

Another prophet had asked : " O death, where is thy sting ? O grave, where is thy victory ? " (Hos. xiii. 14), as he thought of the irresistible might of Jehovah. But the secret of the victory is clearer now. It is " through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Having this hope, be steadfast, for earthly labour is not in vain, if it be " in the Lord " (v. 58). Every act and thought leaves its trace ; it affects that *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, which is, as it were, the seed of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, the companion of the spirit in the world which flesh and blood cannot inherit.

J. H. BERNARD.

### THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

#### VI.

#### CREDIBILITY *contd.*—THE POST-RESURRECTION APPEARANCES.

IT is the testimony of all the New Testament witnesses—of the Gospels, of the Book of Acts, of St. Paul—that Jesus did appear to His disciples after His Resurrection. It was not simply the voices of angels proclaiming to the women that He had risen—not even the eloquent fact of the empty tomb—which produced in the disciples the immovable conviction that their Master had indeed burst the bands of death, and lived to die no more.<sup>1</sup> They believed, and unitedly testified, that they had seen Him, conversed with Him, eaten and drunk with Him ;<sup>2</sup> could give place, and date, and names, to His appearances to them. Often in the primitive circles, while the Apostles were still in their midst at Jerusalem, must the story of the time, occasion

<sup>1</sup> The reports of the women and of others were at first received with incredulity (Mark xvi. 11, 13, 14 ; Luke xxiv. 11).

<sup>2</sup> Acts x. 41.

and manner of the chief of these manifestations, and of the incidents connected with them, have been recited.

There is a point here, it should be noted in passing, in which the weakness of the assault on the testimony for the Resurrection is specially apparent. The assumption, practically, of the hostile critics of that testimony is that the Church had no history; that it knew nothing, really, of its own past; that myths and legends grew up in rank abundance, and were everywhere eagerly received; that the writers of the Gospels had no scrupulous conscience for truth, but imagined, manipulated and altered their materials at pleasure.<sup>1</sup> Any Church of our own day could give a good account of its origin, and of the events in its history, say, for the past fifty years. But the Churches founded by the Apostles—even the Mother-Church at Jerusalem—are believed to have had no such capability. The early believers had a different opinion of their knowledge and responsibility,<sup>2</sup> and of their ability to discern between true and false. They were not so ready as the objectors imagine to be imposed on by “cunningly devised fables.”<sup>3</sup> The Church to which they belonged had a continuous history; they *thought* they knew how it originated, on what facts it was based, who were its early witnesses, and to what they testified; and they told their story without doubt or hesitation.

This witness which the Apostles bore had nothing vague or intangible about it. It was in large part full, detailed, circumstantial. It was not “appearances” simply, but prolonged interviews, that were alleged. The testimony must be treated in view of the actual circumstances and relations between persons in the Apostolic community—

<sup>1</sup> This is really the assumption, e.g., underlying the Abbé Loisy's newly published *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 15.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Peter i. 16.

another point often overlooked. When, e.g., it is argued, as by Weizsäcker,<sup>1</sup> that, when the author of the Acts makes St. Peter say, "We ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead,"<sup>2</sup> he employs a mode of representing the Risen Christ impossible to St. Paul, it has to be asked whether St. Luke, who accompanied St. Paul for so many years, would have ventured to put into the mouths of St. Peter and of St. Paul himself<sup>3</sup> such speeches as are found in Acts, if they had been wholly alien to the Apostles' belief and testimony.<sup>4</sup> We are brought here, in short, to the alternative: either narratives of the kind must be dismissed as wilful fiction, for unconscious legend is impossible in face of the knowledge which the Church possessed of its own beginnings; or if they are allowed to rest on original authentic tradition, they can leave no doubt upon the mind that Jesus was believed to have risen and to have appeared in bodily reality to His disciples.

The fact, however, as before, remains, and has now to be dealt with, that the narratives of the Resurrection appearances *are* challenged, and, line by line, point by point, the story which they tell is sought to be discredited. The grounds on which this is done are various. It is objected that the Gospels give different versions of these appearances, and that none gives *all* the appearances; that the evidence, even if allowed, is not of a kind to satisfy the demands of science—Renan, e.g., asks that the miracle of resurrection be performed before "a commission composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism," and be repeated as often as desired;<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Apost. Age*, i. p. 10. Thus also Loisy, ii. p. 772.

<sup>2</sup> Acts x. 41.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Acts xiii. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Weizsäcker does not, of course, admit St. Luke's authorship of the Acts. His argument breaks down for every one who does.

