., and in the very first month of his reign re-opened the temple for Divine service. It is greatly to his credit that he not only extirpated the more gross foreign idolatries, but spared not the most venerable memorials which seemed likely to be abused to idolatrous uses;

and thus, when the Israelites manifested an inclination to bestow undue reverence upon the brazen serpent which Moses had lifted up in the wilderness, and which had hitherto been preserved in the sanctuary, he without hesitation ordered it to be destroyed, offering by that noble and decisive act a lesson and an example which the relic-worshippers of Christendom have been slow to learn and reluctant to follow. Hezekiah also enforced the celebration of the annual feasts, being alive to their importance in the Mosaical polity. They seem to have fallen much into disuse ; and it was not without great exertions that the people, or even the Levites, were roused to a sense of their duty in this respect. At length, the first passover of this reign was celebrated with a degree of solemnity and on a scale which had not been witnessed since the days of David and Solomon. Hezekiah, on that occasion, "spake comfortably unto all the Levites that taught the good knowledge of the Lord ;" and the people were encouraged by the present of "a thousand bullocks and seven thousand sheep" from the king, and a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep from the nobles, on which they feasted during the days of unleavened

bread. 2 Kings xviii. 1—6 ; 2 Chron. xxix., xxx. Hezekiah added to his honours, as a restorer of religion, that of an improver of Jerusalem. His most important work in that character was the stopping of the upper water-course of Gihon, on the west of the city, and bringing its water, by a subterraneous channel, across to the west side of the city of David. 2 Kings xx. 20 ; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. This work is inferred from 2 Chron. xxxii. 3, 4, to have been of great importance to the town, as it cut off the supply of water from a besieging enemy, and at the same time supplied the inhabitants of the city abundantly. Accordingly, in all the subsequent calamities of Jerusalem, to this day, we never hear that the inhabitants wanted water, although we repeatedly find the besiegers consumed with thirst. In the prospect of a siege, Hezekiah was also led to put Millo in a state of thorough repair, and to rebuild the wall of the city where it was broken, and to strengthen it where it was weak. He also built an additional outer wall, probably on the side where the city was weakest, towards the north. 2 Chron. xxxii. 5.

Manasseh, the son of this good king, during his early and evil years, subverted much of the

good his pious father had accomplished. He went some steps beyond the worst of former kings in his abominations ; for he not only set up idol altars in the courts of the Lord's house, but a carved image of his idol in the very sanctuary. God suffered not such enormities to pass unpunished. Affliction and captivity in a foreign land fell upon him ; and in his sorrows he humbled himself before God, and on his restoration to his kingdom became a wiser and a better king than he had been. He repaired, as far as he could, the evil he had committed ; and, after having restored due order to the house of God, he employed himself in improving and strengthening Jerusalem. He built a wall on the west side of Zion, towards the valley of Gihon, up as far as the Fish-gate—so called from fish being usually brought by that gate into the city, from Joppa. On the east side of the city, he also inclosed, within a very high wall, the promontory of Ophel, which seems to have been hitherto unprotected, save by the natural steep above the valley. 2 Chron. xxxiii.

King Josiah completed the reformation his grandfather had begun. He then undertook a thorough repair of the temple, which was

now nearly 400 years old, and had suffered something from time, and more from the misconduct of the late kings of Judah. The repairs must have been very extensive, as they involved a large outlay in hewn stone and timber. The expense was, as in the time of Jotham, defrayed by a public collection. It was in the course of these repairs that the autograph copy of the law was discovered in the temple ; the perusal of which showed the king how grievously the Mosaical observances had been neglected and contemned, and the judgments which, in consequence, hung over the nation. * He instantly applied himself to the enforcement of the law ; and, as the most glaring defect was in the disuse of the great annual festivals, Josiah deemed it of great consequence to restore the due observance of the passover, which was accordingly kept in the eighteenth year of his reign, with a magnificence even exceeding that of the grand passover which Hezekiah had, a hundred years before, celebrated.

Perhaps Jerusalem never had known a day of greater sorrow than that in which, some years after, the citizens beheld their beloved king brought in at the gate, upon a litter,

dying from the wounds he had received in battle against the king of Egypt. Prophets lamented him in his death ; and the mourning men and mourning women used, in after generations, the elegiac songs which were composed for king Josiah. 2 Kings xxii., xxiii.; 2 Chron. xxxiv. A few months after, the Egyptian king entered the gates of the holy city, as a conqueror. He laid a heavy tribute upon the land ; and took away, as prisoner, Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, who had ascended the throne on the death of his father, and bestowed the crown on his brother, Eliakim, whose name he changed to Jehoiakim. It may be noticed, to the praise of Pharaoh-nechoh, that he abstained from plundering the temple, as former conquerors had done ; but left the ransom he required to be raised by the constituted authorities. This example was not followed by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, when, eighteen years after, he obtained possession of the city, by the then king Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, going forth to render his submission to him. He took away all the treasures of the holy house, as well as most of the vessels of gold which Solomon and other kings had consecrated to its service. The king he sent away as a prisoner

to Babylon, whither he also expatriated those whom, from their rank, their trained valour, or their useful talents, might be considered the flower of the land. This was in 593 B.C.

Nebuchadnezzar, however, spared the city, and made Mattaniah, uncle of the deposed king, and third son of Josiah, king over what remained of the nation, changing his name to Zedekiah. This weak and wicked prince ventured, after some years, in spite of the earnest remonstrance of Jeremiah the prophet, who warned him of the consequences, to revolt against the mighty sovereign who had made him king, and to whom his fidelity stood pledged by solemn oaths. But the iniquity of Judah was full, and the doom of Jerusalem was ripe, and the madness of this miserable king sufficed to bring it down. After a siege of three years, during which the inhabitants suffered the last extremity of distress, the city was taken by the Chaldeans, who razed its walls to the ground, and destroyed its temple, its palaces, and its habitations, with fire. Terrible were the judgments of that day in which Jerusalem was taken. Exasperated by the defection which had rendered the war necessary, and by the protracted defence of the city, the Chaldeans refused all quarter to the inhabitants:

they "slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man, or him that stooped for age," 2 Kings xxv. ; 2 Chron. xxxvi. ; Jer. xxxix.

Thus, on the 9th day of the fifth month, Ab, in the year 588 B.C., 803 years from the departure out of Egypt, and 416 years from the completion of the temple, was fully accomplished the terrible but righteous doom which Moses had foretold should come to pass if the chosen people went astray from the Lord, and refused to observe his covenant. Lev. xxvi. 14—41 ; Deut. xxviii.

CHAPTER VI.

JERUSALEM FROM THE CAPTIVITY TO THE TIME OF CHRIST.

THE ten tribes composing the kingdom of Israel had already been upwards of 130 years transported to Assyria, when now the men of Judah sustained a second and more extensive deportation to Babylon. The castle of David, the holy and beautiful house in which so many kings and prophets had worshipped God, the city itself, were all in ruins, and to all appearance there seemed an end of the chosen people as a nation, and of the city which the Most High had appointed to be the place of his sanctuary. But it was not intended that the people should in this view regard the dispensation to which they were subjected. He who knoweth the end from the beginning, to whom a thousand years are as one day, and "who doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of

men," was careful that they should be taught to look upon it as a chastening, not as a destruction, and their attention was directed forward to a day, not very remote, of restoration and gladness, which the nation might yet realize, when, like the repenting prodigal, it should "come to itself," and say, "I will arise, and go to my father." Moses himself had long ago predicted that, if in the land of their captivity they repented of their evil doings, they should again be restored to the land out of which they had been cast. Deut. xxx. 1—5 ; compare 1 Kings viii. 46—53 ; 1 Neh. i. 8, 9. The Lord had also condescended even to point out the agency through which the restoration of the holy city was to be accomplished, and mentioned by his very name, at least 125 years before he came into existence, the monarch, Cyrus, under whose orders this was to be effected. "Thus saith the Lord of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid," Isa. xliv. 28 ; see also Jer. iii. 2, 7, 8 ; xxiii. 3 ; xxxi. 10 ; xxxii. 36, 37. Another prophetic indication, almost as remarkable as this for its precision, distinctly limits the

duration of the captivity to seventy years. Jer. xxix. 10.

These encouragements were continued through the prophets who themselves shared the captivity. Of this number was Daniel, who thus prayed : " O Lord, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain ; because for our sins, and for the iniquity of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us.—O Lord, hear ; O Lord, forgive ;—defer not for thine own sake, O my God : for thy city and thy people are called by thy name." While the prophet was still urging this supplication in behalf of Jerusalem, it was revealed to him that its streets and its walls should again be built, even in troublous times, Dan. ix. 16, 19, 25. Daniel lived to see the reign of Cyrus king of Persia, and to realize the accomplishment of his prayer, Dan. x. 1. It was in the year 536 B.C., "in the first year of Cyrus," that, in fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy, the Lord stirred up the spirit of this prince, who made a proclamation throughout all his realm expressed in these remarkable words :—" The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth ; and he hath charged me to build him a house

in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel," Ezra i. 2, 3. It is clear, from the terms of this proclamation, that Cyrus had been made acquainted, probably by Daniel, with the remarkable prophecies to which we have referred—those which point him out as the restorer of Jerusalem, and which fix the time of that event. This, it is now generally understood, counts the seventy years, not from the final destruction of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, but from the first captivity under Jehoiachin.

A very considerable number of persons, particularly of priests and Levites, came forward gladly when the proclamation was put forth, and prepared themselves for the journey to their long lost home; and although a far greater number declined to quit the houses and possessions they had acquired in the land of their exile, they failed not to commit valuable gifts to the hands of their more zealous brethren, to assist them in the great work they had undertaken. Cyrus did not suffer them to depart empty handed; for he caused the sacred vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar

had taken away from the temple at Jerusalem to be restored to Zerubbabel, the prince of Judah, who headed the returning party, which consisted of 42,360 people, besides their servants, of whom there were 7,337 ; their beasts were chiefly asses, of which there were 6,720, while there were only 736 horses, 245 mules, and 435 camels, Ezra i. 5—11 ; ii. 64, 67.

On their arrival, in the year 536 B.C., at Jerusalem, which they found lying utterly desolate, every one contributed according to his ability to the great work of rebuilding the temple, which was the first object of their solicitude. They were, indeed, so properly earnest in this matter, that it was concluded to commence the customary services of religion even before the temple should be built ; and, therefore, the prince Zerubbabel and the high-priest Jeshua set up an altar on the spot which the altar in the old temple had occupied, that the proper sacrifices might be offered thereon. Ezra ii. 68—70 ; iii. 1—6.

