

goreans were Oriental, he is content to remark, and some allowance must be made at any rate for Zoroastrian tendencies.

In a final note (p. 680) he refers to a portion of the forthcoming volume of the *Geschichte* for a notice of the Therapeutae, but plainly remains impenitent upon the authenticity of the *de vita contemplativa*. Mr. Conybeare's demonstration of its Philonic authorship does not seem to have convinced him.

JAMES MOFFATT.

### THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

#### III.

##### THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES AND CRITICAL SOLVENTS.

It was before stated that a change in the treatment of the evidence for the Resurrection is necessitated by the new and more stringent methods of criticism applied to the narratives of the Gospels, and especially by the theory, now the prevalent one, of the dependence of the first and third Gospels, in their narrative parts, on the second—that of St. Mark. It is desirable, before proceeding further, to give attention to these new critical methods and their results, in their bearings on the subject in hand. It is, of course, too much to ask, even if one had the competency for the task, that a full discussion of the Synoptical problem should precede all examination of the narratives of the Resurrection, or that the Johannine question should be exhaustively handled before one is entitled to adduce a testimony from the Fourth Gospel. On the other hand, it seems imperative that something should be said on the critical aspect of the subject—enough at least to indicate the writer's own position, and some of the grounds that

are believed to justify it—still always with a strict eye on the special point under investigation.

It will prepare the way for this critical inquiry if a glance be taken first at the range of the New Testament material here falling to be dealt with. The narratives of the Resurrection go together with the narratives of the burial and of the post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus, and form an inseparable whole with them. Supplementary to the Gospel narratives are certain passages in the Book of Acts and in Paul.

The distribution of the subject-matter may be thus exhibited :—

*St. Matthew* : Burial, xxvii. 57–66 ; Resurrection, xxviii. 1–8 ; Appearances, xxviii. 9–20.

*St. Mark* : Burial, xv. 42–47 ; Resurrection, xvi. 1–8.  
*App. to St. Mark* : Appearances, xvi. 9–20.

*St. Luke* : Burial, xxiii. 50–56 ; Resurrection, xxiv. 1–12 ; cf. vers. 22–24 ; Appearances, xxiv. 12–53.

*St. John* : Burial, xxix. 38–42 ; Resurrection, xx. 1–13 ; Appearances, xx. 14–29 ; xxi.

*Acts* : Appearances, i. 3–11.

*Paul* : Burial and Resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 4 ; Appearances, 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

The narratives thus tabulated contain the historical witness to the Lord's Resurrection, so far as that witness has been preserved to us. On them, accordingly, the whole force of critical enginery has been directed, with the aim of discrediting their testimony. The narratives are held to be put out of court (1) On the ground of their manifest discrepancies ; (2) Through the application of critical methods to the text ; (3) Through the presence of legendary elements in their accounts.

The consideration of the alleged discrepancies can stand over, save as they prove to be involved in the general dis-

cussion. Even if all are admitted, they hardly touch the *main* facts of the combined witness—especially the testimony to the central fact of the empty tomb and the Lord's Resurrection on the third day. "No difficulty of weaving the separate incidents," says Dr. Sanday, "into an orderly and well-compacted narrative can impugn the unanimous belief of the Church which lies behind them, that the Lord Jesus rose from the dead on the third day and appeared to the disciples."<sup>1</sup> "There are many variations and discrepancies," writes Mr. F. C. Burkitt, "but all the Gospels agree in the main facts."<sup>2</sup> Strauss' statement of these discrepancies, which he discovers in every particular of the accounts, still remains the fullest and best, and the use he makes of them is not one to the liking of the newer criticism. "Hence," he says, "nothing but wilful blindness can prevent the perception that no one of the narrators knew and presupposed what another records."<sup>3</sup>

As previously indicated, the critical attack on the narratives of the Resurrection connects itself with the criticism of the Gospels as a whole. The newer criticism is principally distinguished from the older by a different attitude of mind to the Gospel material, and it proceeds by bolder and more assumptive methods. It starts rightly with a painstaking and exhaustive induction of the phenomena to be interpreted;<sup>4</sup> its peculiarity comes to light in the more daring, and often extremely arbitrary way in which it goes about the interpretation. It is no longer held to be enough to determine and explain a text. The newer

<sup>1</sup> *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 180: cf. Alford, *Greek Testament*, i. Prol. p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 223.

