

- No. 14. Same source (compare the cap with No. 1).
 No. 15. Bronze figure, same source, bearded, but with non-Semitic features (compare No. 3).
 No. 16. Same source (compare Nos. 1 and 5).

Western.

- No. 17. Etruscan, after a sketch by Dr. Isaac Taylor.
 No. 18. From Cyprus, supposed to be Phœnician (from Perrot's "Hist. de l'Art," vol. iii).
 No. 19. From Cyprus (same source), perhaps female. This type with slanting eyes and long nose is also found on Etruscan monuments.
 No. 20. Cyprian (same source).

Southern.

- No. 21. Pulestha (Philistine ?), from Karnak monument. Cast by Mr. Flinders Petrie.
 No. 22. Takrui (Teucrian ?), same source, showing same head-dress.
 No. 23. Ascalon, a male captive, from cast by Mr. Flinders Petrie.
 No. 24. Early Egyptian type (same source).

There are many other similar heads in the various collections from Egypt, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Chaldea, and Etruria, giving the round-headed beardless types, with broad cheekbones and eyes sometimes slanting as on this specimen plate.

 NOTES ON CALVARY.

In a pamphlet published in 1886 at Jerusalem, and in a recent letter to the "Sunday School Times" in America, Dr. Selah Merrill intimates that, in advocating the site at Jeremiah's Grotto as Calvary, I am appropriating discoveries of Otto Thenius in 1849, and of Fisher Howe in 1871. I have never seen the works of either writer, and do not know what they may say as to Calvary. It is very probable that this hill suggested itself to many visitors as the true site; but what I was, I believe, the first to publish was not the *theory*, but the *tradition*, connecting the site with the Jewish place of execution. Dr. Merrill mentions this tradition without giving his authority, but he fails to point out that this was the chief reason for my fixing on the site. When I was in Jerusalem in 1874-75 the site of Calvary was regarded by residents as being a knoll west of that which I suppose to be the site. Dr. Chaplin, as I have said, called my attention to the Jewish tradition, and sent Jews to see me on the subject. Our enquiries then established the site to which they referred, and, as far as I know, this was never previously brought to public notice. From what he says, Dr. Merrill is apparently afraid lest this discovery should be attributed to himself, and the present note may serve to relieve his apprehensions.

C. R. C.