The first year was spent in clearing the site, in collecting materials, and in procuring the assistance of Phœnician workmen. The Sidonians brought rafts of cedar-trees from Lebanon to Joppa, as had been done in the time of

Solomon ; and, in general, the same course of operations appears to have been followed, so far as the more limited means allowed. The progress of the work was soon impeded through the machinations of the Samaritans, who, in revenge for the repulse which their offers of co-operation and service received from the Jews, spared no pains to misrepresent their objects to the Persian authorities, and at length succeeded in procuring an order for the suspension of the works. It was not until the second year of Darius Hystaspes, 520 B.C., that the building was resumed; and being now assisted by the Persian governors, who had received orders from the king to carry out the decree of Cyrus, the holy structure was finally completed in the sixth year of the same reign, 516 B.C. The dedication was then celebrated with great solemnity; and the ceremony was rendered memorable by one touching circumstance—the younger men shouted for joy at the completion of the goodly structure which their hands had reared; but the ancient men, who had in their youth beheld the glory of the temple built by Solomon, were moved to tears on beholding the new building, which appeared to them as nothing in comparison. Ezra iii.

iv. v. vi ; Hag. ii. 3. In what this inferiority consisted we can easily understand. It occupied the same site, and the dimensions and general arrangements of the first temple seem to have been closely imitated; but in splendour of details it was immeasurably inferior; and, more than all, the ark—that great central object of their ritual observances—was absent, having been destroyed, it is supposed, with the first temple; and it is besides admitted, that the “glory of the Lord” no longer filled the place; nor did fire from heaven descend to consume the sacrifices. Thenceforth they were, therefore, destined to sacrifice on the Lord’s altar with common fire; and the symbol of the Divine inhabitation among them was no more to make their hearts glad.

As described in the proclamation of Cyrus, the new building was to be—and therefore doubtless was—sixty cubits high and sixty cubits wide : but we may gather from Josephus that this height is to be understood of the porch ; for it appears from the speech of Herod, that the second temple was sixty cubits lower than the first, the porch of which was 120 cubits high. Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 11. 1. This writer, who conversed with those who had

seen and ministered in the second temple, describes it as having several courts, with cloisters or cells ; he also distinguishes an exterior and interior sanctuary, and mentions a bridge which connected the town with the temple.

About fifty-eight years after the completion of the temple, in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes, Ezra, a descendant of Aaron, arrived at Jerusalem, with a large party of Jews who had hitherto remained in Chaldæa. This able and pious man was highly esteemed by the Persian king, and came charged not only with valuable gifts, but invested with high powers to regulate the concerns of the Jews in Palestine. He had, in fact, been furnished with a kind of patent, or royal letter, authorising him to make collections of money in the province of Babylon, for the service of the temple ; to claim supplies for the same purpose from the receivers of the revenues in Syria, and to appoint magistrates to administer justice among his own people. Ezra vii. viii.

Ezra performed ably and well the task he had undertaken, but his commission was limited to the temple and the administration of justice. Jerusalem still remained without walls or gates, and the place contained few

houses or inhabitants ; the people having generally settled in those towns, in different parts of the country, which had not been desolated, and which offered dwellings ready for use. Nehemiah, the Hebrew cup-bearer of the Persian king, was so grieved to learn that "the city of his fathers' sepulchre" thus lay waste, that he obtained from his royal master a commission to proceed thither in the quality of governor, with larger powers than had hitherto been conferred. He arrived at Jerusalem thirteen years after Ezra, in 446 B.C., and proceeded at once to rebuild the walls and gates of the city, which he happily accomplished, despite of all the impediments which were cast in his way by the enemies of Israel. Nehemiah i. ii. iv. vi. The space inclosed by the wall was capacious and large ; but the inhabitants were few, and a large portion of the houses were still in ruins. Neh. vii. 4. At Jerusalem, indeed, dwelt the rulers of the people, "and certain of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin ;" but it was now determined that one in ten of the general population of Judæa should be chosen by lot to come and take up his abode in the city, Neh. xi. 1—4. All strangers, Samaritans,

Ammonites, Moabites, etc., were removed, to keep the chosen people from pollution, ministers were appointed to the temple, and the sacred services were ordered more exactly than hitherto according to the law of Moses. Ezra x.; Neh. viii. x. xii. Jerusalem may now, therefore, be regarded as completed and fully peopled. It was, doubtless, in many respects, greatly inferior to the more ancient city, especially in regard to public buildings. The Jews themselves were deeply sensible of this: and it was partly to comfort them under this consciousness that those splendid prophecies were given by prophets who flourished after the exile, describing this city and this temple as destined to be glorified far beyond the former, by the presence of the long-expected Messiah, who is emphatically designated "the desire of all nations," because all nations were to be blessed in him, by being privileged to claim no stinted interest in the atonement to be accomplished in the fulness of time, by the shedding of his most precious blood. Zech. ix. 9; xii. 10; xiii. 3; Hag. ii. 6, 7; Mal. iii. 11.

Thus far the Old Testament, compared in some parts with Josephus, has been our guide in the history and description of Jerusalem.

We now lose this advantage, and in what follows, down to the destruction of the city by the Romans, we have only the guidance of Josephus and the books of Maccabees. In drawing from these authorities such particulars as we require, the difficulty will be to separate that which properly belongs to Jerusalem from that which relates to the country at large.

It is said by Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 8, that when the dominion of Syria passed from the Persians to the Greeks, Alexander the Great advanced against Jerusalem to punish it for the fidelity to the Persians which it had manifested while he was engaged in the siege of Tyre. His hostile intentions were, however, averted by the appearance of the high-priest Jaddua, at the head of a train of priests in their sacred vestments; for in the pontiff, the conqueror recognised a venerable figure which had formerly appeared to him in a dream, and encouraged him to undertake the conquest of Asia. He, therefore, treated him with respect and reverence, and not only spared the city against which his wrath had been kindled, but granted to the Jews some high and important privileges. The historian adds, that the high-priest did not fail to bring to the knowledge of

Alexander those prophecies of Daniel in which his victorious career is foreshown. The whole story is now, however, generally regarded as suspicious, from the absence of any notice of these remarkable circumstances in the histories of this campaign which we possess.

After the death of Alexander, at Babylon, in 324 B.C., Jerusalem was surprised by Ptolemy on the sabbath day; and as the Jews would not fight on that day, he obtained an easy conquest. The city was plundered, and a great number of the inhabitants were sent away into Egypt, where, however, from the estimation in which the Jews of that period were held as citizens, valuable civic rights and immunities were bestowed upon them. In the contests which afterwards followed, for the possession of Syria, between the successors of Alexander, Jerusalem does not appear to have been molested; and it was even spared when Samaria, Acco, Joppa, and Gaza were abandoned by Ptolemy to pillage; the prosperity of the city must, nevertheless, have been seriously obstructed by the distraction and insecurity which these contests produced throughout the country. This state of affairs was, however, ended by the treaty of the year

302 B.C., which annexed the whole of Palestine, together with Arabia Petræa and Cælo-Syria to Egypt. Under easy subjection to the Ptolemies, who reigned in that country, the Jews remained for more than a hundred years, during which no incident of much importance with regard to Jerusalem itself is recorded—excepting the visit which was paid to it in the year 245 B.C. by Ptolemy Euergetes, on his return home from his victories in Syria and the east. He caused many sacrifices to be offered in his name, and at his cost, and presented many valuable gifts to the temple; and there is good reason to suppose that the high-priest took the opportunity of pointing out to him those prophecies of Daniel which referred to the events in which he had lately taken part (Dan. xi. 6—8); and this may very possibly have occasioned his liberal offerings and sacrifices.

In the wars between Antiochus the Great and the kings of Egypt, which reached from 221 to 197 B.C., Judæa could not but have suffered severely; but we are not acquainted with any incident which had particular relation to Jerusalem, until the alleged visit of Ptolemy Philopater, in 211 B.C. It is stated that, after his victory over Antiochus at Raphia

in that year, the Jews, always partial to the Egyptian rule, were present among those who hastened to tender him their homage. He was thus induced to visit Jerusalem, where he offered sacrifices according to the Jewish law, and presented gifts to the temple. But unhappily, the beauty of the building, and the order and solemnity of the worship, excited his curiosity to see the interior. The high-priest, Simon II., remonstrated against this intention, and apprised the king that it was unlawful even for the priests to enter the inner sanctuary. Philopater haughtily answered, that although *they* might be deprived of that privilege, *he* ought not; and he pressed on to enter the sacred place. But while he was passing through the inner court for that purpose, he was "stricken like a reed," and fell speechless to the ground, overcome either by his own fears, or, as the historian seems to intimate, by a supernatural dread and horror cast on him from above. He was carried out half dead, and soon departed from the city, full of resentment against the Jewish people. This resentment he wreaked with great atrocity upon the Hebrews settled in Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, as fully described in the third book of

Maccabees, which, in fact, relates solely to these transactions; but this book is of very inferior historical authority to the two other books of Maccabees, and as the story is not found anywhere else, and is silently rejected by Josephus, little credit is now attached to it.

Towards the end of this war the Jews seemed to favour the cause of Antiochus; and after he had subdued the neighbouring districts, they voluntarily tendered their submission, and rendered their best assistance in expelling the Egyptian garrison from Mount Zion. For this conduct they were rewarded with many important privileges by Antiochus. He issued decrees directing, among other things, that the outworks of the temple should be completed, and that all the materials required for needful repairs should be exempted from taxation. The peculiar sanctity of the temple was also to be respected. No foreigner was to pass the sacred walls; and the city itself was to be protected from pollution, it being strictly forbidden that the flesh or skins of beasts regarded by the Jews as unclean, should be brought into it.

Under their new masters, the Jews must have enjoyed, for a time, nearly as much tranquillity as they had experienced under the

generally benign and liberal government of the Ptolemies. But, in 176 B.C., the reigning king of Syria, Seleucus Philopater, hearing that much treasure was stored up in the temple, and being in great need of money to carry on his expensive wars, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to Jerusalem, to secure the reputed riches of the holy house. This officer concealed the object of his journey till he reached Jerusalem, and then made known his errand to the high-priest, Onias iii., whom he counselled to surrender quietly the treasure which the king required. Onias informed him, in reply, that there was indeed much treasure in the temple, although by no means of such large amount as reported; but that the greater part of it consisted of holy gifts and offerings consecrated to God, the appropriation of which could not be disturbed without sacrilege; and that the rest had been placed there in the way of security for the relief of widows and orphans, whose property it really was. But Heliodorus was not to be deterred, by such considerations, from fulfilling the task which his master had assigned to him, whatever impression this statement may have made upon his own mind. He advanced directly to the temple,

where his entrance was in vain opposed by the priests and Levites. The outer gates he ordered to be demolished, and the whole city stood awaiting the result in the utmost agonies of apprehension. The gates were forced open; but when the treasurer was about to enter the sacred inclosure with his Syrians, he was struck by a panic terror, as it would seem, like to that which Ptolemy Philopater is said to have beforetime experienced; and falling speechless to the ground, he was carried off for dead by his guard: but afterwards revived, and made all haste to quit the city. The apocryphal historian ascribes the terror of Heliodorus to a vision of angels, who chased him from the temple; but the result can be accounted for without this, and little credit is due to the miracles which these writers are fond of introducing, and which are generally very different in their character from those of the sacred books, and far less consistent with the usual course of the Divine procedure.

