

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXII.



LONDON:

Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1930

727TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 2ND, 1929,

AT 4.30 P.M.

DR. JAMES W. THIRTLE, M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections since our last meeting:—As Members: Cyril C. O. Van Lennep, Esq., the Rev. G. B. Withers, George H. Johnson, Esq., Major R. B. Withers, R.A., D.S.O., the Rev. W. M. Evans, and the Rev. Alfred Aldridge, B.A. As Associates: Col. W. G. S. Benson, C.B., John Hern, Esq., M.D., C. H. R. Grant, Esq., L.D.S., the Rev. L. F. Gruber, D.D., LL.D., and Major R. A. Marriott, D.S.O., F.R.G.A.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Sir Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S., President, to read his paper on "The Garden Tomb at Jerusalem: a Possible Site of the Resurrection."

THE GARDEN TOMB AT JERUSALEM: A POSSIBLE SITE OF THE RESURRECTION.

By SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, F.R.S. (*President*).

I.

IT is always interesting to visit the localities where great historical events have taken place, and to recall to our minds on the spot the incidents which have made them famous. Some of us may have seen the undulating fields in Belgium on which the decisive Battle of Waterloo was fought in 1815. There Napoleon's war-worn veterans hurled themselves in vain on the shattered but indomitable British squares and thus brought to an end his military domination of Europe. Others, like myself, may have stood on the heights of Abraham above Quebec, where General Wolfe's daring strategy in 1759 gained Canada for the British Empire; and not a few have walked over the meadows of Runnymede, near Egham, where King John

in A.D. 1215 was compelled by the Barons to agree to that Magna Charta which gave us our fundamental British liberties. But of all the sites and places which are of supreme permanent interest the most attractive to students of sacred history are those in Palestine where the events described in the Old and New Testaments occurred which have been familiar to us all in story from our earliest years. Chief amongst these are the localities in and around Jerusalem which are inseparably connected with the earthly life and footsteps of our Redeemer.

The consideration of the question as to the exact sites of the Crucifixion, Entombment, and Resurrection of our Lord has been the subject of countless investigations, writings, and disputes. As historical events they must certainly have had a place and time. Personally I have not the very smallest claim to be considered as competent to decide any issue on this subject, but, having endeavoured to gather some information on the spot during one visit to Jerusalem last winter, I was informed by our Council it might interest the Members of this Institute if the evidence for and against certain conclusions were presented to you, assisted by some lantern slides illustrating places mentioned.

The first thing to note is that we stand in point of time almost exactly 1,900 years after the events we shall discuss, and that the city of Jerusalem in which they took place has been of all cities in the world the most frequently besieged and destroyed. Hence it is no easy matter to determine now the exact site of any event.

There is no need to occupy time with any detailed description of these destructions of Jerusalem. In A.D. 70 the Roman armies under Titus captured the city and laid it waste after a siege, the horrors of which are described in terrible words by Josephus. Sixty years later the Jews had so far recovered that they revolted again, under a leader called Bar-cochba, against the Roman power, and the Emperor Hadrian thereon destroyed it afresh, made the whole country of Palestine a desolation, built a Roman city on the site of Jerusalem, and called it *Ælia Capitolina*, and forbade any Jew even to approach it under penalty of death. He afterwards built a temple to Jupiter on the site of Herod's temple in Jerusalem. Thus were all the predictions of the Messiah, whom the Jews had rejected and crucified, literally fulfilled as regards that city and people to whom He came.

We pass then over a span of 174 years to the date A.D. 306, when the son of the Roman Emperor Constantius, called Constantine the Great, was acclaimed Augustus at York by the Roman legions encamped in Britain. At that time the headship of the Roman Empire was unsettled, and the four or more claimants to it fought each other for supremacy. Finally the struggle was reduced to a contest between Constantine and Maxentius, and the victory of the former at the Battle of Milvain Bridge, near Rome, made him undisputed master of that city and of the Empire of the West.

II.

A tradition recorded in the life of Constantine, written by Eusebius the historian and Bishop of Cæsarea, states that Constantine was encouraged to advance against Maxentius by a dream or vision of a cross in the sky, with the legend under it, "By this conquer." Be this as it may, Constantine was unquestionably influenced in favour of Christianity, which up to that time had been a proscribed or persecuted religion in the Roman Empire. In A.D. 313 he issued an edict of toleration towards it, and in A.D. 336, shortly before his death, he received Christian baptism at the hands of Eusebius.

When, sometime after the Edict of Toleration, Christianity had freedom to extend, and baptisms and perhaps nominal conversions became general, and interest began to be taken in the localities of its cardinal events, the Empress Helena, wife of Constantius and mother of Constantine, undertook at an advanced age a pilgrimage to Palestine. Her name became connected with a supposed discovery of three crosses in a cave in Jerusalem which were assumed or declared to be those of Christ and the two thieves. There was not the slightest veritable basis for this legend, but it seems to have determined Constantine to erect two Christian churches on the spot, one called Martyrion to commemorate the Crucifixion, and the other called Anastasis to the memory of the Resurrection, to which further reference is made later on.

Before mentioning the reasons which render doubtful, to say the least, the validity of this selection of site, it will be convenient to remind you of some points in the geography of Palestine and Jerusalem.

Whatever it may have been in former times, a pilgrimage to

Palestine presents no particular difficulty now, since the construction of the standard-gauge railway between Kantara in Egypt and Haifa in Palestine, with branch line to Jerusalem starting from Ludd or Lydda. The journey from Cairo or Alexandria in Egypt to Jerusalem is performed in about nine hours by express train, along the line laid down through the north part of the peninsula of Sinai during the Great War for transport of troops to Palestine.

A very usual route to Jerusalem from England is to travel via Paris to Marseilles in the South of France, and then take one of the large steamers of the Messageries Maritimes line across the Mediterranean Sea, a four days' voyage, to Alexandria or Port Said. From those places railways run to Kantara on the Suez Canal, and thence a nine hours' night journey brings you to Jerusalem. The last two hours from Ludd or Lydda, the burial-place of St. George of England, are very interesting. The train winds its way up the steep, tortuous valleys from the sea-level to the railway station of Jerusalem, which is situated about a mile or more outside the city, and at a height of about 2,400 feet above the sea-level.