<sup>5</sup> *Vie de Jésus*, Introd. pp. i., ii.

that Jesus appeared to none but His own disciples ; that legends of resurrection are not uncommon, and are explicable from natural tendencies of the mind.<sup>1</sup> To all which it is sufficient at present to reply that the evidence was not designed to satisfy scientific experts,<sup>2</sup> but to produce faith in those "chosen before of God,"<sup>3</sup> that they might be "witnesses" to others ; and that, as observed earlier, it is not here proposed to set up *a priori* demands for evidence, but to examine carefully what evidence we have, and to ask whether, with what else is known of Jesus, it is not sufficient to sustain the faith that He is risen from the dead, nay—to shut us up to that faith as the only reasonable explanation of the facts.

It is desirable to begin in this inquiry by collecting the evidence for the appearances, and considering generally the value to be attached to the same. The several appearances can then be discussed in order.

There *were*, as already said, appearances of the Risen Jesus, or what were taken to be such, to His followers. St. Paul's list in 1 Corinthians xv. 3–8 is allowed even by the most sceptical to afford unassailable testimony on this head.<sup>4</sup> It is further implied in the accounts, and is generally conceded, that these appearances extended over a considerable time—at least some days or weeks. St. Luke states the

<sup>1</sup> "Heroes," Renan declares, "do not die." "At the moment when Mohammed expired Omar issued from the tent sabre in hand, and declared he would strike off the head of any one who would dare to say that the Prophet was no more" (*Les Apôtres*, p. 3). But heroes *do* die, and the parallel is without relevance. Mohammed's followers never seriously claimed that the Prophet did not die, or had risen from the dead. There is no instance in history, apart from Christianity, of a religion established on belief in the Resurrection of its Founder. This is discussed later.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Luke xvi. 30, 31. A mere intellectual conviction, even if produced, would have been of no avail for the end proposed.

<sup>3</sup> Acts x. 40–1.

<sup>4</sup> Strauss, *New Life of Jesus* i. p. 400. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. ix. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Age*, ch. i. Keim, *Jesus of Nazare*, vi. p. 279 and generally.

period at "forty days."<sup>1</sup> "In Matthew," Strauss says, "the appearance of Jesus upon the mountain in Galilee must be supposed to have taken place long enough after the Resurrection to give time for the disciples to return back from Jerusalem to Galilee."<sup>2</sup> St. Paul<sup>3</sup> and St. John likewise assume a considerable period during which Jesus was manifested to His disciples. The chronological datum of St. Luke in Acts i. 3 must be allowed to rule the interpretation of the obviously condensed ("foreshortened") account of the closing chapter of his Gospel. Events, as will be seen later, are there compressed which were afterwards to be narrated more in detail.

Furthermore, the witnesses to the appearances of Jesus are *many*, and all, it can be claimed, are entitled to be heard with a presumption of their honesty and credibility. Only leading points need be recalled. It was before stated that St. John is here unhesitatingly accepted as an eye-witness. St. Mark was the companion of St. Peter. St. Luke was the companion of St. Paul, and a zealous investigator on his own account.<sup>4</sup> St. Paul had direct communication with St. Peter, St. James, St. John and other members of the original Apostolic company.<sup>5</sup> St. Matthew is believed to be connected with at least the original of his Gospel—to stand in a real way behind it. The Appendix to St. Mark is yet an unsolved problem. The fact that it appears in nearly all extant MSS. and versions<sup>6</sup> points to

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 3.      <sup>2</sup> *Ut supra*, ii. p. 420.

<sup>3</sup> Renan finds in 1 Cor. xv. 3-8 evidence of "the long duration of the appearances." Cf. Acts xiii. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Luke i. 1-4.

<sup>5</sup> Gal. i. 18, 19, ii. 1, 9; Acts ix. 26-7.

<sup>6</sup> The section (chap. xvi. 9-20) is absent, as is well known, from Cod. Sin. and Cod. Vat., from Syr. Sin., from some Armenian and Ethiopic MSS., etc.; on the other hand, "it is supported by the vast majority of uncials," "by the cursives in a body," by all lectionaries and most versions (cf. art. : "Mark" in *Hastings' Dict. of Bible*, iii. p. 252). On the adverse patristic testimony, see Burgon, chap. v.

a very early date, and perhaps to a close relation with St. Mark himself. It does not seem warranted to regard it as simply a summary of incidents based on St. Luke and St. John.<sup>1</sup> It does not show linguistic dependence on the other Gospels; furnishes original (Mark-like) details; bears generally the stamp of a distinct and authentic tradition.<sup>2</sup>

The *amplitude* and *weight* of the evidence will best be seen by a survey of its particulars as furnished by these various witnesses:—

1. St. Mark breaks off at chapter xvi. 8, but in verse 7 forecasts a meeting of Jesus with the disciples in Galilee, as Jesus had foretold.<sup>3</sup> This is evidently the collective meeting which St. Matthew narrates.

