

3, 4. If this fact is allowed, then the east side of Jerusalem must have been the scene of the Crucifixion, and where our blessed Lord died, there was he buried, for "in the place (*ἐν τῷ τόπῳ*, not *near* it) where He was crucified there was a garden (*κήπος*), and in the garden (*ἐν τῷ κήπῳ*) a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus" (John xix, 41, 42).

That garden *cannot* be the traditional Gethsemane, for the following reason: the Virgin Mary was laid close to the scene of her Son's death and burial; but her reputed—I may say, undoubted—grave is now at least 60 feet under ground,¹ due to the Valley of the Kedron having been completely filled up by Hadrian after his total destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 135. Therefore, we must search for our blessed Lord's tomb in the rocky scarps south of the Virgin's tomb, and we know that it was unilocular (Matt. xxvii, 60), and that the loculus was on the *right* side (Mark xvi, 5), and closed by a cylinder of stone rolled up an incline (Mark xvi, 3). That sacred tomb is yet to be found on the level, and to the south of the Virgin's grave.

THE SITE OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

THE "Times" of September 22nd, 1892, contained a letter, signed by Mr. H. A. Campbell and Mr. John Murray, appealing for funds for the purchase of what has been known for some years as "Gordon's Tomb" at Jerusalem, on the ground that the probability of its being the Tomb of Our Lord renders it desirable that it should be preserved from destruction. Strong objections were made to this proposal, and considerable correspondence respecting it took place in the columns of the "Times." The question being one of great interest we publish, by special permission of the "Times," a selection of the principal letters, together with the "Times" leader on the subject:—

"THE GARDEN TOMB' AT JERUSALEM.

"To the Editor of the 'Times.'

"Sir,—Many of your readers are doubtless acquainted with the spot lying outside the Damascus Gate at Jerusalem, which is commonly known as 'Gordon's Tomb,' from the fact that General Gordon, amongst many others who have made a special study of the question, believed it to be

¹ Burcharden de Monte Leoni tells us (p. 68), "There is moreover, on the surface of the ground a certain edifice in the shape of a chapel, which when you shall have descended into its interior by very many steps, you will arrive underground at the sepulchre of the glorious virgin. And I believe it, because there are sixty."

the actual Sepulchre of Our Lord. This question of identity is one of the deepest interest, and although all archæologists are not agreed, and in the existing state of our knowledge a complete solution of it cannot perhaps be looked for, the probability that this tomb may be the Holy Sepulchre renders it very desirable that it should be preserved from destruction or desecration. The tomb, together with the enclosure in which it stands—an area of about four acres—is now for sale, and the time for which we have obtained the refusal of it has almost expired. The price asked for the freehold is 4,000*l.* The object and desire of those who have taken the most active part in the negotiations is to purchase this site, to carry out such excavations and restorations as may be considered advisable by the most competent authorities, to lay out the garden, and to vest the property in the hands of trustees, with a view to maintaining it as far as possible in its present simplicity. In addition to the purchase money it is estimated that the sum of about 2,000*l.* would be required to meet legal expenses, to place the tomb and its surroundings in order, and to provide for the maintenance of the garden. Nearly 1,000*l.* have already been collected privately, and we would ask to be allowed to make an earnest appeal to the public to enable us to seize an opportunity, which may never occur again, of securing and preserving a locality which must be of the highest value and interest to all Christians. The following gentlemen, in addition to many others, without committing themselves to any confident opinion as to the identity of this tomb with the Holy Sepulchre, have expressed their cordial approval of the purchase of the site, and in many cases have already subscribed to the fund :—The Archbishop of Canterbury ; the Bishops of Salisbury, Rochester, Ripon, and Cashel ; the Archdeacons of London and Westminster ; Canon Tristram ; the Hon. Rev. E. Carr-Glyn ; Professor R. Stuart Poole ; the Rev. Sinclair Paterson, M.D. ; the Rev. F. B. Meyer ; Lawrence Hardy, Esq., M.P. ; F. A. Bevan, Esq. ; Hon. H. Dudley Ryder, &c. Subscriptions may be sent to either of the hon. secretaries, or paid in to the Garden Tomb (Jerusalem) Purchase Fund, at Messrs. Barclay, Bevan, and Co.'s Bank, 1, Pall Mall East, S.W., London.

