

# *Theology* on the *Web.org.uk*

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Palestine Exploration Quarterly* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_peq\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_peq_01.php)

## NOTES ON THE "QUARTERLY STATEMENT."

By Major C. R. CONDER.

P. 334. Dr. Flinders Petrie's note is interesting, and the publication of the British Museum letters from Tell Amarna shows he is right as to such letters having been written in Egypt, since one of those now published is from Amenophis III to the King of Babylon. As regards *Khu-en-Aten*, supposing him to have been the son of Amenophis III (which has been disputed), I think his features decidedly Mongolic and very like the lowest Hittite type on the monuments, but he was not a pure Hittite. We are not forced to speculate on the deductions to be drawn from such portraits, since we have inscriptions which give us more definite information. The people of Mitani may have been partly Semitic partly Mongol, owing to the vicinity to the Assyrians. Few, if any, of the Asiatic stocks were of pure blood in 1500 B.C. ; and as the language of the Egyptians shows they themselves were then partly Nubians, partly old Egyptians, with infusion of Mongol and Semitic blood. The language of Dusratta was Mongolic—very like Turkish—and the Hittite Prince of Rezeph, north of Palmyra, also writes in Mongolic dialect. Dusratta, of Mitani, was the Hittite overlord, and about 1480 B.C. we hear of the King of Mitani, with the King of the Cassites and the Kings of the Hittites, of Kadesh, and Merash, forming a great Mongol league to throw off the Egyptian yoke. They took Damascus and poured over Northern Bashan. M. Halévy has lately stated that the Hittites must have been Semitic, because there has been discovered at Merash a Phœnician or Aramaic text of about 800 B.C. written in the alphabet of that age. The Tell Amarna letters show us that the Amorites in this region spoke a Semitic language, but they equally show us that the Hittites were Mongols.

P. 328. I do not wish to enter into controversy with the Rev. Haskett Smith or any other writer, as I think the results of controversy are generally that each disputant remains of his own opinion. I do not agree with either his geographical, his historical, or his archaeological views on many points. He has handsomely allowed his want of acquaintance with some of the books which would have been most useful to him.

*Dabbasheth* I believe to have marked the north border of Zebulon. I may be wrong, but I cannot believe that the root D.B.S. could ever have changed into Z.B.D. I do not know any well-established case in which such turnings inside out are necessary to suppose. As a rule, the ancient names remain unchanged, or change only according to laws which apply to the language as a whole and not to the topography only. Mr. Smith reduces the tribe of Zebulon to a mere narrow strip of country, six miles north and south. This seems to me much too small and to leave an area between Zebulon and the other tribes. I do not think his views as to

Hannathon and Jiphthah-el likely to win general acceptance. As to Neah the question is treated in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" very well. Kazin and Kenna cannot have anything to do with one another.

---

## THE TOMB OF OUR LORD.

By R. F. HUTCHINSON, M.D.

THERE are three or four points, at least, which must be taken into consideration in attempting to localise the site of our blessed Lord's crucifixion, and necessarily that of His entombment.

1. It must be on or near a public road.
2. It must be within easy hail of the reviling priests.
3. It must be across or on the left or eastern side of the Kedron.
4. It must be near a garden.

1. The close proximity of a high road.—St. Matthew tells us (xxvii, 39) that "they that passed by reviled Him, wagging their heads"—and St. Mark, "they compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, ἀπ' ἀποῦ, to bear his cross (Mark xv, 21).

2. It must have been within easy range of the reviling priests—*i.e.*, their abuse *must* have reached (to be effectual) the ears of the dying Sufferer. Whence, then, must it have been hurled, if these sanctimonious individuals would not enter the Prætorium, "lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover?" (John xviii, 28), would they have risked certain defilement by mixing in a rabble on a public highway, and at a public execution? Whence, then, came their abuse? With the busy hum of the city, overcrowded at Passover time, and the distance of the traditional site from the western Temple wall, 1,450 feet, it could hardly have reached the Sufferer's ears, and certainly not at Gordon's tomb, 1,700 feet north of the northern wall of the Temple, with the Prætorium intervening.

But from the *eastern* Temple wall there was no obstruction, and from its lofty height their abuse could easily have reached the dying Sufferer's ears; indeed, to write with the utmost reverence, their reviling would have been most appropriate—and might have resembled that of the passers-by—with their wagging heads—

"Ah, Thou that destroyest the Temple,  
And buildest it in three days,  
Save Thyself, and come down from the cross;  
He saved others—Himself he cannot save."

Mark xv, 29-31.

The distance of the traditional Gethsemane, the scene of His agony, crucifixion, and burial, is only 700 feet from the eastern Temple wall.