2. St. Matthew narrates the meeting in Galilee (on "the mountain where Jesus had appointed them"),<sup>4</sup> but tells also of an appearance to the women on the morning of the Resurrection. The Galilean meeting, with its great commission, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations," etc., is the objective of St. Matthew's Gospel, and to it he hastens without pausing on intermediate events. Yet the fact that he relates the appearance of the women (in which that to Mary Magdalene may be merged),<sup>5</sup> shows

<sup>1</sup> Keim describes it unjustly as "a violent attempt at adjustment between Mark and Luke—John, between Galilee and Jerusalem" (vi. p. 318). The incidents in the Appendix must all have been well known in the early circles to which St. Mark (son of the Mary in whose home the Church met for worship, Acts xii. 12) belonged.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Latham (*Risen Master*, pp. 202-3) is a little hard on the Appendix in fastening on its emphasis of "unbelief" (vers. 11, 16). It is precisely in St. Mark and St. Matthew that the emphasis is laid on *ἀπιστία* (Mark vi. 6, ix. 24; Matt. xiii. 58, xvii. 20); St. Luke uses the verb in chap. xxiv. 11, 41. On upbraiding, cf. Luke xxiv. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mark xiv. 28; Matt. xxvi. 32. "After I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee."

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxviii. 16-20. Regarding this "appointment" the Gospels are silent. Only the promise is given: "There shall ye see Him [Me]" (Matt. xxviii. 7, 10; Mark xvi. 7).

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xxviii. 9, 10. Cf. John xx, 14-17.

that the appointed meeting was not held to exclude earlier appearances.

3. St. Luke has a rich store of original tradition, confined, however, to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. While St. Matthew concentrates on the meeting in Galilee, St. Luke is chiefly interested in the appearances on the Resurrection day and in Jerusalem, as leading up to the promise of the Spirit and the Ascension at Bethany. His accounts include an appearance to St. Peter,<sup>1</sup> the appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus,<sup>2</sup> an appearance to the eleven in the evening<sup>3</sup>—these all on Easter Day—finally, a meeting, more fully reported in Acts, on the day of Ascension.<sup>4</sup> Nothing is said of appearances in Galilee, though ample room is left for these, if indeed they are not implied, in the “forty days” of Acts i. 3.<sup>5</sup>

4. St. John, writing, it is to be remembered, with knowledge of the other Gospels, gives additional valuable information concerning the events of the Resurrection morning, and records, besides the appearance to Mary Magdalene in the garden,<sup>6</sup> an appearance to the assembled disciples that same evening,<sup>7</sup> another appearance to the eleven eight days after,<sup>8</sup> and an appearance to seven disciples some time later, at the Lake of Galilee.<sup>9</sup> St. John’s narratives abound in minute touches which only personal knowledge could impart.

5. St. Paul’s list in 1 Corinthians xv. 3–8—the earliest written testimony, and of undoubted genuineness—covers a wide area. It leaves unnoticed the appearances to the women, but enumerates an appearance to St. Peter, one to the “twelve” (more strictly “the eleven”),<sup>10</sup> one to over five

<sup>1</sup> Luke xxiv. 34. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 5.   <sup>2</sup> Luke xxv. 13, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Vers. 33–43.   <sup>4</sup> Vers. 50, 51; cf. Acts i. 4–12.

<sup>5</sup> “Appearing to them by the space of forty days” (Acts i. 3).

<sup>6</sup> John xx. 14–17.

<sup>7</sup> John xx. 19–25.   <sup>8</sup> Vers. 26–28.   <sup>9</sup> John xxi. 1–14.

<sup>10</sup> Professor Lake says: “‘The twelve’ is the title of a body of men who were originally twelve in number, but it had become a conventional name, and bore no necessary relation to the actual number” (p. 37).

hundred brethren at once, the majority of them still living, one to St. James, and yet another to all the Apostles. To this series St. Paul adds, as of equal validity with the rest, the appearance to himself.

One point about this list is of interest in connexion with the question of "silence" in the Gospels. St. Luke was St. Paul's companion. Apart from what he must often have heard from St. Paul's own lips, he was undoubtedly familiar with this Epistle to the Corinthians, with its enumeration of appearances. Yet in his Gospel and in Acts he omits all mention of the great appearance to the five hundred brethren at once (probably to be identified with St. Matthew's Galilean meeting), and of the appearance to St. James.<sup>1</sup> This bears also on the point of the Evangelist's supposed ignorance in his Gospel of any longer interval than a single day between the Resurrection and the Ascension.<sup>2</sup> How, it may be asked, was this possible, in view of the explicit testimony of St. Paul, known to St. Luke, to Christ's numerous appearances? Acts i. makes it plain that St. Luke did know.