Fiery were the trials which awaited the Israelites under the next Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes, who seems to have taken offence at those peculiarities of the Jewish doctrines which led them to regard with disgust

the idols which their masters and others worshipped with reverence, and to treat their worshippers as unclean and polluted men. At all events, he took up the design of reducing them to a conformity of manners and religion with other nations; or, in other words, of abolishing those distinctive features which made the Jews a peculiar people, socially separated from all others. The design was odious to the great body of the nation; and the accommodating Menelaus, whom Antiochus had appointed high-priest, with the view of facilitating his proceedings, was sent away by them with ignominy in 169 B.C., as soon as the joyful tidings arrived that the king had been slain in Egypt. This rumour proved untrue; and Antiochus was not slow to punish them for having so gladly believed it. On his return home, he marched along the coast of Palestine, and detached his general, Apollonius, with a force of 23,000 men, to vent his fury upon Jerusalem. As his hostile designs were not known, he, as an officer of the recognised sovereign, was admitted quietly into the town, and all was peaceable till the next sabbath, when Apollonius, knowing that the Jews would not fight on that day, let loose his soldiers upon the devoted city. They

scoured the streets, slaughtering all they met, who meekly suffered themselves to be slain, none venturing upon that holy day to stand in his defence. The women and children were spared, to be sold for slaves. All the streets of Jerusalem and the very courts of the temple flowed with blood, the houses were pillaged, and the wall of the city was thrown down. Apollonius then demolished all the buildings near Mount Zion, and with the materials strengthened the fortifications of the citadel, which he furnished with a garrison, and held under his own command. This castle was so situated, as to give the garrison complete command over the temple: and this command was so used, that those who remained of the people would no longer frequent the sanctuary, or the priests perform their sacred ministrations. Accordingly, in the month of July, 167 B.C., the daily sacrifices ceased, and Jerusalem was soon completely deserted by the surviving inhabitants, who fled to the cities of the neighbouring Gentiles.

Soon after, an edict was issued at Antioch, and proclaimed in all the provinces of Syria, commanding the inhabitants of the whole empire to serve the gods of the king, and to

acknowledge no religion but his, with the declared object, that "all should become one people." As the Jews were the only people in the empire, so far as we know, likely to disobey this order, it must be regarded as especially levelled at them, under the insane abhorrence which the king had conceived against the nation.

The Jews were not few who conformed themselves, at least ostensibly, to the terms of this decree ; but the men of truer spirit for the most part fled into the woods, the caves, and wildernesses, and remained in concealment. An aged Syrian-Greek, named Athenæus, was sent to Jerusalem to establish the Greek form of worship, to instruct the inhabitants in the rites of pagan idolatry, and to repress all attempts to follow the observances of the Mosaical law. Athenæus dedicated the temple to Jupiter Olympius ; and on the great altar he placed a smaller altar to be used in sacrificing to the heathen god. This new altar, set up by order of the desolater Antiochus, seems to be what Daniel had prophesied of under the description of "the abomination that maketh desolate," Dan. xi. 31 ; xii. 11. This altar was set up on the 15th day of the month Chisleu, (November—

December,) and the heathen sacrifices commenced on the 25th day of the same month. There was, doubtless, a statue of Jupiter Olympius set up in the temple itself—as required by the Greek religion; but the Jewish writers suppress this circumstance. It must have been placed in “the Holy of Holies,” for the adytum was, in the heathen temples, the place of the idol to which each temple was dedicated. Circumcision, the observance of the sabbath, and every peculiar observance of the law of Moses, was made a capital offence; and all the copies of the sacred book itself which could be discovered were taken away, and defaced, torn to pieces, or burned. Groves were consecrated, and idolatrous altars were erected in every city, and the citizens were required to offer sacrifices to the gods, to eat swine’s flesh every month, on the birth-day of the king, and on the feast of Bacchus to walk in procession crowned with ivy. The Jews were pointedly required to join in all these, and many such like celebrations: and instant death was the penalty of refusal. Accounts have been preserved of most frightful and unrelenting executions which took place upon those who persisted in observing the law of Moses, or who refused to

take part in the heathen celebrations. Among other instances, is that of two women, who with their infant children were cast from the southern battlements of the temple into the deep vale below, because they had ventured to administer to their sons, with their own hands, the initiatory rite of the Abrahamic covenant. Other instances are those of the venerable Eleazar, who, in the ninetieth year of his age, suffered martyrdom for refusing to taste swine's flesh; and of the heroic matron and her seven sons, who openly set Antiochus—who had come into Palestine to see his orders enforced—at defiance, and professed their belief that "the King of the world would raise up to everlasting life, those who died for his laws;" and threatened their tormentor that "he should have no resurrection unto life, but receive the just punishment of his pride through the judgment of God." History relates how fearfully the doom thus denounced was eventually accomplished upon Antiochus Epiphanes.*

* When Antiochus was returning from the Persian frontier in 164 B.C., with purposes of the most terrible vengeance against the Jews, he was seized with an internal disease, which inflicted upon him the most excruciating torments, and at length reduced him to a condition which rendered him loathsome and horrible to himself and others. He died, acknowledging himself smitten by a Divine hand for his barbarities and sacrileges.

This dreadful persecution led to the famous revolt of the Maccabees, who, after an arduous and most sanguinary struggle, obtained possession of Jerusalem in 163 B.C., and repaired and purified the temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were provided for the sacred services; the old altar, which had been desecrated by heathen abominations, was removed, and a new one erected; and the sacrifices were re-commenced exactly three years after the temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympius. The castle, however, remained in the hands of the Syrians, and long proved a sore annoyance to the Jews, although Judas Maccabæus surrounded the temple with a high and strong wall, furnished with towers, in which soldiers were stationed to protect the worshippers from the insults of the Syrian garrison. Eventually, however, the annoyance became so intolerable that Judas determined to endure it no longer, and ventured to lay siege to the fortress. This attempt brought into the country a powerful army under the command of the regent Lysias, to relieve the garrison, and by one great stroke to put down the patriotic party of which the Maccabees were the leaders.

But a more urgent occasion having arisen to turn his arms in another quarter, Lysias was constrained to make peace with the Jews. Having then entered the city, and observing the great strength of the defences, he caused the wall to be thrown down, in violation of the treaty he had made. In the ensuing war with the Bacchides, in which the illustrious Judas was slain, the Syrians strengthened their citadel and placed in it the sons of the principal Jewish families as hostages. This was in 158 B.C. In the year following, the temporising high-priest Alcimus directed the wall which separated the court of the Gentiles from the court of Israel to be thrown down, for the purpose of affording to the heathen as free access to the temple as the Israelites enjoyed: but he was seized with palsy as soon as the work commenced, and expired in fearful agonies.

A few years after this, the rival pretenders to the throne of Syria, Demetrius and Alexander Balas, sought to out-bid each other in order to secure the support of Jonathan. The hostages in the castle were released, and subsequently all the Syrian garrisons in Judæa were evacuated, excepting those at Jerusalem

and Bethzur, which were now chiefly occupied by apostate Jews who were afraid to quit these strongholds.

Jonathan, being now comparatively at rest from enemies, proceeded to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and then repaired the buildings of the city, and erected a palace for his own residence. The particular history of Jerusalem for several following years is little more than an account of the efforts made by the Maccabæan princes to get possession of the citadel in Jerusalem, and of the Syrian kings to retain it in their hands. At length, in the year 142 B.C., the garrison was forced to surrender to Simon, who then altogether demolished the castle, that it might not again be used against the citizens by their enemies. Simon then proceeded to strengthen the fortifications of the mountain on which the temple stood, and built there a palace for himself. This building was afterwards turned into a regular fortress by John Hyrcanus, and was ever after the residence of the Maccabæan princes. It is called by Josephus "the castle of Baris," but after it was greatly strengthened and enlarged by Herod the Great, it was known as the castle of Antonia, under which name it

makes a great figure in the history of the Jewish war with the Romans.

Of Jerusalem itself we find no further particulars of consequence till it was taken by Pompey for the Romans; in the summer of the year 68 B.C., upon the very day which was observed by the Jews as a day of fasting and lamentation in commemoration of the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Twelve thousand Jews were on that day massacred in the temple courts, including many priests, who died at the very altar rather than suspend the sacred rites. After the rage of victory had subsided and the thirst for blood had been appeased, Pompey, attended by his generals, entered the temple, and examined, with curious eyes, even the most holy place; but he left untouched all its treasures and sacred things. He was less gracious with respect to the military defences of the city, for he caused the wall to be demolished.

From this time we are to regard Jerusalem and Judæa as under the dominion of the Romans.

The treasures which Pompey had spared were seized, a few years after, by Crassus, who removed everything that appeared to him

worth taking ; and the value of his plunder is estimated at ten thousand talents. Eight years after, 43 B.C., the walls of the city, which Pompey had demolished, were, by the permission of the Romans, rebuilt by Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, and the first use to which they were turned was, to enable the inhabitants to hold out for six months, in 37 B.C., against this very Herod. This remarkable man had been nominated king of Judæa by the Romans ; and, at this time, having obtained the assistance of a Roman force, made a grand effort to get possession of the metropolis, which held out against him in favour of Antigonus, the last of the Maccabæan princes. Exasperated by the protracted defence of the city, the Romans, having taken it by storm, plundered it, and massacred the inhabitants without mercy, in spite of the remonstrances of Herod, who exclaimed that they were going to make him king of a desert, and at length paid down a large sum of money to induce them to desist.

This is that Herod under whom Jerusalem was destined to assume that new and more magnificent aspect which it bore in the time of Christ, and which constitutes the Jerusalem

described by Josephus. Herod had, in fact, a passion for building and improvement, from which many towns in his territory, and even beyond it, largely benefited, and none more so than Jerusalem, for which he did nearly as much comparatively as his friend and master Augustus did for Rome. The London which our old men remember is, probably, not so different in comparison with the London which our youths survey, as was the Jerusalem which Herod found from the Jerusalem which he left. In fact, there is great reason to suspect that Jerusalem was never before, not even in the time of Solomon, so magnificent, so strong, so convenient, and so populous, as it became in the time of Herod, and as it continued through the time of Christ and his apostles, till it was destroyed by Titus.

CHAPTER VII.

JERUSALEM IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.

WE will now stay the current of our history to survey, so well as our means allow, the city as thus improved. This is the aspect of Jerusalem which is more than any other interesting to us as Christians ; for we are now to behold the temple in whose courts our Divine Saviour taught and wrought miracles, and whose “goodly stones” the apostles regarded with admiration ; the buildings on which his eyes often rested, and which often cast their shadows over his path, and the streets in which his sacred feet walked up and down.

This account of the ancient town we shall endeavour so to frame as to furnish the reader with as distinct a picture of the whole city as can now be realized, with particular notice of such parts, or buildings, as are mentioned in Scripture, with the view of enabling the Christian reader to study, with more advantage

and pleasure, those parts of the sacred history which refer to Jerusalem. Every reader of the Gospels naturally forms in his mind some picture—more or less true, according to the extent of his information—of the appearance and condition of Jerusalem as it existed in the time of Jesus; and it is our pleasant task to endeavour to bring together such facts and circumstances as may assist this operation, and enable him to form a more true and lively idea of the holy city than can be received without some such assistance.

