

ARTICLE IX.

REMAINS OF THE ANCIENT BRIDGE BETWEEN THE JEWISH TEMPLE AND MOUNT ZION.

By E. Robinson.

THIS Article refers to a review of Dr. Olin's "Travels in Palestine," in the *North American Review* for October, 1843; and to a letter from Dr. Olin in reply, published in the number of the same work for January, 1844. The following remarks, with the exception of the letter from Mr. Nicolayson and one or two other instances, appeared also in the *North American* for January, 1844. They are repeated here, partly for the purpose of introducing that letter; and partly as a matter of literary history relating to an interesting point in Jewish Antiquities. As to the other matters in question between Dr. Olin and the *Review*, I have never supposed that it belonged to me to take any part in the controversy before the public.

The first intimation of the existence of any remains of the ancient bridge so often mentioned by Josephus, was given to the public in my work on Palestine. In that work, after recounting the manner in which I was led to notice and recognize these remains, and after a full description of them, there is subjoined the following note:

"Since the above was written, I have been informed by both Messrs. Bonomi and Catherwood, the well known artists, that they likewise remarked these large stones in 1833, and recognized in them the beginning of an immense arch. They regarded them, too, as probably among the most ancient remains in or around Jerusalem; but had no suspicion of their historical import."—*Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Vol. I., p. 427.

This note was first written in London, in October, 1840, after an interview with Mr. Bonomi. He spoke of the remains as being the fragment of an arch; but frankly added, "We could make nothing more of them." The note was afterwards submitted in manuscript to Mr. Catherwood, in New York; who kindly showed me his very beautiful drawing of the remains in question, and corroborated the general statement of Mr. Bonomi. The note was printed with his sanction. My work appeared in July, 1841. The facts respecting the recognition of the bridge had been extensively published in this country in October, 1838; and, before the

possint, in magno illo judicii die erunt ad poenam; et quae nunc laxiora sunt, tunc erunt arctissima et gravissima. 2. Tartarus, in quo detinentur tanquam in carcere, et caligo, sub qua reservantur; quocumque enim abeunt, et ubicumque degunt daemones, suum infernum circumferunt ut ait Beda in cap. III. Jacobi. Distinguendum itaque inter statum infernalem et *πῶν* inferni; oberrant quidem nunc per mundum; catenati tamen sunt et vinculis obstricti tenebrisque obvoluti, et carcerem suum semper secum trahunt. 3. Judicium et supplicium, ad quod reservantur; ubi distinguendum inter supplicium ipsum et supplicii incrementum et complementum; illi jam tum subjecti sunt diaboli, hoc vero in die judicii extremi accedet.

middle of 1839, they had been further spread before the world as widely as the public presses of England, Germany, and the United States could give them currency.

Dr. Olin was in Jerusalem in April, 1840; and in his *Travels*, published in April, 1843, (nearly two years later than my work,) after describing the ancient remains around the mosk, he has the following passage.

"I could not learn that the most interesting and unquestionable of these remains—the massive arch of the ancient bridge—had been so much as mentioned by any modern traveller, though its existence has long been well known to European and other residents, as well as visitors. At least, this is the impression which I derived from my conversation with Mr. Nicolayson; who told me that Mr. Catherwood had examined the remains of the bridge seven years before." Vol. II. p. 268.

To this passage the reviewer took exceptions; and Dr. Olin, in his reply, uses the following language.

"Mr. Nicolayson was my guide to this monument; and I recorded his statement and my own measurement at the time. I now declare, that I never saw or heard the name of Dr. Robinson connected with this subject in Jerusalem or elsewhere, until I read the '*Researches*' nearly two years after my visit. Having no reason to distrust my own information, I of course presumed Dr. Robinson was in an error, in regarding himself as the original discoverer. Mr. Catherwood, who is a professional architect, and the author of Dr. Robinson's plan of Jerusalem,¹ as well as the one always in my hand, in which he had laid down the Temple, Mount Zion, and the valley between them, across which the arch looks directly, could hardly have doubted or been mistaken with regard to its design. Mr. Catherwood has often told me since, that my account is strictly true; and that he, as well as several other gentlemen with whom he conversed in Jerusalem, regarded and spoke of this monument as the remains of an ancient bridge, that connected the Jewish temple with Mount Zion."