6. Lastly, the Appendix to St. Mark contains brief notices of *three* of the above appearances—the appearance to Mary Magdalene, that to the two disciples, and an appearance to the eleven.<sup>3</sup> It is probable that, as in St. Luke, this one appearance to the eleven is made to stand for all, and that some of the injunctions attached to it really belong to other meetings.

In estimating the *value* of this range of testimony, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the remarks of Godet on this point in his *Com. on St. Luke*, E.T., ii. p. 363.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Strauss, Weizsäcker, Keim, etc., but also Meyer, Alford and others. Surely, however, it is evident of itself that St. Luke could not suppose that the journey to Bethany, and the Ascension (chap. xxiv. 50, 51) took place late at night after a crowded day, and the prolonged evening meeting detailed in vers. 39–49. See next paper.

<sup>3</sup> Mark xvi. 9–20.

following points are of significance. It will be seen—(1) that, while certain of the appearances depend on one witness, most are doubly or even triply attested; (2) that, while of one or two we have only brief notices, of most there are detailed accounts; (3) that, if the narratives are at all to be trusted, they leave no room for doubt as to the Resurrection of the Lord in the body. Special weight in this connexion must be attached to the testimony of St. John and St. Paul—one a personal witness, the other basing on first-hand communications. It is of interest, accordingly, to note how large a part of the entire case is covered by the testimony of these two. Thus St. John attests: (1) the appearance to Mary Magdalene, whose summons brought him to the tomb;<sup>1</sup> (2) *two* appearances to the eleven, at both of which he was present;<sup>2</sup> and (3) the meeting at the Lake of Galilee, at which again he was present<sup>3</sup>—*four* instances out of a total of ten. St. Paul again attests: (1) the appearance to St. Peter; (2) *two* appearances to the Apostles, one coinciding with one of St. John's; (3) the appearance to the five hundred; and (4) the appearance to St. James—*four* additional to St. John's or, between the two, *eight* appearances. A further noteworthy result is that, with the exception of the appearance to the women in St. Matthew, the *singly* attested appearances are among the *best* attested, for they are included in the above list; likewise the *greater* appearances, if, as is usually assumed, the appearance to the five hundred is to be identified with the meeting in Galilee, are, with one exception (the appearance to the disciples on the way to Emmaus), all included here. It will be shown after that the Emmaus narrative, corroborated by the Appendix to St. Mark, is one of the most credible of the series.

On the basis of this analysis, the attempt may now be

<sup>1</sup> John xx. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Vers. 19-29.

<sup>3</sup> John xxi. 2.

made to place the recorded appearances in their *order*, and to exhibit the degree of attestation that pertains to each. It is only to be borne in mind, what formerly was said, that in no case is it the design of the Evangelists to furnish *proofs* for the Resurrection.<sup>1</sup> Their object is simply to supply information, each in accordance with his particular aim, regarding a fact already universally believed. Each gives his own selection of incidents, and no single narrative makes any pretence to be complete.<sup>2</sup>

The appearances to the disciples may be arranged as follows :—

1. The appearance to Mary Magdalene (John, Appendix to Mark). According to the Marcan Appendix this appearance was the “first.”

2. The appearance to the women on their way to the disciples (Matt.). The relation to (1) is considered below.

3. The appearance to St. Peter (Luke, Paul). St. Paul doubtless had the fact from St. Peter himself. St. Luke probably had it from St. Paul. But it was known from the beginning.<sup>3</sup>

4. The appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke, Appendix to Mark). St. Luke gives the detailed account.

5. The appearance to the assembled disciples in the evening (Luke, John, Paul, Appendix to Mark). The details are given in St. Luke and St. John.

These five appearances all occurred on the day of Resurrection.

6. The second appearance to the eleven, “eight days

<sup>1</sup> This should be partially qualified in the case of St. John, who does exhibit an evidential purpose (chap. xx. 31, xxi. 24).

<sup>2</sup> Each Evangelist would have been ready to endorse the concluding words in St. John: “There are also many other things which Jesus did,” etc. (xxi. 25; cf. xx. 31).

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxiv. 34. St. Mark may have had this appearance in view in the words: “Go, tell His disciples and Peter” (xvi. 7).

after" (John). St. John had told how, on the previous occasion, Thomas was not present. The doubt of Thomas was now removed.

7. An appearance to seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee (John).

8. The great appearance to over five hundred brethren at once (Paul). This, as above said, is probably identical with the "appointed" meeting in Galilee, when the "eleven" received their Lord's great commission (Matt.).

