

PART FOUR



The Position and Description of Herod's Temple

Chapter 31

DESCRIPTIONS OF FORT ANTONIA AND THE TEMPLE OF HEROD

JOSEPHUS SAID there were actually three fortresses that guarded Jerusalem before the war with the Romans — if one included the Temple itself as a fortress, which indeed it was. The Temple was the only Jewish fortress while the other two were Roman. The Temple as a fortress protected the Lower City (the southeastern portion of Jerusalem). As for the two Roman fortresses, the smallest was located in the Upper City situated at Herod's former palace (that included the three towers of Hippicus, Phasaelus and Mariamne). The function of those three fortresses was to protect Herod's Palace in the Upper City. Though they later became Roman fortresses in 6 C.E., they were finally called "local fortresses" during the client reigns of Agrippa I and II (37–44 C.E. and 50–66 C.E.). This is because Herod had given them "local"

names to distinguish them from the main (international) encampment known as Fort Antonia. This central citadel, however, was always Fort Antonia. It was located to the north of the Temple. Of these three fortress areas, Josephus informs us that the largest and most formidable was Fort Antonia.

“The Temple was a fortress that guarded the city, as was the tower of Antonia a guard to the Temple; and in that tower [Antonia] were the guards of those three [Antonia was the main fort that guarded the City, the Temple and even Fort Antonia itself]. There was also a peculiar fortress belonging to the upper city which was Herod’s palace.”⁵⁹²

Fort Antonia was large and it was critically situated near the Temple. It became the central military headquarters that had the responsibility of protecting the whole of the City of Jerusalem as well as the Temple. Even the western towers (the “local fortresses”) at or near Herod’s palace in the Upper City that were linked together as a single fortress were reckoned to be defended by Fort Antonia.

Josephus said: “He [Herod] had now the [Upper] City fortified by the palace in which he lived, and by the Temple which had a strong fortress by it, called Antonia, and was rebuilt by himself.”⁵⁹³ Josephus indicates that Antonia was preeminently “a strong fortification” located on the north side of the Temple. Josephus said that Antonia was so vast it actually dominated the Temple on its northern flank in all aspects.⁵⁹⁴

Note that Fort Antonia was regarded as a “fortress” before the Roman/Jewish War. In Jerusalem, in the time of Jesus, the Temple itself was the only Jewish fortification. The Romans laid no claim to the Temple as a part of their military encampments for the control and protection of Jerusalem, though they often stationed troops on the outer roadways above the four colonnades surrounding the Temple square, especially at festival times.

⁵⁹² *War* V.5,8.

⁵⁹³ *Antiquities* XV.8,5).

⁵⁹⁴ The Loeb translation states that “Antonia dominated the temple” (*War* V.5,8.).

The fact that Fort Antonia in Jerusalem was a Roman camp can be seen in other ways. For example, when King Agrippa was addressing the Jews in Jerusalem not to go to war with the Romans, he told them their belligerent actions in the initial phases of the conflict already had constituted a war scenario as far as Rome was concerned. This was because in early June of 66 C.E., the Jews tore down some strategic sections of two broad roadways that linked the gates in the southern wall of Fort Antonia with a corner gate of the Temple near its northwestern angle.⁵⁹⁵

These two roadways connecting Fort Antonia with the Temple were actually bridges with level upper decks that were elevated above the ground and resting on columns. The topmost deck was supported by columns that were just like the columns that surrounded the perfectly squared region of the actual Temple walls.

The Temple Was a Perfect Square

It must be remembered that Josephus was an eyewitness of the Temple, Fort Antonia and all of Jerusalem. He dogmatically stated that the Temple was located on an elevated platform with four walls surrounding it that formed a perfect square. Each of the four Temple walls was exactly a *stade* (c. 600 feet) in length.⁵⁹⁶ Besides this (as I will show) the Mishnah a hundred years later said the Temple Mount was a perfect square of 500 cubits (c. 750 feet) on each of its four sides. The figures are *not* contradictory. They are supplemental to each other. While the actual walls of the Temple were a perfect square of 600 feet on each side, there was another area surrounding the walls of the Temple (called the *Temple Mount* — which had NO walls around it) that was also a perfect square of 750 feet on each side. The two areas with their different measurements were quite distinct from each other. These measurements provide us with two different dimensions depicting parameters that were not the same. The greater dimension describes a square area (750 feet on each side) that surrounded the square area of the walls of the Temple that Herod built around the Temple (600 feet on

⁵⁹⁵ *War* II.15,6.

