

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

act on which the kingship of Jesus Christ for ever rests, that by His righteous sacrifice of love He has "taken away the sin of the world." The eternal song of angels and of men is that which St. John heard in his Apocalypse: "Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain, to receive the power and riches and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing!"

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

THE RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD.

I.

THE EVANGELIC TESTIMONY.

THE New Testament constantly declares, and the Church all down the centuries has believed, that on the third day after He had been crucified on Calvary and laid, a mangled corpse, in Joseph's Sepulchre, Jesus revived, came forth, appeared to His disciples, and finally returned to His glory. The disciples saw the empty Sepulchre; they saw the wound-prints on His hands and feet and side; and at this hour, if the testimony of the New Testament be true, He is not a bodiless spirit in the Father's House but wears the form which He wore on earth, glorified but still scarred by His sore Passion. In the midst of the Throne He is still a Lamb as though it had been slain (Rev. v. 6).

This is a stupendous affirmation, and it is no marvel that all down the centuries it has been the jest of unbelievers and to believers an exceeding mystery. It looks on the face of it so incredible, so impossible, nay, so absurd. Nevertheless the New Testament writers advance it with unfaltering emphasis, fully realizing how incredible it must appear, yet asserting it without hesitation or doubt as a most certain and incontrovertible fact; and they deliberately hang upon it the most momentous issues. On the fact of the Resurrection they stake not only their own

veracity but the very truth of Christianity, confessing that, should it be disproved, they would stand convicted of imposture and the hope of the Gospel would perish. "If," says Paul, "Christ hath not been raised, then void is our message, void also our faith; and we are being found also false witnesses for God, forasmuch as we witnessed of God that He raised the Christ. . . . If Christ hath not been raised, vain is your faith, still are ye in your sins" (1 Cor. xv. 14-15, 17). According to the Apostle, there are two conditions of salvation, and one is faith in the Resurrection: "If thou confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. x. 9). It is the fashion of our day to account the fact of the Resurrection as of little moment, the religious ideal which Jesus disclosed and its abiding influence on the souls of men being regarded as alone essential. Whether this be a legitimate conception or not, the fact remains and must be reckoned with that it is not the conception of the New Testament, and, if we rest there, then our Christianity is not the Christianity of the Apostles: we have discarded as immaterial what seemed to them the very foundation of the Faith.

In his *New Life of Jesus* Strauss made the remarkable statement that the Resurrection was the test of his Mythical Theory, and, if he had failed in his previous work to account for it without any corresponding miraculous fact, then he must retract all that he had said and abandon his whole undertaking. And he was right. The Resurrection is the citadel of the Christian faith. While it stands nothing is lost; should it fall, the long battle would be ended. And all down the ages the assailants of the Resurrection have pursued two methods of attack. They have sought, on the one hand, to undermine its foundations by demonstrating the unreliability of the evangelic narratives, and have laboured, on the other, to show how the belief

that Jesus had risen originated in the minds of the primitive believers. And the attack has recently been renewed along the familiar lines by Professor P. W. Schmiedel in the last volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. There is really nothing novel in his article on the Resurrection, nothing that has not been already urged; yet it is worthy of attention. It is written not only with exhaustive knowledge but with a due appreciation of the greatness of the issues and a remarkable hesitancy to pronounce a final verdict. Schmiedel advocates the vision-hypothesis, but he is undisguisedly conscious of its insufficiency. He adopts it simply because no better may be had, and he frankly confesses toward the close of his elaborate discussion that "for all that has been said in the foregoing paragraphs the most that can be claimed is that it proves the possibility—the probability if you will—of the explanation from subjective visions." One rises from a perusal of this article gratefully conscious that destructive criticism has lost much of its unflinching assurance and that faith has reason to lift up its head and take courage.

It is proposed in the present article to follow the first line of attack and endeavour to determine the value of the evangelic testimony to the Resurrection. It might have been expected that, since it is so fundamental and such tremendous issues hang upon its acceptance or rejection, the New Testament writers would take peculiar care to attest the fact of the Resurrection and fortify it by unimpeachable credentials; and it is discomfiting to find that, so far at least as the Synoptists are concerned, precisely the contrary is true. The evangelic narratives, elsewhere so remarkably accordant, here fairly bristle with discrepancies which refuse to be harmonized even by the most violent expedients. It is hardly too much to say that they agree only in their unflinching and triumphant proclamation of the fact that Jesus rose and appeared to His disciples.