9. An appearance to St. James (Paul).

10. The final appearance to the eleven (Paul), identical with the meeting of Jesus with His disciples prior to His Ascension (Luke in Gospel and Acts; Appendix to Mark).

It will be perceived from this enumeration that there were in all no fewer than *five* appearances of Jesus—half of the total number—to the Apostles, when all, or a majority, were present; in one instance at a large gathering of over five hundred. Of the remaining instances, three were private (to Mary, St. Peter, St. James): one was to two disciples on a journey; one was to the group of women. St. Matthew probably introduces the last because of the message then repeated to meet the Lord in Galilee. St. Luke, as shown, confines himself to the meetings in and about Jerusalem. St. Paul dwells naturally for his purpose on the appearances to the Apostles, including that to James, and the meeting with the five hundred. St. John fills up from his reminiscences what the others had left untold—the tender scene with the Magdalene, the second appearance to the Apostles, the appearance to the seven in Galilee. It all seems very natural. The pieces of the puzzle are perhaps not so hard to put together after all.

The circumstances of the several appearances must now be more carefully investigated, with a view to the further elucidation of their *nature* and *reality*. But, first,

there are certain threads of the Synoptical narratives which require to be gathered up, and related to what follows.

1. Two of the Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Mark, agree that the women at the tomb *received a message* to give to the disciples.<sup>1</sup> St. Luke does not mention this message, yet relates: "They returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest"<sup>2</sup> (the implication of a wider company should be noted). In the report of the words spoken by the angels to the women, however, there is an important variation in St. Luke, which needs consideration. In the two other Synoptics, the women are directed to tell the disciples that Jesus goes before them into Galilee, and that there they will see Him. Instead of this message, St. Luke reads: "Remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered His words."<sup>3</sup> In St. Matthew, further, the words which in St. Mark appear in connexion with the direction about Galilee ("as He said unto you")<sup>4</sup> are transferred to the announcement of the Resurrection ("as He said"),<sup>5</sup> and the angel's message closes with the statement, "Lo, I have told you." The difficulty of deriving the form in St. Luke from the others is obvious (the word "Galilee" occurring in both should not mislead). The simple explanation seems to be that it is not the design of St. Luke to relate the appearances in Galilee (cf., however, Acts i. 3; "appearing to them by the space of forty days"); he therefore omits the part of the message bearing on this point. For the rest, Jesus did do both the things here stated: (1) announce when in Galilee His approaching

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxiv. 9.    <sup>3</sup> Luke xxiv. 6-8.    <sup>4</sup> Mark xvi 7.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xxviii. 6.

death and Resurrection <sup>1</sup> (so in Matt.), and St. Luke simply repeats His words ; and (2) announce that He would meet His disciples in Galilee <sup>2</sup> (" as He said unto you," Mark). This second part St. Luke passes over.

2. In the close of his narrative of the Resurrection, St. Matthew gives *the sequel to his story of the guard at the tomb*,<sup>3</sup> formerly alluded to. Certain of the guard, hastening to the city, told the chief priests what had happened. These, after counsel with the elders, bribed the soldiers to spread the report that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus while they (the guard) slept, promising to use their interest with Pilate to secure them from harm. This episode, it was before seen, is rejected by the critics as fabulous. Yet it is difficult to believe that a narrative so circumstantial could be simple invention,<sup>4</sup> or have no foundation in fact. Nor are the grounds alleged adequate to sustain this view of it. The central point in the story—the charge of stealing the body—is evidently historical. It is given as a current report when the Gospel was written,<sup>5</sup> and is independently attested.<sup>6</sup> As giving the Jewish version of the Resurrection, it has value as a left-hand testimony to the fact of the grave being found empty. When it is asked, Is it likely that the soldiers should accept a bribe to plead guilty to a military offence—sleeping on duty—which was punishable by death ? <sup>7</sup> it is overlooked that the breach of discipline had already been committed in their flight

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Matt. xvi. 21 ; xvii. 9-13, etc.    <sup>2</sup> Matt. xxvi. 32 ; Mark xiv. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xxvii. 11-5. Cf. chap. xxvii. 62-66.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Lake thinks that the episode has "neither intrinsic nor traditional probability." It is, in his view, "nothing more than a fragment of controversy" between Jews and Gentiles, "in which each imputed unworthy motives to the other, and stated suggestions as established facts" (p. 180).

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xxviii. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 108 ; Tertullian, *On Spectacles*, 30.

