

appear to be tattooed with the mark or letter *yôd* in Aramaic upon the right hand—a practice which was very familiar throughout the east, although these details are novel.¹

There are numerous points upon which one is tempted to enlarge, but perhaps enough has been said to demonstrate the very great importance of the papyri not merely for the philologist, but for the biblical student. It is a very real gain to be able to obtain some idea of the conditions under which the Jews lived in the fifth century, and these most welcome finds throw much light upon the life and custom of fifth century Judaism. For we may not unreasonably expect that the evidence which is gradually being collected, whether in Egypt or in Babylonia, will enable us to understand the internal conditions in Palestine itself, and the mere fact that these *business* documents have come to light inspires the hope that other papyri, perhaps of more vital importance, may yet be discovered in the near future. And, obviously, if Egypt can furnish such evidence as this, where the Jews formed only a portion of the population, what may we not expect when more excavation has been undertaken in Palestine itself, when this country, which has allowed itself to lag behind, wakes up and shows a more practical interest in the efforts to recover the secrets hidden in the soil of the Holy Land?

GOLGOTHA ON MOUNT ZION.

By the REV. W. F. BIRCH, M.A.

LOVE for truth compels me to show that "The place of a skull" was on the ridge of Mount Zion (the eastern ridge), east of the Damascus Gate. Biblical evidence is decisive on this point. The traditional site seems to have been evolved from a radical error of mischievous Josephus, who shuns the term *Zion*, and, using the term *City of David* only *once*, frequently for it substitutes *Jerusalem*.

That deep interest is still taken in the position of Golgotha is clear from the 250 pages that here have treated of the subject, and from Sir Charles Wilson's recent work on Golgotha, a very armoury for controversialists.

¹ For the use of words or letters as "wasms," reference may be made to the *Q.S.*, 1902, p. 308.

It is admitted that the New Testament does not decide the site. Let the Old Testament therefore speak. One prophecy quoted by priests and scribes satisfied Herod where the Christ should be born : several prophecies have to do with details of the Crucifixion. Would it not be strange if the Old Testament contained no information, ever so obscure, as to the place of either the Crucifixion or Burial or Resurrection of Christ? Surely Christians will not out-Herod Herod by interdicting prophecy on a point of Biblical topography. Yet, since I reflect that some do not see its force, let me proceed cautiously by slow steps, although Butler says "Prophecy is nothing but the history of events before they come to pass."

(1.) I take for a foundation (all here agree) that the four Evangelists place Golgotha near Jerusalem, outside the walls (*i.e.*, the first and second) and probably close to a main road.

(2.) Sir C. Wilson (*Golgotha*, p. 120) writes : "If there be anything in the idea of type and antitype—and there possibly may be—then Christ must have suffered north of the altar, possibly on the eastern slope of that portion of Mount Moriah known as Bezetha." This is virtually the position named above and in *Quarterly Statement*, 1891, p. 255, except as to "eastern."

(3.) *Isaac laid on the altar*. Here is an apparent instance of type and antitype. Alford says (on Heb. xi, 19), "Undeniable as is the typical reference of the whole occurrence to Christ." Josephus twice identifies Mount Moriah (the site of the Temple) with the place of Isaac's altar, while some Christians have located it on one of the mountains of Jerusalem. Stanley's position for it on Gerizim is strangely wrong (*Quarterly Statement*, 1880, p. 103). That the scene of this stupendous transaction in Abraham's life was near Jerusalem seems to me to be beyond question. Some details appear to be typical—as Isaac's carrying the wood, the ram's horns entangled in the thicket, and the two servants (like "two witnesses") beholding afar off by the main north road, or way, which passed over against Jebus.

But it may be urged that the type is incomplete *topographically*, as Golgotha was not on the site of the Temple. To this difficulty I once could only have replied that the Jews, for the greater glory of their Temple, attached to it the story of Isaac's sacrifice; consequently, great was the satisfaction with which I read (*Golgotha*, p. 199): "it was at first the intention to build the Temple on the mount which overlooks Mount Moriah." It is evident that the

sacred story belonging to the intended site, the true site of Isaac's altar, the mount higher than Moriah, was (as was likely) transferred to the actual Temple. Truly, type and antitype are not to be left out of account. I cheerfully admit them, but do not present them to others here as part of the prophetical evidence.