⁵⁹⁶ *War* V.5,2 with VI.5,4 and *Antiquities* XV.9.3.

each side).⁵⁹⁷ The marginal area between the outer limits of the Temple Mount and the Temple walls were reckoned less holy to the Jewish authorities (I will show this in a later chapter).

Josephus also tells us that the two elevated roadways from the northwestern angle of the Temple leading into Fort Antonia were also 600 feet (a *stade*) in length. This means that the precise distance between the southern wall of Fort Antonia and the northern wall of the Temple was one *stade*.⁵⁹⁸ This obviously signifies that the space between Fort Antonia and the Temple was 600 feet.⁵⁹⁹

The Two Colonnade Roadways

The two colonnades leading from the Temple to Fort Antonia had the identical dimensions as those that surrounded the four-square outer court of the Temple (45 feet wide) because Josephus

⁵⁹⁷ The square of the Temple Mount (750 feet on each side) was NOT equidistant from the square of the Temple walls (600 feet on each side). We are told quite plainly that this is a fact, and I will show the evidence for it as we continue.

⁵⁹⁸ As clear as Josephus could make it he stated that the distance between the southern wall of Fort Antonia and the northern wall of the Temple was one *stade*. See *War* VI.2.6. Strangely, some translators (namely, Whiston and Williamson) render this precise distance by the generic word "space" without giving the exact distance of a *stade* as mentioned by Josephus. Even Thackeray in the Loeb edition does the same thing in his main English text, but in a footnote he admits that the Greek manuscripts clearly have "furlong" (that is, in Greek, "*stade*"). Cornfeld in his translation shows that the "space" was actually a "*stade*" in length, though he puts the English word "furlong" in brackets. The reason for this indecision on the part of the translators to render this space to be exactly a *stade* in length (600 feet) is because most scholars imagined that Fort Antonia was a small fortress on the northwestern corner of the Temple Mount (which they wrongly identify with the Haram esh-Sharif) and that there can be little or no space at all between the southern wall of Antonia and the northern wall of the Temple. The truth is, however, as I have been showing in this book, the southern wall of the Haram esh-Sharif is actually the southern wall of Fort Antonia, and Josephus rightly states that a person had to walk a *stade* south of that southern wall (600 feet) to encounter the northern wall of the Temple.

⁵⁹⁹ The *stade* was the length of a stadium where sprint races (and other athletic events) took place. The normal stadium length was about 600 feet, though some stadiums could differ (more or less) in length. In this book, I take 600 feet to be the ideal length of the *stade*, and this could not be far off. See *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p.1010 for details.

called those two colonnades as being appendages of the Temple.⁶⁰⁰ In fact, the two colonnades from the Temple to Antonia were simple extensions of those four colonnades surrounding the square-form Temple complex. They were much the same in appearance and in size as the Temple colonnades. Josephus informs us that the colonnades of the Temple were 45 feet wide (30 cubits) and about 38 feet high (25 cubits).⁶⁰¹ There was a roadway at the bottom part of the colonnades and another on the roof of the colonnades (the top deck was reserved for the military).

These two roadways (both the lower roadway which was the sheltered portion among the columns and the upper roadway on top of the columns) were two avenues leading into the Temple from Fort Antonia. The Roman soldiers who guarded the Temple used the upper roadways on top of the two colonnades. This feature made them to appear as two side-by-side “bridges” 600 feet long.⁶⁰² They led directly from Fort Antonia to the northwest cor-

⁶⁰⁰ The roofs of the colonnades, both of the square Temple enclosure and the two colonnade roadways that extended from the Temple to Fort Antonia, were intended to be areas where Roman troops could guard the entrances and exits to the Temple as well as to the Temple square itself. Josephus refers to this precise usage of the roofs of the colonnades. He said: “The usual crowd had assembled at Jerusalem for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and the Roman cohort [i.e., 2000 troops] had taken up its position on the roof of the portico [colonnade] of the Temple; for a body of men in arms invariably mounts guard at the feasts, to prevent disorders arising from such a concourse of people” (*War* II.12,1 italics mine, Loeb translation). Josephus said it was customary to have 2000 troops on these four colonnade areas surrounding the Temple square in 3 shifts (making 6000 men each day) to control the crowds (*War* IV.3,12).

