

The consideration of Mitanian and Hittite and other names must be postponed for the present.

The examples which I have given here are only a few selected from this important find, but they prove how fine a diplomatic system the Egyptians had developed, and how perfect was the system of official correspondence. The discovery made by Mr. Bliss at Tell Hesi leads us to hope that the day is not far distant when we may be able to construct many chapters of pre-Israelite Palestine from contemporary records from Canaanite libraries.

In many cases here the translations, especially of the Palestine and Amorite letters, must be regarded as tentative, as the language, and especially the grammatical construction, is often very difficult; but I hope that in most cases I have attained to the general sense.

NOTES ON THE CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE SITE OF CALVARY.

By the Rev. J. E. HANAUER.

FOR more than 1,100 years past intelligent visitors to Jerusalem have (as I hope to prove by quoting passages from several of the most important of their itineraries)¹ been puzzled to find that, though the Gospels and the Epistle to the Hebrews tell us distinctly that our Saviour was crucified outside the walls of the Holy City, ecclesiastical tradition locates Golgotha and Christ's Sepulchre in the very centre of the town. In order to explain this apparent divergence between Scripture and tradition, various theories were accordingly put forward.

The earliest of these is, in all probability, that of St. Willibald, and his statement is that Calvary "was formerly outside Jerusalem; but Helena, when she found the Cross, arranged that place so as to be within the City Jerusalem."²

The next explanation is Sæwulf's. He was here in 1,102, and says:—"We know that our Lord suffered without the gate. But the Emperor Hadrian, who was also called Ælius, re-built the City of Jerusalem, and the Temple of the Lord, and added to the city as far as the Tower of David, which was previously a considerable distance from the city, for anyone may see from the Mount of Olives where the extreme western walls of the city stood originally, and how much it is since increased Some, however, say³ that the city was re-built by the Emperor Justinian, and also the Temple of the Lord as it is now; but they say that according to supposition, and not according to truth."⁴ This statement, made a few years after the first Crusaders had taken the

¹ Pilgrim Text Society's Translations.

² Pilgrim Text Society's Translations, "Hodepor," p. 19.

³ The italics are mine.—J.E.H.

⁴ "Early Travels in Palestine," p. 37.

Holy City, contains a distinctly defined theory, as well as an allusion and objection to others, and therefore proves that the statement one often hears to the effect that no difficulties were felt respecting the location of Calvary within the city till *Protestants chose to raise doubts regarding the authenticity of the site*, has no foundation.

The unknown author of "La Cité de Jherusalem," says :—

"Jerusalem [the glorious city] is no longer in the place where it stood when Jesus Christ [was on the earth], and was crucified, and was raised again from death to life. When Jesus Christ was on the earth the City of Jerusalem was on Mount Zion, but it is no longer there. Only an abbey of monks is there now, and in this abbey a church of Holy Mary," "The Church of the Sepulchre as it is now, and Mount Calvary, were, when Jesus Christ was crucified, outside the wall. Now it is in the middle of the city, and the city is also on a slope which looks towards Mount Olivet on the east beyond the Valley of Jehoshaphat."¹

John of Wurzburg (A.D. 1160-70) informs us that in our Lord's time "the Pretorium, or Judgment Hall of Pilate, was on Mount Zion, where also the finest and strongest part of the city was, but that afterwards, when the city which was there was destroyed, it was removed by the Emperor Ælius to another place, where it stands at this day."²

This notice, and that of Theodoric (A.D. 1170), who also locates the Pretorium on Zion, are curious and important, for earlier writers, the Bordeaux Pilgrim (A.D. 333), the author of the "Breviary of Jerusalem" (A.D. 530), and Antoninus Martyr (A.D. 560), place the Judgment Hall, the former near the site now occupied by the Suk al Kattauin, and the two latter on the site of Justinian's Basilica of St. Sophia, on the platform where the Dome of the Rock now stands, an identification most manifestly wrong.

We know that the present Via Dolorosa, with its various stations, is not alluded to by any writer before Marinus Sanutus (A.D. 1321), but Josephus tells us³ not only that the Roman Governor, Gessius Florus, had his quarters in the old Palace of the Hasmoneans on Zion, but also how annoyed Festus and Agrippa were because the view from the dining-hall (or guest-chamber) of Agrippa, whence there was a most delightful prospect of the City and Temple courts, had been obstructed by a wall built by the Jews upon the uppermost building which belonged to the inner court of the Temple towards the west; and what trouble resulted therefrom. Now the civil (Roman) capital of the country, and the seat of the Roman Governors, at that time was at Cæsarea Stratonis, just as at present that of the Turkish Vali is at Damascus. The procurators used to visit Jerusalem at the great feasts, &c., and, as Gessius Florus and Festus seem to have resided on such occasions in the Palace on Zion, it has been suggested that Pilate may have done so too. To

¹ Pilgrim Text Society's Translations, pp. 1, 2, 3, 4.