Palestine is a small country not much larger than Wales, about 250 miles long north to south, and about 100 miles wide east to west. Down the centre, like a spinal column, from north to south there is a chain of mountains tailing away from the snow-clad summit of Mount Hermon in the north to low hills on the margin of the Dead Sea in the south: about two-thirds of the way down on this central elevation lies Jerusalem, at a height of 2,400 feet above the Mediterranean Sea and 3,700 feet above the Dead Sea. The River Jordan winds its way in an irregular course down the deep valley which lies to the east of this chain of hills, and empties itself into the salt waters of the Dead Sea which lies 1,300 feet below Jerusalem and at a distance of about 20 miles.

Jerusalem, therefore, occupies a commanding position from the point of view of military defence, and the site has been inhabited for fully 4,000 years. One of the earliest mentions of it is in Gen. xiv, which describes the recovery of Lot by Abraham when the former had been captured by the three kings or heads of tribes which attacked Sodom and Gomorrah on the Dead Sea. On returning from his expedition, Abraham was met by Melchizedek, King of Salem or Jerusalem, to whom he gave tithes of his spoil. Later the place became known as

Jebusi (Joshua xviii, 28), and was a fort or citadel of the Jebusites at the time when Palestine was invaded by the Israelites under Joshua. Owing to its strong position it remained in possession of the Jebusites until David captured it about 1000 B.C., as described in 2 Sam. v, 6. He then renamed this Jebusite fort "the City of David," and he subsequently reigned there for thirty-three years over Israel.

The city afterwards extended itself over an area which included three or more hill-summits. There was to the east a hill called Mount Moriah, the summit of which has been considered likely to be the place on which Abraham offered up Isaac, for we are told (Gen. xxii, 2) that God said to him, "Get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." Then to the west was a summit called Zion, and to the south a lower hill called Ophel. On the south-east side lies the lower Mount of Olives. The hills were separated originally by deep ravines, but these have now been more or less filled up with the rubbish of centuries due to the many destructions of the city. On the east side there was a deep valley called the Kidron, continuing on the south under the name of Jehoshaphat; on the south-west the valley called Hinnom, which separates Mount Zion from the so-called Mount of Evil Counsel; whilst other valleys, called the Asmonean and Tyropœon, separated the hills of Zion and Moriah from the northern land or promontory.

Hence Jerusalem was only easily accessible from the northern side, from which its invaders generally came, as on the east, south, and west it was defended by deep valleys and steep cliffs, and was moreover protected by high walls, which on the northern side at least have varied in position from age to age. As some questions to be presently considered depend upon the position of this north wall at the time of Christ, it will be well to exhibit a plan of Jerusalem showing the position of these walls.

III.

Jerusalem is, and from the time of David and Solomon has been, a walled city. In order to prepare a site for the Temple, Solomon built walls around the top of Mount Moriah, and a platform was formed called the Temple Area, now termed the Haram-es-Sherif (the noble sanctuary). Through this area

projects the rocky summit of Mount Moriah, which probably was the site of the Altar of Burnt Offering in Solomon's Temple.

At the present time the city wall is roughly quadrilateral in shape, being in all about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles in length and some 40 feet in height. The walls now existing were built in the sixteenth century by the Sultan Suleiman, and are only in part in the position of the three previous ancient walls. In each wall are one or more gates, numbering eight in all. In the north wall the Damascus gate is the most picturesque and opens on to the Damascus road. On the west side is the Jaffa gate, but close to it the wall was taken down to afford a theatrical entrance for the ex-German Emperor in 1898. It was by this gate that Lord Allenby entered the city in 1917. In the south side is the Zion gate, and on the east St. Stephen's gate. The Herod gate is on the north side, half-way between the Damascus gate and the north-east corner.

Inside the present walls the city is now divided into four portions called, respectively, the Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Armenian quarters: Across from west to east, leading from the Jaffa gate up to the Temple area, is a narrow street called David Street continued into one called Temple Street. It may be added that there is at the present time a very large extension of the city outside of the present walls, and chiefly in the north-west direction, where there are colonies of various nationalities.

It is hardly necessary to add that since the British Protectorate was established, there has been a great improvement in the sanitation of the city. A new water supply was laid on from reservoirs in the hills, and the main streets are kept clean. There are several fairly good hotels, but outside of a limited area the interior of the city is a maze of squalid and dirty alleys.

Whilst there is in this chief and ancient city of the world a vast amount to interest the student and antiquarian, the interest of most visitors is concentrated on the sight of the so-called holy places. Prominent amongst these is the Mosque of Omar, more correctly called the Dome of the Rock, which stands in the centre of the stone-paved platform on the east side of Jerusalem on the summit of Mount Moriah, on which place once stood the Temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Herod. This platform has a length of about 1,500 feet and width of 1,000 feet, or an area of nearly 35 acres. The mosque was built in the seventh century by Abd-el-Melik, the tenth Caliph after the capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens. Its great dome

covers the summit of Mount Moriah, which projects through the floor and is surrounded by a marble wall. When you look over that palisade at the few dozen square yards of hard, brown rock, you are gazing at one of the most ancient and sacred spots in human history.

Here on this rock Melchizedek, king and priest of Salem, may have offered sacrifices ; here also Abraham possibly prepared to offer Isaac. It was the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, and bought from him by David as a place of sacrifice after the plague. On it most probably stood the Altars of Burnt Offering in the three successive Jewish Temples. The site is supposed also to be that of a Temple of Jupiter built by Hadrian after his desolation of Jerusalem.

The Crusaders, who held the city for about 100 years, converted the mosque into a Christian church called *Templum Domini*, but on the recovery of the city by the Mohammedans it was restored, and has remained for 700 years a mosque or Mohammedan place of worship. As we look at its wonderful marbles, beautiful stained glass windows, Persian carpets, and glass chandeliers, we cannot help wondering whether it will ever be replaced by a fourth Jewish Temple, or, better still, a Christian cathedral, standing on the area which has been consecrated to various religious worship for at least 4,000 years.

IV.