<sup>7</sup> Lake, p. 178.

from the tomb, and admission that the tomb was open and the body gone. The theft by the disciples was only a pretext to cover an event which both soldiers and priests were aware had really a more marvellous character. The case would be presented in a truer light to Pilate, and the soldiers screened. It was probably from some of the guards themselves—led, like the centurion, to say, “Truly this man was the Son of God”<sup>1</sup>—that the facts were ascertained.<sup>2</sup>

This leads to the consideration of the distinct appearances.

1. Little use has up to this point been made of the testimony of St. John. It is now necessary to consider that testimony in its relation to the Synoptics, as embodying the narrative of the first of our Lord’s recorded appearances—that to *Mary Magdalene*.<sup>3</sup> St. John has the supreme qualification as a witness that he himself was *magna pars* in the transactions he records. His narrative has an autoptic character. Part of its design apparently is to give greater precision to certain events which the other Gospels had more or less generalized. It is a piece of testimony of the first importance.

In the story of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, St. John so far goes with the Synoptics that he tells how Mary Magdalene came in the early morning to the tomb of Jesus, and found the stone taken away.<sup>4</sup> Mention is not made of companions, but probably at least one other is implied in Mary’s words: “They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid Him.”<sup>5</sup> The same words may suggest that, either by her own inspection or that of others, Mary had ascertained that the tomb was empty—not simply open.

<sup>1</sup> Mark xv. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Forrest, in his *Christ of History and Experience*, says: this “incident related by Matthew . . . though it is not corroborated in any of the other Gospels, has, I think, every mark of probability” (p. 145). Cf. Alford on Matt. xxvii. 62–66.

<sup>3</sup> John xx. 11–18.

<sup>4</sup> Ver. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Ver. 2.

But here St. John diverges. We learn from him how, concluding that the body had been removed, Mary at once ran to carry the news to St. Peter and St. John. It was still very early, and the disciples had to be sought for in their private—perhaps separate—lodgings (ver. 10). Aroused by her tale, they lost not a moment in hastening to the spot.<sup>1</sup> St. John—for he only can be meant by “the other disciple”<sup>2</sup>—outran St. Peter, and, coming first to the tomb, stooped and looked in, and saw (*βλέπει*) the linen cloths (*ᾠθονία*) lying, but did not go further. St. Peter followed, but, with characteristic energy, at once entered, and beheld (*θεωρεῖ*), implying careful note), not simply the disposition of the cloths, but the peculiarity of the napkin for the head lying rolled up in a place by itself.<sup>3</sup> St. John then found courage to enter, and “having seen, believed.”<sup>4</sup> It is a weakening of this expression to suppose it to mean simply, “believed that the tomb was empty.” Both disciples believed this. But with a flash of true discernment St. John grasped the significance of what he saw, namely, that Jesus had risen—a truth to which<sup>5</sup> the Scriptures had not yet led him.<sup>5</sup> St. Peter, it is implied, though wondering,<sup>6</sup> had still not attained to this confidence. The two disciples then returned home.<sup>7</sup>

Meanwhile Mary Magdalene had come back, and was “standing without at the tomb weeping.”<sup>8</sup> Afterwards she too stooped and looked into the tomb, and had, like the other women, a “vision of angels”—in her case “two angels in white raiment,” one at the head, the other at the foot, of the ledge or slab where the body of Jesus had

<sup>1</sup> Ver. 3–10.

<sup>2</sup> Vers. 2, 3, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ver. 7. Mr. Latham’s ingenious reasoning from the disposition of the grave-cloths to the manner of the Resurrection should be studied in his *Risen Master*, chaps. i.–iii.

<sup>4</sup> Ver. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Ver. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Luke xxii. 12, below.

<sup>7</sup> Ver. 10.

<sup>8</sup> Ver. 11.

lain.<sup>1</sup> Then came the meeting with the Lord described in the succeeding verses. At first Mary took the person who addressed her for the gardener, and besought him, if it was he who had borne away her Lord from the tomb, to tell her where he had laid Him.<sup>2</sup> Little trace here of the *hallucinée*, whose passion, according to Renan, "gave to the world a resuscitated god."<sup>3</sup> Christ's tender word "Mary" illuminated her at once as to who He was, and with the exclamation "Rabboni," she would have clasped Him, had He permitted her.

