GOLGOTHA AND THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.


(Continued from p. 151).

BEFORE attempting to discuss the evidence available for the determination of the position of Golgotha, it seems desirable to offer some remarks on the topography of Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion.

The ancient city was built at the end of a well-defined spur, which, stretching southward for about 1 3/4 miles from the swelling ground that separates the waters of the Dead Sea from those of the Mediterranean, lies between the valley of Hinnom, and that of the Kidron (see plan). The latter, known also as the valley of Jehoshaphat, runs eastward, from its source, for 1 1/2 miles, and then, changing direction to the south, sharply separates the long high ridge of Olivet from the lower ground upon which the city stands. The valley of Hinnom, after following a southerly course for 1 1/4 miles, turns eastward, and meets the valley of the Kidron below the south-east corner of the city. The enclosed space may be described as a small, rocky plateau of about 1,000 acres, which falls gradually towards the south-east and terminates in abrupt slopes. The

1 Waddington, Nos. 1906 and 2033. It is to be noticed that these fragments allude to the limits of the diocese of the Orient, whose Vicarius seems to be mentioned in our inscription. Reference is also made (No. 1909, b, c) to the allowances given to the duciani and scribiniarii, for the annona and the capitum: ἵνα ἀνωποντι καὶ κατίτοπο[ν], ἢν τοῦ δημοσίου καὶ ἢν τοῦ[ν]... Cf. also the above-mentioned edict of Anastasius.

2 The names in common use have been adopted for the purposes of this paper, without reference to questions of identification.
enclosing valleys, at first little more than shallow depressions in the ground, become, as they approach the city limits, deep, rocky ravines, and their point of junction is 672 feet below the ground in which they rise. Thus whilst, to the north, there is no material difference between the general level of the little plateau outside the walls and that of the highest parts of the city within them, the ravines on the other three sides fall so steeply, and their character is so trench-like, that they leave upon the beholder the impression of a ditch at the foot of a fortress.¹

The surface of the plateau is broken by two smaller ravines, which rise north of the city walls. The more important, the Tyropoeon, runs southward to join the Kidron at Siloam, and divides the lower portion of the plateau into two spurs of unequal size. The western is high and broad-backed, but its continuity is broken by a short ravine² that falls abruptly eastward from the vicinity of the Jaffa Gate, and joins the Tyropoeon about 700 yards above Siloam. This ravine formed a natural ditch to the first or old wall, and near its head stood Herod's palace which, with its three great towers, formed the acropolis of the Upper City of Josephus. From one of the towers, Hippicus, the wall ran eastward along the south side of the ravine, to the Xystus, and there joining the Council House (near a on plan), ended at the western portico of the Temple (Jos., B.J., v, 4, § 2).

The eastern and lower spur is for the most part a narrow ridge of rock, and upon it once stood the Temple and the Castle of Antonia. In three places at least (b, c, and d) its crest line is broken by rock-hewn ditches, and at one, in the north-west corner of the Haram esh-Sherif, a large portion of the ridge has been quarried away. One of the ditches (b) separates “Jeremiah’s Grotto” from the modern city wall; another (c) lies beneath the street that leads to St. Stephen’s Gate; and the third (d) is near the north-west corner of the platform upon which the Dome of the Rock stands.

The second of the small ravines³ rises in the eastern half of the plateau, and, running through the north-east corner of the Haram esh-Sherif, falls into the Kidron a short distance to the north of the

² I have called this “Palace Ravine” on the plan, from the proximity of Herod’s palace.
³ Called St. Anne’s ravine on the plan.
Golden Gate. In it lie two ancient pools, and on its eastern side now stands the Church of St. Anne.

