

from Bezetha, "the new city," by a "deep valley which was dug on purpose." This fosse is supposed now to be discovered in a perpendicular cutting in the rock, which may be seen in the church of the Sisters of Sion, where it forms a part of the interior wall near the entrance. Even the surface of the Sacred Rock, under the dome of the rock, has not escaped, and evidences are visible almost all over it that a tool has been used. Some of the cuttings on this stone are so old that they are now almost crumbled away again; it was only while making a careful sketch of it that I became conscious of lines which must have been cut, and which were only to be made out by the continuity of a few detached points. There are a few illustrations of important changes produced by quarrying or cutting away of the original rock upon which Jerusalem stands. Everyone has been interested in learning, through the Explorations of the Fund, of the accumulation of *débris* over almost every part of the surface, but it is equally important to know the changes which have taken place in the form of the rock upon which the whole rests.

---

### NOTES ON OUR LORD'S TOMB.

1. *Nature of the tomb.* All accounts concur in describing it as an excavated sepulchre, a new and recently finished work, and not as yet used for purposes of burial.

The general idea concerning the tomb is that it was single-celled. When constructing it, Joseph could never have had any idea of the sacred use to which it would be applied, and must have had in view a multi-, not uni-locular *family* sepulchre. The narratives uphold the idea of a multi-locular tomb; had it been otherwise, the angel's invitation, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay" (Matt. xxviii. 6), would have been unnecessary, for a glance would have revealed the interior to the two Marys. St. Mark's narrative is more clear; he describes evidently an antechamber, from which the loculi branch off, and in this case there were apparently only two rows, right and left. On entering this chamber, the Marys find the angel "sitting on the right side" (lit. : ἐν τοῖς δεξιῶν; right what, if not row of loculi?), probably at the entrance of the lately tenanted loculus, which he points out to the affrighted women, "Behold the place where they laid him" (xvi. 6).

According to St. Luke it was only on entering the chamber that the women found not the Lord's body (xxiv. 3); if it had been a one-celled tomb a glance from the entrance would have revealed its emptiness; again, the presence of a loculus branching off from the chamber would necessitate the stooping of Peter to see the grave-clothes laid by themselves (xxiv. 12).

So with St. John—the chamber of the sepulchre admits both Peter

and John (xx. 8), from whence they view the vacant cell and carefully-arranged grave-clothes.

*The tomb was closed by a great stone rolled to the entrance.* How was this done? Here again the general idea is very vague, and refers to the laborious rolling of a huge spherical mass of rock (for only such could roll) to the door of the tomb, no attention being paid to fact that such a mass could not accurately fit the upright entrance, much less receive the protection seal. How was it then done? The radical verb *κυλῶ* implies to roll, but not necessarily a spherical object. The Rev. J. L. Porter describes a Jewish tomb which was accurately closed by a millstone-like slab which was rolled down an inclined plane, at the bottom of which was the circular entrance to the sepulchre. Some such arrangement would be necessary to meet the requirements of St. Matthew's narrative, where the angel rolls away, *ἀπεκάλισε* (not back) the stone and then sits upon it (xxviii. 2).

2. *How was the tomb situated?* According to St. Matthew's narrative, we are, I think, driven to the conclusion that at the scene of the burial there were two hillsides, with a valley between them, for he describes the two Marys as "sitting over against the sepulchre" (*ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου*) xxvii. 61; as if, supposing the tomb had been in the side of Olivet, the Marys had been looking on from the opposite side of the valley, beneath the city walls, but yet in full view, the distance being about 150 yards. If this position be allowed, then in no possible way, at least as far as my reading goes, can the present site of the Holy Sepulchre answer the requirement of St. Matthew's expression, *ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου*.

3. *Where was the tomb situated?* St. John minutely describes the locality: "Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden (*κῆπος*, literally an orchard, *παράδεισος* being garden in our sense of the word); and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There they laid Jesus" (xix. 41-2).

St. John alone tells us that our Lord's agony also occurred in a garden (*κῆπος*), xviii. 1, which St. Matthew and St. Mark describe as near a place (*χώριον*), estate, or hamlet, called Gethsemane (lit. *Gath*, winepress; *shemen*, oil).

Now was the *κῆπος* of the agony identical with the *κῆπος* of the burial? If not, why does St. John use the same word to describe two localities?

If they were, then we can understand why our Lord "oft-times resorted" to the *κῆπος* which witnessed his agony, and was to be the scene of his burial, and in its gloomy shade he trod in solitude the winepress of the wrath of Almighty God.

Gethsemane witnessed the agony and burial; if this is allowed, then it witnessed also the crucifixion, for the *κῆπος* was *in the place* (*ἐν τῷ τόπῳ*) where he was crucified.

If my position be at all allowed, then let us inquire—

1. Does the name Gethshemen in any way linger upon the hillside?
2. Are there any stone presses lying about?
3. Can any tomb be identified as facing the city, and clearly visible from its walls, and likely to have been in an orchard?

4. Does the monkish garden of Gethsemane meet our requirements?  
 5. Does the monkish site of the Holy Sepulchre?

These questions have of course a close bearing upon the site of the crucifixion; the notices of it all convey the idea of an intervening gorge or valley.

The women watched "beholding afar off" (*ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*), Matt. xxvii. 55. St. Mark describes the centurion in command as standing "over against him" (*ἐξ ἐναντίας*), xv. 39; and he and St. Luke also describe the women as "watching afar off" (*ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*).

I should fancy that the site of the crucifixion must be sought along the Bethany road, on the eastern side of the valley of Jchoshaphat.

R. F. H.

## POSITIONS OF PLACES EAST OF JORDAN.

*The distances are very roughly approximate.*

Jeb'l 'Ajlûn .....	N. W. of Jerash
Aljabâyyahât .....	3 miles N. of Aman
Talâât al 'Ali .....	4 miles N. of Aman
Albett .....	W. of Aman
Jeb'l Umm 'Aâwyeh .....	Near Wady Shaïb
Wady al Ârnab .....	2 miles W. of Aman
Belâl Ajhâr .....	3 miles W. of Aman
Baidh Âhmâr .....	? a doubtful name
Wady Deir 'Abar .....	Ruin W. of Aman (Akbar?)
Albikreh .....	4 miles W. of Aman
Almarkab .....	W. of Aman
Al'âwatyeh .....	Perhaps Alawâly
Aljahâr .....	Probably Ajhax
Annawablissîyeh .....	W. of Aman
Wady Adydzalâmeh .....	Near head of Wady Seir
Wady al Âshât .....	Called Wady Eshteh on Van de Velde
K. al Alwâlyeh .....	Probably Alawâly
Tell al 'arýmeh .....	At junction of Ashât and Bahâr
Arkûb al Khilâl .....	E. of Wady Shaïb
Wady umm Âdsis .....	To Wady Kafreïn
Wady Afdheil .....	To Wady Hesban
Wady abu 'Aineïn .....	To Wady Kafreïn
Wady Am'alakah .....	
Wady 'Abyân .....	
Wady Kabr Amhamed .....	
Umm al 'Amad .....	A mound on Belka Plain
Jabl 'Atrûd .....	Jabl Atarûs, high point to E. of Dead Sea
Zimlet al 'Alâyâ .....	On Belka
Al 'Aâl .....	Eleal (?) N.E. by E. of Hesban
Kabr Abd'allah .....	Ruin S. W. of Hesban