The words with which the Risen Lord in this interview gently checked the movement of Mary at once to worship and to detain Him—to hold Him, now restored to her, as if never more to let Him go—have been the subject of sufficiently diverse interpretations. "Touch me not" (*μή μου ἅπτοῦ*; R.V. marg., "Take not hold on Me"), Jesus said, "for I am not yet ascended unto My Father; but go unto My brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and My God and your God."<sup>4</sup> The meaning that lies on the surface is: "Do not hold me now, for I am not yet ascended unto My Father, but go at once unto My brethren," etc. But the terms of the message to the brethren ("Say unto them, I ascend," etc.) show that a deeper reason lay behind. "Tell them," its purport is, "that I am risen; the same, yet entered on a higher (the Ascension) life, in which old relations cannot be renewed, but better ones begin."<sup>5</sup>

If this striking narrative of St. John stood alone, it would be sufficiently attested, but it is corroborated by

<sup>1</sup> Vers. 11-13, see the plates of the tomb in Latham.

<sup>2</sup> Ver. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Vie de Jésus*, p. 434.

<sup>4</sup> Ver. 17.

<sup>5</sup> The chief interpretations of the passage can be seen in Godet, *Com. on St. John*, iii. pp. 311-13, and in Latham, *ut supra*, pp. 419-20. Godet takes it to mean: "I have not reached the state in which I shall be able to live with you in the communion I promised you" (p. 311).

two notices which probably are independent of it. The Appendix to St. Mark tells of the early morning appearance to Mary Magdalene; <sup>1</sup> St. Luke records the visit of St. Peter to the tomb, in language closely resembling St. John's, with an indication later that he was not alone. St. Luke xxiv. 12 reads: "But Peter arose, and ran into the tomb; and stooping and looking in, he seeth (*βλέπει*) the linen cloths (*ᾠθονία*) by themselves; and he departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass." In verse 24, the disciples journeying to Emmaus say: "And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even as the women had said: but Him they saw not." <sup>2</sup> On the ground of its absence from certain Western texts, the former passage (ver. 12) is regarded by textual critics with suspicion. <sup>3</sup> This doubt does not attach to verse 24, which plainly has in view the visit described by St. John. Its genuineness, in turn, supports that of verse 12, where St. Peter only is mentioned. It may reasonably be supposed that St. John, in his fuller narrative, has the aim of rectifying a certain inexactitude in St. Luke's summary account. St. Luke, e.g., speaks of St. Peter, at the tomb, as "stooping and looking in." St. John, the disciple who accompanied St. Peter, explains that, while this was true of himself (cf. chap. xx. 5), St. Peter did more, actually entering the tomb and inspecting the contents. In his consecutive account, he makes clear also the precise time of this visit.

<sup>1</sup> On the supposed dependence on St. John, cf. remarks above.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer remarks: "Of the 'other disciple' of John xx. 3, Luke says nothing, but, according to ver. 24, does not exclude him" (*Com. in loc.*).

<sup>3</sup> The preponderance of early MSS. authority sustains the passage. Godet, who in his *Com. on St. Luke* (ii. p. 352) upholds the genuineness, treats it in his *Com. on St. John* (iii. p. 308) as "a gloss borrowed from St. John." Had it been so, it would surely have avoided the appearance of contradiction.

2. At this point a question of some nicety arises as to the relation of this appearance to Mary Magdalene, and *the appearance to the women* recorded in St. Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, which stands next upon our list. Are these appearances different? Or is the second (that in Matthew) merely a generalized form of the first (that in John)? The latter is the view taken by many scholars.<sup>1</sup> In favour of it is the fact that only two women, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, are mentioned in St. Matthew's narrative.<sup>2</sup> We know, however, that there were other women present, and there is a marked contrast in the circumstances in the two narratives. The women in St. Matthew are already on their way to tell the disciples; they hold Jesus by the feet, and are apparently unrebuked (the act was *only* one of worship); the message, too, is different. The appearance to Mary may well be grouped (probably is) with that of the other women; it is not so easy to identify the latter with Mary's solitary experience. If, on the other hand, the appearances are taken to be distinct, a difficulty arises as to the order of time. The appearance to the women coming from the tomb would now seem to claim precedence over that to Mary, who had in the interval gone to Jerusalem and had returned. There is nothing absolutely to preclude this, if the note of order in the Appendix to St. Mark ("appeared first to Mary Magdalene") be surrendered. Some, accordingly, do place the appearance to the other women first.<sup>3</sup>

But even on the ordinarily received view that the appearance to Mary Magdalene was the prior, the problem, when the circumstances are fairly considered, does not seem insoluble. Both appearances took place in early morning, with at most an hour or two between

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Ebrard, Godet, Alford, Swete.      <sup>2</sup> Ver. 1.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Milligan, *The Resur. of our Lord*, pp. 259-60.

them. The disciples, mostly lodging apart—in Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> in Bethany, elsewhere<sup>2</sup>—could not be convened till later. The women, after their first hurried flight (cf. Mark xvi. 8), must have paused to regain their self-possession, to confer with one another on what they had seen and heard, to consider how they should proceed in conveying their tidings to the still scattered disciples. In such a pause, their hearts aflame with love and holy desire, Jesus, who a little earlier had made Himself known to Mary in the garden, appeared to them. Even before He approached a single Apostle, He disclosed Himself to this company of faithful hearts. His “All hail!” and the renewed commission to the disciples sealed the message at the tomb.