² Pilgrim Text Society's Translations, p. 28.

³ "Antiq.," XX, viii, 11; "Wars," II, xiv, 8.

show how easy it is to form theories regarding the topography of Jerusalem, I may mention that it is popularly supposed that the premises of the London Jews' Society, at Jerusalem, occupy part of the site of the Palace and palace grounds of the Hasmoneans, enlarged and beautified by Herod, and that there is therefore a grand opportunity, for anyone who chooses to waste time and labour on the task, to write a treatise proving that there is reason to suppose that Christ Church, Jerusalem, stands on the very spot where Pilate said to the Jews of his day: "Ecce Homo. Ecce rex vester."

But to proceed:—Jacob de Vitriaco (A.D. 1220), and William of Badensel (A.D. 1336), felt the same difficulty that had perplexed so many pious minds before them,¹ while Balthasar de Monconys (A.D. 1657) was not satisfied with the explanations given, and the Franciscan Quaresmius, at first a simple monk in the Latin Convent at Jerusalem, and later on the Reverendissimo, or Father Guardian of the Holy Sites (A.D. 1627–29), disposes of the objections as "nebulones occidentales hereticos" (Robinson, "Bib. Res.," i, 408), and it was, doubtless, the fear of being considered and treated as heretics that, up to the eighteenth century, deterred many from openly calling in question the identity of the so-called Holy Sites. The first to *protest against the possibility* of the Church of the Sepulchre being on the right spot was Jonas Korten,² the German bookseller who visited Jerusalem in 1738, and some years later wrote an interesting little work, which seems to have caused quite a sensation amongst the Protestants of his day. In this work he argues that the site on which the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands could not possibly have been outside the city in our Lord's time, because it is so near the site of the Jewish Temple. No other traveller or writer of the eighteenth century endorsed this view, but in the present century the identity of the traditional site has been both attacked and defended by various able writers, "the eloquent, though superficial, Chateaubriand" (A.D. 1811), leading the way in a very plausible defence, from which most of the later advocates of tradition have drawn their chief arguments; and Dr. Edward Daniel Clarke following in the same year with a violent attack. Unfortunately, Dr. Clarke (who did not spend more than seventeen days in Palestine from the date of his landing at Acre, June 29, 1801, and who wrote his book years afterwards) seriously compromised and brought discredit on the cause he advocated, by broaching theories which I must mention, not only because of their extravagance and absurdity, but because they illustrate one point to which I would take the liberty of calling the attention of all interested in Palestine exploration, namely, the necessity, if I may use such an expression, of Gamaliel-like caution in advancing any theory, and the imprudence of drawing hasty conclusions from *single*, though

¹ Robinson, "Biblical Researches," I, 408. Vitriaco, "Hist. Hieros.," c. 60. Badensel, ed. Canis, p. 348. Monconys, "Journal de Voyages," Paris, 1657, Tom. I, 307. "Quaresmius," Tom. II, p. 515.

² Robinson, "Biblical Researches," vol. i, p. 408, &c. Jonas Korten, "Reise Altona," 1,741–8, pp. 210–212.

well-ascertained facts.¹ Happening to visit² the old Christian cemetery (the traditional Aceldama) in the Wad Er Rababeh, he noticed that over several sepulchre doors were the words, τῆς ἁγίας Σιων. "Of the Holy Sion," which inscriptions still exist, and on them he based the hypothesis that the Hill of Evil Counsel was Mount Zion, and that therefore the Wad Er Rababeh, the traditional Hinnom, was the Tyropeon; and further, that a certain tomb he visited hereabouts was possibly "the identical tomb of Jesus Christ." Since then inscriptions have been found at Aceldama, proving beyond doubt that the Christian cemetery there dates back to the ninth century,³ and that the mention of Zion refers to the monastery situated on the hill-top on the other side of the valley, and known as "Holy Sion," or "St. Zion," in the same way that recently-discovered and analogous epitaphs of deacons buried close to St. Stephen's Church refer to the Resurrection (or to the Church of the Resurrection *i.e.*, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre), give us reason to suppose that the Christian cemetery (fifth to ninth, perhaps to thirteenth century) near St. Stephen's, was known (and the knowledge that a cemetery so named should have during the Middle Ages existed so close to the "Skull Hill" seems, at first sight, startlingly suggestive and significant) in mediæval times as that "of the Holy Resurrection (or Anastasis) of Christ."

