brings examples to shew that the same was  
the custom of the Romans.

**32.**] Previously, Jesus had *borne his own cross:*  
John, ver. 17. We have no data to ascertain any further particulars about this Simon of Cyrene. The only assumption  
which we are perhaps justified in making,  
is that he **was** afterwards known in the  
Church **as** a convert: see note on Mark,  
ver. 21. He *was coming from the country,* Mark, ibid.; Luke, ver. 26. Meyer  
suggests, to account for the selection of  
one out of the multitude present, that possibly **he was a slave;** the indignity of the service to be rendered Preventing their  
taking any other person.

**33.**] **Golgotha,** a skull: the name is by Jerome,  
and generally, explained from its being  
the usual place of executions, and *abounding with skulls—*not however *unburied,* which was not allowed. This last consideration raises an objection to the explanation,—and as the name does not  
import a *place* of **skulls,** but a *place of* a skull or simply **a skull** (Luke), many understand it as applying to the *shape*  
of the hill or rock. But neither does this  
seem satisfactory, as we have no analogy  
to guide us, and no such hill or rock is  
known to have existed. As regards the *situation,* we await some evidence  
which may decide between the conflicting  
claims of the commonly-received site of  
Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and that  
upheld by Mr. Ferguson, who holds that  
the Dome of the Rock, usually known as  
the Mosque of Omar, is in reality the spot  
of our Lord’s entombment. See his Article “Jerusalem” in Dr. Smith’s Biblical Dictionary: and on the other side, Williams’s Holy City, and Stanley’s Sinai and Palestine, edn. 3, p. 459 ff.

**34.**] It was customary to give a stupefying drink  
to criminals on their way to execution:  
of which our Lord would not partake,  
having shewn by tasting it, that he was  
aware of its purpose.

In St. Mark’s account it is *“wine mingled with myrrh”*—and though *wine* and *vinegar* might mean  
the same thing, *myrrh* and *gall* cannot.  
We may observe here (and if the remark  
be applied with caution and reverence, it  
is a most useful one), how St. Matt. often  
adopts in his narrative *the very words of  
prophecy,* where one or more of the other  
Evangelists give the matter of fact detail ;  
see above on ch. xxvi. 15, and compare  
with this verse, Ps. lxix. 21.

**35—38.**] HE IS CRUCIFIED, Mark xv,  
24—28. Luke xxiii. 32—34, 38. John xix.  
18—24. The four accounts are distinct  
from one another, and independent of any  
one source in common.

**35. they crucified him**] The cross was an upright  
pale or beam, intersected by a transverse  
one at right angles, generally in the  
shape of a T. In this case, from the ‘title’  
being placed *over the Head,* the upright  
beam probably projected above the horizontal one, as usually represented ✝,  
To this cross, the criminal, being stripped  
of his clothes, was fixed by nails driven  
through the hands and (not always, nor  
perhaps generally, though certainly not  
seldom — see note at Luke xxiv. 39) through  
the feet, separate or united. The body  
was not *supported by* the nails, but by a  
piece of wood which passed between the  
legs. On the rest of the verse, see notes  
on John. The words omitted in the text  
as not found in *any of the ancient  
manuscripts,* are clearly interpolated from  
John, ver. 24, with just the phrase *which  
was spoken by the prophet* assimilated  
to St. Matthew's usual form of citation.

**36.**] **watched him**—this was usual,  
to prevent the friends taking crucified  
persons down. There were *four* soldiers,  
John, ver. 23; a centurion and three others.

**37.**] St. Matthew finishes relating  
what the soldiers did, and then goes back  
to the course of the narrative. The ‘title’