<sup>3</sup> *Life of Jesus*, iii. p. 344.

<sup>4</sup> Illustrations are furnished in the analysis of the linguistic phenomena of the Gospels in Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, Plummer's *St. Luke*, Introd., Harnack's *Lukas der Artzt* (St. Luke and Acts), etc.

criticism must get behind the text and show its genesis ; must show by comparison with related texts its probable "genealogy ;" <sup>1</sup> must take it to pieces, and discover what motive or tendency is at work in it, how it is coloured by environment and modified by later conditions—in brief, how it "grew" : this generally with the assumption that the saying or fact must originally have been something very different from what the text represents it to be. Such a method, no doubt, may open the way to brilliant discoveries, but it may also, and this more frequently, lead to the criticism losing itself in fanciful conjectures. Abundant illustration will be afforded when we come to the examination of the Resurrection narratives.

One question of no small importance is that of the relation of the Synoptical Gospels to each other. It has already been pointed out that the current theory on this subject—what Mr. W. C. Allen and Mr. Burkitt regard as "the one solid result" of the literary criticism of the Gospels—is that St. Matthew and St. Luke, as respects their narrative parts,<sup>2</sup> are based on St. Mark.<sup>3</sup> It is desirable to keep this question in its right place. It would manifestly be a suicidal procedure to base the defence of the Resurrection on the acceptance or rejection of any given solution of the Synoptical problem, especially on the challenge of a theory which has obtained the assent of so many distinguished scholars. Assume it to be finally proved that St. Matthew and St. Luke used St. Mark as a chief "source,"

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lake, *Res. of Jesus Christ*, pp. 167–8.

<sup>2</sup> The supposed *Logia* source does not come into consideration here.

<sup>3</sup> Allen, *St. Matthew*, Pref. p. vii. : "Assuming what I believe to be the one solid result of literary criticism, viz., the priority of the second Gospel to the other two synoptic Gospels." Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, p. 37 : "the one solid contribution," etc. "We are bound to conclude that Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used, and, further, that Mark contains very little besides."

the limits of the evidence for the Resurrection would be sensibly narrowed, but its intrinsic force would not be greatly weakened. St. Mark, after all, is not inventing. He is embodying in his Gospel the common Apostolic tradition of his time—a tradition which goes back to the Apostles themselves, and rests on their combined witness. There is no reason for believing that St. Mark took the liberties with the tradition, in altering and “doctoring” it, which some learned writers suppose. If the other Evangelists, whose Gospels, on any showing, are closely related to St. Mark’s, adopted the latter as one of their sources, it can only be because they recognized in that Gospel a form of the genuine tradition. Their adoption of it, and working of it up with their own materials, but set an additional imprimatur on its contents. At the same time, it is not to be gainsaid that, in practice, the attack on the credit of the Gospels has been greatly aided by the prevalence of this theory of the dependence of the other Synoptics on St. Mark. As before indicated, it affords leverage for treating the narratives of the first and third Gospels as a simple “writing up” and embellishing of St. Mark’s stories, and for rejecting any details not found in the latter as unhistorical and legendary. The *modus operandi* is expounded by Professor Lake. “When, therefore,” he says, “we find a narrative which is given in all three Gospels, we have no right to say that we have three separate accounts of the same incident; but we must take the account in Mark as presumably the basis of the other two, and ask whether their variations cannot be explained as due to obscurities or ambiguities in their sources, which they tried to clear up. . . . Since Matthew and Luke, so far as they are dealing with the Marcan source, are not first-hand evidence, but rather the two earliest attempts to comment on and explain Mark, we are by

no means bound to follow the explanations given by either.”<sup>1</sup>

This leads to the question—Is the theory true? Despite its existing prestige, this may be gravely questioned. Detailed discussion would be out of place, but the bearing of the theory on the Resurrection narratives—which will be found to afford some of the most striking disproofs of it—is so direct, that a little attention must be given to it.

