immediately adjoining; and that the transference of the site from the eastern to the western hill took place some­where about the commencement of the 11th century, when, in consequence of the invasion of the Turks, the Christians were driven from the former hill for a time. This work was followed up by his article “Jerusalem” in Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible* and by several minor pub­lications @@1 ; and the whole question was, with some modifi­cations, re-argued by him at great length in *The Temples of the Jews and the other Buildings in the Haram Area at Jerusalem* in 1878.

Though at first Fergusson’s essay seemed to fall dead, it inaugurated a discussion which has within the last twenty years been carried on with much keenness. His views have been supported on architectural grounds by Unger, @@2 and on general grounds by Sandie, @@3 Smith, @@4 and Langlois, @@5 while among the multitude of his opponents may be specially noted Williams, @@6 Lewin, @@7 the Abbé Michon, @@s De Vogué, @@9 Pierotti, @@10 Sir Charles Warren, @@11 and Captain Conder. @@12

The architectural arguments in favour of Fergusson’s theory have forced Lewin, one of his most strenuous opponents, to argue that the Dome of the Rock may have been a temple to Jupiter erected by Hadrian, which he imagines may have been restored or rebuilt by Maximin Daza, the successor of Diocletian. @@13 But they must be studied in Fergusson’s own works or in that of Unger above referred to. The topographical objections are mainly founded on the necessity of restricting the Jewish temple to the south-eastern corner of the Haram, the site, how­ever, assigned to it by Lewin himself and Thrupp, @@14 and on the difficulty of supposing a place of interment so near the sacred building. But Josephus, at the time of the siege, speaks of “the monuments of King Alexander,” whatever that may mean, existing just over against or in front of the north colonnade of the temple. @@15

As regards the historical argument, it would certainly appear that up to the close of the 6th century the balance of evidence is in favour of the eastern site. The narrative of the Pilgrim of Bordeaux @@16 may perhaps be read as sup­porting either view. But Antoninus Martyr @@17 and Theo­dosius @@18 can hardly be reconciled with the existing location ; in two manuscripts of the latter @@19 the writer believed that the same hill witnessed in succession the offering of Isaac, the vision of the angel at Araunah’s threshing-floor, the building of the temple, and the death and resurrection of

our Lord. Many more passages might be quoted from writers of this period testifying to the belief that the hill that witnessed the offering of Isaac witnessed also the resurrection of Christ, and many others identifying the scene of the offering of Isaac with the hill on which the temple was built. Perhaps the strongest point in this connexion against Fergusson is that so striking a fact as the identity of the hill of the Passion with that on part of which the temple stood should only be directly spoken to by a single writer. After the 9th century the historical evidence becomes more difficult to interpret. Fergusson would date the transference of the site about 1000 ; but it seems clear from Istakhri (9 7 8) @@20 and Mokaddasi (987), @@21 both of whom were unknown to him, that before their days the Dome of the Rock was a Mohammedan place of worship, and the latter expressly states that it was suggested by a great Christian church. @@22 The natural date to assign for such a transference would be about 614, when the city was captured by the Persians, and, to quote the carefully guarded narrative of Gibbon, “ the sepulchre of Christ and the stately churches of Helena and Constantine were con­sumed, or at least damaged, by the flames.” The buildings were repaired or rebuilt by Modestus a few years later, and their praises are sung by Sophronius, his successor in the patriarchate, but in terms which give little topographical information. Sophronius lived to see the capture of the city by Omar in 636, the earliest records of whose doings as yet available are the brief one of Theophanes (818) and the more lengthened one of Eutychius (937). From both of these it seems clear that the caliph confirmed the Chris­tians in the possession of the sites (whatever these might be) which he found in their hands. In or about 670 the French bishop Arculph visited Jerusalem, and under the hand of Adamnanus we have a detailed account taken down from his lips, @@23 and a plan of the church of the Resurrec­tion as he saw it, which strikingly corresponds to the Dome of the Rock,—as, however, it necessarily would correspond with any church which had been erected in close imitation of that building. @@24 There are passages, however, in Arculph descriptive of the city very difficult to understand unless on the assumption that the transference of Sion, which had hitherto (see Jerusalem) been identified with the eastern hill, had already in his time taken place. The next pil­grim who has left us a record is Willibald, @@25 who visited the city early in the 8th century, and whose description applies on the whole better to the western than the eastern site ;
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