

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

-4-

**THE PRESUMED SITE OF THE TEMPLE
AND
THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS
OF THE 19TH CENTURY**

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

1/ The first signs of Democracy germinated from the fertile Judeo-Christian Seed made possible the progressive development of social, economic, scientific and technological advances hand in hand with military skills. The start of this democratic growth in the Christian West was to be fatal to the Ottoman Empire with its sterilizing conception. In effect, most of the conquests of the Ottoman Empire in Christian Europe were progressively overturned and the Christians repossessed most of their lost territories that had been Islamized and dhimminised by force.

The Ottoman Empire successively lost:

- In 1774, Crimea
- In 1812, Bessarabia (Moldavia-Ukraine)
- In 1830, Greece
- In 1878, Romania and Serbia
- In 1908, Bulgaria

In regard to Palestine and more specifically Jerusalem, the Ottoman Empire was split up at the end of World War I, and had lost Palestine in 1917. This territory was then placed under British mandate (whilst Syria was placed under French mandate).

2/ It is in this general context of the progressive loss of power of the Ottoman Empire, which was accompanied by the unceasing quest by the Muslims for technological assistance from the West, that in the course of one single century (1830-1930), and under the most diverse pretexts, engineers, architects, cartographers, archaeologists, all Christians, succeeded, for the first and only time, in obtaining access for the exploration and investigation of the Haram and its immediate surroundings.

Western scholars were then able to study and very precisely survey the Haram and the bedrock of its foundations. Further, certain of these first archaeologists succeeded in making veritable excavations at the base of the ramparts and at the gates of the Haram as well as in their close proximity.

These few archaeological excavations were nevertheless often carried out in secrecy as a result of the opposition by local Muslim religious leaders, due to the latent suspicion of many of the Muslims of Jerusalem.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

The golden age of archaeology, in Jerusalem in general and in the Haram in particular, lasted for a period of about sixty years between 1855 and 1914 when work was carried out in relative freedom, until progressively, from around 1930, the formal and complete opposition of the religious authorities and the Muslim population could no longer be overlooked or overridden.

3/ The first archaeological campaign of systematic exploration of the subterranean rock foundation of the Haram lasted for three years, from 1867 to 1870, and was to form the reference for scientific studies, thus serving as the overall basis for all ulterior explorations and researches, and, specifically, for this present work.

The global topographical survey and precise altitude measures were principally established by Captain Charles Warren, an officer in the Royal Engineers.

It is his almost miraculous and extremely precise survey of the Haram underground, enriched by other archaeologists over the course of the preceding years and of those that followed, that, scientifically, allow to establish that the Temple of Solomon could not have been situated above its water supply system and reservoir for two reasons :

- for ritual and religious reasons that required Purification by "living spring waters",
- for hydraulic reasons based on the circulation of waters by means of gravity.

Paradoxically this English army officer-engineer-archaeologist, as his predecessors and those who followed him, did not even envisage the idea, forcibly ensuing the logical and scientific measurements of the various elevations made in his own survey, that the Temple could have been located outside of the Haram : this was due to the accepted religious dogma and secular postulates whose authenticity were at that time unquestionable :

- It is true that in history Jerusalem was an extremely unusual city : this was due to the incessant destructions and transformations the holy City had experienced across the centuries.

- It is equally true that the English army officer and engineer depended directly on a Foundation dedicated to the exploration of Palestine, '*The Palestine Exploration Fund*' under the patronage of Queen Victoria, who was also Head of the English Anglican Church.

- In addition Captain Charles Warren was promoted to general and knighted by the Queen in recognition of his distinguished services that had contributed to a better knowledge of biblical sources and the topography of Jerusalem, without however, having questioned any of the mystical and religious traditions of Christianity, of which the Anglican Church was part, or the Muslim traditions whose authorities had the power to sanction or forbid all exploration work in Jerusalem and Palestine.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

- Moreover, these topographical traditions of almost two thousand years were fully integrated into the three monotheist religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The latter was in addition that of the powerful governor of Palestine who authorized and tolerated over a period of fifty years the excavation works undertaken by '*The Palestine Exploration Fund*' across the whole of the Palestinian territory.

Consequently, amongst other archaeologists, the very scholarly and meticulous English engineer, Captain Charles Warren, who was physically immersed in the exploration of the underground of the Haram, had not himself dreamt for one instant of questioning the finality of the elevations and installations that he had been identifying and measuring so meticulously.

And it seemed, at that time, almost absurd that an archaeologist of the 19th century would dare to reconsider the measurements made by Warren, putting to one side the irrevocable postulate that implied that the Temple had once stood on the Haram according to the inalterable historical, topographical and mystical consensus that, then, had force of law.

4/ The first research carried out in the Haram by learned and non-Muslim scholars and specialists, commenced, in fact, in the 1800's.

These first works principally consisted of simple observations and descriptions.

- One of these first descriptions of the Haram with detailed plans was published by Catherwood in 1833.

- Amongst the first observers was the American Dr. Edward Robinson, who carried out the first scientific survey of the Holy Land covering the whole of Palestine including Jerusalem and the Haram with a study of historical and scriptural topography.