It is the testimony here ascribed to Messrs. Nicolayson and Catherwood, to which I would invite the reader's attention. On comparing it with my note in the *Biblical Researches* quoted above, the discrepancy is seen to be so striking, that one of three things must necessarily follow, namely: either I was wrong in my statement respecting Messrs. Bononi and Catherwood; or Dr. Olin was here in the wrong; or Mr. Catherwood at different times had made different statements. It seemed due to both the gentlemen above named, as well as to myself, to call their attention to the matter. The number of the *North American Review* for January, was seen by me two or three days before January 1st; and I immediately wrote both to Mr. Nicolayson and to Mr. Catherwood upon the subject. The reply of the former did not reach me, for the reasons therein given, until August. It has reference to the paragraph first quoted above from Dr. Olin; and is as follows:

¹ Mr. Catherwood was not the author of the plan of Jerusalem in the *Biblical Researches*; but Mr. H. Kiepert, of Berlin. He made use of the same original as Mr. C. appears to have done, viz. the earlier plan of Sieber, and introduced all Mr. C.'s corrections in and around the Haram, which were made from careful measurements. But Kiepert's plan varies very materially from Mr. C.'s, on the south and west, and in the shading of the hills within the city; all these being corrections derived from measurement made with my own hands.—E. R.

" On board the Austrian Steamer, }
Off Cyprus, May, 31, 1844. }

" MY DEAR SIR,—Yours of Dec. 30th, not having reached me till shortly before my late departure from Constantinople, where I have spent the last six months, I had neither time nor opportunity to answer it thence. Though I shall touch at Beirut to-morrow, yet as I am anxious to quit that place again the same day, if possible, for Jerusalem, I prepare this line now, in order to drop it there for Mr. Smith to forward.

" I am happy to be able at once to give an answer satisfactory to you ; and at the same time to account for the slight mistake into which Dr. Olin seems to have fallen. I have the most distinct recollection, not only that I had never heard the projection in question identified with the bridge mentioned by Josephus till it was thus identified by you ; but moreover that I had myself never noticed the projection itself, till on the occasion of your visit, when it first became known to me. Nor have I any recollection of having heard it even mentioned by any previous traveller ; certainly not by Mr. Catherwood and his party.

" At the same time, I can easily account for Dr. Olin's having received the impression, as if I had referred to Mr. Catherwood on this subject. I had undoubtedly mentioned him and his researches and measurements at Jerusalem, particularly of the mosk and the underground work in the south-east corner ; but the measurement of the supposed span of the arch (of the bridge in question) attempted from the fraction of the sine obtainable from the projection of the spring, which I also mentioned to Dr. Olin, was done by an English engineer, Mr. Brettell, to whom I showed the projection, some time after your visit ; to whom also I referred it, and not to Mr. Catherwood. Dr. Olin's mistake consists, then, simply, in referring to Mr. Catherwood, who visited Jerusalem *before* you, what I had told him of Mr. Brettell, who visited it *after* you ; and the mistake was the more easily made, as I had spoken of both in the same connexion.

Yours, very faithfully,

REV. DR. ROBINSON.

JOHN NICOLAYSON."

This letter shows very clearly, that the original statement copied above from Dr. Olin's Travels, and professedly made on the authority of Mr. Nicolayson, was without foundation, and was probably the result of misapprehension. To the same main fact, viz. that before my visit in 1838 the projection in question was *not* known to either residents or travellers as the remains of the bridge described by Josephus. I have further the written testimony of the Rev. Messrs. Whiting and Lanneau, American Missionaries, long resident in Jerusalem ; and also of the Rev. Eli Smith who had previously made repeated visits to the Holy City. As however, Mr. Nicolayson was the main witness ; and his letter is so explicit and decisive, it is unnecessary to publish here the cumulative testimony of these other gentlemen.

The reply of Mr. Catherwood reached me the latter part of March. It has reference to the second paragraph quoted above from Dr. Olin ; and is so full of frank and honorable feeling, and is so creditable to the writer's candor, that I should not have felt justified in withholding it from the

public. I therefore give it here entire, subjoining a few remarks. The reader will perceive, that Mr. Catherwood here narrates in fuller detail, what he said to me more briefly when he read my note in manuscript and sanctioned its publication; while the language of Dr. Olin assumes for him something else, to which he never laid claim, and which indeed in this letter he expressly disclaims.

“ London, 9th February, 1844.

“ DEAR SIR, — Your favor of January 6th reached me but a few days before the sailing of the February steamer, and I was too much engaged to answer it at the moment. I had also to make some inquiries, to refresh my memory, which is not very good, in regard to conversations held many years ago. I am sorry that anything I should have said, or omitted saying, should have produced an apparent discrepancy in my testimony regarding the bridge; but I will endeavour to recall to mind and relate all I know of the matter in question.