Those portions of the ravines which lie within the city walls are so filled with débris that neither their character nor their true course can now be distinguished: their beds lie in places from 80 feet to 125 feet beneath the surface of to-day. Even the rocky sides of the Kidron and Hinnom valleys, above which the walls of the city rise, present the appearance of steep continuous slopes, broken only by a few terraced gardens. Originally the aspect of the ground must have been very different. At Jerusalem the limestone hills consist, in ascending order, of beds of pink and white indurated chalk, of a thick stratum of soft, easily worked stone (melke), of thin beds of hard reddish and grey stone (missse), and of soft white limestone with bands of flints and fossils. The strata have a south-easterly dip, and the hard beds of missse, which form the surface of the plateau, pass eastward beneath the soft white limestones of the Mount of Olives. As a result of this formation, the hill-slopes, before the city was built, must have broken down in a series of rock-terraces of varying height and width, which, from the hardness of most of the stone, could have been little encumbered by detritus. How far the original features of the ground had been modified by the time of the Crucifixion it is difficult to say, but there can be little doubt that the ravines were then deep and rocky, and that the terrace-formation was well marked within and without the walls. Beyond the limits of the city the terraces were probably planted with fig, olive, and vine; and the small cliffs, or scarps, in which the limestone beds terminated, were utilised for the construction of rock-hewn tombs. Deeply cut ravines, with terraced sides, are common in the limestone formation of Central and Southern Palestine, and in many places the conjunction of cultivated terrace and scarp with rock-hewn tombs may still be seen. In fitting a site of this nature to the requirements of a capital city, with its public buildings, its streets, its open places, and its fortifications, large masses of rock must have been quarried away in some places, and massive foundations built in others, to obtain the requisite amount of level ground. These rock-clearances and substructures are found in every quarter of the city, and, as their date is in no case certain, it is hazardous to base any theory upon the discovery of isolated rock-scarps and fragments of solid masonry.

According to Josephus (B.J., v, 4, § 2), Jerusalem, when
besieged by Titus, was defended on the north by three walls, and on all other sides by one. The outer or third wall on the north was built after the Crucifixion by Agrippa (A.D. 41-43), and need not be considered here. Nearly all authorities agree that the oldest, or first wall, ran eastward from the citadel by the Jaffa Gate to a point in the west wall of the Harâm esh-Sherif at or near Wilson's Arch. The course of the second wall, which is still uncertain, will be considered later, when discussing the authenticitity or otherwise of the traditional site of Golgotha. Beyond its limits, on the eastern and western spurs, were terraced gardens, and probably a few villas; in the valleys were large reservoirs with aqueducts, which carried their water to the city, and there are some slight indications that the rocky sides of St. Anne's ravine, beneath the north-east corner of the Harâm esh-Sherif, were honey-combed with rock-hewn tombs. Within the wall, all authorities agree that Herod's palace and gardens covered the ground now occupied by the citadel at the Jaffa Gate, and the Armenian gardens to the south; that the castle of Antonia stood at the north-west angle of the Harâm esh-Sherif, and that the palace of Agrippa—the old Asmonæan palace, occupied a fine site, on the western spur, facing the Wailing Place of the Jews (see plan).

It may be inferred, from the known tendency of main roads and streets to preserve their original direction during many centuries, and through periods of great change,¹ and in this case also from the marked character of the topographical features, that the principal approaches to Jerusalem, and several of the streets, follow very closely the lines of those which existed in the time of Christ and probably earlier. Thus the great highway from the north appears, on reaching the "Tombs of the Kings," to have branched off, as the modern road does, in three directions. The eastern branch,² following the direction of the St. Anne's ravine, reached the castle of Antonia and the Temple without leaving the eastern spur. The central branch ran southward to the Tyropoeon Valley, and below the Damascus Gate appears to have forked—one arm (fff on plan), now represented by the street el-Wâd, followed the west side of the valley to the Pool of Siloam, where it left the city and went on to the wilderness of Judah:

¹ Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in London.
² The roads and streets supposed to follow the direction of those in the time of Christ are shown on the plan by red dotted lines.
the other arm \((ggg)\), keeping to a higher level, ran nearly due south through the city, along a line still well marked, and passed out by a gate in the south wall to the Valley of Hinnom. This must have been always one of the principal streets\(^1\) of the city, and on it there must have been a fortified gateway in each of the walls. The \textit{western} branch of the highway from the north avoided the Tyropoeon Valley, and keeping to the higher ground of the western spur probably entered the city near Herod's palace.

From the Jordan Valley on the east, one road crossed the ridge of Olivet, and another, followed by Christ on a memorable occasion, wound round the shoulder of the same hill. The approach seems to have been up St. Anne's ravine, but there was, doubtless, a pathway with steps leading directly across the Kidron to the Temple precincts.\(^2\) The approaches from the south could never have been of much importance. The roads from Hebron, Bethlehem, and the western districts appear to have entered the city by a gateway, east of the Jaffa Gate, from which a street \((hh)\) ran directly to the Temple precincts near Wilson's Arch.\(^3\) There may also have been posterns in the west wall, giving access to paths to the valley of Hinnom.