This task is not without its difficulties. Some of them have been pointed out by different writers; and by none of them in a more striking manner than by Dr. Richardson, in the following passage, copied from his "Travels :"—"It is a tantalizing circumstance to one who wishes to recognise in his walks the sites of particular buildings, or the scene of remarkable events, that the greater part of the objects mentioned in the descriptions both of the inspired and Jewish historian, are entirely razed from their foundation, without leaving a single trace or name behind to point out where they stood. Not an ancient gate, or wall, or tower, or hardly even a stone

remains. The foundations are not only broken up, but every fragment of which they were composed is swept away; and the spectator looks upon the bare rock, with hardly a sprinkling of earth to point out her gardens of pleasure, or groves of idolatrous worship. A few gardens still remain on the sloping base of Mount Zion, watered from the pool of Siloam: the gardens of Gethsemane are still in a sort of ruined cultivation; the fences are broken down, and the olive-trees decaying, as if the hand which dressed and fed them were withdrawn; the Mount of Olives still retains a languishing verdure, and nourishes a few of those trees from which it derives its name; but all around Jerusalem the general aspect is blighted and barren: the grass is withered: the bare rock looks through the scanty sward, and the grain itself, like the starving progeny of famine, seems to doubt whether to come to maturity or to die in the ear. Jerusalem has heard the voice of David and of Solomon, of prophets and apostles: and He who spake as never man spake, has taught in her synagogues * and in her streets. Before her legislators, her poets, and

* This is rather a mistake; Jesus taught in the synagogues of other cities, but in the temple at Jerusalem.

her apostles, those of all other nations became dumb, as unworthy to stand in their presence. Once she was rich in every blessing, victorious over all her enemies, and sitting in peace, with every man under his own vine, and under his own fig-tree, with none to disturb or to make him afraid. Jerusalem was the highest of all the cities of the east, and fortified above all other towns; so strong that the Roman conqueror thereof, and the master of the whole world besides, exclaimed on entering the city of David, and looking up to the towers which the Jews had abandoned—‘ Surely, we have had God for our assistance in the war: for what could human hands or human machines do against these towers? It is no other than God who has expelled the Jews from their fortifications.’ It is impossible for the Christian traveller to look upon Jerusalem with the same feelings with which he would set himself to contemplate the ruins of Thebes, of Athens, or of Rome, or any other city that the world ever saw. There is in all the doings of the Jews, their virtues and their vices, their wisdom and their folly, a height and a depth, a breadth and a length, that the angels cannot fathom. Their whole history is a history of

miracles; the precepts of their sacred book are the most profound, the best adapted to every station in which man can be placed: they moderate him in prosperity, sustain him in adversity, guide him in health, console him in sickness, support him at the close of life, travel on with him through death, live with him throughout the endless ages of eternity; and Jerusalem lends its name to the eternal mansions of the blessed in heaven, which man is admitted to enjoy through the atonement of Christ Jesus, who was born of a descendant of Judah."

This fine passage, although not in all points strictly accurate, is suggestive, and will suitably introduce the subjoined particulars.

A general view of the site of Jerusalem has already been given (p. 30); and our present attention will therefore be confined to the buildings and scriptural localities of the city.

The WALLS, of which the history has already been given in the preceding sketch of the city's history, require our first attention. The description which we must follow is that of Josephus. He assumes as the starting point of his description, the Tower of Hippicus, which occupied the north-west quarter of Mount Zion.

The first wall skirted the northern brow of Zion, and then crossing the valley of the Tyropœon, was joined to the natural wall of the temple, which was completely surrounded by a strong wall of its own. In the opposite direction it encompassed the hill on the western and northern sides, so far as the pool of Siloam, where it again crossed the valley of Tyropœon, and was continued round the edge of the temple mount, here called Ophel, until it joined the extremity of the eastern wall of the temple. From the pool of Siloam there was a wall along the eastern brow of Zion, to meet that which bounded it on the north, so that the upper city was completely surrounded by a wall of its own. A wall thus encircling Mount Zion was doubtless the first which existed on the site of Jerusalem, and enabled the Jebusites so long to maintain themselves in the possession of the upper city.

The second wall is described as commencing at a place called the Gate of Gennath, a point in the first wall east of Hippicus, and encircling the northern part of the city, was joined to the fortress Antonia, which occupied a considerable space at the north-west of the temple area. In process of time, the population in this part, north of the temple, had overflowed the limits

of the old city, and occupied a third hill to the north, known by the name of Bezetha. In the time of Christ, this suburb remained unprotected; but, subsequently, Herod Agrippa conceived, and began to execute, the idea of adding to its security by the erection of a strong wall, which he resolved to extend much farther than was at the time required, to allow room for a possible future increase of the city in that quarter. Commencing, then, at the tower of Hippicus, it extended far to the north, and passing by the monuments of Helena, it reached the upper part of the valley of Jehoshaphat at the tombs of the kings, from whence it followed the course of the valley, bending with it to the Fuller's monument, where was a corner tower, until it was joined to the temple wall at its north-eastern angle. This wall was intended by Agrippa, who inherited his grandfather Herod's magnificent ideas, to be a lasting monument of his liberality, and an impregnable defence to the city. It was commenced on a vast scale; and Josephus is of opinion that, if it had been completed according to the original design, the city would never have been taken. But a representation made to the emperor Claudius, when the work had made some

progress, excited his alarm, and its continuance was prohibited ; but the design was afterwards taken up and completed by the Jews themselves, though on a scale of less strength and magnificence. Some traces of this wall have lately been discovered, and it is probable that a well-arranged course of excavation might throw much light upon the structure and direction of the ancient walls. The circumference of the city, as inclosed by this outer wall, was thirty-three stadia, equal to nearly three and a half geographical miles. The circumference of the present walls is about a mile less, or two and a half geographical miles ; but the extent of Mount Zion, now without the walls, and of the open tract to the north which was formerly inclosed, or partly so, by the third wall, sufficiently accounts for the difference. This description of the walls will scarcely be intelligible to the reader unless he follows it on a plan of Jerusalem ; and even then some obscurity remains, from our being uncertain as to the exact position of some of the points and objects which are used to indicate the course and turnings of the wall. Some of these will, however, be presently considered. The question, as regards the direction of the wall in one

part, has lately become of much importance from its necessary connexion with the discussion concerning the site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, which has lately been carried on with considerable warmth. The spot which we have historical evidence of having been regarded as the site of these holy places from the time of Constantine to our own day, is considerably within the city. But we know that our Lord suffered death for our sins outside the town. If, therefore, we believe that the site now indicated is the true one, we must needs draw the line of the ancient wall so as to place it without the town ; but in doing this we find that we have so awkwardly narrowed the city in this part, as alone suffices to beget a doubt on the subject; and this doubt will be strengthened when we come to consider how improbable it is that, pressed up as the population was within limits naturally circumscribed in breadth, it should have been still further circumscribed voluntarily, by so planting the wall in this part as to throw an important portion of useful and available site beyond the city. It is impossible to resist the conclusion to which these considerations tend, but by a reliance, at all hazards, upon the authority of the traditions which

profess to identify the spots now inclosed within the church of the Holy Sepulchre, as the scene of our Lord's death, sepulture, and resurrection. These traditions it will be therefore necessary to examine further on.

Many different statements have been made respecting the GATES, through which these walls afforded access to the city. The following may be offered as probably the most correct distribution of them.

On the north side three, namely:—1. The *Old Gate*; probably at the north-east corner. Neh. iii. 6; xii. 30. 2. The *Gate of Benjamin* or of *Ephraim*, mentioned in Jer. xxxviii. 7; xxxvii. 13; 2 Chron. xxv. 23; and Neh. xii. 39. This gate seems to have derived its name from its leading to the territories of Ephraim and Benjamin, and it is supposed by Dr. Robinson, that it may possibly be represented by some traces of ruins which he found on the site of the present gate of Damascus. 3. The *Corner Gate*, which was four hundred cubits from the former, seems to have been at or near the north-west corner. It is mentioned in 2 Kings xiv. 13; 2 Chron. xxv. 23; Zech. xiv. 10; and is probably the same with that which is called the "Tower of the Furnaces" in Neh. iii. 11; xii. 38.

On the west side one ; namely, the *Valley Gate*, which was over against the Dragon Fountain in the valley of Gihon. Neh. ii. 13; iii. 13; 2 Chron. xxvi. 9. It seems to have been the same with the gate which Josephus distinguished by the name of Gennath, which appears to have stood at some small distance east of the Hippic tower, which occupied the north-west angle of Zion. At this point a gate seems to have always existed.

On the south side were two gates, namely:—
1. The *Dung Gate*, so called because the filth of the city was carried out this way, and cast into the valley of Hinnom, Neh. ii. 13; xii. 31. It was one thousand cubits from the Valley Gate, and the Dragon lay between them, Neh. ii. 13; iii. 14. This gate is probably the same with the “gate between two walls” of 2 Kings xxv. 4 ; Jer. xxxix. 4 ; lli. 7; and it seems to be also that which Josephus distinguishes as the Gate of the Essenes. The other gate on this side was—2. The *Gate of the Fountain*, which is named in Neh. ii. 14; iii. 15, and seems to have been near the south-eastern corner. It is more fully described as “the gate of the fountain near the king’s pool,” Neh. ii. 14 ; and “the gate of the fountain near

the pool of Siloah, by the king's garden," Neh. iii. 15: and the same fountain is doubtless intended by these different designations. It is also probable that this gate is the same which is elsewhere denominated the Brick Gate, (or "Potter's Gate,") leading to the valley of Hinnom, Jer. xix. 2, where the authorised version has "the east gate."

On the east side there were four gates, namely:—1. The *Water Gate*, mentioned in Neh. iii. 26; 2. The *Prison Gate*, otherwise called the *Horse Gate*, near the temple, Neh. iii. 25; xii. 39; 3. The *Sheep Gate*, probably near the sheep-pool, Neh. iii. 1, 32; xii. 39; and, 4. The *Fish Gate*, which seems to have been quite at the north-east, Neh. iii. 3; xii. 39; Zeph. i. 10; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14.

It will be observed that in two instances the distances of the gates from each other are specified. The inner gate was only 400 cubits from the gate of Ephraim; and the Dung Gate was 1000 cubits from the Valley Gate. This shows that the gates were in fact less distant from each other than agrees with European notions, and so accounts for the number of the gates, which some regard as objectionable. The account we have given makes them ten;

but some make them even more numerous by regarding every name as representing a different gate, whereas we have indicated instances in which several names appear to have belonged to one gate. Those who remember "the hundred-gated Thebes," and have read the accounts which we possess of other ancient cities of the east, will feel justified in doubting whether the ancient orientals had the same objections to numerous gates as are now usually entertained.

The gates of Jerusalem, like those of other walled towns in the east, were shut up at night: hence the force of the beautiful passage in the description of the New Jerusalem, "the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there," Rev. xxi. 25; implying that if there had been night, they would have been shut; but since it was there always day, they would never be closed. It seems, however, that at the great festivals, if there were no cause to apprehend danger, the gates, or some of them, were left open at night; or at least that egress or ingress was then easily obtained. The reader will remember that our Lord left the city the night before he suffered, to go to the garden of Gethsemane; and Mary Magdalene and the other women set forth "early in the

morning while it was yet dark," to visit the sepulchre, which was outside the town.

The TOWERS, which stood at regular distances along the wall, must have tended greatly to aggrandize the view of Jerusalem from without, as well as to impart great strength to the fortifications. These towers are often mentioned in Scripture and by Josephus. There is indeed no general account of them ; but some of the chief of them are described, and we may reasonably infer that the others, more or less, resembled them in form and arrangement. Most of the towers mentioned by Josephus were erected by Herod the Great, and were consequently standing in the time of Christ. It was on these, therefore, his eyes often rested in approaching Jerusalem, or when he viewed its walls and towers from the Mount of Olives. Of all these towers, the most important and interesting is that of Hippicus, which, it has been already seen, is the starting point in his description of all the walls of the city. Herod gave it the name of a friend who was slain in battle. It was a quadrangular structure, twenty-five cubits on each side, and built up entirely solid to the height of thirty cubits ; above this solid part was a cistern of twenty

cubits, and then for twenty-five cubits more were chambers of various kinds, with a breast-work of two cubits, and a battlement of three cubits upon the top. The height of the whole tower was consequently eighty cubits. The stones of which it was built were very large, twenty cubits long by ten broad and five high, and (in the upper part probably) were of white marble.