Dr. Clarke seems to have been the first to attempt to identify the Saviour's sepulchre with another than that shown in the centre of the modern city. Since his time Fergusson maintained that the Church of the Sepulchre does not even stand on the site of Constantine's great Church of the Resurrection, but that the present "Dome of the Rock" was originally that church of Constantine's, and that the cave under the

¹ Another case in point is that of Dr. Wild, who "discovered in 1838 a cave containing a great number of skulls, which, according to his statement, were not those of Jews but of foreigners, by which circumstance the fact was" considered "established beyond doubt that this is the very field which was bought for thirty pieces of silver," &c., &c. (Rev. Dr. F. C. Ewald, "Journal," London, Wertheim, Aldine Chambers, Paternoster Row, 1841, p. 239). The facts that the cemetery was a ninth-century Christian one, and that close to Dr. Wild's cave the ruins of an old charnel-house exist (which, when first mentioned in the fourteenth century, belonged to the Knights Hospitallers), and that many of the bones may have come from this place, the fact further that though St. Jerome (A.D. 420) locates Aceldama hereabouts, yet that Eusebius, writing almost a century before him, places it *north* of the city, sheds quite a new light on the fact that Dr. Wild ascertained the skulls found at the traditional Potter's Field to be those, not of Jews, but of foreigners, and gives cause for the supposition that they were the crania of Christian pilgrims, who, during the Middle Ages, came, as they do now, to Jerusalem, from all parts of the world, died, and were buried here. The skulls, therefore, do not prove the traditional Aceldama to be the true one.

² "Travels in Holy Land," 4to, pp. 549, 551, 554.

³ "Survey of Western Palestine." Jerusalem Volume, p. 418.

Sakkhra was the sepulchre of our Lord. Major Conder has, in his turn, pointed to a Herodian tomb 200 yards west of the knoll above Jeremiah's Grotto, and suggests that it may have been the true sepulchre;¹ and some time after this General Gordon gave his opinion in favour of a tomb (now known by his name) nearer the said knoll, and apparently one of a group belonging to the above-mentioned mediæval cemetery at St. Stephen's.

Others, again, have indicated the slopes of Olivet as having been in all probability the scene of the Crucifixion, Burial, and Resurrection, as well as of the Ascension²; whilst in our own day, certain residents in this holy city point tourists to the ash-heaps west of Bishop Blyth's present residence, and supposed by many to be the remains of the ashes from the ancient temple-sacrifices, and if so, the place where, in the sin-offering, "the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp."³ Holding this view, those who consider that the type was burned at this spot are consistent in considering it identical with that where the Antitype "suffered without the gate." I cannot, however, understand the reasons which have led these same people (unless, as some state, they lay claim to having received a Divine revelation on the subject) to consider a rock-hewn sepulchre at the foot of Mount Scopus, and at a good distance from the said ash-heaps, to be the tomb in which our Lord's body lay.

Between the years 1840 and 1876, no fewer than *sixteen* different theories (each backed by a learnedly-written work), respecting the topography of Ancient Jerusalem, and more especially about the course of its second wall, outside of which our Lord suffered, were advanced. The late Professor Zimmermann, of Bâle, has arranged these sixteen different restorations of the Holy City of our Lord's day, side by side in chronological order, so that, at a glance, one can overlook all and compare each with the others; and when we do so we are struck with the discovery that twelve of these theories (those of Williams, Schulz, Krafft, Thrupp, Lewin, Sepp, De Vogüé, De Sauley, Menke, Caspari, Sir Charles Warren, and Farrer) were in favour of the traditional site. Of these twelve, however, no fewer than nine have been disproved, wholly or in part, by facts discovered since they were put forward. The authorities against the traditional site were, in 1876, Robinson, Fergusson, Tobler, and Mr. Schick, the latter of whom, however, some years ago changed his mind on the subject, and now maintains the genuineness of the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, though to do so he is obliged to sacrifice the whole of the traditional Via Dolorosa. His present theory and restoration of the second wall, therefore, counts as the seventeenth, and Major Conder's,⁴ which goes against the traditional site, is the eighteenth. Dr. Selah

¹ "Tent Work," 1882; "Good Words," April, 1892.

² Rev. S. Manning, "These Holy Fields," p. 107; and N. Hutchinson, M.D., in *Quarterly Statements*, 1870, June and September, and 1873, July.

³ Hebrews xiii, 11, 12.

⁴ Facing p. 365 in vol. i, of "Tent Work."