The grounds on which the Marcan theory rests are stated with admirable succinctness by Mr. Burkitt. “In the parts common to Mark, Matthew and Luke,” he says, there is a good deal in which all verbally agree; there is also much common to Mark and Matthew, and much common to Mark and Luke, but hardly anything common to Matthew and Luke which Mark does not share also. There is very little of Mark which is not more or less adequately represented either in Matthew or in Luke. Moreover, the common order is Mark’s order. Matthew and Luke never agree against Mark in transposing a narrative. Luke sometimes deserts the order of Mark, and Matthew often does so; but in these cases Mark is always supported by the remaining Gospel.<sup>2</sup>

With little qualification this may be accepted as a correct description of the facts, and it admirably proves that there existed what Dr. E. A. Abbott calls an “Original Tradition,” to which St. Mark, of the three Evangelists, most closely adhered, giving little else, while St. Matthew and St. Luke borrowed parts of it,<sup>3</sup> combining it with material drawn from other funds of information. But

<sup>1</sup> *Ut supra*, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ut supra*, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Abbott, *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*, Introd., pp. vi., vii. “To speak more accurately, it is believed that the Gospel of St. Mark contains a closer approximation to the Original Tradition than is contained in the other Synoptics.”

does this prove the kind of *literary* dependence of the first and third Gospels on St. Mark which the current theory supposes? Or, if dependence exists in any degree, is this the form of theory which most adequately satisfies the conditions? It is not a question of the *facts*, but one rather of the *interpretation* of the facts. A few reasons may be offered for leaning to a negative answer to the above queries.

1. The impression undeniably produced by agreement in the character and order of the sections in the Gospels is seriously weakened when account is taken of the *widely divergent phraseology* in large parts of the resembling narratives. The divergence is so marked, and so often apparently without motive, that, notwithstanding frequent assonances in words and clauses, a direct borrowing of one Evangelist from another seems next to incredible. The narratives of the Resurrection are a palmary example,<sup>1</sup> but the same thing is observable throughout. Mr. Burkitt has been heard on the agreements; let Alford state the facts that make for literary independence. "Let any passage," he says, "common to the three Evangelists be put to the test. The phenomena presented will be much as follows: first, perhaps, we shall have three, five, or more words *identical*; then as many *wholly distinct*; then two clauses or more expressed in the same words but *differing order*; then a clause contained in one or two, and *not in the third*; then *several words identical*; then a clause or two not only *wholly distinct* but *apparently inconsistent*; and so forth; with recurrences of the same arbitrary and anomalous alterations, coincidences, and transpositions."<sup>2</sup> A simple way of testing this statement is to take such a book as Dr. Abbott's *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*,

<sup>1</sup> See the words of Strauss quoted earlier.

<sup>2</sup> *Greek Testament*, i. Prol. p. 5.

where the narratives are arranged in parallel columns, and verbal agreements of the *three* Evangelists (the so-called "Triple Tradition"; the "Double Tradition" can be obtained by underlining in pencil) are indicated in black type, and note the proportion of agreement to divergence in the different sections. The proportion varies, but in most cases the amount of divergence will be found to be very considerable. Dr. Abbott himself goes so far as to say: "Closely though the Synoptists in some passages agree, yet the independence of their testimony requires in these days [as recently as 1884] no proof. Few reasonable sceptics now assert . . . that any of the three first Evangelists had before him the work of the other two. Proof, if proof were needed, might easily be derived from a perusal of the pages of the following Harmony, which would shew a number of divergencies, half-agreements, incomplete statements, omissions, incompatible, as a whole, with the hypothesis of borrowing."<sup>1</sup>

It cannot be said that the difficulties created by these remarkable phenomena have, up to the present time, been successfully overcome by the advocates of the dependence theory. Dr. A. Wright, in contending for an original "oral" Mark, thinks they have not yet been removed.<sup>2</sup> Sir John Hawkins, though he argues for a use of St. Mark, yet draws attention to a large series of phenomena which he declares to be, "on the whole, and when taken together, inexplicable on any exclusively or mainly documentary

<sup>1</sup> *Ut supra*, Introd. p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. his *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, Introd. p. x: "At present the hypothesis of a Ur-Markus having been discredited and practically abandoned, the supporters of documents insist—in spite (as I think) of the very serious difficulties which they have not yet removed—that St. Mark's Gospel was used by St. Matthew and St. Luke." He points out elsewhere the difficulties of supposing that St. Luke used St. Mark (p. xvi.). Dr. Wright's own theory of a proto-, deutero-, and trito-Mark is loaded with many difficulties.



