message, though it is difficult not to   
connect the two in the mind. The mention  
of him here is probably merely official—as  
the ‘first among equals’ We cannot say  
that others of the Apostles may not have  
denied their Master besides Peter.

It must not be concluded from this that  
we have a trace of Peter’s hand in the  
narrative.   
  
**8.]** The idea of our   
narrative here is, that the women *fled* in  
terror from the sepulchre, and *did not  
deliver the message at the time*,—for they  
were afraid. All attempts to reconcile  
this with the other Gospels are futile. It  
is a manifest evidence that our narrative  
is here suddenly broken off, and   
(perhaps?) that no more information about  
the women was in the possession of its  
author. The subsequent verses are quite  
disconnected from this; and contain the  
substance of their writer's information  
respecting the other appearances of the  
Lord.

**9–20.]** APPEARANCES OF JESUS AFTER  
HIS RESURRECTION: HIS ASCENSION. An  
addition to the narrative of a   
compendious and supplementary character, bear-  
ing traces of *another hand* from that  
which has shaped the diction and   
construction of the rest of the Gospel.

The reasons for and against this inference  
will be found in the various readings in my  
Greek Testament, and in the course of this  
note; and a general statement of them at  
the end of it. I may here state, for the  
English reader, that the passage is omitted,  
—or marked as suspicious, as variously  
given,—or asserted not to occur in the   
correct copies,—in many of our oldest   
authorities, It is quoted as early as Irenæus, in  
the 2nd century: but Jerome in the 3rd  
says that nearly “*all the Greek MSS. by  
his time did not contain it*. The legitimate   
inference is, that it was placed as a  
completion of the Gospel soon after the  
apostolic period,—the Gospel itself having  
been, for some reason unknown to us, eh  
incomplete.

**9.]** **the first day of the  
week** is remarkable as occurring so soon  
after the mention of it, ver. 2 (see Luke  
xviii. 12).

**out of whom he had cast...]**This notice, coming so late, *after the  
mention of Mary Magdalene in ver. 1*,  
is remarkable. The instances quoted by  
De Wette to shew that the unexpected  
introduction of notices contained in the  
other Gospels is in St. Mark’s manner, do  
not seem to me to apply here.

This  
verse agrees with John xx. 1 ff, but is  
unconnected with the former narrative in  
this chapter.

**10. went and...]** This  
idiom, *never used by St. Mark, is three times  
contained in this passage* (vv. 12, 15).

**them that had been with him**, though  
found in the Acts (xx. 18), *never occurs in  
the Gospels*: nor does the word “*disciples*”   
in this passage.

**11.]** See John  
xx. 18: Luke xxiv. 11.

**had been  
seen of** (by) **her** is a construction only  
found here in N. T., and the word here  
used for “*seen*” (which occurs again ver.  
14) is not used by Mark.

**believed  
not (disbelieved)** is only used in ver. 16  
and Luke xxiv. 11, 41, throughout the  
Gospels.

**12.] After that** is *not found  
i Mark*, though many opportunities   
occurred for using it. This verse epitomizes  
the events on the journey to Emmaus,  
Luke xxiv. 13–35.

**was manifested**... as they **walked**, though in *general*