This work exercised a certain influence on the research that followed, which, within the scope of this present work, necessitates an examination of the different postulates that were thus "scientifically" endorsed by Robinson. One of the governing concepts in Robinson's general theory from an archaeological point of view was that there had always been a line of continuity between the sites of the past and the sites of the present.

And according to Robinson, one of the essential characteristics of this continuity was marked, in particular, by the name, which throughout the ages and across generations, was attributed to a given site, as well as by the phonetic modifications that this name underwent according to the language of those who occupied successively the same site.

Thus, this fixation of a needed continuity by Robinson systematically sought from the contemporary Arab name and its past the successive phonetic roots in Latin, Greek, Assyrian, and Hebrew languages.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

In general this methodology could prove to be quite reliable, but it could also sometimes induce a certain systematic unwieldiness and immobility of thought, discarding out of hand any possibility of radical topographical mutations.

This methodology of Robinson, by the sufficiency of his introductory research, exercised a certain influence on the driving thought of many of the archaeologists during the 19th century in Palestine.

It is interesting, within the scope of this present book, to examine two of his principal arguments, because these were implicitly or explicitly taken up by all the archaeologists of that period, in an archaeological consensus as to the localization of the Temple of the Jews, which was to be either on the site of the Dome of the Rock, or somewhere in its close proximity, and in any case on the Haram.

5/ Dr. Edward Robinson's argumentation :

- The first argument often presented as indisputable and which was to be amply used, is that of the **immediate visual evidence** which is presumed irrefutable and would even be reinforced by certain of these archaeologists of the 19th century with a kind of mystical and evocative exaltation or trance.

- The second more objective argument is the reference to the descriptions given by the Jewish Historian, Flavius Josephus, and by the *Tractate Middoth of the Mishnah*.

In this second argument, when the descriptions and measures indicated by Flavius Josephus and the *Tractate Middoth* were not in agreement with the indisputable reality of the Haram, as is the case for the most part of the important dimensions that Robinson could observe and verify himself on the spot, he blamed either a tendency to exaggeration, errors of measurement, or even the poor memory of Flavius Josephus :

Edward Robinson : *Biblical Research in Palestine Jerusalem V :*

The Site of the Ancient Temple, a summary :

The description given by Flavius Josephus of the Temple of the Jews, with its courts and ramparts as they were in his time, is quite confused in certain of its elements and undoubtedly exaggerated in others.

He was writing in Rome (where he had followed Vespasian and Titus) being far from his land of birth and long after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Nothing permits me to think that he had been able to assemble, before this event in his country the information necessary for his work.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

Also when he undertook the detailed descriptions and gave the precise and detailed measurements, we have every reason to doubt the exactitude of his affirmations, with the exception however of facts that are generally known such as the distance between localities on main roads.

But When Flavius Josephus describes in specific terms, the length, width and height of buildings or the different parts of the Sanctuary, measurements that he had probably not carried out himself, and which were not generally known – **it is justifiably possible to ignore the information** he gave considering them as very approximate or very conjectural. On the one hand Flavius Josephus wrote far from the places he mentioned and on the other hand he was naturally inclined by vanity to considerably embellish all the constructions described in order to increase the (past) splendour of his people, and the glory of his protectors (Vespasian and Titus who had succeeded in conquering Jerusalem and destroying the Temple of the Jews).

This specific demonstration of Robinson, which was in a certain manner initiator of the mental approach used by all the 19th archaeologists on this particular question, was making disdainfully the work of the great Jewish Historian a kind of documentary basis ,with a very variable geometry according to the objective of the demonstration chosen or decided by any future archaeologist.

6/ In this respect and in this rather contemptuous view of the works of Flavius Josephus, it appears rather useful to examine the example of two very precise affirmations by Flavius Josephus :

AFFIRMATION -A- :

This first affirmation of Flavius Josephus is that the Esplanade of the Temple was a **square with sides measuring one 'stade' (sides of approx. 180 metres)**, and not a rectangle of approximately 500 metres long by 300 metres wide, which are in fact the present dimensions of the Haram.

It is possible and most probable to admit that the Esplanade had been enlarged in the northern direction of its length by the Muslims :

It would then have been however inconvenient to place originally the site of the lost Temple at the northern extremity of the initial Esplanade, quite at its exterior, that is to say in a very eccentric location and very improbable for the Holy of Holies in the Temple of the Jews.

On the other hand due to the structure of the Haram ramparts and in particular the age of

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

the stones forming the three ramparts to the south, it is impossible to envisage that the width of the Esplanade could have been enlarged by the Muslims.

This means that the width of the esplanade of the Haram is undeniably greater by around **one hundred metres** than the Esplanade of the Temple, according to the precise measurements given to us by Flavius Josephus.

This therefore explains the laborious hypothesis of Robinson that tried to demonstrate that the figures given by Flavius Josephus were inexact.

AFFIRMATION -B- :

As Flavius Josephus indicated, not only was the Esplanade a **square** having a perimeter of 4 stades ($180 \times 4 = 720$ metres), but by enclosing the Citadel of Antonia, the total perimeter of the porticos surrounding the Esplanade of the Temple, prolonged by the Citadel of Antonia, was 6 stades ($180 \times 6 = 1080$ metres).

This is to say that the whole of the Esplanade of the Temple and the Citadel of Antonia which was joined to it on one side was formed by a square and by a quadrilateral the exact dimensions of which are unknown, since it has not been specified whether the porticos completely surrounded the Citadel of Antonia or not.