1. All the Evangelists agree that it was womanly love that paid the first visit to the Sepulchre on that ever memorable Sunday morning and was rewarded with the first vision of the Risen Lord. But here their agreement ends. According to Matthew the visitants were Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (xxviii. 1); according to Mark, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome (xvi. 1); according to Luke, "women who had followed Him from Galilee" (xxiii. 55, xxiv. 1), including Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Mary the mother of James (xxiv. 10); while according to John Mary Magdalene went alone (xx. 1). It should not, however, be overlooked that, when Mary ran to Peter and John and told them that the Sepulchre was empty, she cried, "We know not where they have laid Him," as though she had companions.

2. The Evangelists differ as to the time of the visit. According to Matthew, it was "late on the Sabbath, when the light was dawning unto the first day of the week" (xxviii. 1). This language seems self-contradictory, since, according to Jewish reckoning, the Sabbath ended and the first day of the week began at nightfall; but *τῆ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων* does not mean "at the dawn of the first day of the week." The signification of the phrase is determined by Luke xxiii. 54.¹ The light that was breaking was not the light of dawn but the light of the lamps which were kindled at the commencement of the new day. Matthew's language is therefore self-consistent and means that as soon as the Sabbath ended (cf. Mark xv. 56*b*) and the first day of the week began, i.e. at nightfall, the women hastened to the Sepulchre. According to Luke, however, they went at "deep dawn" (xxiv. 1);² according to Mark

¹ See Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, and Wetstein *ad loc.*

² Cf. Plat. *Crit.* 43*A*, where *δρθρος βαθύς*=*πάνυπρόφ*. Phrynichus defines *δρθρος* as *τὸ πρὸ ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας ἐν ᾧ ἐτι λύχνῳ δύναται τις χρῆσθαι*, "ubi nox abiit nec tamen orta dies" (*Ov. Amor.* I. v. 6). *βαθύς* because the darkness looks like a deep chasm.

“very early, when the sun had risen” (xvi. 2); whereas John says that Mary went “early, while it was yet dark” (xx. 1). The desperateness of the harmonistic case is illustrated by Jerome’s comment: “Quod diversa tempora istarum mulierum in Evangeliiis describuntur, non mendacii signum est, ut impii objiunt, sed sedulæ visitationis officium, dum crebro abeunt ac recurrunt, et non patiuntur a sepulchro Domini diu abesse vel longius.”

3. The object of the visit was, according to Mark (xvi. 1) and Luke (xxiv. 1), to embalm the Lord’s body; according to Matthew (xxviii. 1) and John (xx. 1), simply to see the Sepulchre.

4. According to Mark (xvi. 1) they bought the spices after the Sabbath was past; according to Luke (xxiii. 56) they had bought them on the Friday evening betwixt the burial and the commencement of the Sabbath.

5. Matthew (xxviii. 2-3) says that the stone was rolled away from the Sepulchre after the arrival of the women: there was a great earthquake, and an angel descended from heaven and rolled the stone away and sate upon it.¹ Mark (xvi. 3-4), Luke (xxiv. 2), and John (xx. 1), knowing nothing of the earthquake nor, thus far, of the angel, agree that on their arrival they found the stone already removed.

6. Matthew (xxviii. 2, 5) and Mark (xvi. 5) say that there was one angel, the latter calling him “a young man” (*νεανίσκον*); Luke (xxiv. 4) and John (xx. 12), that there were two, the former calling them “men” (*ἄνδρες*).

7. Matthew’s angel was outside the Sepulchre seated on the stone which he had rolled away from the entrance (xxviii. 2, 5).¹ According to Mark (xvi. 5) the women entered the Sepulchre and saw the young man clad in a white robe already there, seated on the right side. According to Luke also they entered the Sepulchre, but they

¹ Cf. Celsus’ sneer (*Orig. C. Cels.* v. 52): ὁ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἀνοίξει τὸν τάφον ἀλλ’ ἐδεήθη ἄλλου ἀποκινήσαντος τὴν πέτραν.

found it empty, and it was while they were wondering that the two men suddenly appeared beside them in flashing raiment (xxiv. 3-4).¹ According to John Mary fled away on seeing the stone removed and told Peter and John that the Lord had been taken away. They went and searched the Sepulchre, and saw only the cast off cerements, and not till they had gone and Mary had returned, did the two angels appear. As she peered in she saw them "sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain" (xx. 1-12).