Dr. Robinson and other writers on the topographical antiquities of Jerusalem have shown, that this tower must have existed at the north-west corner of Mount Zion. This spot, a little to the south of the Jaffa gate, is now occupied by the citadel. This is an irregular assemblage of square towers, surrounded on the inner side towards the city by a low wall, and having, on the outer or western side, a deep fosse. It is protected on that side by a low, sloping bulwark, or buttress, which rises from the bottom of the trench, at an angle of forty-five degrees. This part bears evident marks of antiquity: and Dr. Robinson inclines to ascribe these massive outworks to the time of the rebuilding and fortifying of the city by Adrian. Within it, as the traveller enters the city by the Jaffa gate, the north-eastern tower attracts his notice,

as obviously of higher antiquity than any of the others. It is built of larger stones, bevelled at the edges, and apparently still occupying their original places. This is the tower which the early travellers and the historians of the crusades mention as the tower of David, while the citadel itself bears with them the name of the castle of David. Taking all the circumstances into account, it appears highly probable that the antique lower portion of this tower is no other than a remnant of the tower of Hippicus, which, Josephus states, was left standing by Titus when he destroyed the city. The aspect of the lower part agrees well enough with his description. Some of the large stones in it are from nine to twelve feet long ; and the dimensions are fifty-six feet four inches on the east side, and seventy feet three inches on the south. Herod built two other similar towers, one of them named after his brother, Phasaelus, and the other after Mariamne, his favourite wife. They stood not far from Hippicus, upon the first or most ancient wall, which ran from the latter tower eastward along the northern brow of Mount Zion. Connected with these three towers, was the royal castle or palace of Herod, which on the north was inclosed by this wall.

and on the other sides, by a wall of thirty cubits high. Of this we shall presently speak. A fourth tower, called Psephinos, is mentioned by Josephus. It stood at the north-east corner of the third or outer wall of the city, and it therefore did not exist in the time of Christ the wall itself having been built by Herod Agrippa. It deserves to be noticed, however, from the peculiarity of its structure. All the other towers were square, but this was octagonal, seventy cubits high; and from its top could be seen the whole breadth of the land, from the mountains which lie beyond the Jordan and Dead Sea on the east, to the Mediterranean Sea on the west. This shows that it must have stood upon the high swell of ground (Bezetha) which extends up, north-north-west from the north-west corner of the present city. In this quarter there are ancient substructions, apparently of towers, and other fortifications, and although the foundations of Psephinos have not yet been distinguished, there can be no doubt that the tower stood in this vicinity.

These are all the towers that are particularly mentioned by Josephus: but in describing the outer or third wall of Agrippa, he takes care to inform us that it had battlements of two cubits,

and turrets of three cubits more; and as the wall was twenty cubits high, this would make the turrets of the height of twenty-five cubits, or nearly thirty-eight feet; many loftier and more substantial towers than these were erected upon each of the walls, at regulated distances, furnished with every requisite for convenience or defence. Ninety such towers are enumerated in the outer wall, forty in the middle or second wall, and sixty in the inner or most ancient wall—190 in all, of which 100 existed in the time of Christ.

Having thus defined the outline of the city, as marked by its walls, towers, and gates, we may proceed to notice the principal public buildings which it contained.

The TEMPLE was in all ages the principal public building and crowning ornament of Jerusalem, as the heathen temple, the Christian church, and the mosque, which successively have occupied its site, have been since it was destroyed.

When Herod felt himself firmly settled on his throne, he began to entertain the notion of rebuilding the temple of Zerubbabel, which had fallen considerably into decay. To this he was led less by zeal for God and for the Mosaical

institutions, than by his taste for building, by the magnificence of his ideas, and by a wish to do something to ingratiate himself with his subjects, who disliked him on account of his treacheries and cruelties towards the last members of the illustrious house of the Maccabees, and on account of his dangerous conformity to Roman usages and idolatries, which had led him to erect heathen temples in various towns, and even to desecrate Jerusalem itself, by introducing foreign customs and amusements into the holy city.

Herod's proposal to rebuild the temple was received with doubt and suspicion. It was feared that opportunity might be taken to introduce some heathen innovations; and it was strongly doubted whether, considering the vastness of the undertaking, the new temple would be duly built if the old one were taken down. To remove this fear, Herod undertook not to disturb the old temple till all the preparations for the new one were perfect before their eyes; and as the second temple was thus not in fact destroyed, but only removed after the preparations for the new one were completed, a question has arisen whether the temple of Herod should be regarded as a *third* temple or not.

In this, the chief of all his great undertakings, Herod acted with more consideration than might have been expected, however policy might have taught him the inexpediency of still further provoking the hostility of his subjects. The utmost care was taken not in any matter connected with it to offend the national sentiment ; he scrupulously performed all the particulars of his promise, and neither labour nor expense were spared to render this temple a worthy successor of that which the wealth and wisdom of Solomon had originally erected on the Holy Mount ; and the fragments of columns built into the modern walls of the Haram,* exhibiting most rare specimens of porphyry and other precious marbles, still testify to the glory of this latter house.

No sooner had Herod obtained the consent of the people than he proceeded to get ready a thousand waggons to bring stones for the sacred building ; he secured the services of ten thousand of the most skilful workmen in the land, and he provided ten thousand sacerdotal vestments for the priests, some of whom he caused to be instructed in the arts of the mason

* The name given to the entire inclosure of the present Mosque of Omar.

and the carpenter, that they might be able to take an active part in the proceedings.

The building itself was commenced in the eighteenth year of the reign of Herod, twenty-one years before the Christian era. The temple itself was finished in a year and a half; but the out-works and courts required eight years. Some building operations were, however, constantly in progress under the successors of Herod; and it is in this respect that the temple is said to have been not entirely finished till the government of Albinus, the last but one of the Roman procurators, not long before the commencement of the war in which the temple was again and finally destroyed. It was in reference to these protracted building operations that the Jews said to Jesus:—"Forty and six years was this temple in building," John ii. 20.

This temple, honoured as it was by the frequent presence of our Lord and his apostles, seems to us far more interesting to the Christian reader than even that of Solomon; and for this reason we shall endeavour to give as complete a description of it as the accounts of Josephus and other Jewish writers, and the investigations of Christian travellers and antiquarians admit.

The site which the temple occupied, and the preparations which it needed, have been already described in connexion with Solomon's temple. In its natural state it declined steeply from the north-west towards the south-east; and, in order to render it applicable for the building of a magnificent temple, it was necessary to cut away a considerable portion of the rock at the north-west, and raise the ground at the south-east angle. Both these works still exist, and form the only existing parts which can with certainty be referred to Solomon. These could need no repair, and must have remained unaltered by the improvements of Herod, and by the changes which the place has since experienced.

Josephus states that the whole of the buildings upon the site were a stadium square, and consequently four stadia, or half a Roman mile, in circumference. But this account, although copied by the best writers, seems to be incorrect; for Mr. Catherwood, who examined and measured the ground under discussion, states that the lower courses of the masonry of ancient walls still exist on the east, south, and west sides of the great inclosure for nearly its whole length and breadth; and the north side is

distinguished by a wall on the brink of a deep trench, and at the north-west inner angle, by the rock being cut perpendicularly to an extent of twenty feet in some parts. There is little, if any doubt, from the nature of the site, that these walls coincide with those of Herod's temple, if indeed these lower courses of masonry did not actually belong to that or even the earlier temple. Now the dimensions of these walls describe an area which could never have been mathematically square; for the length of the east wall is 1520 feet, of the south wall, 940 feet, of the west wall, 1617 feet, and of the north, 1020 feet; affording a total circumference of 5097 feet, or little short of a mile.

The temple was situated not exactly in the centre of the area, but on its highest point, which was somewhat to the north-west of the centre. It was surrounded by different courts, descending in terraces, the innermost central court being higher than the next outward; the temple was visible from the town, notwithstanding the height of the walls which inclosed the outer court. This outer court was distinctively called "the mountain of the house," a phrase which some writers incorrectly suppose to have been applicable to the whole site of the temple,

The Jewish writers state that the inclosure of this mountain of the house had six principal gates, three on the west, and one on each of the other quarters. The chief gate was that towards the east. It was called the Gate of Shusan, because a representation of the Persian metropolis of Shusa, or Susa, had been affixed to this gate in the temple of Zerubbabel, when the Jews were naturally anxious to express by all possible means, their gratitude and submission to the Persian government. This representation of Susa was preserved in the new temple. This is by some supposed to have been the "Beautiful Gate," at which Peter and John healed the cripple, Acts iii. 2, 10. There is good reason to think that this gate occupied the place which is now filled by the Golden Gate, which name, indeed, appears to have come from an ancient gate of the temple said to have been covered with gold. But this name cannot be traced back beyond the time of the Crusaders, and is called by the Arabs the Gate of Mercy. The exterior of this remarkable gate presents two archways of Roman character, filled up with Saracenic masonry, and presenting a curious piece of patch-work. It is conjectured to have actually belonged to the inclosure of the

heathen temple built by Adrian upon this site. It is double; and being now walled up exteriorly, the interior forms a recess or chamber, used as a place of prayer by the Moslem worshippers.

It would seem that, besides these five principal gates, there were some other entrances to the temple, because Josephus mentions four gates on the west and several on the south. Connected with the outer wall, on the inside, were cloisters which surrounded the temple. These were thirty cubits wide except on the south side, where the royal cloister seems to have been thrice as wide as the others, apparently from being free from the chambers which backed the cloister on the other sides. The most celebrated of these cloisters or porticoes was that called "Solomon's Porch," and which is mentioned by that name in John x. 23; Acts iii. 10; v. 12; and seems to have been so called from having been built in imitation of, and upon the site occupied by, a porch in Solomon's temple. It was on the east side, and is described by Josephus, who calls it the eastern porch. It seems to have projected so as to overhang the valley at the deepest part; and the inclosing wall, measuring 400 cubits, was composed of immense squared blocks of a

very white stone, twenty cubits long by six broad. Stones of this size are not easily overturned or destroyed, and it is possible, as Josephus seems to intimate, that this was a part of the first temple left standing by the Babylonians; and if not, the stones were doubtless the same. These cloisters were not arched, as they would be in modern arrangements, but roofed with cedar-wood, overlaid at top no doubt, as is still usual in the east, with layers of earth and hard compost, to form a terrace or promenade. The weight of the roof was supported by columns of marble, twenty-five cubits high, which must have had a most magnificent appearance. This arrangement is very intelligible to those who have seen a mosque, or a caravanserai, in the east, at the present day. In the cloisters the Levites were lodged during the course of their duty. There was also in these cloisters a kind of synagogue to which the doctors of the law were wont to resort, and where they might be asked questions, and their discussions might be heard. Professedly religious persons were, therefore, fond of resorting to this spot; and it was here, doubtless, that Jesus, when a child, had his famous interview with the doctors in the temple, (Luke ii. 46.)

These cloisters formed a common resort of piously-disposed persons, and in them religious teachers were wont to address the persons present, or such hearers as might gather around them. It was thus that our Lord found frequent opportunities of refuting the Pharisees and doctors of the law, and of addressing the people as one having authority, and not as the scribes who frequented the place. Here also the first converts assembled with one accord, Acts ii. 46, this being the place to which those who had to impart or wished to receive religious instruction habitually resorted for the purpose.