The principal streets, running north and south, were connected by cross streets, forming blocks \((\text{insula})\) which were intersected by narrow winding lanes.\(^4\) The two main streets which cross each other, almost at right angles, probably had a central roadway for chariots, camels, \&c., and, on either side, a \textit{trottoir} for foot passengers with colonnades, similar to those of the principal streets of Damascus, Samaria, Gadara, \&c. Other streets, possibly representing those of pre-Christian date, are that \((ii)\) running from the citadel to the Zion Gate, which perhaps skirted the gardens of Herod's palace; that \((kk)\) connecting \(ii\) and \(gg\); and two streets \((ll\text{ and }mm)\), which possibly led westward from the Temple precincts

\(^1\) This street and that following the direction of el-Wād are represented with colonnaded sides in the Medeba mosaic.

\(^2\) In Byzantine times a flight of steps led down from the Golden Gate to a bridge over the Kidron, whence there was a path to the Church of the Ascension.

\(^3\) The ancient street was probably some yards to the south, within the line of the first wall.

\(^4\) Josephus (\textit{Ant.}, xiv, 16, § 2; \textit{B.J.}, ii, 14, § 9; v, 8, § 1; vi, 6, § 3). Making allowance for the different topographical conditions, the streets and narrow lanes could not have been very unlike those of Pompei.
to the city. There seems also to have been a road (nn) running east and west, which, after the third wall was built, possibly connected the castle of Antonia with the tower Psephinus. Whether these streets crossed the Tyropceon and "Palace" ravines by bridges or causeways is unknown. Most of the bazars (B.J., v, 8, § 1), market places (B.J., i, 13, § 5; ii, 14, § 9, 19, § 4; v, 4, § 1), and important public and private buildings, incidentally mentioned by Josephus, must have been in existence in the time of Christ, and the great Temple of Herod was then in its full glory.

The principal sources of information available for the determination of the site of Golgotha are the Bible; writings of earlier date than the official recovery of Golgotha during the reign of Constantine; the works of Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius, who must have known the circumstances under which the site was recovered; the histories of Rufinus, Sulpicius Severus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Theophanes, and others, who were compilers, and recorded the traditions current at the times they wrote; letters, sermons, and treatises of the Church Fathers; the monograph of Alexander Monachus De Inventione Crucis; and early traditions and legends.

For the purposes of topographical identification, it will be sufficient to give the Bible narrative in the following condensed form:

After the Last Supper, Christ and his disciples left the city, and crossing the brook Kidron, went to the Mount of Olives, to a plot of ground, or garden, called Gethsemane. The spot was one to which Jesus often resorted with his disciples, and it was consequently well known to Judas who betrayed him (Matt. xxvi, 30, 36; Mark xiv, 26, 32; John xviii, 1, 2, 26). Luke, who does not mention Gethsemane, says (xxii, 39, 40) that Jesus "went, as his custom was, unto the Mount of Olives," and that when he was "at the place," perhaps that referred to in xxi, 37, he bade his disciples pray.

From Gethsemane Christ was taken, in the first place, to Annas, the high priest by right, who, after informal inquiry, sent him bound to Caiaphas, the actual high priest—Annas having been deposed. At the house of Caiaphas, possibly his official residence,

1 R.V., Margin, ravine; Greek, winter torrent.
2 See Appendix III (1).
3 See Appendix III (2).
where the scribes and elders were assembled, a preliminary investigation was held, and, early the next morning (Luke xxii, 66, "at dawn"), Christ was led away to the place where the Sanhedrin usually held its sittings, and brought before the full Assembly of the chief priests, scribes, and elders of the people (Matt. xxvi, 57, xxvii, 1; Mark xiv, 53, xv, 1; Luke xxii, 54, 66; John xviii, 13, 24). Immediately after his condemnation, whilst it was still early, Christ was taken to the Praetorium (palace), and handed over to Pilate (Matt. xxvii, 2; Mark xv, 1; Luke xxiii, 1; John xviii, 28), that he might be put to death by the Roman power.

It is still uncertain whether the Praetorium of the Gospels was Herod's palace on the western spur, or the Castle of Antonia to the north of the Temple. The former was, almost certainly, the usual residence of Pilate when at Jerusalem, whilst the latter was at once the headquarters of the Roman garrison, and the prison in which important criminals were confined. It is possible that Pilate went to the Castle of Antonia, and even passed the night there, during the critical days of the feast; but it is equally permissible to suppose that Christ was tried at Herod's palace, and was taken, after judgment, to the Antonia, where the two robbers were probably confined, before being led out to crucifixion.