8. According to Matthew (xxviii. 7) and Mark (xvi. 7), the angel bade them go and tell the disciples and, adds Mark, Peter that the Lord had risen and would meet them in Galilee. Luke (xxiv. 6-7) omits the command and represents the angels as merely reminding them that, while yet in Galilee, Jesus had predicted His Betrayal, Crucifixion, and Resurrection.

9. According to Matthew (xxviii. 8), Mark (xvi. 8), and Luke (xxiv. 9), the women hastened away from the Sepulchre, but, according to Mark, they "said nothing to any one, for they were afraid";² according to Luke, though unbidden by the angels, they "told the whole story to the Eleven and all the rest," but gained no credence: "these words appeared in their sight as an idle tale, and they disbelieved the women" (xxiv. 11). According to Matthew (xxviii. 8-10), as they were hurrying to tell the disciples,

¹ T.R. ἐξελθούσαι (NBCL Tisch. WH: ἀπελθ.) in Matt. xxviii. 8 is harmonistic. Euth. Zig.: εἰ καὶ οὐκ ἐμνημονεύσεν ὁ Ματθαῖος ὅτι εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀλλὰ νῦν εἰπῶν ὅτι ἐξῆλθον ἐπέφησεν ὅτι πρῶτον εἰσῆλθον.

² Euth. Zig. on Matt. xxviii. 8 comments harmonistically: οὐδενὶ δὲ οὐδὲν εἶπον τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων αὐταῖς κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. Mark's Gospel is broken off abruptly at v. 8, vv. 9-20 being a later supplement and quite valueless. There is no knowing what the missing conclusion may have contained. The apocryphal *Ev. Petr.* gives an account closely resembling Mark's of the visit of the women to the Sepulchre. It concludes τότε αἱ γυναῖκες φοβηθεῖσαι ἐφυγον and proceeds to narrate an incident similar to John xxi. 1 sqq. The MS., however, breaks off after a few sentences.

Jesus Himself met them and reiterated the angel's behest. Their story was evidently believed, for the Eleven repaired to Galilee as they were bidden (xxviii. 16). John (xx. 2-10) makes Mary of her own accord, ere she had seen the angels, run, not to the Eleven, but to Peter and John and tell them that the Sepulchre was empty. They immediately repaired thither and found it so. Cf. Luke xxiv. 24.¹

10. When, according to Matthew (xxviii. 9), Jesus met the women, including Mary Magdalene, and greeted them on their way from the Sepulchre, they laid hold of His feet and worshipped Him; nor did He repulse them. But when, according to John (xx. 17), He revealed Himself to Mary at the Sepulchre and she would have clung to Him, He forbade her.

11. According to Luke (xxiv. 41-43), when Jesus appeared to the disciples in their lodging in Jerusalem on the evening of the Resurrection-day and they could not believe that it was He but took Him for a spirit, He reassured them and conquered their doubt by asking for some food. They gave Him a piece of a broiled fish,² and He took it and ate it in their presence. This touch is omitted by John in his account of the incident (xx. 19-25).

12. Luke (xxiv.) represents the Ascension as taking place from the Mount of Olives late on the Resurrection-day, crowding all the appearances of the Lord into that brief space and making Jerusalem and its neighbourhood the scene of them all. According to Matthew (xxviii. 16-20) and John (xxi.) the disciples repaired to Galilee and there met with Jesus. According to John (xx. 26), they remained at least a week in Jerusalem ere betaking themselves northward. In the *Acts of the Apostles* (i. 3) Luke says that forty days elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension; and it might be supposed that the twenty-

¹ Luke xxiv. 12 is spurious.

² Tisch. WH. om. *καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου.*

fourth chapter of his Gospel is a compendious narrative, omitting between the 43rd verse and the 44th all that occurred in Galilee, were it not there prevailed in early days a tradition that Jesus rose and ascended on the self-same day.¹ The fact seems to be that Luke had this tradition before him when he wrote his Gospel, and by the time he came to write his later book he had ascertained the truth, and silently but pointedly corrected his error.