7/ The Archaeologists of the 19th century almost unanimously accepted the prolegomena-Dogma explanations advanced by Robinson concerning (the Affirmation A), the so called errors of Flavius Josephus on the measurements of each side of the square of the Esplanade of the Temple.

Concerning the second Affirmation B, the area and position of the Citadel of Antonia, the archaeologists neglected the explanations given by Robinson, who vainly tried to demonstrate that the Citadel of Antonia in reality extended along the whole length of the northern side of the Haram.

In fact on this particular point concerning the width of the Citadel of Antonia, Robinson was right because the Citadel of Antonia was in reality the Haram, to which the Esplanade of the Temple was for all intents joined.

But what Robinson could not have imagined was that the position of the two architectural structures (square and quadrilateral) was in fact inversed, and that, in reality, the rampart south of the Citadel of Antonia had been almost parallel to the northern rampart of the Esplanade of the Temple, with an angle slightly more open towards the Mountain of Olives.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

In effect the Esplanade of the Temple before being completely razed by Hadrian stood below the Citadel of Antonia (nowadays Haram) which protected the Temple, overlooked it, and contained its supplying "Water Towers", as will be demonstrated below.

8/ Contrary to the affirmations of Robinson, given as a convenient prolegomenon-postulate, which explained that the dimensions of the Esplanade of the Temple given by Flavius Josephus were wrong, all indications show that not only the figures of the Jewish historian were right, but also extremely precise, and that they were verified with the greatest care by the Roman military engineers :

In fact, the whole of the monumental work of Flavius Josephus reposed on references that were extremely meticulous and from the best sources of his time, concerning particularly the Temple, for the following reasons :

-A- As a member of a family of hereditary Temple Priests, Flavius Josephus was bathed in the respect and the mysticism of biblical culture of numbers that were sacred, whenever they represented the materialization of the ancient prescriptions of Jewish Worship. It was therefore out of the question that approximate or estimated figures were transmitted to future generations.

-B- The Roman military engineers on the staff of Titus, as all military engineers in the Roman armies, always listed with the greatest attention and with precise measurements the military installations that they inspected during their campaigns or those that they had besieged and conquered.

And in as much as the future Emperor Titus had the ambition of bequeathing to posterity a detailed account of his campaigns and victories for which the conquest of Jerusalem constituted an unquestionable apotheosis.

Appreciated in the court of the Emperor Titus, whose virtues Josephus glorified in his work *The Jewish War*, the courtier Flavius Josephus had most probably the best access to the measurements of the engineers who had participated in the Palestine Campaign, in the very unlikely case he himself had not at his disposal measurements sufficiently precise and reliable concerning the architecture of the Esplanade of the Temple which was considered by the Roman military specialists as an outstanding example in the art of fortification.

In addition it was a question of the reputation of Flavius Josephus as a historian whose detailed descriptions could have been easily verified by these same military specialists, when the Emperor Titus and his court read the work of the Jewish historian.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

-C- It perhaps happened on occasions that Flavius Josephus had exaggerated certain dimensions in order to magnify the lost monuments of the Jews, so as to increase the glory of the Emperor Titus who had defeated once and for all the Jews and put down their revolts. But there is no example where Flavius Josephus would have undervalued the architecture of the Jews and where he would have given measurements inferior to what they actually were. Moreover the case of the Esplanade of the Temple was a highly symbolic site that at the same time represented the grandeur of the Jewish nation and constituted the ultimate conquest of Jerusalem by the Emperor Titus. Also it is probable that if Flavius Josephus had had the possibility, he would have preferred to overestimate the size of the Sanctuary platform by giving it even more impressive dimensions instead of the **very modest dimensions of a square of 180 metres**. Further it was still possible, at the time of Titus and Josephus, to go to Jerusalem and to carry out measurements to verify the dimensions of the Esplanade of the Temple given by the Jewish historian, since at this time this Esplanade of the Temple had not yet been razed, as it would be by the Emperor Hadrian 65 years later. On the other hand, from another view point it is easy to admit that being victim to bitter regrets, the Roman Jew, Flavius Josephus, had at times, through his aesthetic and decorative evocations, embellished and magnified his painful memories. But **never** has he belittled them.

9/ Then after having arbitrarily disqualified the precise arithmetical data transmitted by Flavius Josephus, Robinson nevertheless presents the description of the Esplanade of the Temple as it was described by the Jewish historian, and then without dwelling on all the implicit contradictions therein, he concludes definitively and dogmatically in the following manner :

Edward Robinson : *Biblical Research in Palestine Jerusalem V.*

The Site of the Ancient Temple, Extract :

Therefore with this description (of Flavius Josephus) in view, if we now turn our regards, to the similar place of the Grand Mosque of Omar (the Dome of the Rock), it appears, with unquestionable evidence (!), that the Haram occupies, completely or partially, exactly the same place (as that was once occupied by the Esplanade of the Temple of the Jews).

This **visual evidence** forms a Dogma-Postulate which for Robinson did not need to be rationally demonstrated or which replaced sufficiently any demonstration, and this sensorial

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

logic was to be taken and amplified by **all** the Archaeologists of the 19th century as perfectly and intrinsically sufficient in itself.