⁶⁰¹ In this book, the cubit is accepted as being 18 U.S. and British inches.

⁶⁰² Professor George Adam Smith shows how scholars have realized that these two “bridges” existed over some kind of “valley” between the Temple and Fort Antonia, but most who recognize them in the writings of Josephus fail to understand why they were necessary. Professor Smith said: “Sanday and Waterhouse (*Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 108, with Plan 116; see also frontispiece) suppose a ‘valley’ crossed by ‘a double bridge’ between the Temple and Antonia, for which there is ‘some reason’ (108)” (*Jerusalem*, vol.II., p.499, n.1). Professor Paine in his work *Solomon’s Temple* (Boston, 1861) correctly illustrates those colonnade “bridges” in a diagram in his book (see this diagram also in M’Clintock & Strong, *Cyclopaedia*, vol. X., p.258). These “bridges” led from the Temple to Antonia. Indeed, Josephus stated dogmatically that there was exactly a distance of one *stade* (600 feet) in this narrow and confined space on

ner of the outer Temple colonnades. One roadway allowed ingress to the Temple and the other roadway provided an egress from the Temple. These were the “military entrances and exits” to and from Herod’s Temple. For this reason the general public normally did not use the northern entrance to the Temple. Though these were two roadways that led to the top of the Temple colonnades, there was only one gate in the northern wall. It was called the Tadi Gate.⁶⁰³ This northern gate was not used by the general public.

Josephus later described these two colonnades (military roadways) as being an integral part of Temple.⁶⁰⁴ They were likened to two “limbs attached to a body.”⁶⁰⁵ Josephus used this illustration to describe how the Jews destroyed parts of these two colonnades to keep them from being connected to the Temple. He said that cutting down these two colonnades was like the amputation of two arms from a diseased body. Those “arms” from the Temple extended northward to Fort Antonia and were considered to be a part of the Temple itself.⁶⁰⁶

top of the two bridges between Fort Antonia and the Temple (*War* VI.2,6 ¶144).

⁶⁰³ This was the only gate into the outer Temple courts from the north (*Mid-doth* 1:3). The name Tadi signifies “private” or “obscurity” (that is, it was normally off-limits to the general public because it was used almost exclusively by the military forces in Fort Antonia in order to enter onto the Temple colonnades from the two colonnade “bridges” that reached from Antonia in the north).

⁶⁰⁴ We will discover in a later chapter that the top of the northern wall of the outer Temple (at the juncture with these two colonnades from Fort Antonia) was at least 180 feet in height above the rocky ground below. If there were no colonnade bridges spanning this area between the north Temple wall and the south wall of Fort Antonia, then the troops from Fort Antonia would have had to descend to the ground level and then, when they reached the north wall of the Temple, climb steps upward for at least 150 feet in order to reach the platform on which the Temple was built. Such a situation would provide little or no military advantage to any troops coming from Antonia. But, if two bridges went directly from the southwest corner of Antonia practically on a level to the northwest corner to the outer Temple colonnades (and none but military forces could use such bridges), this would have been highly advantageous. This, indeed, is precisely what Herod provided for the troops in Fort Antonia who supervised the crowds in the courts of the Temple. These bridges gave easy access from one fortress (Fort Antonia) to the southern fortress (the Temple).

⁶⁰⁵ *War* VI.2,9.

⁶⁰⁶ In architectural terms, “arms” represent “an extension of a building or of a group of buildings” (Merriam-Webster *Third New International Dictionary*).

These colonnades were the two military roadways used by the Roman troops (built with a north/south orientation) that the Jews severed from the Temple early in the war. They cut them down again near the end of the war to impede the final Roman entry into the Temple. As a matter of fact, when the Romans eventually demolished the north wall of Antonia and captured the whole fortress, they immediately rushed through the entire length of the fortress area to its southwest corner. This allowed them to reach the two southern exits from Antonia that led directly to the Temple. They found themselves at the beginning of the two elevated roadways spanning the open space between Antonia and the Temple. In the latter phase of the war, the Romans chased the retreating Jewish forces onto these narrow elevated roadways as the Jewish troops ran southward toward the Temple. A battle then took place on top of the two narrow bridges.