(4.) It was in the Temple that the words were quoted, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner." On the north was the eminence of Bezetha containing the subterranean quarries in which ("in the mountain," 2 Chron. ii, 18) were hewn the royal stones for Solomon's Temple; some faulty ones might still be lying rejected underground, or even on the surface of the hill. If so, here again was type. Easily, then, might the fancy pass into the suspicion that Bezetha might be the site of Golgotha. Thus the typical was preparing me for the prophetical.

(5.) The first prophecy I take from Isaiah xxv, 6-8: "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast. . . . And he will destroy in this mountain. . . . the veil that is spread over all nations. He hath swallowed up death for ever." See also v. 10: "For in this mountain shall the hand of the Lord rest," etc. One day, on reading this, I saw with some degree of surprise at my former inattention, that the feast, destruction of the mourning veil, and swallowing up of death are twice connected with *this mountain*, obviously the Mount Zion of xxiv, 23, and subsequently that while the *swallowing up* in 1 Cor. xv, 54, is future, 2 Tim. i, 10, speaks of Christ who abolished death (past tense). Even if this be (as some may say) only equivalent to "began to abolish," etc., still the important point remains that the act was to begin *in this mountain, i.e., Zion*. Now the veil of ignorance as to the site of Golgotha was being taken away. I asked myself: has Isaiah thus foretold the position of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, and have I been blind to it? Have I now made a great discovery or a gross mistake? Neither. Already, since 1832, it was in type that, "It should seem that all the great things which God promised to the world were to be transacted upon that spot" (*i.e., Mount Zion*).

(6.) Was this the only text, or were there others teaching this truth about Zion? One had not far to search. Isaiah xxviii, 16, says: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious (*ἐκλεκτόν*, LXX) corner stone," etc. I had learned from the Old Testament that Zion was always the *eastern* hill, and (4) above showed that Christ was the stone. Whether the prophet

referred to the great event of Good Friday or Easter Day made topographically no difference, since the Tomb was in (or near) Golgotha. It is remarkable, however, that St. Paul (Rom. ix, 33) and 1 Peter ii, 6, make the same variation from LXX, substituting *τίθῃμι ἐν Σιών* for *ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὸ θεμέλιον Σιών*, while in the Gospel accounts of Christ's burial, the verb *τίθῃμι* occurs several times.

(7.) Psalm ii gave a still more striking prophecy: "Why do the nations rage, and the peoples imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers," etc. (*vs.* 1, 2). "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion" (*v.* 6). "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son; This day have I begotten thee" (*v.* 7). As in Acts iv, 25-27, St. Peter quotes *vs.* 1, 2, and adds, "For of a truth in this city against thy holy servant Jesus . . . both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles . . . were gathered together," and as St. Paul, Acts xiii, 33, quotes *v.* 7: "He raised up Jesus, as also it is written in the second psalm, 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee,'" it is obvious that the earlier verses describe the great events of Good Friday, and the last verse that of Easter Day, *i.e.*, the Resurrection. I fail to see on what ground I can refuse to admit that the intermediate verse (*v.* 6) with its topographical statement, "Yet I have set my king *upon my holy hill of Zion*," must be intermediate or within these limits as to both time and place. The question of figurative language does not here come in (so far as I can see). The first and last verses describe actual admitted facts, so must the words "set my king upon Mount Zion." On the one day, the title was conspicuous on Golgotha: "This is Jesus, the king of the Jews." On the other, He was seen near the tomb by Mary Magdalen. As to the body of Christ according to the Psalmist it (or He) was on Mount Zion during the period when, according to the Evangelists, it (or He) was on or near Golgotha. It follows, therefore, that Golgotha had to do with Mount Zion, the eastern hill, and was not situated across a valley to the south-west. In other words, as stated in the heading, "Golgotha was on Mount Zion," and the traditional site (the Church of the Holy Sepulchre) is consequently wrong. The mistake, I believe, is due to Josephus. As it is not apparent to me where my calculation errs, I hope no one who may detect a fallacy will hesitate to point it out. Meanwhile, if Micah v satisfied Herod the King, Psalm ii ought (in my opinion) to satisfy, topographically, a thoughtful Christian.

(*To be continued.*)