10/ Following Catherwood and Robinson, several other explorers proceeded to make the first archaeological investigations in Jerusalem, for various reasons, and often resorting to subterfuges when the excavations came too near to the Haram.

Amongst these first archaeologists were :

- Between 1854 and 1861, Ermete Pierotti, a Commandant of the Italian Army Engineers, who had been appointed Architect-Engineer of the City by the Pasha, Governor of Jerusalem.

In this role he had access to many sites in Jerusalem including the Haram and Pierotti left many works amongst which figured a monograph entitled *Jerusalem Explored*.

A paragraph in his introduction confirms the basic Dogma accepted from then onwards by all the researchers having a scientific vocation and who were interested, directly or indirectly, in the Temple of Jerusalem and its Site in the 19th century :

Ermete Pierotti : *Jerusalem* : *Extract* :

Mount Moriah, which forms the south-east part of the city, is one of the points of Jerusalem from which the site can be determined with the greatest certitude by the evidence (?) with its ruins and remains (ramparts and gates of the Haram) and by the testimony of the ancient authors and local traditions.

- Also between 1850 and 1864, Félicien de Saulcy, a member of the Institute of France, conducted a mission to Jerusalem, in the course of which Captain Gelis established one of the first maps with the elevations of Jerusalem's rocks.

Félicien de Saulcy was interested amongst other things in the drainage system of the Haram that he discovered during the excavations he succeeded in carrying out at the base of the Triple Gate in the southern rampart of the Haram.

We will examine below the importance of these excavations that complete or rather prefigure the evidence of the data relative to the elevations established between 1867 and 1870 by the English engineer Charles Warren, later collated by Lieutenant Conder, and in particular those of the different underground giant Cisterns and connecting conduits in the bedrock foundation of the Haram.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

11/ Amongst the numerous descriptions and studies of the Haram that succeeded each other in the 19th century, and at the beginning of the 20th century, is that published by the Count Charles-Jean Melchior de Vogüé which marked a notable milestone.

In effect, it was one of the first most complete and detailed monographs that were published at that early time on the Temple of Jerusalem.

The Count Melchior de Vogüé was one of the first Western researchers who obtained the right to get relatively free access to the interior of the Haram, where he proceeded to make plans and sketches.

In this perspective it is interesting to examine certain extracts of his work, which, at the same time, reflected the spirit of his times, and defined the context and the spiritual Postulate that would always be an implicit prerequisite to all archaeological researches on the "Temple Mount".

To the '**visual evidence**' of the observer, a believer but proclaiming himself 'objective' as Robinson presented himself, is henceforth added by this other archaeologist, the immediate **evidence of the esoteric exaltation of mystical speculation**, at the start of the archaeological exploration of the 'Site of the Temple'.

To this effect Count Melchior de Vogue confused, with a certain fervour and secret greedy pleasure, the different Pagan, Jewish, Christian and Islamic beliefs and 'fables', in an anthology destined, according to him, to "guide" the scientific archaeologist in his work !

There, one can find heaped up the most disparate hotchpotch of amalgams fabricated by the two Religions issued from the Religion, Scriptures, books and traditions of the Jews.

But it must be said in fairness, that the example of these amalgams had been set by the Jews themselves, with for instance :

- the invention of the "Mount Moriah" by the Scribe-Priests of *Chronicles* (2 *Chronicles* 3-10) this "Mount Moriah" being totally ignored by the basics *Genesis* 22 or by 2 *Samuel* and 1 *Kings* .

- or later, the invention by the Rabbis of the Eben Shetiyyah (Stone of the Foundation) which was never heard of, neither in the basics *Exodus* and 1 *Kings* for the first Temple, nor in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* for the second Temple, nor even in the quite reliable *Tractate Middoth* for the third (Herodian) Temple ;

Furthermore, in this precise example, the Rabbis had submitted themselves and had submitted their developing ideology to a decision of Omayyad Caliph Abd al-Malik, who had chosen a prominent rock on the surface of the Haram to build the Dome of the Rock, in order to try to supplant the Islamic pilgrimage to the Kaaba, with its worship of the pagan inherited Black Stone, at Mecca, which was, then, under the control of Abd al-Malik's fierce rebel enemy, Abdullah ibn Zubayr.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

Count Charles-Jean Melchior de Vogue : *The Temple of Jerusalem*

Monograph on the Haram-ech-Cherif : Extracts :

The Mount Moriah is certainly one of the most venerable points on earth, one of the most fit to call for study and stimulate meditation.

Not only has it borne over ten centuries the Temple of Jerusalem, it is the premier Sanctuary of the ancient world, the altar of the true God, the only fixed point offered to our intelligence, in the midst of the obscurity of the religious origins of humanity, and even further to the time before history, it seems to have been the object of a worship that goes back to the first ages of the world.

The memory of this worship is recorded in a cycle of traditions grouped around the summit of the hill 'around the Dome of the Rock', and it can be found under the crude envelope that surrounds it...

These traditions can be thus resumed :

On Mount Moriah can be found a sacred stone, marked by the name of the ineffable, sealed in the abyss where it stopped the Flood. The waters of the Deluge had not touched it. From its flanks comes the mysterious spring predicted by the prophets: it is the foundation stone, and the centre of the world, Eben Shetiyyah. In this fable, the details of which I have omitted, can first of all be distinguished the old Canaanian worship of Betil, of the stone raised on the high ground...