Merrill's restoration of Ancient Jerusalem, an autograph chart of which has for several months' past been exhibited in the saloon of the Grand New Hotel at Jerusalem, resembles Conder's in some respects. The literature on the subject being so extensive, it is impossible to mention all the arguments on either side of what we may now, with good reason, term the controversy respecting the site of Calvary, and in which we find a good many Protestants espousing the cause of ecclesiastical tradition; but, as far as I have been able to ascertain, only one Roman Catholic of note, Professor Scholz, of Bonn,¹ taking a stand against it. I must, therefore, restrict myself to the mention of the most salient points in the discussion which is carried on along two distinct lines of argument, one historico-traditional, the other topographical, and which we shall now briefly consider in their turn.

I.—*The Historico-traditional Phase of the Controversy.*

The defenders of tradition, following Chateaubriand and Williams, state that² all the members of the first Christian Church, which was gathered immediately after the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, must have known the holy places, and, as they doubtless erected churches on those sites, they must have honoured the Holy Sepulchre in like manner; and, at any rate, it is certain that the line of sixteen Jewish bishops of Jerusalem, from the days of St. James till those of Bar Cocheba's revolt (A.D. 135), must have known and handed on the Christian traditions, which could not have been lost when the Christians withdrew to Pella during the siege by Titus, at which time the holy places, being outside the city, could not have suffered much; and that it is also certain that Adrian set up a statue of Venus upon Calvary, and one of Jupiter over the heap of rubbish that wicked men had purposely piled over the Holy Sepulchre, and thus the place was only made more conspicuous by the attempt to profane it. As from Hadrian's time till that of Constantine there was again a general succession of bishops of Jerusalem, the holy places could, of course, not have been forgotten, and the statement that when by Constantine's orders the earth was removed, the Sepulchre was discovered *contrary to all expectation*, is to be understood in the same sense in which, speaking now-a-days of the wonderful discovery by Dr. Schliemann of the ruins of Troy, &c., &c., one could say rightly that it was "contrary to all expectation." The modern archæologist knew where to look for the objects of his search and found them, though no one thought he would be likely to do so, and it was just the same in the case of the first Christian Emperor.³

¹ See Robinson, "Biblical Researches," vol. i, on this subject.

² Robinson, "Biblical Researches," vol. i, p. 411.

³ Such was the answer given on this point in the lecture delivered by the Dominican Prior of St. Stephen's, at Jerusalem, as a counterblast to one given by the writer of this paper, on the subject of the Site of Calvary controversy, and of which latter these notes contain the substance, with some amplifications.

To this reasoning the anti-traditionists, following Dr. Robinson, reply that it is indeed certain that the first Christians knew the sites of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, yet that no evidence, either literary or documentary, exists to prove that they built churches on sites rendered sacred by miracles, or that those churches were situated outside the city; nor can it be proved that there was a regular succession of Jewish bishops of Jerusalem such as has been described. Eusebius, writing in the fourth century, is the first to mention these bishops, and he is careful to tell us that he could find no document in proof of what he reports from hearsay.

But further, though extant coins prove Adrian to have built temples at Jerusalem, there is no evidence in proof of their having been erected over Calvary or the Sepulchre. Eusebius, again the earliest witness, does not even mention Adrian in connection with the building of the Temple of Venus¹ on the mound of earth removed by Constantine. The first to mention Adrian in this connection is St. Jerome, who, writing more than sixty years after the destruction of the Temple of Venus, very strangely and inexplicably speaks of a Temple of Jupiter as standing where Eusebius, the *eye-witness* of the transaction, and *its historian*, states that the Temple of Venus stood, and says that the fane of Venus was on Calvary, where, as a plain matter of fact, it is more than doubtful that any heathen temple ever stood. What Eusebius says is, in short, this:—² “Ungodly men (or rather the whole race of demons by their means) set themselves to consign to darkness and oblivion that Divine monument of immortality’ . . . ‘the most blessed place of the Saviour’s resurrection’ . . . ‘They covered it with earth, paved the mound thus raised with stone, and then built a temple to Venus over it.’ . . . ‘Their machinations against the truth continued for a long time, till Constantine, inspired by the Divine Spirit and holy zeal, ordered that the Temple should be destroyed, and the mound of earth transported to a distance’ . . . ‘This was accomplished without delay. And, as one layer of earth after another was laid bare, the place which was beneath the earth appeared; then forthwith, *contrary to all expectation*, did the venerable and hallowed monument of our Saviour’s resurrection become visible.’” This language does not seem to show that a well-defined tradition had pointed to the place as the site of the Sepulchre; and the following extracts from Constantine’s own letter on the subject also lead us to suppose an absence of all tradition.³ “No power of language seems worthy to describe the present wonder. For that the token of that most Holy Passion, long

¹ “We have no single intimation in any known author of the time of Hadrian” to show that he built a temple to Venus at Jerusalem, “though several buildings of his are noticed by contemporary writers; the story of this temple of Venus is first mentioned by Eusebius two centuries later.”—“Tent Work,” vol. i, p. 363.

