it was the *third hour* when they crucified  
Him. If so, He had been on the cross  
three hours, which in *April* would answer  
to about the same space of time in our  
day—i.e. from 9—12 A.M. On the difficulty presented by St. John’s declaration ch. xix. 14, see notes there and on Mark.

**darkness**—this was no *eclipse of  
the sun,* for it was *full moon* at the time —nor any partial obscuration of the sun such as sometimes takes place before an  
earthquake—for it is clear that no *earthquake in the ordinary sense of the word* is here intended. Those whose belief leads  
them to reflect WHO was then suffering,  
will have no difficulty in accounting for  
these signs of sympathy in Nature, nor in  
seeing their applicability. The consent, in  
the same words, of all three Evangelists,  
must silence all question as to the universal  
belief of this darkness as a *fact;* and the  
early Fathers appeal to the testimony of  
profane authors for its truth. The omission of it in St. John’s Gospel is of no more weight than the numerous other instances of such omission. See Amos viii. 9, 10.

**over all the earth**] The *same word* in the original is rendered  
*earth* in Luke, but *land* here and in Mark.  
This would seem to be pure caprice on the  
part of our translators; and might mislead. Whether these words are to be taken in all their strictness is doubtful. Of course,  
over the *whole globe* the darkness would not  
be supernatural—as it would be night *naturally over half of it.* The question is, are we to understand t*hat part of it over which  
there was day?* I believe *we are;* but  
see no strong objection to any limitation,  
provided *the fact itself,* as happening at  
Jerusalem, is *distinctly recognized.* This  
last is *matter of testimony,* and the three  
Evangelists are *pledged to its truth:* the  
present words hardly stand on the same  
ground, not being matter of *testimony* properly so called.

**46.**] See Ps. xxii. 1, The words are Chaldee, and not  
Hebrew. Our Lord spoke them in the ordinary dialect, not in that of the sacred text itself. The weightiest question is,  
*In what sense did He use them?* His  
inner consciousness of union with God  
must have been complete and indestructible—but, like His higher and holy will, liable to be obscured by human weakness  
and pain, which at this time was at its  
very highest. We must however take  
care not to ascribe *all* his suffering to  
*bodily pain,* however cruel: his *soul was  
tn immediate contact with ‘and prospect  
of death—the wages of sin,* which He had  
*taken on Him, but never committed*—and  
the conflict at Gethsemane was renewed.  
‘He himself,’ as the Berlenberg Bible remarks (Stier), ‘becomes the expositor of the darkness, and shews what it imports.’  
In the words however, *‘My God’*—there  
speaks the same union with the divine Will,  
and abiding in the everlasting covenant purpose, as in those, ‘Not my will, but thine.’

These are the only words on the Cross  
related by St. Matt. and St. Mark—and they  
are related by none besides.

**47.**] This was not said by the *Roman soldiers,*  
who could know nothing of Elias; nor  
was it *a misunderstanding* of the Jewish  
spectators, who must have well understood the import of Eli, nor again was it said in any apprehension, from the supernatural darkness, that Elias *might really come;* but it **was** replied in *intended  
mockery,* as the contemptuous **This man,**  
—‘this one among the three,’—clearly  
indicates.

This is one of the cases where those who advocate an original  
Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are obliged  
to suppose that the Greek translator has  
*retained the original words,* in order to  
make the reason of the reply clear.

**48.**] This was on account of the words  
*‘I thirst,’* uttered by our Lord: see John,  
ver. 28. St. Mark’s account is somewhat  
different: there *the same person* gives the  
vinegar and utters the scoff which follows.  
This is quite intelligible—contempt mingied with pity would doubtless find a type