Retracing our steps again from the Temple area, we return to the centre of the Christian quarter to visit there a building far older in parts than the Dome of the Rock, called the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which for 1,500 years has by tradition been revered as the site of the Crucifixion and Entombment of our Lord. The history of it, as far as it is definitely known, can be told in a few words. When Hadrian had desolated Jerusalem in A.D. 135, he partly rebuilt it as a city called *Ælia Capitolina*. It is said he erected on one spot a Temple to the pagan deity Aphrodite. The Christians who were in Jerusalem at the time when Titus began its circumvallation in A.D. 70, bearing in mind their Lord's warning in His great prophecy in Matt. xxiv, 15-20, and Luke xxi, 20-21, fled from the city, before its complete enclosure, to Pella on the other side of the Jordan. They were allowed later to return to *Ælia Capitolina* by Hadrian. It is not at all certain, however, that they had retained, in the sixty-five years that had elapsed since the

destruction by Titus, any clear memory of the locality of the sacred places, or that they would have been able to identify them, in view of the vast destructions that had taken place under Titus and Hadrian. Neither is it certain whether the Temple to Aphrodite was erected at a place chosen by chance, or whether it was deliberately erected on the site known to be that of the Crucifixion, to annoy and insult the Christians.

Nevertheless, when, after his conversion, as already mentioned, Constantine had determined to build two churches in Jerusalem, the task of searching for the true site of the Tomb and the Cross was entrusted to Bishop Macarius. The bishop decided that the true locality was probably under the above-mentioned Temple of Aphrodite supposed to have been built by Hadrian. Constantine ordered this Temple to be pulled down, and a Jewish tomb which was found cut in the rock below was somewhat too confidently identified as the sepulchre of the Lord.

It is worthy of notice that some historians doubt whether any Temple to Aphrodite or Venus was ever erected by Hadrian on this place. Thus Dean Milman, in his book *The History of the Jews*, vol. ii, p. 327, says in a footnote: "The only indication, the Temple of Venus said to have been built by Hadrian in contempt of the Christians, I am confident is utterly unhistoric, out of character with Hadrian and his times, and perhaps the fiction which has perplexed the question for ever." This is important, in view of the much later find, as mentioned below, of a relic at the site of the Garden Tomb connected with the worship of Venus. On the other hand, Mr. C. C. Dobson, in his little book *The Empty Tomb and Risen Lord*, says, without quoting his authority, that Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) saw as a boy the clearing away of the Temple of Venus and the subsequent erection of the Church of Anastasis on the same place.

There is no valid proof, however, that these places selected by Macarius were the true sites of the great events of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection.

Some might ask, how was it that the locality of these supreme events was not more carefully determined and recorded? The answer to this seems to be, that the attention of the early Christians was far more closely riveted on the fact of the Resurrection of Christ than on the mere question of locality where it occurred.

We do not even know whether the interment of the body of the Lord, after being taken from the Cross and its laying in the private tomb of Joseph of Arimathæa, was a temporary expedient intended merely to tide over the Sabbath-day and Passover Feast, until a suitable permanent place could be found, or whether it was intended as the final resting-place. The whole behaviour of the disciples at the time shows that they never anticipated the Resurrection would take place at all.

V.

As far as localities were concerned, the early Christians seemed to attach more importance to the site of the Ascension than that of the entombment of Christ.

The result, however, of Macarius' decision, made more than three hundred years after the events in question, and on very slight evidence, such as the apocryphal story of the discovery of the three crosses, was that the Emperor Constantine ordered the construction of two churches on the site of this said Temple of Aphrodite.

Eusebius, commonly called the father of ecclesiastical history, in his *Life of Constantine*, gives a vague description of them, but there still exists in the Church of Santa Pudentiana, one of the oldest churches in Rome, a mosaic of the fourth or fifth century showing the general appearance of Constantine's churches. The Church of the Anastasis or Resurrection was a round church with a domed roof, and the Church of the Martyrion, 100 yards or so away, was a polygonal building also with a domed roof. Between the two was a slight rocky elevation of the ground, which was called *Mount Golgotha* or *Calvary*, though the gospel records say nothing about any *mount* or hill. It is said that there exists another mosaic in a church of Madeba, east of Jordan, in which these two churches are shown.

There are other descriptions, such as that of the Bordeaux Pilgrim who visited Jerusalem in A.D. 333, during the construction of these churches, which agree with the above statements. Eusebius took part in the services of consecration in A.D. 336. The buildings seem to have remained intact for about 300 years.

These churches were damaged in A.D. 614 by the Persians when Jerusalem was captured by them under Chosroes II, but

when the Saracen Caliph Omar took the city in A.D. 636, he treated the Christians with leniency and left these churches in their possession. In A.D. 1010 the Caliph Hakim destroyed the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and from that date the Church of the Cross seems to have disappeared.

In 1099, the Crusaders, after they gained possession of Jerusalem, rebuilt and enlarged the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to which other buildings were added from time to time. The part added by the Crusaders is known as the Catholicon or sometimes the Greek cathedral, and was formerly called the *Chorus Dominorum*. It now forms, as it were, the nave of the rotunda, and at the other end opens into the Chapel of St. Helena which is the oldest part of the whole. The Crusaders also built a large Romanesque church which served as the choir or chancel of the Holy Sepulchre Church.

In 1808, the latter part, and a great portion of the Crusaders' basilica or nave, was destroyed by fire. In 1868, Russia, Turkey, and France undertook the replacement of the old wooden dome by an iron one, and under this dome is now a quite modern marble structure or chapel called particularly the Holy Tomb. It is only about 6 or 8 feet square, and one-half is occupied by a raised marble slab or shelf.

It will be seen then that at the present day the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a conglomeration of many buildings of various ages, some parts dating back to about the seventh century and some not yet sixty years old. The complicated arrangement of the thirty to forty "holy places" within it can be best judged from a modern plan.

The impression produced upon a visitor who sees this building for the first time is that it seems a purely artificial structure, resembling a collection of Roman Catholic churches or chapels, with numerous lamps, altars, and pictures of a highly ornate modern character, and with nothing at all which is in accord with the simplicity and unadorned nature of the localities described in the gospel narratives.

VI.