² Palestine Pilgrim’s Text Society’s “Churches of Constantine,” pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

³ “Churches of Constantine.” See above.

ago buried under ground, should have remained unknown for so many cycles of years, until it should shine forth to His servants . . . 'truly transcends all marvel' . . . 'for the nature of the wonder as far transcends all capacity of man's reason as Divine things surpass in permanence those which are human.' It must further be noticed that though Justin Martyr (second century), and Origen (third century), speak of Christ's birth-place at Bethlehem as a well-known spot, yet that neither Eusebius, nor Constantine, nor the Bordeaux Pilgrim (A.D. 333), nor St. Cyril, Patriarch of Jerusalem, twenty years later, who mentions the existence of what was in his time believed to be the wood of the true Cross, nor St. Silvia of Aquitaine (A.D. 385), nor indeed any writer of the fourth century, St. Jerome included, make mention of Helena in connection with the discovery of the Sepulchre and our Lord's Cross. The legends about her are first met with in writers of the fifth century. This fact (when we remember that it is certain she did build churches on Olivet and at Bethlehem), is very remarkable and significant, though indeed it does not prove conclusively that Helena had *nothing whatever* to do with the removal of the Temple of Venus and the discovery resulting therefrom.

We now come to the statement of—

II.—*The Topographical Arguments For and Against the Traditional Site.*

From the New Testament we learn that Calvary was :—

1. Outside the gates of, though near to the city. Heb. xiii, 11, 12 ; John xix, 20.

2. Interments were permitted and actually did take place close by. John xix, 41, 42.

3. It was so near a road or roads leading to and from the country that the remarks of passers-by (Orientals, generally the peasants of Palestine, especially, speak loudly), could be understood, and it was also within sight and hearing of some place where priests and scribes could stand without fear of ceremonial pollution. Matt. xxvii, 32, 39 ; Mark xv, 21, 29, 31 ; Luke xxiii, 35.

4. It could be seen "afar off." Matt. xxvii, 55 ; Mark xv, 40, 41 ; Luke xxiv, 48, 49.

5. It was known "as the place of a skull," doubtless not, as some have supposed, because skulls were scattered about there, for this was contrary to all Jewish custom ; but most probably the place had something in its general appearance, or in its contours, suggestive of the shape of a skull. Matt. xxvii, 33 ; Mark xv, 22 ; Luke¹ xxiii, 33 ; John xix, 17.

6. Lastly, the language of the Evangelists seems to imply that on leaving the Judgment Hall the procession passed, not through the city, but outside it.²

¹ Calvaria, ac., *f.*, a skull. Vineal calvata—Pliny. Calveo, -vere, -vi, to be bald, &c.,

² "Those Holy Fields," Rev. S. Manning, p. 105.

How do these indications suit the traditional site of Calvary? They can only be made to do so in part, and that with difficulty. The *second* wall, outside of which our Lord was crucified, ran, according to Josephus, from the Gate Gennath, near the Tower Hippicus, northwards, encompassing (*κυκλούμενον*) the northern part of the city, and ending at the Castle of Antonia. It had forty towers. The Pool of Hezekiah (then called "Amygdalon") was inside it, and to the north was a tract of land sufficiently extensive and level to enable Antiochus Sidetes (b.c. 130) to erect his 100 towers; and the distance of the third wall from the second was so great that at the siege by Titus (A.D. 70), the defenders being worn out, retired in despair to the latter. Several traces of the *third* wall were distinctly visible when the writer of these notes was a lad of from fourteen to sixteen.¹ They had been noticed and described by Dr. Robinson many years before, but now-a-days, in consequence of the erection of numerous buildings round the city, these vestiges, with one exception (in the north wall of a cistern, just east of the Damascus road, and north of the property of the Dominicans), at St. Stephen's, have disappeared, and people interested in the maintenance of the traditional view, deny that they ever existed, and point to the present north wall of the city as coinciding with the course of the third wall.

A portion of the *second* wall was discovered in 1885, when the foundations for the eastern wall of the present "Grand New Hotel" were dug. All modern authorities are agreed in its belonging to the second wall. It was traced northwards for about 120 feet, and the general anti-traditionist view is that it ran on towards the Franciscan Convent, and then bent eastward, perhaps following the same line as that of the present northern wall of Jerusalem, till it joined on to the undoubtedly ancient remains visible at the Damascus Gate. On the other hand, the latest theory (Mr. Schick's) of the traditionist party is that it bent eastward at the Greek Catholic Convent, then ran along the street leading past the Coptic Convent till it reached an archway and some old masonry (the stones of which have the very distinctive "diagonal dressing" of the mediæval period, but which this theory makes do duty as part of the "Eck thor" or corner-gate of the second wall), and then on past the Khan el Kubt, across Christian Street, past Jamia el Omary, and the Muristan, till it joins, at a right angle, the remarkable remains in the new Russian Hospice east of the Church of the Sepulchre. These remains are supposed (by this theory) to extend northward as far as the present traditional Porta Judiciaria, and from that point the second wall is supposed to have proceeded in an oblique direction towards the Austrian Hospice till it joined the well-known rock scarp in the Ecce-Homo Church.

