

MAP AND DESCRIPTION OF JERUSALEM BY CHRISTIAN
VAN ADRICHEM (1533-1585).

By A. W. CRAWLEY-BOEVVEY, M.A., INDIA CIVIL SERVICE,
BOMBAY (Retired.)

CHRISTIANUS ADRICHOMIUS (to use the Latin form of the name by which Van Adrichem is most generally known) was a famous Dutch writer and geographer, born at Delft, 14th February, 1533, and died at Keulen (Cologne), 20th June, 1585. He was by profession a Roman Catholic Priest, but is said to have been driven from his own country by the Protestants during the religious troubles of his day, and spent most of his subsequent life in Germany. (*Nouvelle Biog. Gén.*) He is best known as a writer on Palestine subjects, and his works entitled (1) *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae cum tabulis geographicis*, (2) *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae juxta XII tribus Israel*, (3) *Descriptio urbis Hierosolymitanae* were regarded in his day as standard geographical authorities. A brief account of his life appears in Van der Aa's Dutch *Biographisch Woorden Boek der Nederlanden* (1852), and a few additional particulars can be gathered from the German *Allgemeine Deutsche Biog.* (1875), the French *Biog. Universelle* (1843), and *Nouvelle Biog. Gén.*

Of this Map and Description of Jerusalem, several copies are available for readers in the British Museum, viz :—

- (1) Latin version with Map annexed (1584). Press Mark 794.k.17.
- (2) Reduced copy of same Map entitled *Typus veteris Hierosolymae*. (1621).—Map. Cat. 715.9.
- (3) English translation of No. 1 above, by Thomas Tymme, with Map (1654).—10076.b.18.
- (4) Earlier Edition of Thomas Tymme's translation (1595). Imperfect, without Map.—10076.b.17.
- (5) French version of *Description of Jerusalem* aforesaid, with Map of Adrichomius annexed, by L'Abbé J.M.D. (1857.) 8vo.—3128.f.24.

Both the earlier and later editions of the translation by Thomas Tymme (Nos. 3 and 4 above) contain bibliographies (preceding the Index) showing the works on which the Map and Description of Adrichomius were founded. These works—35 in number—are almost all included in Tobler's valuable German Work entitled, *Bibliographia Geographica Palaestinae*, a Geographical bibliography of Palestine (Leipsic, 1867).

These Maps of Adrichomius exhibit, in some respects, a marked departure from ordinary Roman Catholic tradition by placing Calvary and the Tomb of Christ outside the three historic walls of the City on a small hillock situated north-west of the gate now known as the Damascus Gate, near the great Northern highway leading to Samaria.

A reference to Map No. 5 will show that the hillock in question is *not* apparently the well-known *Tel es Zahireh*, or Skull Hill, which has attracted so much attention during the past 60 years, but another hillock *in the same locality* corresponding approximately to the site shown as Conder's Tomb in the map facing p. 109 of Wilson's *Golgotha*.

This position assigned for Calvary has caused, as might be expected, some perplexity in Roman Catholic circles. If the Map of Adrichomius is accepted as correct, it seems clear that the traditional position of Calvary within the walls on the site now occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre cannot possibly be sustained. The French Roman Catholic Abbé who edited, in 1857, the Map of Adrichomius (No. 5), was evidently much puzzled on this point. He notes, at p. 248, that Calvary ought to have been placed where he himself has located the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—see his own map annexed to No. 5 above. The Abbé ingenuously remarks that the error would have been corrected but for his desire to produce the exact plan of Adrichomius.

Thomas Tymme's English translation of 1595 shows that the Protestant party soon became aware of the use that could be made of the famous Dutch Geographer's views. This translation seems to be of little value except as a convenient handbook for the use of persons who were unable to read the Latin original. The translation, indeed, appears, from internal evidence, to have been prepared far more with an eye to current sectarian controversy than to any scientific interest in Jerusalem topography. Thomas Tymme was, in fact, from his own account, a typical Puritan of his own day. He dedicated his translation of 1654 to the Right Hon. Sir John Puckering, Kt., Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England, remarking that its author had "swept with the broom of truth some of the rubbish and reliques of the Roman superstition." And, in commenting on the list of authors relied on by Adrichomius, Tymme remarked that most of them were superstitious Romanists: "but, as the bee can gather honey from some noysome flowers, so God and his people can make use of such authors."