Vantage-Point of Titus on Antonia's South Wall

At this battle, Titus ascended the southern wall of Antonia to watch the conflict that was taking place on the narrow roadways spanning the 600 feet open space between Fort Antonia and the Temple. Recall that Josephus said that the whole of Temple precincts could be observed by anyone who was standing on top of the southeast tower of Fort Antonia.⁶⁰⁷ What Titus did was to position

The term is similar to "the wing of a building." It was common in the imperial period of Rome for architects to ascribe terms denoting the human body to parts of buildings. Vitruvius, who wrote in the first century before Christ in his work on *Architecture*, states: "As in the human body, from cubit, foot, palm, inch and other small parts comes the symmetric quality of eurhythmy [harmony and esthetics of design in the human body], so it is in the completed building" (Book I.c.ii,4 Loeb ed.). That is, many early architectural terms for buildings were associated with the nomenclature of appendages attached to the human body. As a modern example, the "Brentwood Arms Hotel" would have originally signified an appendage to the main building. Later, if the "Arms" section became more prominent, people forgot the main building and concentrated only on the "Arms" itself. Josephus in his reference above was speaking of two colonnades attached to the Temple, part of the Temple complex. They connected Fort Antonia to the northwestern angle of the Temple and both were 600 feet in length. They were the Temple's northern "arms."

⁶⁰⁷ *War* VI.2,6.

himself on the southern wall of Antonia and he could easily see what was happening below him and on the roadways leading to the Temple some 600 feet in the south. Professor George Adam Smith called attention to the fact that the conflict took place between the Romans and the Jewish forces at this particular spot clearly shows there was open space between Fort Antonia and the Temple and not (as it is most often shown on maps of Antonia) that the area south of Antonia abutted directly to the Temple. This is why Josephus described the battle area as 600 feet long,⁶⁰⁸ and he also said the spot was “narrow” and confined. The troops had no where to maneuver (except in a north or a south direction) on the two bridges that were 600 feet long that connected Fort Antonia and the Temple.

In spite of the fact that Josephus said the space between Fort Antonia and the Temple was 600 feet, scholars for the past 200 years have had difficulty in believing him (though he was an eyewitness who lived in Jerusalem and was a Priest at the Temple). Professor Smith, however, was willing to waver a little in the right direction of interpretation. He said:

“Though some of the language used by Josephus may be interpreted as though the Antonia immediately adjoined, or even abutted upon, the Temple cloisters [colonnades], this is not the only possible meaning; and in his description of the struggles between the Romans and the Jews, after Titus had taken the Castle [Antonia], Josephus implies that some little space intervened between the latter and the peribolos [colonnades] of the sanctuary.”⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁸ *War* VI.2,6.

⁶⁰⁹ *Jerusalem*, vol.II, p.496. Professor Smith is referring to the narrative of Josephus in *War* VI.1,7–8 and VI.2,6. The whole battle scene shows there was the space of 600 feet between Fort Antonia and the Temple. It was a “narrow space” in an east/west direction within which the Romans and Jews were fighting with one another. The only way the troops could maneuver was either north (back into Antonia) or south (back into the Temple). Since Titus could witness everything going on from the top of the southern wall of Antonia, the battles must have taken place on the narrow roadways situated on top of the two colonnades. Those roadways on top of the colonnades were used for military purposes. Below these “bridges” the general public could walk and they could even enter Fort Antonia through lower gateways with stairs approaching the various other gates. The general public, however, could not enter the Temple area from

Professor Smith should have noticed that in Josephus' Greek text, the historian accurately said the space was 600 feet.⁶¹⁰ Almost everyone has overlooked this important geographical point. But the fact that a full *stade* of open space existed between the south wall of Fort Antonia and the north wall of the Temple is a cardinal factor given by Josephus that should never have been jettisoned from our appraisal in understanding that geographical setting.

The narratives in Josephus clearly show that Fort Antonia could not have abutted directly to the Temple as we observe in almost all maps by modern scholars. Soon I will show another way of determining that the colonnade roadways were each 600 feet long — they were each a *stade*. Those two colonnades having the narrow roadways on top (45 feet across) bridged this open space between the Temple and Fort Antonia.⁶¹¹

the north. There was only one Temple gate in the north, the Tadi Gate on top of the Temple platform, used only by the military. The only avenues from Fort Antonia directly to the courts of the Temple were the two colonnade roadways reserved for military purposes. The battles mentioned by Prof. Smith were fought on top of those narrow and confined roadways that were 600 feet long and orientated north/south.