The ruins at the Russian Hospice are very remarkable, the most striking portion of them being part of a massive wall, resting on a small rock scarp running east, built in part of levelled stones (which have, however, holes in their faces,² as if for metal clips to hold in position the slabs

¹ Robinson, "Biblical Researches," vol. i, 314, 315.

² *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1891, p. 214.

of a marble casing, like that a portion of which is seen in the ruins near the Skull Hill), facing east, and having a buttress or cross-wall of the same style at its southern end, immediately east of which, and, as it seems, *in situ*, is the well-worn threshold of an old gateway. This threshold is now protected by an iron railing.

Canon Williams, De Vogüë, and M. Guérin believed this piece of wall to have formed part of the second wall. Sir C. Wilson examined it very carefully in 1864, and "the general impression which resulted from this examination was that the corner in question was probably early Christian work, in imitation of the Haram masonry, and that the buttress marks the south-east angle of the Atrium of Constantine's Basilica, the pillars to the east being remains of the Propylæa in front of the Atrium doorways."¹ Professor Hayter Lewis endorses this opinion²; but Mr. Schick³ believes that in ancient times a castle stood here at right angles to the second wall, which joined it, as above described, at its south end, and then ran on towards the Antonia from its north end. He thinks, further, that the lowest courses of the massive wall we have been speaking of, served, at a later period, as a foundation for part of the Atrium of Constantine.

Now, though by taking a course such as that described the second wall would have left (though only just have left) the traditional site outside it, and though it seems to have in its favour the fact that there exists, east of the Church of Sepulchre, and between it and the supposed castle ruins I have referred to, a great *artificial* depression, or rock-cut trench, containing at present the so-called Chapel of Helena, and in line with, and north and south of the latter, several immense and remarkable cisterns (one of them 100 feet long, 35 feet wide, and 35 feet deep), and though the latest traditionist theory (given above) supposes this trench to have been a moat outside the second wall, the following reasons for thinking that the second wall did not take the course the traditionists suppose may perhaps merit attention.

1. The second wall did not run in a zigzag, but in a curve.
2. According to Mr. Schick's theory, the wall would, after passing the site of Calvary (traditional), have had to cross, before reaching the Antonia, a valley at a point where the ascertained rock-levels prove it to have been from eighty to one hundred feet deep.
3. It is scarcely possible to locate twenty towers along this proposed line (Mr. Schick scarcely manages to place eighteen), and certainly not forty.
4. The size of the stones, and the *diagonal dressing* on the remains north-west of the Pool of Hezekiah, mark them as belonging most probably to the Crusading period, and not to the "Corner-gate of Biblical times."

¹ "Survey of Western Palestine." Jerusalem Volume, pp. 252-254.

² Pilgrim Text Society's "Churches of Constantine," Introduction, p. xxv.

³ "Z.D.P.V.," Bd. viii, Heft 4, "Das Stadtviertel der Grabes kirche, der Lauf der zweiten Mauer, und die Bauten Constantin's am heiligen Grabe."

5. The depression east of the Church of the Sepulchre may be satisfactorily accounted for, and in this manner: Dr. Robinson, Sir Charles Warren, Major Conder, and Mr. Schick agree (their views being confirmed by what is now known with certainty regarding the rock-levels and rock-site of Ancient Jerusalem)¹ in stating that there was a steep hill to the east and south-east of the said trench. The present platform-like top of this hill (which Sir C. Warren calls "Zion" or "Akra") shows the rock at a level of 2,477 feet above the sea,² whilst other levels show that north-east, east, and south of it are valleys with beds ascertained to be only from 2,360 to 2,400 feet above the sea, and therefore the hill-sides must have been very steep on the north-east, east, and south. Further, the level platform on the hill-top has been found to be bounded by a precipitous scarp, or cliff, which is continued northwards on the west of the street leading from the so-called *Porta Judiciaria* towards the Damascus Gate, and at the same general level (2,465 to 2,467 feet) as the northern edge of the platform.