“ Before going to Jerusalem, I was furnished with a manuscript map of the city by Mr. J. J. Scoles, architect, who made it on the spot, and at that time it was the best extant. I also had conversations with Mr. Barry and Mr. Scoles regarding the most interesting points that still remained for investigation. Among other directions, Mr. Scoles told me to ‘look out for the remains of a bridge which joined Mount Moriah to Mount Zion’ He had been unsuccessful in finding it himself; and did not mention to me whence he derived his information respecting it. (I have a note from Mr. Scoles to this effect, dated a few days ago.) This direction was a verbal one, not written down, and which I afterwards forgot altogether; and when I discovered the arch, it was not from purposely looking for it, but casually, in making my survey of the walls surrounding the mosk of Omar.

“ I therefore was in error when I stated to Dr. Olin, that others (meaning Messrs. Barry and Scoles) were previously acquainted with the arch in question. Mr. S. has set me right on this point; and I thus rather unexpectedly find myself to have been (so far as I know) the discoverer. I had no doubt, from the moment I saw it, that it had formed part of a viaduct and aqueduct; but I was totally ignorant of its historical importance. I merely looked at it as an architect, with reference to its position, both to the *water-course from Bethlehem* and the deep ground between it and Mount Zion. I do not recollect whether I spoke on the subject to Mr. Bonomi or Mr. Nicolayson; but when Dr. Olin told me that Mr. N. mentioned my name in connection with it, I concluded I had spoken to him on the point; which is very probable, from my having had almost daily intercourse with Mr. N.

“ This, therefore, will explain my not having made any observation, when I read your note. I was in doubt, and therefore said nothing; at least, so far as I can recollect. I was, moreover, desirous, that you, who have labored so diligently and successfully in the field of Jewish antiquities, should have the full merit (as is justly due to you) of being the first to publish and bring to light the historical importance of this monument.

I have stated the facts to the best of my recollection and present knowledge; and hope the explanation will prove satisfactory.

"I am, dear Sir, very truly yours,

"F. CATHERWOOD.

"P. S.—March 2d. About a week ago I received a letter from Dr. Olin, asking some explanation on this subject; and I thought the best plan would be, to send him a transcript of my letter to you; which I have accordingly done. F. C."

REMARKS.

I. The question here at issue is not, whether these remains have ever been noticed before; for they must have been seen by thousands upon thousands, in the long course of seventeen centuries, and especially in the age of the Crusades. Nor is it, whether they have been recognized as an arch; for among the multitudes who have looked upon them, it is scarcely possible to suppose, that some one should not have detected their true character in this respect. Yet there is no known testimony extant earlier than that of Mr. Catherwood; so that, in this sense, he is the discoverer, as I have stated in the *Researches*. Nor is it here the question, whether any one had, or had not, before speculated upon the purpose of such an arch in this place; for among the multitudes of learned men and artists who have visited the city, as, for instance, during the Crusades, we can hardly suppose, that such speculations would not have arisen in some minds; and then nothing would have been more natural than to refer these remains to a bridge or an aqueduct. Yet here, too, there is no recorded testimony in behalf of any one before Mr. Catherwood. The true question at issue is simply this: Had any person, before my visit to Jerusalem, in April, 1838, in any way brought these remains into connection with the important historical fact, made known to us by the Jewish historian, that a bridge anciently existed over the valley between the Temple and Mount Zion? I know of no such person. Had Mr. Scoles found the spot, he very probably would have brought out the result years ago. Or had Mr. Catherwood published his own observations, it is hardly to be supposed, that scientific inquirers would not have quickly perceived their identity with the bridge of Josephus. But he did not do this; and he frankly says of himself, "I was totally ignorant of its historical importance." There is no other person, so far as I know, who can in any way be brought forward in derogation of my right to this very casual honor; and this is all that I have ever claimed for myself in the *Biblical Researches* or elsewhere. I went to Jerusalem knowing nothing of the existence of any such remains; my attention was called to them there; and their identity with the ancient bridge instantly suggested itself to my mind.

II. I sincerely regret, that Mr. Catherwood, in his conversations with me, in January, 1841, did not mention that he had, at the time, regarded the arch as having "formed part of a viaduct and aqueduct." Had he done so, I certainly should have stated the fact in connection with my

note; both because my only object was, and is, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and also because, in a matter of so much archaeological importance, it is interesting to scholars to be able to trace the progress of discovery. The idea of an aqueduct and viaduct would very naturally present itself to Mr. C.'s mind, not only as an architect, but also from the analogous fact, that the water-course from Bethlehem is actually carried over the Valley of Hinnom, on the west of the city, in a similar manner. But how little stress Mr. Catherwood himself laid upon this hypothesis, as also upon the whole matter, is obvious, not only from his having thus left it to sleep for so many years; but also from the fact, that, on his plan of the city, instead of bringing the said water-course into the Haram in any possible connection with the arch, he actually brings it in from the south, at a point where the ground is nearly a hundred feet below the level of the Mosk and of the ancient bridge. The real place of its entrance is along the eastern precipice of Zion, and across the Tyropœon, at an elevation considerable less than that of the bridge.