The offence for which Christ was tried and condemned by Pilate was political—sedition against Caesar (Luke xxiii, 2; Matt. xxvii, 23). The trial, whether it took place at Herod's palace or at the Antonia, was, in accordance with Roman custom, public; and Pilate, probably, had his judgment seat (βήμα) erected in the open air, in front of the Praetorium, as his successor, Florus, did some years later (Jos., B.J., ii, 14, § 8). A great crowd had assembled whilst the trial was proceeding, and, apparently followed Christ when he was sent to Herod Antipas (Luke xxiii, 7, cf. Acts iv, 27), who was then residing at the Asmonaean Palace.

1 Possibly the Council House mentioned by Josephus (B.J., v, 4, § 2). See Appendix III (3).
2 See Appendix III (4).
3 Many Jews were crucified for this offence by Florus (Jos., B.J., ii, 14, § 9) and by Varus (Ant., xvii, 10, § 10).
4 See Appendix III (4).
5 This seems to be the meaning of Matt. xxvii, 17.
6 Son of Herod the Great and Malthace, called Herod the Tetrarch in the New Testament.
7 The palace was situated to the right of the street leading from Herod's palace to the Temple.
(see p. 285). Christ having been condemned by the Roman Governor, was sentenced to be crucified. If he had been sentenced to death by the Sanhedrin, according to the Mosaic law, he would have been stoned (Quarterly Statement, 1902, p. 152, ff.); but, the Great Assembly having lost the power of capital punishment (see p. 294), Jewish methods of execution had been replaced by Roman. Crucifixion was the punishment reserved by the Romans for those to whom the honour of death by the sword was not granted; and Christ was treated like ordinary highwaymen, robbers, slaves, and persons guilty of sedition. According to common custom execution followed quickly upon condemnation, and he was handed over to a detachment of Roman soldiers, commanded by a centurion, and led away with two robbers to Golgotha, to be crucified (Matt. xxvii, 31-33; Mark xv, 20-22; Luke xxiii, 26-33; John xix, 16-18).

It has been suggested that Pilate "chose Golgotha for the Crucifixion for the purpose of insulting them (the Jews), not in order to fulfil their law." There is, however, no indication of motive on the part of Pilate in the Bible narrative. The natural inference from the simple statements in Matt. xxvii, 26; Mark xv, 15; John xix, 16, that Pilate "delivered" Jesus to the soldiers "to be crucified," and from the more explicit words of Luke xxiii, 25, "but Jesus he delivered up to their will," is that the soldiers of the garrison were allowed to carry out the sentence where they pleased. This view derives some support from the fact that the robbers who were crucified with Christ were men of the class whose execution was, at that period, left in the hands of the soldiers (Quarterly Statement, 1902, p. 153). The probability is, then, that the selection of the place of execution was left to the centurion, and that his choice of Golgotha was fortuitous, or dictated by motives of convenience, and was not due to any desire on the part of Pilate to insult the Jews.

1 The robbers (λησταί) crucified with Christ were brigands, freebooters, or outlaws, and must not be confounded with thieves (κλέπται,—so in John x, 8, "thieves and robbers," κλέπται κ. λησταί). Thus Josephus calls Hezekias, who was subdued by Herod the Great, and Eleazar, "arch-robbers" (Αρχιλησταί, B.J., ii, 4, § 1; 13, § 2); and those with them and with Simon, "robbers" (B.J., ii, 4, § 2; 13, § 2). In the Bible the word is applied to Barabbas (John xviii, 40).

2 Canon McColl in Quarterly Statement, 1901, p. 283, Note 2.

3 According to Renan (Vie de Jésus, 16th ed., p. 428), sentences on those condemned for sedition, as Christ was, were also carried out by the soldiers.
There is an old tradition that the procession to Golgotha passed through the streets of Jerusalem, then thronged with Jews who had come up for the Passover. But whether the tradition refers to the circumferre, which the Romans considered an essential part of the punishment, or to a temporary transfer from Herod's palace to the Antonia, as suggested above (p. 288), or to the visit to Herod Antipas, is uncertain. The route of the procession depends upon the site of the Praetorium, which is not certainly known. But modern tradition is clearly at fault in identifying the first part of the Via Dolorosa with a street that lies above the ditch which, at the time of the Crucifixion, must have protected the Antonia, and the second wall. 1

