

the pictured face of Jesus in the hands of the woman cured of the flux is to be sought in the mythic association of the planetary Venus-Astarte-Baaltis and the solar head of Adonis-Baal, otherwise Belus or Bel.

THE GOSPEL ACCOUNTS OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY WM. WEBER.

IN order to establish the facts of the resurrection of Jesus, one must ascertain first of all the composition, mutual dependence, and, if possible, the date of the accounts of the resurrection, handed down to us in the Gospels. It is, as a matter of course, also necessary to understand and appreciate the true meaning of the statements and information contained in those narratives. Our investigation may be confined to five of them. The first is the well-known story of the Roman soldiers watching the grave of Jesus. The other four are the different versions of the pericope of the women who visited the tomb on Easter morning.

There are other narratives, closely connected with the resurrection, as "The Interview on the Way to Emmaus" and "The Appearance in Jerusalem" in the third Gospel, as well as "The Appearance in Jerusalem," "The Thomas Episode," and "The Appearance at the Sea of Tiberias" in the fourth. Likewise the accounts of the ascension belong to the same group of documents. However, they are in a class by themselves and may be treated separately under the title "Manifestations of the Risen Jesus."

Properly speaking, not even the first-named accounts furnish us with a direct and complete story of the resurrection. Still, the one comes very near doing so; and the others relate events following more closely upon the resurrection than anything else found in the Gospels. We may be permitted for that reason to call them "The Resurrection Accounts."

The pericope of "The Guarded Grave" is really the only report of the resurrection the Gospels contain. It is separated at present into two parts, Matt. xxvii. 62-xxviii. 1a and 2-4, and xxviii. 11-15; and is interwoven with the pericope of "The Women at the Tomb." It occurs only in the first Gospel, whereas the visit of the women at the tomb is told in all four Gospels. Accordingly, the Guarded Grave account cannot belong to the Synoptic source nor to what we may name the Diatessaron source. Consequently, it must be

originally quite independent of the pericope of the Women at the Tomb. That is to say, the passage Matt. xxvii. 62-xxviii. 15 cannot form one integral whole, but consists of, at least, two heterogeneous parts.

The very first half of Matt. xxviii. 1 corroborates this impression. It reads in the American Revised Version: "Late on the Sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." That translation is certainly wrong. As the Jewish day closed about 6 p. m., "late on the Sabbath day" near the vernal equinox can mean only "about six o'clock Saturday night." The Greek word of our text, rendered "late," is employed in the Septuagint for a Hebrew noun signifying "evening." The English clause: "as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," can signify only "Sunday morning," or, more distinctly, "six o'clock Sunday morning." But as a matter of fact, the Greek verb, supposed to mean "begin to dawn," stands for a Hebrew verb which signifies "begin to shine" and which refers not only to the sun, but also to the moon and the stars. The Jewish day, as we have to bear in mind constantly, begins and ends in the evening; and lacking timepieces, the first star appearing in the evening sky announced to the Jews the change from one day to another. To express that idea and fact, we may translate the above-quoted temporal clause: "as the star ushered in the first day of the week." That, of course, means at the season of the Passover "about six o'clock Saturday night"; but it implies in addition the idea that the Sabbath had just become a thing of the past. The author uses both nearly synonymous expressions of time in order to emphasize that what he is about to tell came to pass immediately after the Jewish first day of the week had begun.

That, however, is not the time at which the women visited the tomb. For they went there Sunday morning at sunrise, cp. Mark xvi. 2—"at early dawn," that is, early Sunday morning, Luke xxiv. 1, "early while it was yet dark," John xx. 1. Besides, Mark xvi. 1 informs us that the women bought spices Saturday night after six o'clock, "when the Sabbath was past." So there is no room left for doubt as to the time when the women of the Synoptic or Diatessaron pericope went to the tomb of Jesus. Hence, Matt. xxviii. 1a and 1b do not agree with one another. Either the definition of time or the introduction of the two women interrupts the context, which means, either the first or second half of verse 1 is an interpolation and as such to be assigned to the editor of the Gospel or the compiler of its closing section.