Thus inconsistent are the evangelic accounts of the Resurrection, and a frank recognition of their inconsistency is the first and indispensable step toward a solution of the problem. It seems at the first glance as though there were no escape from the alternative which Strauss presents: either we must "adhere to one of the four accounts as pre-eminently apostolic, and by this rectify the others," or we must "confess that in all the evangelic accounts of these first tidings of the Resurrection we have before us nothing more than traditional reports."² It is, Strauss maintains, the latter course that must be preferred, and nothing then remains but to abandon all faith in the historicity of the Resurrection. A tissue of discordant legends were truly a feeble attestation of so stupendous an affirmation.

Yet it is on the face of it impossible to acquiesce in this conclusion. It is beyond question that the Apostles believed with exultant faith that Jesus had arisen, and the conviction rescued them from despondency and sent them forth with resolute hearts to preach and die. They must have been right well assured that their faith was true, or it would never have nerved them to sacrifice and toil and martyrdom. If their faith was a delusion, then a delusion

¹ Cf. *Ep. Barn.* xv. § 9: διὸ καὶ ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς.

² *Leb. Jes.* III. iv. § 137.

has proved itself the most potent of all factors in the shaping of history, despite that surest of moral laws that falsehood is ever weak and evanescent, and it is truth that is mighty and prevails.

And an attentive scrutiny of the evangelic narratives discovers order amid their chaos and a firm foothold for faith. It is a remarkable fact and in truth the clue to the solution of the problem, that when the Synoptists came to tell the story of the Resurrection, they parted company with the Evangelic Tradition, "that fairest memorial," as Weizsäcker terms it, "which the primitive Christian community has raised for itself."¹ Up to that point they had employed "the Fair Deposit" (1 Tim. i. 14) as their staple material; allowing themselves indeed a large measure of editorial freedom in the manipulation of it, yet so faithfully reproducing it that their narratives exhibit an almost verbal agreement and may be arranged in parallel columns. A glance at Tischendorf's *Synopsis Evangelica* reveals that the common Tradition begins with the advent of the Baptist and ends with the Crucifixion, comprehending, that is, the active ministry of our Lord; and thus it appears that for their narratives of the two supreme events of our Lord's Birth and His Resurrection the Synoptic Evangelists—i.e. the redactor of Matthew's Aramaic Book of Logia, Mark the interpreter of Peter, and Luke the companion of Paul, none of them eye-witnesses—had to fall back upon other sources of information.

The failure of the Tradition just where its testimony is most needful is matter for profound regret. Let it be distinctly understood that, whatever it may mean, it does not mean that the Apostles knew nothing of the Resurrection or had any doubt about it. It is absolutely certain that they believed it and that it was the burden of their preaching. For Paul it was the supreme fact, the very

¹ See EXPOSITION, July 1901, pp. 16-28.

foundation of the Faith; and at the commencement of his ministry he had a conference with the Apostles, the men who had been with Jesus, and laid his Gospel before them, and in after days he publicly claimed that they had approved it (Gal. i. 18—ii. 9). Why then is the Resurrection omitted from the Apostolic Tradition? In regard to the omission of the Lord's Birth and the Silent Years it is enough to say that the Apostles included in the Tradition only what they had themselves seen and heard; but they had been witnesses of the Resurrection.

There are two considerations which go some way toward a solution. One is that, when the Tradition took shape, the wonder of the Resurrection was at its height. The purpose of the Tradition was to prevent the facts of the Lord's ministry from being forgotten or distorted; but the Resurrection was an amazing and overwhelming fact which had happened but yesterday and was fresh in every mind. The very fact that it was deemed needless to record it is an evidence of its notoriety and certainty. And it was deemed all the more needless forasmuch as the Lord's Return was believed to be imminent. It was enough, the Apostles thought, to proclaim the fact that He had risen and keep His words and works fresh and clear in remembrance. Again, it is remarkable, though in no wise inexplicable, that the Apostles always speak with a certain reticence about the Resurrection. They proclaim the fact but they refrain from entering into particulars. As time went on and still the Lord did not return, John, the last living eye-witness, yielded to the importunities of the believers and wrote the wondrous story.¹

“Imminent was the outcry ‘Save our Christ!’
Whereon I stated much of the Lord's life
Forgotten or misdelivered, and let it work.”