It was also into this outer court that the cattle-dealers brought for sale such animals as would be required for sacrifice or offering at the altar : and during the passover, when every family offered a lamb and fed upon its flesh, the traffic was immense. Here also the money-changers had their seats, and drove a thriving trade by enabling those who, coming from abroad, had only foreign coin, or coin of common currency, to exchange it for the half-shekels of full weight which alone the priests would take. This traffic often produced scenes most unsuited to the house of God, and which excited the indignation of our Saviour, who scourged them

forth from the place which they had made "a den of thieves," Matt. xxi. 13; Mark xi. 15—17; Luke xix. 45, 46; John ii. 13—17.

The outer court had a pavement of various-coloured stones. It was freely open to all comers, even to Gentiles, and was hence called "the court of the Gentile:" but along the edge of the next terrace, which was several steps higher up the ascent than this of the outer court, was a low balustrade of stone, which marked the point beyond which the heathen and the unclean might not intrude, on pain of death. They were warned of this by inscriptions in Greek and Latin, affixed to columns within this balustrade. There was once a clamour against Paul on suspicion that he had introduced Greeks beyond this limit. Acts xxi. 28.

At some distance within this balustrade rose a wall, which appeared very high from without, but much less so within. A gate in this wall, upon the east side, opened to a flight of steps, which led to an upper court, called "the court of the women," not because it was for the exclusive use of the women, but because even women were admitted into it, which they were not into the court beyond. The breadth of this court was 135 cubits; and from it there were

ascents by steps to the court of the Israelites, that is, of the men, which lay on the north and south sides of the innermost quadrangle, as this did on the east, and which had separate entrances on the north and south, besides those from the outer court of the women. The gates leading from the outer court to those within the second inclosure, were imposing and magnificent structures, rising to the height of above forty cubits, and containing chambers over the gateway. Two columns, twelve cubits in circumference, adorned each gate; and the gates were closed by double valves, each thirty cubits high and fifteen wide, and overlaid with gold and silver. The east gate being the principal, was made of Corinthian brass, and was higher, broader, more elaborately wrought, and more enriched with precious metals than the others. The strength of twenty men scarcely sufficed to open and shut this large and ponderous gate, which is supposed by some to have been the "Beautiful Gate" of Acts iii. 2, although others claim that distinction for the opposite outermost gate of Shusan. The court to which these gates conducted was surrounded by a corridor, supported by handsome columns of marble. This court of the Israelites

was separated by a low stone balustrade of one cubit high from the innermost court—the court of the priests, in which the temple itself stood, and in which the sacred services were celebrated. The temple itself was fifteen cubits higher than the court of the Israelites, and stood not in the midst of the court of the priests, but towards the north-west corner of it, upon the highest point of the whole site. The whole space occupied by the two innermost courts together, (those of Israel and of the priests,) was 187 cubits from east to west, and 135 cubits from north to south, and the breadth of each of the courts was eleven cubits. The court of the priests surrounded the whole temple. On its northern and southern side were magazines for the wood, water, salt, etc., required in the sacred ceremonials; and on the south side was also the place in which the Sanhedrim held its sittings. Towards the east, with entrances from the court of the women, were the chambers in which the musical instruments were laid up; and towards the north-west were four rooms in which the lambs for the daily sacrifices were kept, the shew-bread was prepared, and other preparatory services performed. (1 Chron. ix. 31, 32.) All the courts were paved

with flag-stones ; and in each of them there were several alms-boxes, in the shape of horns. The establishments for sanitary police, which were under the supervision of the priests, were in the court of the women, in the four corners of which were apartments for the reception and examination of persons suspected of leprosy and other infectious disorders.

The foundation of the sacred structure itself is said to have been formed of white marble, in large blocks, some of which were forty-five cubits long, six cubits wide, and five cubits high ; the porch measured externally a hundred cubits in width, but the body of the building not more than sixty cubits ; so that the projecting frontispiece must have spread out like shoulders fifteen or twenty cubits on each side. The whole length of the building was 100 or 110 cubits long, and its height was 100 cubits. The internal dimensions of the porch were fifty cubits wide by twenty deep, and ninety cubits high ; the holy place was forty cubits long by twenty broad, and ninety high ; and the most holy place measured twenty cubits square, and was sixty cubits high. According to this account, the Holy of Holies was not so high by thirty cubits as the holy place ; and

although it is said that chambers above the sanctuary raised it to the same external height, this circumstance is so adverse to eastern notions of becoming reverence for a holy place, that we cannot receive it without much doubt. If, however, this so-called chamber was merely formed by an upper roof, supported to the requisite height by pillars, and destined for no other purpose than to protect the proper roof, and to maintain the symmetry of the structure, the alleged superstructure would cease to be objectionable.

The summit of the temple was furnished with tall spikes of metal, which are said to have been intended to prevent the birds from resting upon the holy house. The roof itself was flat, and was surrounded by a low parapet or balustrade.

In the temple of Solomon, the Holy of Holies had contained the ark and the overspreading cherubim ; but in Herod's temple that sacred chamber was empty, save that a stone marked the spot which the ark, had it been there, would have occupied. This stone, instead of the ark, the high-priest sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice on the great day of atonement, and thereon he set the censer with which

he, on that day alone, offered incense in the inner sanctuary. Before the entrance to this most holy place hung a curtain, which was miraculously rent at the crucifixion of our Lord, in token of the great fact that "the middle wall of partition" was from that hour and for ever broken down; and through the atoning sacrifice there completed by his death, the gates of mercy were freely opened to mankind, Matt. xxvii. 51. The entrance from the porch to the outer chamber, or holy place, was by folding doors, twenty cubits high and ten cubits wide; but the whole of this entrance, with its mouldings and ornaments, was not less than fifty-five cubits high by sixteen cubits wide. The valves of this doorway were usually thrown back; but the space was filled by a magnificent curtain, made in imitation of that which filled the same place in Solomon's temple. The entrance to the porch, being of course the outermost gate of the temple, was externally not less than seventy cubits high and twenty-five cubits wide, with folding doors forty cubits high by twenty wide, which were commonly left open. This entrance was decorated with the celebrated golden vine, whose grapes are said to have been as large as men. This vine was intended as a symbol of the Jewish church, so often

represented in Scripture under the figure of a vine or a vineyard which the Lord had planted. Isa. v. 1—7 ; Jer. ii. 21 ; Ezek. xix. 10 ; Joel i. 7. Many commentators suppose that this vine gave occasion to the parable of the vine in John xv. ; and the strange calumny of the pagan writers, that the Jews were worshippers of Bacchus, may perhaps be traced to the same source.

The contents of the holy place were the same kind as in the former temples ; but in the porch was a table of gold and another of marble, on which the priests temporarily rested the sacred loaves when they removed the old and set on the new shew-bread.

The site of the temple was naturally impregnable to ancient warfare on the south and the east. On the north and east, towards the town, its natural defences were less strong, and there was need of artificial fortification. This was supplied by the fortress and tower built at the north-west corner of the site by the Maccabæan princes, which we formerly mentioned, (p. 124.) This was improved and strengthened by Herod, and received from him the name of the tower of Antonia. It had previously borne the name of Baris, a Persian word for a royal palace,

but which was adopted in Palestine to any large quadrangular buildings provided with turrets and walls. As improved by Herod, this fortress had the extent and appearance of a palace, being divided with apartments of every kind, with galleries and baths, and with broad halls or barracks, for soldiers. Having thus every thing complete within itself, it seemed as a city, while in magnificence it was a palace. At each of the four corners was a tower, one of which was seventy cubits high, and overlooked the whole temple and its courts. This fortress communicated with the cloisters of the temple by secret passages, by which the soldiers could enter and quell any tumults, which were always apprehended at the great festivals. As the Roman governors, on their visits to Jerusalem, at the time of the passover, took up their abode in this fortress, we are, doubtless, to regard it as the place to which our Lord was brought before Pilate, and where he was condemned by that unrighteous judge, and scourged and mocked by his men of war. The house which forms the usual residence of the Moslem governors of the city, is supposed to occupy nearly, if not exactly, the same site. It was from the soldiers stationed in this fortress that the Jews

obtained a guard for the sepulchre of Christ. Matt. xxvii. 65. This is also "the castle" into which St. Paul was carried when the Jews rose against him in the temple and were about to kill him ; and from the stairs leading to which he delivered the noble defence contained in the twenty-second chapter of Acts.

Having thus explained the temple, let us survey the other public places and buildings of Jerusalem, as it existed in the time of our Lord and his apostles.

At the north-west corner of Mount Zion, in a site marked out on the north side by the three towers of Hippicus, Phasaël, and Mariamne, and connected with them, was the palace built by Herod, which seems to have been the most magnificent civil building in Jerusalem. It was very extensive, comprehending not only two immense chambers, so large and splendid that the temple itself could not be compared with them, large bed-chambers, that would each contain beds for a hundred guests, and a vast number of other palatial apartments—but also many porticoes, one beyond another, round about, and green courts, and groves of trees with long walks through them, with fountains supplied from deep cisterns

and aqueducts. The whole was inclosed by a wall thirty cubits high, which, on the north side, seems to have been a continuation of the town wall—that is, the first wall—separating Mount Zion from the rest of the city. The furniture of this palace was on a scale of corresponding magnificence, the greater part of the vessels contained in it being of gold and silver. This grand building is not directly mentioned in the Scriptures: but it was probably occupied by Herod the tetrarch, at the passover at which our Lord suffered; and, if so, it was to this place that Jesus was sent by Pilate to be examined by Herod, and where, on his refusal to answer the idle questions put to him, he was set at nought and mocked by the tetrarch and his court, who scornfully threw over him a gorgeous robe,* and sent him back in that guise to the Roman governor. Luke xxiii. 6—12. No part of the superstructure of this palace can now be traced, unless we regard the more ancient portion of the tower of Hippicus as belonging to it. But in

* It appears from the original, that the robe was white, that being the regal colour among the Hebrews. Compare Matt. vi. 28, 29. But the regal colour among the Romans was purple, and that was, therefore, the colour of the robe with which the soldiers of Pilate invested Jesus. John xix. 2.

digging for the foundation of the English church upon Mount Zion, an interesting discovery was made, at the depth of not less than forty feet below the surface of the soil, of an immense conduit, partly hewn in the rock, and in parts formed of very solid masonry, coated with a most durable cement. It was doubtless intended to supply the inhabitants with water ; and as the English church stands on what must have been part of the site of Herod's palace, we may doubtless regard this as the "deep conduit" which, according to the description of Josephus, supplied water to the fountains and cisterns of the palace.