Looking now at verses 2ff, forgetting for a moment what has just been said, we learn there that Mary Magdalene and her companion arrived at the tomb exactly at the moment when Jesus was raised from the dead. To be quite correct, they certainly were there when the earthquake shook the ground, when the angel of the Lord came down from Heaven, removed the stone which closed the door of the grave, and took his seat upon it. But that is not less at odds with the parallel accounts than the time. The statements of all the other Gospels are clear and unequivocal. The women came to the grave, not before but after the resurrection; they found at their arrival the stone rolled away from the opening of the tomb; and they met one angel, or two, not outside, seated on the stone, but within the chamber of the tomb. This second discrepancy between the Matthew version of the pericope of the Women at the Tomb in its present position and the testimony of all the parallel versions, confirms that Matt. xxviii. 1b interrupts the original connection existing between Matt. xxviii. 1a and 2ff. In other words, the sentence: "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the grave," is an interpolation.

A third characteristic feature which excludes the presence of the women at the events related in verses 2-4 is the fact that, according to verses 5-8, the women were not affected at all by the appearance of the angel of the Lord. If they had been present, they would have shared the fate of the watchers and become unconscious. This point, however, will be made clearer later on.

The mutual independence of the two pericopes is, furthermore, confirmed by the two different terms employed to denote the place where Jesus was buried. I have rendered them by the nouns "tomb" and "grave" respectively. Coming in verse 1b upon the term "grave" whereas we should expect the word "tomb," we are compelled to ascribe the sentence, known to stand in the wrong place, to the editor or compiler who attempted to weld two entirely different stories into one narrative. For it is absolutely impossible to consider verse 1b as the original introduction to verses 5-8. Moreover, the names of the women who visit the tomb agree in none of the four Gospels; therefore, those names were not given in the common source.

On the other hand, verses 2-4 can be united readily with verse 1a. Only the two little words "and behold" which now connect verse 2 with verse 1b have to be dropped. Thus our passage read originally: "In the evening of the Sabbath, as the evening star ushered in the first day of the week, there was a great earthquake.

For the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for the fear of him the watchers did quake and became as dead men."

This passage is continued and concluded in verses 11-15. There, however, the clause "but as they were going" and the word "behold" belong to the compiler who inserted not only verse 1b but also verses 5-10 into the account of the Guarded Grave. He was forced, however, to eliminate a short statement to the effect that the guards awoke from their trance and found the grave empty. The exclamation "behold" in verse 2 is possibly part of the original text and may be intended to call attention to the suddenness and unexpectedness of the earthquake. But in verse 11 the word can hardly be accounted for. I am thus inclined to ascribe it in both instances to the editor because the narrative of the Guarded Grave is told in a plain and straightforward manner and is free from mere expletives.

One more passage requires an explanation. The account opens with the statement: "On the morrow which is after preparation." That such a paraphrase is out of place and uncalled for has been felt long ago. The text might read: "On the morrow which is the Sabbath." We cannot assume the author to have been unfamiliar with the expression "Sabbath." For he actually uses it in xxviii. 1. The strange wording can be explained in my opinion only as follows. The immediately preceding Joseph of Arimathæa pericope must have contained the word "preparation" even after the account of the Guarded Grave had been added to the first Gospel. Some commentator who was not quite certain what "preparation" really signifies, inserted the relative clause stating that the morrow is the day after "preparation." Later on, by some accident, the word "preparation" dropped out of the Joseph of Arimathæa pericope and was never replaced.

The pericope of the Guarded Grave is an exceptionally well-written story. The sentences, although abounding in participial constructions and containing subordinate clauses, are distinguished by clearness and fluency. The author was fully aware of what he wanted to tell and what he had to leave untold. He must have been tempted to relate what happened after the angel of the Lord had removed the stone and to describe how Jesus, attended by angels, came forth from the grave. But he wisely refrained from doing so, for, as he realized, the only witnesses of the resurrection were Roman soldiers, and they had fallen into a deathlike trance at the

sight of the angel of the Lord. The latter term is used very likely in its Old Testament sense and denotes a self-manifestation of Yahweh. The Old Testament teaches that no human being, whether saint or sinner, can see God and live. Even Moses could behold only the back of God (Ex. xxxiii. 18-23). The appearance of ordinary angels did not affect mortals in such a manner. That is demonstrated, for instance, also by the angel, or angels, who announced the Easter message to the women. Hence, I feel compelled to substitute "the angel of the Lord" for the usual translation "an angel of the Lord." In the Old Testament, at least "according to the general grammatical rules, the rendering 'an angel of the Lord' is inaccurate." The raising of Jesus required the presence of God Himself. That is also indicated by the earthquake.