Now, let it be granted (several undoubted authorities are in favour of the view) that a Castle, or Akra (of which the massive wall in the Russian property once formed part) topped the hill at some period of its history: what special and characteristic feature would we expect to find (a feature found in almost all ancient fortresses in this country, as at Bittir, Hunin, Baniyas, Tibnin, and Kalu'at Es Shukif, &c.) cut in the rock, and ineffaceable, even if not a single vestige of the masonry ramparts had been preserved? The obvious answer is, an artificial valley, rock-hewn trench, fosse, or moat dug along that part of the defences which, for want of a natural valley to protect it, would be most easily approached and exposed to attack. This consideration will, perhaps, make it clear that an artificial depression in the rock was to have been expected where indeed it exists, and that, without being forced to the conclusion that it belonged to the second wall, its being where it is need cause those holding anti-traditionist views less difficulty than another fact, namely: that it is certain that the site of the Church of the Sepulchre was, at some time or other during the Jewish period, a place where interments were allowed, although the Mishna states ("Baba Bathra," ii, 9) that "corpsees and tanneries were separated from the city fifty cubits."

It has been discovered³ that the so-called tombs of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, supposed by Dr. Robinson to be forgeries, are genuine ancient Jewish tombs, that there are others underneath them, whilst others have been found under the Coptic Convent at the other side of the Church of the Sepulchre, and that thus the second condition required by the Gospel narrative is satisfied. In order to meet this fact Major Conder⁴ supposes that these tombs were either those of the Davidic dynasty or of Huldah the Prophetess; for, these excepted,

¹ See Plate facing p. 33 in Sir C. Warren's "Temple and Tomb."

² Ordnance Survey.

³ *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1877, pp. 76-85.

⁴ "Survey of Western Palestine." Jerusalem Volume.

all sepulchres within the Holy City are stated (Tosiphta "Baba Bathra," c. i.) to have been transferred without the walls. Attention is also called to a passage in the Mishna, which seems to show a way out of the difficulty by stating that "the buildings of Jerusalem were founded on the rock, with caves under them, because of the Kabe Ha Tahtum (Sepulchre of the Abyss), i.e., "hidden tombs of unknown depth" (Maimonides, "Nezir," ix. 2), to prevent defilement, from which the children, sent to fetch water from Siloam for the Red-Heifer Sacrifice, were mounted on bulls, in order to have their feet off the ground; and besides this, and for the same reason, the priest who had to sacrifice the heifer crossed the valley between the Temple and Olivet over a causeway of peculiar construction, consisting of one row of arches built over the other, and therefore the Jews knew that hidden tombs existed within the city,¹ and even near the sacred enclosure.

It does not seem as if the site of the Church of the Sepulchre, though, indeed, being the top of a ridge with a valley 100 feet deep (though now nearly filled up), and 800 feet wide, immediately south of it, it could be seen at a distance answers the rest of the conditions (*see* above) required by the Gospel narrative, and therefore I will now speak of the site outside the present Damascus Gate, and which, in the opinion of many of the present day, commends itself to notice as fulfilling *all* requirements of the Story of the Crucifixion. In our Lord's time it was doubtless outside the second wall, though not far from the northern gate of the city, traces of which are visible at the present Damascus Gate. Close by was a place where interments were made, for 200 yards to the west of it Major Conder discovered a Jewish tomb of the Herodian period, which he suggests might have been the sepulchre in which Joseph of Arimathea laid the body of Jesus, and, seeing the direction in which public opinion respecting the site of Calvary is now setting, this tomb and the property in which it is situated have been purchased and recently enclosed by the Franciscan monks. Besides this tomb, Mr. Schick² has recently pronounced the tomb, identified by General Gordon as that of our Lord, to have been "*originally* a rather small rock-cut Jewish tomb." (The italics are mine.)

It has further been shown by Dr. Merrill, in a pamphlet published in Jerusalem in 1886, that two great Roman roads led past the site in question, which is the knoll above Jeremiah's Grotto, now often called "Gordon's Calvary." One of these roads runs northwards along its western side, and is in all probability the same over which Saul of Tarsus travelled to Damascus as a persecutor of Jesus.³ The other, on the east of the knoll, leads straight from the site of the Antonia, past the present "Herod's Gate," so-called, to Antipatris and Caesarea-on-the-Sea. It is the road along which Paul was carried prisoner by night,⁴ and the spot

¹ Lightfoot, "Temple Service," chap. xvii, sec. 2.

² *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1892, p. 120.

³ Acts ix.

⁴ Acts xxiii.

where, close to the Tombs of the Kings, it crosses the other, forms one of the most important and interesting road-crossings known in history.