theory." "Copying from documents," he says, "does not seem to account for them: but it is not at all difficult to see how they might have arisen in the course of oral transmission."<sup>1</sup> To bring the phenomena into harmony with the theory of literary dependence on St. Mark there is needed the assumption of a freedom in the use of sources by St. Matthew and St. Luke which passes all reasonable bounds, and commonly admits of no satisfactory explanation. "The Evangelists," says Mr. Burkitt, "altered freely the earlier sources which they used as the basis of their narratives."<sup>2</sup> This freedom of theirs is then used as proof that "literary piety is a quality . . . which hardly makes its appearance in Christendom before 150 A.D."<sup>3</sup> With doubtful consistency the same writer declares that, if the Evangelists had worked on a "fixed oral tradition," he "cannot imagine how they dared to take such liberties with it"!<sup>4</sup> That is, a "fixed tradition" is sacred, and dare not be tampered with, but a document *embodying* this tradition, even though by a writer like St. Mark, is liable to the freest literary manipulation! It is to be remembered that the proof of the alleged lack of "literary piety" is mainly the assumption itself that St. Mark *was* used by the other Evangelists.

2. Assuming, however, some degree of dependence in the relations of the Gospels, the question [is] still pertinent—Is the theory of dependence on St. Mark *that which alone, or best, satisfies the conditions?* It has not always

<sup>1</sup> *Horae Synopticae*, p. 52. The instances given in Pt. iv., sects. ii., iii., include variations in the reports of the sayings of Jesus, the attribution of the same, or similar words, to different speakers, the use of the same, or similar words, as parts of a speech, and as part of the Evangelist's narrative, transpositions, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Ut supra*, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> P. 15.

<sup>4</sup> P. 35. Elsewhere he bases an argument on St. Luke's "literary good faith" (p. 118).

been thought that it is, and very competent scholars, on grounds that seem cogent, take the liberty of doubting it still. It is almost with amused interest that one, in these days, reads the lengthy and learned argumentation of a Baur, a Strauss, a Dr. S. Davidson,<sup>1</sup> to demonstrate from the textual phenomena that St. Mark was the *latest* of the three Gospels, and depended on St. Matthew and St. Luke, not they on St. Mark.<sup>2</sup> The very phenomena now relied on to prove the originality of St. Mark, e.g., his picturesqueness, are turned by these writers into an argument against him. The argument from verbal coincidences is reversed, and St. Mark is made out to be based on the others because in numerous instances St. Mark's text agrees partly with St. Matthew and partly with St. Luke. And, assuredly, if dependence is assumed, lists can easily be furnished in which the secondary character of the text of St. Mark can as plausibly be maintained. But the Tübingen theory of St. Mark's dependence is by no means the only alternative to the prevailing view. The learned Professor Zahn, e.g., strikes out on a different line, and supposes a dependence of St. Mark on the *Aramaic* St. Matthew, but, conversely, a partial dependence of the *Greek* St. Matthew on the canonical St. Mark.<sup>3</sup> It is, in short, yet too early to take the dependence on St. Mark as a fixed result.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, i. pp. 169-183; S. Davidson, *Introd. to New Testament*. i. pp. 278 ff., etc.

<sup>2</sup> More recently, the dependence of St. Mark on St. Matt. and St. Luke is upheld by an able scholar, Dr. Colin Campbell, whose work, *The First Three Gospels in Greek, arranged in Parallel Columns* (2nd edition, 1899), is designed to support this thesis. In a recent communication Dr. C. writes: "I have seen nothing yet to alter my conviction as to the substantial truth [of this hypothesis] . . . Every detail I have accumulated—and I have a large mass of material—convinces me that the prevalent view is wrong. . . . There are multitudes of expressions in Mark which are best understood if we presuppose his use of Matthew and Luke." (Pages of instances are given.)

<sup>3</sup> *Einleitung*, ii. pp. 322 ff.