The communication between the temple and the lower city, and Mount Zion, over the formerly steep hollow, or valley, of the Tyropœon, was maintained by causeways, bridges, and flights of steps. The causeway constructed by Solomon, by which the kings of Judah went from their palace on Mount Zion to the temple, has been already noticed. Its place was afterwards supplied by a bridge, which is first mentioned by Josephus in stating that the party of Aristobulus destroyed it, on withdrawing into the temple, in order to cut off the access on that side to the Romans under

Pompey. The bridge he restored existed in the time of Christ, and is that across which Titus is described as, after the destruction of the temple, addressing the Jews who still held out in the upper city of Zion. Some remains of this bridge have lately been discovered, and are highly interesting, as being among the very few traces of the ancient Jerusalem which can now be ascertained, and as forming the communication between the temple courts and Mount Zion, over which our Lord must often have passed. These remains appear, at the spot indicated, in the shape of the springing stones of a large arch, on the wall which incloses the area of the temple, and connected with the lower and more massive masonry which goes round the whole area, and which is supposed by good judges to have formed part of the inclosure of Herod's temple—if not of those of Solomon, or of Zerubbabel. The lower portion of the ancient wall could, in any case, be little liable to destruction or overthrow from the violence by which the superstructures were overturned; and when we see that this more permanent portion of the wall of the sacred inclosure is visibly of a more ancient date than the smaller masonry of the superstructure, from

which it is distinguished by being composed of very large squared stones with bevelled edges, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that they belonged to the latest, if not to the earliest, of the Jewish temples. The Jews themselves seem to be of this opinion; for there is a spot in front of the lower wall, about an hundred yards north of the bridge, where the Jews assemble weekly, to mourn over the desolations of Zion, and over their exclusion from that holy and beautiful house in which their fathers worshipped God. Here, every Friday, venerable men, come from far to lay their bones in the city of their fathers' sepulchre, may be seen reading the law under the shadow of the wall; while females, in long white robes, may be observed walking along the sacred wall, and kissing its ancient masonry with every appearance of deep devotion.

But let us return to Mount Zion to notice the sepulchre of David, which still remained there in and after the time of Christ. It is very evident from Scripture that the sepulchres of the kings of Judah were upon Mount Zion; and the reader must not be misled by supposing that the tombs to the north of the city now distinguished as the "sepulchres of the kings,"

had any connexion with the royal sepulchres in which the kings of David's line were buried. In the site occupied by these sepulchres, David seems to have had a separate tomb, distinguished by a remarkable monument. In this tomb, Solomon is said by Josephus to have deposited much treasure at the burial of his father. On the same authority it is stated, that the tomb was first opened by Hyrcanus, prince and high-priest of the Jews, who took from thence no less than three thousand talents of silver. Not long after Herod the Great attempted to take possession of the remaining treasure ; but was prevented by a sudden burst of flame, which destroyed two of the soldiers employed in the proceeding, and effectually scared the rest. Herod himself, as if to repair the offence, restored or rebuilt the monument with fine white marble, which, in the time of our Lord, (Acts ii. 29,) and till the destruction of Jerusalem, formed one of the finest ornaments of Mount Zion. On this tomb, or what they supposed to be such, a mosque was built by the Saracens, which still exists, and is held in great reverence by the Moslems.

There was a market-place upon Mount Zion, probably for the sale of such provisions and

other commodities as the inhabitants of that quarter required. It was called the upper market to distinguish it from the great market in the lower town. Mount. Zion itself was often, in a loose way, called the upper market on this account.

In the lower city, called Acra, were several buildings and public places requiring notice.

It has been already mentioned that Herod gave much offence to the more zealous Jews, by the introduction of foreign customs and amusements into the holy city. Connected with this offensive innovation, and for the purpose of the sports and games which they embraced, he built, with great cost and labour, an amphitheatre, capable, it is said, of containing eighty thousand persons. Here the spectators were entertained by the struggles of the wrestlers, and the mortal combats of the gladiators. Here also lions, leopards, bears, bulls, boars, wolves, and other wild and fierce beasts, were set to fight with each other, and sometimes condemned men and captives taken in war were cast to them to be devoured. When these horrid sports were celebrated the ground was strewed with sand, that the combatants might not fail in their footing or be defiled with

the blood of the slain, and that the sight of the sanguinary streams might not too deeply shock the spectators. It is highly honourable to the Jews that they deemed their city polluted by such horrid scenes—so popular among other people. It does not appear that the sports of the amphitheatre were kept up in Jerusalem after the death of Herod. There is no allusion to them in the Gospels : but in the Epistles, which were mostly written to persons who had been familiar with such scenes, there are frequent and beautifully illustrative references to them.

There was also in this quarter of Jerusalem a hippodrome, or circus, over against the south end of the temple. Here horses were raced against horses, chariots against chariots, and men against men; and various feats of agility and strength were performed. It was in this place that the dying tyrant, Herod, directed the nobles of the land to be shut up, and ordered that they should be slaughtered there when his own soul departed, that there might be a national mourning at his funeral. Dead tyrants may, however, be safely disobeyed; and this savage order was not executed : but the conception was worthy of him whose equally

barbarous decree had lately made the mothers of Bethlehem desolate.

Among the buildings of this quarter was a house of records, in which were preserved the charters and public registers of the city, as well as the deeds and bonds of the citizens. One of the first acts of the seditious men whose conduct brought about the downfall of Jerusalem, was to destroy this building with fire, that creditors might possess no evidence of their claims against their debtors.

There was a common prison of the city, with proper guards and officers. In this the apostles were shut up by the rulers of the Jews. Acts iv. 5. It seems to be the same which Josephus calls Betiso.

In the midst of the city, taken as a whole, and adjoining to the castle of Antonia, was the great market which is often mentioned in the later history of the Jews, but is not particularly described. It seems, however, from the circumstances mentioned in connexion with it, to have been not a bazaar of covered passages, such as are now common in the east; but a large open area, surrounded by shops under a covered way—like many of our own market-places, and such as are still sometimes seen in

the east. In the upper part of the lower city there was another market, in which fish and other perishable commodities were sold. It was in this market that the apostle James, the brother of John, is said to have been put to the sword by order of Herod Agrippa. Acts xii. 2. Near to the temple, and to the gate by which cattle were usually brought into the town, was a market for sheep, oxen, and other beasts fit for sacrifice. This is called the sheep-market in John v. 2. There was another market for the sale of wood, which formed the exclusive fuel of the city and temple. This market was burned by Cestius at the beginning of the Jewish war.

The royal family of Adiabene, which had been converted to Judaism, had several palaces in Jerusalem. In the very midst of Aera was the palace of the queen Helena, which seems to have been a building of some mark and consequence. Not far from it was the palace which Grapta, niece of the king Izates, built for herself; and in the east part of the town was the palace of Monobaz, king of Adiabene, and son of Helena. These buildings belong to the period of time covered by the Acts of the Apostles.

In the south-west of the lower city, bordering

upon Zion, were handsome sepulchral monuments erected in honour of Alexander Januæus, and of John Hyrcanus, princes and high-priests of the Maccabæan time.

In the same part of the town was a hospital, founded by Hyrcanus, with the money which he took out of the sepulchre of David. It was the only establishment of the kind which we read of among the Jews. It was an asylum where poor foreign Jews visiting Jerusalem, the destitute poor, and the impotent, were maintained and lodged.

Having now explored the city itself, we may proceed to notice the more remarkable places and objects that lay beyond its walls. On the north, beyond the third wall, were many sepulchres and monuments. The monuments have disappeared ; but the site still exhibits traces of decayed tombs, and some remarkable sepulchres. The portions of the site not thus applied to sepulchral uses was laid out in farms and gardens.

Of the monuments in this quarter, the most remarkable was that of Helcna, queen of Adiabene. This princess, who has been already mentioned, fixed her residence at Jerusalem for purposes of devotion, and was a great

benefactress to the city, particularly during the famine predicted by Agabus, (Acts xi. 28,) in the time of Claudius Cæsar, when she imported at her own expense large quantities of corn from Alexandria, and figs from Cyprus, for the use of the poor. Having resolved to end her days here, she prepared her sepulchre in her lifetime, as was the custom of that age. The tomb was hewn in the rock, and was surmounted by a goodly monument of white marble, rising in three spires, or pyramids. The door opened by some mechanical contrivance which attracted the admiration of travellers. In this tomb Helena and her son Izates were buried. The monument still existed in the time of Jerome, but no trace of it now remains. It stood about three furlongs from the city. In the same quarter was the monument of Herod Agrippa, the tyrant, whose death, by the righteous judgment of God, is recorded in Acts xii. 23. It was connected, seemingly, with what Josephus calls "the royal caves;" and we have good reason to conclude that they are the same which are now known as the sepulchres of the kings, and which claim notice, as by far the most interesting of the ancient sepulchres existing near Jerusalem. The visitor descends

into a trench cut in the rocky level, and divided by a wall, consisting of the rock itself squared into shape, from a large court similarly sunk below the level, and of course open to the sky. The passage through the wall of rock is by an arch. The great court is about ninety feet square, and on its west side is a portico five feet wide excavated in the rocky wall. It was formerly supported by two pillars. The style of the rich entablature is what is called Roman Doric, and the entire front, when perfect, must have been very rich in effect, from the profusion of carved foliage and fruit which it exhibits. The interior is explored by the light of candles. The entrance is by a low door at the left hand corner, which leads to a square and plain ante-chamber hewn in the rock. On the south side of this chamber are two passages leading to two rooms, containing in their walls niches or crypts, for sepulture, running into the rock. On the west side of the ante-chamber is a door in the centre of the wall, which leads to the most extensive of all the sepulchral chambers. It has the same kind of recesses in the walls, in which the dead were laid, as the other chambers. From this great chamber, there is, on the north

side, a passage through an arched entrance into a low vaulted room, from which there is no outlet; and this, as being the innermost, was probably the resting-place of honour in these sepulchral chambers. The dead were deposited in the crypts, in coffins of stone beautifully sculptured in wreaths of fruits and flowers, the remains of which now lie broken and tenantless in the rocky floor. There also lie the fragments and one entire specimen of the panelled stone doors by which the entrances were closed, and which were hung by their stone tenons being inserted into grooves hollowed out in the angle of the door-way. This noble sepulchre has crypts for thirty corpses; and although no known historical interest attaches to it, it is highly interesting as an example of great sepulchres of which we so frequently read in Scripture, and from the probability that the tombs of the kings on Mount Zion exhibited similar interior arrangements.

The objects and places east of the city are of more interest and importance than those in any other direction. The valley on this side is now called the valley of Jehoshaphat, from a probably unfounded notion, that it is the same which is mentioned by the prophet under that

name. Joel iii. 2, 12. Along this valley, tombs hewn in the rock arrest the eye and awaken the thought of the modern traveller. These were the last resting-place of ancient Jews ; and below them appear the slabs which mark the graves of the descendants. It has been, even to this day, the master passion of the Jews to lay their bones in this valley, not only because Jerusalem is their historical home, to which the hearts of the least worldly among them continually turn, but because it is their firm belief that in this valley God shall plead for Israel, and judge the nations which have afflicted her, in that day when it shall please him to turn again the captivity of Zion. Hence it is that we see here the tombs of unbroken generations of the seed of Abraham ; and it is an affecting thought that, while long ages have rolled on, and the city has been successively possessed by Pagans, Christians, and Mohammedans, who have all trodden the Jews under their feet, that people, " wonderful from their beginning hitherto," have still maintained possession of its graves.

Of the ancient tombs hewn in the rock, many are now occupied as habitations by the Arabs, and this is especially the case at the

village of Siloam, which is in great part composed of such habitations—the living in the abodes of the dead. The modern Jews, coming, in their old age, from the uttermost parts of the earth to seek a grave in the sacred soil, like to lie under the shadow of the temple. The Moslems have themselves, however, appropriated the space in the valley, immediately under the temple mount, and the Jews are, therefore, content to lie opposite, on the other side the Kidron, towards the foot of the Mount of Olives, where the ground is crowded with the whitish slabs which cover their remains.

Among these humble graves appear some remarkable monuments of the past; in fact, the most singular and picturesque group of ancient tombs to be seen anywhere near Jerusalem. The first of these tombs, though standing detached, is hewn out of the solid rock. It is ornamented with Ionic pillars, and rises to a singulary shaped top. The whole monument is about forty feet high, of which the part above the architrave, which is about half the height, is of masonry, the rock not having been high enough to complete the design. It is, upon the whole, somewhat heavy, but not wanting in a certain grace of outline and detail.