All that can be said is, that this complicated church occupies the site of Constantine's buildings, and perhaps of a former Temple of Aphrodite. In spite of the fact that tradition for 1,500 years has held it to be the locality of the Crucifixion and

Resurrection, there is one great, and perhaps fatal, objection to this identification. It is beyond doubt that the Crucifixion took place outside the then walls of Jerusalem and that the tomb was close to that place.

The evidence of the New Testament writers is unquestionable on this point. St. Mark says (xv, 20, 21), "and they led Him *out* to crucify Him. And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming *out* of the country." St. Matthew says (xxvii, 32), "And as they came *out*, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name": and also (xxviii, 11), "some of the watch came *into* the city." St. John says (xix, 17-20), "He bearing His Cross *went forth* into a place . . . *nigh* to the city": also (xix, 41), "in the place where He was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre." Also, in Heb. xiii, 12, "Jesus . . . suffered *without* the gate."

These expressions, and the fact that two thieves were crucified at the same time and place, show that the place of crucifixion must have been a place of common execution outside the then wall of Jerusalem and near to some high road. It is not in the least likely that the Roman authorities, who alone could at that date inflict capital punishment, would have selected a site for it inside the city, which site would be deemed ceremonially unclean and abhorrent to the Jews.

The question of authenticity of site, therefore, all turns upon the position of the north wall of Jerusalem at the date A.D. 28-31.

The walls south, east, and west of Jerusalem all remain in substantially the same position as in the time of the Kings of Israel and Judah, and could not be otherwise on account of the position of the adjacent valleys. The north wall, however, has been changed in position at least three times.

At the time of the Kings and of Nehemiah the north wall was built due west to east from the point now the Jaffa gate to the middle point of the Temple area; this is now called the "old" wall. It ran along the present David Street. At some time between the Maccabean revolt against the Greeks in 168 B.C. and the time of Herod the Great a second or outer north wall was built, but it is not possible to fix an accurate date or position for it. Herod Agrippa built a third north wall later on, which probably coincided very nearly with the present north wall. The completion of this third wall was

stopped by the Romans, and it was not completed at the time of the siege of Titus in A.D. 70. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands nearly in the centre of the Christian quarter of Jerusalem and well inside this third and present north wall.

Comparatively recently the remains or bottom courses of a length of about 120 feet of wall, it is said, have been found running just south of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This, it is contended, would place that site outside the city wall in A.D. 29-31. Even if this were the case, it would only place the church just against, but outside, the wall, and this location would have necessitated an irregular change of direction in this second wall, which is not very probable. Colonel Conder has also shown the grave disadvantages, from a military point of view, of such a disposition of the wall. It must be remembered also that this second north wall was built 400 or 500 years before the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. If, then, there was a great irregularity of direction in that wall, the reason for it must be sought in the nature of the ground or otherwise, and not in any desire to locate the church outside the wall.

Dean Milman, in vol. ii, p. 328, of *The History of the Jews*, gives some details of the course of this second wall. He quotes Josephus as having said that the whole circuit of the city (he seems to mean by that the walls) was 33 stadia, or rather more than 4 miles, at the time of the siege of Titus. If this was in fact the circuit of the walls, then it is difficult to see how the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre could have been outside the walls of the city in any sense in which it could have been called "nigh to the city."

The consideration of these arguments has, however, led a number of writers, including some leading authorities, to reject the view that this Church of the Holy Sepulchre is on the true site of the Cross or Tomb. The important question then arises, if this is not the true site, where was that site?

VII.

For the last eighty years, or since 1849, attention has been directed to another site which has gained many strong and learned advocates. Just outside the present north wall, close to the Damascus road and not more than a few minutes' walk from the Damascus gate of Jerusalem, is a low hill, part of which is now occupied by a Mohammedan cemetery. On one side this hill

has a vertical rocky face, and a recess or shallow cave in it has been for long known as "Jeremiah's Grotto." At the foot of this cliff, and on the side towards the city, is at present a garden with an area of perhaps an acre, more or less. Now there are three remarkable things which seem to indicate this place as a very probable site of the Crucifixion. In the first place, part of this cliff when seen from the front has a most remarkable resemblance to a human skull; there are the holes forming the eye-sockets, and a broken nose and slit which resembles a mouth. When once it has been pointed out it cannot possibly be overlooked. This skull-formation is certainly not an artificial construction and not of very recent date, and *if* it has existed for 1,900 years there is nothing more likely than that a place showing such a curious characteristic would come to be called "*skull hill*," or "the place of a skull," by persons familiar with it.

It will be remembered that all four gospel writers say that the place of Crucifixion was called Golgotha or Calvary, which is by interpretation the place of a skull. St. Matthew says (xxvii, 33), "And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull . . . they crucified Him." St. Mark says (xv, 22), "And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a skull." St. Luke says (xxiii, 33), "And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary" (in Greek, *Kranion* = a skull). St. John says (xix, 17), "He bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha." There must have been, therefore, some very well-known place familiar to all inhabitants of Jerusalem by the name Golgotha. There is nothing whatever about the traditional site which in the least degree would make it deserve the name Golgotha.

Then, secondly, this "skull hill" must have been a place of common execution. There is an ancient tradition that it was called also "the place of stoning."

Early in 1882 the ruins of a monastery and church dedicated to St. Stephen were found close to this hill, and are held to be those of the church erected by Eudoxia, wife of the Emperor Theodosius, to the memory of the first Christian martyr. If this is so, then that supports the view that this hill was a place of execution. St. Stephen was stoned outside of the city (Acts vii, 58).

It has been stated that this low hill and vertical cliff is identical

with the Beth-ha-Sekelah, or House of Stoning, mentioned in the Mischna. The summit of this low hill commands a view of Jerusalem, and any crucifixions on it would be seen by all passing along the Damascus road.

Then, in third place, a rock tomb has been discovered cut into part of the vertical cliff above mentioned which opens into the garden, and is now called "The Garden Tomb." This tomb complies in a very remarkable way with the conditions mentioned in the gospels. First, this sepulchre is "nigh at hand" to the "place where He was crucified," and there is, and no doubt was, a garden adjacent (*see* John xix, 41).

