

been at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, in the northwest angle of the present city; and to this place critical opinion is now strongly inclining. Many, however, favor the conjecture advocated at large by Dr. Fisher Howe of Brooklyn, New York. (*The True Site of Calvary*, New York, 1871), which locates Golgotha at the "Jeremiah's Grotto," a quarry in the south face of a knoll about five hundred feet north of the city. As the crucifixion took place just outside the city, its position depends upon that of "the second wall," as described by Josephus; and as the remains of this no doubt still exist, buried in the ruins under the modern city, they can only be found by excavations, which would be expensive, even if the Turkish authorities would permit them. A few traces of what is thought to be their beginning have recently been discovered near David Street, but they have not been followed out. By a somewhat circuitous course (in accordance with Josephus's language) the wall may have run from this point to the Damascus Gate (where it again appears), so as to include Hezekiah's Pool, and yet exclude the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. This for the present is the most probable conclusion.—*James Strong.*

24. How do you account for the variations in the four gospels of the superscriptions on the cross?

The words "King of the Jews" are common to all four accounts; the only additions being the words "this is" and "Jesus of Nazareth." For the purposes of public teaching one form was as serviceable as the other. The variations are such as are natural to eye-witnesses, whose memories often agree as to substance but vary in details.—*Prof. M. D. Buell.*

In the same way as we account for the other verbal variations of the gospels. No one aimed to give the identical words, but all state in substance the purport of the superscription.—*M. S. Terry.*

By the peculiar circumstances of the writers of those gospels. In Matthew's statement that the inscription was "this is Jesus," etc., we may, I think, recognize not only the record of an eye-witness, but that the eye-witness was one whose mind was especially impressed with the Hebrew version of the trilingual inscription. The fact, on the other hand, that Luke is careful to remark that "it was written.... in letters of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew," marks him as one who, though he had not been a witness of the events, had been anxious to obtain "a perfect understanding of all things from the very first" from those "whom from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word." I think that he has preserved the very words of the Greek. Mark was not an eye-witness. It is commonly thought that he wrote either from the story of Peter or at his dictation, and for Romans. If so, may we not detect in the short "This is the King of the Jews" *Res ille Judæorum*, the Latin version. Taking this for granted, the supposition that John, writing his gospel at the end of the century, long after the other gospels had appeared and been thoroughly studied, gave in his version not indeed the exact words of either the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, but the general sense of all the three, will not be considered either unlikely or far-fetched.—*J. E. Hanauer, Jerusalem.*

25. How are the words, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" to be interpreted?

There is a remarkable Jewish tradition to the effect that Queen Esther when proceeding on her hazardous and venturesome errand (Esth. 5, 1) felt on reaching the inner court and beholding an idol temple such a sudden and overpowering feeling of utter and miserable loneliness and helplessness that she uttered these very

same words, with which the twenty-second psalm commences. It doubtless was a feeling of the same kind, intensified by the fact that he had in that awful hour to tread the wine-press of God's anger alone, and alone to meet all the concentrated bitterness of the assaults of the powers of darkness that wrung this cry from the dying Saviour.—*J. E. Hanauer.*

Cambridge Notes.

Matt. 27, 33-50 (Mark 15, 21-41; Luke 22, 26-49; John 19, 17-30).

The four narratives of this greatest event in the world's history are dominated each by the writer's general purpose. Matthew depicts Jesus as the promised King. Mark brings out the Redeemer's universal lordship. Luke portrays the mighty working of his dying love on men's souls. John shows how the guilty Church killed their Christ, and yet attested his kingship in all their seeming triumph. The style of the gospels here calls for the deepest thought. There is nothing but the barest narrative, with reflections which never betray a note of indignation or pity. He was too great to be plighted, and the story would be safely left to produce its own effect. And how absolutely they discountenance the morbid realism which so constantly ruins reverence by a parade of horrors that cannot be good to look into! The early Church never tolerated a picture of the crucifixion, and surely they showed love as well as wisdom. In studying the relations of prophecy to this narrative we must remember that nearly all prophecies were strictly historical. Thus Psalms 22 and 69 depict the actual experience of their author (possibly Jeremiah). Sufferers in every age bore the "reproach of the Christ," and their sacred words reached their full meaning only when they were centered. In this sense all that was best in them was centered. In this sense there are true prophecies outside Scripture. Plato shows that if a man came from heaven with a mission to earth his story would be contemptuously rejected and himself slain (*Republic*, 7, 2; compare a yet closer parallel, 8, 5). And in chap. 9 of that masterpiece of literature, the Book of Wisdom, there is a passage so close to gospel history that many attribute the book to one who had heard our Lord. *VER. 33, Golgotha.* An Aramaic title, denoting a low, round-topped mound. The place was possibly selected as an insult to Joseph, Comp. John 19, 41 and Luke 23, 51. Note it was "without the gate," Heb. 13, 12. *VER. 34, Though the "gall"—which may mean something like poppy-juice—was here given mercifully to deaden suffering, it recalls to the evangelist the words of Ps. 69, 21. This slight mitigation was of course a Jewish custom. Rome scorned such tenderness. Perhaps the women of Luke 23, 27 brought it. Jesus refused the drink which would impair his consciousness; that which he took later was to restore natural forces. *VER. 35, Psa. 22, 18. The enemies of Jehovah's servant "bound" hand and foot (ibid., ver. 17, R. V., marg.), treated him as already dead. As usual here the words describe the usual custom at executions. The learned Jews might never have read the words which showed that their Messiah was even now the usual *titulus*, drawn up by Pilate especially to mock the priests, was fixed to the cross. It had been carried before Jesus to Golgotha. Perhaps John gives the Hebrew form, Luke the Latin, Mark the Greek, Matthew a combination. Thus was the crucified King proclaimed to the worlds of religion, empire, and culture.**

VER. 35, bas's b which with Jo This sa at his nling of dently ch.4.6, of blasp his wo cnes, a whose Time down." preach. VER. 43, crucifix "darkn eclipse, tine alo of that arrange -26; (4) (6) John Matthew by a diff cry, tha the utm not help he can s due to th invoked would n 48. One the soue merciful thirsh. Indicate show of The wor his spiri phrase,

Hints fo

Begin Pilate, s Pilate. condemn crucifix map of J Tower of Antonia the wall; to place of tradition cation or trest of yourself of the cross 4. Prayer needed nu this even People).

Referer
Place of
21: Stup