“ We are, sir, your obedient servants,

“ HENRY A. CAMPBELL,

Eastwell-park, Ashford, Kent,

“ JOHN MURRAY,

50, Albemarle-street, London, W.

} Hon. Secs.,
pro tem.”

“ To the Editor of the ‘Times.’

“ Sir,—As I see that it is proposed to raise a large sum of money to buy a certain tomb at Jerusalem under the supposition that it may be the true site of the Holy Sepulchre, will you allow me to warn those interested, by means of your columns, that there is not only no reason to suppose that this tomb is the real site of the tomb of Christ, but that there is

every reason to suppose that it did not exist in the time of Our Lord at all. The tomb was excavated in 1873 (nearly 20 years ago), and I then explored it, and found in it the remains of the bones of a large number of persons and two red paint crosses on the walls, which had the form of a Latin Patriarch's cross, and could not be earlier than the 12th century, A.D., in Palestine. The tomb was close to a large Crusading hospice, and I have no doubt that it was used for the burial of pilgrims. It has not the form of the Jewish sepulchres such as were in use about the Christian era; but it resembles the tombs that were cut by the Greek Christians of about the 9th century A.D.—such as that of Thecla Augusta, south of Jerusalem. Two inscriptions giving the names of deacons of the Greek Church, and, by the characters used, dating from the Byzantine period, have been found near the tomb.

“The tomb, with many others of the same Byzantine age, is close to the great knoll which (as I pointed out in 1878) is probably the true site of Calvary; but this is no reason why, in the 19th century, we should repeat the errors of the 4th century and give to the world two false and impossible sites for the Holy Sepulchre instead of the one which at present represents the ‘pious fraud’ of Constantine.

“I am, sir, your obedient servant,

“C. R. CONDER.

“September 24, 1892.”

“To the Editor of the ‘Times.’

“Sir,—That Major Conder is correct in saying that the ‘Garden Tomb’ at Jerusalem has been used at some time as a place of general interment no one of experience will for a moment deny. The great accumulation of human bones which were discovered in it at the time of its last excavation is sufficient proof of this. Possibly also he is right in conjecturing that these were the remains of Crusading pilgrims.

“But this has absolutely nothing to do with the question of the identity of the tomb. As Major Conder and every Palestinian explorer knows, it was the common practice in the time of the Crusades, as, indeed, throughout all the centuries of the Christian era, to utilise as places of interment the rock-hewn sepulchres which had been excavated ages before. And, in the present instance, supposing that Our Lord had been buried in this tomb, there was nothing to prevent Christians of the middle ages from using it as a place of interment. The ecclesiastical tradition of many centuries had already consecrated the other site; and even to consider the question of its identity would have been a heinous and unpardonable sin. Moreover, if I mistake not, there were clear indications that this tomb had already been partially filled in with *débris* before the interments of the middle ages took place, as no bones were discovered close to the flooring of the tomb. These combined circumstances would have hindered any one in the middle ages from suspecting that Christ had been buried here. As regards the rock-hewn tomb itself, I cannot agree with Major Conder

when he says that 'there is every reason to suppose that it did not exist in the time of Our Lord at all.' The existence of the head cavity in the receptacle at the north-east corner of the tomb and the fact of its facing directly to the valley of Jehoshaphat are strong arguments in favour of its being originally Jewish in its character. The absence of this head cavity in the south-east receptacle and the unfinished groove towards the north end of the west wall show clearly that the tomb was never completed. Its general appearance would lead one to believe that it was certainly of a late Jewish period, or, in other words, that it was constructed at or about the time of Christ.

"But, as I understand the feelings of those who are appealing for aid in preserving this interesting monument, there is no desire or intention upon their part to dogmatise in the matter, much less to give to the world a rival sepulchre to that 'which at present represents the pious fraud of Constantine.' They take their stand upon the fact that here is a possible, if not, indeed, a probable, spot fraught with the most sacred and hallowed associations of Christianity. The very possibility, if not probability, that the garden and tomb which are offered for purchase are those mentioned by the Sacred Evangelists should surely arouse the devout interest of Christians, and lead them to take measures for securing their immunity from desecration. There is not the slightest intention of converting them into shrines of superstitious adoration, nor of elevating them even to the position of undoubted 'holy sites.'