If the present garden, bounded on one side by Golgotha, is over the garden of Joseph of Arimathæa, that would meet the conditions, because then nothing would be more likely than that Joseph would cut his "own new tomb" (*see* Matt. xxvii, 60) into this cliff. The Jewish tombs round Jerusalem were not dug down into the earth as a pit like our graves, but cut horizontally into a vertical cliff like a cave, and closed by placing a large stone at the entrance.

This Garden Tomb was not known to exist until 1867, when it was accidentally discovered and exposed, and it at once attracted attention from eminent authorities on Jerusalem topography, such as Colonel Conder, General Gordon, and many others. So great was the general interest that later on an influential committee was formed, and the site of the tomb and garden purchased in 1894 for £2,000, after some difficulties with the Turkish authorities. That property has been confirmed to the Trust Committee since the British occupation of Jerusalem.

The tomb is a cave cut into the limestone cliff on the north side of the garden at a distance of about 70 yards from the summit of the low hill Golgotha. It is about 7 feet 6 inches high, 14 feet 6 inches long, and 11 feet 6 inches deep. It is clearly (1) the tomb of "a rich man"; (2) it was "hewn out in the rock" (*see* Matt. xxvii, 57, 60); (3) it was "his own new tomb," prepared for the proprietor and his family, for it contains three loculi, or places for bodies, but only one has been completed and used; (4) there is provision for "a great stone" to be rolled against the entrance in the form of a mill-stone rolled in a stone trough. Those who have the necessary knowledge assert that it is a Jewish tomb of Herodian character and date, and a number are strongly of opinion it was the actual tomb in which the body of the Lord was laid.

VIII.

It is only proper to add that the identifications of Golgotha and of this tomb are not necessarily connected. Some who agree that the most probable locality of the Crucifixion was this low hill, now partly occupied by a Mohammedan cemetery, do not agree with the identification of the Garden Tomb. Colonel Conder, R.E., who is in favour of the new Golgotha, has publicly repudiated all belief in the Garden Tomb.

There is evidence that this site in the time of the Crusaders was occupied by some buildings, probably stables. One curious fact was brought to light in 1923 by excavations near the tomb made by Miss Hussey, a member of the Committee. She cleared away a quantity of rubbish, and found evidence of the above-mentioned Crusaders' buildings, but about 10 feet underground came on a carved stone shaped to represent a columbarium or dove-cot. Now, the dove was sacred in pagan mythology to Venus, otherwise Astarte or Cybele. A German professor who saw it remarked on its possible nature as part of a shrine to Cybele, and, on cleaning it, marks indicating the pillar and tree sacred to Adonis were found. It is therefore possible that this is a fragmentary remains of the true shrine of Venus, said to have been erected in the time of Hadrian over the place of the Crucifixion, and that the Temple to Aphrodite found by Bishop Macarius, which fixed the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, was another shrine, but not the one erected in the time of Hadrian.

It is however, only fair and proper to add that several authorities question the identity of this Garden Tomb with that of Christ. It has been declared by some, such as Dr. Merrill and Colonel Conder, to be a Christian tomb of much later date than the Crucifixion. The late Dr. Schick pronounced it to be a rock-cut Jewish tomb, but used subsequently for Christian burials. The arguments for and against these views are given at length in the books mentioned at the end of this paper: they are too long to repeat here in detail.

At the present time this Garden Tomb is visited annually by a large number of visitors to Jerusalem. The entrance to it is a little way up a lane turning out of the Damascus road. There is a house in the garden for the caretaker. The tomb itself is now closed with an iron door kept locked, but visitors are admitted by the caretaker. There is also a small window

closed by a wire network. On entering the tomb we find it divided into an antechamber separated by a low wall from the actual loculi. The one at the extreme left, or next the back wall, is completed, and is marked by having a recess cut out for the head. This loculus is separated from the other incompleting places by a low ridge or wall. Then outside the door there is evidence of a stone-groove in which a stone could be rolled. It was the custom of the Jews to close these rock-cut tombs by a circular stone, like a large mill-stone, which was rolled down a groove so as to block up the entrance.

The whole of the arrangements can best be understood from photographic views shown by lantern slides, some of which are my own photographs taken on the spot, and some are borrowed from a pamphlet on the Garden Tomb which is sold to visitors by the curator of the garden. (*Slides exhibited.*)

With regard to the stone closing the tomb, the expressions used by the writers in the gospel narratives, viz., "he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre" (Matt. xxvii, 60, 66) (*also* Mark xv, 46); "the angel of the Lord . . . rolled back the stone" (Matt. xxviii, 2); and the query of the women, "Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" (Mark xvi, 3, 4), are only consistent with the fact of a large circular stone being rolled down in a groove in front of the entrance. This groove was laid on the slant, so that it would be easy to roll the stone down but very difficult to roll it up again. By thongs or cords sealed to the rock-wall and to the stone, it would be readily seen if the stone had been moved at any time subsequent to the sealing.

One other fact may be mentioned, and that is that the Garden Tomb is at no greater distance from the accepted site of Pilate's Judgment Hall, which was near the Tower of Antonia, close to the Temple area, than is the traditional Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

IX.

Time will not permit us to follow out in detail the manner in which the characteristics of this Garden Tomb fit in consistently with the narration of events, as stated in the gospels, concerning the Entombment and Resurrection of the Lord and the visits of the women and disciples to it, as well as the actions of Joseph and Nicodemus at the tomb. I can only

refer you to several excellent books in which the whole of this subject has been treated with deep insight and reverent knowledge.

The first of these is a work by the Rev. Henry Latham, Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, called *The Risen Master*. He deals especially with the evidence of the grave clothes (as recorded by St. John, an eye-witness) to a supernatural Resurrection. Then there is an admirable series of lectures by the Rev. Dr. Henry Wace, a former Dean of Canterbury (and former President of this Institute), called *The Story of the Resurrection*. Next, a small but excellent book by Rev. C. C. Dobson, Vicar of St. Mary-in-the-Castle, Hastings, called *The Empty Tomb and the Risen Lord*; and finally a chapter in a book, by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, called *The Morning Lands of History*. A small pamphlet by A. W. Crawley-Boevey, revised and enlarged by Mrs. Theodore Bent and Miss Hussey, is published by the Committee of the Garden Tomb in Jerusalem, and gives full details of the site.

