xx.1–10. On the general difficulties of  
this portion of the Gospels, and my view  
respecting them, see notes on Matthew.

**1. when the sabbath was past]** It  
was strictly *when the Sabbath was ended*,  
i.e. at sunset, that they bought the spices.  
St. Luke xxiii. 55, places it on the evening  
*before* the Sabbath ; a slight but valuable  
discrepancy, as shewing the independence  
of the accounts. To suppose *two parties*  
of women (Greswell) or to take **bought**  
as *pluperfect* (as the A.V.) is equally  
arbitrary and unwarranted.

**anoint him]** This had not been done as yet.   
Nicodemus (John xix. 40) had only wrapped  
the Body hurriedly in the spices with the  
linen clothes.

**2. when the sun was risen]**   
This does not agree with Matthew,  
“*as it began to dawn toward the first day  
of the week*” —Luke, “*at early (or deep)  
dawn;*” or John, “w*hen it was yet dark:*”  
—nor indeed with “*very early in the morning*”   
of our narrative itself. If the sun  
was up, it would be between 6 and 7  
o’clock; which in the East especially,  
where even public business was transacted  
*very early*, could not be so called. Even  
Greswell virtually acknowledges a difficulty  
here.

**3, 4.]** It had been rolled away  
by an angel, Matthew.

{4} for it *was  
very great* is stated as a reason why *they  
could see that it was rolled away on   
looking up*, possibly at some distance. This  
explanation is according to St. Mark’s  
manner of describing minute   
circumstantial incidents; but to refer this clause  
  
back as the *reason why* they questioned  
who should remove the stone, is not only  
harsh, but inconsistent with the usage  
of this Gospel.

**5.] In Matthew**—an angel,   
sitting on the stone which he had  
rolled away. Here he is described *as he  
appeared*, and we are left to infer *what* he  
was. In Luke,—*two angels* appeared to  
them in the tomb. The incident to which  
these accounts point, must be distinct from  
that related John xx. 11, which was *after  
Mary Magdalene returned from the city*.  
It is not worth while to detail the attempts  
which have been made to reconcile these  
various reports of the incident: they   
present curious examples of the ingenuity, and  
(probably unconscious) disingenuousness,  
of the Harmonists. I may mention that  
Greswell supposes the angels in Matthew  
and Mark to be distinct, and accounts for  
**were affrighted** in our text thus: ‘After  
seeing one angel *without* already, they  
were probably less prepared than before  
to see another so soon after *within*.’

**6.]** From the **come** of St. Matthew, I should  
be inclined to think that his is the strictly  
accurate account. This word implies that  
the angel accompanied the women into  
the tomb: and if so, an imperfect   
narrative like that in the text might easily  
describe his whole appearance as taking  
place within.

**7.] But** breaks off the  
discourse and turns to a new matter—  
**But now rather** do ye...

**and Peter]**  
It is hardly perhaps likely that the  
*denial of Peter* was the ground of this