As our pericope is found only in the first Gospel, it cannot have been derived from the sources which were at the disposal of the Synoptists or of all four Evangelists. That again implies that there cannot have existed many copies of our pericope at the time when it was embodied into the first Gospel nor does it seem that those few copies were distributed over a large area. Of course, any Evangelist may have rejected certain documents pretending to contain information concerning Jesus, because he judged them to be spurious or apocryphal. But I fail to see how any of the early Christians could take exception to our narrative. Consequently, we cannot escape the conclusion either that Matthew had got possession of the only copy in existence or that he lived in a district where alone such copies were in circulation. Our pericope must, therefore, have been of very recent origin at the time when it was added to the first Gospel.

This conclusion, suggested by general considerations, is confirmed directly by our narrative. It closes with the statement: "And this saying was spread among the Jews until this day." Unless we decide that we must regard this sentence as an interpolation, it implies that a considerable interval of time had elapsed between the event related and the writing of our account of it. The text does not betray the least trace of having been tampered with. The length of that interval cannot be determined from our pericope. It may have amounted to a hundred years or more. But it may be possible to arrive at an approximate date, provided we determine when the Jews first began to accuse the Christians of having stolen the corpse of Jesus in order to prove their claim that he had risen from the dead.

Apparently, the Jews might have begun to spread that story as

soon as the Christians commenced to preach the message of the resurrection. But, as a matter of fact, they did not do so; at least, the New Testament does not refer to that charge except in our pericope. During the apostolic age, the Jewish opponents of the religion of Jesus had no chance of calling the Christians grave-robbers. For whenever the latter bore witness to the resurrection they never mentioned the open and empty tomb. They stated simply they knew Jesus had risen from the dead because they had seen him alive after his death and burial. Moreover—and this is the most important and significant part of their testimony—they had seen him in the state and condition not of resuscitated mortality but of heavenly glory as the recognized Son of God. One must always remember that the first Christians did not merely believe that Jesus in some way became alive again after he had been buried for a while, but that Jesus, by what they called his resurrection, entered upon the life everlasting. St. Paul formulates that idea as follows: "Christ being raised from death dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him" (Rom. vi. 9). We may quote also 1 Peter i. 21: "God raised him from the dead and gave him glory." Acts xiii. 30f likewise supports this assertion: "God raised him from the dead. And he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people." Furthermore, 1 Cor. xv. 4ff and many other passages may be compared. The Easter faith of the first disciples was not based on such an unreliable and, at the best, purely negative proof as the empty tomb might have furnished. They relied on the direct and uncontroverted testimony of their own senses. Such a faith could not be attacked and shaken by any silly explanation how the tomb chanced to be found open and empty; and evidently no attempt along that line of attack was ever made as long as the first disciples were living.

The first Christian writer who speaks of the Jewish calumny that the disciples stole the body of Jesus at night is Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (108). This apologist died probably about 163 A.D. The next of the Fathers who refers to it is Tertullian, who died about 230 A.D. (*De Spec.*, 30). From these dates we may infer that the special brand of Jewish polemics mentioned in our pericope, arose during the first half of the second century of our era. Justin says among other things: "You have sent selected men over the whole earth who preach that a certain impious and lawless sect has been founded by a certain deceiver, Jesus of Galilee, and although his disciples had stolen him at night

after he had been crucified by us from the tomb where he had been laid after he had been taken off the cross, people have been deceived by them saying he had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven." Tertullian merely says: "This is he whom his disciples secretly stole away or the gardener took away that his lettuces might not be injured by the crowds of visitors." A comparison of the two quotations shows that the controversy was at its height at the time when Justin wrote his *Dialogue*. That is to say, Justin beheld the rising of the very crest of the tidal wave of Jewish calumny sweeping the earth while Tertullian lived to witness its ebbing out. The first saw the beginning, the second the end of that movement.

The question whether Justin was acquainted with the pericope of the Guarded Tomb is easily answered. He does not refer to it. To be sure, he uses the term "deceiver of the people" (69), and "deceiver" (108), which occurs also Matt. xxvii. 63. But in all these cases the term is quoted as the opprobrious epithet applied by the Jews to Jesus. The Jewish calumny is the common source of the Evangelist and the apologist.

