

It is more than probable that it is the epitaph of some person connected with the Crusades. I should not be surprised if the stone came from St. Jean d'Acre. Paleographically and epigraphically the inscription closely resembles a tombstone from this city which I reported and published in my "Rapport sur une Mission en Palestine et en Phénicie" (1881), planche X, *a*. The date is a little more recent, 1278. The epitaph—that of Sire Gautier Meynebeuf—is also in old French.

NOTE ON DOLMENS.

As regards dolmens in "Western Palestine," it seems to be overlooked that I have described one on Mount Gilboa, and a group west of Baniâs, and that others, such as the *Hajr ed-Dumm*, occur in Upper Galilee. I have given reasons for concluding that those in Moab were not tombs; but I have also pointed out that the modern Arabs erect small trilithons in connection with the circles round their graves, and I believe the nomads west of Jordan do the same. It seems to be necessary to distinguish these monuments, and to make it clear that those recently discovered in the south, and said to be connected with such graves, are not merely quite modern Bedawin structures, such as would not have been considered worth special notice during the survey.

C. R. CONDER.

THE SITE OF CALVARY.

By COLONEL C. R. CONDER, LL.D., R.E.

CANON MACCOLL is well known as a controversial writer; but in the present case he does not appear able to throw any new light on the question in dispute. He is pleased to suggest that within the last seven years I may have changed my mind, having apparently not read my article on Jerusalem in the new "Dictionary of the Bible" (Messrs. Clarke and Co.). He recommends me to read the Bible, which I had been in the habit of doing before I had the pleasure of making his acquaintance. He describes me as a "convert" to the views of Dr. Robinson, though I am not aware of having ever changed my views on

this question. He considers that my writings lack evidence of research, and that I rely chiefly on Robinson, though he does not quote any evidence with which I have not been acquainted, from the original authors, for many years past. In spite of the strength of assertion which characterises his paper, I consider that it is an imperfect representation of the question in dispute, and that, in many respects, it is misleading. I do not think that much good is done by raising such controversies; but if they are raised it should be in a tone of moderation and respect for the opinion of others. The views which I advocate are held by a large number of persons, who have examined the evidence with care and intelligence, and have reached a conclusion the reverse of that held by Canon MacColl.

I will only refer briefly to points which seem to me likely to mislead. I deny that Canon Williams disposed of the arguments of Dr. Robinson, or that the opinion of a German writer in 1854 has any particular value now. Canon MacColl mixes up two distinct questions: (1) whether the cliff at Jeremiah's Grotto be the true site of Calvary, as I believe; (2) whether the tomb beneath be the true Holy Sepulchre, which I have always denied. He is apparently not aware that the Jews had four different methods of execution, and that they crucified those whom they stoned. The Carthaginians, as well as the Romans, used also to crucify. He should make further study of the Talmud before committing himself to his assertions.

Considering the uncleanness connected with death, I cannot believe that the "place of a skull" could ever have been sacred to Jews, and Origen must have referred to Jewish Christians. St. Paul does not allude to the legend of Adam's skull, nor do I know of any legend in Jewish writings connecting Adam with Golgotha—I consider it most improbable. Pilate delivered over Our Lord to the Jews to crucify, and they may naturally be supposed to have used the ordinary "place of stoning." But whatever Pilate may have thought as to Jewish customs, it is stated that Christ suffered "without the gate" (Heb. xiii, 12).

The Christian authorities quoted by Canon MacColl are all later than the conversion of Constantine, excepting Origen, who does not say that he knew the site of Calvary, and Tertullian, who is only cited. I have been carefully through the works of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, in the hope of finding

some light on the subject, with the result of being unable to discover a single passage showing that the site was known to them. Nor have I found such a passage quoted by others. Nor is there any contemporary account of the return of the Christians to Jerusalem after 70 A.D. There are certainly no coins in existence which prove that a temple to Venus was erected "over Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre." There is no contemporary account of Helena's visiting Calvary, and Eusebius (whether an eye-witness or not) does not explain how the conclusion was reached, that the site uncovered was the true one, recovered as he says, "beyond all hope."

Whatever we may think of the fourth century—and such men as Jerome and Chrysostom had a very bad opinion of the state of the Church in their days—it is certain that the views of Eusebius as to Bible sites are as often wrong as they are right, while the earliest pilgrim (from Bordeaux) makes many mistakes, as when he places the scene of the Transfiguration on Olivet. That Eusebius,¹ Jerome, and others were wrong in saying that the New Jerusalem was opposite the old is shown by the extant remains of the second wall. Jerome does not refer to that wall, however, but to the wall built by Hadrian. It is impossible to show that a garden still existed in the time of Cyril or Willibald, especially if we are to believe that a Pagan temple had been built on the sites. Nor do these authors mean us to understand this. I am at a loss to understand how Canon MacColl can suppose this garden "in" the place of Crucifixion ("not near," he insists) to have existed still in the thirteenth century, when the whole space was covered by the Cathedral as now. El Yakût could not describe what could not exist. Like the preceding authorities, he means that the site was believed to have been originally in a garden. There was, moreover, no "second wall" visible in the thirteenth century, and the Cathedral was inside the city.

Canon MacColl seems to think that the Babylonian Mishnah differs from that of Jerusalem (the correct citation is, I believe, T.B. *Baba Kama*, 82*a*), but anyhow the evidence of a writer about 800 A.D., as to a rose garden "in the time of the prophets," has no value at all.

The statement that the second wall "must cross the Tyropœon"

¹ Eusebius does refer to New Jerusalem. According to the only note I have at hand, the passage is in his "Life of Constantine" (iii, 33).

shows, unfortunately, that Canon MacColl does not understand the topography of Jerusalem.¹ This is exactly the reason why I have always drawn the second wall just where its remains have subsequently been discovered to exist. The passage mentioned by the Canon (2 Chron. xxvi, 9) is one frequently quoted in my published works; but it does not, in my opinion, bear the construction which he gives, nor does it in the least conflict with the line I have always proposed for the wall, nor does the Greek text conflict with the Hebrew. The passage from Tacitus I have also had occasion to quote, but it throws no fresh light on the question. I consider that his description applies well to the walls as I propose to draw them.²

There are many other points which seem to me to show that Canon MacColl has not mastered the literature of his subject, or weighed the arguments on the other side. It is certain, from the rock levels of Jerusalem, that the present traditional site of Calvary was the summit of a rocky knoll rising high above the Tyropœon. The line of wall as he draws it would leave this knoll just outside the wall, in a way which, in my opinion, no one acquainted with ancient fortified sites could for a moment think possible. But the city of Jerusalem, about 30 A.D., extended considerably beyond the second wall on this side. The old difficulty remains, that the position is so central, as regards both the present and the ancient town, that even in the fourth century some explanation was felt to be necessary to account for its not being outside the city. That which Jerome gives, and which most later Christian writers repeat, seems to me to have been apologetic; and it was certainly incorrect, as far as the evidence of Josephus and of the extant remains of the second wall are any indication.

I do not, however, suppose that any argument will convince those who have taken another view, and I have no desire to enter further into controversy on the subject.³

ENNIS, *July 12th, 1901.*

¹ I would note that Josephus does not use the word given by Canon MacColl as meaning to "enclose."

² He does not, I think, refer to zigzags, but to the various directions of the walls, which gave flanking fire—on the north, west, and south sides of the city.

³ For detailed argument on the subject, I beg to refer to the last chapters of my "Handbook to the Bible," and to my recent article on Jerusalem in Dr. Hastings's "Dictionary of the Bible."