It is that these traditions were written at the Rabbinic period, but it is incontestable that in the midst of a quantity of puerilities, the Talmudic literature encloses the traces of distant memories ; however, these traditions of such an archaic character are very much anterior to the Christian era : they have in addition a persistence that indicates to which point they are rooted in the soil, because they are found in the fables that the Muslims tell of the Sakhra (Rock of the Dome of the Rock).

According to Josephus, it was at the summit of the mountain that the sacrifice took place. This collection of memories and traditions are in the stone called Eben Shetiyyah. According to the Rabbis it was placed in the Holy of Holies and was suspended three inches above the earth ...

The geographical, topographical and archaeological studies applied to the Holy Scriptures received a new direction under the impulsion of (the first archaeologists in the beginning of the 19th century) : Seetzen, Robinson, Laborde, Williams, Saulcy, Tobler, Sepp and many others that are not cited here.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

The question of the Temple had therefore a new approach filled with ardour. But almost always in an incidental and incomplete fashion, under the form of travel notes. These new commentators had over their predecessors the advantage of a greater knowledge of the site but this was still insufficient and was reduced to an inspection outside of the walls of the Haram. The only work that had for object the interior of the Haram (*to the knowledge of Melchior de Vogue*), the plan of Catherwood, the starting point of all the efforts attempted to that date, did not distinguish between the different ages of construction, leaving the way open to conjecture. In addition the vainest hypotheses had come forth without any consideration for the topography and the ruins, each fashioning the Haram to his own liking and for the need of his own theories, certain like Fergusson reduced them to one of his angles, others like Robinson removed the whole northern extremity ...

It would have been necessary to enter into (*as Melchior de Vogue was able then to do*) the inside of the Haram to know (*visually*) that the area enclosed by ramparts was identical (?) to that of the Temple of the Jews, in its last form, that it constituted a homogeneous indivisible form with its door, windows, its external defences, a whole to which nothing could be added or removed, and that at the centre of this perfectly delimited enclosure rose a natural butte (to the north of the Dome of the Rock) designated by the topography alone as the site of the Sanctuary (*according to the vision of Melchior de Vogue*)...

To my eyes today the enclosure of Herod is clearly characterized, the site of the Temple of Solomon is identified (?) because we know that one succeeded the other in the same place, and the emotion inspired by the majesty of these memories of the past grows with the satisfaction that my vision is right. And besides if these blocks are not contemporary with the first foundation, they have seen enough great things to merit our veneration, they have seen the accomplishment of the destiny of the Jewish people, heard the preaching of the Christ, suffered the terrible assaults of Titus.

Now, from this debris that still remains we can mathematically restore the theatre of these events, entering by these gates that we describe, climbing these ramps of which we measure the slope, passing this bridge whose height we measure, we arrive at the platform, that is the first courtyard, that we fill with thought of the porticos where Jesus Christ stood, then following the form of the rock, we arrive on the second platform, that is to say the interior courtyard where we go with the Priests of the ancient Law (Jewish), finally, climbing guided by the form of the rock and the imprint that it has kept, we reach the

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

culminating point of Mont Moriah (to the north of the Dome of the Rock according Melchior de Vogue), clearly the heart of the Sanctuary of Herod (the third Temple) as the Sanctuary of Zorobabel (the second Temple) and of Solomon (the first Temple), the material centre of these great architectural ensemble, mystical centre of the ancient faith, having made the stones speak all along our route and the Rock itself, as witness of the historical character of our most cherished traditions...

This sentimental and imago approach characterizes Melchior de Vogüé, who camped uniquely on the fundamental archaeological certitude of **visions and feelings** increased by an evocation, a kind of mystical trance that remained, in fact, a quite constant in all the works of the first 19th century archaeologists, whilst the data and measurements taken with incredible talent and using the instruments of a dawning science should have normally and scientifically suspected that the Postulate, the bases of this sensorial archaeological certitude, should in reality have been radically and, above all seriously, studied and questioned.

12/ It was between 1867 and 1870 that exceptional explorations and some excavations were possible in the rocky underground of the Haram, that is to say detailed measurements inside the bedrock of the Haram itself, with excavations by tunnels and galleries, which were often made in secret at the base of its ramparts from the exterior.

These works did allow to draw up the first complete map of **altitude levels of the rocky underground** of the Haram and of its surroundings :

These works were carried out by British Army officers of engineering regiments, altogether scholars, and lovers of archaeology in Palestine.

And without these precious and irreplaceable studies, it would have been impossible to establish the very precise geological data which allow our demonstration in the present book.

This 19th century exploration, that was almost unthinkable, because of the sacred character conferred overages to the whole of the Haram by the Muslim authorities, was made politically possible by the convergence of two decisive factors :

- In Jerusalem, there was the need of the city authorities to remediate the waters supply and distribution system that had become disastrous, as well as its drainage and waste waters system.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

In effect, the anarchy that reigned in the antiquated, abandoned, neglected public works of the city buried in the numerous levels of debris accumulated from past destructions had at this time resulted in a disastrous and pestilential situation in Jerusalem's public hygiene. And with the incessant degradation of conditions it became evident that only radical resetting on a large scale could change the situation.

