among the bystanders. There is no need for  
assuming that the *soldiers offering vinegar*in Luke, ver. 37, is the same incident as  
this. Since then, the bodily state of the  
Redeemer had greatly changed: and what  
was then offered in mockery, might well  
be now asked for in the agony of death,  
and received when presented. I would  
not however absolutely deny that St. Luke  
*may* be giving a less precise detail;  
and may represent this incident by his  
ver.37. The **vinegar** is the *posca,* sour  
wine, or vinegar and water, the ordinary  
drink of the Roman soldiers. On the other  
particulars, see notes on John.

**49.**] we take our account as the strictly  
precise one, the *rest*—in mockery—*call  
upon this person* to desist, and wait for  
Elias to come and save Him: if that of  
St. Mark, *the giver of the drink calls wpon  
the rest* (also in veers) to let this  
suffice, or to let *him* (the giver) alone,  
and wait, &c. The former seems more  
probable.

**50.**] It has been doubted  
whether **it is finished** of John (ver. 50),  
and **Father, into thy hands I commend  
my spirit** of Luke (ver. 46), are to be  
*identified with this crying out,* or to be  
taken as *distinct from it.* But a nearer  
examination of the case will set the doubt  
at rest. The *“delivered up”* of John (ib.)  
*implies the speech in Luke;* which accordingly was that uttered in this *loud voice.*“*It is finished”* was said before ; see notes  
on John.

**51-56.**] SIGNS FOLLOWING HIS DEATH.  
Mark xv. 38—41. Luke xxiii. 47—49. The  
three narratives are essentially distinct.  
That of St. Luke is more general—giving  
only the *sense* of the centurion’s words—  
twice using the indefinite *“all”*—and  
not specifying the women. The whole is  
omitted by St. John.

**51.**] The **behold** gives solemnity.

This **was** the *inner veil,* screening off the holy of holies from  
a holy place, Exod. xxvi. 33: Heb. ix. 2, 3.  
This circumstance has given rise to  
much incredulous comment, and that even  
from men like Schleiermacher. A right  
and deep view of the O. T. symbolism  
is required to furnish the key to it; and  
for this we look in vain among those who  
*set aside that symbolism entirely.*

That was now accomplished, which was  
the one and great antitype of all those  
sacrifices offered in the hole place, *in order  
to gain,* as on the great day of atonement  
(for that day may be taken as the representation their intent), *entrance into the holiest place,*—the *typical presence of  
God.* What those sacrifices (ceremonially)  
procured for the Jews (the type of God's  
universal Church) through their High  
Priest, was now (really) procured for it  
men by the sacrifice of Him, who was  
at once the victim and the High Priest.  
When the objectors assert that no use  
is made of this event in the Epistle to  
the Hebrews, they surely cannot have  
remembered, or not have deeply considered, Heb. x. 19—21. Besides, suppose it *had* been referred to plainly and  
by name—what would then have been  
said? Clearly, that *this* mention was *a  
later insertion to justify that reference.*  
And *almost* this latter, Strauss, *recognizing the allusion in Heb.,* actually does. Schleiermacher **also asks,** *how could the  
event be known,* seeing none but priests  
could have witnessed it, and they would  
not be likely to betray it? To say nothing of the *almost certain spread of the rumour,* has he forgotten that (Acts vi. 7)  
*“a great company of the priests* were  
obedient unto the faith ?” Neander, who  
gives this last consideration its weight  
(but only as a possibility, that *some* priests  
may have become converts, and apparently  
without reference to the above fact), has  
an unworthy and shuffling note (L. J.  
p. 757), ending by quoting two testimonies, one apocryphal, the other rabbinical, from which he concludes that ‘ *some*  
matter of fact lies at the foundation ’ of  
this (according to him) *mythical adjunct,*

**the earth did quake**—not an ordinary earthquake, but connected with the  
two next clauses, and finding in them its  
explanation and justification.

**the rocks rent**] It would not be right altogether to reject the testimonies of travellers to the fact of extraordinary rents  
and fissures in the rocks near the spot.  
Of course those who know no other proof