3. A strong argument against the current theory seems to the present writer to arise from *St. Luke's Prologue*,<sup>1</sup> in which the principles which guided the Evangelist in the composition of his Gospel are explicitly laid down. It is to be noted that, in this Preface, St. Luke assumes that the chief matters he is about to relate are already well known—fully established (*πεπληροφορημένων*)—in the churches; that they had been received from those who “from the beginning were eye-witnesses (*αὐτόπται*) and ministers of the word”; that they had been the subject of careful catechetical instruction (*κατηχήθης*); that many attempts had already been made to draw up written narratives of these things. For himself St. Luke claims that he has “traced the course of all things accurately from the first,” and his object in writing, as he says, “in order” (*καθεξῆς*), is that Theophilus may “fully know” (*ἐπιγνῶς*) the “certainty” (*ἀσφάλειαν*) of those things concerning which he had already been orally instructed. Does this, it may be asked, suggest such a process of composition as the current theory supposes? St. Luke speaks, indeed, of “many” who had taken in hand to draw up written narratives. He alludes to these earlier attempts, not disparagingly, but evidently as implying that they were unauthoritative, lacked order, and generally were unfitted for the purpose his own Gospel was intended to serve. He himself, in contrast with the “many,” goes back to first-hand sources, and writes “in order.” He is not appropriating the work of others, but drawing from his own researches.<sup>2</sup> How does this

<sup>1</sup> Luke i. 1-4; cf. on this point Dr. A. Wright, *St. Luke's Gospel in Greek*, pp. xiv., xv.; *Synopsis of Gospels in Greek*, p. xviii.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Wright says: “His authorities were not written documents, but partly eye-witnesses, partly professional catechists” (*ut supra*). Dr. Plummer says: “That [the reference to ‘eye-witness’] would at once exclude Matthew, whose Gospel Luke does not appear to have known. It is doubtful whether Mark is included in the πολλοί.”

tally with the hypothesis now in vogue? On this hypothesis another principal Gospel not only existed, but was known to St. Luke, and was used by him as a main basis of his own. This Gospel was the work of John Mark, son of Mary of Jerusalem, companion of St. Peter; therefore may be presumed to have been of high authority. St. Luke sets such value on St. Mark's Gospel that he takes up fully two-thirds of its contents into his own—draws from it, in fact, nearly all his narrative material. He relies so much on its "order" that in only one or two instances does he venture to deviate from it. Does this harmonize with the account he himself gives? The linguistic phenomena in St. Luke, which show a far wider divergence from the Marcan type than in the first Gospel, again present difficulties.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the "order," which appears to belong to the form which the narratives had come to assume before any Gospel was written,<sup>2</sup> cannot alone be relied on to prove dependence, and singular *omissions* remain to be accounted for.<sup>3</sup>

On the whole, therefore, it appears safer not to allow a theory of dependence to rule the treatment, or to create an initial prejudice against one Gospel in comparison with another. St. Matthew and St. Luke may be heard without assuming that either Gospel, in its narrative portions, is a simple echo of St. Mark.

It is impossible here to enter on the grounds which, it

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wright, *Synopsis*, p. xvi.

<sup>2</sup> In all the Synoptics certain groups or chains of events are linked together in the same way, evidently as the result of traditional connexion. E.g., the Cure of the Paralytic, the Call and Feast of Matthew, Questionings of Pharisees and of John's Disciples; again, the Plucking of the Ears of Corn, the Cure of the Man with the Withered Hand (Sabbath Stories). St. Matthew frequently transposes, in the interests of his own plan—chiefly, however, in the *earlier* part of his Gospel.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Burkitt, p. 130: "He freely omits large portions of Mark," etc. One important series in St. Matthew (xiv. 22–xvi. 12) and St. Mark (vi. 45–viii. 26) is, for no obvious reason, wholly omitted in St. Luke.

is believed, justify the view that the Fourth Gospel is a genuine work of the Apostle John,<sup>1</sup> containing authentic reminiscences of that Apostle of the Lord's doings and teachings, especially in Judæa, and in His more intimate intercourse with His disciples, thus filling up the outline of the other Evangelists in places which they had left blank.<sup>2</sup> The difficulty which weighs so strongly with Mr. Burkitt of finding a place in the framework of St. Mark for the Raising of Lazarus is certainly not insuperable ;<sup>3</sup> while his own view of the free invention of this and other incidents and discourses by the Evangelist<sup>4</sup> deprives the Gospel of even the slightest claim to historical credit. But the whole tone of the Gospel suggests a writer who has minute and accurate knowledge of the matters about which he writes—down even to small personal details—and who *means* to be taken as a faithful witness.<sup>5</sup> As such he is accepted here.