"Major Conder himself is a strong advocate of the claims of the skull-shaped hill, at the western base of which they lie, to be the genuine site of Calvary. And, if this be so, I cannot see how he can venture to assert that the 'Garden Tomb' is an 'impossible site' for the Sepulchre of Our Lord. The garden is 'in the place where He was crucified,' if Calvary be located here; 'in the garden' is this sepulchre, which at the time of its first occupation was evidently new, 'wherein was never man yet laid.' Granted that El-Heidhemiyeh (Jeremiah's grotto) is the scene of Our Lord's crucifixion, the Garden Tomb is the only sepulchre which has yet been discovered that will satisfy the conditions of the Biblical record. Certainly, the alternative site suggested by Major Conder utterly fails to do so, for by no stretch of language could it be said to be 'in the place where He was crucified.'

"The appeal which has been made by Mr. Henry Campbell and Mr. John Murray commends itself most heartily to my mind, and I sincerely trust that it will meet with complete success.

"HASKETT SMITH, M.A."

"To the Editor of the 'Times.'

"Sir,—As I happened to be from home, I have only to-day seen Major Conder's letter in your issue of Saturday. May I be permitted, as one who, so far back as 1858, ventured to suggest El Heydhimiyeh, the

skull-shaped mound, as the probable site of the Crucifixion (arguing chiefly from its position as just outside the gate of Samaria, the only direct exit from the Castle of Antonine), to say a word in reply to Major Conder? No one has more ably or convincingly supported the claim of that mound as the actual site of that transcendent tragedy, and I have reason to believe that he arrived at his conclusion quite unaware that the same identification had presented itself to others. So cogent have been his arguments that, so far as I am aware, his identification has been accepted by most subsequent topographers who were untrammelled by the reception of the traditional sites.

“Now, Major Conder’s Calvary being received, it follows from the Scripture narrative that the tomb must have been in its proximity. The neighbouring ground has been pretty exhaustively searched, and no other site, so far as I know, has been discovered which could possibly meet the conditions of the problem. It was in a garden near, and hewn out of the rock, and it was a hitherto unused tomb. Those of us who have suggested it as a probable site have not dogmatically asserted it to be certainly the true sepulchre; but we do say that it answers the required conditions, and to those who uphold Major Conder’s identification of Calvary no other known sepulchre does so. I am sorry that Major Conder should have brought forward as an argument the fact that it was afterwards used as a place of sepulture, and that there were two red paint crosses which he places as late as the 12th century. No doubt it was so used, and I saw the crosses, but there was certainly no indication that they were contemporary with the excavating of the tomb, the date of which is certainly not of the 12th century. If Major Conder cannot prove the tomb itself to be of 12th-century work, which it certainly is not, his observation is surplusage.

“I do not pretend to rival Major Conder in architectural chronology, but he gives us no proof of his opinion that the tomb is of the 9th century A.D. I am not aware of any other such tombs ever supposed to be of so late a date in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and I think I have searched all known sepulchres in that district pretty carefully. Major Conder says nothing in support of his statement that ‘there is every reason to suppose that it did not exist in the time of Our Lord at all.’ It has no other *kokim* than this one. As the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea had never been used, there would have been no need for multiplying *kokim*. I know of no *kokim* of this character in any sepulchres whose date is so late as the 9th century. The tombs used at that period, so far as my observation goes, are invariably old tombs, though possibly partially remodelled.

“I do not dogmatise, but I do venture to submit that those who, like myself, fully accept the identification of what is called ‘Conder’s Calvary’ are justified in pleading that what is, to say the very least, a probable site of the adjacent sepulchre should be preserved from desecration.

“I am, sir, your obedient servant,

“H. B. TRISTRAM, F.R.S.

“Durham, September 26.”

“To the Editor of the ‘Times.’