It was in this perspective that the Jerusalem authorities turned to the British military engineers in search of modern hydraulic technology.

- In London, Queen Victoria, Empress, Head of the Anglican Church, at the summit of her glory and British Empire's power, watched over the foundations of her legitimacy.

At the heart of this quest for legitimacy was the desire of Victoria and her aides to leave an imprint in Palestine, the very source of the Anglican Church.

It was in this context of imperial expansion, not void of motives of rivalry with the Papal Authority, that the '*Palestine Exploration Fund*', patronised and created by Queen Victoria, was financed for an ambitious archaeological exploration programme throughout Palestine.

13/ Thus when the Ottoman demand for technological aid to Jerusalem was formulated, the Royal Engineers of the British Army received the order to appoint for this mission certain engineers who had also an appropriate scholarly knowledge in history and archaeology :

In this way the officers Wilson, Warren and Conder (among others) were to be successively sent to Jerusalem.

All started in 1864 when the officers of the mapping department of the British Army were officially ordered to carry out a general survey (*Ordnance Survey*) that included the relief and basement of Jerusalem.

The result was published in 1865 by the Ordnance Survey Department with the creation in the same year of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*.

In order to firmly establish this new institution an *Annual Report* was published that was progressively transformed into a *Quarterly Statement*, which in its final form became *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly*.

As time passed, the *Palestine Exploration Fund* co-opted non-British archaeologists, such as, for example, the German Schick or the Frenchman Clermont-Ganneau.

Then, other countries like Germany or France undertook projects of a similar nature to that of the British : Among others, it is worth noting, as a result of this unique wave of archaeological works in Jerusalem, appeared the monographs of Vincent (and Abel) as well as that of Buizink.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

14/ Besides their regular publications in the *Palestine Exploration quarterly*, Wilson, Warren and Conder published a number of different works presenting the various phases of their researches.

And in 1884 was published a work that recapitulated the whole of their works entitled, '*Survey of Western Palestine*'.

Thus the principal and successive works of the British 19th century Archaeologists concerning Jerusalem are :

- 1871: *The Plans, Elevations and Sections of Excavations in Jerusalem (Ordnance Survey)*
- 1871: *Recovery of Jerusalem*
- 1876: *Underground Jerusalem*
- 1884: *Survey of Western Palestine*

15/ From his first work in 1871, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, Warren, in turn, established as an undisputable fact, to which all possible discussion would be useless and pointless, the basic Postulate establishing, topographically, the idea that the Haram had "**obviously**" replaced the Temple of the Jews.

Warren : *Recovery of Jerusalem, Extract* :

On Mount Moriah, there is now a vast open space called the Haram-esh-Sharif, a place that is particularly sacred in the eyes of the Muslims

To the interior of this sacred space, the Sanctuary as it could be called, stood the Temple of the Jews. It is scattered with Cypresses and Olive trees, and its sides are mostly surrounded by a line of ramparts that are amongst the most beautiful in the world. At the southern extremity of this esplanade is the Al-Aqsa Mosque, and a group of buildings that were used by the Knights of the Temple (during the Christian Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem).

Almost in the centre of the Esplanade is a platform, paved with stones, on which stands the famous Kubbet al Sakhra Mosque (Dome of the Rock), with its dome of admirable proportions.

- There, in the centre of this Esplanade stood the Temple of the Jews. -

Every sign of this Temple has disappeared '*there shall not be left one stone upon another*' (*Gospel according to Luke 21/6 Matthew 24/2, Mark 13/2*), and its exact position (on this Esplanade) has been the cause of one of the most bitter controversies.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

16/ In the publication that summarized his works, *The Survey of Western Palestine*, in 1884, Warren consecrates one small chapter to the history of archaeological explorations in Jerusalem and one chapter to various archaeological controversies. Here Warren, in a certain way, exposes again his basic doctrine, by implicitly using for his own purposes the Postulate established by Robinson and Melchior de Vogüé, which recognized out of hand and without any questioning this affirmation, that the Temple of the Jews stood on the Haram, in agreement with a permanent law of physical continuity of any site across the ages :

Charles Warren *A Survey of Western Palestine* :
History of the (Archaeological) Exploration of Jerusalem : Extract :

The first work of James Ferguson on the topography of Jerusalem dates from 1847, and his last work *The Temple of the Jews* appeared in 1878.

Amongst the other persons who treated the archaeology of Jerusalem, before the Ordnance Survey was undertaken, the most important are the following : Willis, (1849), Lewin (1863), Stanley (1856), De Saulcy (1865) Barclay (1857), Vandevelde and the important publications of the Duke de Vogüé (in reality, Count and Marquis) including the *Églises de la Terre Sainte* (1860) and the *Temple de Jérusalem* (1864).

Plans of Jerusalem were established by Sieber in 1818, by Catherwood in 1833, by Robinson (from 1838 to 1856), by Tobler in 1850, and by Lieutenants Aldrich and Symons in 1849. Thrupp and Barclay, as Vandevelde have made additions to the existing plans, but all these plans had been made obsolete by the plans established for the cartographic department of the British Army (*Ordnance Survey*) by Captain Charles Wilson, now Colonel and Sir (knighted by the Queen), and published in 1866. The work of modern explorers (including that of the British Royal Engineers) have rendered obsolete the works of their predecessors with the exception of the work of the erudite, Robinson, and the scientific work accomplished by de Vogüé.