But, to proceed. The "new," or "Gordon's Calvary," is visible "afar off" from the west and north, as well as from the slopes of Olivet on the east, and, looking across the city, from the Hill of Evil Counsel to the south. It is within sight and hearing of many places where priests and scribes could have stood and looked on from positions where they were out of danger of ceremonial pollution. Nor is this all, for the cavern underneath the hill has for centuries been pointed out as the Grotto where Jeremiah wrote his Lamentations, and where, according to a venerable tradition [found in a Christian Apocryphal Book ("The Rest of the Words of Baruch") written about A.D. 136, and part of which is to this day read annually in the Orthodox (or Greek) Church, on November 4th, when the Greek Church commemorates the destruction of Jerusalem] the prophet Jeremiah was stoned. To this tradition, and to that relating to the martyrdom of Isaiah, who is said to have been sawn asunder by order of Manasseh, it has been supposed that St. Paul alludes in Heb. xi, 37, and possibly even our Lord Himself, Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34.¹

Besides this early Christian tradition, it has been discovered² by Dr. Chaplin, and the fact has been confirmed by independent inquiry made by Major Conder, that the Jews consider the knoll above Jeremiah's Grotto to be identical with the "Beth-ha-Sekelah," or "House of Stoning," mentioned in the Mishna ("Sanhed" vi, 1-14), where criminals were put to death by being hurled over the cliff, and then, if the fall had not killed them, by being stoned. After death their corpses were, according to the same authority, suspended till sunset on a cross fixed on the summit of the hillock. I may perhaps be forgiven, in this connection, for remarking that according to the³ "Hagadah of Shimeon Bar Kepha," a Jewish work of the eighth or ninth century, our Lord was first stoned and then crucified.

When in connection with all this we remember that Dr. Rufus Anderson and Otto Thenius in 1848, and Fisher Howe in 1871, were struck with the skull-like appearance of the rocks in the southern precipices of the hillock, and the late General Gordon with its skull-like contours, already indicated on the Ordnance Survey Plan of Jerusalem 1864-5, and that close by we have not only the ruins of the great church, dedicated in A.D. 460, to the proto-martyr Stephen, but also a mediæval⁴ Christian cemetery known, whatever the reason may be, as that "Of the

¹ "The Rest of the Words of Baruch," a Christian Apocalypse of the year 136 A.D. The text revised, with an introduction, by J. Rendel Harris, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages in Haverford College, Pennsylvania. London, C. J. Clay and Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, 1889, pp. 4, 21, 23, 24.

² "Tent Work," vol. i, p. 374.

³ Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," appendix xviii.

⁴ *Quarterly Statement*, 1890, p. 68.

Holy Resurrection (Anastasis) of Christ," we seem to possess, in favour of the identification of the hillock above Jeremiah's Grouto, with the Site of Calvary, a mass of cumulative evidence apparently overwhelming. I would, however, in conclusion, venture to suggest that the last word in favour of either this site or that within the city has not yet been spoken, and there is no knowing what discoveries, modifying or confirming the opinion of authorities on this subject, may yet be made.

List of Papers and Notes on the Site of Calvary, published in the
Quarterly Statements, 1870-1892.

Date.	Page.	Heading.	Writer.
1873. July	Further Notes on Our Lord's Tomb ...	N. F. Hutchinson, M.D.
1877. July ...	138	The Holy Sepulchre ...	C. W. W.
1877. April ...	76	The Holy Sepulchre ...	Clermont-Ganneau.
1879. January ...	18	Transference of Sites ...	W. Simpson.
1881. July	The Place of Stoning ...	J. E. Hanauer.
1883. July	The Holy Sepulchre ...	Henry A. Harper.
1883. April	The Holy Sepulchre ...	Captain Conder, R.E.
1887. April	Notices ...	Guy le Strange.
1888. July	Notes on Calvary ...	Ditto.
1888. July	Notes on Calvary ...	Captain Conder.
1889. October	Notes on the Holy Sepulchre ...	Major Conder.
1889. July	Recent Discoveries ...	Herr Baurath Conrad von Schick.
1889. April	Notes on the Plan ...	Ditto.
1889. January	Holy Sepulchre and Dome of Rock ...	William Simpson.
1890. April	Site of Calvary ...	Professor Hull.
1891. July	The Holy Sepulchre ...	Major Watson, R.E.
1891. April	Entrance to the Holy Sepulchre ...	William Simpson.
1891. January	On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre ...	Henry Gillman.
1892. July	On the Identification of Calvary...	J. E. Hanauer.

ESSAYS ON THE SECTS AND NATIONALITIES OF
SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

(Continued from July "*Quarterly Statement*," p. 218.)

THE MARONITES.

By FREDERICK JONES BLISS, B.A.

V.

THE CALENDAR.

The following Calendar has been compiled after a careful comparison between the full notices upon the Saints, Martyrs, Councils, &c., found in the Sinksar, with the abbreviated lists containing the important commemorations alone, printed in the smaller Shim and in the Book of the Mass. The Shim differs in some points from the other lists, naming