These extracts may be taken as fair samples of Thomas Tymme's ultra Protestant point of view; but whatever may now be thought of this Map of 1584, there can be no doubt of its importance at the time when it was first published.

Sir Charles Wilson (*Golgotha*, p. 104) notes the fact that from the time, at least, of Willibald (*circ.* A.D. 754) doubts were current regarding the authenticity of the "holy places," one view being that "the City had been

moved from its original position to the vicinity of the Sepulchre, the other, held by those who impiously asserted that the Tomb had been moved, and not the City. (Gretzer A.D. 1598.)”

Willibald himself has puzzled many of his commentators by his candid remark that Calvary was formerly outside Jerusalem, but “Helena, when she found the Cross, arranged that place so as to be within the City.” Sir Charles Wilson thought that these words read like a reply to the remarks of some doubting spirits of his age. He comments very briefly on what he terms a “quaint” statement; but the words quoted seem very significant by the light of modern criticism which practically asserts to-day what Willibald asserted some twelve centuries ago. The fact that the Cross was discovered on September 15th, 335, the very day that the Church of the Anastasis was dedicated, shows clearly that the miracle occurred by deliberate arrangement.

The doubts referred to have, in fact, always been entertained—not only by the rascally Western heretics (*nebulones occidentales hereticos*), who are castigated in the ponderous folios of Gretzer and Quaresmius, but also by devout and learned Roman Catholics like Adrichomius, and the numerous authors quoted by him in his bibliographical list.

Ordinary Christian readers will be inclined to dismiss with incredulity the “impious” notion of the Holy Sepulchre having been moved from its original position, but the following considerations will show that the idea of a transfer must not be hastily dismissed. (1) The words “sepulchre” or “tomb” convey to Western minds the natural idea of Christian burial; but the fact is often overlooked that these familiar words convey to Eastern and Western minds very different ideas; (2) That the so-called Holy Sepulchre bears no resemblance to any ordinary Jewish tomb of which we have any knowledge in Jerusalem or elsewhere.

As regards the first point, Eastern tombs may be either places of burial, or mere memorials unconnected with burial. Memorial tombs of the latter class are, in fact, extremely common in Palestine and throughout Syria, as they are in India, and in almost all Mahomedan countries. Such tombs are the commonest means of preserving the local memory of saints and holy men who have passed away. These memorials were, of course, sometimes erected where an actual interment had taken place, but were commonly constructed without any reference to the saints’ place of burial, and solely with an eye to the use and convenience of their worshippers and guardians. A tomb and churches constructed inside the walls several centuries after the death of Christ would naturally suggest the idea of a transfer of the Tomb from the real place of Christ’s burial at some spot outside the walls.

Those who have seen the traditional Holy Sepulchre, and are acquainted with the common shape of Mahomedan tombs and catafalques, will readily understand that the so-called Holy Sepulchre is, in outward appearance,

a tomb of exactly the same class. It is, in fact, an artificial monument of the conventional type, differing from other similar tombs chiefly in the costliness of its materials and the extreme richness of its surroundings. But the important points are :—(1) That Christ's so-called tomb has no apparent connection with any public cemetery or common place of burial ; (2) That this tomb is not a mere artificial construction *over a rock-hewn Jewish cave*, but is asserted to be the actual Jewish Sepulchre of the Gospels. To believe an assertion of this kind requires invincible faith.