Principal Controversies : Extracts :

It has often been declared that there is not a single question of topography concerning Jerusalem that has not been the subject of controversy. This is however a little exaggerated, because there exists a number of points on which all authorities agree.

- Firstly concerning the natural relief, everybody admits the Mount Olives is the

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

hill that is to the east of the Temple Mount, and the valley overlooked by Mount Olives on its western flank is the Valley of the Kedron torrent.

- Everybody also agrees that the Temple stood on the eminence (Haram) that is to the west of the Kedron (Valley), and that the downstream prolongation of this eminence was called Ophel....

- Everybody accepts, since Robinson, that the Tyropeon Bridge (connecting the Upper City to the Temple, above the valley to the west of the Haram) ended at the court of the Temple of Herod; and all the plans (of the Esplanade) of the Temple are based on the same **postulate**, that is to say the south west angle of this Esplanade coincide exactly with the south-west angle of the Haram....

Diplomatically, Warren preferred not to become explicitly involved in the controversy concerning the exact position of the Temple on the Haram : For example, Melchior de Vogüé had not been won over to the tradition that resulted from the Muslim construction of the Dome of the Rock over the Sakhra.

Furthermore on this particular point Warren preferred prudently to refer cautiously to the position taken by his assistant, the lieutenant Conder (who later became captain, major and finally general) :

Captain Conder commenced with the **Postulate**, which accepts the tradition common to the Jews, Christians and Muslims, and which identifies the Sacred Rock as the Foundation Rock on which the Ark of the Covenant stood : the Dome of the Rock stands on this rock site, situated at the highest point of the Haram.

17/ This prudent and diplomatic attachment of Warren (not taking himself position on this question) in search of the largest consensus possible with regard to the historical and archaeological traditions, was shared by most of the first Archaeologists in Jerusalem in the 19th century, but could nevertheless in certain cases result in fundamental errors, cruelly demonstrated by later discoveries.

An example of such error can be illustrated by the anecdote concerning the Church of the Virgin built in Jerusalem by the Byzantine Emperor Justinian :

The Archaeologists of the 19th century and of the first half of the 20th century, borne by the premise established by Count Melchior de Vogüé, based their theory on an account of Procopius to determine the position of the Church of the Virgin as having been precisely that of the Al-Aqsa Mosque.

The details provided by Procopius, and the intense desire of Melchior de Vogüé to establish a continuous link between Jewish, Christian and Muslim veneration, led him to affirm with

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

force that the Al-Aqsa Mosque had been built on the ruins of the Basilica of the Virgin, which itself would have been built on the ruins of the Palace of Solomon...

Moreover, Melchior de Vogüé, and those 19th century and early 20th century Archaeologists who followed him, detected in the structure of the Al Aqsa Mosque certain architectural elements that appeared to them as indisputably parts of the Byzantine Basilica of the Virgin :

Charles Warren *A Survey of Western Palestine :*
History of the (Archaeological) Exploration of Jerusalem : Extract :

Amongst the most important constructions of the first period of the Christian era that succeeded that of Constantine appeared those that were built on the Haram, by Justinian in 522 AD (a century before the construction of the Al Aqsa Mosque). Theodore was the architect, and it is mentioned in a 6th century work (Procopius : *The Buildings of Justinian*).

Amongst the constructions on the Haram, there was the Basilica of the Virgin Mary that stood on arches and was surrounded by a court. There were also two hospices for the poor and sick. The remains of this basilica were identified by the Duke de Vogüé in the Al Aqsa Mosque...

As an example of this particular **19th century archaeological methodology**, here is the text of Count Melchior de Vogüé that allowed the 19th century Archaeologists (and Warren) to affirm that the Basilica of Justinian of the Holy Virgin (called *Nea* and completely razed by the Muslims) once had stood on the Haram, on the exact site of the Al-Aqsa Mosque :

Count Charles-Jean Melchior de Vogüé : *The Temple of Jerusalem :*
Monograph on the Haram-ech-Cheri : The Mosque Al-Aqsa: Extracts :

An ancient tradition indicates that (the site of Al-Aqsa) is (that of) the Cathedral of the Virgin, built by Justinian, and of which Procopius has left us a description.

It was even believed up to now that the Al-Aqsa Mosque was the cathedral itself, taken from the Christians and transformed by the Muslims.

Myself I accepted this error until the day when I was allowed to enter into the Mosque : one glance was sufficient to convince me that the edifice in its present form is entirely Arab ; it is nevertheless true that its form of a basilica, its cruciform layout, the existence of certain remains that I will describe in due course prove that **it had been preceded by a Christian Church** whose ruins had served as a base of the Arab construction, and whose principal lines have been preserved in the successive transformations of the Mosque.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

This church could only be the Basilica of Justinian : **Everybody is in agreement with that** : It suffices to compare the description of Procopius to be convinced with the very particular situation of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and with the great substructures that support it.