Yet even John hesitated when he came to speak of the

¹ Eus. *H. E.* iii. 24.

Resurrection. The twenty-first chapter of his Gospel is an after-thought, a subsequent addition. He stopped when he had told what happened in Jerusalem during the first week. Here he ended his Gospel, and it was probably not only the importunities of the Ephesian elders but a desire to silence the wild story which had got abroad regarding himself (xxi. 23), that moved him to take up his pen again and reveal what had happened at the Sea of Galilee. In truth it is no marvel that the Apostles should have observed such reticence. The story was too sacred to be divulged. The Risen Lord had manifested Himself unto them and not unto the world, and they remembered His word, "Keep the mysteries for Me and for the sons of My house."¹

When the Synoptists took in hand the task of writing their Gospels, they laboured under this disadvantage, that the Apostles had dispersed in prosecution of their missionary labours and were inaccessible for inquiry and consultation. In the Oral Tradition, so far as it went, they had an amplitude of trustworthy material; but it stopped short with the Crucifixion, and for the episode of the Resurrection they had to be content with such information as they could glean among the believers. Vague talk was all that they had to go upon, and from the fact that their narratives comprise hardly anything beyond the visit of the women to the Sepulchre, it is a fair inference that they learned only what the women had divulged. And this meagre information would be distorted at once by the excitement of the moment (cf. Matt. xxviii. 8; Mark xvi. 8) and by the subsequent process of transmission from mouth to mouth.

Luke pushed his inquiries further than his predecessors (i. 1-4), and his diligent research has rescued from oblivion that story of what befell Cleopas and his nameless companion

¹ Clem. Rom. *Hom.* xix. § 20: μεμνήμεθα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου ὡς ἐντελλόμενος εἶπεν ἡμῖν· τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 10, § 63,

on the road to Emmaus. The story carries its own credentials. It shines amid its surroundings like a gem in a heap of dust. It is likely that Luke, in the prosecution of his inquiries, got it from the lips of Cleopas, and the Greek name of the latter—Cleopas being short for Cleopatros¹ and quite unconnected with Clopas (John xix. 25)—suggests that he belonged to the circle of Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward. Throughout his narrative there is evidence of a close intimacy between Luke and this circle of believers.

There are thus three distinct strata of evangelic testimony to the Resurrection: the vague talk reported by the Synoptists (Matt. xxviii. 1-10, 16-20; Mark xvi. 1-8; Luke xxiii. 56-xxiv. 11 [12], 36-53); that exquisite story which Luke's research has rescued from oblivion (xxiv. 13-35); and the clear and full narrative of John (xx.-xxi.) Each has its peculiar value. The Synoptic traditions are from their very nature worthless as history, yet they constitute a testimony of no little weight to the fact of the Resurrection. They prove that it was universally recognized and was much on the lips of the rank and file of the believers. And, moreover, loose and inaccurate as they may be, they are never very far from the truth. They are in every case vague reports, distorted versions of actual occurrences. The Lucan passage and the Johannine narrative stand out clear and strong, and the more closely they are scrutinized, the more convincingly do they assert their title to historicity. There is at least one point where they are linked together and undesignedly attest each other. "And," says one of the wayfarers to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 24), "certain of our company went away to the sepulchre, and found it even as the women said." While this is a plain contradiction not only of the accounts of Matthew (xxviii. 8-9) and Mark (xvi. 8) but of Luke's own previous statement (xxiv. 11), it entirely agrees with John's narrative (xx. 3-10).

¹ Cf. Antipas = Antipatros.