The date at which the Jews started on their ecumenical campaign against the Christian belief in the resurrection of Jesus may also be fixed by approaching the problem from another side. The first generation of Christians, as we have learned, abstained from calling attention to the empty tomb for the purpose of demonstrating the truth of their Easter faith. That argument characterizes unmistakably the age of epigones. The living faith, based on personal and, therefore, unassailable evidence was changing rapidly into a belief in doctrines which it was deemed necessary to prop by external evidence. Such evidence in the case of the resurrection was afforded, as they imagined, by the open and empty tomb. But the eye of a bitter antagonist is sharp in detecting weak spots in the armor of his opponent. So the Jews were quick to attack and tear to pieces the external evidence offered in proof of a spiritual truth. They were indeed far from making good their specific charge; in their passionate zeal they overshot the mark. But it is to be admitted that the open and empty grave does not and cannot establish the fact of the resurrection, because it admits of other reasonable explanations.

The foregoing, seemingly far-fetched discussion is closely connected with our narrative. For the latter was doubtless written to reduce to absurdity the Jewish lie as to the clandestine removal of the body of Jesus by his disciples. It is from that view-point

a very masterpiece of apologetic literature. The author does not argue his case. He simply tells how the chief priests and Pharisees, the leading men of the Jewish nation, took effective measures to prevent the disciples from stealing the body of their master. They had the grave sealed and guarded by Roman soldiers, who would have made short shrift with any suspicious persons approaching them. But the angel of the Lord Himself rolled the stone from the door of the grave and left the soldiers like dead. When they recovered their senses and found the grave open and empty, they made haste to report their strange experience to the chief priests and elders, and these wicked men bribed them to tell the people that the disciples stole the body while they were asleep.

The pericope of the Guarded Grave must therefore have been composed in the course of the first half of the second century about the time when Justin Martyr composed his *Dialogue*. The author evidently had realized the utter futility of all attempts to overcome a wicked lie by arguing against it. He rather preferred to tell a story which, on the one hand, confirmed the Christian belief that the grave had been opened and Jesus raised from the dead by God Himself, and, on the other hand, branded the new Jewish attack upon that belief as an old lie, invented by the very murderers of Jesus.

Of course, if our pericope was not written before the middle or end of the first half of the second century, it cannot have been inserted into the first Gospel before that time. That fact would not imply by any means that everything contained in that Gospel originated at such a late date. All our Gospels hand down to us authentic material of undoubtedly apostolic origin. Eye-witnesses, able to wield the pen, recorded very early what they knew about Jesus. The number of personal disciples, however, being rather small (cp. 1 Cor. xv. 6 and Acts i. 15), there can have been only a few of such authors. So far I have discovered only two. Other sections of the Gospels go back to persons of the second generation who put down in writing what they had heard from eye-witnesses. Still other portions belong to authors who, being farther removed from the events they were interested in, wrote what they thought had occurred or ought to have occurred. These different elements were combined by and by into larger collections till, at last, the Gospels were complete in their present shape and scope, that is, till new additions, except mere glosses, by writers of the third class together with additions even from the first two classes were forever excluded.

Before closing this chapter, it may be advisable to state once more at what time the resurrection took place. According to the distinct testimony of the pericope of the Guarded Grave, Jesus was raised from the dead shortly after six o'clock Saturday night, within the first hour of the first day of the week.

Each of the four Gospels contains a version of the Women at the Tomb. In Matthew it consists only of the message of the angel (xxviii. 5-8). The latter is almost identical with the corresponding angel message in Mark (xvi. 6-7). In Westcott and Hort's edition of the New Testament in Greek, the passage comprises in both cases five lines of text. The statements given are almost literally the same. Therefore, the first two versions of the Easter message are derived without doubt from a common source. Slight verbal differences and additions prove, however, that the text of the first Gospel has not simply been copied from that of the second. From a purely literary view-point, the Mark text must be considered as superior to that of Matthew.

In the second Gospel the angel message is preceded by an introduction, occupying seven lines of Greek text (Mark xvi. 2-5). The Matthew pericope does not contain any equivalent. That strange phenomenon may be accounted for in two ways. Either the compiler who combined the story of the Women at the Tomb with that of the Guarded Grave omitted that part of his source on purpose. In that case, it must have resembled the corresponding passage in Mark in about the same degree as the angel messages are like each other. Or the manuscript which the compiler copied contained only the angel message without any introduction.