(Text of Procopius)

Procopius, in telling us that the Church of the Virgin was the only monument in Jerusalem that was situated on the steep slope of a hill in such a manner that part of it was in the rock itself and the rest supported by tall substructures, designated by that the Al-Aqsa Mosque or at least the monument that preceded it : It is in effect the only point of the city that satisfies the said conditions.

Finally, Antonin of Plaisance, a pilgrim, at the end of the 6th century, by the order in which he enumerated the places he visited, proved the Church of the Virgin and its great Hospice were near to the ruins of the Temple of the Jews.

Thus all the witness accounts are concordant :

It is evident that in the construction of a grand ecclesiastical edifice they had wanted to use the unshakable antique underground foundations of the ancient Temple of the Jews.

Melchior de Vogüé then proceeds with the detailed examination of the facades of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and comments on one of its fragments as follows :

For me it is **indisputable** that this fragment of the (Al Aqsa façade) belongs to the ancient church : by this we know the disposition of the naves and the length of the main building : if necessary this fragment would suffice to restore the plan of the church, but I think this mental exercise is not worth the effort.

The southern extremity (of the Church of the Virgin) was borne by the substructures that still exist (under the Al-Aqsa Mosque).

Thus what Procopius ascertained is confirmed. To the east of the church the whole space that is today filled by grand Arab constructions was empty. The narthex (the entry porch) the atrium and its colonnades, the grand entrance and its hemicycles stretched to the north of the façade, in the space that is today empty and which separates the porch of Al-Aqsa from the platform of the Sakhra (the Dome of the Rock). The great Hospices were to the west and were probably in part supported by the fine terraces of the south-west angle of the enclosure (of the present Haram)....

This firm Postulate, established by the Archaeologist's vision, inspired by ancient texts, fixed the position of the Church of the Virgin on the site of the Al Aqsa Mosque :

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

And this credence continued firmly until Israeli Archaeologists discovered the genuine ruins of this church built by Justinian near the Cardo, the principal Roman road that crossed the Byzantine city of Jerusalem.

In fact the archaeological discovery by the Israelis, destroying the unshakable **certitudes** of the 19th century Archaeologists, was confirmed by an inaugural inscription on one of the foundation stones, 'in situ', of this lost Byzantine Basilica, *Nea*.

18/ Following the Archaeologists of the 19th century, those of the 20th century did not raise the least question as to whether the Temple of the Jews had once stood on the Haram.

That was archaeologically speaking "evident" and was part of the quasi structural and institutional certitudes that were immediately available by simple sight, good judgment and by the use of a concept that implied a supposed obvious historical and topographical continuity.

For example the French Archaeologist and clergy man Hugues Vincent, who led excavations in 1910 (but not in the Haram), published an important monograph in two different editions:

- 1914-1926 : Vincent and Abel: *New Jerusalem*.
- 1954-1956 : Vincent and Steve : *Jerusalem of the Old Testament*.

Hereafter, amongst different examples of the unanimously recognized archaeological Postulate of the 19th-20th century, is the introductory passage concerning the Temple of Solomon :

Vincent and Steve : *Jerusalem of the Old Testament* :

Archaeology B: The Temple: Chapter XIV The Temple of Solomon Preliminary remarks:

When the panorama of the Holy City is contemplated from a view point like the Mountain of Olives, what first attracts the viewer's attention is the immense esplanade in the foreground presenting a striking vision with its harmonious buildings punctuated by a few trees. In modern toponymy, this is the "*Haram esh-Sharif*", *The Noble Sanctuary*. In the traditional designation it is the 'Temple', that is to say : "the Israelite Sanctuary which was for a millennium, at the same time, the heart and head of the nation, the spiritual and profane centre where people of religious and those of civil life met, the movement of affairs and ideas, politics and school, liturgy and commerce." (quotations from the Book *The Temple of Jerusalem* by Melchior de Vogue) .By its monumental and splendid character, it was the pride of Israel but it was also a guarantee of the permanent

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*

protection with which Yahweh surrounded his chosen people. Towards him converged national aspiration and piety : *'I rejoice when they say : Go to the house of Yahweh! Here our feet have rested within your doors, Jerusalem! (Psalms CXXI : 1)* Across a multitude of vicissitudes, this monument was for ten centuries, the unique centre of the true God in the world : thus what matters most is that we achieve the most true and solid notion possible about its authenticity...

19/ In view of the visual, sensual, mystical, esoteric and finally rather approximate methods that were used by the Archaeologists of the 19th century to establish the splendid Postulate apparently transmitted by history, by which they proclaimed, with fervour and without the least shadow of doubt, that the Temple of the Jews had stood on the Haram, and most probably on the spot where the Muslims had built the Dome of the Rock, a kind of antidote is proposed with the present Study, as a necessary and new counter-examination, 'virginal', and without any prerequisite Dogma-Postulate, but based entirely on the only precise and **arithmetical survey and measures ever taken in the bedrock beneath the Haram** that is to say those taken by the same talented and meticulous Archaeologists of the 19th century.

And in order to fully clarify these irreplaceable and irrevocable arithmetic measures, and to arrive at a final and definitive conclusion, it appears necessary, before all, to examine how the Temple of the Jews really functioned, altogether in its religious and linked underground Hydraulic aspects, miraculously preserved and faithfully **engraved** in the bedrock of the Haram.

*The Temple of Solomon Could not Stand
On its Water Tower*