Golgotha, the scene of the Crucifixion, was, according to the Bible, in a garden (κήπος, John xix, 41), outside the city walls 2 (“without the gate,” Heb. xiii, 12, 13; cf. Matt. xxvii, 32; Mark xv, 20; John xix, 17), and “nigh to the city” (John xix, 20). The spot was near a frequented thoroughfare leading from one of the city gates to the country (Matt. xxvii, 39; Mark xv, 21, 29; Luke xxiii, 26), and was visible from “afar” (Matt. xxvii, 55; Mark xv, 40; Luke xxiii, 49), and presumably from some place whence the chief priests, scribes, and elders could look on, and revile without the risk of incurring ceremonial defilement (Matt. xxvii, 41; Mark xv, 31; cf. John xviii, 28). In the garden in which He was crucified there was a “new tomb, wherein was never man yet laid,” that belonged to Joseph of Arimathea (Matt. xxvii, 60; Mark xv, 46; Luke xxiii, 53; John xix, 41).

It will be noticed that the Bible narrative gives no indication of the direction of Golgotha with regard to the city, 3 or to any feature connected with it, nor of the position of the gate 4 by which Christ passed out of the city, nor of the place to which the frequented thoroughfare led. Nor is any certain clue afforded by the statements that the spot was “nigh to the city,” and visible from

1 The course of the second wall will be discussed later.
2 That is, outside the second wall.
3 Unless, as some writers suppose, a clue is supplied by the words in Heb. xiii, 11, 12. This will be considered later.
4 Whether Paul had any particular gate in his mind is uncertain. At Rome condemned criminals passed out by the Esquiline Gate, and at Athens by the Charonian Gate. According to a medieval tradition, Christ bore His cross through the P. Judiciaria.
“afar,” for the words “nigh” (εγεριν), and “afar” (μιαροθεεν), as used in the New Testament, appear to have no very definite meaning. It has been suggested that the transfer of the cross to Simon, at or just outside the city gate, may indicate that Golgotha was not near at hand; but this is not very apparent. The transfer of the cross was unusual, but it may well be supposed that the Lord, after all his sufferings, mental and physical, sank beneath the burden, and that the soldiers, impatient of delay, impressed a man, coming from the opposite direction, who met the procession as it left the city.

It would appear then that the only certain facts to be gathered from the Bible narrative are: that Christ was crucified in a garden, or orchard (κηρυς), outside the city, and, in accordance with Roman custom, close to a public thoroughfare. Golgotha was evidently so well known that it was not necessary to define its position more precisely. The garden was most probably a terrace (see p. 284) planted with fruit trees, such as the olive, fig, and vine, or with trees that gave a grateful shade; and the mouth of the tomb would naturally be in rock-scarp of the next higher-lying terrace. The accompanying illustration shows clearly the vertical face of a terrace, with the mouths of rock-hewn tombs, and the floor of the next lower-lying terrace forming a garden (κηρυς), on which, in this instance, wheat or barley has been grown. A

1. John uses the same word to define the relative positions of the tomb and the cross (xix, 42); of Christ, when walking on the lake, and the boat (vi, 19); and of Bethany and Jerusalem (xi, 18). In Acts the Mount of Olives is said to be nigh to Jerusalem (i, 12), and Lydda to Joppa (ix, 38). See also Luke xix, 11; John iii, 23; vi, 23; xi, 54; Acts xxvii, 8. The word appears to be used as a pleonasm, like μαρουβ.

2. A late Greek word and well-known pleonasm. It is used to define the relative positions of Peter and Christ on the way from Gethsemane to the House of Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi, 58; Mark xiv, 54; Luke xxii, 54); of Christ and the fig tree (Mark xi, 13); of the Pharisee and the publican in the Temple (Luke xviii, 13); and of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi, 33). See also Mark v, 6; viii, 3.


4. This is the usual explanation of the expression “as they came out” (Matt. xxvii, 32); but the words may refer to the departure of the procession from the Praetorium.

5. The language of Mark xv, 22, they “bring him,” literally “bear him,” to Golgotha, seems to imply this.

6. From a photograph by Mr. Macalister, of tombs near the “Tombs of the Judges.”
family tomb in a garden is mentioned in connection with the burials of Manasseh and Amon.

The absence of any definite statement in the Bible with regard to the position of Golgotha, has led to much curious speculation since 1738, when Jonas Korte vigorously attacked the authenticity of the traditional site, and gave wider currency to doubts that had previously been expressed. The scene of the Crucifixion has been placed north, south, east, and west of the city; but the more important authorities are now agreed that it must have been some

spot, outside the second wall of Josephus, which was situated on the small plateau that lies between the Kidron and Hinnom valleys. Such, according to tradition, was the position of the site upon which Constantine built his great churches, and it is necessary, in the first place, to examine carefully the claims of that site to authenticity. Was its official recovery based upon any certain tradition? Is there anything in its natural features which is not in

1 It is unnecessary to discuss the theory of Fergusson that the churches were on the eastern hill, for they are clearly shown on the western in the Medeba mosaic.
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accordance with the Bible narrative? Was it outside the second wall? These questions must now be considered.

