

buried with his *fathers*, which word must at least include another besides Abijam, if we accept the words of Josephus. Thus we have in the Bible an unbroken link showing that (except Abijam) all the kings from Ahaz upward to Rehoboam inclusive were buried with their fathers. Therefore, all from David to Ahaz (except Abijam) were buried in one and the same cemetery, *i.e.*, David's tomb was not distinct from the cemetery, but the site of the two was the same.

In *Q.S.*, 1881, p. 94, on "The city and tomb of David," I dealt with this subject, and showed that when Josephus is at variance with the Bible the only satisfactory plan is to discard him altogether, and not to make a compromise between truth and error, from which have arisen almost all the difficulties about Jerusalem.

The Bible says David went to Jerusalem, took the stronghold of Zion, the same is the city of David; David dwelt in the stronghold and called it the city of David; or briefly, David took one place, dwelt in it, and called it the city of David, and was buried in (or at) it, and his successors as above.

Unfortunately, Josephus gave this paraphrase—David came to Jerusalem, took two places (probably due to the glossed *πρω* in *προκατελάβετο*, implying two captures, in 1 Chron. xi, 5, LXX), called Jerusalem the city of David and was buried in Jerusalem and so were his successors—briefly he gives a miserable blundering abridgement, a Jew, not even naming Zion, and cruelly misleading his readers by writing that David called Jerusalem (not Zion) the city of David. "Those explorers knew better."

CALVARY—"PLACE OF A SKULL."

By J. M. TENZ.

ABOUT 250 feet east of the traditional Calvary there were traces of a wall supposed to have been remains of the second north wall of ancient Jerusalem, but by careful investigations made by Mr. Archibald C. Dickie, it was found to have been a gateway, with a large door and a smaller one on each side, probably to an enclosure within which the Churches stood (see *Quarterly Statement*, 1907, p. 297, and 1908, p. 298). So far we have only historical

evidence for the site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, but the late Major-General Sir Charles W. Wilson in his most interesting work *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre*, with all the evidence for and against the traditional sites, remarks: "No obligation urged against the sites is of such a convincing nature that it need disturb the minds of those who accept in all good faith the authenticity of places which are hallowed by the prayers of countless pilgrims since the days of Constantine."

The following theory may be given in support of the traditional site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre. Josephus states: "The second wall took its beginning from that gate which they called Gennath which belongeth to the first wall: it only encompassed the northern quarter of the city and reached as far as the tower Antonia." It would be difficult, in trying to lay down the second wall, to leave the site of the Holy Sepulchre outside the wall except by an angle in the wall, for beside the traditional Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, there are some Jewish rock-cut tombs within the Church, and according to Rabbinical statement, sepulchres had to be excluded from the city and to be fifty cubits from the wall. Only royal tombs were permitted within the city, and they may be looked for south of the Temple.

The second north wall may date from the time soon after the building of Solomon's Temple, but how can we account for the angle in the wall and the "Place of a Skull" at that time?

The late Dr. Schick suggests that Goliath's skull, which David brought to Jerusalem (1 Sam. xvii, 54, and xxi, 9) and buried somewhere close to and outside the city (as it could not be buried near the Tabernacle at Nob where he deposited Goliath's sword), may have been found when Nehemiah rebuilt the walls, and the spot called "The Skull," that is, the place where the remarkable skull was found—this may also have led to that strange tradition that Adam was buried in Golgotha, "Place of a Skull."

If Joseph of Arimathea placed any reliance on this wonderful legend he may have considered it an honour to have his new sepulchre so near the tomb of our great ancestor, the head of the human race.

Origen, who was born more than a hundred years before the churches were built by Constantine, stated that there was a Hebrew tradition to the effect that Adam was buried at the place called "Place of a Skull," which the Hebrew teachers declare was Adam's

sepulchre; later the Skull Place was also called Mount Calvary, some asserting that Adam was first buried at Kirjath Arba and then in Mount Calvary. The late Sir Charles W. Wilson also stated: "as far as we know it was first called little Mount Golgotha by a pilgrim who visited Jerusalem in A.D. 333."

There are now eighteen steps leading from the floor of the church to Calvary, which may have been an inducement for pilgrims to the Holy Land to call it Mount Calvary, but during the Roman occupation of Palestine, places held sacred by Christians were desecrated. Jerome writes that from the time of Hadrian to the reign of Constantine there stood a statue of Jupiter in the place of the Resurrection, and a Venus in marble on the rock of the Cross. The surface of the site of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre would have been much changed during that time; Constantine, when removing the idolatrous statues and cutting the rock floor to lay the foundation for the church, would also have made Calvary more prominent; originally, it may only have been a little above the level of the surrounding ground. May we also venture to suppose that, at the time of Hezekiah when the king of Assyria sent a great army against Jerusalem, this little elevation within the angle in the wall may have served as a convenient spot for Rabshakeh to stand and speak to the people who were on the city wall (2 Kings, xviii, 26, 27)?

Because the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands within the modern Jerusalem, the Crucifixion has been placed north, east, and west of the city; one writer places Calvary on the east side of the Temple because the red heifer was led from the east gate to the Mount of Olives to be slain and the blood sprinkled in the direction of the Temple (Talm. *Middoth*, Heb. xiii, 2), but east of the Temple is the Garden of Gethsemane which was the scene of our Saviour's agony and betrayal; others assign various places north of the city for the site of Calvary because the sacrifices brought to the Temple had to be slain on the north side of the Altar, but north of the Temple was the tower of Antonia and Pilate's Praetorium where Jesus was condemned—and bearing His cross He went forth into a place called the Place of a Skull, which is also called in Hebrew Golgotha, where they crucified Him (John xix, 17, 18).

West of the Temple is the traditional Calvary and west of the Altar was the sanctuary where once a year the High Priest brought the blood within the Vail and sprinkled it on the Mercy Seat to

atone for the sins of Israel (Lev. xvi). If the directions for the slaying of the sacrifices and the sprinkling of the blood were given to denote the direction of our Saviour's Passion from Gethsemane to the Cross, then may we also look to the west of Jerusalem for the site where our Lord and Saviour shed His blood for the sins of the world.

Explorations within a busy part of the city cannot easily be carried on except when old houses have to be removed and foundations laid for new buildings, when opportunities may be given for important discoveries to be made in that part of the city in connection with the north walls and the sites of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre.

FURTHER NOTE ON INSCRIPTIONS RELATING TO ROMAN CAMPAIGNS IN PALESTINE.

By H. H. CLIFFORD GIBBONS.

SINCE the publication of the article by Mr. Offord and myself in the April *Statement*, some interesting and valuable research on the above inscriptions has been given us by M. Mispoulet, the well-known authority on Roman Law.¹ He points out that the titles attributed to Domitian are wrong, as two other diplomas issued the same year (A.D. 93) give "TRIB. POT. XIII; IMP. XXII; COS. XVI." Moreover the arrangement of the various clauses of the diploma does not follow the customary practice. He considers that the *Caesareum Magnum* was undoubtedly at Rome, probably situated in the Forum of Caesar, from whence was brought the certified copy of the edict. He rejects the idea that *Quadratus'* panel was copied at Alexandria.

May I be permitted a suggestion? Surely the Roman Government, if the original was at Rome, would forward an authentic copy to the Alexandrian authorities. The latter would most certainly file one for their own use, or affix it to a public building, in addition to

¹ *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; Bulletin de Décembre, 1910* (Auguste Picard, Paris).