As soon as the true character of the Synoptic narratives is recognized, the history of the Resurrection is disencumbered of several bewildering accretions and assumes a distinct and harmonious shape. It is a subordinate yet by no means unimportant gain that the real errand of the women—if there were indeed others besides Mary—to the Sepulchre stands revealed. It is impossible that they should have gone, according to the confused traditions of Mark and Luke, to embalm the Lord's body. There was no need for them to perform that rite of reverence. It had already, according to John (xix. 39-40), been performed with lavish hands by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa, who had been "disciples but secret ones for fear of the Jews" and thought to make amends for their cowardice by this tardy homage; and all the Synoptists agree that the women had witnessed the burial. The body had already been embalmed, and they knew it. Moreover, it had lain over thirty hours in the Sepulchre ere they went thither, and in that sultry climate the process of decomposition must already have set in. The Synoptists know nothing of the embalming by Nicodemus and Joseph, and the anointing by the women is the loose version thereof which had reached the ears of Mark and Luke. The fact is that it was not at all to embalm the body that the women went to the Sepulchre, but, as John implies and Matthew expressly alleges, to see the Sepulchre. In that sultry climate, where immediate interment was necessary, it sometimes happened that a trance was mistaken for death, and the buried man revived in his sepulchre. And thus the idea had arisen that for three days after death the soul hovered round the tomb loath to forsake its tenement of clay, and during the three days the mourners cherished the hope that it might resume its tenancy, and visited the sepulchre from time to time to see if their dead had awoke. But when three days had elapsed and they saw the face disfigured by corruption, they abandoned their

hope.¹ The women went to the Sepulchre, not to embalm the Lord's body, but, according to Jewish custom, to see if haply He had come to life again.

There is, however, a still greater gain which results from a perception of the real nature of the Synoptic traditions. These traditions represent Jesus as performing with His resurrection-body, "the body of His glory," the same carnal functions which He had performed while He wore "the body of His humiliation." It appears indeed that to those to whom He manifested Himself, the Lord's body was not only visible but tangible (cf. John xx. 27),² and it is abstractly conceivable that when, according to Matthew, the women met Him as they hastened from the Sepulchre, they should have laid hold on His feet. The objection is that in what is doubtless the true version of this incident (John xx. 11-18), when Mary Magdalene would have laid hold on Him, Jesus forbade her. "Do not cling to Me," He said, not, obviously, because He was impalpable, but because He would fain dissipate Mary's delusion that He would henceforth abide with His disciples. He had not returned to stay. She must not imagine that the old relationship would be resumed. "Do not cling to Me; for I have not yet ascended unto the Father."

It is, however, wholly different when Luke represents Jesus as eating in the presence of the disciples (xxiv. 41-43). Though this is mysterious ground, it may without presumption be held as certain that the spiritual body no longer

¹ See Lightfoot and Wetstein on John xi. 39. *Beresh. Rabb.* 114. 3 "Tribus diebus anima vagatur circa sepulchrum, exspectans ut redeat in corpus. Cum vero videt quod immutatur aspectus faciei recedit et relinquit corpus." *Mass. Sem.* 8: "Historia: Inviserunt quendam, atque ille revixit, vixitque viginti quinque annos et postea est mortuus. Alterumque qui revixit et genuit quinque filios, et postea obiit."

² Contrast a curious tradition in Clem. Alex. *Adumbr. in Ep. Joan.* i. (Dindorf's ed. iii. p. 485): "Fertur ergo in traditionibus, quoniam Joannes ipsum corpus quod erat extrinsecus tangens, manum suam in profunda misisse et ei duritiam carnis nullo modo reluctatam esse, sed locum manui præbuisse discipuli."

performs the gross functions of the flesh. "In Heaven," according to our Lord's express declaration, "they neither marry nor are given in marriage"; and it is inconceivable that He should have carried to Heaven a body which needed food, and no less inconceivable that such a body should have been capable of passing through closed doors (John xx. 19, 26; cf. Luke xxiv. 36).

In this connexion two theories have been advanced with a harmonistic tendency. One is the blunt and obvious notion that when Jesus took the broiled fish and ate it in presence of the disciples, He acted *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*. He ate supernaturally, and the miracle was designed to establish the disciples' faith and assure them of the reality of His presence.¹ The other theory, modern and more subtle, is that betwixt the Resurrection and the Ascension the Lord's body underwent a process of sublimation. It was "in a state of transition and change, upon the boundary of both worlds, and possessed the impress or character both of this world and of the next."² It were indeed conceivable that there should have been such a process, gradually purifying His body of fleshly qualities and advancing it to a glorified condition, but it is difficult to conceive the possibility of His body being at the self-same stage so sublimated that it could pass through closed doors and so gross that it required food (John xx. 19-25; Luke xxiv. 36-43).