III. It may be asked, What is here the difference between a bridge and the bridge? Why is not the inference of a scientific architect just as conclusive and important as the testimony of an historian? The reply is, that, while such an inference brings out no result beyond or more important than itself, the identification of the arch in question with a known ancient bridge is at once an immense step gained in the archaeology and topography of the Temple and city. For example: Travellers have for ages gazed upon the many courses of huge stones in the external substructions of the Haram; and perhaps all have conjectured, and many have believed, that these had been in some way connected with the Jewish Temple. This, however, was merely matter of credence, and not of demonstration; and it is not too much to say, that not a single point in the topography of the city had ever been certainly and indubitably settled. But the moment we identify this arch with the bridge described by Josephus, the conclusion follows irresistibly, that these courses of stones, with which it is thus connected, are parts of the identical wall existing in the time of Josephus. Similar reasoning applies to the southern and eastern walls; and hence is demonstrated beyond cavil the general identity of the present area of the Mosk with that of the ancient Temple. Further, the same bridge connected the Temple with Zion; and the hill now opposite on the west is thus proved to be Zion. In this way is shown the falsity of Dr. Clarke's theory, who held Zion to be the hill south of the Valley of Hinnom;—a theory which, heretofore, scholars might disbelieve, but could not disprove. Thus we may go on through the whole city; and, as one point after another is gained, each may be referred back, for all the certainty it can claim, to the identification of the arch in question with the ancient bridge.

IV. The sum of the whole matter may, therefore, be stated as follows: Mr. Scoles was aware, doubtless from Josephus, that an ancient bridge had existed; but was unable to find any remains. He suggested to Mr. Catherwood to look for such remains, but the suggestion was forgotten; and when Mr. C. found the arch in question, he was not aware that

there had been an ancient bridge. That is to say; the former knew there had been a bridge, but found no remains; the latter did not know that a bridge had existed, but found the fragment of an arch, which he referred to an aqueduct and viaduct. Thus far there was no gain to history or topography. It was left to a third person, five years afterwards, (knowing nothing of what the former two had done or thought,) to connect and identify on the spot the said remains with the ancient bridge; and thus to fix a definite and imperishable landmark, from which to trace out and settle beyond controversy many most important points in the archæology and topography of the Holy City.

INTELLIGENCE.

WE are glad to learn that the Rev. Pres. Sears of Newton is preparing for publication a Dictionary of the German language. Allen, Morrill & Wardwell, Andover, have in press Stuart's Commentary on the Apocalypse, in two vols. 8vo. ; a second edition of Taylor's translation of Krebs's Guide for Writing Latin, revised and enlarged; and a second enlarged edition of Weld's Latin Lessons. The same publishers have in preparation a translation of Kùbner's Elementary Greek Grammar, Xenophon's Cyropaedia for the use of schools and colleges, and Russell's Pulpit Elocution.—Crusius's Homeric Lexicon, an excellent help to the students of Homer, has been translated by Prof. Smith of Marietta college, and published in a handsome octavo volume.

ERRATA.

Page 154, at end of l. 23, insert *of*.—P. 195, l. 34, for *Wolf* read *Niebuhr*.—P. 195, l. 33, for *his* read *Wolf's*.—P. 419, l. 16, for *with* read *in the*.—P. 424, l. 2, for *Zenophons* read *Xenophon's*.—P. 615, l. 9, for *or* read *nor*.—P. 617, l. 31, read *Schmidthenner*.—P. 626, l. 12, read *critic*.—P. 627, l. 18—20, read *παρῶντος, παρῶντιον*.—P. 631, l. 34. Since this article was written, the word *improvements*, as we are told, has been left out of the advertisement. Mr. Liddell, one of the authors of the Lexicon, requests a friend in this country "to convey to the American public the fact that this reprint [the American] is a piracy undertaken without the consent or knowledge of the authors and proprietors of our Lexicon, and to protest against our being made responsible for anything contained in a book altered and mutilated as this may be." Mr. L. states that he and his collaborator are at work on the second edition, which will be enlarged, and that no pains will be spared to render it as correct as possible.

The publication of the present number has been unavoidably delayed, in consequence of the ill health of several contributors to the work.