⁶¹⁰ *War* VI.2,6.

⁶¹¹ This space of 600 feet between Fort Antonia and the Temple is clearly allowed in the narrative concerning the apprehension of the apostle Paul in the Book of Acts. The angry mob of the Jews took hold of Paul in the Temple, then dragged Paul "outside the Temple [*heiron*]" and immediately closed all public gates into the Temple (Acts 21:30). They then sent messengers to the judicial authorities "seeking" permission to kill Paul (which would have been by stoning) (verse 31). Such stoning had to be outside Jerusalem at what was called The Place of Stoning (Sanhedrin 6:1 and also see sections 2, 3 and 4). This is where Stephen had been stoned to death earlier (Acts 7:58–60). Later Christian authorities recognized this place of stoning as being at the top of the Mount of Olives (Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*, p.185, n.1). Paul was being taken toward this spot when the commandant of Fort Antonia (with other officers and troops) left the fort and "ran down" (verse 32) to the crowd waiting with Paul for permission to stone him. When they saw the Romans, the crowd became agitated and unruly and asked for judgment against Paul. So violent was the crowd that the commandant ordered Paul to be taken "into the encampment" (Fort Antonia). In doing so, they had to ascend what was called "the stairs" (verses 34–35). At the top of the stairs, and just before entering Fort Antonia, Paul asked to speak to the people. After his speech the people became violent and began throwing dirt into the air (making clouds of dust fouling the air) (Acts 22:22). This shows the crowd was at the bottom of the stairs and at ground level in order

The initial battle scene for the Temple as described by Josephus shows that the Romans and Jews had only two directions to maneuver within this narrow 600 feet long area between the Temple and Fort Antonia. Those directions were north (back into Antonia) or south (into the Temple). Since Titus and the generals could witness from the southern wall of Antonia the whole battle scene, the pushing back and forth in this narrow and constricted area of the 45 feet roadways means the fighting was on top of the colonnades themselves (not in the sheltered underneath part). As the battle raged, the Jewish troops in this case got the upper hand and drove the Romans back into Fort Antonia. Then the Jews cut down the portion of the two colonnades nearest the Temple. This impeded the later movements of the Romans to capture the Temple. To finally conquer the Temple itself the Romans had to use battling rams and ramps in order to break down and to scale the Temple walls.

Remember, at the very beginning of the war, the Jewish revolutionaries cut down parts of those same two colonnades reaching from Fort Antonia to the Temple. But at that early period they listened to the pleadings of King Agrippa and repaired these "Arms of the Temple." So, this space of 600 feet between Fort Antonia and the Temple was again bridged in this earlier time when the

to secure dirt (to throw into the air) which they got no doubt from the garden sites encompassing the area. Paul was then taken into Fort Antonia for his protection. All of this shows that the crowd was waiting for permission to take Paul through the east gate of Jerusalem (located in the east wall built between the southeastern angle of Fort Antonia and the Temple). In this 600 foot space between Fort Antonia and the Temple was a garden area where loose dirt could be obtained for protest. Besides this, there was the main staircase that led upwards to the southern gates that the public would use to enter Fort Antonia. These very stairs were first unearthed in modern times by the college students that I supervised (under Prof. Mazar) at the excavations outside the southern wall of the Harem esh-Sharif. Those stairs where Paul stood can now be seen and walked on by the public today. This geographical information reveals that a good deal of space existed between the north wall of the Temple and the south wall of Fort Antonia (Josephus said the distance was 600 feet) in which the general public could walk and assemble. The Roman troops, however, who wished to enter the Temple could use the two elevated roadways that bridged this area of space from Antonia to the Temple.

Jews resumed paying taxes to Caesar.