“Sir,—If a number of persons choose to join together to purchase a tomb which, in their opinion, may be the Tomb of Our Lord, that is no concern of other people. But when an appeal for funds for the purpose is made in the public newspapers, and backed by an array of distinguished names, the project takes a new character, and it becomes almost a duty for those who have studied the subject to make known their views respecting it.

“That the locality north of the Damascus Gate has all the requirements for being the place of the Crucifixion can hardly be doubted. I, at least, am not prepared to question it, for it was at my suggestion that attention was given to the claims of this spot some years ago. But it should be remembered that in the 4th century the spot which has now been so long venerated was also believed to possess all the requirements. Many writers have asserted that in the time of Our Lord it was outside the city wall, the contrary has never been proved, and if this were so, the other requirements would easily fall in.

“In regarding the locality now proposed as the possible or probable site, we are, then, no nearer proof than we were before.

“And if it be assumed without proof that this locality is the true one, there is still no proof that the hill over Jeremiah’s Grotto is the exact spot. I believe it was not, for the following reasons:—

“1. If the Crucifixion had taken place on such a lofty hill, it is probable that allusion to the circumstance would have been made in the sacred narrative. The hill at that time was much more lofty than now for a person coming out of Jerusalem.

“2. I am not aware that either Jews or Romans fixed their places of execution on the summits of hills; these were rather reserved for temples and shrines. Jewish tradition points out the place of stoning at the foot of this hill, and, had the Christians believed it to have been at the top, it is fair to presume that they would have put the Church of St. Stephen there.

“3. It appears certain that the spot was near to and in full view of a frequented high road, which is not the case with the top of the hill in question. There was a road at its foot on the east and another on the west, but both seem too distant to explain the wording of the narrative. There is, indeed, now a path on the north side of the hill connecting these two roads; but in ancient times, if it existed at all, it was, in all probability, as now, a mere path, and little frequented by passers by.

“If this hill was not the site of the Crucifixion, then the tomb in question cannot be Our Lord’s Tomb.

“A far more probable site, as seems to me, and one which meets every requirement, is a rocky knoll to the west of the Damascus road, and only a few yards from it. Some ten feet below the summit of this knoll, on the side towards the road, is a remarkable ledge, or little plateau, which now has olive trees growing on it and this, I venture to

think, should be regarded as the place of the Crucifixion, if the place were in this locality. The knoll is still surrounded by 'a garden,' with vines and olive trees, but in recent years houses have been built against it and upon it on its western side. At the south end of it is the rock-cut tomb known as 'Conder's Tomb.' The knoll, the olive trees, and the tomb are all shown on the reduced plan of Jerusalem and its environs, recently published by the Palestine Exploration Fund.

"It was this tomb that I was requested about eight years ago to endeavour to purchase as being the supposed Tomb of Our Lord; and now the public are invited to subscribe for the purchase of a rival tomb! Who shall decide on the merits of the claimants?"

"In my own view, the case may be stated thus:—

"If the old site is not the true one, the true one may not unreasonably be sought in the neighbourhood north of the Damascus Gate; but there is at present no proof that the old site is not the true one. I do not affirm that there is not a strong probability of its not being the true one.

"If the place of the Crucifixion were north of the Damascus Gate, it may have been on the top of the hill above Jeremiah's Grotto, or on the knoll to which I have alluded, or on neither.

"If the hill above the grotto were Calvary, 'Gordon's Tomb' may be the true one; if the little knoll were Calvary, 'Conder's Tomb' may not improbably have been the Tomb of Our Lord. But there would still be no proof on the side of either.

"It is unfortunate that the name of General Gordon should have become mixed up with this question. The glamour of his reputation tends rather to confuse the mind of the inquirer. I had the honour to know General Gordon in Jerusalem, and to spend many delightful hours in his society—hours which can never be obliterated from my memory. But great as is my admiration for that extraordinary man, I cannot pretend to regard him as an authority on Jerusalem topography.

"There is still another point which I should be sorry to pass unnoticed. Travellers in the Holy Land frequently smile at the simplicity, or otherwise, of mediæval monks in fixing the localities of events narrated in Holy Scripture, and some, perhaps, have unwisely permitted themselves to sneer at their credulity or imposture. Is it desirable that, at the end of the 19th century, we should go back to these old world ways and pay six or eight times its value for a place because it 'may be' the Tomb of Our Lord, whilst not one Christian in a million believes that it has been proved to be such?"