(To be continued.)

APPENDIX III.

PLACES MENTIONED IN CONNECTION WITH OUR LORD'S PASSION.

(1) Gethsemane is called by Matthew (xxvi, 36) and Mark (xiv, 32) "a place," or, more accurately, as in R.V. margin, "an enclosed piece of ground" (χωριόν); and by John (xviii, 1) "a garden," or orchard (εἰδύρος). Luke (xxii, 40) uses the indefinite term "the place" (τόπος), to signify the spot where what he narrates occurred. No descriptive details are given in the Bible, but the Hebrew name, "an oil press," and the expressions "went in" and "went out" (εἰσῆλθεν and ἐξῆλθεν, John xviii, 1, 4), seem to indicate that the place was one of those terraces planted with olive trees, which form such a marked feature of the scenery in the hill country of Judah. From the fourth century, possibly from the date of the Empress Helena's visit to Jerusalem, in A.D. 326, Gethsemane has been shown at the foot of the Mount of Olives (see plan). Proximity to the Kidron may perhaps be inferred from John xviii, 1, 2, and is considered by Stanley (Sin. and Pal., p. 455) and others, to be an argument in favour of the traditional site. But a comparison of the statements in Luke xxi, 37, and xxii, 39, has led some authorities to believe that the garden was higher up the mount. This view derives some support from the early tradition that Christ taught the Apostles in a cave near the summit of the Mount of Olives. Thus Eusebius (Dem. Ec., vi, 18) mentions a cave, near the top of the hill, where Jesus prayed, and this may be the "sacred cave" over which Constantine built a church (De Laud. Const., ix; whilst he simply describes Gethsemane as an "enclosed piece of ground" at the Mount of Olives where the faithful used to pray (Lagarde, O.S., 248*). The Bordeaux Pilgrim (A.D. 333) saw "a stone at the place (apparently near the traditional Gethsemane) where Judas Iscariot betrayed Christ," and afterwards ascended "to the Mount of Olives, where, before the Passion, the Lord taught his disciples." Cyril (Cat. xiii, 38) apparently distinguishes between Gethsemane "where the betrayal happened," and the Mount of Olives "on which they were that night praying." St. Sylvia (A.D. circ. 385) seems to connect the "cave in which the Lord taught the Apostles" with the Church of the Ascension

1 The word χωριόν is translated "parcel of ground" in John, iv, 5; "field" (called Akeldama) in Acts i, 18, 19; "land" (of Ananias) in Acts v, 3, 8; and "lands," in the plural, in Acts iv, 34.

2 The same word is used by John (xix, 41) for the garden in which Christ was crucified and buried.
GOLGOTHA AND THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

(Pilgrimage, English edition in P.P.T.S., vol. i, pp. 51, 58, 77). Eucherius (circ. A.D. 440) mentions two churches on the Mount—one at the place of the Ascension, the other where Christ talked to his disciples (in P.P.T.S., vol. ii, p. 10). The first to distinctly state that Gethsemane was "at the foot of the Mount of Olives" is Jerome (OS. 2, 130).

The general conclusion is that, although the authenticity of the traditional site cannot be proved, it is not impossible or improbable.

(2) THE HOUSE OF CAIAPHAS (אָלֶלֶת in Matt. xxvi, 3, 58; Mark xiv, 54; John xviii, 15; and ὁ ἱλικός in Luke xxii, 54), with its uncovered courtyard (Matt. xxvi, 69; Mark xiv, 66; Luke xxii, 55), and its porch (πύλη, Matt. xxvi, 71, or προαύλιον, Mark xiv, 63), closed by a door, or gate (δύο, John xviii, 16, cf. the gate of the porch of Mary's house, Acts xii, 13, 14), was perhaps the official residence of the high priest. It was probably not far distant from the Temple and the hall in which the Sanhedrin sat; and it may have been the same place as the house (ὁ ἱλικός) of Ananias, the high priest, which was, apparently, near the Asmoncean palace, and was destroyed by the insurgents during the tumult that commenced the war with Rome (Jos., B.J., ii, 17, § 6).