Fort Antonia Belonged to Rome

It is easy to understand why not paying their taxes would bring the wrath of Rome down on them, but Rome was equally incensed over their action of cutting down the two colonnades linking the Temple to Fort Antonia. Why was this an act of war in Rome's eyes? Because Agrippa told them Fort Antonia belonged to Rome, and not simply to Florus (the Roman procurator with whom the Jews had particular grievances). Agrippa brought to their attention that Fort Antonia was official Roman imperial property and that the Jewish rebels had destroyed Fort Antonia's effectiveness by cutting off the fort's access to the Temple.⁶¹²

There is another reference in Josephus to show that Fort Antonia was reckoned to be Roman property even before the war. In the time of King Herod, when he enlarged what was formerly called the Baris and renamed it Fort Antonia, he decided to keep the pontifical robes of the High Priest in the fortress. When the Romans took control of Antonia in 6 C.E., they built a special building for those robes and retained them in the fortress for several years afterward. Josephus tells us dogmatically that while those priestly robes were in Fort Antonia, they were "under the power [authority] of the Romans."⁶¹³

⁶¹² The Jewish authorities told Agrippa that

"they would not fight against the Romans, but against Florus, on account of what they had suffered by his means. To which Agrippa replied, that what they had already done was like such as make war against the Romans: 'for [said Agrippa] you have not paid the tribute which is due to Caesar; and you have cut off the cloisters [the two colonnades] (of the Temple) from joining to the tower Antonia. You will therefore prevent any occasion of revolt if you will but join these [colonnades] together again, and if you will but pay your tribute; for the citadel [Fort Antonia] does not now belong to Florus, nor are you to pay the tribute money to Florus'" (*War* II.16.5 italics & brackets mine).

What King Agrippa was telling the Jewish authorities was that Antonia did not belong to Florus himself. It belonged to Caesar, the Senate and to the People of Rome. In a word, Fort Antonia was Roman imperial government property. Attacking Antonia was making war against Rome, not Florus.

⁶¹³ *Antiquities* XX.1,1.

This clearly shows that Fort Antonia was reckoned as Roman military property before the start of the war. Though the two colonnade roadways belonged to the Temple, the Romans still saw them as the main access from Antonia to the Temple. So, when Agrippa confronted the Jews for their rebellious activities at the early period of the war, the Jews listened to him and rapidly rebuilt the sections of the two colonnades that had been destroyed.⁶¹⁴ This incident reveals the Jewish authorities recognized Fort Antonia was Roman property and it was not reckoned part of the municipality of Jerusalem. This understanding is important in this research because the prophecies of Jesus about the complete destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple referred to Jewish property, not to that which belonged to Rome.⁶¹⁵

Herod's Palace Was Roman Military Property

Herod's former palace in the Upper City was also considered Roman imperial property before the war, temporarily assigned to Agrippa I and Agrippa II as the "local *Praetorium*" for governing the Jewish people by the client kings. This can be seen in the narratives of Josephus. He recorded that when the Jewish revolutionaries cut down the colonnades that connected Fort Antonia to the Temple, they routed the Romans from all areas of Jerusalem. Josephus tells us that the remaining Romans fled to the camp at Herod's palace in the Upper City where there were Roman soldiers.⁶¹⁶ Then about three months later (when the war intensified) the Romans even had to abandon their camp at Herod's palace and retreat into the three towers of Phasael. Hippicus and Mariamne that were alongside.⁶¹⁷ These references in Josephus prove conclusively that Herod's palace in the Upper City next to the three towers also had Roman soldiers stationed within it.

⁶¹⁴ *War* II.17,1.

⁶¹⁵ Recall the attitude of Jesus in regard to Roman property. He said: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21). Jesus had no quarrel with Rome at the time and his prophecies did not concern things belonging to Rome.

⁶¹⁶ *War* II.15,5.

⁶¹⁷ *War* II.17,8.

This information is significant in explaining why Titus after the war did not destroy Fort Antonia (nor did he destroy at first the three towers in the Upper City that had been loaned to the client kings Agrippa I & II). These areas were already acknowledged as Roman government property in which Rome had invested a considerable amount of money to maintain after the year 6 C.E. This is one of the essential reasons why the troops did not tear down Fort Antonia.

As for the three towers in the Upper City, Titus had a change of mind regarding them. He surmised that it was not necessary to leave two immensely fortified areas in Jerusalem (one at Fort Antonia and the other at the three towers in the Upper City). Really, there was nothing of consequence left in Jerusalem to justify the retention of the “local fortresses” as well as Fort Antonia. So, Titus finally let his troops tear down the western wall and the three fortresses in the Upper City, leaving only Fort Antonia as the Camp of the Romans to quarter the Tenth Legion. There is a great deal of evidence to support these matters. Let us see.