If these books are carefully read in connection with the statements of the Evangelists, they produce a very strong conviction that whatever may be the true site of the Crucifixion and Entombment, they are not located in the traditional Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but that the site of the Garden Tomb agrees far more nearly with the narratives of the New Testament. In addition, the ornate, rather tawdry, decorations of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, with its very numerous candles, altars and pictures, and the attempt to give a false realism by such exhibits as the silver sockets in the assumed holes in the ground for the three crosses, the stone of unction, a very modern slab of marble, the pillar of scourging, and the Chapel of the Apparition, also the artificial and modern character of the Holy Tomb itself, offends all well-informed and critical taste, and generates a sense of unreality or make-believe in the entire collection of them.

On the other hand, the quiet, natural, untouched surroundings of the Garden Tomb appeal extremely strongly to those who approach the locality with a proper sense of the reality of the incidents connected with the redemption of the world. In this quiet garden, General Gordon, when on his visits to Jerusalem, was accustomed often to rest and meditate, and countless others have found it bring home to them a keener realization of the facts and events of the Passion in a way that is quite impossible

in the fictitious atmosphere and crowds of the traditional church.

Nevertheless, prudence forbids any confident dogmatism as to the claims of any particular site to be certainly ascertained. The vast gap of time, and the immense destructions that have taken place in the interval between then and now, make it necessary to be very cautious in drawing conclusions.

Archæological research still proceeds, and at any moment may reveal things which will upset all previous theories. A visit to Jerusalem is, however, to the serious-minded traveller a most stimulating experience, and any one who wishes to profit fully by it must pay at least one unhurried visit to the Garden Tomb.

This paper was illustrated at its reading by about 30 lantern slides, most of them from photographs taken by the author.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (Dr. Thirtle): I am sure we have listened with profound interest to the paper read by the honoured President of the Institute—a paper which not only records the impressions of past observers, but likewise sets forth the views and judgments of the President himself, as they grew out of a personal visit to Jerusalem, with special attention bestowed upon the Garden Tomb. There are doubtless among those who have listened some who have personally examined the site and its surroundings; and likewise others who, without such individual examination, have notwithstanding gathered opinions more or less definite from a perusal of some or all of the works which the President has mentioned. From beginning to end the paper has, I doubt not, been helpful to such as, up to the present, have been of uncertain mind in regard to the particular issue dealt with by Sir Ambrose Fleming.

Apart from that special issue, topical in its allusion, who can fail to be thankful for the study, patient and reverent, of the subject of our Lord's Resurrection, as a sublime occurrence altogether vital in its bearing upon the Christian faith, in its every element and its every aspect. There may be a type of thought which

passes by the fact that our Lord "rose again, the third day, from the dead," also a type that is indifferent to the warning which suggested the well-known words of the Apostle Paul: "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." But the mind that is in any degree submissive to Holy Scripture, and occupied with thoughts of God's movements among men, can hardly fail to have been thrilled in presence of the strong and unanswerable case for the living Christ, the risen Lord of life, as we have been privileged to gather it from Sir Ambrose's paper.

While thanking the lecturer for the study he has read in our hearing, it gives me great pleasure to move that the thanks of the meeting be accorded him for an utterance, at once cogent and valuable, and calculated greatly to enrich the body of instruction given to the world in the Transactions of the Institute.

The motion was carried with applause.

Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN, Hon. Sec. of the Palestine Exploration Fund, said: There is one fortunate thing about the subject of this paper, and that is, whatever view we take about the position of the tomb of our Lord, it has no bearing on the great fact on which we are all agreed, namely, that He did actually rise from the tomb in which His body had been laid. In the closing words of the lecturer's able and interesting paper there was a reference to what I may call the *sentiment* about the tomb. There is no question but that, to most of us here, the present surroundings of the Garden Tomb—"the quiet, natural, untouched surroundings"—appeal to us as far more in accord with the incidents of that first Easter morn than the "rather tawdry" surroundings of the traditional "Holy Sepulchre." From that point of view doubtless the tomb—now purchased through the generosity of friends—has a real use. It conveys to the visitor a setting for his imaginative reconstruction of the Bible Story. At the same time, when we mention sentiment we must think of the other side of the question.

With regard to the site of Golgotha and the tomb, no one disputes that they must have been outside the city walls of that time. Yet it is difficult to make a mental picture of the traditional site as outside the walls, because, on account of the sacredness of the

site, the Christian quarter of the city has grown around it. But archæological students—some of them also students of military history—have agreed that it is possible that the site was outside the second wall. If not, one may ask how do Jewish tombs come to lie within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre? The course of the second wall is described by Josephus as running from the Gate Gennath and ending near to Antonia, *i.e.*, at the north-west corner of the Temple enclosure. Unfortunately, we do not know the site of this gate, and, that being so, we cannot say how much was enclosed within its circuit. It must, however, be admitted that the recent discovery, further north than the present northern wall, of remains of a powerful wall, which appears to be the "Third Wall" of Herod Agrippa II, raises a new difficulty.

With regard to the so-called "Skull Hill," I must mention a few points. Firstly, as to the supposed skull-like appearance of the face of the rock, it can be said with considerable certainty that this condition cannot be as ancient as is claimed. No early or even mediæval writer ever suggested that the "Place of a Skull" was a place shaped like a skull. That is quite a modern theory. The term "Place of a Skull" probably has reference to a tradition that at Golgotha the "Skull of Adam" had been found—a tradition which survives in the "Skull of Adam" which is still shown in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. There is archæological evidence that small private tombs were not provided with "rolling stones." In the vast majority of the thousands of private tombs which have been examined, the entrance was closed by a rough rock rolled against the entrance, the inner part being sometimes shaped to fit the entrance, like a cork in a bottle.