In the first case, the compiler must have regarded Matt. xxviii. 1-4 as a much better introduction than the one presented by his source. But Matt. xxviii. 1b is, as we have seen, an editorial interpolation and interrupts the narrative of the Guarded Tomb. Without that sentence, however, which was inserted by the same hand which put the angel message in its present place, it is impossible to understand how Matt. xxviii. 1a and 2-4 could ever have been supposed to introduce xxviii. 5-8. It cannot be explained why the compiler should have thrown away the first half of his manuscript only to force the remaining half into a context where it does not belong. For he could have left the story of the Guarded Grave just as he found it and added the pericope of the Women at the Tomb to it in its unabridged form. For the first narrative treats of an event which happened shortly after six o'clock Saturday

evening, whereas the second occurrence took place twelve hours later, about six o'clock Sunday morning.

The names of the women who went to the tomb are not the same in the different Gospels, as has been mentioned before. Neither do our four versions agree as to their number. Moreover, the women visit the tomb for different purposes. Matthew and evidently John send them thither simply as mourners; Mark and Luke to anoint the body of Jesus. All these observations lead to the conclusion that the source followed by the compiler of the first Gospel contained nothing but the Easter message without any introduction parallel to Mark xvi. 2-5.

That again may be explained in two ways. Either the first half of the manuscript copied by the editor had been lost or destroyed by some accident; or the angel message existed at the time when it was inserted in the first Gospel actually as a separate unit. Wright (*Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*) prints that message both in Matthew and Mark in the form of a verse. That is in my opinion the only acceptable solution of the problem presented by the Matthew text. For one should think the compiler, if his manuscript had been mutilated, would have noticed it and might have secured a better copy. There certainly existed more than one, as the example of the second Gospel demonstrates.

As soon, however, as we accept the second alternative, the question arises how the Easter message received its poetic form. The only answer is, it must have been used by the early Christians in their Easter services. That might suggest to us psalms and hymns sung or chanted by the congregation. But the parallel account in the third Gospel has preserved a prose version of the Easter message; and in all three Synoptic Gospels it is an angel or angels, not the congregation, who proclaim the message.

For these reasons, I venture to offer the following theory. The Christians had arranged, let us say, not very long after the beginning of the second century a special Easter morning service at which the visit of the women at the tomb was enacted in dramatic form. A tomblike structure was erected in the place of worship, and the congregation beheld some women, two or more, wending their way toward that tomb. In some churches, they would carry vessels supposed to contain ointment for anointing the body of Jesus. In other places they would go simply as mourners. Those who carried spices would stop shortly before they reached the sepulchre and ask each other, "Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb?" But all when face to face with the

tomb—perhaps a curtain was raised at that moment—would behold in the rays of the rising sun the stone removed, the grave open, and within it one or two angels in white garments and with shining faces. These would announce to the amazed and frightened women the Easter message as we find it in the Synoptic Gospels.

The whole congregation knew those words by heart, hearing them every year. By and by, the scene enacted in church would assume the form of a narrative such as we possess in the second Gospel. But the complete narrative succeeded the dramatized scene produced in the churches. That is indicated, in my opinion, at least by the Matthew version which contains only the Easter message. Also the Easter verse of the first Gospel is in my judgment older than that found in Mark. For such verses, being not the product of poetical inspiration, are as a rule rather clumsy at first but become more and more polished the longer they are used. Thus, the text of the first Gospel though in several respects inferior to that of the second Gospel, or just on that account, is the older of the two.

Under these circumstances, the pericope of the Women at the Tomb would have to be regarded as a poetical rather than a historical document. If it had been written shortly after the event itself by an eye-witness or an individual intimately acquainted with the eye-witnesses, there could be no doubt as to the identity of the women. As it is, the names given in the Gospels are mere guesses. In the dramatized Easter morning scene, women were represented as visiting the tomb. That was done for obvious reasons. In the first place, no man was known to have approached the tomb. The silence of the first two Gospels as to that fact is decisive. The attempts made in the other two Gospels to have Peter, or Peter and John, visit the tomb are interpolations, as will be proved later on. In the second place, it appears to be more natural for women than for men to seek consolation in going to the graves of their beloved ones.