In the houses of the wealthy the public and private apartments were built round a paved court, which was entered from the street through a porch, or passage, closed by a heavy door, having a room on one side for the porter and attendants. In some instances the houses had a forecourt and an inner court, and this appears to have been the case in that of Caiaphas. It may be inferred, from a comparison of Matt. xxvi, 57-75; Mark xiv, 53-68; Luke xxii, 54-61; John xviii, 12-27, that Caiaphas and Annas lived in the same house, in which both, doubtless, had their own separate apartments.

(3) THE SANHEDRIN, OR GREAT COUNCIL, at Jerusalem consisted of 70 members—chief priests, scribes, and elders, with the high priest as president. Under the Romans it could try important cases, and pass sentences of death (Matt. v, 22), but they were not valid until confirmed by the Roman procurator (John xviii, 31; Jos., Ant. xx, 9, § 1). The Great Council originally sat, on ordinary days, in a stone hall (לישkah lishkath ha-Guzith) in the inner court, on the south side of the Temple; and on Sabbaths and festivals in the Temple synagogue, in the chel between the outer court and the court of the women (Maim., San. 3). But 40 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, or, more probably, when Archelaus was deposed, and the first Roman governor was appointed (A.D. 7), the right to inflict capital punishment was withdrawn, and the Sanhedrin

1 It is uncertain whether this refers to a forecourt or to a porch.
2 The chief priests included those who had held the office of high priest and had been deposed, and influential members of the families from which the high priests were selected.
3 According to Talm. Bab. Yoma, the hall was in the form of a large basilica. Here alone, according to the old law, sentence of death could be pronounced.
transferred its sittings to “the sheds,” or “trade halls.”¹ This place may have been in the outer court,² or precincts of the Temple, and possibly that which Josephus calls the “Council House” (βουλή), and places between the Xystus, and the western portico of the Temple.³ The “Council House” must, from the nature of the ground, have been on the Temple Mount, and either within the precincts, or partly within them, and partly on the bridge which connected the Temple with the Xystus,⁴ not far from Wilson’s Arch (see map). The view that the Sanhedrin was sitting in the “Council House” when Christ was brought before it, seems, however, to conflict with the statement in Matt. xxvii, 5, which seems to indicate, though not certainly, that when Judas cast down the pieces of silver, the members of the Sanhedrin were in the ναός,⁵ or sanctuary, which did not include the outer courts or precincts.

(4) The Πρεστορίον was originally the tent of the Prætor in a Roman camp, but the word was afterwards applied to the official residence of the Governor or Procurator of a Roman province. Amongst the Romans it was customary for the governors of provinces to appropriate to their own use the palaces in which the kings and princes had formerly dwelt. Thus in Sicily the Proprætor lived in the castle or palace of Hiero (Cic. in Ver. II, v. 12, 30); and at Cæsarea the Procurator occupied Herod’s Πρεστορίον (palace) (Acts xxiii, 35, xxv, 23). It is impossible to believe that Pilate, when staying at Jerusalem for the transaction of public business, did not follow the usual custom, and select as his residence the magnificent palace that Herod had built for himself in the Upper City (Jos., Ant. xv, 9, § 3; B.J. i, 21, § 1, v, 4, § 4). It would have been


² The “tables of the money-changers,” and the place where people bought and sold (Matt. xxi, 12; Mark xi, 15; Luke xix, 45), must have been in the outer court, or in one of the porticoes, possibly near the spot where the Sanhedrin sat.

³ The first wall extended “to the Xystus, and then, joining the Council House, ended at the western portico of the Temple” (B.J., v, 4, § 2). As Schürer remarks (H.J.P. II, i, p. 190, ff., Eng. ed.), the Council House must have been on the Temple Mount, as there was nothing between the Temple and the Xystus but a bridge. It could not have been in the upper city for the Romans destroyed the βουλή, before they took that part of the city (B.J., vi, 6, § 3). Schürer argues that ʿishkath ha-ʿGazith means that the hall was so named because it was near the Χαστός, and not because it was built of wrought stones, which would hardly be a characteristic feature.

⁴ B.J., ii, 16, § 3. This was one of the principal approaches to the Temple, and the point at which it entered would be a convenient place for the money-changers, &c.