To those who are unacquainted with Eastern customs, the notion of a memorial tomb, unconnected with a place of burial, may, at first sight, seem strange and improbable ; but missionaries and travellers familiar with the East will probably regard the facts stated as perfectly natural, and even commonplace. The real fact is that tombs—or, more correctly, funeral monuments in the shape of tombs—are in Palestine, as in India, almost all of a conventional type. They answer the same purpose, in the East, as the memorial brass and monumental inscription of the Christians in the West. And the memorial tombs in India and Palestine have often as little reference to the real place of burial as the commemorative monuments and inscriptions of deceased persons in Western churches. On the subject of worshipping sacred tombs, Dr. Thomson has some suggestive remarks in "*The Land and the Book*" (1879), pp. 639, 640. This common form of idolatry was specially condemned : Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ! because ye build the tombs of the Prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous. Matt. xxiii, 29.

If these facts are correctly stated, why, it may be asked, should we expect the Tomb of Christ to differ from other Oriental tombs in the points noted ? In other words, why should anyone who discards the popular legend seek to identify the traditional Tomb of Christ with his actual place of burial ? The real grave of Christ—like that of Moses—has most wisely and mercifully been hidden from men's eyes. For all we know to the contrary, the rock-hewn cave of Joseph of Arimathea may have long since perished like thousands of other Jewish graves, in the repeated cataclysms of the Holy City. The traditional tomb which is now shown in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is surely sacred enough as the historical memorial of Christ's sufferings, even if it be dissociated from all claim to be the actual place of his burial.

Adrichomius, as a learned geographer and Palestine scholar, was probably well aware of the distinction between an Eastern memorial tomb and an ordinary place of Jewish burial. He doubtless compiled his celebrated Map of Jerusalem in the interests of historical truth, without any reference to current Roman Catholic superstition. If this Map be accepted as important literary evidence bearing on an ancient controversy, many persons will probably be glad to have their attention directed to it, and both supporters and opponents of ecclesiastical tradition may be glad

to find that Helena's memorial site is still deserving of all honour, even though it be altogether dissociated in men's minds from the real scene of Christ's sufferings and death.

Adrichomius is not included in the list of Authors and Authorities referred to by Sir Charles Wilson in Appendix I, p. 149, of *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre*, 1906.

I desire, in conclusion, to acknowledge my obligations to the Rev. Evan H. Hopkins and Mr. G. F. Barwick, of the British Museum. Mr. Hopkins was the first to bring to my notice, at the British Museum, the Map of Adrichomius, and the works of Thomas Tymme. Mr. Barwick gave me a clue to the personal history of Christian van Adrichem in Van der Aa's Dutch Dictionary. This paper could not have been written without their help; but I am solely responsible for any errors which it may contain.

DEAD SEA OBSERVATIONS: 1908.

By Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.

(Continued from *Quarterly Statement*, April, 1908, p. 161.)

(1) *Spring Visit to 'Ain Feshkhah*, made April 22nd, 1908, by Mr. Hornstein. Left Jerusalem April 20th, Bar. (12.30 p.m.) 27.4; April 21st, Jericho (7 a.m.), Bar. 30.45; N. end of Dead Sea (12.10 p.m.), Bar. 31; April 22nd, 'Ain Feshkhah, Bar. 31.2.

Measurements.—That at Observation rock showed a *rise* since previous November of 2 feet 3½ inches. In the pool there was a rise of 2 feet 5 inches.

General Observations.—There was a gentle S.E. breeze; no clouds; "white line" running longitudinally along lake—very broken. Reeds in fine condition. A few sand partridges seen. A small spring, said to have first made its appearance about a year ago, was visited in the *Wady Kumrán*: it is at the foot of the precipitous rocky descent from the mountains to the level plain.

(2) *Autumn Visit made November 26th.*—I left Jerusalem, accompanied by Mr. Hornstein, at 7.20 a.m. (November 25th). Bar. in Jerusalem (7.15 a.m.) 27.52; slight E. wind. The mountains to east of the Jordan and Dead Sea entirely hidden in haze; when we reached the neighbourhood of Jericho we might have been riding on a boundless plain for all we could see eastwards; in other directions we could see a considerable distance through slight haze. No excessive heat, pleasant sunshine. We