The Garden Tomb is one of a whole series of similar tombs which lie just over the circling wall, in the property of the Dominicans, and archæological authorities—Col. Conder among them—agree that, like the tombs in the adjoining property, it is a Christian, and not a Jewish, tomb at all. When first found it was not unstained by decay as some have claimed, but full of bones. Personally, I fear we shall never have a certainty about this or any other site. Possibly it is as well. With regard to the Garden Tomb, I view the arguments in its favour as so open to objection that its claim to be the "actual tomb" should be abandoned; yet, as it assists our imagination to picture the great scene of the

Passion, it must always have value to the earnest Protestant pilgrim who visits the Holy Land to realize more fully the events that occurred there.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE, from Jerusalem, thanked the lecturer for his noble defence of the truth of the literal Resurrection of Christ; he also thanked Dr. Masterman for his remarks. He agreed that Calvary and the adjoining Garden Tomb are a most strikingly suitable site for realizing the whole Gospel story of the Crucifixion, Burial, and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Some 38 years ago, on a Palm Sunday morning, he was taking a walk alone around the walls of Jerusalem, and saw the Place of a Skull; and at that time it looked more impressive even than at the present, as changes in the surroundings have taken place. He well remembered how, on the Easter Sunday afternoon, Mr. D. L. Moody, of Chicago, preached to a large gathering of Evangelical Christians on Gordon's Golgotha. Since then he had visited both the so-called Holy Sepulchre and the Garden Tomb many times, and realized how much more the latter appealed to one than the former.

It has been stated that, in the neighbourhood of the Garden Tomb, grave-stones had been found with the inscription "Buried near his Lord": these stones had been deliberately broken up by the Dominican monks, as they bore such strong evidence against the site within the city walls. A lady formerly in charge, Miss Lomax, a relative of Lord Salisbury, also said that her old Arab servant had declared that, many years ago, in excavating the very ancient cisterns, skulls had been found.

It was a great joy on Easter Sunday to attend a Resurrection service at the Garden Tomb, to take Jew and Moslem there, and tell them the story of the Risen Redeemer, also to sing the hymn beginning "Up from the grave He arose."

Lieut.-Col. HOPE BIDDULPH said: It is recorded in the Gospel by St. Matthew that the angel "rolled back the stone, and sat upon it." This would seem to cast some doubt as to the stone being one that rolled in a groove, like a large grinding-stone, but rather appears to indicate a solid block which sealed the entrance, and was rolled away outwards.

Major R. A. MARRIOTT said: I gathered that Dr. Masterman was not in favour of the Garden Tomb being the place of burial of our Lord. But in the derivation of the word Calvary, which is unknown generally, we have a striking proof, of what was claimed in the address, that the scarp of the cliff still shows its skull-like features; and that being "nigh at hand," the Garden Tomb, with all the evidences found in it, *must* be the true site of the Holy Sepulchre.

Metathesis, meaning a change in the order of the syllables of a word, is common to all languages alike, when they adopt foreign words, but the Hebrews carried this peculiarity into words of their own language. For example, the French change "*mosquito*" into "*moustique*"; the Portuguese, "*crocodile*" into "*cocodrillo*"; and with our Tommies, the "*ricochet*" in musketry becomes "*rackoshee*." Now there is a word still used in parts of Greece, *kephalári*, which is applied to the top of a hill, or a hill with a rounded top, from *kephalé* (head). The Hellenists, who came in great numbers to the Feast, brought this word with them, which the Jews turned into *kelphari*, and thus, perhaps because Golgotha involved the idea of defilement, the word Calvary was generally adopted.

This word Calvary is not to be found in the Greek Testament, but I think it was originated by Jerome, when he translated the Scriptures at Bethlehem, finding it called locally *kelphari*, Latinized it into *Calvarius*.

The recent find of an ancient wall seems to preclude the possibility of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre being the true one.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said: May we not approach the question from a new angle? Let us inquire how this *intermural* place came to be regarded as a sacred church. I suggest that this church possibly occupies the site of the "large upper room." Tradition tells us that this place escaped the general destruction, in A.D. 70. Let us turn to Acts i, 12, 13, "Then returned they . . . and when they were come in, they went into the upper chamber where they were abiding" (R.V.). I doubt not that this "large upper room" became the church—the Mother Church, the scene of the wondrous Pentecost. To-day a large *lower* room is shown in another part of the city—the Cænaculum, but let us consider *this* as an alternative site.

Turn to Mark xiv, 12-16. Our Lord said: "Go into the city and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him." Let us do so in imagination. We go down the slopes of Olivet and enter the ancient gate called St. Stephen's, really the only gate on *that* side leading into the city. There has been a gate here for thousands of years, and therefore a street, so we may be sure that we are on the right road and following the two disciples (Peter and John) and the water carrier. On our left we pass the pool of water called to-day "Birket Israel," and here are entrances to the Temple. Out of the side comes our man with the pitcher of water; he may have gone to get water out of the pool, but I suggest that he has drawn water from the well in the Temple area. Remember, perhaps this is the very water later to be used to wash the disciples' feet. I may remind you that it was customary for the worshippers to enter the Temple area by going over the Tyropœon Bridge at the S.W. corner, then to cross the Court of the Gentiles, and go out by an exit at the N.W. corner. This would agree with the theory which I am now advancing. We follow the water carrier into the city—whither does this road lead? It bends round to the quarter of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

With a map before you, see how this site fits in with regard to the story of the Resurrection. The streets from the Damascus gate converge also to this place. Please turn to Acts xii. The Apostle Peter is in a prison in the citadel and Palace of Herod, which is on the other side of the city. An angel guides him out *into the city*; he passes on through one street (? the Jaffa gate street) and the angel leaves him; he has but to turn to the left and again he is at this famous site. He went to the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark—some of the Church have gathered here and are having an all-night prayer-meeting in her house. The "upper room" was probably close by, if not the very same.

I therefore, and for these reasons, beg to suggest that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands really on the site of the "upper room."

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

From Sir CHARLES MARSTON: I have read with interest Sir Ambrose Fleming's paper. I have twice been to Jerusalem and

studied the claims of the Holy Sepulchre. In my opinion, Skull Hill, that is to say the site by Jeremiah's Grotto, is the probable scene of the Crucifixion.

But if it was a place of common execution and stoning, it seems unlikely that a rich man like Joseph of Arimathea would have his tomb located there. Nor would the place of common execution be also a garden. I suggest that the immediate proximity of the Tomb to the scene of the Crucifixion is an argument both against the site of the Holy Sepulchre where Golgotha is also shown, and also against the Garden Tomb.