Of course, neither the compiler of the Gospel nor any of their fellow-Christians doubted but that the dramatic representation as well as the narrative based thereon were authentic. They were sure that everything had actually happened just as they saw it in their miracle-play or read it in their books. The first disciples had not seen the grave or place where the body of their master was interred. They had not thought of ascertaining whether or not the body had disappeared from its resting-place. They had returned to Galilee, and there they had seen their risen master. Their belief

in his resurrection was first of all belief in his life everlasting. That belief was doubt-proof because it was based upon their personal knowledge and experience.

The pericope of the Women at the Tomb marks an important turning-point in the history of the religion of Jesus. It proves that the Christians at that time had commenced to confound belief in the life eternal of the crucified Jesus, which is of a spiritual nature, with belief in his coming forth from his tomb in his body, which is a material thing. That change was perhaps unavoidable; nevertheless, it was a change for the worse. It rendered Christianity very vulnerable.

The Jewish calumny, discussed above, which charged the disciples with the theft of the body of Jesus, must have been called forth by that change of faith on the part of the Christians. For as soon as they began to advance the argument of the empty tomb, the Jewish adversaries would naturally declare the empty tomb a fraud and a hoax. As the date when such attacks upon the Christians commenced is known, we also know the time when our pericope originated. For as cause and effect, they are bound closely together. The Joseph of Arimathæa episode must first have suggested the dramatized Easter morning scene. That scene, as presented in the churches, gave birth to the pericope of the Women at the Tomb. But when that narrative became the fundamental argument of the Christian missionaries among Jews and Gentiles, it was attacked must violently by the Jews. That controversy produced among the Christians, besides other things, the pericope of the Guarded Tomb.

The passage Matt. xxviii. 9-10 presents a very interesting problem. The closing words of verse 8: "They departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy and ran to bring his disciples word," are evidently the end of our story; and verse 16, where we are informed: "But the eleven disciples went to Galilee," is a perfectly satisfactory continuation of verse 8. For the angel had told the women (verse 7): "Lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall see him." We cannot understand why Jesus should appear to the women while they were on their way to carry the Easter message to the disciples as directed. For he only repeats the command of the angel in the rather insignificant words: "Fear not; go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me." Moreover, the words spoken by the angel leave no room for a special revelation of Jesus to the women in the neighborhood of the grave. Besides, the word "then" at the beginning of verse 10, instead of the usual coordinate conjunction "and," is

suspicious and indicates that verse 9 and verse 10 do not really belong to each other. Therefore, I prefer to consider Matt. xxviii. 9-10 as a parallel account to Matt. xxviii. 5-8, changed to some extent by the editor who put the two together. The principal difference is that in the one passage Jesus himself delivers the Easter message, while in the other an angel acts as his spokesman. Also the speech of the angel is more elaborate than the words uttered by Jesus. For that reason, Matt. xxviii. 9-10 represents an older tradition than Matt. xxviii. 5-8. Evidently, when the idea of the empty tomb first took hold upon the Christian mind, it was the risen Jesus himself who directed his disciples to go to Galilee. When the churches introduced the scene into their Easter services, they substituted one or two angels for Jesus. They may have had scruples as to the propriety of showing the risen Christ on the stage and judged an angel message to be just as convincing as the words of Jesus himself.

The Luke version of our pericope demands special attention. As far as the outline is concerned, it is closely related to the Mark version. But as soon as we enter upon details, the Luke account is found to be in a class by itself. The narrative consists of three parts. The introduction (xxiv. 1-5a) brings the women to the open tomb in which they find two angels. The main part (xxiv. 5b-7) contains the angel message. The conclusion (xxiv. 8-9 and 11) tells how the message was received by the disciples. It is superfluous to prove laboriously why verse 10 must be a gloss, for verse 11 is the direct and original continuation of verse 9. Verse 12 has been marked as an interpolation already by Westcott and Hort.

The main divergence between our pericope in the third and the first two Gospels is found in the angel message. The Luke message is innocent of any poetic aspirations whatever. As far as its contents are concerned, it has nothing in common with that of Matthew and Mark except the single word "seek." Only the first sentence: "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" betrays anything like a spark of originality such as we should expect from the mouth of angels, speaking about an absolutely unique event. The main part of the message consists only of words spoken by Jesus before his journey to Jerusalem.