The way is now open for the consideration of the application of these critical theories to the narratives of the Resurrection, and attention may first be given to certain features in the accounts of the Resurrection itself.

At first sight, nothing might seem plainer than that the narratives of the first three Gospels, while necessarily related, are yet *independent*, in the sense that no one of them is copied from, or based on, the others. As already hinted, the difficulties of a theory of dependence are here

<sup>1</sup> Reference may simply be made to the works of Principal Drummond and Dr. Sanday on the Fourth Gospel. Mr. Burkitt is hard driven when he relies on the late and untrustworthy references to Papias to overturn the unanimous early tradition of St. John's residence in Ephesus (p. 252).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Burkitt doubts if our Synoptic Gospels contain stories from more than forty separate days of our Lord's life (p. 20).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. pp. 222-3, and Pref. to 2nd edition.

<sup>4</sup> "If [Mark] did not know of it [The Raising of Lazarus], can we believe that, as a matter of fact, it ever occurred?" Cf. pp. 225-6, 237, etc.

<sup>5</sup> The interesting treatment of "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel," from a lay point of view, in R. H. Hutton's *Theological Essays*, well deserves attention at the present time.

at their maximum. In scarcely any particular—time, names and number of women, events at the grave, number, appearance and position of angels, etc.—do their accounts exactly agree. This is indeed the stronghold of the argument from “discrepancies,” of which so much is made. The theory, however, is, that the narratives in St. Matthew and St. Luke are derived from the simpler story of St. Mark; and in carrying through this theory the advocates of dependence are driven to the most arbitrary and complicated hypotheses to explain how the divergences arose. It will be interesting to watch the process of dissolving the credit of the narratives by the aid of this assumption in the skilled hands of a writer like Professor Lake—though the result may rather appear as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory itself.

To begin with, certain cases of omission of details by St. Matthew and St. Mark are proposed to be solved by the hypothesis of an “original Mark” (*Ur-Markus*), from which these details were absent. Professor Lake, while not committing himself to the theory, which Dr. Wright tells us is now “discredited and practically abandoned,”<sup>1</sup> yet so far inclines to it that he thinks—the reader will note the *simplicity* of the hypothesis—“there is something to be said for the view that the original Marcan document did not give any names in Mark xv. 47, and that this form was used by Luke; <sup>2</sup> that a later edition, used by Matthew, identified the women as Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; and that another editor produced the text which is found in the canonical Mark.”<sup>3</sup>

More serious, however, is the difficulty that the narratives are frequently divergent in phraseology and circumstance

<sup>1</sup> *Synopsis*, p. x.

<sup>2</sup> It is a difficulty that St. Luke so often omits the proper names in St. Mark. Cf. Wright, *ut supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Lake, *ut supra*, p. 54.

in what they *do* relate. How is this to be explained? To take a leading example, St. Mark narrates of the women that, "entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe."<sup>1</sup> St. Matthew has an independent story of a great earthquake, and represents an angel as rolling away the stone and sitting upon it.<sup>2</sup> St. Luke records that, when they had entered the tomb, "two men stood by them in dazzling apparel."<sup>3</sup> No divergence could be greater, on the principle that "the two other Gospels, Matthew and Luke, are closely based on the Marcan narrative."<sup>4</sup> But Professor Lake is not discouraged. Accepting St. Mark's narrative as the original, "the others," he thinks, "all fall into place on an intelligible though complicated system of development under the influence of known causes."<sup>5</sup> "Complicated" indeed—and unreal—as will be seen by glancing at it.

First, there is a slight (infinitesimal) possibility that the Marcan text may originally have read, "came to the tomb" (instead of "entered into"),<sup>6</sup> and this left it doubtful whether the "young man" of the story was seen "on the right side" *inside* or *outside* the tomb.<sup>7</sup> In "elucidating" the point left in ambiguity, St. Luke took it the one way and St. Matthew the other—hence their variation. Only, if this is not the correct reading, the explanation falls.