My understanding of the narrative contained in the Gospels is that our Lord's Tomb may have been as much as 250 yards away from the actual scene of the Crucifixion; it is a matter of relativity. The late Director of Antiquities for the Palestine Government (Professor Garstang), after a long discussion on the subject of the site of the Holy Sepulchre, enables me to sum up as follows: If the present Damascus gate existed in our Lord's time, the Holy Sepulchre cannot have been outside the Wall. The Damascus gate contains Roman architecture. What is the date of it? If it is Herodian, then the site of the Holy Sepulchre cannot be genuine. But if the Roman work in the gate belongs to the time of Hadrian, then the Holy Sepulchre may be the genuine site.

Members are doubtless aware that Hadrian, about A.D. 130, infuriated at the fresh rebellion of the Jews, razed Jerusalem to the ground and rebuilt it as a Roman city under another name. I understand that the so-called "Ecce Homo" arch is a relic of the time of Hadrian.

It is thought that it would not be difficult to determine the date of the Roman work embedded in the Damascus gate, but it might involve a temporary obstruction of that thoroughfare. Until such examination has been made, my conclusions are as above.

From Rev. HAROLD C. MORTON, Ph.D.: The most interesting paper from our President commands my full agreement with respect to the Garden Tomb. I spent some time in Jerusalem last year, and gave such special attention as I could to the Garden Tomb, as also to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the more I studied the position the more convinced did I feel that the Garden Tomb satisfies all the requirements of the Gospel narratives.

One of the supreme needs, if the issue is to be finally settled, is that excavation should be carried out to discover the line of the Second Wall, the wall of our Lord's day, and the rumour that properties are being bought up in the neighbourhood of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre with the object of preventing excavation, should be indignantly negated by facilitating excavation at the earliest possible moment.

What so many regard as the almost certain site of Calvary, viz., the low hill, evidently an ancient quarry, backing the Garden toward the north, still remains a Mohammedan cemetery! I was warned not to try to enter, because the presence of a Christian upon Calvary, *after eleven years of British rule*, would quite possibly lead to riot, or at all events to violence. I commend such a position to those who never tire of talking about our "overbearing imperialism." For my own part I believe no small part of our present lamentable troubles in Palestine is due to the incomprehensible weakness of leaving the great sacred Christian and Jewish sites in Mohammedan hands when the Great War plainly destined them for restoration to their rightful guardians.

There are two things which I rather think call for reconsideration in the paper. The first is the continued identification of the high western hill of modern Jerusalem with Zion. This cannot be sustained. Zion was Mount Ophel, the Jebusite fortress between the southern end of the Tyropœon Valley and the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It seems to have been thoroughly established by excavation that the little ridge of Ophel, about 1,200 feet north to south and 150 feet east to west, was Zion.

The second point is on p. 21, viz., the statement that "the walls south, east, and west of Jerusalem all remain in substantially the same position as in the time of the Kings of Israel and Judah." But the present wall of Jerusalem runs far to the north of the wall of the time of the Kings. The ancient wall ran along the depth of the Valley of Hinnom, and is in one place standing to-day to the height of 40 feet. Excavation has revealed the old wall right along the valley. The modern wall is roughly 400 feet above the depth of the valley and runs along the edge of the height, before the tongue of land upon which the modern city stands falls away to the valley on the south.

THE LECTURER'S REPLY.

I should like, in the first place, to thank the Members of the Institute and the various speakers in the discussion, and especially our Chairman, for the kind reception they have given to the paper. As I said in it, I make no pretence to be able to speak with authority on the difficult archæological and topographical questions involved, and I avoided as far as possible dogmatic statements.

The contributions made, however, to the discussion have shown that the subject is one of immense interest to thoughtful minds. We are here concerned with matters of historical fact, although the power of reaching certainty as to localities may be denied to us.

The question of the identification (or possible identification) of the sites of the greatest events in the history of the world is not merely a matter of sentiment or useful imaginative setting, as some of Dr. Masterman's remarks seem to indicate, but is a call for careful weighing of the evidence for or against certain conclusions. It does not produce the same effect on the minds of serious believers in the truth of the historical statements in the Gospels when they are told that a certain place is the traditional site of one of these events, but that there is no particularly good evidence for that identification, as when forceful evidence is presented showing the high probability and consistency with facts of some other locality.

For instance, one can now visit the ruined village Bethany, and guides always show to visitors a tomb-like place asserted to be the grave from which Lazarus was called back to life. There is no evidence of any value that this is the site, whereas our feelings in viewing it would be very different if there were valid evidence for it.

It is perfectly clear that absolute certainty on the sites of the Crucifixion and Entombment of our Lord cannot be reached. Perhaps it was not intended that it should be; but at any rate this discussion has shown that those who have visited Jerusalem, such as Rev. A. W. Payne, Sir Charles Marston, and Rev. Dr. Morton, and carefully examined on the spot the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Garden Tomb and Skull Hill, incline to

the belief that the evidence for the latter is stronger than that for the traditional site.

I may say that, in all questions of ascertained topography, I willingly submit myself to the opinions of speakers such as Dr. Masterman and Dr. Morton, who have studied the questions at issue in Jerusalem itself. For most of us, however, the questions raised can only be viewed in the light of a conflict of evidence. Unquestionably the statements of the Gospel writers, who were, as St. Peter says, "eye-witnesses" of the facts, should have the proper value given to them in any discussion, as this eye-evidence is of far more weight than any traditions or mere sentiments.*

* Members of the Institute may be interested to learn that there is a Fund called "The Garden Tomb (Jerusalem) Maintenance Fund," for the preservation of the Garden Tomb—and of the "Garden of Joseph of Arimathea"—within which the rock-hewn tomb is situate, close under the hill of Calvary, or Golgotha. The Committee welcome subscriptions for the maintenance of what is believed to be the most sacred spot on earth. Communications to Lieut.-Col. C. C. Robertson, D.S.O., Hon. Secretary of The Garden Tomb Association, Benholme, Fleet, Hants.