Luke clearly has preserved for us the most primitive and, consequently, oldest form of the angel message. A comparison of the three Synoptic versions shows how that message has been improved gradually. Just because there existed no authentic account of the Easter morning scene and of the words spoken at that occasion, the Christians were satisfied at first with using words that Jesus

himself had pronounced at a former occasion. By and by, the Easter message was changed and improved until it became what we find in Mark. The men who had charge of the Easter play must have felt very early how little such words as used in Luke fitted into the situation. Luke, Matthew, and Mark stand therefore for three distinct stages of that development. Those three stages succeeded each other in the order named. Matthew adds to his account a most interesting specimen of a still older and more primitive attempt to describe the scene at the tomb.

The Johannine version is the most accomplished narrative of what happened on Easter morning which we possess. It is a story pure and simple of great artistic merit. It is no longer a groping attempt of transforming a dramatic scene into a narrative. It is, moreover, a story based upon a painstaking study of the material with which the Synoptic writers and other predecessors furnished the author. With a masterful hand, the latter disposed of the unhewn blocks he found just as he saw fit and proper. In other words, John xx. 1-18 is not another and independent version of the visit to the tomb but combines all the prominent features of his principal source, the first Gospel, in its present condition although he changes and modifies his prototype just as it suited his own ideas.

His work, however, has been disfigured by one extensive interpolation, namely, the passage xx. 2-10 which treats of a visit of the disciples Peter and John to the tomb. It has a curious parallel in Luke xxiv. 12 which is evidently based on the Johannine passage. Perhaps also the words "and Peter" (Mark xvi. 7), which are not supported by the Matthew text, are related to this Johannine interpolation.

The true character of John xx. 2-10 is readily recognized. Verse 2 Mary Magdalene is said to have run away from the open tomb in order to inform Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved of what she had discovered. Nothing is mentioned about her return to the tomb. Nevertheless, we find her in verse 11 standing at the tomb and weeping as if verse 2-10 did not exist. Another point of difference between the Mary Magdalene pericope and John xx. 2-10 consists in the fact that the two disciples saw no angel in the tomb when they entered it, whereas Mary Magdalene beheld two angels sitting there, "one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain" (verse 12). One might try to remove this discrepancy by claiming that angels could become visible and invisible at will. Peter and John did not see the angels because the latter

did not want to be seen by those men. They preferred to appear only to Mary Magdalene. But then, the two disciples noticed the linen cloths and the napkin in which the body of Jesus had been wrapped (John xx. 5-7); Mary Magdalene, on the other hand, did not see those things.

The outline of the Johannine story is traced easily. Mary Magdalene comes to the tomb of Jesus early Easter morning. She finds it open; the stone had been removed. After a while she stooped and looked into the tomb where she beheld two angels. After exchanging a few words with them, she meets Jesus himself.

The author introduces only Mary Magdalene because her name is the only one that is mentioned in all the other accounts. He may also have preferred one woman to more because the interview, as he describes it, excludes a larger number of witnesses. The open and empty tomb is common to all accounts. That Mary Magdalene speaks first with the angels and afterward with Jesus is a feature adopted from the first Gospel. But the Johannine writer has taken good care to avoid all the difficulties we observed in the Matthew passage. Of course, it might be said the number of angels pointed to Luke. But I believe the number of angels depended rather upon the locality where the author lived than upon documentary evidence. Where the angel was considered principally as the messenger, there would appear only one angel upon the scene. Where they were looked upon rather as attendants of the risen Jesus, two angels were preferred. The two angels in Luke are a kind of compromise or else indicate a stage of transition inasmuch as they are heralds and attendants at the same time. In John the angels have ceased to act as messengers. They guard simply the place where Jesus had lain and address the weeping Mary only with the sympathetic inquiry: "Woman, why weepest thou?"

The immediately following interview with Jesus is characterized likewise by the absence of everything which is out of place and superfluous. Neither the angels nor Jesus himself announces his resurrection. That message was the most important part of the Easter play. But it hardly fits into a written story. For the reader realizes at once that the mere fact of Jesus talking to Mary Magdalene while angels are present proves his resurrection and his heavenly life. However, after all the author follows in this respect only the precedent set by Matt. xxviii. 9-10.

The words "Touch me not!" (verse 17) refer in all probability directly to Matt. xxviii. 9 where we read: "And they came and took hold of his feet and worshiped him." The Johannine writer

very probably cherished a less materialistic conception of the body of the risen Jesus than the one he found expressed in his source. Thus he deemed it necessary to record his protest. The message which Jesus sends to his disciples deals, not with his resurrection, but with his ascension. "Go unto my brethren (cp. Matt. xxviii. 10), and say to them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." The meaning of these words, of course, is: I am going to share the heavenly glory of God.