⁵ The word ναός (vadz), usually applied to the actual Temple, here evidently includes the inner court which is generally considered to have formed part of the ἱερον, or Temple with its courts. Possibly ναός may not accurately represent the original Aramaic of Matthew.
derogatory to the dignity of an official of his rank to live in a building of less importance, and his neglect to occupy it would have been regarded, in an Oriental country, as a sign of weakness. His occupation of the palace is implied by the statement that he insulted the Jews by hanging inscribed shields in it (ἐν τοῖς Ἑρώδου βασιλείοις, Philo, Leg. ad Gaium, § 38); and by the presence of his wife, who he would not have lodged in the Antonia, which was inferior as a residence, and was the head­quarters of the legion that garrisoned Jerusalem (Ant. xv, 11, §§ 4, 7; B.J. v, 5, § 8). It may also be remarked that the Antonia is called "the barracks" (παρεμβολή, R.V. "castle"), and not the Pretorium, in the only passages in the Bible that allude to it (Acts xxi, 34, 37; xxii, 24; xxiii, 10, 16, 32); and that there is no certain instance of the application of the word pretorium to a camp or barracks. At a later date (A.D. 66) Gessius Florus, Pilate’s successor, certainly occupied Herod’s palace, and erected a judgment seat (bema, βῆμα) in front of it, and took his seat thereon: then the chief priests, and men of influence, . . . . came up and stood by the judgment seat." (Jos., B.J. ii, 14, § 8). From this interesting passage it would appear that there was an open space in front of the palace, possibly adjoining, or opening on to the "upper agora" of Josephus, where the governor sat to administer justice. Probably the bema was usually set up on the same spot, and if the palace was the Pretorium, that spot may have been a small raised platform, with a tessellated or mosaic pavement, which was called in Aramaic Gabbatha, and in Greek Lithostrotolon.

Although the evidence in favour of the identification of the Pretorium with Herod’s palace is very strong, it must not be forgotten that a tradition, at least as old as the fourth century, places “the house or Pretorium of Pilate” to the east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The existence of this tradition, at a time when the towers of Herod’s palace were standing, and the Antonia had long disappeared, certainly points to a very early belief that the latter place was connected in some way or other with the events which led up to the Crucifixion. Cumanus,
at the time of the feast of unleavened bread, strongly reinforced the
garrison in the Antonia, and was himself either in the castle or on the
porticoes of the Temple (Jos., Ant. xx, 5, § 3; B.J. ii 12, § 1). Pilate may
have done the same, and have set up his _bema_ on the open space between
the Antonia and the Temple. A not impossible explanation is that Christ,
after the trial and judgment at Herod's palace, was handed over to the
soldiers for execution; and that they, in the first place, led him through
the streets to the Antonia, and then, after receiving the two robbers from
the commandant, passed on to Golgotha.

With our present knowledge, the conclusion must be that the position
of the Praetorium of the Gospels cannot be certainly ascertained. An
identification with Herod's palace is supported by Alford, Edersheim,
Ewald, Keim, Meyer, Schürer, Tobler, Wieseler, Winer, &c.; whilst the
Antonia is preferred by Caspari, Clermont-Ganneau, Krafft, Langen,
Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott, &c.

---

'AIN EL-FESHKHAH, EL-ḤAJAR EL-ÅṢBAH, AND
KHURBET KUMRĀN.

By Dr. E. W. G. Masterman.

_(Continued from p. 167.)_

March 21st, 1902.—Rise of Dead Sea level since February 19th,
3·5 inches.

Rise of 'Ain el-Feshkhah level since February 19th, 2·5 inches.

Rainfall at Jerusalem since February 19th, 2·68 inches.

Temperatures, 7·30 to 9 A.M.—Air, 70°; Dead Sea, 68°; 'Ain
el-Feshkhah, 74°; 'Ain el-Mabneyeh, 80·5°.

Weather.—Fine; few clouds; light N.W. wind till about 8 A.M.,
then S.E., increasing to a breeze; in afternoon, strong W. breeze with
showers.

State of Dead Sea.—Small waves, not crested with foam; some haze
over the lake to S.E.

White Line.—Two white lines visible at 7 A.M., the outer one passing
straight from direction of north shore, about half-way between 'Ain
el-Feshkhah and mouth of Jordan (the north end itself being invisible),
until directly to the east of 'Ain el-Feshkhah, when it made a bend

M. Clermont-Ganneau, this church, which succeeded the Church of Pilate, was
built on the site of the Castle Antonia, where the Turkish barracks now stand
(Rec. d'Arch. Or., ii, 154; iii, 228, 229). Other authorities, however, place
the Church of St. Sophia on the site now occupied by the Dome of the Rock.
There is no certain evidence on this point, and a discussion of the question
would occupy too much space.