Nor is it necessary to maintain a position so embarrassing and, if the epithet may be employed without impropriety, so grotesque. Only in one place (Luke xxiv. 41-43) is it alleged that the Risen Lord ate, and the passage is simply

¹ Euth. Zig.: οὐχ ὡς ἔτι δεόμενος τροφῆς ἀλλὰ πρὸς πλείονα πίστιν καὶ βεβαιότεραν ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν φάσμα. Ὡσπερ δὲ ὑπερφυῶς ἔφαγεν, οὕτω καὶ ὑπερφυῶς ἀνάλωσεν ἅπερ ἔφαγε. Cf. Joan. Damasc. *De Fid. Orth.* iv. 1.

² Martensen, *Chr. Dogm.* § 172. This theory was anticipated by Origen. *C. Cels.* ii. 62: καὶ ἦν γε μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ ὡσπερὶ ἐν μεθορίῳ τιῶ τῆς παχύτητος τῆς πρὸ τοῦ πάθους σώματος καὶ τοῦ γυμνῆν τοιοῦτου σώματος φαίνεσθαι ψυχῆν.

an unhistorical tradition. It occurs in Luke's narrative of that appearance to the disciples in their lodging at Jerusalem which John also records. It is absent from John's narrative, and is obviously a faint echo of the incident by the Sea of Galilee (cf. John xxi. 5, 9, 13). It is remarkable that alike in the Lucan narrative of the supper at Emmaus and in the Johannine narrative of the breakfast on the shore of the Lake it is plainly implied that, while He gave food to His disciples, Jesus Himself took none (Luke xxiv. 30; John xxi. 12, 13).

In his narrative of the appearance to the disciples at Jerusalem on the evening of the Resurrection-day Luke has introduced a singular sentence which is absent from the parallel narrative of John. "Handle Me," Jesus is represented as saying, "and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold Me having" (Luke xxiv. 39). Ignatius quotes the saying in a similar though less gross form: "I know and believe that even after the Resurrection He was in flesh. And when He came to Peter and his companions, He said to them, '*Grasp, handle Me and see; for I am not a bodiless daemon.*' And straightway they touched Him and believed, being mingled with His flesh and spirit. . . . And after the Resurrection He ate and drank with them as fleshly, though spiritually united to the Father."¹ Jerome says² that Ignatius quoted the saying from the apocryphal *Gospel of the Hebrews*, and this fact indicates its true character. It is simply one of the unhistorical traditions which floated about the primitive Church. It reached Luke, ever watchful for fresh material, and he incorporated it in his Gospel, inserting it in what he judged a suitable place. It may be that Paul had heard this tradition which represents the Risen Lord as saying, "A spirit

¹ *Ep. ad Smyrn.* iii. λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με και ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἄσώματον.

² *Script. Eccles.* under Ignatius.

hath not flesh and bones as ye behold Me having," and had it in his mind when he wrote (1 Cor. xv. 50): "This I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Luke's is indeed the Pauline Gospel, yet his acceptance of a tradition so alien from Paul's fundamental conception of the Person of Christ evinces his independence. He was no mere echo of his master and friend.

DAVID SMITH.

THE VALUE-JUDGEMENTS OF RELIGION.

II.

CRITICAL AND CONSTRUCTIVE (*continued*).

II. *The Relation of Religious Knowledge to Science and Philosophy.*

(1) HAVING discussed the theory of value-judgements, as presented by Ritschl, Herrmann, and Kaftan, as developed more fully by Otto Ritschl, Reischle, and Scheibe, as criticized by Denney, Orr, and Wenley, and having indicated wherein the theory seems still defective, I may now venture to deal briefly with the problem to the solution of which this theory is a contribution. What is the relation of religious knowledge to science and philosophy? That this question is being asked at all is a proof that there is a rift in our intellectual lute which makes the music of a harmonious view of God, man, and the world mute. That there is a discord felt in human thought on the highest themes, and that an escape from it is desired by our finest minds is proved by such lines as Tennyson's:

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
 But more of reverence in us dwell;
 That mind and soul, according well,
 May make one music as before."