It is not unlikely that, before long, on her way back to the city, Mary Magdalene joined her sisters, and that, after interchange of experiences, the errand to the disciples was undertaken by the women together. Keen indeed must have been the chill to their enthusiasm at the reception their message met with when they did deliver it. Their words received no credence: were treated as “idle talk.”<sup>3</sup> That the tomb was found empty, the Apostles did not dispute; but stories of visions of angels and appearances of Jesus they refused to accept. There was astonishment, but not belief. Yet it is this sceptical circle, antipathetic to visionary experiences, in which belief in the Resurrection is supposed spontaneously to have arisen through visions of their own!

3. It must have been still early on this eventful day, probably soon after the Apostle’s visit to the tomb, and while he was still brooding on what had happened, that the third [appearance of Jesus took place—the appearance to *St. Peter*, attested by both *St. Paul*,<sup>4</sup> and *St. Luke*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As *St. Peter* and *St. John* above.

<sup>2</sup> Two were from *Emmaus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Luke* xxiv. 10, 11, 22, 23. Cf. *Mark* xvi. 9–11.

<sup>4</sup> *1 Cor.* xv. 5.

<sup>5</sup> *Luke* xxiv. 34.

The critics, as will be found, transfer this appearance from Jerusalem to Galilee, but without a shadow of a valid reason. It was in harmony with the tender, considerate spirit displayed by Jesus in all these manifestations that such an appearance should be granted, so soon after the Resurrection, to the disciple who had denied, yet who so devotedly loved Him—whom He Himself had named the “Rock.”<sup>1</sup> Like the appearance to St. James at a later period, the meeting was entirely private. It can only be conjectured how, with another look, reproachful perhaps, but gracious and forgiving, the memory was banished of that look turned upon St. Peter in the High Priest’s palace, which had overwhelmed him with such sorrow.<sup>2</sup> The great stone was now rolled away from his heart, as before the stone had been rolled from the tomb. The transformation which this appearance of Christ wrought in the Apostle is reflected in the excitement which the report of it created in the circle of the disciples. “The Lord hath risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon.”<sup>3</sup> The disciples might disbelieve the women; they could not doubt the reality of the experience of St. Peter. The “conversion” which Jesus had predicted was realized, and thereafter the Apostle was to “strengthen” his brethren.<sup>4</sup>

4. As it is with the appearance to St. Peter, so it is with the other appearance which may be associated with this, as of the same private order—the *appearance to St. James*.<sup>5</sup> It is among the latest of the appearances, as that to

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi. 18, John i. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxii. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxiv. 34. Prof. Lake thinks it “uncertain” whether Simon Peter or another is intended in this passage—a characteristic excess of scepticism. He cannot believe that St. Luke has in view the appearance to Cephas referred to by St. Paul. He prefers, “with the courage of despair,” as he calls it, to “think that St. Luke himself did not write” the passage (pp. 101-3).

<sup>4</sup> Luke xxii. 32.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 7.

Peter is the earliest. With regard to both, while the facts are well-attested, no particulars are given. It is not doubted that the person intended in St. Paul's notice is the well-known James, the brother of the Lord."<sup>1</sup> This of itself explains much. James, so far as is known, was not a believer in Jesus up to the time of the Crucifixion.<sup>2</sup> Yet immediately after the Ascension, he, and the other brethren of Jesus, are found in the company of the disciples.<sup>3</sup> Thereafter he became a "pillar"<sup>4</sup>—finally the chief personage—in the Church at Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> He ranked with the Apostles.<sup>6</sup> What could explain such a change, save that, like the other Apostles, he had "seen the Lord"?<sup>7</sup> Christ's appearance to St. James was not simply His revelation to His own family—His kinsfolk according to the flesh—but was the qualification of this brother for lifelong Apostolic service. St. James exercised an authority at Jerusalem hardly second to that of St. Paul among the Churches of the Gentiles.

The remaining appearances will introduce us to the problems connected with the nature of the Resurrection body of the Lord.<sup>8</sup>

#### JAMES ORR.

<sup>1</sup> Gal. i. 19. Cf. Matt. xiii. 35; Mark vi. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. John vii. 5.      <sup>3</sup> Acts i. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. ii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23. There is a legend about St. James in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (cf. Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 463; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 274), to which, however, little, if any, weight can be attached. Apocryphal ideas will be considered later.