There is a small excavated chamber in the body of the tomb, into which a hole had already been broken through in one of the sides several centuries ago. Tradition identifies this tomb with the monument which Absalom erected in the king's dale to keep his name in remembrance. 2 Sam. xviii. 18. A monument erected for such a purpose was likely to have been of very durable construction ; and it seems to have been still in existence when Josephus wrote his Antiquities. The Jews, who, since the time of Benjamin of Tudela, at least, have regarded this monument as the pillar of Absalom, in order to testify their horror of his crimes, have been in the habit, from time immemorial, of casting a stone and spitting whenever they pass by it. The style of architecture militates against this notion, as it exhibits the undoubted characteristic of a later age ; and although it is true that the architectural details may have been sculptured, and the superstructure of masonry may have been added at a date much later than the original erection of the monument, who was there likely to render this honour to the memory of Absalom ? This, however, and the other tombs may have existed, and probably did exist, in the time of Christ. They are

of a style very similar to that of the tombs of Petra, which exhibit a mixed style of architecture, compounded out of the Ionic, Doric, and Egyptian, which seems to have prevailed in those parts in and somewhat before the time of Christ ; and which the Herodian family—which was of Edom, and was, as a family, remarkably given to building—may be presumed to have introduced into Judæa.

The other monument, similarly detached, is the so-called tomb of Zacharias, understood to be the same who was slain by the Jews, between the temple and the altar. Matt. xxiii. 35. But for this there is not the slightest authority. It is about thirty feet high, and is, with all its ornaments, wholly cut of the solid rock even to the summit. The body of the tomb is a square block of twenty feet on each side, and is apparently solid. It is surrounded by Ionic columns and half columns, with a cornice of acanthus leaves, and is surmounted by an obtuse pyramid of ten or twelve feet. It is a heavy and inelegant structure, standing in a square niche or area formed by cutting away the rock around it.

These two are real monuments of rock ; the other two, known as the tombs of Jehoshaphat

and of St. James, are only excavated tombs with ornamented porticoes. The portal of the so-called tomb of Jehoshaphat is behind the tomb of Absalom, at the north-east corner of the niche in which it stands. It is in the perpendicular face of the niche, and is, of course, a later work than the tomb before it. The portal is surmounted by a fine pediment resting on square pilasters.

The cave of St. James is so called, not as the sepulchre, but as the supposed temporary refuge of the apostle James during the interval between the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord. It occupies a middle place between the two monolithic monuments. It consists of an open portal, with two Doric columns, in the face of the rock ten or fifteen feet above the ground. The interior consists of an ante-chamber, within which is the sepulchral vault.

There are tombs, as we have already seen, at the foot of the Mount of Olives, and at the narrowest part of the valley of Jehoshaphat. To the north of them, where the valley is wider and more cheerful, occupying part of a wide space between the brook Kidron and the foot of Olivet, we find what is now considered the Garden of Gethsemane, memorable as the resort

of our Saviour, and as the scene of the agony which he endured on the night he was betrayed. There is little, if any doubt, that this is the real place of this solemn transaction. It seems to have been an olive plantation in the time of Christ, as the name Gethsemane signifies an oil-press. That which is now pointed out as Gethsemane is probably but a part of the ancient garden. It is about fifty paces square, and is inclosed by a wall, of no great height, formed of rough loose stones. Eight very ancient olive-trees now occupy the inclosure, some of which are very large, and all exhibit symptoms of decay clearly denoting their great age. As a fresh olive-tree springs from the stump of an old one, there is reason to conclude that, even if the trees which existed in the time of our Saviour have been destroyed, those which now stand sprang from their roots. But it is not incredible that they should be the very same trees. The olive-tree lives to a great age, and these eight trees are certainly very old. They are, at least, of the times of the eastern empire, as is proved by the following circumstance. In Turkey, every olive-tree found standing by the Moslems when they conquered Asia, pays a tax of one *medina*

to the treasury, while each of those planted since the conquest pays half its produce. Now the eight olive-trees of Gethsemane pay only eight *medina*. Dr. Wilde describes the largest of these as being twenty-four feet in girth above the root, though its topmost branch is not above thirty feet from the ground. M. Bové, who travelled as a naturalist, asserts that the largest are at least six yards in circumference and nine or ten yards high—so large, indeed, that he calculates their age at 2000 years. The garden belongs to one of the monastic establishments, and great care has been taken to preserve the old trees from destruction; and several young ones have been planted to supply the place of those which have disappeared. The garden, as now inclosed, is too small to satisfy all the conditions of the Gospel narrative; and it is more than probable that the ancient garden occupied also some of the space now covered by several similar inclosures adjacent, some of which exhibit olive-trees equally old.

In the time of our Lord, there was near the south end of the Mount of Olives, according to Josephus, a large dove-house. It was made of stone, large, lofty, and fashioned like a tower.

It accommodated doves to the number of four or five thousand; and, from the description, would seem to have been exceedingly similar to the large dove-houses which are still to be seen near to Ispahan and other great towns of Persia. From this were probably supplied the doves of which great numbers were employed by the poorer Jews in the ceremonies of purification, Lev. xiv. 22; Luke ii. 24. And this is the more likely, as Lightfoot informs us, after the Jewish writers, that there were at this time two great cedar-trees on Olivet, under which were shops and stalls for the sale of all matters required for purification. It is here, therefore, that we should expect to find a house for doves.

We learn from Josephus that there was over the Kidron a stone bridge of one arch, erected at the expense of Helena, queen of Adiabene. It was probably not far from the present bridge, on the common line of route between the city and the Mount of Olives. The present bridge is near to the pillar of Absalom.

On the top of the middle summit of the Mount of Olives is now the ancient church of the Ascension, supposed to mark the spot whence our Lord ascended into heaven. Whether this church does, or does not, cover the exact spot

of earth on which the feet of our blessed Saviour last stood, seems a question of little real interest, though much has lately been written with reference to it. It is of more importance to know whether he did or did not ascend from the top of Olivet at all. If he did not, the church is an imposture or a mistake ; if he did, the church cannot be far from, if it does not cover, the exact spot. It is stated by St. Luke that "Jesus led out his disciples as far as Bethany, and blessed them ; and while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven," Luke xxiv. 50, 51. But the summit of Olivet is not more than half way between Jerusalem and Bethany, which here seems to be made the scene of the ascension. But the same evangelist, in recording the event in Acts i., states that, after they had seen their Lord ascend into heaven, "they returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey." These texts cannot contradict each other : but how are we, with our imperfect knowledge, to reconcile them ? The explanation given by Lightfoot is by far the best which has been offered ; and it not only removes any apparent discrepancy between

these texts, but makes them confirmatory of each other. It amounts to this; that the side of Olivet facing Jerusalem was called Bethphage, and that the other side, away from Jerusalem, was called Bethany. Bethphage ended and Bethany began at the very top of the mount; and when, therefore, a person was said to go from Jerusalem, upon Olivet, as far as Bethany, he was understood to go to the top of the mount where Bethany commenced. The boundary lines of many of our own parishes, taking their names from villages, as defined by the tops of hills, so that the opposite slopes of the hills are in different parishes, and bear different names, would suggest no inapt comparison to illustrate this circumstance.

The southernmost of the three summits of Olivet is that which is called the Mount of Offence, or Hill of Corruption, as the supposed site of the idol temples which Solomon built for his heathen wives. Clinging to the rocky side of this mount are the stone hovels of the straggling village of Siloam, or Kefr Selwan, many of which are built before caves or rather excavated sepulchres; while, as already mentioned, the sepulchres themselves are in many cases used as dwellings without addition.

Then to the south, in the angle formed at the point where the valley of Jehoshaphat joins that of Ben-Hinnom, is the site formerly occupied by the royal garden, which is several times mentioned in the Scripture, and by Josephus. The latter describes it as walled all round, planted with trees, and laid out in pleasant walks like unto a paradise. Here grew all kinds of luxurious fruits and fragrant flowers to delight and refresh the sense. It was watered by the fountain of En-Rogel, and contained the stone Zoheleth; and it was here that Adonijah, when he attempted to supersede Solomon in the throne of his father David, made a great feast for his followers. 1 Kings i. 9.

We now reach the south of the city—even to the valley of Ben-Hinnom, which lies between Mount Zion on the north, and what is called “the Hill of Evil Counsel” on the south. This latter hill has this name from the notion that it was here that the priests and elders took counsel against Jesus to destroy him. John xi. 47. And in corroboration, some shapeless remains of a building upon the hill are regarded as having belonged to the house of Caiaphas the high-priest. “There is something,” says Mr. Bartlett, in his *Walks about Jerusalem*, “in the

gloomy scenery of the valley and the hill above, its tombs hewn in the rock, long since tenantless ; the gray gloom of its old fig and olive-trees starting from the fissures of the crags—the overhanging wall (cliffs) of Zion, desolate as in the time of the prophet (Jeremiah,) that forcibly recalls the wild and mournful grandeur of the prophetic writings. It has been chosen, too, as the traditionary Aceldama, or ‘ field of blood,’ of the traitor Judas ; a small plot of ground overhung with one precipice, and looking down another into the glen below. Here is a vast charnel-house, into which it was formerly the custom to throw the bodies of the dead, as the earth was supposed to have the power of rapidly consuming them. The plot of ground was selected as the burial-place of pilgrims who died at Jerusalem during the middle ages.”

Beyond the city on the west—in the valley of Gihon, and on the inclosing hills—there do not appear to have been any objects of particular interest, except the upper and lower pools of Gihon, which we reserve for notice in connexion with the pools and fountains of Jerusalem. On this side the city, the site of Calvary and of our Lord’s sepulchre should perhaps be sought by those who hold that the spots now

within the city, which tradition has consecrated, never were or could be outside the town, as Golgotha and the tomb of Jesus must have been. But whatever evidence is brought against the traditional sites, rests on the improbability of them, and not on the better claim of others. In fact, no one who has disputed these sites has ventured to propose others in their room. And if we reject the tradition, we have no ground for concluding that the site of Calvary was on the west side of the city at all, or for knowing on which side it lay; for it is the presence of the traditional Calvary towards the west of the city which has led to the impression that the crucifixion of our Lord took place outside the western walls. Those who question the identity of the traditionary site, would do well to inquire on which side of the city capital executions usually took place. It is by no means impossible that a diligent search among the Jewish writings might discover this fact; and if it should prove that such executions usually took place on some other side of the city, this would be the most powerful argument which has yet been brought against the existing allocation; and it is only when we have ascertained that

these executions did take place on the west of Jerusalem, that it becomes worth while to inquire whether the site which is now designated as Calvary and the holy sepulchre, was then outside the city, or must even then have lain within the city walls. Intrinsically, and apart from the questions which have been raised in connection with it, and from the historical interests which have in the course of ages gathered around it, the question seems to us one of exceedingly small consequence. To know the exact spot where Jesus was crucified, may gratify a certain natural sentiment, but can really concern us little. But it is of infinite importance for us to know and feel, that the Lord of life became obedient unto death for our sakes; and that, if we believe in him, and cast ourselves without reserve—all overwhelmed with sins and sorrows as we are—upon the merits of that great atonement which his blood accomplished, we shall not fail to obtain life through his name.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

DS Ancient Jerusalem
109
 .912
A64