"Your obedient servant,

"THOMAS CHAPLIN, M.D.

"18, Anerley Park, S.E.,

"September 27th."

“To the Editor of the ‘Times.’

“Sir,—I trust you will allow me, as one who has made a study of the topography of ancient Jerusalem, to draw attention to one or two points that do not seem to have been sufficiently considered by your correspondents.

“There is no evidence, historical or traditional, that the hill above ‘Jeremiah’s Grotto,’ to which the somewhat fantastic name ‘Skull Hill’ has been attached, was connected either directly or indirectly with the death and burial of Christ. The Russian Abbot Daniel, who visited Jerusalem A.D. 1106-7, calls this hill ‘Gehenna,’ and says that it split up at the time of the Crucifixion; but he is the only pilgrim who mentions the tradition, and he certainly believed implicitly in the authenticity of the traditional sites.

“There is no evidence that the ‘place called Golgotha’ was a hill, or even that it derived its name from a topographical feature, though that is a commonly accepted explanation. The term ‘Mount (Monticulus) Golgotha,’ first appears in the Itinerary of the Bordeaux Pilgrim, A.D. 333, and it was applied, not inaptly, to the ‘Rock of Calvary’ in the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which had then been recently isolated by cutting away the adjoining rock. The name ‘Golgotha’ may have been due to some local legend, or to some occurrence of which no record has come down to us.

“There is sufficient evidence to justify the belief that the Jewish ‘Place of Stoning’ was identical with, or very close to ‘Skull Hill’; but this, to my mind, is a strong reason for not connecting the spot with the Crucifixion. If Our Lord had been condemned to death by the Sanhedrin, He would doubtless have been stoned at the usual Jewish place of execution. But He was condemned by Pilate, and there is no reason to believe that the Roman soldiers, who carried out the execution, departed from the usual practice, which appears to have been to crucify within a few feet of a main road. It is scarcely probable, too, that Joseph of Arimathea would have owned a garden and made himself a new tomb in close proximity to the common place of execution.

“The Biblical account of the Crucifixion gives no indication of direction; and it is uncertain whether Christ was led out to crucifixion from Herod’s palace, near the Jaffa Gate, or from the Castle Antonia, at the north-west corner of the Haram-esh-Sherif. It may, perhaps, be inferred that as, in the wilderness, the sin-offering was to be burned without the camp and to the north of the altar, so Christ, the great Antitype, suffered without the walls and to the north of the altar of the Temple. This view was pressed upon me by the late Bishop Gobat whilst I was conducting the survey of Jerusalem in 1864-65; and in those days it was customary to those who aspired to identification to locate Calvary on ground due north of the site of the altar, and to the east of Jeremiah’s Grotto.

“Otto Thenius was, I believe, the first to suggest the hill above Jeremiah’s Grotto as a possible site for Calvary; but, though his view was adopted by some English and American writers, it never took any direct hold upon the public mind until it was strongly advocated by Major Conder and the late General Gordon. The suggestion thrown out less than 50 years ago has now almost become an accepted fact. During the last twelve months open-air services have been held on ‘Mount Calvary’; a devout lady has, I am informed, washed out the ‘Garden Tomb’ with her own hands, and passed the night in it in silent prayer; and artists, unmindful of truth-telling photographs, have supplied the ‘skull’ of the nineteenth century Golgotha with eyes, nose, and mouth.

“No one can object if a number of wealthy men choose to pay ten or twelve times its value for a plot of ground outside the walls of Jerusalem. But is it fair to invite subscriptions on the plea that that plot of ground is connected with the Passion of Our Lord, when nothing can be urged in support of the view but bare possibility? The purchase of the ground will be followed by the erection of a church, and 50 years hence a later Cyril will, no doubt, be illustrating his sermons by pointing to the knoll above Jeremiah’s Grotto and the ‘Garden Tomb’ as evidence of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Our Lord.