Next, the "young man" in St. Mark "appears without any explanation of his identity or mission."<sup>8</sup> He was really, on Professor Lake's theory, as will be seen later, a youth at the spot who tried to persuade the women that they had come to the wrong tomb.<sup>9</sup> Naturally, however, attempts were soon made to identify him. "The most obvious view for that generation, in which angelology was

<sup>1</sup> Mark xvi. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxviii. 2-5.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxiv. 3-5.

<sup>4</sup> *Ut supra*, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup> P. 62-3.

<sup>6</sup> The Vat MS. reads *ἐλθοῦσα*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ut supra*, pp. 62-3.

<sup>8</sup> P. 184.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. pp. 251-2.

so powerful a force, was that he was an angel. This view is adopted in Matthew."<sup>1</sup> "Still a further step is to be found in the doubling of the angel, again strictly in accordance with Jewish thought." This in St. Luke, St. John, and the Gospel of Peter.<sup>2</sup> "Why are there two men in Luke instead of one? The answer is not quite plain, but it seems probable that there was a general belief in Jewish and possibly other circles that two angels were specially connected with the messages of God."<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere the probability is conceded that St. Luke is here following a different tradition from St. Mark's.<sup>4</sup> But why, then, not all through?

We are not done yet, however, with this "young man" of St. Mark's narrative. An attempt is made "to bring together and trace the development of the various forms in which the original 'young man' is represented in various books."<sup>5</sup> "Two hypotheses," we are told, "naturally presented themselves: one that the young man was an angel; the other that he was the Risen Lord Himself."<sup>6</sup> St. Matthew, after his manner, adopted both views. The angel sitting on the stone is one form: the appearance of Jesus to the women as they went<sup>7</sup> is the other. This appearance of Jesus recorded by St. Matthew is held to be a "doublet" of St. Mark's young man story. So is St. John's account of the appearance of the Lord to Mary Magdalene.<sup>8</sup>

If attention has been given to this incident in some detail, it is because, in its far-fetched conjectures and hypothetical ingenuities, it represents so characteristically the processes by which it is sought to dissipate the credibility of the Gospel narratives, and the methods by which the Marcan theory is applied to this end. The real effect of its forced

<sup>1</sup> P. 185.<sup>2</sup> P. 185.<sup>3</sup> P. 67.<sup>4</sup> Pp. 67, 92.<sup>5</sup> P. 67.<sup>6</sup> P. 85.<sup>7</sup> P. 85, Matt. xxviii. 9.<sup>8</sup> P. 186, John xx. 14, 15.



combinations and toppling structure "of possibles" and "perhapes" is to cast doubt on the theory with which it starts, and lend strength to the view of the independence of the narratives. After all, why should St. Luke, whose narrative is so very divergent, be supposed to be dependent on St. Mark in his account of the Resurrection? Professor Lake has been heard admitting that it is possible that St. Luke followed a different tradition. Going a stage further back, we find Mr. Burkitt allowing that St. Luke in the Passion "deserts Mark to follow another story of the last scenes."<sup>1</sup> At the other end, St. Luke is admittedly original in his account of the *post*-Resurrection appearances. Why then should he not be so in the narrative of the Resurrection itself? The same question may be asked regarding St. Matthew. The harmonistic expedients censured in commentators are mild in comparison with the violence needed to evolve the narratives of either of the other Evangelists out of that of St. Mark.

The detailed examination of the narratives next to be undertaken will further illustrate the untenableness of the new critical constructions, and provide the basis of a positive argument for the reality of the Resurrection.

JAMES ORR.

### SHAKING OUT THE LAP.

NEHEMIAH v. 13.

It is perhaps not generally known that "*shaking out the lap*" is still practised in the East. The text (Neh. v. 13) occurs in the following context: "I pray you let us leave off this usury"; (v. 11) "Restore, I pray you, to them, even this day, their fields, their vineyards, their oliveyards, and their houses, also the hundredth part of

<sup>1</sup> *Ut supra*, p. 130.