of the historical truth of the event, will  
not be likely to take this as one; but to us,  
who are firmly convinced of it, every such  
trace, provided it be soberly and honest  
ascertained, is full of interest.

**52,53.**] {52} The whole transaction was *supernatural* and *symbolic:* no other interpretation of it will satisfy even ordinary  
common sense. Was the earthquake a  
*mere coincidence?* This not even those  
assert, who deny all symbolism in the  
matter. Was it a mere *sign of divine  
wrath* at what was done—a mere *prodigy,*like those at the death of Cæsar? Surely  
no Christian believer can think this. Then  
*what was it?* What but the *opening of  
the tombs*—the symbolic declaration, that  
*the Death* which bad happened had broken  
the bands of death for ever? These following clauses, which have no mythical nor apocryphal character, require this  
explanation to be fully understood. The  
graves were opened *at the moment of  
the death* of the Lord; but inasmuch as  
He is the firstfruits from the dead—  
*the* Resurrection and the Life—the bodies  
of the saints in them *did not arise till  
He rose,* and having appeared to many  
after his resurrection,—possibly during  
the forty days,—went up with Him into  
His glory. Moses and Elias, who were  
before in glory, were not *from the dead,*properly speaking: see note on ch. xvii. 1.

**arose** is the *result*—not the *immediate accompaniment,* of the opening of  
the tombs. {53} It is to prevent this being  
supposed, that the qualification **after his  
resurrection** is added.

**54.**] **the earthquake and those that were done** is  
represented by *“that he so gave up the  
ghost,”* Mark. Does the latter of these  
look as if compiled from the former? The  
circumstances of our vv. 51—53, except the  
rending of the veil, are not in the possession St. Mark, of the minute accuracy of whose account I have no doubt. *His*  
report is that of *one man—*and that man,  
more than probably, a *convert*. St. Matthew’s is of *many,* and represents their general impression. St. Luke’s is also  
*general.*

**those things that were done** points to the crying out, as indeed  
does the “*so*” in Mark:—but see notes  
there.

**was the Son of God**—which  
the Centurion had heard that *He gare  
Himself out for,* John xix. 7, and our ver.

43. It cannot be doubtful, I think, that  
he used these words *in the Jewish sense—*and with some idea of that which they  
implied. When Meyer says that he must  
have used them in a heathen sense, meaning a *hero or demigod,* we must first be shewn that *“Son of God”* was *ever so used.* I believe St. Luke’s to be a different report: see notes there.

**55, 56.**] {56} **Magdalene** from **Magdala** : see note on ch.xv. 39. She is not to be confounded with Mary who anointed our Lord, John xii. 1,  
nor with the woman who did the same,  
Luke vii. 36: see Luke viii. 2.

**Mary the mother of James . . . .**] The wife of  
Alphæus or Clopas, John xix. 25: see note  
on ch. xiii. 55.

Mark adds *“the less”* to distinguish him from the brother of our  
Lord (probably not from the son of Zebedee).

**The mother of the sons of Zebedee** (i. e. of James and John: not *“of Zebedee’s children,”* as **A.V.** curiously renders it)]  
*Salome,* Mark. Both *omit Mary the mother of Jesus* :—but we must remember,  
that if we are to take the group as  
described at this moment, *she was not  
present,* having been, as I believe (see note  
on John, ver. 27), **led away** by the beloved  
Apostle immediately on the speaking of  
the words, ‘Behold thy mother.’ And if