I will only add that for the sum which it is proposed to expend on the purchase of the plot of ground outside the Damascus Gate it would be possible to solve several interesting points connected with the ancient topography of the Holy City.

“I am, sir, your obedient servant,

“C. W. WILSON.

“October 1st.”

“To the Editor of the ‘Times.’

“Sir,—The discussion now going on in your columns upon the so-called ‘Garden Tomb’ of Jerusalem is naturally a subject of the greatest interest to the Committee of this Society. It is not for the Committee to take a side, or to pronounce an opinion upon any controversy on the Holy Site. It is their function to investigate and communicate facts, leaving the conclusions to be drawn by others.

“I beg, however, to call the attention of those who are interested in the subject to the papers already issued by this Society during the last few years on the Holy Sepulchre, viz., Jerusalem volume of the Survey, p. 429, *Quarterly Statements* :—

Date.	Heading.	Writer.
1873. July	Notes on Our Lord's Tomb	R. F. Hutchinson, M.D.
1876. January	Rock-Cut Tomb	Lt. C. R. Conder.
1877. July	The Holy Sepulchre	Col. Sir C. Wilson.
1877. April	The Holy Sepulchre	Clermont-Ganneau.
1879. January	Transference of Sites	W. Simpson.
1879. October	Supposed Site of Calvary... ..	Herr C. Schick.
1881. July	Tomb 200 yards west of Jeremiah's Grotto.	Lt. C. R. Conder.
1881. October-January .	The Place of Stoning	J. E. Hanauer.
1883. July	The Holy Sepulchre	Henry A. Harper.
1883. April	The Holy Sepulchre	Capt. C. R. Conder, R.E.
1885. January	Golgotha	General Gordon.
1885. April	Golgotha	Girdler Worrall.
1887. April	Notices	Guy le Strange.
1888. July	Notes on Calvary	Guy le Strange.
1888. July	Notes on Calvary	Capt. C. R. Conder, R.E.
1889. October	Notes on the Holy Sepulchre	Major Conder.
1889. July	Recent Discoveries	Herr C. Schick.
1889. April	Notes on the Plan of Jerusalem	Herr C. Schick.
1889. January	Holy Sepulchre and Dome of Rock	William Simpson.
1890. April	Site of Calvary	Professor Hull.
1891. July	The Holy Sepulchre	Major Watson, R.E.
1891. April	Entrance to the Holy Sepulchre	William Simpson.
1891. January	On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre	Henry Gillman.
1892. April	'Gordon's Tomb'	Herr C. Schick.
1892. July	On the Identification of Calvary	J. E. Hanauer.
1892. October	Notes on the controversy regarding the Site of Calvary.	J. E. Hanauer.

"I would also point out that when an officer of experience and long study of this subject, such as Major Conder, pronounces a tomb to be of any century, it is a judgment representing not an individual opinion, but the accumulated knowledge amassed during 27 years of scientific examination of the tombs and other monuments of Palestine. (*See Papers on the rock tombs of Western Palestine in 'The Special Papers' volume of the Survey, p. 280.*)

"I would also point out that when Dr. Chaplin, who is a member of the Executive Committee, writes on Jerusalem and its monuments he brings to the subject the results of a patient study carried on during 25 years' residence in the city.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES GLAISHER,

Chairman of the Executive Committee.

"Palestine Exploration Fund, 24, Hanover-Square, W.,

"October 5th."

"Leading Article from the 'Times' of October 8th.

"An interesting controversy has been going on for some time back in our columns, originating in the proposal to raise a fund for the purchase of what is known as the 'Garden Tomb,' outside the Damascus Gate at Jerusalem. We published about a fortnight ago a letter from Mr. Campbell and Mr. John Murray acting as secretaries to a committee