The whole narrative, as separated from its later addition, contains only a single textual flaw, and that a slight one. The very last word should read "me" for "her." The Am. R. V. tries to smoothe away the uncalled-for transition from direct to indirect discourse by inserting the conjunction "that" and translating the simple past tense in Greek as if it were a pluperfect. A literal translation of the sentence under discussion would read: "I have seen the Lord, and this he said to her." The personal pronoun of the third person singular is too well attested to consider it as a corruption of the text. I am therefore inclined to see in the whole closing clause "and this he said to her" a gloss. The author avoids, as we have seen, all unnecessary words and statements. Mary Magdalene would report, as is self-evident, to the disciples every word Jesus had spoken. But some reader missed a direct statement to that effect. He added the final clause; but lacking imagination, he used the third instead of the first person of the personal pronoun.

This completes our examination of the parallel accounts which relate what took place at the tomb early Easter morning. The five accounts, found in the four Gospels, may be arranged according to their age in the following order: Matt. xxviii. 9-10; Luke xxiv. 1-9 and 11; Matt. xxviii. 5-8; Mark xvi. 2-8; and John xx. 1 and 11-18. In the oldest as well as in the youngest of them, Jesus appears in person; in the two others, angels act as his harbingers.

The statement that the tomb of Jesus had been found empty on the morning of the third day after his death, aroused violent resentment among the Jews about one hundred years after the death of Jesus. We must conclude from that fact that the story of the Women at the Tomb had just become known to the world at that time. The pericope of the Guarded Grave represents an excellent attempt to meet the storm of Jewish calumny. Since it was called forth thereby, it must have been written after its outbreak.

If these conclusions have to be accepted, all the passages discussed would be, at least, a whole century younger than the events they describe. For that reason, they could no longer be regarded

as authentic sources of the history of Jesus. They rather reflect the ideas of the Christians of the second century as to what might have occurred when Jesus was raised from the dead.

Still, these passages may contain some features and remarks which are derived from sound and authentic traditions. Perhaps that Jesus appeared to his disciples in Galilee, not at Jerusalem, as is stated expressly in the first two Gospels, may be a historical fact. Luke and John, including Acts, locate the appearance of Jesus at Jerusalem. Yet their versions of the pericope of the Women at the Tomb do not mention the Jewish capital. In so far, they do not contradict Matthew and Mark. However, anything beyond the mere mention of this problem exceeds the limits of the present investigation which reached its goal as soon as the different accounts of the resurrection preserved in the Gospels were clearly defined, explained, and dated.

MISCELLANEOUS.

"ARIMATHÆA."

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In "The Interment of Jesus" (*Open Court*, October, 1919) Mr. Wm. Weber says that scholars have been unable to locate Arimathæa in Palestine. As far as I know, scholars have quite unanimously identified the Greek *Arimathæa* of the Gospels with the *Armathaim* of the Septuaginta (1 Sam. i. 1, and repeatedly in 1 Sam.), for the Hebrew *Ramathaim*, with *ha*, the article, preceding (the *h* hardly sounded). The Syriac translation of the New Testament has *Remathea*. A *Ramathem* occurs also in 1 Macc. xi. 34.

The only question is whether the *Ramathaim* (a dual form for *Ramah*) in 1 Sam. is the same as *Ramah* (height) occurring otherwise in 1 Sam., mostly preceded by the article *ha*, as also the *Ramathem* in Macc. The Septuaginta in 1 Sam., by having *Armathaim* where the Hebrew has *Ramah*, identifies these two. Besides this, even if different towns were meant by *Armathaim* in the Septuaginta for the Hebrew *Ramathaim* in 1 Sam. i. 1; by *Ramah* in other places of 1 Sam.; and by the *Ramathem* in 1 Macc. xi. 34; all of them were either near Jerusalem, or in the hill country of Ephraim, and on the northern border of Judea, as the context in 1 Sam. and 1 Macc. xi. 34 shows.

After having written the above, I find that Josephus in *Ant.*, V, 342; VI, 47, 293 (Ed. Naber, 1895) has *Armatha* for the birthplace and home of Samuel, thus like the Septuaginta identifying it with *Ramah*.

A. KAMPMEIER.

IOWA CITY, IA.