formed to promote this object, explaining that the monument in question, commonly known as 'Gordon's Tomb,' from the fact that General Gordon and many other enthusiastic persons believed it to be the Holy Sepulchre itself, was now in the market and was to be obtained for a sum of 6,000*l.*, two-thirds of it to be paid for the freehold to the actual proprietor, a shrewd German speculator, and one-third for legal and other incidental expenses, including the maintenance of the property. The case for the purchase was stated with laudable moderation. 'The probability,' it was argued, 'that this tomb may be the Holy Sepulchre renders it very desirable that it should be preserved from destruction or desecration.' No attempt was made, indeed, to show that either destruction or desecration was threatened, and, in point of fact, one of the most energetic advocates of the purchase, Mr. Haskett Smith, has contended that the owner's offer of the tomb ought to be closed with immediately, 'since the Franciscan monks have made a bid for it and the Germans are prepared to buy it forthwith.' The appeal is addressed, however, to a deeply-rooted and reverential form of sentiment, and it is in no way surprising that it has been supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, several Bishops and other high ecclesiastical personages, as well as others interested as scholars or travellers in the archæology of the Holy Land. At the same time, these eminent authorities, while giving their approval to the movement for raising the purchase-money by public subscription, have exercised a wise discretion in expressly refraining, as the secretaries have told us, from 'committing themselves to any confident opinion as to the identity of this tomb with the Holy Sepulchre.'

"The wisdom of this reservation, though it obviously weakens the force of the appeal, has since been made evident. Major Conder, whose work in connection with the survey of the Holy Land and the Palestine Exploration Committee is well known, wrote to express a strong opinion adverse to the suggested identity. He contended that there was no reason to suppose that the tomb was even of Jewish origin or of the period assigned to it, but that, on the contrary, the evidence of its workmanship and ornamentation rather showed that it belonged to the Byzantine period, and was used as a place of sepulture for pilgrims in the Crusading times. While admitting that it was near the probable site of Calvary—the skull-shaped hill, the identification of which is, however, itself a moot point—Major Conder protested against adding a new and more than dubious rival to the spurious 'Holy Place' which at present represents the 'pious fraud' of Constantine. Mr. Haskett Smith, Mr. Campbell, Canon Tristram, and others attacked Major Conder's position with a good deal of animation and a curious display of the 'wish to believe.' Upon their own showing they have only a tissue of vague and speculative possibilities to oppose to the emphatic negative testimony of Major Conder, supported by such high authorities in the domain of sacred exploration and archæology as Sir Charles Wilson, Dr. Chaplin, and Mr. Glaisher. Mr. Haskett Smith thinks it sufficient to contend that the ground now offered for sale is 'a possible, if not a probable, spot' on

which to seek for the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Mr. Campbell says it is not alleged that the tomb is the Holy Sepulchre, but that 'it may be so.' Canon Tristram urges that it 'answers the required conditions,' which is true if we accept other disputed identifications and build a superstructure of conjectures upon them. One enthusiastic gentleman considers 6,000*l.* 'a small price to pay for a hallowed spot' on the assumption that, even if the identity of the tomb be doubtful, what more probable than that the ground now for sale may be the 'original Garden'? Another regards every piece of land that can be identified as near Calvary as 'an object of the deepest interest, if not of priceless value,' which ought to be secured. When the question of purchase is looked at in this light it is easy to understand how the Garden Tomb, which Mr. Hanbury might have had a few years ago for 1,200*l.*, and which he was about to buy under the glamour of General Gordon's faith, when the improbabilities of the identification were placed before him, stands at five times that price at present in the hands of Herr Frutiger.

"The advocates of the expenditure of 6,000*l.*, which, as Sir Charles Wilson points out, there are many ways of using to good purpose in the exploration of Jerusalem, have nothing to rely upon except guesswork, yet they assert that Major Conder has not proved his case. Absolute proof in such matters as archaeological chronology is not to be expected, but the conclusions arrived at by a high authority like Major Conder, though they are only in strictness inferential, represent, as Mr. Glaisher has remarked, the accumulated knowledge amassed during years of patient toil and study. The exploration of the Holy Places has been undertaken in a serious spirit and carried out with eminent success. It is a pity that attention should be diverted from it, on palpably insufficient grounds, by enthusiasts bent on 'restoration,' and Mr. Floyer has spoken severely of 'the sentimental and antiquarian ruin' of places historically interesting in the impassioned hunting down of sites and the multiplication of wildly conjectural 'discoveries.' In the present case while we respect the feelings that inspired the promoters of the movement, we are constrained to say that they seem to have shown no adequate grounds for their appeal for public aid."
